

Re: Yet another Attempt at Disproving the Halting Problem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-08/0672.html>

From: Peter Olcott (olcott_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 08/05/04

Date: Thu, 05 Aug 2004 01:47:02 GMT

"Eray Ozkural exa" <erayo@bilkent.edu.tr> wrote in message news:fa69ae35.0408032329.8964970@posting.google.com...
> "Peter Olcott" <olcott@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:<dLWPc.381367\$Gx4.219217@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > "Eray Ozkural exa" <erayo@bilkent.edu.tr> wrote in message news:fa69ae35.0408030811.ef493b0@posting.google.com...
> > > Peter, you really should have a look at my post below. Do you know
> > > when argument from authority can be valid?
> >
> > Within deduction it is never valid.
> > Only deduction can guarantee that it always provides correct results. It is
> > considered to be valid inductive inference, yet inductive inference can not
> > guarantee correct results. Deduction can not err, induction can err.
>
> It has nothing to do with deduction or induction, Peter.

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

An argumentum ad verecundiam is an argument based on authority.

Fallacious because:

a.. Experts are often wrong. Perhaps less so than laypersons, but still so.

> It is apparent that you cannot even understand what is written on the
> very page that you cite yourself. It is established, probably for the
> 100th time, that there is no need to respond to you, by any person on
> this group.
>
> People, please do not talk to this net.kook. This guy is just as
> hopeless as Arthur T. Murray.