

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-09/msg00483.html>

---

- *From:* "Mas Plak" <[spamless@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:spamless@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 3 Sep 2007 15:09:16 -0500
- 

"JSH" <[jstevh@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jstevh@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
<news:1188833147.062403.32640@xx>

On Sep 3, 1:42 am, rossum <[rossu...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rossu...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Sun, 02 Sep 2007 10:19:32 -0700, JSH <[jst...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jst...@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

I asked, what if?

Stick to reality, James, I know it can be hard for you, very hard, but accept the FACT that surrogate factoring is twice as slow as random guessing.

TWICE AS SLOW AS RANDOM GUESSING.

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

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

have a proof that it is polynomial time?

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

you have no "pure math", you hate it, never read a book on it.

In the real world, only math that is practical matters, which is a major point I'm making.

wrong again, you know nothing of the Math world.

Let's say that down the line someone proves that surrogate factoring not only is polynomial time, but that it blows away all other factoring approaches known, what does that say about the current math community's expertise in this area?

Lets say pigs have wings.

Note, I'm talking a hypothetical.

yes you are, liar.

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?

it sucks, get over it, troll

How expert then could you really be?

your piece of shit idea was twice as slow than a baboon picking fleas out of his arss

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

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]

I came up with the approach of using  $k = 2x \pmod T$  along with  $x^2 = y^2 \pmod T$ , last August, so a little over a year ago.

and in one year you have made backwards progress,

Only within the last few days have I completed a very thorough analysis.

you are twice as slow as a normal person, because your IQ is 50.

That's not years. It's a bit over a year with crucial research only done within the last few days.

poop search.

The years were involved in trying to take a concept to concrete reality, and it took humanity thousands of years to take some concepts to reality, like being able to fly.

if you are a kid playing blocks in a sandbox.

With my prime counting research I first found my prime counting function, and then proved how it was different from anything else

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

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

But mathematicians have said it's not important, when I can note even  
now that in all of the mathematical literature there is to this day no  
other known prime counting method that relies on a partial difference  
equation.

it is not important.

But the math community ignores it or posters on sci.math say it's not  
important or is just a rehash of what was known.

it is just a rehash of what was known, you did not invent it.

And with my non-polynomial factorization research posters proclaimed  
it wrong, and I got a crucial bit of research published,

It was never published, but rejected, tell the truth liar.

so they  
declared the journal system flawed, and then downplayed it when the  
math journal itself died.

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.

You proved it \*yourself\* that it is twice as slow as random guessing!!

What a dumbass!

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

See the pattern?

pattern of ignoring the obvious, shit stinks so does SF

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.

you should migrate back to your country of origin and poop on the ground there.

That forces me to break you with something that you can't just claim is wrong or not important, understand?

Why are you ALWAYS WRONG ? ALWAYS!

But then, if I am right, shouldn't the math community take some penalty?

you are just a liar.

Shouldn't it pay some price?

idiot

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?

skank

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

What punishment fits the crime?

moron

James Harris