

Re: JSH: Key in the lock, factoring technique

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-02/msg00614.html>

- *From:* marcus_b <marcus_bruckner@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 9 Feb 2008 12:54:41 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 9, 1:31 pm, JSH <jst...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

So guess what? Big new thing is that I came up with this guessing technique to factor, which is a key in the lock technique, where the guesses have to be correct or you don't get all integers.

Trouble is, and why I'm still putting out the posts, the math people are either quiet or still arguing with me, which in this case means showing complete contempt for your knowledge of basic algebra:

The four equations are:

$$(f_1 + c_1 * p_1)(f_2 + c_2 * p_1) = T = r_1 + k_1 * p_1$$

$$(g_1 + d_1 * p_2)(g_2 + d_2 * p_2) = T = r_2 + k_2 * p_2$$

and

$$(f_1 + c_1 * p_1) = (g_1 + d_1 * p_2)$$

$$(f_2 + c_2 * p_1) = (g_2 + d_2 * p_2)$$

Note however that if you substitute the right sides of equations 3 and 4 into equation 1, you get exactly equation 2. The 4 equations are not independent. You really have only 3 equations in 4 unknowns.

Which means in general there are infinitely many solutions. Of course you are only interested in solutions which are all-integers. So how do you find those solutions?

The four unknowns are c_1 , c_2 , d_1 , and d_2 . You can set one of them equal to an arbitrary integer – say, $c_1 = 48$ – and solve for the others. In general the solutions are not integers. You could

Re: JSH: Key in the lock, factoring technique

therefore try another value for c_1 , solve again, see if the solutions are integers.

But in general they are not. How many c_1 's must you try before you find all-integer solutions for the other unknowns?

Maybe a lot. There is no reason to think the number is small. And it may be that, for a given choice of p_1 and p_2 , there is NO integer choice for c_1 which gives integer solutions for c_2 , d_1 , and d_2 . Which means you may have to search over various values of p_1 and p_2 also.

Maybe you should try to figure this out before continuing to claim an efficient solution to the factoring problem.

and that may seem like a LOT of variables (ok, it is) but most of them

are known as p_1 and p_2 are prime numbers. T is the target composite to factor, $r_1 = T \bmod p_1$, and $r_2 = T \bmod p_2$, so k_1 and k_2 are easily calculated.

And f_1 , f_2 , g_1 , and g_2 are residues where

$$f_1 * f_2 = T \bmod p_1 \text{ and } g_1 * g_2 = T \bmod p_2$$

so those are your keys to the lock. If you guess right then the last two equations are true. If you guess wrong, then they are not true for integers.

That's why this technique is about a key in the lock.

Note, guessing wrong will still give you an answer for the c 's and d 's, but not all integers.

You have four equations and four unknowns as if you counted along, only c_1 , c_2 , d_1 , and d_2 are left as unknowns, and you can see the four equations.

It's really only 3 equations in 4 unknowns. The solution-space is infinite in the rationals. You need only the integer solutions. But how do you find them without checking a huge set of rational solutions?

Re: JSH: Key in the lock, factoring technique

Math people have a reason to fight my research, and the point here

is

there are NO LIMITS in their fight so they cannot be the ones who are telling the truth.

Otherwise, they'd celebrate a great advance.

But I suggest to you they feel fear and are just looking to see if they can hide the result or if I'll just be ignored.

It's like, if quantum theory and relativity had been blocked by the physics community because most physicists were fakes so that Einstein, Schroedinger and Heisenberg had to get creative to get the truth out.

I am being creative but I realize the future still is in doubt.

They will hide the truth because they see truth in mathematics as their enemy.

The mathematical field was corrupted. And the future of the human species is in danger as a result.

This is delusional talk. You keep rushing out with one bogus solution after another, and before you have validated a solution you start predicting apocalypse. And every time you have done that you have been wrong. This time is no different. You keep proving over and over again that you are utterly negligible.

Marcus.

Continued scientific progress is in doubt if the problem is not addressed as correct mathematics is crucial to it.

James Harris