

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-09/msg00485.html>

---

- *From:* marcus\_b <[marcus\\_bruckner@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:marcus_bruckner@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 03 Sep 2007 12:18:38 -0700
- 

On Sep 2, 12:19 pm, JSH <[jst...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jst...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Sep 1, 11:27 pm, junoexpress <[MTBrenne...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:MTBrenne...@xxxxxxxxxx)> 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.

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?

Re: JSH: Contradictory behavior, issue of math fraud

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.