

## Lecture 22: Unsolvability Problems

Harvard SEAS - Fall 2025

2025-11-18

## 1 Announcements

- Salil's next OH Thu 1-1:45pm SEC 3.327.
- Last SRE this Thursday! Be sure to prepare (both senders and receivers) and arrive on time.

Recommended Reading:

- Hesterberg–Vadhan 25
- MacCormick 14.4, 14.6, 14.8

## 2 Programs that analyze programs

**Q:** Are there problems that cannot be solved no matter how much time we allow?

We will find many examples of such impossible-to-solve problems when we turn to questions about analyzing programs. Having programs as input occurs often in the practice of computing:

**Input:** A RAM program  $P$

**Output:** A Turing Machine  $M$  that is equivalent to  $P$ . That is, for every input  $x$ ,  $M$  halts on  $x$  iff  $P$  halts on  $x$ , and if so, then  $M(x) = P(x)$ .

**Computational Problem** RAM2TM

**Theorem 2.1.** *There is an algorithm that solves RAM2TM. More generally, for every two of the Turing-equivalent computational models  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  that we have seen, there is an algorithm that converts an arbitrary program  $P$  in model  $\mathcal{M}$  to an equivalent program  $Q$  in model  $\mathcal{N}$ .*

*Proof idea.*

□

We refer to computational models  $\mathcal{M}$  for which programs can be algorithmically converted to and from equivalent programs in the RAM Model as *constructively Turing-equivalent*.

**Theorem 2.2** (Universal RAM Program). *There is a RAM program  $U$  such that for every RAM program  $P$  and input  $x$ ,*

*Proof idea.*

□

### Variants of Universal Programs.

- There are universal programs for every constructively Turing-equivalent model. Runtime statements may vary.
- There is also a universal Word-RAM program, where runtime increases by a constant factor (like in Theorem 2.2) but also word size increases by an additive constant.
- Can also do *clocked* simulations, where  $U(P, x, t)$  only simulates  $P$  on  $x$  for  $t$  steps.

See the textbook for precise statements.

### Importance of Universal Programs.

- Historically: Universal Turing Machine (Turing, 1936)

- Hardware vs. Software: Can build just one computer ( $U$ ) and use it to execute any program  $P$  we want. Previously: build new hardware for every new type of problem we want to solve. (The Mark I computer near the main entrance of the SEC was one of the first such computers.)
- Inspired the development of modern computers (e.g. the “von Neumann Architecture”).
- Programs vs. Data: we can think of programs  $P$  as data themselves.

### 3 The HALTING PROBLEM

In the previous section, we were able to specify the computational problems that compilers solve, namely ones like RAM2TM. What problem might we *hope* that the universal program can solve?

**Input:** A RAM program  $P$  and an input  $x$

**Output:** The output of  $P$  on  $x$  (if  $P$  ever halts on  $x$ )

**Computational Problem** DETERMINE OUTPUT

**Q:** Why doesn't the Universal RAM Program solve DETERMINE OUTPUT?

**A:**

In fact that limitation is inherent, because the following problem is unsolvable:

**Input:** A RAM program  $P$  and an input  $x$

**Output:** yes if \_\_\_\_\_, no otherwise

**Computational Problem** HALTING PROBLEM–RAM

**Theorem 3.1.** *There is no algorithm that solves HALTING PROBLEM–RAM.*

We'll prove this theorem in the next class. For today, we'll just assume it's true.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\Pi = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, f)$  be a computational problem. We say that  $\Pi$  is *solvable* if there exists RAM program  $P$  that solves  $\Pi$ . Otherwise we say that  $\Pi$  is *unsolvable*.

Note that we don't care about runtime of  $P$  in this definition; classifying problems by runtime was the subject of Computational Complexity. HALTING PROBLEM–RAM is the first unsolvable problem we have seen.

## 4 Unsolvability via reduction

Similarly to what we saw with NP-completeness and SAT, that we have one unsolvable problem (HALTING PROBLEM–RAM), we will be able to obtain more via reductions. For this, we recall the following:

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\Pi$  and  $\Gamma$  be computational problems such that  $\Pi \leq \Gamma$ . If  $\Pi$  is unsolvable, then  $\Gamma$  is unsolvable.*

We highlight that this lemma applies to *all* reductions, including those whose runtime is more than polynomial.

The following problem is a special case of HALTING PROBLEM–RAM.

**Input:** A RAM program  $Q$

**Output:** yes if \_\_\_\_\_, no otherwise

**Computational Problem** HALTS ON EMPTY–RAM

Here the empty input  $\varepsilon$  is just an array of length 0.

**Theorem 4.2.** HALTS ON EMPTY–RAM *is unsolvable*.

*Proof.*

A template for this reduction **Red** is just like the *mapping reductions* between decision problems that we discussed in the context of NP-completeness, except that now we don't care about the runtime of the reduction (since we are studying solvability vs. unsolvability):

**Red**( $P, x$ ):

**Input** : A RAM program  $P$  and an input  $x$

**Output** : yes if  $P$  halts on  $x$ , no otherwise

0 Construct from  $P$  and  $x$  a RAM program  $Q_{P,x}$  such that

\_\_\_\_\_;

1 Call \_\_\_\_\_;

**Algorithm 4.1:** Template for HALTING PROBLEM–RAM  $\leq$   
HALTS ON EMPTY–RAM

How can we construct this RAM program  $Q_{P,x}$  in Line 0? If  $P$  has commands  $C_0, \dots, C_{m-1}$  and  $x$  has length  $n$ , we construct  $Q_{P,x}$  as follows:

The following is the key claim for the correctness of our reduction.

**Claim 4.3.**  *$Q_{P,x}$  halts on  $\varepsilon$  if and only if  $P$  halts on  $x$ .*

*Proof.*

□

Now, we see that plugging the construction of  $Q_{P,x}$  from into the reduction template (Algorithm 4.1) gives a correct reduction from the HALTING PROBLEM–RAM to HALTS ON EMPTY–RAM.

By the unsolvability of HALTING PROBLEM–RAM (Theorem 3.1) and Lemma 4.1, we deduce that HALTS ON EMPTY–RAM is unsolvable. □

Using compilers, we can deduce that HALTS ON EMPTY is unsolvable for other models.

**Theorem 4.4.** *For every constructively Turing-equivalent computational model  $\mathcal{M}$ , HALTS ON EMPTY– $\mathcal{M}$  is unsolvable.*

*Proof.*

□

The Word-RAM model is also constructively Turing-equivalent, but the formulation is a bit more complex since a Word-RAM’s computation (in particular, whether or not it halts) depends not only on its input  $x$  but its word size  $w$ .

**Input:** A Word-RAM program  $R$

**Output:** yes if  
no otherwise

**Computational Problem** HALTS ON EMPTY-WORD RAM

**Theorem 4.5.** HALTS ON EMPTY-WORD RAM *is unsolvable*.

Our next example of an unsolvable problem is the following:

**Input:** A RAM program  $S$

**Output:** yes if \_\_\_\_\_, no otherwise

**Computational Problem** IS A 3-COLORING SOLVER

**Theorem 4.6.** IS A 3-COLORING SOLVER *is unsolvable*.

*Proof.* We give a mapping reduction **Red** from HALTS ON EMPTY-WORD RAM to IS A 3-COLORING SOLVER.

Given a program  $Q$ , our reduction **Red** constructs the program  $S_Q$  as follows:

To establish the correctness of our mapping reduction, we need to check:

**Claim 4.7.**  $S_Q$  solves GRAPH 3-COLORING *if and only if*  $Q$  halts on  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.*

□

□

We note again analogous results hold for all constructively Turing-equivalent models. In particular, the variants of IS A 3-COLORING SOLVER where the inputs are Turing Machines, Word-RAM programs, Python programs, etc. are all unsolvable.

**Theorem 4.8** (Rice's Theorem, informally stated). *Every non-trivial semantic property of programs is unsolvable.*

- Semantic property: depends only on the input–output behavior of the program. (As opposed to internals like lines of code, values of variables, runtime, etc.)
- Nontrivial property: no constant answer correctly solves the problem for all inputs.
- Precise statement given in the textbook. If you study it, you may use Rice's Theorem, but be sure to verify both of the required properties when you use it!