

Re: *** TRY THESE SCI.MATH *******

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-01/1780.html>

From: george (greeneg_at_cs.unc.edu)

Date: 01/21/05

Date: 20 Jan 2005 20:01:37 -0800

|—|erc wrote:

> *Take any reasonable interpretation of the terms*

No. The whole point about logic is that if you are dealing with something PROVABLE, then IT NEVER MATTERS how you interpret the terms. The provability of what you are saying arises from the STRUCTURE of the argument and it is valid for ALL interpretations. The interpretation IS IRRELEVANT. It's the fact that your crap NEEDS interpreting THAT IS THE PROBLEM.

> *you can to get an answer where possible.*

It is ALWAYS possible to get AN answer if you interpret things in YOUR preferred way. That's why YOU always have an answer. The problem with THAT strategy is that the resulting answers are WRONG.

> *If there is ambiguity, state all possible interpretations and answer each.*

Make me. As if I didn't have better things to do with MY time.

> *"A random real number will be on a computables list to an infinite number of digits" True / False / Other*

> _____

Other; "random" and "on a list ... to an infinite number of digits" are both simply meaningless. Reinterpreted reasonably, what you MEANT as OPPOSED to "random" was "arbitrary", and what you meant by "on...to...number of digits" is unsalvageable. It is salvageable for finite numbers, but if you plug w into the hole where the finite numbers is in THAT re-interpretation, you just get that the "random" real must occur on the list, and therefore must be computable, which is, as I said at the outset, THE WRONG answer.

> *"All finite subsequences of a random real number will be on a computables list"* True / False / Other

> _____

Other; again, "random" is relevant.

However, if you replace "a random" with "every", you will then have something salvageable, if you will expand "on a computables list" to something meaningful. It has gone under-stressed throughout this argument that what you call "a computables list" is itself NONcomputable. The list you are talking about is one that no TM can generate, even though every element on it corresponds to some TM.

>

> *"All digits of a random real number are covered in all finite subsequences of that number"* True / False / Other

> _____

Other; you can't define "covered".

You're also dangerously equivocating on "all".

In THIS room, "all" means EACH. The empty subsequence is a finite subsequence of that number.

IT doesn't cover ANY digits of ANY real number.

So this would be obviously false if you had a COHERENT definition of "all" and "covered". But you don't.

We could get you one, but why should we do your homework for you? Hint: the proper typing of the function

you are trying to call "covering" is that it relates not

"all subsequences", but rather ANY OLD ARBITRARY COLLECTION of sequences, to the ONE sequence representing 1 real.

It returns some subsequence of that real. By "all digits ...

are covered", you mean that the returned subsequence is equal to the whole real argument.

> *"If you have the list of computables, a random real number can be on it to an infinite number*

> *of digits, and yet not be on the list"* True / False / Other

> _____

False.

The only way a number can be "on" a list of countably-infinite digit-strings "to" infinite digits is for it to be on the list. The truth we have instead is that it is (in your language, which we DON'T endorse) on the list to EACH AND EVERY FINITE number of digits. BUT NOT "to" any infinite numbers of digits. This IS NOT analogous to the finite case.

If something is on the list "to" 5 digits then it is on it to 0,1,2,3,4, AND 5 digits. This is 6 different numbers of digits. But that does not entitle you to say that the number is on the list to 6 digits. Similarly, there being w natnums n with the property that the number is on the list to n digits does NOT entitle you to say that the number is on the list to w digits.

> *How many digits of a random sequence*

You really need to just delete the word "random" from your vocabulary. It doesn't mean anything here. Making your argument for EACH AND EVERY sequence will AUTOMATICALLY include all the "random" sequences! There is no reason to try to separate them out!

> *have the prefix up to that digit*
WHAT digit, DUMBASS?
PRONOUNS HAVE TO HAVE ANTECEDENTS.
LEARN TO FUCKING *SPEAK* *ENGLISH*, MORON.

> *occur on a member of any complete computable number list?*

You gotta be more careful there.
A list with all and only the computable reals on it, once each, isn't practically generatable. You should just talk about a denumerable list with the property that every computable real occurs on it at least once. Lots of other things can be on it as well but THAT DOESN'T HAVE TO BOTHER YOU.

>
> *Random Sequence =*
>
<593738.....>
> |<--- *How many of these digits satisfy the question?* --->|

WHAT question, moron? A DIGIT cannot satisfy the question.

>
> *UTM(row, col) mod 10*
> 1 <23424.....>
> 2 <54434.....>
> 3 <59373.....>
> ...

As I've told you before, infinitely many of the points in that matrix are UNDEFINED because UTM(row,col) DOES NOT HALT.
> ____
>
> * *remember : how many digits (of the random sequeence), not how many digits (fit on each row of UTM).*

The fact that you have to try that lame clarification just proves how stupidly you phrased it in the first place. IF YOU WOULD GET IT RIGHT TO START WITH, you would NOT have these problems.