Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007−09/msg00468.html

- *From*: Joshua Cranmer <Pidgeot18@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 03 Sep 2007 13:35:22 −0400

JSH wrote:

> I asked, what if?

What if the sky was orange? What if tomorrow the world blew up? What if yesterday never really happened? What if the CIA is controlling everybody through mind−controlling drugs?

"What if?" asks a hypothetical question. The burden of proof is on *you* to show that the question is pertinent, i.e., the "if" was probably.

> > 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?
>
> If practicality is all that matters then acknowledge that "pure math"
> is a bogus concept.

One thing that should be pointed out is that there exist *several* factoring algorithms. In order for your algorithm to be pertinent, it needs to bring something that other factoring algorithms don't have, like the most efficient when the two numbers are same order of magnitude, are be most efficient over all.

IIUC, "pure math" tends to be generated new *classes* of algorithms.

> The question is, what if it turns out to be this incredibly powerful
> factoring technique that most of the math community ignored and people
> like you talked down?

I would say that these avenues have been explored by other people and then rejected as not being useful. Beware of generating "new" algorithms from "obvious" lines of exploration on very old problems.

> So now I invented a new factoring method, but NOW supposedly that is easy and trivial to do, where it only matters if that method is the fastest known at each point in time as if it doesn't take time to figure out best approaches.

I still haven't seen any evidence that your factoring method actually works. It is based on the premise that factoring another number can help factor the current number, and I have shown one instance (admittedly contrived) in TWO separate posts that shows where your algorithm is wrong.

Creating a factoring method is simple, because all factoring methods boil down to "try numbers to see if they are factors"; the only difference is in how to generate the trial divisors.

> See the pattern?

No.

> No matter what, someone from the math community is there to downplay any and everything that would indicate value in my research, so it is clear there is an absolute position taken that you people are ready to put your expertise against my research.

Saying that there exists a conspiracy does not make it true, especially when there exist valid reasons to question some of your approaches. I would furthermore say that experience has taught me to not belabor this point because there is no changing your mind in this matter.

Summary: meh.

> But then, if I am right, shouldn't the math community take some penalty?
>
> Shouldn't it pay some price?
>
> Shouldn't it? If I have to break you with a demonstration that you can't just downplay or lie about, and in so doing prove that you DID lie all these years about all the previous research, what should your community's punishment be?
>
> What punishment fits the crime?

1. There's that "what if?" again. After all, if I become Supreme Dictator of the world, shouldn't everyone who doubts that be forced to some gulag somewhere (*ahem*, work camp).

2. Research is not a zero−sum game. Your loss is not my gain and vice versa.

3. The only punishment would be an apology. But then again, if you're wrong, we should sue you for libel... Oops, there's that "what if?" again :−D
.