Huntsman:

While there are other reasons why the Stock feat can't be used to scale L's LA, these are some of the main reasons.

1. The feat violates Economic validity which undermines the idea that it is supported by an understanding of economics.

A 20,000x return in two years is economically impossible under real-world trading principles due to constraints such as liquidity, price slippage, market volatility, arbitrage limits, and regulatory safeguards. These are not theoretical limitations, they are physical and institutional limits. If the feat requires breaking these, then either the DN market is fundamentally different (and cannot be compared to real-world economics), or the feat must be attributed to luck, narrative exaggeration, or non-economic factors, not learned skill.
In short, if the feat can only occur in a market where real-world laws don't apply, then it cannot demonstrate superiority in real-world economic learning, making it irrelevant as a metric for LA.

2. The Outcome Is Not Evidence of the Learning Process

Real LA must be demonstrated through some kind of process involving the acquisition, integration, and application of knowledge. L's feat provides only a result (high returns), with no shown or inferred learning process. No economic theories, mental models, or problem solving steps are shown. A result without a demonstrated method of achievement does not constitute a learning feat; it is simply a narrative outcome with no instructional or analytical trace.

3. Why we can't "imply or assume" a learning process or the existence of things like mental models which could try to explain the returns. Extraordinary Claims Require Extraordinary Evidence.

Saying L surpassed all known economic theory and invented superior mental models is an extraordinary claim, one that has no textual evidence in the source material. No such models or knowledge are shown, described, or hinted at. You cannot assume hyper-advanced learning took place without evidence. Making such claims without support is headcanon. Since no extraordinary evidence exists for L learning economics to such a degree that he could "break" conventional understanding of how markets work this claim cannot be supported.

Loy

So I'm gonna sum it up. Please carefully read and affirm my reiteration of your stance.

1. You are trying to state that L's feat is a LOGICAL IMPOSSIBILITY. Therefore the feat is contingent on

A. The DN world having a different stock market

OR

B. The feat is luck, narrative exaggeration, and external factors such as intuition (you stated this in your doc so correct me if I'm wrong)

2. There is no evidence of learning ability, since process is a prerequisite for learning

3. You apply Sagan's standard. There's no evidence of L having known or learnt anything in order to make these levels of returns on the stock market.

Huntsman

In broad strokes yes, but I should clarify a few oversimplifications.

1. Referring to the feat as a “logical impossibility” isn’t quite accurate. I pointed out how claiming L would need to violate valid economic understanding to accomplish his returns. It’s not that the feat is conceptually impossible in all scenarios, but that it's economically impossible under the constraints of real-world markets. This is what invalidates it as a demonstration of learning ability grounded in economic understanding.

2. This is correct, without evidence of a learning process we can't claim the feat involves one.

3. This is slightly reductive but mainly yes. I am not saying there is "no evidence of L's learning" or anything like that, rather that claims of L using mental models or other cognitive tools to surpass conventional economics are extraordinary claims and require evidence as such. That is how the Sagan standard applies here.

Loy

Ok I'll refute now

1. So What kind of impossibility here? Is it a practical impossibility? An epistemic impossibility? Because if the feat isn't logically impossible then it's not impossible to perform. Moreover you claim that it's luck is a blatant contradiction since if something happens by luck then it's possible therefore the feat cannot be impossible. Feat cannot be intuition since that contradicts the epistemology of intuition under cognitive psychology and intuition is a faculty of the mind and not an externality. Your argument of the DN alternate Stock Market is a razor dichotomised to be the other explaination if the other one doesn't work. Also contingent on the feat being "impossible"

2. This is a presuppostion. Prove this.

3 is an extension of 2 anyway so deal with that as such

Huntsman

Your attempted refutation is based on both a semantic mischaracterization and dismissal of foundational concepts in both economics and how learning ability works.

1. When I refer to L's feat as "impossible," I am not invoking logical impossibility in an abstract sense, but rather economic impossibility under real-world financial systems. I made this explicitly clear in my previous statement.

The feat violates core market constraints such as liquidity, slippage, volatility scaling, and arbitrage suppression which are all measurable limitations. These constraints prevent these kinds of extraordinary gains being proposed. Then for the idea that if the feat is possible via luck, it can't be impossible, you again just clearly missed the point that I made explicitly clear. That earning insane returns isn't "impossible" but rather it can't be performed through economic understanding. Please read my actual arguments before you make claims about them. I don't want to go circular because I need to repeat the same thing over and over.

> Because if the feat isn't logically impossible then it's not impossible to perform <

As for this line I'm not really sure what you are trying to accomplish by claiming that. You aren't trying to prove the feat "isn't impossible to perform" but that L DID perform it.

There's no contradiction in suggesting the feat may have involved luck while also arguing it was impossible to achieve through economic knowledge. Luck makes a result possible without making it replicable or skill-based, which is why it cannot demonstrate learning. As for intuition, while it is a mental faculty, it doesn't require the acquisition or application of formal knowledge. Even if L relied on intuition, it wouldn't validate the feat as a product of learning ability. The use of philosophical terminology doesn't change the fact that there is no evidence L learned or applied economic theory.

Then, if the market in Death Note operates under different rules than ours then it cannot be used to demonstrate real-world learning. Your response is a jumble of word soup that betrays a serious misunderstanding of my arguments. My argument is NOT manufacturing a dichotomy like you are falsely claiming, I am creating a conditional premise of which one MUST be true. If the DN market does not follow the same rules as ours, then such returns are not indicative of our real-world economics or anything surpassing it. If it does function the same as ours, then real world economics prove that L couldn't have used economics knowledge to accomplish this.

2. Your claim that I presuppose a process as necessary for proving learning misunderstands how learning is defined. In educational psychology and cognitive science, LA is inherently process-based. It involves an acquisition, integration, and application of knowledge. A result, no matter how impressive, tells us nothing about a person's learning unless we see how it was

achieved. This is not an arbitrary standard as you are falsely trying to assert, it's how learning is evaluated in any serious framework.

3. The claim that L used advanced economic models or surpassed known financial theory is indeed an extension of my second point, but it reinforces it under a stricter epistemological lens. These are extraordinary claims with no basis in the manga. The feat, as presented, shows no evidence of such a process, no economic theory referenced, and no otherwise explanation. Thus I was invoking the Sagan Standard and saying extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. The burden is then on you to demonstrate that such a feat reflects learning rather than speculative narrative and to provide some kind of evidence in support of such. Without that, the stock market feat cannot be used to scale L's LA.

Loy

You still aren't refuting the contradiction since for one you make the claim that "these constraints prevent these kinds of extraordinary gains" meaning there's a physical limit that obstructs these gains objectively. Since you're agreeing that he's "above" these "physical limits" of this economic system (thus the violation) then you're saying luck can somehow extend past these limits in order to perform the feat? Then surpassing these physical limits isn't impossible that's literally a contradiction and a self defeating argument.

They're opposing arguments functioning on conditionality lol. Economic theory merely models systemic operations, mental models are literally just how the human mind internally comprehends frameworks of external systems. The limits of economic modelling doesn't mean L can't just understand a system better. Moreover your razoring of irl markets = your burden since markets are self correcting and meta-dynamic systems so prove how constraints would shift to such a degree. Yeah Sagan's standard is effective against PMH but not this sadly, since the extraordinary evidence is made explicit through the panel stating he made the 2,000,000% returns which in fact, is so extraordinary, that you're arguing it violates our known economic principals 🤣 I'm convinced you don't even know what mental modelling even is, humans mentally model practically everything. Even things like "Basic demand and supply" is a mental model, one which you once attributed to L's feat but switched up to 🫠

Achieving a feat above humanity inherently entails a process and comprehension of the same caliber. By your logic cognitive neuroscience could not determine the learning capacity of a 9 year old who entered harvard simply because they didn't see him study. Which is obviously incorrect. As for your intuition point, I'm stating L didn't rely on intuition as you say he did objectively. So you've conceded on it not being an external factor but a faculty of the mind. Intuition cannot be used to solve novel complex tasks objectively, it's an integration of your cumulative knowledge. So it literally cannot be used to perform this feat because you have no clue how intuition even works.

Huntsman

Your rebuttal misunderstands both my position and basic logic and involves gross misapplications of logical principles. Additionally, you seem to be employing a shotgun fallacy, introducing many different unrelated ideas that don't even prove your point rather than responding to main argument of a lack of learning process. As such I will respond to your numerous points but I'll attempt to be as brief as possible given that most can be easily dismissed.

Your claim that I've contradicted myself by calling the feat "economically impossible" while also suggesting it could've occurred through luck is simply false. I've repeatedly clarified that the feat is not absolutely impossible, only that it's impossible through learned economic knowledge. Given real-world financial constraints, this result cannot be achieved through applying market expertise. A lucky result however, doesn't demonstrate a replicable process or learned understanding. So yes, something can be impossible via economic learning but still can happen by chance. That's not a contradiction, it simply means the feat is not a valid measure of learning, as such is not representative of LA.

Next, you attempt to dismiss my critique of your mental model claim by pointing out that all humans use mental models to understand systems. That's true, but irrelevant. It does nothing to prove that L used advanced or superior models to achieve this specific outcome. You're conflating basic cognition with the kind of transcendent mental modeling required to earn a 20,000x return. Your claim that "L must have used extraordinary mental models" is a textbook case of begging the question, you assume your conclusion, then retroactively try to justify it. There's no indication in the manga that L developed any economic frameworks. You're inventing a reasoning process that was never shown or implied.

Then you completely misapplied the Sagan standard. Your claim that the feat is so extraordinary that it serves as its own extraordinary evidence is circular reasoning, you're using the result to prove a process that was never shown. ECREE requires evidence of the mechanism behind a claim, not just the outcome. You're claiming he surpassed real-world economists, yet you provide no proof he learned or applied any economic theory. What makes this worse is your blatant double standard. You claimed ECREE to reject PMH but abandon it here without justification in a laughably ridiculous case of a Special pleading fallacy.

Apparently, L is so extraordinary that his results serve as evidence of his extraordinary process, as if that is how argumentation works lol. 🤣

Your Harvard claim is a false analogy. A 9 year old entering Harvard would have verifiable achievements like exam scores, grades, and interviews that confirm their knowledge. In contrast, L's feat is presented without any insight into what knowledge he acquired or applied.

Even if intuition played a role in L's decision making, it doesn't prove he learned economics. Intuition, even when shaped by experience, is often subconscious and not rooted in formal knowledge acquisition. Learning ability is evaluated by structured, intentional application of knowledge and not by instinct. Redefining intuition to equate it with learning is inaccurate.

Across your entire response, you repeatedly avoid the central issue that the stock market feat is not supported by any evidence of a learning process. You rely entirely on inference and speculative reasoning. You assume that because L got a massive return, he must have applied learning, built superior mental models, and surpassed economic theory. But you never show that any of this was stated or even implied in the manga. You've only provided philosophical jargon and rhetoric to cover for a complete lack of evidence supporting your claims.

Loy

None of my ideas are unrelated anyone with basic tracking would be able to tell you that. Not to mention your arguments are literally longer than mine lmao.

Brother, economic and financial knowledge in relation to stock market strategies, are just our mental models of it's systemic fundamentals and operations. The market is a composite system including agents who utilise said models and its constraints are levelled out accordingly. The physical limits being capable of being bypassed by your own admittance demonstrates that the limitor is one of systemic modelling since it's composition is of high level chaos. These in cumulation attribute to its meta dynamicity which is why your former conditional razor also doesn't work. Thus your argument that L can't do it through learned economic knowledge is incoherent as it attempts to restrict Lawliet into using pre-existing frameworks of the stock market when the result demonstrates he couldn't have achieved it using solely them as we know it. Like let me make this as comprehensible for you as possible

1. You made the claim that the feat is impossible due to physical limits of this economic system.

2. A limit by definition is "a point or level beyond which something does not or may not extend or pass."

3. Your admittance that going past these limits can be done by luck necessitates possibility of transgression.

4. If there is a possibility for the physical limits to be transgressed then they're not limits in the first place are they? This is blatantly contradictory and infact a category error at that since it's not even a limit atp it's determining likelihood LOL.

Oh and don't even get me started on the fact that your luck argument blatantly conflicts with the narrative, since L is the actual greatest mind in the world. Attribute cause to luck is a gross miscategorisation of the literary substance even if we set aside the lack of logical substance behind your claims.

Your 3rd paragraph doesn't even make sense. Wdym by basic cognition? L doesn't even have basic cognition he can literally consciously parallel process which objectively transcends our cognition 😭 mental modelling is a cognitive process too like what the fuck are you saying??

The Ecree refute is completely valid because actually you're right there's no evidence of him having surpassed real world mental models of the stock market... there's proof! Since proof is declarative and conclusive. L being above real world models of the stock market can be proved conditionally and syllogistically i.e if our frameworks and models can't achieve such a result and L did, then L achieving the result necessary entails he understood something beyond them.

The harvard analogy is expressed to suggest that said team of analysts couldn't determine his learning capacity just by the result/achievement in a vacuum. Obviously if those things exist then by technicality a character in the DN verse could in theory, ask Lawliet how he got those returns and he'd be able to break it down. Why? Because a result/achievement objectively necessitates causal antecedence 😳

You just strawmanned my entire intuition argument? How tf did i redefine it? What? I'm literally arguing that the feat can't be pulled off intuitively because intuition doesn't let you do that sort of stuff. Reread my argument 😭

> you rely entirely on inference <

Yeah cus only dumbasses use inferences amirite

Huntsman

Your response is an incoherent mix of jargon, misrepresentations, and fallacies strung together with misplaced confidence. If you applied even half as much effort to understanding my arguments as you do to dressing yours in “intellectual sounding language”, we might have something resembling a debate. Sadly we don’t.

Let’s start with the luck point…again. For the third time now, I’ve explicitly said the feat is economically impossible through applied market knowledge, not logically or narratively impossible. I’ve clarified this multiple times. You have ignored that entirely and keep pushing this delusional argument that if luck can bypass constraints, the constraints somehow don’t exist. That’s either a staggering misunderstanding of how probabilistic systems work or deliberate dishonesty. The existence of luck doesn’t erase the existence of constraints, it just bypasses them.

Next is your nonsense about mental models. Yes, humans use mental models. Congratulations on stating the obvious. But this does nothing to prove L used superior or reality breaking ones. You equivocate between “people use mental models” and “L must have used extraordinary ones” without proving anything. That’s begging the question dressed up as insight. You assume your conclusion, then repeat it louder and throw in buzzwords like “meta dynamicity” as if that makes your point stronger somehow. If you had any actual evidence of L applying a novel economic framework, you'd present it. Instead, you're left relying on rhetoric to cover the lack of a real feat here.

As for the Harvard analogy, it only works if we assume L went through an equivalent vetting process. He didn't. We got a result, no process, no method. Your analogy assumes what you need to prove and that the outcome must reflect learning. That's a textbook false analogy.

The irony of you claiming I strawman your argument is laughable. Your entire point about intuition is the real case of strawmanning. I never claimed L used intuition to accomplish the feat. I said that if economic learning isn't the explanation, the alternatives would be luck or intuition, neither of which demonstrate LA.

> As for intuition, while it is a mental faculty, it doesn't require the acquisition or application of formal knowledge. Even if L relied on intuition, it wouldn't validate the feat as a product of learning ability.<

That's not endorsing intuition as the cause, it's showing that your argument leaves no viable way of this being LA. To think you also had the audacity to say I am the one failing to track the arguments or can't read yours.

And lastly, there's your complete butchering of ECREE. You actually argued that the feat is so extraordinary, it constitutes its own extraordinary evidence. That's circular reasoning of the highest order. I genuinely had to reread it to confirm that you weren't being sarcastic. You're literally saying, "The feat is so absurdly improbable, it must prove L had a method to achieve it." That's not logical reasoning. ECREE is clear and requires not just outcomes, but mechanisms, process, and causality. You offer none of that. Instead, you declare the result to be proof that L must have had superior economic understanding, without demonstrating a single step of how he acquired, applied, or even engaged with such knowledge. That's not a syllogism, it's an assumption built on wishful thinking. Your claim that "if existing models can't do this and L did, he must have had something beyond them" is so epistemologically empty it borders on delusional. By that logic, any sufficiently extraordinary unexplained event constitutes its own explanation, erasing the need for evidence-based reasoning. If you genuinely believe that a result justifies its own process, then you've abandoned reasoning altogether.

Stop with the buzzwords and rhetoric, just provide evidence L used economic knowledge or advanced mental models. You won't, because none exists. This is just your headcanon otherwise.

Loy - My response was made under the premise of you stating it's economically not impossible not that it's a logical impossibility. Can we get this judged now I don't think we're going anywhere