

5HC : Utopias and tests

The Urth list — 5 messages, 4 voices, 03 Feb 2005

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/4355>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Jim Raylor — 03 Feb 2005, 11:14

Another person's Utopia is always worth a visit, but I would not want to live in most of them.

In private conversation, Skinner referred to his own internal processes as any of us do (I feel, I remember, I believe, I think etc) though if pushed he could rephrase himself in more behaviouristic terms.

Turing abstracted by considering simple devices with a finite number of states, from this he came upon the basis of universal computing devices and an operational definition of mathematical undecidability.

I maintain 5HC is a logically and operationally decidable proposition within the axiomatic structure of literature and art.

A full simulation of all the conditioning agents is NOT required to reinforce the problem-solving behaviour once the pattern is established.

=====

<http://prisoner143.50megs.com/>

I am not a number I am a free person!

Iorwerth Thomas — 04 Feb 2005, 06:11 · in reply to Jim Raylor

From: Jim Raylor <rjaylor at yahoo.co.uk>

Turing abstracted by considering simple devices with a finite number of states, from this he came upon the basis of universal computing devices and an operational definition of mathematical undecidability.

I maintain 5HC is a logically and operationally decidable proposition within the axiomatic structure of literature and art.

Ok, I'll bite. What's the axiomatic structure, and does it support:

- a) Self-reference
- b) classical or non-classical logic ?

(You might find that the system is Godel incomplete...)

I'm not convinced that 5HoC is anything at all like a proposition. It's a little... big.

Iorwerth

Maru Dubshinki — 04 Feb 2005, 15:24 · in reply to Iorwerth Thomas

You ever look at the encoded integers involved in the proofs of the various Godel proofs? Those are propositions (If I am understanding 'proposition' as equivalent to theorems; if they are axioms, well it is still true, just in a different way), way bigger in information and bulk than 'Cerberus'

~Maru

Microsoft delenda est.

Remember what the dormouse said! Feed your head! Feed your head!

On Fri, 04 Feb 2005 14:10:29 +0000, Iorwerth Thomas

<iorweththomas at hotmail.com> wrote:

I'm not convinced that 5HoC is anything at all like a proposition. It's a little... big.

Iorwerth

Chris — 04 Feb 2005, 15:41 · in reply to Maru Dubshinki

The information "in" 5HoC is not at all limited to the explicit data (the words written on the page); the vast majority is implicated by the text. Which is not to say that Godel's work is entirely explicit. But we are talking about two very different ways of writing or using language - one is tailored to try and be as explicit and rigorous as possible, the other not so much.

I suspect there is also an inherent problem with calling a work of fiction a 'proposition'; I have some doubts that something can be both at the same time, because even a false proposition is not exactly fictional.

Also, if 5HoC were intended as a proposition, it would be difficult to explain why the relations between its elements are so hard to define. Unless one means to suggest that it's just a really, really lousy proposition.

You ever look at the encoded integers involved in the proofs of the various Godel proofs? Those are propositions (If I am understanding 'proposition' as equivalent to theorems; if they are axioms, well it is still true, just in a different way), way bigger in information and bulk than 'Cerberus'

~Maru

Microsoft delenda est.

Remember what the dormouse said! Feed your head! Feed your head!

On Fri, 04 Feb 2005 14:10:29 +0000, Iorwerth Thomas

<iorweththomas at hotmail.com> wrote:

I'm not convinced that 5HoC is anything at all like a proposition. It's a little... big.

Iorwerth

Maru Dubshinki — 04 Feb 2005, 16:31 · in reply to Chris

What you say is true: I was merely pointing out that size is no bar to a proposition. They can be as big as are needful. I myself do not think Cerberus as a whole is a proposition; it is clearly, and truly segmented in three parts, both in topography, composition (style and historical) and in that they are transformations of one proposition if anything. But if Cerberus can be said to be a proposition, it is laid out nowhere in an unveiled form.

~Maru

Remember what the dormouse said! Feed your head! Feed your head!

On Fri, 04 Feb 2005 23:40:05 +0000, Chris <rasputin_ at hotmail.com> wrote:
The information "in" 5HoC is not at all limited to the explicit data (the words written on the page); the vast majority is implicated by the text. Which is not to say that Godel's work is entirely explicit. But we are talking about two very different ways of writing or using language - one is tailored to try and be as explicit and rigorous as possible, the other not so much.

I suspect there is also an inherent problem with calling a work of fiction a 'proposition'; I have some doubts that something can be both at the same time, because even a false proposition is not exactly fictional.

Also, if 5HoC were intended as a proposition, it would be difficult to explain why the relations between its elements are so hard to define. Unless one means to suggest that it's just a really, really lousy proposition.