

## Re: Proof factoring solution is closed form

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-02/3682.html>

---

**From:** Tim Peters (*tim.one\_at\_comcast.net*)

**Date:** 02/10/05

Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 16:30:48 -0500

[JSH]

>>> ...

>>> *I say, quit hiding things, put up your example where I can see it,*

>>> *like in a thread where I'm paying attention, as if you're right I'd*

>>> *like to know.*

[Tim Peters]

>> *Rick replied in one of the threads you started. How is he supposed*

>> *to guess which of those you pay attention to? If you're so bored by*

>> *your proliferation of redundant threads that you don't pay attention*

>> *to them anymore, and are too lazy to do a simple search, tough luck.*

[JSH]

> *I don't need luck. Remember I'm the inventor of surrogate factoring.*

LOL! If you thought people here have been competing for the honor of that title, believe me when I say everyone is happy to acknowledge that you're its inventor. Nay, positively eager.

But are you implying that if Rick were the inventor, then he wouldn't have needed luck to guess which of the dozens of threads you started you were still paying attention to? You really didn't respond to anything I said, although you echoed back one word of it.

> *And I mentioned in an earlier post that I'd tested out this latest*

> *twist on my own idea and found it didn't work, over the weekend.*

Despite your claims that you proved it worked, and that everyone else was deliberately obscuring your method in order to ... oh, I've lost track of all your accusations.

> *So, deep down some part of me knew it didn't work anyway, so it wasn't*

> *worth the effort to try and find some post out in the haystack.*

But it was worth your effort to insult Rick repeatedly, and despite that you apparently now agree he was right all along. He didn't insult you, you know. You owe him an apology.

sci.math: Re: Proof factoring solution is closed form

- > *Nonetheless talking it out paid dividends as the full solution was just*
- > *an inversion away.*
- >
- > *I find it interesting that no one else thought to just invert  $x$ , and*
- > *pull out the complete solution,*

Sorry, but inverting  $x$  doesn't work either. If you post a specification for your new algorithm (find Rick's message for a concrete example of what that means, if you don't know), I'm sure you'll get a small counterexample back within a day.

- > *but I seem to have a gift for this sort of thing.*

In this respect, yes, it seems you can always come up with another way to complicate the problem, and (more amazingly than that) convince yourself it has to work.

- > *And yes, in case you're wondering, I did find a short proof of Fermat's*
- > *Last Theorem,*

You should write it up. If true, that would be an extraordinary accomplishment indeed.

- > *and I did find THE prime counting function, though people don't seem*
- > *to realize its importance for some reason,*

I've said before that I'm fond of that algorithm. It's cute! I don't believe there's anything essentially new in it, though, and don't believe it was an advance in either theory or practice.

- > *though it has application in number theory and physics,*

Your specific algorithm does, or prime numbers do? If the former, sorry, I haven't seen an application of your algorithm.

- > *and I did find a problem in algebraic number theory with erroneous*
- > *thinking by mathematicians over a hundred years ago that lasted to*
- > *this day.*

Sorry again, I don't believe that. I also find it very hard to understand how you could fail to understand the detailed refutations you were given.

At this rate, I expect you'll eventually claim that the real reason your factoring attempts don't pay off is that there's a problem in integers themselves, which has bamboozled bovine mathematicians for millenia before your studly arrival. Then you can claim that your method (whatever it is at the time) actually does work, and always did, but on "integer objects", not the flawed old "integers" everyone else foolishly uses. It would be a nice complement to the nebulous "ring of objects" you need to hypothesize to prevent your polynomial factorization stuff from hitting simple counterexamples.

- > *That's not even all, as I have work in logic that I just don't bother*
- > *discussing.*
- >
- > *I have more discoveries that I simply don't see the point in talking*
- > *about, as people find it hard to comprehend the simple ones.*

Indeed, advancing the state of the art in mathematical logic by applying a quadratic equation is too unlikely for me to even imagine <wink>.

- > *There is no reason that a sane world should have left me to fiddle with*
- > *the factoring problem as there was every reason to believe that I would*
- > *succeed, and with a very basic solution, which I did.*

Eh? Sorry, but you still haven't produced anything here that can't be beaten by choosing trial divisors randomly. I'm surprised you came back to factoring, because you really can't gain a lick of credibility in this area without actually factoring *\_some\_* "hard" composite. All the bluff and bluster in the universe can't cover up a failure to do so. I'll be delighted if you succeed.

- > *You people had no good reasons to let this happen this way.*

What are you talking about? You pee on people who try to help you, refuse to answer their questions, and can't break out of monologue-from-Mars mode long enough to collaborate on even the simplest points. That the rest of us are able to help each other out isn't actually due to a conspiracy to suppress revolutionary truths.

- > *But you did--seeming to enjoy insulting me more than anything else,*

Most people do, yes. You bring out the worst in many people, because your own behavior is so jaw-droppingly poor. But *\_some\_* people sincerely try to help you. Amazingly, they're the ones you piss on the most.

- > *which I find frustrating as you seem to be weird little children with*
- > *barely even a basic comprehension of mathematics--and now the full*
- > *solution to the factoring problem is not only known, but easily*
- > *implemented, as the math is childishly simple.*

If so, then by your own words, if you fail to factor a "hard" composite soon, you're less capable than a child. I wouldn't hold you to that standard myself, but you've got no complaint if others take you at your word here.