

Re: ANSWER THE FCKING QUESTION GHOST

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-01/0746.html>

From: David C. Ullrich (ullrich_at_math.okstate.edu)

Date: 01/11/05

Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2005 08:04:32 -0600

On Tue, 11 Jan 2005 22:07:38 +1000, "|-|erc" <h@r.c> wrote:

>-----s-o-s-----

> "David C. Ullrich" <ullrich@math.okstate.edu> wrote in message

>> On Tue, 11 Jan 2005 15:17:54 +1000, "|-|erc" <h@r.c> wrote:

>>

>>>

>>>>

>>>> Neither follows from my answer, which involves all finite prefixes only.

>>>> While all digits do appear (given any digit, it has a finite index),

>>>> the number does not.

>>>>

>

>> >Anyone else comment on those 2 statements.

>>

>> Two comments. (i) He's right and you're wrong (in

>> particular he's right when he says that what

>> you say follows from what he said actually

>> doesn't follow).

>>

>> (ii) Saying "SO JUST IGNORE ALL MY POSTS"

>> in a thread titled "ANSWER THE FCKING QUESTION

>> GHOST" is kind of funny.

>>

>> >Herc

>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>

>>

>> *****

>>

>> David C. Ullrich

>

>

>Nice try!! God's don't make mistakes David I keep telling you.

sci.logic: Re: ANSWER THE FCKING QUESTION GHOST

In case you're wondering why a few people found that funny, you meant to write "Gods don't make mistakes". Saying "God's" instead of "Gods" wouldn't usually be all that funny, but coming from an infallible one it's sort of amusing.

>Remember the other 5
>times you've confronted me became the 5 biggest laughing stock moments of your life?

No, don't recall that.

>Remember how you said irrationals are perfect and rationals are real life approximations?

But I'm certain I never said that irrationals are perfect. I don't even have any idea what that means.

>And some guy named YOU-WRONG or some meaning alias laughed his head off at you?

Maybe you're confusing me with someone else. Very puzzling.

>It seems a few hundred digits was close enough for Planck and crew after all.

>

>What's it leading up to Dave? Why do you suffer the supernatural falter so precicely?

>

>

>I

>*EVERY* DIGIT OF THE ENTIRE SEQUENCE TO INFINITELY MANY DIGITS

>

>*APPEARS IN ORDER#*, IN POSITION

>

>SOMEWHERE IN THE SET

>

>

>What are you talking about here when you rebuke this statement after confirming

>

>ALL digits OF PI appear IN ORDER?

>

>

>Remember ORDER# is a property of one digit.

>

>Herc

>

>

David C. Ullrich