

Re: JSH: Let's recap

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-09/msg02773.html>

- *From:* hagman <google@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 13 Sep 2007 13:29:01 -0700
-

On 13 Sep., 05:37, JSH <jst...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Years ago believing Andrew Wiles had found a proof of Fermat's Last Theorem I began wondering if there wasn't a simpler answer out there as what he had was so convoluted that he himself said it was impossible to explain simply to laypeople.

To myself I said that maybe with modern problem solving techniques not available over the centuries of searching in the past, and believing that maybe there was a simpler answer when mathematicians for the most part thought there was none, I might stumble across something, and so I began.

Stumbling, yes, definitely.
But never across anything.

Eventually I ended up posting on math newsgroups versus bugging mathematicians in person or at journals which I'd done before, and entered a hellworld of insults and taunts from people who claimed to be mathematically adept.

Still I persevered and in December 1999 I introduced the technique I now call non-polynomial factorization where I use a complex identity and subtract an equation from it—just one step in concept from the normal use of identities.

A technique that you later developed further to "rigorously" "prove" that rings and/or Galois theory were "flawed".
Yet you were not able to present a single proposition of ring or Galois theory that you could prove wrong.

Four more years later using that breakthrough I found a short proof of

Re: JSH: Let's recap

Fermat's Last Theorem and expected that I could convince serious members of the math community so I discussed it expecting that with time disagreement would die down as people realized I was right.

During that initial time I was arguing about my proof when I started thinking about counting prime numbers for some reason and within a few weeks had discovered a somewhat complex form of my prime counting function which over the months I simplified.

It was from my prime counting function that I realized that there was something seriously wrong with the math community as I stepped through ways it was like no other discovery in this area and mathematicians I contacted behaved oddly, while on newsgroups people just lied, repeatedly denying even the most obvious differences from what was previously known.

Your results on prime counting were generally acknowledged as correct, mostly because a simple substitution could derive it from century-old results – your result was correct but had not the dimmest spark of novelty in it.

Persevering and hoping still I went back to my proof of Fermat's Last Theorem and isolated out one part of the argument and expanded it into a paper which I sent to a mathematical journal which formally peer reviewed and published it. I thought it was over and finally my research would be acknowledged.

But members of the sci.math newsgroup mounted an email campaign against the paper and convinced the editors who yanked it after publication.

Nothing wrong. These emails were convincing in the sense of "Please convince yourself of the following obvious error in JSH's paper and see if you can still support its publication" rather than "Take it down!! Or expect the Hammer to come!!".

A few months later after one more edition the journal itself died.

On some very few occasions, journals *have* published erroneous papers, and it often took *years* for someone to pin down the gaps (and maybe close them). Thorough peer reviews are one means to prevent such problems as good as humanly possible.

Re: JSH: Let's recap

Re: JSH: Let's recap

A journal that publishes your paper (where reading a few sentences immediately reveals obvious error) and other crap raises the suspicion that their peer reviewing system was dysfunctional or effectively not existing at all.

The story is like some horror movie with one constant: a peanut gallery behaving demoniacally, with taunts and jeers.

You are the only one who is obviously not under demonical influence. But do you recall who turns out to be the freaky killer at the end of a horror movie? The only one who obviously could not be it...

I began to realize I was facing a monumental problem unlike any I could have imagined, and a world that did not behave as it should, as there were parallels in the rest of the world:

1. Enron collapsed dramatically after capturing the hopes of many with promises that turned out to be lies. So finance was involved.
2. The Catholic Church finally was forced to acknowledge pedophilia among its priests after years of denial. So religion was involved.
3. The US invaded Iraq under false pretenses relying on the thirst of the American people for revenge for the 9–11 terrorist attacks and kept up its invasion to this day despite much of the truth coming out. So politics was involved.
4. JSH polluted sci.math under false pretenses that he had achieved one goal or another and would not acknowledge his faults even when presented the simplest counterexample. So stupidity was involved.

The pattern was clear: powerful and entrenched people when faced with a truth they did not like, would simply deny it until broken by it.

I began working on the factoring problem.

Now with an invention of surrogate factoring and a rapid development unlike any other in history where first there was a concept from a question, then there were mathematical equations, and then analysis, to find the best practical approach and now there is implementation closing in on a final solution, all within four years.

In contrast the congruence of squares approach with its penultimate

Re: JSH: Let's recap

level reached with the number field sieve took HUNDREDS of years to develop.

To make the comparison real impressive you should say that number field sieves etc. took MILLIONS of years to developed because evolutio had to bring up hmo sapiens first .

Meanwhile demonic taunts and insults continue from the math newsgroups as the world is on the brink.

In concert with my progress the financial world is crumbling and the US is on the brink of recession, and the taunts continue with one clear demand: give a factorization of an RSA Challenge number.

An obvios request for someone claimin that he has found a new method to factor big numbers.

IF the worst case scenario occurs after that demand is met, the financial world may collapse, and the world as we know it now will be a thing of the past, so why is this happening?

This is not the worst case scenario.
The worst case is that you learn nothing and continue producing the very same crap as ever before.

Who could put together such an extraordinary sequence of events?

So I hold yet a little while longer while I ponder these questions.

What intelligence or intelligences, could be great enough to have created this situation? And why?

I think you could answer this question about intelligence better than we could – sometimes a view from an uninvolved observer can give fresh insights.

Why bother?

Re: JSH: Let's recap

Re: JSH: Let's recap

What does the human species matter anyway?

So I hold.

Who else is out there pulling the strings on all these puppets?

Dare you finally answer me clearly yet? Or must this sad, sick game continue still further?

James Harris