

Re: No Unique Initial Segment And No Characteristic Expansion

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-12/6698.html>

From: |-/erc (h_at_r.c)

Date: 12/10/04

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 2004 12:40:07 +1000

"george" <greeneg@cs.unc.edu> wrote in >

George Greene I take it?

> |-/erc wrote:

>

> > *I'm amazed grown men believe in this, DMC's diagonalizer is never*

> *unique,*

> > *not after 1 anti-flip, not after 10 anti-flips,*

>

> *So FUCKING What??????*

Sounds like George Greene..

> *WHY do you even GIVE A SHIT whether anything is unique??*

no domain of discourse for the question.

> *The number of POSSIBLE DIFFERENT OUTCOMES for what all these*

> *random flippers are doing is NOT 1, dumbass. OBVIOUSLY,*

its infinite, no hyperinfinity just because you can't understand the 1 to 1 map

> *for DIFFERENT possible [input]outcomes, THERE MUST BE different*

input outcomes? I see, and output incomes aswell ?

> *possible results! That is an absolutely necessary property of*

> *ANY process that has RANDOM inputs (and actually bothers to*

> *depend on all of them).*

its a property, but hardly a necessary one, dependable and random oppose one another.

>

> *We don't HAVE to have a diagonalizer, LET ALONE an anti-diagonalizer,*

sci.math: Re: No Unique Initial Segment And No Characteristic Expansion

you don't even have a diagonaliser. its a self referential phantom like russels paradox.

- > *to do this. Let's just define an "initializer" as*
- > *flip-sequence-reader-writer*

flip-sequence-reader-writer.... do ever read your old posts and wonder what you were on about?

- > *that visits each of Herc's Infinite flippers once and asks, NOT, "what*
- > *was your nth flip", but rather, "what was your first flip?", and*
- > *adds, as the mth flip of HIS sequence, NOT the denial of, but rather,*
- > *the exact SAME as, whatever the mth flipper's first flip was.*

the "1st flips sequence", it can appear most anywhere.

- >
- > *THIS SEQUENCE IS NOT UNIQUE *EITHER*, DIPSHIT.*
- > *It will be DIFFERENT depending on which of the 2^m possible different*
- > *ways the original first m flippers' flips came out.*

sheesh george, its just a list, a piece of paper, top and left edges are there but the right and bottom edges can't be seen.

- >
- > *SO *FUCKING* what? Does this mean "take the first flip of*
- > *every flipper" is somehow an "invalid" way of defining an*
- > *infinite sequence??*
- > *OF FUCKING *COURSE* * N O T * !!*

we agree there, false does not imply anything.

- >
- > *not after googelplex anti-flips, he*
- > *never has anything unique about his sequence at all, ever.*
- >
- > *And that NEVER MATTERS,dipshit.*

it matters to the people who can't tell the difference between
INFINITE FLIPS OF H&T and
INFINITE FLIPS OF H&T

when there is no finite digit that is different

- > *Actually, if this is in binary, then he DOES have something unique*
- > *about his FINITE sequence: it is THE ONLY finite sequence with the*
- > *property that for ALL n, its nth flip disagrees with the nth*
- > *flipper's nth flip. THAT is unique and*

say that 3 times!!!

- >
- > *yet this is overlooked,*

- >
- > *It is NOT overlooked, DIPSHIT! WE SEE what you*
- > *are saying!*

I actually held my breath reading this...

- > *And you are saying NOTHING!*

but it was just a cliché

- > *What you*
- > *are saying in NO way demonstrates any sort of illegitimacy*
- > *or ill-definedness of this sequence!*

wake up and smell the sunshine,
two lists with the same sequence.
one is to infinite digits, the other to unlimited digits.

your... define i, n as not n, n is froth.
look at it a minute and think about russel,

think about "YOU CANT PROVE ME"

$G = \neg \text{proof}(G)$

when $\text{proof}(X) \leftrightarrow X$ is a metaconsistency axiom.

**SQUASH THOSE SELF DEFEATING FORMULA
THEY DON'T PROVE SQUAT, THEY DON'T DEFINE VALID OBJECTS,
THEY DON'T STOP COMPUTERS COUNTING REALS**

- > *If we are in binary*
- > *then it is uniquely defined AFTER the flippers have flipped*
- > *enough (given that every flipper is only a finite number of*
- > *flippers from the beginning, and every flip is only a finite*
- > *number of flips from the beginning, no individual flip or anti-*
- > *flip needs infinite inputs to compute).*

My new sig.

- >
- > *> either this trivial diagonal, a line down the middle of a big square,*
- > *is an illusion*
- >
- > *Well, it obviously isn;t that.*

"Obviously" meaning you have no idea how to dispute it.
Obviously and Clearly are the call signs around here of presumed knowledge.

- >
- > *> or its a bona fide witness to hyperinfinity*
- >
- > *No, it obviously isn't that either.*

THEN YOU HAVE NO CASE.

> *It's just one more denumerable number.*

ONE MORE THAN COUNTABLE INFINITY

> *You could ADD it to the*

> *list, at the beginning, and THEN what could they say?*

no george, the paper has writing all over it remember?

> *THEY could try again, but whatever they came up with, you could*

> *just add that, too.*

we can both safely skip past these dynamic attacks to diagonalisation.

>

> > *and computers don't fully work,*

>

> *NOTHING *fully* works, you ignorant jackass.*

the space time continuum moves forward, you're just stuck in a rut because you take formula literally.

"this statement is false"

s = !s

this is the only formula you have formalised that you discredit, isn't it?

everything else is a gateway to new modelling theory.

> *NO framework can generalize about ITSELF.*

from a perspective, but generalize is rather trivial to achieve.

but now you're getting somewhere.

IF no framework can generalise about itself,

WHY do you expect cardinal representation to have a simple formal completeness.

(considering anti-diag is a choice element of itself)

> *Suppose you have some natural numbers (all positive)*

> *written on a blackboard (a finite positive integer*

> *number of finite positive integers). These numbers*

> *have to have a sum. "The sum of the numbers on this blackboard"*

> *is a well-defined concept. BUT YOU CAN'T *WRITE* IT *ON* that board.*

great lecturers trick! Get kids to come up to write the answer, then tell them wrong, get the next kid (a dim one)... can you give the real sum... wrong... next kid.

that's because sum is self referential here.

sum is a number.

the particular–number of the numbers
the sum–number of { numbers and itself)
 $y = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + y$
no solution for $x_1, x_2 \dots \in \mathbb{N}$.

- >
- > > *just ignore the fact negating the flip does not make a new outcome.*
- >
- > *It makes an outcome different from THE ONE flipper's list that supplied*

Doesn't matter, its not a sufficient mechanism to determine a new sequence when it fails to terminate for any finite digit position.

- > *the flip being negated, DIPSHIT. That's how we do it: ONE flipPER AT A*
- > *TIME.*
- > *That's just how THEY do it: one FLIP at a time.*

never guarantees a new sequence.

- >
- > > *You knowingly base a hyperinfinity higher mathematics on this*
- > *solution?*
- >
- > *This is not a "solution", dipshit. It is just noticing that*

the following dud paragraph solution, you ticked right.

- > $Ax[rRx \leftrightarrow \sim xRx]$
- > *is a logical contradiction -- there CANNOT BE any such r.*
- > *This does not mean that r is not well–defined or that the method*
- > *by which you constructed it is wrong, though: it may instead be*
- > *that SOME OTHER PREMISE (i.e., "there is a list of all the reals")*
- > *in your argument was wrong. The specific means by which this*
- > *infinite list of flips was constructed ARE PROVABLY constructive,*
- > *simple, and legitimate. There is NOTHING special, specious, or suspect*
- > *about them. They are means that you have NO choice BUT to ALLOW and*
- > *that*
- > *you yourself, AND your precious finite computers, USE ALL THE TIME in*
- > *other contexts.*
- >
- > >

Read it this time.... everyone is watching this guy, millions of people ALWAYS have the same sequence he has so far... will they pay up?

- > > > *Take one of the people, whatever his 1st flip was, reverse it! If he*
- > > > *flipped a head you select tail, if he flipped a tail, heads. That's*
- > > > *your first outcome, cross him off and select someone else, whatever was*
- > > > *their second flip, reverse it! Keep on going and you have an infinite*
- > > > *sequence that is different to everyone's sequence in atleast one flip.*
- >

> *Right.*
>
> > *Literally unbelievable*
> > *Herc*

for a sequence to be unique, its must have one of the following

- 1/ unique initial segment
- 2/ characteristic expansion

The antiflip diagonal on the random coin toss cartesian plane, and any modified diagonal of UTM(x, y) don't have either of these properties. They are indistinguishable from the other members.

"New" sequence <HTHTHHHTHTHTHTTTHTTTHTHHHHHHHTHTHTHTTTTHTHTH..>
"On list" sequence <HTHTHHHTHTHTHTTTHTTTHTHHHH..>

You can go to any length you want, $10^{10^{10^{10^{10^{10}}}}$ flips and the initial segments will match perfectly to $10^{10^{10^{10^{10^{10}}}}$ flips.

They match to UNLIMITED PRECISION. the sequence is on the list to infinite flips.

IT * DOES * contradict your conclusions of LET $(i,n) \neq (n,n)$, contradiction therefore new sequence therefore higher infinities than infinite lists exist.

Herc

--
> then it is uniquely defined AFTER the flippers have flipped
> enough (given that every flipper is only a finite number of
> flippers from the beginning, and every flip is only a finite
> number of flips from the beginning, no individual flip or anti-
> flip needs infinite inputs to compute). GEORGE GREENE sci.logic