

## Re: Theory versus implementation, I'm puzzled

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-02/0017.html>

---

*guenther.vonKnakspott\_at\_gmx.de*

**Date:** 01/31/05

Date: 30 Jan 2005 23:08:26 -0800

jstevh@msn.com wrote:

- > *Now one of the oddest things to me is that you can discover a*
- > *mathematical theory, explain it in detail, and have people not*
- > *believe*
- > *you, as I have the full theory for surrogate factoring worked out,*
- > *but*
- > *just haven't gotten a program implementing it to fully work, yet.*
- >
- > *But I have the full mathematical theory.*
- >
- > *The sad reality is that the mathematics is not enough.*
- >
- > *You people sit back, act like it's just nothing, and I tell you the*
- > *theory is worked out to a solution to the factoring problem.*
- >
- > *Then, I see requests to prove it that involve factoring large*
- > *numbers.*
- >
- > *Since when did it not matter if a person could prove something*
- > *mathematically before they could demonstrate it in an implementation?*
- >
- > *And it's not like the math is really hard either.*
- >
- > *The sad thing is that I'm worried that demonstration of one kind or*
- > *another beyond mathematical proof is just around the corner, and then*
- > *what?*
- >
- > *By then the shock will be so much greater, and it could have been*
- > *prevented if any of you could follow a simple mathematical theory,*
- > *and*
- > *accept something as true because it had been proven true*
- > *mathematically.*
- >
- > *I say, that people harmed in any way, should come to you, as the*
- > *claim*
- > *in the math field is the opposite of what I'm seeing, as the claim is*
- > *that mathematical proof is what's important. Some mathematicians*

even

- > *claim to disdain demonstration or even practical uses to mathematics.*
- >
- > *They \*claim\* that proof is all that matters.*
- >
- > *Well, in just a little while the world will be able to see how great*
- > *was their lie, as try as I might, I'm not seeing much attention paid*
- > *to*
- > *a very developed theory, which is a solution to the factoring*
- > *problem.*
- >
- > *If demonstration is all you people care for, then I fear that nothing*
- > *will happen until demonstration is what you get, and if you're lucky,*
- > *it'll be me demonstrating and then maybe something can be done.*
- >
- > *If we're unlucky, then the demonstration might come from anywhere in*
- > *the world, from maybe even just some small group, smart enough to*
- > *check*
- > *claims such as mine, but not people we'd want with powerful*
- > *mathematical tools.*
- >
- > *But this is the world I'm stuck with, a world full of lies, where*
- > *people often say things they are not, make claims they do not back*
- > *up,*
- > *and act like it never matters.*
- >
- > *Sometimes it matters in a very, very, very big way.*
- >
- > *I say the world should come to you, if things go badly. I notified*
- > *the*
- > *US Government of my research. I contacted mathematicians around the*
- > *world. I've tried my best.*
- >
- > *What happens, happens.*
- >
- >
- > *James Harris*

Hey Harris wake up call! You got it even wronger this time. There are already enough factorization algorithms around. It actually is of no import that you may have come up with a new one. What matters is whether it is dramatically better in speed and resources than the current best ones or not. So this time the mathematical proof of the correctness of the algorithm is a mere prerequisite. The obstacle standing between you and fame and fortune, is the lack of a working implementation. So far, it don't look good for you mister. And no, whining won't be of help either.