

Re: Theory versus implementation, I'm puzzled

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-02/0148.html>

From: Christian Bau (christian.bau_at_cbau.freemove.co.uk)

Date: 01/31/05

Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 23:22:53 +0000

In article <1107155306.029220.307840@c13g2000cwb.googlegroups.com>, "guenther.vonKnakspott@gmx.de" <guenther.vonKnakspott@gmx.de> wrote:

> *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.*

I must contradict you here. If anyone posts any *_new_* algorithm here that shows some new idea, even if it is not the fastest known algorithm, I and many other readers would appreciate it. sci.math is not about the leading edge of mathematics, it is much more about learning.

There is of course in the case of Harris a certain attitude problem. He behaves like a complete idiot, and gets treated accordingly. But if he had come with something new and interesting, I am sure it would have been recognised here. (Apparently he hasn't. Seems he just found a way to find lots of trial divisors in a completely unpredictable order, and with enough trial divisors sometimes a factoring is achieved. How sad.)