

# Re: A little knowledge is a dangerous thing – THE HALTING PROOF

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2005-05/msg00075.html>

---

- *From:* "george" <[greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:greeneg@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 5 May 2005 17:25:14 -0700
- 

Bhupinder Singh Anand wrote:

- > A closer look at the arguments will show that,
- > formally, the possibility that there is always a
- > non-algorithmic, but effective, way, of assigning
- > a natural number to any given real number cannot
- > be ruled out.

That is flatly ridiculous. It is ruled out immediately by the BRUTE FACT that there IS NO formal definition of "effective"! The CLOSEST THING to a formal definition of "effective" is "algorithmic", i.e., TM-computable. The Church-Turing thesis is that this closeness is absolute, that, no PRIOR formal definition of "effective" being extant, we are FREE TO STIPULATE the formal definition of both "effective" AND "algorithmic" as "TM-computable".

.

---

- *Follow-Ups:*
  - ◆ ***Re: A little knowledge is a dangerous thing – THE HALTING PROOF***
    - ◇ *From:* Charlie-Boo
- Prev by Date: ***Re: Why do we have the natural numbers?***
- Next by Date: ***Re: A Small Blackboard***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: refining the diag proof. defn of countable***
- Next by thread: ***Re: A little knowledge is a dangerous thing – THE HALTING PROOF***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***