

Re: Mike Helland Reading List

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg01975.html>

- *From:* theman <genericjoe2005@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 26 Mar 2008 17:08:44 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 26, 7:25 pm, Michael Helland <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
<snip>

So I understand algebra.

And from there I suppose I grok equations.

And you'd be wrong, since algebra is one small area of math, and not a comprehensive idea of mathematics...

You say that you know a dozen fields that I don't know.

From there, you suppose that you grok equations.

You probably don't see the irony.

Sure you think high-school algebra qualifies you as a mathematician I don't call it irony, i call it stupidity...

<snip>

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conjecture>

I suggest you read up...

I suggest you read that webpage.

Did you make it to the second paragraph?

It says:

Re: Mike Helland Reading List

"In scientific philosophy, Karl Popper pioneered the use of the term "conjecture" to indicate a proposition which is presumed to be real, true, or genuine, mostly based on inconclusive grounds, in contrast with a hypothesis (hence theory, axiom, principle), which is a testable statement based on accepted grounds."

One slight problem here: "conjecture" to indicate a proposition which is presumed to be real, true, or genuine, mostly based on inconclusive grounds" one small issue mike is that the only reason to presume your conjecture to be true is because you say so... which is not listed as any sort of a reason to assume validity... sorry mike, I'd figured you'd point this out... but you haven't even an inconclusive basis for assuming your right since you can't grok math or physics...

<snip>

Yet you are absolutely sure you proved my conjecture wrong.

Sorry mike your idea is wrong based on your lack of qualifications and the fact that the only value basis your paper has is that you say your right... and your a self proclaimed ignoramus... so no value, no basis....

I've read dozens of Popper's books and essays. I understand term he pioneered.

And popper would never condone hiding behind the term to avoid admitting your wrong, sorry mike there isn't a single intellectual out there who would support what your doing, hiding behind semantics... you think that by saying its a conjecture you can just sidestep all criticism, which is what you do, your an idiot, conjecture doesn't keep you from being wrong...

Obviously you never actually read popper, so in fact we can just add liar to your ever expanding resume..

You don't.

And of course you know what I have and haven't read you worthless waste of space...

Re: Mike Helland Reading List

You are working with a version of the scientific method that has been outdated since the 1950s.

Your working with a scientific method that you made up... who dumber under the context...

Not to mention you don't have a clue as to the scientific method if one looks at your paper... so the non-scientist cash register programmer (Mike Helland) is telling the mathematician and scientist (me) that I don't know what I am doing... because you managed to read a book 15 years ago that you misunderstood... well mike congrats thats almost the dumbest thing you've said...

<snip>

Semantics,

Definitions. That aren't on your side.

Actually they are... thanks though

I predict you'll whine about it.

mike go buy yourself some diapers and stop wetting yourself in public...

and more of you trying to hide behind said semantics because you won't admit your wrong, no matter how dumb you look, hence you are a fool...

I am a fool.

Yes.

Great we are agreed... your a fool....

<snip> wiser then you...

Cheers

.