

sci.math: Re: \*\*\*\*\* CAN ANYONE HERE DEFINE CHAITIN'S OMEGA ? \*\*\*\*\*

**Re: \*\*\*\*\* CAN ANYONE HERE DEFINE CHAITIN'S  
OMEGA ? \*\*\*\*\***

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-01/8862.html>

---

**From:** r.e.s. (r.s\_at\_ZZmindspring.com)

**Date:** 01/31/05

Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 02:03:10 GMT

"r.e.s." <r.s@ZZmindspring.com> wrote

- > *In the thread*
- > *"Herc defines the HOLY GRAIL OF MATHEMATICS"*
- > *I'd already explained to Herc about the problems with the*
- > *MathWorld definition of Omega, \*and\* how to fix it, \*and\**
- > *provided a reference to the paper by Calude, et al, \*and\**
- > *explained differences between Omega and the quantity tau,*
- > *which is special case of your K\_U.*

I meant to refer to the thread "Why we cannot compute omega".

Re: \*\*\*\*\* CAN ANYONE HERE DEFINE CHAITIN'S OMEGA ? \*\*\*\*\*