

Re: Foundation for a Formal Refutation of the Original Halting Problem?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-08/2073.html>

From: >parr\(*> (gniKyrual_at_tenretnitb.moc)

Date: 08/16/04

Date: Mon, 16 Aug 2004 06:43:11 +0000 (UTC)

"Owen Jacobson" <angstrom@lionsanctuary.net> wrote in message
news:pan.2004.08.04.05.00.47.135323@lionsanctuary.net...

<...>

| The second example is clearly incorrect as it
| provides no correct inputs to Halt, but I
| strongly suspect he means Halt (Halt,
| (LoopIfHalts, LoopIfHalts)) (where (LIH, LIH)
| is an encoding of the parameters to Halt).

<...>

| Since, in order to satisfy the definition of a
| program that can determine if arbitrary
| programs and their inputs halt, none of these
| requirements may be ignores, we can conclude
| that no program can exist to satisfy all of
| these requirements.

|

| Note that LoopIfHalts is clearly a perverse
| case designed specifically to thwart Halt (M,
| x). This does not excuse Halt (M, x); one of
| the requirements (the last one, in my list) is
| that Halt (M, x) must be able to analyze any
| program and its input.

Nice try, Owen

Peter will reply in one of the following ways:

You are wrong

I am right

Showing one case is not enough

You deliberately chose a pathological function

My program is prevented from behaving that way

--

)>==ss\$\$%PARR(°> Parr