

Re: Theory of beliefs, belief fields

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-12/msg00046.html>

- *From:* "FabrizioJBonsignore" <djbonsignore@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 01 Dec 2006 15:55:34 -0500
-

I cant believe it, they authorities are letting them be brutalized and go perturbed. Not a single official has had the guts and authority to come see me and explain what are they doing. There MUST be two letter in the 26 Federal Plaza Building FBI since 2004 that were ignored. They are protecting and obvious thief and he is not I, an obvious cadre of thieves and they are not of my group. The women were, and I am still confused as to who are they, if they are the same after 15 years, and why am I being rejected. Didnt they notice that the man producing ideas was left in the street and advantages are being give to somebody else BECUASE of essentially contradictory old... I cant even call it thinking! No moment to philosophize, the direction of good should be quite evident, it is in SEVERAL writings. It is OBVIOUS: whoever is behind the experience I and the women and people who know are going through, has to be considered enemy of humanity and treated as a war criminal.

Note this algorithmic ethic:

I. hurt yourself or I hurt you

This statement hold no value, few people will fall prey to it, that is, they wont hurt themselves because they can confront the issuer of the threat and it becomes a two parties affair. It is not compelling, as the actor of the statement can wait til something happens and then act. The termination of the statement is also obvious, a two parties situation, once the issuer of the threat is confronted and acted on the cycle finishes and there is nothing else to be done, or the threat is false and the person can go on with his life; eventually the threatener acn be found and disabled. Compare to the next one:

I*. hurt yourself or I send _somebody_ to hurt you

This statement closes a cycle and is compelling! It is now a third party situation, an n-party situation in a sequence $p \leftarrow c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 \dots \leftarrow t$ P is person, c_i is criminals, t is the threatener. In this case the actor becomes t. p can stay in place and wait for successive hordes of c_i , without affecting the engine, t. Termination is then simple: just effect the statement and hurt him or herself! Then accordingly t will stop sending c_i s. Under this logic p is forced to be hurt, even if no c_i s are sent! t may remain untouched. But p can do nothing and just wait for the

Re: Theory of beliefs, belief fields

ci s to come to deflect them. In any case damage is t s responsibility.
Compare to the next:

I** . hurt yourself or I send _somebody_ to hurt you or to hurt somebody else

The sequence is more compelling! But the solution would still be the same: it is t who initializes the situation, the quicker t is disabled the less will happen. In both cases there is no guarantee that t will stop once p gets hurt, which is why for p is better to wait til something happens and then act.

Applying I* or I** recursively to all p s in a group, some p s can be turned into ci s! A single t can make a whole group go into selfflagellation by aplying I* or II* to all members of the group individually. In this case the solution is to ignore t. And to propagate the knowledge of t to the whole population. It is an algorithmic ethic once applied as every individual can follow a clear course of action: hurt himself or do nothing and wait for trouble. But if all people in the implied population follow EXACTLY the same behavior, either t succeeds (everybody is hurt) or the ps win (nobody acts)! It is then more rational NOT to hurt yourself and NOT to go hurt somebody else because the whole situation is disabled. Which is then the correct rule to follow. This solution depends on all ps in the population being aware of t. NOte that to act t must communicate itself with at least one p and one c to issue the __directive__. It means that a path between p and t can be found even if several ci s are used. THE obvious strategy for t is to incommunicate ... thhis is beingstolen by a keylogger...

Mathematics... all symbols are nothing if you dont know the rules to combine them; all symbols are worth nothing if you dont have the words to interpret them.

Fabrizio J Bonsignore now Danilo J Bonsignore

.