

is there a Great Attractor in Gametheory of VonNeumann?? Re: There exists a Nim version that is a "draw" OS

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-07/1329.html>

From: Archimedes Plutonium (a_plutonium_at_iw.net)

Date: 07/11/04

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 2004 13:55:07 -0500

Sat, 10 Jul 2004 15:24:42 -0500 Archimedes Plutonium wrote:

> *Sat, 10 Jul 2004 13:16:51 -0500 Archimedes Plutonium wrote:*

>

>> *10 Jul 2004 00:25:53 -0700 Jan Kristian Haugland wrote:*

>>

>>> *A combinatorial game such as Nim can not be a draw.*

>>> *Here is a distant relative that can be a draw:*

>>>

>>> <http://home.no.net/zamunda/split.htm>

>>

>> *I beg to differ.*

>>

>> *Yesterday I was working on a game of Nim, a morph of Nim where there are*

>> *no draws in the game itself but where either player can win in the OS*

>> *and not automatically that one player always wins the OS. Call it a*

>> *pseudodraw.*

>

> *The minimax theorem says a singular point. Thus a pseudodraw is*

> *nonexistent.*

>

> *Unless there is a draw within the game itself can the OS be a draw.*

>

>>

>>

>> *Secondly, I was looking for another Nim morph where it actually has a*

>> *draw within the game itself and the OS is a draw.*

>>

>> *Thirdly I was looking for a Tictactoe morph that was not a draw in the*

>> *OS and where either X or O can win in the OS. Call it a pseudodraw.*

>>

>> *Here is what I come up with:*

>>

>> *Nim-morph with pseudodraw OS: Let me call the person with first move as*

sci.logic: is there a Great Attractor in Gametheory of VonNeumann?? Re: There exists a Nim version that is a "draw" C

> > *white and let me call the person with second move as black. The first
> > move in this game is not the removal of any matchsticks but is the
> > actual layout of the number of rows and the number of matchsticks within
> > each row. Black then proceeds as in normal nim. I contend, thence, that
> > this nim morph will end up as a win for one of the players but not
> > automatically the black player (provided regular nim is considered a
> > loss for the one who is forced to pick up the last matchstick).*

>
> *This is a erroneous claim. Even if I added the rule that only one or two
> matchsticks can be removed per move.*

>
>>
>>

> > *Nim-morph with a Draw in the game itself: This is where white with first
> > move determines the number of rows of matchsticks and the number of
> > matchsticks in each row. And finally, determines that at least one row
> > is a "Draw row" so that if this row or any of its matchsticks is picked
> > up last then the entire game is a draw.*

>
> *This is possible. It perhaps needs the rule of only one or two matchsticks
> removed per move.*

>
>>
>>

> > *TicTacToe-morph with pseudodraw OS: this one was a tough one to work out
> > last night. I would have thought that Nim was going to be the tougher
> > challenge. We have several rule changes to normal tictactoe. Call the
> > first mover as X and the second mover as O. In this morph, O gets two
> > first moves so that at the end of the game there will be five O on the
> > board to four X. And the other change in rule is that if there are no
> > three-in-a-row for a outright win then the win goes to the person who
> > has the most two-in-a-row. Now I have not fully played out all the
> > consequences. But I suspect, not sure of this suspicion, that the OS of
> > this morph tictactoe is a win for either X or O or a pseudodraw. And
> > that every game played of this morph will produce a winner whether it be
> > X or O.*

>>
>

> *Trouble with whether "end row middles" would count as 2-in-a-row rather
> than having only "shortened 3-in-a-rows" count as 2-in-a-row. When X makes
> first move with placing an X in center square then X has the most
> 2-in-a-row unless we count end-row-middles as 2 in a row for O.*

>
> *Here again, the concept of Pseudodraw is erroneous, and that unless a draw
> exists in the game itself can the OS be a draw. And the minimax theorem
> says as much.*

>
>>

> > *Now, the most important aspect of the above, if true, implies that there
> > exists a Pseudodraw for the games of checkers and chess, but more
> > importantly, that those games OS is a draw with their current and*

is there a Great Attractor in Gametheory of VonNeumann?? Re: There exists a Nim version that is a "draw" C

sci.logic: is there a Great Attractor in Gametheory of VonNeumann?? Re: There exists a Nim version that is a "draw" C

> > *present rules.*

>

> *But the above is not all lost and wasted. I can salvage the idea that to*

> *make Nim a draw is to add the rule that the player with first move decides*

> *the arrangement of how many rows and number of matchsticks per row and*

> *which row is the "Draw" row.*

>

> *The implications for chess and checkers still remain. That if a game has a*

> *draw possibility, then the OS of that game ends up into that draw play.*

>

> *Nim OS is a win for one of the players always, well, because there is no*

> *draw possibility while playing the game.*

>

> *I never played Go. I suspect it has a draw possibility. If it does, then*

> *that is its OS-- a draw. Chess has a draw possibility, thus chess OS is a*

> *draw.*

> *This claim can be made into a assertion and then a theorem.*

>

> *Devise a game that is a VonNeumann game which has a draw possibility but*

> *has a nonDraw OS. Nim has a nondraw OS but nim has no draw within the game*

> *itself. So when we inject a draw possibility into Nim then does the one*

> *player always win the OS??????*

>

Initially I was tempted to call a draw game in any VonNeumann game as a gravity attractor such as gravity equilibrium or gravitational center so that if you introduce a "draw game inside of Nim" that the OS of Nim shifts and then becomes something different from its automatic win for second player.

That the moment you introduce a possible draw game that the entire OS of Nim shifts and becomes that draw end result.

But there is another concept in physics that is like gravitational attraction. And I suppose a "good physicist" not the usual run of the mill sort can tell you the conceptual difference between gravity attraction and Great Attractor in chaos theory.

I like to think of Great Attractors in EM of electricity and magnetism.

Anyway, Nim is VonNeumann gametheory and the OS is a certain victory for second player. But introduce just one possibility of a draw outcome, then, does the entire OS of this Nim change to the draw outcome? As like a Great Attractor, the draw outcome forces itself as the Optimal Strategy.

Archimedes Plutonium

www.archimedesplutonium.com

www.iw.net/~a_plutonium

whole entire Universe is just one big atom where dots of the electron-dot-cloud are galaxies

is there a Great Attractor in Gametheory of VonNeumann?? Re: There exists a Nim version that is a "draw"