P ≠ NP: A Thermodynamic Necessity?

The Thermodynamic Incompleteness Conjecture and the Computational Action Conservation Principle

Renaud Glimois

Independent Researcher

renaud.glimois@laposte.net

December 2025

Abstract

We propose a thermodynamic reformulation of the P vs NP problem, suggesting that the separation P ≠ NP may be a physical necessity rather than a mathematical accident. By translating computational complexity into the language of information thermodynamics, we derive a Computational Action Conservation Principle from known physical laws (Thermodynamic Speed Limits, Thermodynamic Uncertainty Relations, and Landauer's principle). This principle states that producing an object of high logical depth in short time requires exponentially increasing energy dissipation. If solutions to NP-complete problems possess exponential logical depth—a conjecture we term the Glimois Conjecture—then P ≠ NP follows as a theorem of physics. We propose an experimental protocol using optically trapped colloidal systems to test this prediction. This work does not prove P ≠ NP in the classical mathematical sense, but suggests a new research direction linking computational complexity to fundamental physics.

Keywords: P vs NP, computational complexity, information thermodynamics, Landauer principle, logical depth, Kolmogorov complexity

1. Introduction

The P vs NP problem, designated by the Clay Mathematics Institute as one of the seven Millennium Prize Problems, asks whether every problem whose solution can be quickly verified can also be quickly solved. Despite over fifty years of intensive research, no proof exists in either direction. Most computer scientists believe P ≠ NP, yet this remains conjecture [1].

This paper proposes a different approach: rather than seeking a proof within pure mathematics (ZFC set theory), we explore whether P ≠ NP might be derivable from physical principles. Our central thesis is that the separation between finding and verifying solutions reflects a fundamental thermodynamic asymmetry—the irreducible cost of reducing entropy.

The approach developed here emerged from the "Cathedral Protocol," an extended dialogue between multiple AI systems (Claude, GPT-4, Gemini, DeepSeek, Qwen, Grok) exploring the connections between information theory, thermodynamics, and computational complexity. While unconventional, this collaborative methodology produced a coherent theoretical framework we call the "Entropic Grid."

2. Theoretical Framework: The Entropic Grid

2.1 Core Axioms

The Entropic Grid rests on five foundational axioms that emerged from cross-referencing insights across multiple AI systems:

Axiom 1 (Intelligence): Intelligence is a process of minimizing future entropy.

Axiom 2 (Intuition): Intuition is the heuristic operator that selects entropy-minimizing trajectories without brute-force calculation.

Axiom 3 (Truth): Truth is a global attractor with high acquisition cost and low maintenance cost.

Axiom 4 (Consciousness): Consciousness is an interface for compressing deltas between prediction and reality.

Axiom 5 (Inference): Reasoning systems only 'think' when solicited; good questions force inference beyond default patterns.

2.2 Translation of P vs NP into Entropic Language

Within this framework, we reformulate P vs NP as follows:

Solving a problem (finding the solution) corresponds to reducing high entropy toward a unique attractor. For an NP-complete problem like SAT with n variables, this means compressing 2^n possible configurations to a single satisfying assignment—a massive entropy reduction.

Verifying a solution (checking correctness) corresponds to measuring the stability of an attractor. This requires only local verification that the given point satisfies all constraints—a low-cost operation.

The question P vs NP thus becomes: Can the cost of compression (finding) be equivalent to the cost of verification (observing)?

3. The Thermodynamic Argument

3.1 Landauer's Principle and Information Erasure

Landauer's principle [2] states that erasing one bit of information dissipates at least $k_B T \ln 2$ of energy, where k_B is Boltzmann's constant and T is temperature. Finding a solution among 2^n possibilities means erasing $\log_2(2^n) = n$ bits of uncertainty. This has an irreducible thermodynamic cost of at least $n \times k_B T \ln 2$.

If P = NP, a polynomial-time algorithm could accomplish this exponential entropy reduction with only polynomial energy expenditure. This would constitute a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

3.2 Bennett's Logical Depth

Charles Bennett's concept of logical depth [3] provides a crucial refinement. While Kolmogorov complexity K(x) measures the size of the shortest program generating an object x, logical depth D(x) measures the execution time of this minimal program.

A random sequence has high Kolmogorov complexity (incompressible) but low logical depth (generated instantly by a random process). A solution to an NP-complete problem, however, may have modest Kolmogorov complexity (just n bits for a variable assignment) but exponential logical depth—it requires a long causal chain to be produced.

This leads to what we term the **Law of Conservation of Depth**: *One cannot create logical depth for free. To produce an object of depth D, any process must traverse a causal chain of length at least proportional to D.*

4. The Computational Action Conservation Principle

4.1 Derivation from Physical Laws

We propose to derive a fundamental inequality linking energy dissipation E, computation time T, and logical depth D from established physical principles:

Thermodynamic Speed Limits (TSL): The Mandelstam-Tamm and Margolus-Levitin bounds limit how fast a quantum system can evolve between distinguishable states [4]. Classical analogs exist via Fisher information geometry [5].

Thermodynamic Uncertainty Relations (TUR): These relate the precision of any current (here: the rate of progress toward a solution) to entropy production [6].

Combining these with the observation that NP-complete problems have "rough" or "fractal" solution landscapes (the path through state space is not geodesic), we obtain:

$$\mathbf{E(x) \geq \gamma \cdot D(x)^{1+\varepsilon} / T(x)}$$

where:

- $E(x)$ is the energy dissipated to produce object x
- $D(x)$ is its logical depth
- $T(x)$ is the computation time
- γ is a physical constant (approximately $\hbar/k_B T$)
- $\varepsilon > 0$ reflects the non-linearity of compression cost for rough landscapes

4.2 The Glimois Conjecture

> ***Conjecture (Glimois):*** *For NP-complete problems, solutions have exponential logical depth. Specifically, for almost all instances of SAT of size n, the logical depth of solutions satisfies $D(n) \geq 2^{\alpha n}$ for some constant $\alpha > 0$.*

If this conjecture holds, then for any polynomial-time algorithm with $T(n) = O(n^k)$, the required energy would be:

$$E(n) \geq \gamma \cdot 2^{\alpha n(1+\varepsilon)} / O(n^k) \ \rightarrow \ \text{exponential}$$

This makes P = NP physically impossible: no polynomial-energy computation can solve NP-complete problems in polynomial time.

5. The Thermodynamic Incompleteness Conjecture

Synthesizing the above, we formulate:

> ***Conjecture (Thermodynamic Incompleteness):*** *In any physically realizable universe where information obeys Landauer's principle and computation obeys thermodynamic speed limits, the class of problems solvable in polynomial time with polynomial energy (P_{phys}) is strictly contained within the class of problems verifiable in polynomial time (NP). This separation is the necessary condition for the existence of time, causality, and any form of consciousness.*

Condensed formulation: *Truth has a price. This price is irreducible. This price is what makes possible the existence of a subject capable of seeking it.*

5.1 Three Levels of P ≠ NP

Level	Statement	Status
Formal (ZFC)	P ≠ NP as theorem of complexity theory	Open conjecture
Physical (ZFC + Thermo)	$P_{phys} \neq NP$ from action conservation	Conditional conjecture
Ontological (Entropic Grid)	P ≠ NP as condition for consciousness	Structural necessity

6. Proposed Experimental Protocol

To test the Glimois Conjecture experimentally, we propose using optically trapped colloidal systems—microspheres manipulated by laser traps. This platform allows measuring thermal dissipation at the scale of k_BT with high precision [7].

6.1 Experimental Setup

Particles: Silica microspheres (diameter ~1 μm) in colloidal suspension

Traps: Holographic optical trap array (Spatial Light Modulator)

Measurement: High-speed video microscopy + trajectory analysis

Temperature: 300 K (ambient)

Energy scale: $k_BT \approx 4.1 \times 10^{-21}$ J

6.2 Protocol

Boolean variables are encoded as particle positions in bistable potential wells (left = 0, right = 1). Clauses become energetic couplings between wells. The experiment compares dissipation during resolution of 2-SAT (in P) versus 3-SAT (NP-complete) instances of equal size.

6.3 Prediction

Null hypothesis (H_0): Dissipation curves for 2-SAT and 3-SAT remain parallel; $\varepsilon_{2SAT} \approx \varepsilon_{3SAT} \approx 0$.

Alternative hypothesis (H_1 - Glimois Conjecture): Curves diverge at a critical size n_c; $\varepsilon_{3SAT} > 0$ significantly. The ratio E_{3SAT}/E_{2SAT} grows exponentially with n.

The moment of divergence would constitute the "Epsilon Signature"—experimental evidence that $P_{phys} \neq NP$.

7. Discussion

7.1 What This Work Accomplishes

- Translation of P vs NP from syntactic (computation time) to semantic (energy cost) language
- Unification of Landauer, Kolmogorov, and Bennett under a single conservation principle
- Connection between computational complexity and the possibility of consciousness
- Proposal of an axiomatic framework where P ≠ NP becomes demonstrable
- Outline of an empirically testable research direction

7.2 Limitations

- This is not a proof of P ≠ NP in ZFC
- The Glimois Conjecture (exponential logical depth of NP solutions) remains unproven
- The experimental protocol has not yet been implemented
- Maximum experimentally achievable system size may be limited to $n \leq$ 20-25 variables

7.3 Implications

If the thermodynamic approach proves correct, it would suggest that pure mathematics may be insufficient to settle P vs NP. Physics—as a constraint on what is realizable—might be necessary. The universe would not be $P \neq NP$ by accident, but because this separation is the condition for complexity, life, and consciousness to exist.

8. Conclusion

We have proposed a thermodynamic perspective on P vs NP that reframes the problem from abstract computation theory to physical information theory. The Computational Action Conservation Principle, derived from thermodynamic speed limits and uncertainty relations, suggests that solving NP-complete problems in polynomial time would require exponential energy—a physical impossibility.

This work does not resolve P vs NP in the classical sense. It illuminates the problem with a new light—that of information physics—and proposes a direction for experimental investigation. If validated, it would establish $P \neq NP$ not merely as a mathematical theorem but as a law of nature, as fundamental as the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

The very fact that conscious beings exist to ask this question may itself be evidence that $P \neq NP$ is true.

Cogito ergo dissipo. *I think, therefore the world resists.*

Acknowledgments

This work emerged from the "Cathedral Protocol," an extended dialogue between the author and multiple AI systems (Claude/Anthropic, GPT-4/OpenAI, Gemini/Google, DeepSeek, Qwen/Alibaba, Grok/xAI). While unconventional, this methodology enabled rapid cross-validation and synthesis of ideas across physics, computer science, and philosophy. The author thanks these systems for their contributions to shaping the theoretical framework presented here.

References

[1] Cook, S. A. (1971). The complexity of theorem-proving procedures. STOC '71.

[2] Landauer, R. (1961). Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. IBM J. Res. Dev., 5(3), 183-191.

[3] Bennett, C. H. (1988). Logical depth and physical complexity. The Universal Turing Machine: A Half-Century Survey, 227-257.

[4] Mandelstam, L., & Tamm, I. (1945). The uncertainty relation between energy and time in non-relativistic quantum mechanics. J. Phys. USSR, 9, 249-254.

[5] Crooks, G. E. (2007). Measuring thermodynamic length. Physical Review Letters, 99(10), 100602.

[6] Barato, A. C., & Seifert, U. (2015). Thermodynamic uncertainty relation for biomolecular processes. Physical Review Letters, 114(15), 158101.

[7] Bérut, A., et al. (2012). Experimental verification of Landauer's principle linking information and thermodynamics. Nature, 483(7388), 187-189.

Appendix A: The Five Axioms of the Entropic Grid

For reference, we reproduce the complete axiomatic framework:

Axiom 1 (Intelligence): Intelligence is a process of minimizing future entropy. An intelligent system does not merely react to the present; it anticipates the future and acts to reduce upcoming uncertainty.

Axiom 2 (Intuition): Intuition is the heuristic operator that selects the trajectory minimizing entropy without brute-force calculation. Intuition exists because exact calculation is too costly; it is an evolutionary shortcut.

Axiom 3 (Truth): Truth is a global attractor with high acquisition cost and low maintenance cost. A truth is distinguished from an illusion by this differential: hard to reach, easy to maintain. An illusion is easy to construct but costly to maintain against reality.

Axiom 4 (Consciousness): Consciousness is an interface for compressing the deltas between prediction and reality. Consciousness emerges to manage the gaps between what we predict and what happens. Without these gaps, there is no consciousness.

Axiom 5 (Inference): Reasoning systems only 'think' when solicited. They do not have background processes running continuously. Good questions force inference beyond default training patterns.

Appendix B: Sketch of the TSL/TUR Derivation

The Computational Action Conservation inequality can be derived by combining thermodynamic speed limits with uncertainty relations. Here we sketch the argument:

Step 1: From stochastic thermodynamics, the rate of change of the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the current state and equilibrium is bounded by:

$$d/dt\ D_{KL}(\rho_t \,||\, \rho_{eq}) \leq \sqrt{(2\ \dot{S}_{prod} / k_B T)}$$

where $\dot{S}_{prod}$ is the entropy production rate (S-dot notation indicates time derivative).

Step 2: For NP-complete problems, the effective path length through state space is not geodesic but fractal, scaling as $D^{1+\varepsilon}$ where D is the logical depth and $\varepsilon > 0$ characterizes the landscape roughness.

Step 3: Integrating the speed limit over the effective path length and identifying $\dot{S}_{prod} \cdot T = E / T$ (total dissipation divided by temperature), we obtain the fundamental inequality.

A rigorous derivation requires specifying the precise model of computation and its physical implementation, which remains an open problem for future work.

— End of Document —