

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2009-05/msg01436.html>

- *From:* Martin Michael Musatov <marty.musatov@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 17 May 2009 16:52:07 EDT
-

<http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=3F1C3F01.7010501%40farir.com&oe=->
> UTF-8&output=plain

W. Dale Hall View profile
More options Jul 21 2003, 2:44 pm

Newsgroups: sci.math, sci.skeptic, alt.writing
From: "W. Dale Hall" <mailtodh...@xxxxxxxxxx>
Date: Mon, 21 Jul 2003 19:50:47 GMT
Local: Mon, Jul 21 2003 2:50 pm
Subject: Re: Reply from German editor about my paper
Reply to author | Forward | Print | View thread |
Show original | Report
this message | Find messages by this author
James Harris wrote:

Will Twentyman <wtwenty...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
message

<[news:3f1aa917\\$1_2@newsfeed](mailto:news:3f1aa917$1_2@newsfeed)>...

James Harris wrote:

... [P==NP] ...

I noticed a poster DID reply to this classic
example, but didn't point

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

out the obvious, possibly because the
assumption

is that everyone

knows why the argument is flawed. Now
someone

might call it a proof,

but it's clearly not, as a proof is correct.

That's easy to get

confused because you may hear people
talking about

proof, when they

have a *claim* of proof.

Most importantly, notice that a short, flawed
argument can be handled

by showing a break in the logical chain at a
single point.

Then why do you fail to address breaks in your
logical chain that others

have pointed out? Why do you fail to deal with the
counter-examples and

counter-proofs?

How am I supposed to answer those questions? If
you're right then I'm

someone who has deluded himself to the point I'm no
longer rational.

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ? 2

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

Having lost trust in my own mind, what would I have

left? Yet if

you're wrong, then what can I say in response?

You can state that the other person is wrong, and point out the error, as you're demanding of others [yet continue to evade the responses].

I, for one, have pointed out [and will do so again in this article] a point where your proof breaks down. I do not point out a statement that fails to follow from its predecessors in the argument, because your argument is so foggily written that virtually **every** statement fails to follow from those that precede it.

Rather than slog through a pile of eminently unreadable, ill-formulated pidgin-mathematical blathering, I point out where you make an incorrect statement. As you yourself will attest, a correct argument cannot (given consistency, which you are not addressing, nor do you have the knowledge to address) produce an incorrect result. Your result is demonstrably incorrect (as I point out), therefore your argument fails.

What I will say is that if you point to a single logical break in the chain, that is all that's necessary to sink a proof claim. So your questions are automatically suspicious with the claims of "counter-examples" and "counter-proofs".

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

That is one way to rebut an incorrect argument, but it is also sufficient to demonstrate that the argument produces an erroneous conclusion. You are doing yourself no service by evading that point, especially when the erroneous conclusion is one you promoted in your paper. That is important, since you cannot claim that someone else somehow mangled your argument to produce the error. If anyone understands that argument, it must be you, and if you produce errors in it, then no one else can be blamed for being somehow mis-interpreting what you say, or particularly inept at doing what you call "simple math".

To claim that my demonstration (that you have a false result) is somehow suspicious, or that anyone else's questions to you, based on that result, are suspicious, is unconscionable.

If you can't support your argument in a *particular* case, how then can you dare to claim that it holds *in general*?

For you to repeatedly state, "It's a correct argument, because no one has found the statement where it goes awry," is NOT a legitimate defense against a demonstration that your argument produces an erroneous result.

Now let's suppose that you believe what you're saying, and you're facing me, whom you must think is a deluded person, would you use your *best* most succinct evidence i.e. the "smoking gun" or would you try

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ? 4

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

to build a case?

Stop the posturing. This is not about a legal case,
this is not about
a commitment proceedings, this is about your
continuing parading of
a thoroughly discredited argument, with claims of its
being a new
result about algebraic integers. Given that you don't
even know what
a ring is, or what a polynomial is, or a variable,
for that matter,
why do you feel that your pitiful efforts have
exposed the sham
that you imagine mathematics to be? Maybe you've
exposed the sham that
mathematicians imagine you are?

If you're trying to convince others, you might

build a case, but why

bother if you have a smoking gun? If you have

videotape of a witness

shooting the victim, why bring in character

witnesses?

Whom is it that you imagine you're referring to?

Do you imagine that someone other than you needs any
convincing? From my
perspective, all this effort is directed towards
getting you to realize
that you're playing in a game where you refuse to
learn the rules, and
where you have no particular skills, aside from doing
prodigious amounts
of trivial calculations, and constructing text that
only you can
decipher. Why anyone would care to convince your
sorry self of the
error of your ways is at times a puzzle to me, but a
large part of this
is to stand up in the face of your incorrigible

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ? 5

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

arrogance and stupidity,
and to refuse to let the newsgroup be taken over by
such punks as
yourself.

If you have a victim giving a positive
identification of the
perpetrator, why worry about fingerprint evidence?

Why all the flailing about? Why not just say what you
mean?

In mathematics, the logical break in a "proof" is
THE smoking gun.

Idiot. Your proof is *all* logical break, punctuated
only by, well,
punctuation. There is no connected argument in your
paper, not one. The
closest you come (which is still laughably distant
from a good argument)
is the "Factorization Lemma", and that is either
trivially true:

Let g divide P . Then $g = r + c$, where c is a
 e c is a constant
and r may or may not not be a constant.

Or absolutely irrelevant; others have pointed out how
it is a crock,
and I won't be repeating their arguments. You've seen
them, but true
to your own no-class upbringing, consistently ignore
them.

It is irrefutable, and cannot be bridged or fixed.

No witness now

born, nor that will ever be born can stand against
it. And no

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ? 6

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

rational jury will ever rule against you once you
present it.

Back to pseudo-argument. Get off that soapbox before
you hurt yourself.

A flawed argument cannot stand on its own. That's
why it's flawed.

No, a flawed argument is flawed because it contains
errors. It cannot
stand on its own because those errors lead to more
errors.

Just like the error that I pointed out. Error. Yours.

You don't need to find another proof to duel with
it. You don't need
to attack the person finding the argument. You
don't need to argue
persuasively.

Can somebody say Amen, brother! Can I get a
Hallelujah? Glory be!

You present the logical break--the smoking gun.

That's mathematics.

Do you still deny that your argument is producing an
error?

If you have the evidence, present THE logical

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ? 7

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

break.

The evidence,

From the paper:

Therefore, with the factorization

$$65x^3 - 12x + 1 = (a_1x + 1)(a_2x + 1)(a_3x + 1)$$

one of the a's is coprime to 5, [...].

This does not follow from the preceding text [the whole earlier part of the paper].

Why not? Because it's false:

I have found common factors between the a's in the following factorization:

$$65x^3 - 12x + 1 = (a_1x + 1)(a_2x + 1)(a_3x + 1)$$

and the number 5. Those factors are algebraic integers and not units.

You claim, by virtue of your own apparently unassailable method of argument, that the a's are coprime to 5. Does your definition of coprime numbers allow for common factors between the numbers?

I have proposed that these polynomials

$$\begin{aligned}q(x) &= 8x^2 - 76x - 185 \\r(x) &= 8x^2 - 4x - 45 \\s(x) &= 4x^2 - 37x - 104\end{aligned}$$

have the property that, for any root z of the polynomial

$$p(x) = x^3 - 12x^2 + 65,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}q(z)r(z) &= 5 \\r(z)s(z) &= z.\end{aligned}$$

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ? 8

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

I've shown how this can be verified, by doing the following multiplications (courtesy of DOE Macsyma):

First, here are the products that I'm making claims about:

$$\begin{aligned}q(x)*r(x) &= 64 x^4 - 640 x^3 - 1536 x^2 + 4160 \\ &+ 4160 x + 8325 \\ r(x)*s(x) &= 32 x^4 - 312 x^3 - 864 x^2 + 2081 \\ &+ 2081 x + 4680\end{aligned}$$

Next, a couple of products of $p(x) = x^3 - 12 x^2 + 65$ with polynomials of degree 1:

$$\begin{aligned}(64 x + 128)*(x^3 - 12 x^2 + 65) \\ = 64 x^4 - 640 x^3 - 1536 x^2 + 4160 \\ 1536 x^2 + 4160 x + 8320\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(32 x + 72)*(x^3 - 12 x^2 + 65) \\ = 32 x^4 - 312 x^3 - 864 x^2 + 2080 \\ 864 x^2 + 2080 x + 4680\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we compare the results and see this:

$$\begin{aligned}q(x)*r(x) &= (64 x + 128)*p(x) + 5 \\ r(x)*s(x) &= (32 x + 72)*p(x) + x,\end{aligned}$$

Note that, for any value x_0 that makes $p(x_0) = 0$, that same value x_0 will make $q(x_0)r(x_0) = 5$, so $r(x_0)$ is a factor of 5.

That value of x_0 also makes $r(x_0)*s(x_0) = x_0$, so $r(x_0)$ is a factor of x_0 .

In short, $r(x_0)$ becomes a factor of *both* x_0 and 5.

Since $r(x)$ is a polynomial with integral coefficients, $r(x_0)$ is an algebraic integer whenever x_0 is.

It is similarly simple to demonstrate that, whenever x_0 is a root of $p(x)$, then $r(x_0)$ is a root of the polynomial $mpr(x) = x^3 - 969 x^2 + 315 x + 5$:

First, expand the polynomial $mpr(r(x))$:

$$\begin{aligned}mpr(r(x)) &= (r(x))^3 - 969 (r(x))^2 + 315 \\ &+ 315 (r(x)) + 5\end{aligned}$$

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ? 9

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

$$\begin{aligned} &= (8x^2 - 4x - 45)^3 - 969(8x^2 - \\ &3 - 969(8x^2 - 4x - 45)^2 \\ &+ 315(8x^2 - 4x - 45) + 5 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= 512x^6 - 768x^5 - 70272x^4 + \\ &^5 - 70272x^4 + 70592x^3 \\ &+ 731136x^2 - 374400x - 2067520 \end{aligned}$$

Next, multiply these two polynomials:

$$p(x) = x^3 - 12x^2 + 65,$$

and

$$w(x) = 512x^3 + 5376x^2 - 5760x - 31808$$

to get this:

$$\begin{aligned} p(x)*w(x) &= 512x^6 - 768x^5 - 70272x^4 + \\ &x^4 + 70592x^3 \\ &+ 731136x^2 - 374400x - 2067520 \end{aligned}$$

Notice the equality

$$\text{mpr}(r(x)) = p(x)*w(x).$$

That means for every value of x , the polynomial you get by computing $r(x)$, then evaluating $\text{mpr}(x)$ at that value, is equal to the product of $p(x)$ and $w(x)$.

If x_0 is a root of $p(x)$, you have $p(x_0) = 0$, so $p(x_0)*w(x_0) = 0$, and therefore $r(x_0)$ is a root of $\text{mpr}(x)$.

Note that there are three such roots of $\text{mpr}(x)$, and (taking the three roots x_1, x_2, x_3 of $p(x)$), three values

$$r_1 = r(x_1) \sim 968.67481$$

$$r_2 = r(x_2) \sim -0.01517$$

$$r_3 = r(x_3) \sim 0.34036$$

correspond to the three real roots of $\text{mpr}(x)$. As such, their product must be -5 .

Your earlier claim that the a 's must be coprime to 5 implies that the

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ? 10

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?

r's must be units (since they're common factors of a_i with 5, in the ring of algebraic integers).

If you multiply units, even you must realize that the product is again a unit.

Therefore, -5 (and equivalently, 5 itself) must be a unit in the ring of algebraic integers.

Do you agree or not?

If so, then say so. I'll make it easy; here's a form for you to fill out and post to your full array of newsgroups:

I, James S. Harris, affirm my belief that, in the ring of algebraic integers, the (rational) integer 5 [five] is a unit.

James S. Harris.

If not, then show me (hey, don't worry about me, show your public!) where my error is. I've done all the multiplication; you can verify or refute all this very easily, given the ability to multiply or expand polynomial expressions.

Show how highly you value algebra: Do some.

It's easy: ordinary polynomials, ordinary polynomial multiplication, nothing up my sleeves, no salesman will call. You don't even need to solve any equations. Just multiply, combine terms, show me wrong!

Prove me wrong. Your mama says you can't.

Show us all how much you got that power, how powerful your powers are, and how you aren't afraid to use your powers for good instead of evil!

Crush that damnable Evil Mathematics Cabal, once and

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ? 11

Re: JSH: JSH Paper proven totally wrong 5 years ago by many, so why is JSH still whining now ?
for all!

The proof is out there.

James Harris

So is your published error.

Unfortunately, error trumps proof.

You lose.

Dale.

Check: --Martin Musatov