

Re: Surrogate factoring approach, analysis

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-01/7482.html>

jstevh_at_msn.com

Date: 01/25/05

Date: 25 Jan 2005 15:27:24 -0800

Douglas A. Gwyn wrote:

> *jstevh@msn.com* wrote:

> > *And you really can't be as stupid as you're playing here, as remember*

> > *quantum factoring techniques?*

> > *They factored 15, and made headlines.*

>

> *Quantum computing is so technologically challenging*

> *that even a "toy" implementation that really works*

> *was newsworthy. The same would be true for the first*

> *vacuum triode, the first germanium point-contact*

> *transistor, the first MASER, etc. All these are*

> *"proofs of the concept" and the expectation is that*

> *since the idea has been shown to really work, the*

> *details can be refined to provide improved technology*

> *as time goes on.*

>

Quantum computing at its heart relies on mathematics, right?

I think many of you think it's really about some weird quantum voodoo or something profoundly strange about the quantum world that allows it to do magic without math being involved.

I say you are wrong.

If a quantum computing algorithm exists, then I say it has a mathematical basis, and just like you can build a mechanical computer with gears and other mechanical stuff, you can also work out how it would work mathematically.

So I say there is a mathematical way to check a tremendous number of possible solutions simultaneously.

It's not a major leap.

Now I say it can be done, and I've proven it can be done, as that's how my program works, and it does a lot better than factor 15.

So, it's like I am arguing with people who have a mechanical gizmo that they got all excited about that can at best, with a lot of effort, manage to factor 15, and I'm demonstrating the mathematical ideas necessary for quantum to even work, abstracted out, where I have a working program that can factor much bigger numbers, and you give me grief.

I think you're just too dumb to see the relationship, and act like it's my problem.

> *The problem with all the factoring methods you have
> so far posted is that they don't work even in "toy"
> implementations. There is always some crucial gap*

That's a lie.

The program does factor. It just doesn't factor every number you try to factor with it, and I've been working out why, theoretically.

Now notice, I've explained how my work is important—as it involves mathematically checking infinite sets, like a quantum computer anyway—and I have an implementation that does far better than factor 15, though I admit it doesn't factor every number you run through it.

You on the other hand are ignoring the spectacular features of my work, and are caught in a rather dramatic lie where you claim it does not work, when the truth is it works sometimes, but not always.

I think Usenet posters are not up to a real intellectual challenge, and when given something that your brains can't manage, you lie about it.

That explains you, but I think it's sad.

If you can't understand my work, then you can just quiet down, rather than trying to dismiss what you don't understand.

It's like I have the heart of the mathematics necessary for a quantum computing device to work, abstracted out, so that you don't need a mechanical device—quantum circuits—but can just use a regular computer.

I have proven that my program checks through an infinite set, even with the trivial calculations done so far, which you people so casually dismiss because you're dumb.

I'm light years ahead of you, and you think I'm behind you.
James Harris