Math discovery versus math society

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005−02/7187.html

---

jstevh_at_msn.com
Date: 02/18/05

Date: 18 Feb 2005 15:30:16 −0800

I am on my fourth major mathematical discovery. It is a new way to factor integers. Mathematicians have so far managed to avoid properly acknowledging all four of my discoveries.

I am an amateur mathematician. About three years ago I started on a burst of creativity which has produced four major mathematical discoveries. Before that I had over four years of failures, some of them kind of big, as I'd proclaim I had wonderful simple proofs of Fermat's Last Theorem, only to eventually find out I was wrong.

What I learned from public humiliation, and outright failure that happened more than once, is in mathematics, wishes don't make truth, great desire does not mean you are right, and if you are wrong, then you are just wrong.

When you are wrong mathematically, it does not change. Giving it a couple of days won't make it where you are right. Denial is just a waste of time.

Two of my four results are without debate in terms of actually working, but they are debated in terms of how important they are.

I have repeatedly brought up one, which is a formula that counts prime numbers.

There is no debate about whether or not the formula works.

Math people just keep claiming it's not important.

Now I have a set of equations with which you can factor:

Ax= Az(−Az +/− sqrt((Az − 2M^2)^2 − 4TM^2))/(2j^2 − 2Az)

Az= Ax(−Ax +/− sqrt((Ax − 2j^2)^2 + 4Tj^2))/(2M^2 − 2Ax)

where T = M^2 − j^2.

Here you have a two equations defining rationals Ax and Az, where M is the number to be factored and j is an integer you pick to try and factor it.

They do work, if you can pick a rational Ax.

So, at this point, I'm not doing so well picking that rational Ax, so the math people are jumping up and down, getting excited, and claiming my result is not important, yet again.

Um, it's a new factoring method, at a base level, at such a base level that no factoring method at this level has been discovered in centuries.

Yeah, I can't quite get it to factor really big numbers yet (like hundrds of digit numbers but I can factor smaller numbers) but it's new factoring method.

Supposedly mathematicians care about such things.

One of the four results that is not so easily demonstrated, as a prime counting formula, or a new way to factor, I wrote up in a paper, and sent to a math journal, which after NINE FREAKING MONTHS, told me they liked the paper and would publish.

Well someone posted that they were publishing my paper on the sci.math newsgroup, and some sci.math'ers promptly began attacking the journal and its editors in posts, talking about how horrible they were, etc., and THEN some of them decided it would be a good idea to send emails challenging my paper.

Well I got an email the NEXT FREAKING DAY from the chief editor of the journal who told me that publication was a mistake, and then he claimed that he'd accidentally told me the paper was accepted, but included in his email text posted by a sci.math'er the day before.

Then they just yanked my paper.

An electronic journal so for those of you who have thought about using those, consider this experience. Some editor can try to just yank a paper.

They didn't even leave anything there at first, so the pages were all off, and eventually they settled on saying it was withdrawn:

http://www.emis.de/journals/SWJPAM/vol2−03.html

And that's from a math journal, when maybe you thought math people followed freaking rules.

That journal no longer exists. I don't know exactly why, but they just quietly shut down, though you can see what was in the journal from its mirrors which are still up.

Weird math society. Freaking journal shuts down, its main website GONE but you can still see it on freaking mirrors.

So what do you do?

You're an amateur mathematician, got major mathematical results, lots of people on Usenet hate you and will email, get a paper shut down, what do you do?

I don't know what you'd do, as you're not freaking me, but I re−wrote the goddamn paper and sent it to a BIGGER journal.

That journal is at Princeton. The editor in charge of the section that has my paper is Andrew Wiles.

I'm not freaking worried about freaking sci.math'ers and stupid emails with this goddamn paper!

So yeah, it's great being me in many ways. I can peruse my own research into prime numbers, or deep properties of algebraic integers, or play with my own method for factoring−−trying to figure out how to get the goddamn thing to work!!!

But also, there are the negatives, the people still calling me names, priding themselves on putting me down, feeling like they're doing something with their hostile postings, and their webpages.

Hell! Life is something, eh?

...It's about time. History shows that what's happening now is what happens with truly massive discoveries, as they so upset the status quo.

And don't yap about Einstein or some other discoverer who supposedly didn't go through this crap, as I have read the history thoroughly, and you don't know as much as you think if you think even Einstein had an easy going.

Besides, I'm no Einstein. I'm some guy who found out that there were these relatively simple equations and formulas that the math people missed, and I didn't.

But they want to make me hurt for it.

I say, screw them. I'll outlast them. And someday I'll dance on their graves.

James Harris