

Re: Can the 'Turing Problem' be deflated?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2008-04/msg00180.html>

- *From:* J Jones <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 03 Apr 2008 21:08:56 +0100
-

george wrote:

On Apr 2, 5:25 pm, J Jones <jonescardiff@xxxxxxx> wrote:

In any event, a determination of a 'halt' is the recognition of a fulfillment of a command.

No, it isn't.

Please.

Please stop pretending that you know what you are talking about. TMs are SYMBOLIC. They are ABSTRACT. They do NOT INVOLVE "recognition" and "fulfillment". They just statically ARE what they are, all the time, LIKE THE LETTER 'a'. A TM program is like a string or sentence of letters. It has a structure just as surely as a sentence has words. But it does not *really* involve anything or anybody DOING anything, whether halting or anything else. It just lies there. It just *is*. It's about BEING, AND NOT doing, DESPITE the metaphorical language. While the program is actually being executed on some hardware, you can talk about doing. But the source CODE, the PROGRAM, is just a thing that *is* as *opposed* to "does". And a TM is its PROGRAM, NOT any physical machine that does something.

There are many many DIFFERENT ways of specifying or encoding the program.

The stuff I said above is stuff you NEED to just BELIEVE. You need to just TAKE MY WORD for it. You DON'T get to have your own special super-insightful perspective. You START by agreeing with THAT and THEN we can disagree about complexities that follow FROM that. But we *must start* from the *same* axioms.

Re: Can the 'Turing Problem' be deflated?

OK. The sort of 'machine' you have envisioned on behalf of Turing is not a machine. It is an anthropomorphised artifact. NO machine executes a program. All a machine does is execute a single command.

The mistake is to assume that because we know that the TM has identifiable, single, commanded steps then they must summate to an identifiable program. But 'the program' is our own conception, and if there is no halt associated with it, then there isn't a program. The machine DOES NOT OFFER US A PROGRAM and DOES NOT OFFER US a theoretical outcome.

That's what machines are like. WE can't confuse a program with a machine. That's the first step. The next step is to translate Turing's problem in recognition of it.

.