Re: Surrogate factoring, room for error?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005−02/4967.html

---

From: mm (*mm_at_nowhere.net*)
Date: 02/14/05

Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 04:39:32 +0100

jstevh@msn.com wrote:

> Nora Baron wrote:
>
>>jstevh@msn.com wrote:
>>
>
> <deleted>
>
>>>Why? The proof itself is all that matters.
>>>
>>>
>> In the past, you have asserted, as you do below, that a proof
>>begins with a truth and proceeds by logical steps. Since
>>clearly you believed that your "proof" in the thread "I was right,
>>surrogate factoring proof" begins with a truth and proceeded by
>>logical steps, it had to be correct. You have used this exact
>>
> argument
>
>>on many other occasions. You have a proof, every step is logical,
>>therefore it is correct. Why should the proof itself matter?
>>All we need is your assertion that you have started with a truth
>>and proceeded by logical steps. If that was good enough for your
>>"proof" in "Advanced Polynomial Factorization" and for your "proof"
>>of FLT, surely it is good enough here. In the case of Advanced
>>Polynomial Factorization, it led you to the conclusion that the
>>ring of algebraic integers itself had an error. Perhaps the same
>>is true here? The field of rational numbers has an error? Doesn't
>>include square roots, for example.
>>
>>
>
> You sound whiny to me. And why bother about methods under review at
> Princeton University?
>
> Don't trust them?
>

> *I've moved on and am worrying about factoring.*
>
> *I actually care about what's true versus talking.*
>
> *If you hadn't noticed, investigations are going on now both into the*
> *theory and implementing the theory, where I'm hearing it doesn't work.*
>
> *If it doesn't work then I don't have a proof, or the implementations*
> *are flawed.*

A proof of what? A proof that A = A? Your error is not in your equations (well, maybe, but we don't care), your error is to believe that you can use these equations to factor M.

Ok, after years of basic research, I recently discovered that if N is an odd composite it always exists integers X and Y such that N = XY and, of course, such that 1 < X < N. This extraordinary discovery totaly solves the factoring problem. Of course, it does! My theory is correct, such an X exists. I clearly show the way, it just remains to implement my theory and anybody can factor any composite integers.

Of course, I could also have written

N = X^2 − Y^2

or

yx^2 + Ax − N^2 = 0
zx^2 + Az − j^2 = 0

or else...

What does it change? These are just equations, there is no algorithm. BTW, James, I wouldn't bet that your way of doing is the shortest path for going from nowhere to nowhere but, after all, if you are not in a hurry, why not?

> *Now, if you believe I don't have a proof, fine, but you can chatter*
> *like a nincompoop or actually be constructive and find a flaw.*
>
> *Or is too much to ask that you think versus talk?*
>
> *If there is an error in the proof, give it.*
>
> *If all you care about is social crap, then keep chattering proving what*
> *you are, as I've said what you are many times.*
>

>
> *James Harris*