

# Re: Alan Turing's Halting Problem is Incorrect (FINAL PART)

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-07/0959.html>

---

**From:** Acme Diagnostics (*LFinezapthis\_at\_partpostmark.net*)

**Date:** 07/07/04

Date: 7 Jul 2004 13:05:04 -0500

"Peter Olcott" <olcott@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

Hi Peter. I have no interest in the Halting Problem on Turing computers, only on real ones. You seem to be the resident expert on that, at least wrt explaining same. Please check out the computer program on this page (CS Dept, University of Maryland):

[http://www.csee.umbc.edu/~squire/cs451\\_126.html](http://www.csee.umbc.edu/~squire/cs451_126.html)

Isn't that the same as your example in the respect that they both contrive the same logical paradox to make the counterexample?

Is diagonal.c a good demonstration of the Halting Problem on real computers?

Is there no other counter-example for real computers, other than essentially a compiler error-checking its own self for infinite loops containing this contrived paradox?

That specific case seems rather trivial in practice wrt real computer programming.

*>I can derive no other reasonable conclusion.  
>Some of the things that I am saying would be  
>easily understood by every five year old, yet  
>are not "understood" in this forum.*

I've encountered that in this group, but only with a couple of posters, not some of the heavy-hitters who you are encountering. In my case, there was a simple explanation. It doesn't necessarily mean that either you or they are deficient in any way. You could both be right if you have separate contexts, adding typical newsgroup dynamics of most being invested and competitive in the one theoretical logic context.

But if you've said things that place your "trivial" characterization in

sci.logic: Re: Alan Turing's Halting Problem is Incorrect (FINAL PART)

theoretical logic context, then I would agree that you are in error.  
In that context, the Halting Problem is decided, and non-trivial.

For example, every 10-year-old (bumping your analogy a bit) knows the Liar's Paradox and that it is trivial in the real-world. Would "real-world" in this case also include your "semantics?" But the Liar's Paradox is very non-trivial in theoretical logic.

Regarding context, I offer the following short article by yours truly, with two paragraphs titled "Point-of-View," but specifically the examples at the very end, of how basic assumptions or a priori can make two POV's irreconcilable but still legitimate. When I read about your "truth condition" in "pure semantics," which sounds pretty a priori to me, I wonder if you and your adversaries don't have such a legitimate but irreconcilable difference based on POV.

<http://thor.prohosting.com/~chrismay>

Thanks,

Larry