

Re: Theory versus implementation, I'm puzzled

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-02/0036.html>

From: Larry Hammick (larryhammick_at_OMIT-MEtelus.net)

Date: 01/31/05

Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 09:00:07 GMT

<jstevh@msn.com> wrote in message
news:1107133752.934996.123670@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com...

> *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.*

It's hard to believe that you would expect anybody to swallow this shit, Harris. You've made an exceptionally poor choice of problem on which to claim (yet again) to have made some earth-shaking discovery. You should have stuck with FLT. If you can factor a big integer, that means I can give you a big integer and you can tell me its factors. You cannot. Two integers >1 whose product is any of those RSA challenge numbers -- that would be more than enough. Two integers, Harris. Not another 5K is your bullshit. Two integers.