

Why isn't James Harris working on halting problem?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2007-06/msg03912.html>

- *From:* Richard Henry <pomerado@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 20 Jun 2007 19:24:06 -0700
-

On Jun 18, 4:41 pm, tommy1729 <tommy1...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

A halts if B halts

determining if A halts
depends on the halting of B
and B on C
and C on D etc

that's the basic idea of the halting problem and its so-called unsolvability.

however the idea is WRONG !

1) there is no known algorithm A for which an algorithm B C AND D EXISTS !!!!
(in the sense that B C AND D are very different from A AND EACH OTHER and thus not A repeated n times in m steps)

2) the proof of the unsolvability is clearly a self-reference rather than a proof.

3) mathematical proof rather occur like proving that two opposite things don't add up, rather than saying this is true if that is true and that is true if this is true ...

4) iterations cannot be described by totally different iterations

iteration A can not depend on iteration B unless they are equal (see 1)) if the iteration cannot be rewritten in a simpler "closed form"

more promising is

A halts if B does not.

B can then not be tested by trial , but by THEORY.

the idea of taking proofs to test iterations is childish and primitive
IN GENERAL NO GREAT MATHEMATICIAN OR PROOF HAS EVER BEEN DONE
LIKE THAT. (with a few exceptions but these never had an A B AND C AND D , just an A
or an A and B nothing more)

Why isn't James Harris working on halting problem?

another controversial topic

but i dare you to disprove 1) for any conjecture that is (not) decidable and no closed form functions used.

James will get the answer before you do.

.