(1) Test 1 Review/Discussion/Plan;
(2) Return to Authentic Happiness (prior deck);
(3) Pointer @ Former Topic re Madoffs & Rational! Detective;
(4) Monday: Chinese Room Argument, The Singularity & The MiniMaxularity etc
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1. Test 1 …

2. Back to Seligman, briefly. Will be on Test 2, where I’ll want to you what you to express your thinking about that last meaning-of-life chapter in *Authentic Happiness*. Is his position rational?

   2.1. (Regardless of the answers here, developing & deploying your signature strengths is as matter of empirical fact a source of happiness!)

3. Pointer to former topic, the rational! detective, and the irrational (& immoral) Madoff.

4. Monday: Chinese Room Argument, Irrational Fearlessness, Rational Fear & What to Do About It!
Grading/Learning Scheme

• 8–10: A
• 5–7: B
• < 5: Encouraged to see Thomas and/or me, & must retake to secure higher grade.
• 9–10: Can retake, but I don’t recommend it. Instead, recommend skimming 2nd Test 1.
• 5–8: Can retake and I recommend it. Not required.
• Which problems wish reviewed/explained now, if any?
Return to Seligman’s final chapter …
“This logic stuff and the three areas A1, A2, and A3 ... it’s boring, and worse, I’ll never need to use it. What in the real world’s gonna ever give me stimuli like this? Slow-moving System 2 is a drag, and has no payoff.”
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Madoff’s strategy is split-strike conversion (a rational one in the textbooks that can be understood by you with some System 2 thinking).

Madoff’s returns, size-wise, are possible for split-strike conversion if the underlying stock-picking is brilliant—but the consistency of those returns is formally impossible on that strategy.

He’s either front-running or running a (massive) Ponzi scheme.

He’s not front-running.

It’s a Ponzi scheme! QED
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