

Re: Math discovery versus math society

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-02/7288.html>

From: josephus (dogbird_at_earthlink.net)

Date: 02/19/05

Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2005 06:32:27 GMT

WHAT DID YOU DO? JUST CHANGE THE THREAD?

what a dork. Stupid. you dont have any thing. they just busted you for stupidity and here you go again. It just aint so. you can not do mathematics because your stupid theorem does not have a proof. One of those formal mathematical things and You need to show the algorithm works by actually factoring a long integer that someone else would give you and if you cant do this YOU DO NOT HAVE A MATHEMATICA FACT OF ANY KIND.
josephus

jstevh@msn.com wrote:

- > *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.*
- >

sci.math: Re: Math discovery versus math society

- > *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 $T = M^2 - j^2$.*
- >
- > *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 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.*
- >

sci.math: Re: Math discovery versus math society

- > *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*
- >