

All.Net Analyst Report and Newsletter

Welcome to our Analyst Report and Newsletter

How to defeat any system

Step 1: Identify the assumptions

Step 2: Violate them

Conclusions

You lose.

But what if?

I realize that I have just given away the big secret behind my whole 50-ways series of articles and that this means I can never write any more of them, because I have now published the unified theory of how to generate a new 50-ways article at any time. All the rest is just commentary.

But suppose you then ask me:

How do I defeat this system of defeating systems?

Of course that's easy... follow the theory:

- Step 1: Identify the assumptions
 - I have apparently assumed there are assumptions!
 - If you make no assumptions, I cannot identify them, because there are none.
 - If there are no assumptions I cannot violate them!
 - But how do you do anything without making assumptions?
 - Oops...

Assumptions can be implicit as well as explicit

One of the problems with making systems that do anything useful is that we cannot (yet) even identify all of our assumptions. However...

- Most engineering disciplines do a pretty good job of identifying operating parameters
 - Operating parameters are assumptions
 - About the environment in which the system will operate
 - Violate the operating parameters and the system may fail
 - Most engineers design with some leeway (they over design)
 - But the over-design is also limited
 - So under-assume when you defeat them...
- Most hardware systems today are engineered
 - Most software systems today are not engineered

Can we ever identify all of our assumptions?

I think not.

- But I think therefore I am.
 - So if I think not, I am not.

The problem seems to be in our logical reasoning systems.

- The universe is, according to current theory an infinite dimensional Hilbert space
 - Which means it is continuous – analog and infinitesimal in time and space
- Our system of reasoning seems based on a linguistic set of patterns
 - Our language is finite but unbounded
 - So we cannot really describe things well enough to fit the model of reality

When we reason about things, we cannot reasonably be reasoning about reality. We reason about our models. As such:

We are not perfect

Which brings us to the 3rd rail of discourse – religion

- Assume G-d exists
- Assume perfection means never making a mistake

Following the rules of how to defeat any system:

- There is an assumption, violate it!
 - G-d does not exist
 - Therefore G-d is not perfect (G-d is not anything – G-d doesn't exist)
 - But G-d can not make a mistake because G-d does not exist!
 - So then G-d is perfect because G-d cannot make a mistake!

I don't want to carry this to its logical conclusion

For two reasons:

- The logical conclusion is that nothing exists
 - Once I get there we will no longer exist
 - So I won't be able to finish thi