

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-09/msg00482.html>

---

- *From:* JSH <jstevh@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 03 Sep 2007 12:58:31 -0700
- 

On Sep 3, 11:18 am, marcus\_b <marcus\_bruck...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 2, 12:19 pm, JSH <jst...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sep 1, 11:27 pm, junoeexpress <MTBrenne...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

I believe the burden of proof  
is on you.

Not necessarily if you believe that a concept  
can be of interest in  
and of itself to people who are supposedly  
experts in a field.

Stupid.  
Nobody will be even the slightest bit interested in it until you  
give  
some indication (I'm not even saying proof, which I know  
you can't do)  
that it's performance is in \*some way\* optimal.  
Why should they waste their time on your half-baked ideas  
when they're  
trained in the field and know they have ideas that are at least  
worth  
working on.

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

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?

A hypothetical. Hypotheticals are cheap.

What if THEY are the ones deluding themselves and doing research that is valueless because they actually lack real mathematical ability?

So they are incapable of seeing important research as well?

More hypotheticals. You are counting chickens before they are hatched, in fact before there is any reason to think they will ever hatch.

You might as well say: "What if pigs are actually able to fly, and zoologists have overlooked this possibility for centuries?" Should zoologists really spend a lot of time worrying about this?

Challenging Santos to commit every dime is part of that action, as to con artists, what really is more important than money?

I don't know, you tell us. You've been perpetuating a con job on sci.math as long as I can remember, always promising something and never having delivered on one promise. If that's not a con-job, I don't know what is. What's even worse is that a lot of it you've done dishonestly, using others to work out things you can't do, all the while boasting how much smarter you are than the rest of humanity.

Except I HAVE delivered. Instead of just arguing with people over my proof of Fermat's Last Theorem I wrote a paper over a key results that

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

followed from it and got it published.

The publication was a careless error on the part of an incompetent editor. You knew before the paper was submitted that there were fatal objections. You delivered, all right. You delivered crap. And you got what you deserved, and more, in return.

Posters on sci.math then declared that the journal system was flawed and that math journals routinely publish false papers!!!

Oh, no. No one has said math journals routinely publish false papers. There is no evidence for this in general. That particular journal had a poor track record, having previously published at least one very questionable paper. The papers in it were often poorly edited, and a surprising fraction of them were by the editor himself.

Others mounted an email campaign against the paper and convinced the journal editors it was false, so they yanked it, and later the journal shut down.

The paper was wrong to its very core and wrong in details. It is NORMAL BEHAVIOR to write to the editor when an incorrect paper is published. The editor lied to you regarding peer review. The editor acted AGAINST explicit advice from letter-writers here and yanked your paper with no explanation. It is plausible that the editor was pressured to discontinue the journal because of his incompetence and dishonesty. His handling of your worthless paper was contributing evidence.

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 algorithm is a minor variant of Legendre's method. Your algorithm (not 'your function') is not competitive with current methods in speed for counting primes. Neither you nor anyone else have indicated why your 'partial difference equation' is useful or important.

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

Posters on sci.math when challenged with those points shift the definition of "difference equation" to a non-standard one, and ignore the second point about finding primes or just lie about it.

Repeatedly, by all normal standards, I achieve and posters deny in unreasonable ways all achievements while making dubious achievements of their own—like killing a math journal.

REASONABLE people who listen to me talk about the factoring problem can note that I'm making sense,

No, liar. REASONABLE people here have repeatedly tried to implement your many variants of surrogate factoring. None are remotely close to competitive with existing methods for factoring integers. Further, you have not provided any rationale for why factors of a surrogate might be connected algebraically or probabilistically to nontrivial factors of the original target. It looks like your rationale is the following: "I have this vague hunch that factoring an integer  $S$  which is a function of the target  $T$  might have a high probability of producing nontrivial factors of  $T$ . The reason this might work is, I am a genius and ideas generated by geniuses often turn out to be right. No one can prove that my vague hunch is wrong, so I am being unfairly ignored by the evil hacks who call themselves mathematicians."

Sounds like you're ready to defend on every point, so your position is clear, and now if that position is refuted ultimately by the evidence, so that everything you said falls apart like a house of cards, what then?

Can you get what I'm emphasizing here? That the math community cannot have its cake and eat it too?

I want it clear that if you turn out to be wrong you lose the title of experts.

Period.

No if's and's or but's, but quite succinctly, you lose the title of experts in the field.

Get it? So it's not about me asking anything from you except clarity on this position.

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

I want you and your community to understand that if I force this and prove that I am correct, you lose the title "mathematicians".

James Harfis

.