

# Re: Calculus XOR Probability

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-05/msg02999.html>

---

- *From:* Virgil <vmhjr2@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Tue, 16 May 2006 13:49:38 -0600
- 

In article <MPG.1ed3c816de9c707c98acde@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Tony Orlow <aeo6@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

imaginatorium@xxxxxxxxxxxx said:

What is ill defined about  $N=S^L$  or IFR? To me, almost everything in transfinite set theory is ill defined, and I give reasons for that. Can you?

We have time and again. We who reject TO's stupidities each understand each other quite easily, but TO does not seem able to understand any of us.

TO has no system in which any of his variations on standard mathematics are valid, yet insists on them despite repeated logically and mathematically impeccable proofs of their falsity in every extant system.

No-one disagrees that for an alphabet of (pofnat)  $S$  symbols, if  $N$  is the number of strings of length  $L$ , then  $N = S^L$ . You persist in abusing this little formula, for example for making claims relating to \*any length\*, with  $L$  replaced by some arbitrary symbol.

Why is that abuse?  $L$  IS an arbitrary symbol. It's called a variable. It represents a quantity, specifically, a natural number. You just don't like it when I plug infinite values into it.

Since in standard mathematics what one is allowed to "plug in" to a variable is limited to its domain, we expect those limits to be honored.

If TO insists on putting square pegs in round holes, he must be prepared to see objections.

Re: Calculus XOR Probability