

Re: Proof factoring solution is closed form

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-02/3737.html>

From: David C. Ullrich (ullrich_at_math.okstate.edu)

Date: 02/11/05

Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2005 18:42:15 -0600

On Thu, 10 Feb 2005 16:30:48 -0500, "Tim Peters" <tim.one@comcast.net> wrote:

>[...]

>

>> *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.*

This really sounds like you haven't been paying attention.

>>[...]

>

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

>> *Last Theorem,*

>

>*You should write it up.*

As does this. I mean really, it's like you're trying to get him started on that again.

>[...]

>

>*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.*

But here you've hit the nail on the head.

I guess your point in posting this was just to show that you're a hard guy to figure out. Sorry, we're used to guys like that here.

> *Then you can claim that your method (whatever it is at*

>*the time) actually does work, and always did, but on "integer objects", not*

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

>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.

So you don't understand about objects. Maybe if you studied some
modern programming languages it would help.

David C. Ullrich