

THE LIMITS OF MATHEMATICS (Extended Abstract)

G. J. Chaitin
IBM Research Division
chaitin@watson.ibm.com

In June 1994 I gave a five-day course on the limits of mathematics at the University of Maine in Orono. This course featured a new approach to algorithmic information theory (AIT). Four versions [1]–[4] of the course notes for this course, each using a somewhat different approach, are available. To automatically obtain any one of them in L^AT_EX, for example chao-dyn/9407003, send e-mail to “chao-dyn @ xyz.lanl.gov” with “Subject: get 9407003”.

AIT deals with program-size complexity. I define the complexity $H(X)$ of an object X to be the size in bits of the smallest program that can calculate X . Up to now, to get elegant mathematical properties for this complexity measure $H(X)$, I had to measure the size of programs for an abstract universal Turing machine. This gave the right mathematical properties, but it was not a programming language that anyone could actually use. Now I have found a way to obtain the correct program-size complexity measure of AIT by measuring the

size of programs in a series of powerful and easy to use programming languages. These programming languages are versions of LISP that I have invented expressly for this purpose. Which of these programming languages one considers most natural is to a certain extent a matter of personal taste.

What does AIT have to say concerning the limits of mathematics? My theory yields two fundamental information-theoretic incompleteness theorems. First of all, my theorem, originally going back to 1970, that an N -bit formal axiomatic system cannot enable one to exhibit any specific object X with program-size complexity $H(X)$ greater than $N + c$. Secondly, my theorem, originally going back to 1986, that an N -bit formal axiomatic system cannot enable one to determine more than $N + c'$ scattered bits of the halting probability Ω . In `chao-dyn/9407003`, $c = 2359$ bits and $c' = 7581$ bits. In `chao-dyn/9407005`, $c = 1127$ bits and $c' = 3689$ bits. In `chao-dyn/9407006`, $c = 994$ bits and $c' = 3192$ bits. And in `chao-dyn/9407009`, $c = 735$ bits and $c' = 2933$ bits.

I think I prefer the “aggressive” formulation in `chao-dyn/9407009`. I can also make a case for the “conservative” formulation in `chao-dyn/9407003`. `chao-dyn/9407005` and `chao-dyn/9407006` are the intermediate steps between `chao-dyn/9407003` and `chao-dyn/9407009`.

After the references we summarize `chao-dyn/9407003` in a four-page appendix. The first page is a table summarizing the version of LISP that is used. The second page is an example of a program written in this LISP. The third page summarizes the definitions, and the fourth page summarizes the results.

References

- [1] G. J. Chaitin, “The Limits of Mathematics,” IBM Research Report RC 19646, e-print `chao-dyn/9407003`, July 1994, 270 pp.
- [2] G. J. Chaitin, “The Limits of Mathematics II,” IBM Research Report RC 19660, e-print `chao-dyn/9407005`, July 1994, 255 pp.
- [3] G. J. Chaitin, “The Limits of Mathematics III,” IBM Research Report RC 19663, e-print `chao-dyn/9407006`, July 1994, 239 pp.

- [4] G. J. Chaitin, "The Limits of Mathematics IV," IBM Research Report RC 19671, e-print chao-dyn/9407009, July 1994, 231 pp.

'	quote	1 arg	'(abc) \longrightarrow (abc)
+	head	1 arg	+'(abc) \longrightarrow a +a \longrightarrow a
-	tail	1 arg	-'(abc) \longrightarrow (bc) -a \longrightarrow a
*	join	2 args	*a'(bc) \longrightarrow (abc) *ab \longrightarrow a
.	atom	1 arg	.a \longrightarrow 1 '(a) \longrightarrow 0
=	equal	2 args	=aa \longrightarrow 1 =ab \longrightarrow 0
/	if	3 args	/0ab \longrightarrow b /xab \longrightarrow a
&	function	2 args	('&(xy)y ab) \longrightarrow b
,	display	1 arg	,x \longrightarrow x and displays x
!	eval	1 arg	!e \longrightarrow evaluate e
?	try	3 args	?teb \longrightarrow evaluate e time t with bits b $?teb \longrightarrow \left(\begin{array}{l} ! \\ ? \text{ captured} \\ \text{(value)} \text{ displays...} \end{array} \right)$
@	read bit	0 args	@ \longrightarrow 0 or 1
%	read exp	0 args	% \longrightarrow any s-expression
#	bits for	1 arg	#x \longrightarrow bit string for x
^	append	2 args	~'(ab)'(cd) \longrightarrow (abcd)
~	show	1 arg	~x \longrightarrow x and may show x
:	let	3 args	:xv e \longrightarrow ('&(x)e v) :(fx)d e \longrightarrow ('&(f)e '&(x)d)
&	define	2 args	&xv \longrightarrow x is v &(fx)d \longrightarrow f is &(x)d
"	literally	1 arg	" + \longrightarrow +
{}	unary		{3} \longrightarrow (111)
[]	comment		[ignored]
()	empty		
0	false		
1	true		

lisp.c

LISP Interpreter Run

```

[[[(Fx) = flatten x by removing all interior parentheses]]]
[Define F of x as follows: if x is empty then return empty, if
 x is an atom then join x to the empty list, otherwise split
 x into its head and tail, flatten each, and append the results.]
& (Fx) /=x()() /.x*x() ^(F+x)(F-x)

```

```

F:          (&(x)(/=(x())()(/(.x)(*x())^(F(+x))(F(-x)))))

```

```

(F,F) [use F to flatten itself]

```

```

expression (F(F))
display    (&(x)(/=(x())()(/(.x)(*x())^(F(+x))(F(-x)))))
value     (&x/=x/.x*x^F+xF-x)

```

```

[[[(Gx) = size of x in unary]]]
[Let G of x be [if x is empty, then unary two, if x is an atom,
 then unary one, otherwise split x into its head and tail,
 size each, and add the results] in ...]
: (Gx) /=x()'2 /.x'1 ^(G+x)(G-x)
[Let G of x be [...] in:]
(G,G) [apply G to itself]

```

```

expression ((('(&(G)(G(G,G)))('(&(x)(/=(x())(' (11))(/(.x)(' (1)
)^(G(+x))(G(-x)))))))
display    (&(x)(/=(x())(' (11))(/(.x)(' (1))^(G(+x))(G(-x))))
))
value     (11111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
111)

```

End of LISP Run

Elapsed time is 0 seconds.

DEFINITIONS

- An S-expression x is elegant if no smaller S-expression has the same output. (Here “output” may be either its value or what it displays.)
- Let x be an S-expression. The LISP complexity $H_L(x)$ of x is the size in characters $|p|$ of the smallest S-expression p whose value is x .
- Let X be an infinite set of S-expressions. The LISP complexity $H_L(X)$ of the infinite set X is the size in characters $|p|$ of the smallest S-expression p that displays the elements of X .
- [U(p) = output of universal machine U]
 [given binary program p.]
 & (Up) ++?0'!%p
- Let x be an S-expression. The complexity $H(x)$ of x is the smallest possible value of 7 times (the size in characters $|p|$ of an S-expression p whose value is x if it is given the binary data d) plus (the size in bits $|d|$ of the binary data d given to p).
- Equivalently $H(x) \equiv H_U(x)$ is the size in bits $|p|$ of the smallest bit string p such that $U(p) = x$.
- The halting probability Ω of U is the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ of (the number of t -bit programs p such that $U(p)$ halts within time t) divided by 2^t .
- Let X be an infinite set of S-expressions. The complexity $H(X)$ of the infinite set X is the smallest possible value of 7 times (the size in characters $|p|$ of an S-expression p that displays the elements of X if it is given the binary data d) plus (the size in bits $|d|$ of the binary data d given to p).
- Equivalently $H(X) \equiv H_U(X)$ is the size in bits $|p|$ of the smallest bit string p such that $X = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} -?t'!%p$.

RESULTS

- Lowercase variables x, y, n are individual S-expressions.

Uppercase variables X, Y, T are infinite sets of S-expressions.

- $H_L(x, y) \leq H_L(x) + H_L(y) + 8$.
- If $x \in T \implies x$ is elegant, then
 $x \in T \implies |x| \leq H_L(T) + 378$.
- If $(x, n) \in T \implies H_L(x) \geq n$, then
 $(x, n) \in T \implies n \leq H_L(T) + 381$.
- $H(x, y) \leq H(x) + H(y) + 140$.
- Let x be a string of $|x|$ bits.
 $H(x) \leq 2|x| + 469$, and $H(x) \leq |x| + H(|x|) + 1148$.
- Let Ω_n be the first n bits of Ω .
 $H(\Omega_n) > n - 4431$.
- $H(X \cap Y) \leq H(X) + H(Y) + 4193$.
- $H(X \cup Y) \leq H(X) + H(Y) + 4193$.
- If $(x, n) \in T \implies H(x) \geq n$, then
 $(x, n) \in T \implies n \leq H(T) + 2359$.
- T cannot determine more than $H(T) + 7581$ bits of Ω .