

Re: Yet another Attempt at Disproving the Halting Problem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-08/0167.html>

From: Peter Olcott (olcott_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 08/01/04

Date: Sun, 01 Aug 2004 16:57:37 GMT

"Eray Ozkural exa" <erayo@bilkent.edu.tr> wrote in message
news:fa69ae35.0408010802.4ad5b27b@posting.google.com...
> *"Peter Olcott" <olcott@att.net> wrote in message
news:<[AuZOc.363583\\$Gx4.224797@bgtmsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net](mailto:AuZOc.363583$Gx4.224797@bgtmsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net)>...*

> > *Ah so pointing out any errors that I have made in an objective
> > way, without resorting to disdain is not reasonable? So far it
> > seems I am mostly only getting disdain. I am not getting any
> > valid refutations.*
>
> *To prove my point, I'll answer you.*
>
> *What is the probability that all of the computer scientists who
> > responded to you have a poorer understanding of the problem than
> > yourself? (Hint: assume that there are 10 people who responded to you
> > independently)*

I will answer that question with another question.

What is the probability that the ad verecundiam fallacy is not an error of reasoning?

<http://c2.com/cgi/wiki?AdVerecundiam>

> *Regards,*
>
> --
> *Eray Ozkural*