

Re: What is the Result from Invoking this Halt Function?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-08/2034.html>

From: Peter Olcott (olcott_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 08/15/04

Date: Sun, 15 Aug 2004 19:06:58 GMT

"David C. Ullrich" <ullrich@math.okstate.edu> wrote in message
news:un6vh0li4ht2f7rb6uti2499kkjm0veeqf@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 15 Aug 2004 16:12:02 GMT, "Peter Olcott"
> <olcott@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> "David C. Ullrich" <ullrich@math.okstate.edu> wrote in message
news:1svuh0hna7ca545tamjoh03gvuum0dne79@4ax.com...
>>> On Sun, 15 Aug 2004 14:54:41 GMT, "Peter Olcott"
>>> <olcott@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>>>
>>> >Proof by contradiction:
>>>
>>> [*]
>>> >A--->B
>>> >Not(B)
>>> >Therefore Not A
>>> >
>>> >This quits working when A--->B is not true.
>>>
>>> we all understand that. the fact that you think for some reason
>>> we don't -is- hilarious.
>>>
>>> You don't get it because you keep ASSUMING that A--->B
>>> is still true in the case of my method. Could you do me (and yourself)
>>> a favor, and quit assuming anything at all? I don't want this to be
>>> an infinite loop, around and around, all because you guys keep
>>> leaping to the wrong conclusions. Quit leaping will ya?
>>>
>>> as always, it's amazing the way you can't get anything straight.
>>>
>>> in fact of course nobody's assuming A--->B, it's been proved.

It has not been proven in the case of my method.

It has been proven for an entirely different case, and assumed

sci.logic: Re: What is the Result from Invoking this Halt Function?

to also apply to my method. It does not apply to my method

That A can return correct results does not entail that B can return correct results. I have now devoted a whole thread to just this one subpoint.

{ Can returning a value change the value itself (in the Halting Problem) }

- > *but that's irrelevant to the –current– hilarious confusion:*
- > *even if it were true that we were all just assuming $A \rightarrow B$,*
- > *that wouldn't show that we don't understand that [*] is how*
- > *a proof by contradiction works. the fact that you continue to*
- > *insist that we don't understand this really –is– one of the*
- > *funniest aspects of all this.*

Yup just as funny as a Sound Argument requires both True Premises AND Valid Reasoning was hilarious up until it was quoted from a textbook, and then suddenly it was not funny at all anymore.