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New ver of syll up.

Any questions/comments re syll & course mechanics?
Seating all set?
Humans, at least neurobiologically normal ones, are fundamentally rational, where rationality is constituted by certain logico-mathematically based reasoning and decision-making in response to real-world stimuli, including stimuli given in the form of focused tests; but mere animals are not fundamentally rational, since, contra Darwin, their minds are fundamentally qualitatively inferior to the human mind. As to whether computing machines/robots are fundamentally rational, the answer is also “No.” For starters, if $x$ can’t read, write, and create, $x$ can’t be rational; neither computing machines/robots nor non-human animals can read nor write nor create; ergo, they aren’t fundamentally rational for this reason alone. But news for non-human animals and computing machines/robots gets much worse, for they have not the slightest chance when they are measured against $\mathcal{H}$. 

Main Claim
And Supporting Main Claim …

$\mathcal{H}$ Humans have the ability to gain knowledge by reasoning (e.g., deductively) quantificationally and recursively over abstract concepts, including abstract concepts of a highly expressive, including infinitary, nature, expressed in arbitrarily complex natural language.
Problem!
Problem!
$\langle \theta, \pi \rangle \mapsto_{L_1} \text{ "proof"}$
< \theta, \pi > \rightarrow_{Li} "proof"
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Humans, at least neurobiologically normal ones, are fundamentally rational, where rationality is constituted by certain logico-mathematically based reasoning and decision-making in response to real-world stimuli, including stimuli given in the form of focused tests; but mere animals are not fundamentally rational, since, contra Darwin, their minds are fundamentally qualitatively inferior to the human mind. As to whether computing machines/robots are fundamentally rational, the answer is also “No.” For starters, if $x$ can’t read, write, and create, $x$ can’t be rational; neither computing machines/robots nor non-human animals can read nor write nor create; ergo, they aren’t fundamentally rational for this reason alone. But news for non-human animals and computing machines/robots gets much worse, for they have not the slightest chance when they are measured against $H$. 
And Supporting Main Claim ...
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   ✦ Any ethic that includes the notion that humans can be harmed etc because of any cognitive limitations is rejected out of hand (as itself an irrational policy).
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