

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

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-02/0028.html>

---

**From:** Bill Unruh ([unruh\\_at\\_string.physics.ubc.ca](mailto:unruh_at_string.physics.ubc.ca))

**Date:** 01/31/05

Date: 31 Jan 2005 08:01:39 GMT

[jstevh@msn.com](mailto:jstevh@msn.com) writes:

*>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.*

Because you have not explained your mathematical theory, if you have it.  
Rarely are prizes given for claims without proof.

*>But I have the full mathematical theory.*

Maybe you do, maybe you do not.

*>Then, I see requests to prove it that involve factoring large numbers.*

Well, if your theory is correct, it should apply to particular factoring problems, like factoring the RSA challenges. Were you able to do that people would believe you had something. As it is you have made claims and nothing else. Claims are cheap. Either proof or demonstration are not.

*>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 think we are willing to be shocked. do not worry.