

## Re: Can the 'Turing Problem' be deflated?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-04/msg00005.html>

---

- *From:* J Jones <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 31 Mar 2008 23:27:48 +0100
- 

george wrote:

On Mar 31, 4:45 pm, J Jones <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx> wrote:

"The TM either halts or does not engage in computation."

That should suffice. The statement is analytic –

In the first place, you don't know the definition of "analytic". Analytic statements are provable BY DEFINITION, but that may require you to actually KNOW the definitions of the terms in the statements.

its proof is self-evident.

Only if you actually KNOW the definition of "engage in computation", and possibly not even then. In any case, YOU DON'T know the definition of "engage in computation". You probably don't know the definition of TM either. And how does any of this relate to what you were saying BEFORE, about how a TM halts "between" EVERY step of the process?? By YOUR (incorrect) definition, every TM is always halting all the time, so there are no TMs around to fail to "engage in computation".

It's bedtime now so I will just quickly say that I would not want to say that a machine halts between computations. 'Halt' is the recognition of a fulfillment of a command.

And TMs halt all the time, otherwise they are not computing.

.