

# Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-09/msg00411.html>

---

- *From:* rossum <[rossum48@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rossum48@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 03 Sep 2007 09:42:11 +0100
- 

On Sun, 02 Sep 2007 10:19:32 -0700, JSH <[jstevh@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jstevh@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

But if the idea turns out to be a brilliant one which means factoring is not a hard problem after all, then how can mathematicians who not only couldn't figure it out, but who ignored it when presented with it be considered to be true experts in the field?

In its current version surrogate factoring is too slow to be considered "brilliant". Only when you have speeded it up sufficiently can it be considered brilliant. Slow factoring methods are a dime-a-dozen. The difficult part is finding a \*fast\* factoring method, that is a polynomial time rather than an exponential time method. So far your method seems to be exponential time, or do you have a proof that it is polynomial time?

All the indications so far are that factoring is a hard problem, which can only be confirmed by the fact that you have been working on it for years and have still not cracked it.

[snip]

With my prime counting research I first found my prime counting function, and then proved how it was different from anything else previously known as to this day no one can give any other partial difference equation used to count prime numbers, and no other known that finds primes on its own.

Your prime counting function works fine.

rossum

[snip]

James Harris

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud