Re: JSH: Surrogate factoring, periodic behavior

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007−09/msg00522.html

- *From*: "local host" <Dorkus@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

- *Date*: Mon, 3 Sep 2007 18:39:22 −0500

"JSH" <jstevh@xxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1188661628.595657.146380@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> On Sep 1, 7:23 am, Rotwang <sg...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > James Harris wrote:
> >
> > > If they did show this idea was just total crap then I might still
> > do
> > > analysis to figure out why, as with all previous "surrogate
> > factoring"
> > > equations I could always pull them apart to find out why I
> > wasn't
> > > getting the desired behavior.
> >
> > > And that behavior I remind is the ability to factor an RSA
> > sized
> > > number in under 10 minutes on a standard desktop computer.
> >
> > > Recently I came back to do a detailed analysis which
> > includes new info
> > > like the decision relations this thread is ACTUALLY about,
> > and next
> > > I'll see if the new info leads to better working code.
> >
> > > That's how it's done.
> >
> > > You people instead just want to come out every once and a
> > while and
> > > claim it doesn't work well, without being able to explain

why.

Your lack of curiosity is what I am using to get people suspicious of
you.

So, yeah, maybe surrogate factoring is a bum idea that will never work
well, but why?

Why?

That simple question is a driver of human evolution. Without asking
it, you cannot truly be an intellectual if you are criticizing an idea.

If you don't care, fine. But if you care enough to attack an idea, if
you are a real researcher you need to care enough to figure out why it
doesn't work!

No, that is not how real researchers work. If you were a doctor and somebody came up to you and suggested that maybe one could cure brain cancer by eating two pounds of fudge before stroking a tree while facing north, would you drop what you were doing and devote your time to figuring out why that isn't going to work? Or would you first ask the guy why on Earth he thinks it *would* work?

If that person drove traffic in medical subjects from around the world and had a dedicated mob of respondents who argued with him day and night over medical topics, I might.

Google searches shift on a day to day basis on what I talk about on sci.math which is an impact far beyond what most of you can even imagine.

> The issue is not whether or not there are people who are interested in
> what I say, as the evidence is overwhelming that there are.
>
> > The fact is that any algorithm that generates integers and then
> > calculates their GCD with a target T *might* reveal non−trivial
> > factors of T. Moreover if that algorithm checks enough numbers then it
> > is very likely that eventually it *will* reveal a non−trivial factor
> > of T. But a simple counting argument suggests that if T is RSA−sized
> > and has no small factors then for most such algorithms the time taken
> > to find a non−trivial factor of T is prohibitively large. If you want
> > anybody to believe that your method is any kind of breakthrough then
> > you must present some reason to believe that it might find factors of
> > T faster than existing methods, or else you will be taken no more
> > seriously than a man who claims with no justification that fudge−
> > eating and tree−stroking can cure cancer. But you haven't − in fact
> > when Marcus asked you to do so you chose instead to rant about how sub−
> > human we all are.
>
> Surrogate factoring is kind of mysterious because people can do these
> checks as they have posted about that indicate very much worse than
> random!
>
> But how is that possible?
>
> Isn't random the bottom?

yes, and you have invented something even slower, worser.

> > I know it's probably futile but I'll ask again: why do you believe
> > that your method should work better than trial division or random−GCD?
> >
> > [snip social crap]
>
> Sigh. Years ago I wondered, might you be able to factor one number by
> instead factoring another?

like answering another question instead of this one, surragoat answering.

> That's it dude. I wondered that years ago and started looking to see
> what the math said.

you don't know how to read math, you admit to that.

> Can you comprehend asking a question and then going looking?

Answer ??

> So yeah, I question your basic human curiosity because I have to keep repeating that over and over again for you so you clearly DO NOT GET IT.

You keep losing it James, but then again, you never had it.

> Somehow your brain seizes up on the possibility of someone just wondering about something and going to go see if it is possible, which to me does not make you a candidate for an evolutionary leap in the human species as I think MOST people on the planet WOULD get it.

so you are going to vote for HILLARY !?

> Or do you disagree?

disagree with you, therefore I am right, because you are always wrong.

> James Harris

.