

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:

$$Ax = Az(-Az \pm \sqrt{(Az - 2M^2)^2 - 4TM^2}) / (2j^2 - 2Az)$$

$$Az = Ax(-Ax \pm \sqrt{(Ax - 2j^2)^2 + 4Tj^2}) / (2M^2 - 2Ax)$$

where $T = M^2 - j^2$.

sci.math: Math discovery versus math society

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 hundreds 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