



[Course](#) > [Omega...](#) > [Revers...](#) > The Bo...

Audit Access Expires Sep 9, 2020

You lose all access to this course, including your progress, on Sep 9, 2020.

Upgrade by Jul 5, 2020 to get unlimited access to the course as long as it exists on the site. **Upgrade now**

The Bomber's Paradox

In this lecture we'll talk about some paradoxes based on reverse ω -sequences.

Josh Parsons, who was a fellow at Oxford until shortly before his untimely death, once told me about the following puzzle. (It is a version of Benardete's Paradox.)

There are infinitely many electronic bombs, B_0, B_1, B_2, \dots , one for each natural number.

They are set to go off on the following schedule:

| Bomb | When bomb is set to go off |
|----------|-------------------------------------|
| B_0 | 12:00pm |
| B_1 | 11:30am |
| B_2 | 11:15am |
| \vdots | \vdots |
| B_k | $\frac{1}{2^k}$ hours after 11:00am |
| \vdots | \vdots |

Our bombs are of a special kind: they target electronics. Should one of the bombs go off, it will instantaneously disable all nearby electronic devices, *including other bombs*. This means that a bomb goes off if and only if no bombs have gone off before it.

More specifically:

- (0) B_0 goes off if and only if, for each $n > 0$, B_n fails to go off.
- (1) B_1 goes off if and only if, for each $n > 1$, B_n fails to go off.
- (2) B_2 goes off if and only if, for each $n > 2$, B_n fails to go off.
- \vdots
- (k) B_k goes off if and only if, for each $n > k$, B_n fails to go off.
- (k + 1) B_{k+1} goes off if and only if, for each $n > k + 1$, B_n fails to go off.

Will any bombs go off? If so, which ones? Here's a proof that bomb B_k can't go off:

Suppose that bomb B_k goes off. It follows from statement (k) above that B_n must fail to go off for each $n > k$. This means, in particular, that B_{k+1} must have failed to go off. But it follows from statement (k + 1) that the only way for that to happen is for B_m to go off for some $m > k + 1$. And that's impossible: we concluded earlier that B_n must fail to go off for each $n > k$.

But wait! Here's a proof that bomb B_k must go off:

Suppose that B_k fails to go off. It follows from statement (k) above that B_n must go off for some $n > k$, and the previous argument shows that that is impossible.

What's going on?

Video Review: The Bombers

[Start of transcript. Skip to the end.](#)



So now let's talk about the bomber paradox.

▶

0:00 / 0:00

▶

1.50x

🔊

🔗

CC

“

So the bomber paradox, too, is a reverse omega sequence.

So just to remind you, what's going to happen is that you have infinitely many people,

Video

[Download video file](#)

Transcripts

[Download SubRip \(.srt\) file](#)

[Download Text \(.txt\) file](#)

Discussion

Hide Discussion

Topic: Week 3 / The Bomber's Paradox

Add a Post

Show all posts

▼

by recent activity

▼

💬

[Reverse omega sequence of logical statements.](#)

3

Let's consider a reverse omega sequence of logical statements which can be true or false. Statem...

▼