

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2008-02/msg02366.html>

- *From:* finite guy <adamlewis@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 13 Feb 2008 21:22:25 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 14, 11:56 am, Dustan <DustanGro...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 13, 5:52 pm, finite guy <adamle...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Thanks for the decent reply.
Here we go again...

And irrelevant to the description of the circle. All that's needed to describe a circle is:
 $x^2 + y^2 = r^2$

Gee, I thought x and y were axial.
Are you saying they are not?

Well, when you look at it that way... Oh crap, this really does have no bearing on reality whatsoever. Errr... That was what you meant, right? Even though it's not true; calculus is an important application in physics.

Really...
what do "as $x \rightarrow$ " mean then... ?
and the inverse of that... ?

Ever heard of fractals? They are infinite in complexity but finite in size. They're mathematical concepts, NOT reality. Reality can only represent them to a certain extent. But the mathematical concept still exists. The fact that I'm talking about it proves that.

Fractals are a scaling issue.
And they go on infinitely reducing... according to the mathematical concept?

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

What if you 'start' at the minimum and fractal 'upwards'... to a finite degree?

Gee, same thing happens...

Who said that? I certainly don't believe it.

Fair enough – it was a generalisation.

Generally, we all use them... :-)

So you believe with certainty that space is finite – 'inward' and 'outward'?

By definition.

Your errant definitions are the problem...

that's what I have been saying.

Did you miss that?

You gotta start somewhere, otherwise you'll get nowhere. In this case, we're starting at the concept of points and sets of points, ie shapes (those sets, by the way, are, in the vast majority of cases, INFINITE).

The infinite DOESN'T START ANYWHERE or finish...

Without realising it you are muddling finite and infinite... again...

If I said, "(those sets, by the way, are, in the vast majority of cases, BLUE)", you would criticize.

But 'blue' is as much a 'number' as infinite.

Infinity is not a number.

Would COW also be as appropriate a description as infinite... ?

Mathematically impossible with the most commonly accepted premises.

Because you futilely try to infinitise the finite...

Your premise holds no promise... :-)

Do you even accept the existence of real numbers?

Yes, really...

Both rational and irrational ones.

They shouldn't try to be put on the same number line though.

That's been discussed previously.

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

I think it was 'Iwas?' who pointed out that that is correct.

Coincidentally, points are also a mathematical concept.

So is a line, a plane, a cube, etc.
Your point being... ?

For a good reason. In case you haven't noticed, math has a tendency to go on tangents completely unrelated to reality.

Yeah, and they are presumably based on the fundamentals... 1, 2, 3...
Why do they try to negate the fundamentals?
Oh, philosophy is why... not mathematics.
True... ?

No, sir, YOU are bound by reality. You're reality, to be exact, which exists only in your head.

Yes, sir. I am bound by reality as best I understand it.
But YOU are proudly not bound by reality...
Haven't you already said that... ?

And perpendicular, don't forget perpendicular.

I didn't. But thanks anyway.

On paper, yes. On your graphing calculator, yes. Conceptually, yes.
Mathematically, no, the actual relation (be it a line or a circle or a parabola or anything else) is not composed of successive points. If it were, then there would be a finite number of points. Which there isn't.

So, once again, you confirm your belief that finite is infinite...
This is the problem...
Is that getting through... ?

Ummm... What?

Sounded simple. Read it again.

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

Nope.

There is always hope...

What misconceptions? You mean of reality? Who claimed that any of this had anything to do with reality?

The one we have been discussing... oops, you can't hear it.
Infinitising the finite and flying off into non-reality.
The real question is:
Are YOU interested in reality since the foundations are built upon it... ?

Because that's how it works out. You can actually prove the theorem, you know.

Ha, ha, ha...
Why 'squares' was the question.
You are thinking that it is a 'square' relationship.
It isn't – it is an 'area' relationship, silly.
Is proved... is good... I agree.
It still has a misconception... squares...
Circle area is $\pi \cdot r^2$.
Gosh, that's not a square... is it?

Irrelevant and incorrect. The existence of Pythagorean triples has no bearing on the truth of the Pythagorean theorem.

Did I mention triplets?
The reason I mentioned Fermat is that a 'cube' is an extended 'square'.
And Fermat is correct – meaning that there is a problem for you to go from (1,1,1) to (2,2,2).
Thanks for the valid comment though.
BUT 'squares' have no bearing on the truth of the PT... do they... ?

Pythagorean $\Leftrightarrow E=mc^2$??? You're connecting this guy to someone over 2 millennia ahead of his time???

Come on.. this is a dumb statement...

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

Re: A SIMPLE CHALLENGE that you great Mathematicians won't answer...

Of course they are connected.

Bear in mind that Pythagoras was way ahead of BOTH YOU AND ME.

Are you superior to Pythagoras such that you might call him dumb-ass?

I think not...

I'm not going to argue with you anymore; it's obvious to me that you're not about to give up on your misconceptions. The fact that I have had a complete, logical and valid response to every one of your misconceptions doesn't seem to deter you.

My misconceptions are actually 're-conceptions'...

No one thinks that their held opinion is illogical or invalid.

As you can see above, you misconceive my misconceptions... :-)

Hopefully, you will reply.

If you do reply, please tell me why $E=mc^2$ is a planar equation in triangular form.

Regards.

Adam Lewis.

.