

Re: Simple answer, surrogate factoring

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/1694.html>

jstevh_at_msn.com

Date: 03/04/05

Date: 4 Mar 2005 15:52:24 -0800

Nathan wrote:

> *jstevh@msn.com* wrote:

> > *fiziwig* wrote:

> > > *Could you take a reasonably small number, say 8 or 10*

> > > *digits, and DEMONSTRATE, step by step how your method would be*

> > > *applied to factoring that number. Can I see how you use it to*

> > > *factor an easy number like 50,985,511 for example?*

>

> > *Why? It'd make as much sense to factor an easy number like 15.*

> >

> > *I'm more of a theoretical guy. I want to know why.*

>

> *So give a clear explanation of "how".*

I *have* posted algorithms.

Even this thread contains an algorithm which should work perfectly.

I'm just not interested in going through the effort of demonstrating the algorithm with a test number, especially when other posters have posted the algorithms in programmatic form, as has happened.

I'm the theory guy.

Other people are the experimental people.

It's how physics works, and I'm showing how it can be done with mathematics.

If you push me on details I get annoyed, as I'm the theory guy.

I'm the theoretical amateur mathematician.

>

> > *So I give the mathematical basis for various ideas, and if you're*

> > *interested enough, you can play with it and test it out.*

>

> *The "basis" you've given so far isn't enough to really figure out*

> *what it is you mean.*
>

I know it is for some people, and that's important to me as more than anything else I want to get to the bottom of this and understand it.

To me people who can figure out what I'm doing are more valuable than people who need extreme detail, as those people are more likely to be able to test or critique.

More than anything else I need people who are capable of pointing out mistakes in my reasoning, or testing out the ideas themselves.

Later I can address people who need more help, once the basic research is done, and I'd fully intend to do that as I see it as an important point.

One of my BIG beefs with Wiles is that he disdained explaining his work to a general audience claiming it was just beyond them.

> > *I don't like specific factorization requests though I have tried some*
> > *at times, as they don't serve a purpose.*
>
> *Okay, so you pick the number. Just show us, in *complete* detail.*
>

I explained above on that point.

Yes, I can do it, and later I might, but for now, I need people who can do it for themselves who feel motivated to do so, as hopefully then, they may do more.

> > *If I factor the number, people will just put up bigger numbers, and*
> > *if I could factor RSA Challenge numbers I wouldn't be talking about*
> > *it on Usenet, but posters would keep putting up numbers until that*
> > *point and beyond, as that's how Usenet is.*
>
> *I think you misunderstood fiziwig. I think he's just asking for a*
> *demonstration. That's something I would like to see, too.*
>
> *You get a lot of hostile, rhetorical questions, and you deserve that.*
> *But I read this as a genuine request.*
>
> *Do you really think you've explained "surrogate factoring" in enough*
> *detail for someone else to implement it? I don't think you have.*

People have implemented it.

Given that the perfect algorithm is now out, I'm sure many more people have implemented it, and that number will grow rapidly, which may be

sci.math: Re: Simple answer, surrogate factoring

unfortunate.

I would like to address a more general audience later, but for now I need people with expertise.

People who can find holes in my reasoning or test out the ideas.

I need experimental mathematicians.

James Harris