

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
COLLEGE OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND THE ARTS
Department of Philosophy

Technical Report

TURING-MACHINES AND THE ENTSCHEIDUNGSPROBLEM

J. Richard Büchi

ORA Project 03105

under contract with:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH
CONTRACT NO. Nonr 1224(21)
WASHINGTON, D.C.

administered through:

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

ANN ARBOR

December 1961

ENGN
UMR 1101

Turing-Machines and the Entscheidungsproblem*

by J. Richard Büchi

Let Q be the set of all sentences of elementary quantification theory (without equality). In its semantic version Hilbert's Entscheidungsproblem for a class $X \subseteq Q$ of sentences is:

[X]: To find a method which, for every $S \in X$, yields a decision as to whether or not S is satisfiable.

Church (1936) showed that $[Q]$ is recursively unsolvable. Shortly thereafter Turing (1936) obtained this result more directly by reducing to $[Q]$ an unsolvable problem on Turing-machines. This reduction, however, is rather involved, and requires much detailed attention of the kind which does not add to one's over-all understanding of the situation. We will show in this paper that the connection between Turing-machines and quantification theory is really a rather simple one. The key to it is lemma 3, which is closely related to the Skolem-Gödel-Herbrand work on quantification theory. As a result we obtain the first really elegant proof of unsolvability of $[Q]$. It can be outlined thus:

Lemma 1: The set Hlt, consisting of all Turing-machines which eventually halt, if started on the empty tape, is not recursive.

Lemma 2: To any Turing-machine M , one can construct a matrix $\underline{M}(x,u,y)$, with

*The results of this paper were announced in the Notices, Am. Math. Soc., 8 (1961), 354. The work was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation and contracts with the Office of Naval Research and U. S. Army Signal Corps.

individual variables x, u, y , monadic predicate letters Z, \dots , and \exists binary predicate letters S, K , and H , such that $M \not\equiv \text{Hlt}$ if and only if $Z(o) \wedge (\forall xy) \underline{M}(x, x', y)$ is satisfiable in the natural number system $\langle \mathbb{N}, o, ' \rangle$.

Lemma 3: For any matrices $\underline{Z}(x)$ and $\underline{M}(x, u, y)$, the sentence $(\exists x) \underline{Z}(x) \wedge (\forall x) (\exists u) (\forall y) \underline{M}(x, u, y)$ is satisfiable if and only if $\underline{Z}(o) \wedge (\forall xy) \underline{M}(x, x', y)$ is satisfiable in $\langle \mathbb{N}, o, ' \rangle$.

By lemmas 2 and 3, to any Turing-machine M one can construct a sentence S of form $\exists x \forall y \exists u$, such that $M \not\equiv \text{Hlt}$ if and only if S is satisfiable. Therefore, by lemma 1,

Theorem 1: The problem $[\exists \forall \exists \forall]$ is not recursively solvable, even if restricted to sentences in which, besides monadic letters, only three binary predicate letters occur.

To stress the simplicity of this argument, we wish to claim that the following hints suffice to prove the three lemmas: Lemma 1 is well known and immediately follows from the basic unsolvability result on Turing-machines (machine halting on the tape carrying its description). Proving lemma 2 just means describing the operation of a Turing-machine M on the empty tape in the form $\underline{C}(Q, S, K, o, ', x, y)$, whereby $Q_y =$ state at time y , $K_{xy} \equiv$ position x is scanned at time y , $S_{xy} =$ tape-symbol at position x and time y . $M \not\equiv \text{Hlt}$ then means that no Q, P and S exist such that for all places x and all times y , $\underline{C}(Q, S, o, ', x, y)$. As the functions Q and S are finite-valued, they can be coded as vectors of monadic and binary predicates on natural numbers. It remains to invent some tricks to put the matrix $\underline{C}(o, ', x, y)$ into the form $\underline{Z}(o) \wedge \underline{M}(x, x', y)$, by adding auxiliary predicates. Lemma 3 is trivial in the "if-direction". In

the other direction one might use the axiom of choice to introduce a monadic Skolem-function fx for $(\exists u)$ and a constant c for $(\exists x)$. It remains to establish that $\underline{Z}(c) \wedge (\forall xy) \underline{M}(x, fx, y)$ is satisfiable if and only if it is satisfiable by predicates in \mathbb{N} and $c=0, fx=x'$.

Our proof has the further advantage of directly yielding unsolvability for the very simple type $\exists \wedge \forall \exists \forall$ of sentences. By passing to the Skolem-form of $\forall \exists \forall$, theorem 1 also yields unsolvability of $[\exists \wedge \forall \exists \wedge \forall \forall \forall]$. Compare this with Bernays' (1958) analysis of Turing's proof, and note that such results are usually obtained by reduction of [Q] [see Suranyi (1959)]. Another feature of our proof is that, with slight modifications, it yields an improved version of Trachtenbrot's (1950) result about satisfiability in finite domains:

Theorem 2: There is no recursive set which separates the not-satisfiable sentences from those satisfiable in a finite domain, even if only sentences of form $\exists \wedge \forall \exists \forall$ are considered.

Corollary: The set of $\exists \wedge \forall \exists \forall$ sentences, which are finitely satisfiable, is not recursive.

Clearly theorem 2 follows from the following stronger versions of lemmas 1, 2, and 3:

Lemma I: Let Cyl be the set of all Turing-machines which eventually cycle, if started on the empty tape. The sets Hlt and Cyl are not recursively separable.

Lemma II: The construction $M \mapsto \underline{M}$ of lemma 2 has the further property: $M \in Cyl$ if and only if $\underline{Z}(0) \wedge (\forall xy) \underline{M}(x, x', y)$ is satisfiable in $\langle \mathbb{N}, 0, ' \rangle$ by periodic predicates.

Lemma III: Add to lemma 3: The sentence $(\exists x) \underline{Z}(x) \wedge (\forall x) (\exists u) (\forall y) \underline{M}(x, u, y)$ is satisfiable in a finite domain, if and only if $\underline{Z}(0) \wedge (\forall xy) \underline{M}(x, x', y)$ is satisfiable

in $\langle \mathbb{N}, 0, ' \rangle$ by periodic predicates.

We will now indicate the proofs of the lemmas, and add some further discussion at the end of the paper.

Proof of lemmas 2 and II: A (Turing-) machine we define to be a system $M = \langle \underline{D}, A, \underline{L}, \underline{R}, \underline{P}, \underline{Q}, \underline{S} \rangle$ consisting of a finite set \underline{D} of elements called states; an $A \in \underline{D}$ called the initial state; three binary predicates $\underline{L}[X,Y]$, $\underline{R}[X,Y]$, $\underline{P}[X,Y]$, called commands of left-move, right-move, and print; a binary function $\underline{Q}[X,Y]$ with values in \underline{D} , called the new-state-function; and a function $\underline{S}[X,Y]$ with values in $\{T,F\}$, called the print-function. All these predicates and functions have arguments $X \in \underline{D}$ and $Y \in \{T,F\}$; furthermore, \underline{L} , \underline{R} , \underline{P} are to be exclusive and complementary. The tape-symbols are T and F; a tape is a one-way infinite sequence of tape-symbols, i.e., a predicate I_x on \mathbb{N} . The tape $I_x \equiv F$ is called the empty tape.

The operation of a machine M , set to work on a tape I , is as follows. M is started in its initial state A , scanning the zero-position of the tape I . If at any time t it is in state X and scans position u of the tape, which now carries the symbol Y , then,

if $\underline{L}[X,Y]$, it moves to scan position $u-1$;

if $\underline{R}[X,Y]$, it moves to scan position $u+1$;

if $\underline{P}[X,Y]$, it prints $\underline{S}[X,Y]$ in place of Y at position u .

In all cases it goes into the new state $\underline{Q}[X,Y]$. Note that, if $u=0$ and the command is $\underline{L}[X,Y]$, then M will next scan position -1 , i.e., it runs off the tape. In this case we say that the machine halts at time $t+1$, and that the tape I is accepted by M ; in symbols $H1(M,I)$. The set $H1t$ consists of all

machines M which eventually halt if put to work on the empty tape.

Now suppose that M is put to work on the empty tape, and never comes to a halt (i.e., $M \not\equiv \text{Hlt}$). Then the functions

Q_x = state of M at time x

S_{yx} = tape-symbol at time x and position y

$K_{yx} \equiv$ at time x position y is scanned by M

L_x = at time x the command is left-move

R_x = at time x the command is right-move

P_x = at time x the command is print

are defined for all x and y in \mathbb{N} , and satisfy the conjunction \underline{C} of the following conditions:

$$Q_0 \equiv A \wedge \sim S_{y0}$$

$$K_{00} \wedge \sim K_{y'0}$$

$$K_{yx} \supset \cdot \quad Q_{x'} \equiv \underline{Q}[Q_x, S_{yx}]$$

$$L_x \supset \cdot \quad K_{yx'} \equiv K_{y'x}$$

$$K_{yx} \wedge \underline{L}[Q_x, S_{yx}] \supset \cdot \quad L_x \wedge \sim P_x \wedge \sim R_x$$

$$P_x \supset \cdot \quad K_{yx'} \equiv K_{yx}$$

$$K_{yx} \wedge \underline{P}[Q_x, S_{yx}] \supset \cdot \quad P_x \wedge \sim L_x \wedge \sim R_x$$

$$R_x \supset \cdot \quad K_{y'x'} \equiv K_{yx}$$

$$K_{yx} \wedge \underline{R}[Q_x, S_{yx}] \supset \cdot \quad R_x \wedge \sim L_x \wedge \sim P_x$$

$$R_x \supset \cdot \quad \sim K_{0x'}$$

$$[\sim K_{yx} \wedge P_x] \vee L_x \vee R_x \supset \cdot \quad S_{yx'} \equiv S_{yx}$$

$$\sim [K_{0x} \wedge L_x]$$

$$K_{yx} \wedge P_x \supset \cdot \quad S_{yx'} \equiv \underline{S}[Q_x, S_{yx}]$$

Conversely, the existence of Q, S, K, L, R, and P, which satisfy $(\forall yx)\underline{C}$,

implies that M will not come to a halt if started on the empty tape. Thus

(1) $M \not\equiv \text{Hlt} \equiv (\forall xy)\underline{C}$ is satisfiable in $\langle \mathbb{N}, 0, ' \rangle$. Note that the states of a machine may be coded as vectors of truth-values, so that the function-letter Q simply stands for a vector $\langle Q_1, \dots, Q_n \rangle$ of predicate-letters (n depending on the number of states of M), and \underline{C} therefore is a matrix of quantification

theory. With the construction $M \rightarrow \underline{C}$, and the established (1), we thus are pretty close to a proof of lemma 2. All that remains to be done is to note that the following modifications of \underline{C} do not affect the validity of (1).

1. Introduce an additional binary predicate-letter H. On the right side of \underline{C} replace $Ky'o$ by Hyo , $Ky'x$ by Hyx , $Ky'x'$ by Hyx' , and conjoin $Hxy \equiv Kx'y$. The resulting matrix is of form $\underline{C}^*(o, x, x', y)$.

2. Introduce an additional monadic predicate-letter Z. To \underline{C}^* conjoin $Zo \wedge \sim Zx'$ and replace $Qo \equiv A \wedge \sim Syo$ by $Zx \supset Qx \equiv A \wedge \sim Syx$, $Koo \wedge \sim Hyo$ by $Zx \supset Kxx \wedge \sim Hyx$, $\sim Kox'$ by $Zy \supset \sim Kyx'$, and $\sim [Kox \wedge Lx]$ by $Zy \supset \sim [Kyx \wedge Lx]$. The resulting formula is of form $Zo \wedge \underline{M}(x, x', y)$. $M \rightarrow \underline{M}$ is the construction required in lemma 2. The same construction also satisfies lemma II, as will now be shown.

The machine M, if started on the tape I, goes into a p-cycle at time X , if at the later time $(X+p)$ it is faced with an identical situation, i.e., at times X and $(X+p)$ M is in the same state and scans identical tapes in the same position. We will say that M (eventually) p-cycles on I, in symbols $Cy_p(M, I)$, if at some time it goes into a p-cycle. (It may be shown that for some p, $Cy_p(M, I)$ holds if and only if M never runs off the tape and scans only in a bounded part of the tape.) The set Cyl is defined to consist of all those machines M which eventually cycle, if put to work on the empty tape.

A predicate Ux on N is called periodic with phase X and period $p > 0$, if $U(x+p) = Ux$ for all $x \geq X$. A relation Vxy on N is called periodic with phase X and period $p > 0$, if $V(x+p)y \equiv Vxy$ for all $x \geq X$ and all y , and $Vx(y+p) \equiv Vxy$ for all x and all $y \geq X$. (Note that the entire line VxX has to repeat at $Vx(X+p)$, and not just from $x=X$ on!)

Suppose now that $M \in \text{Cyl}$, that is, M goes into a p -cycle at time ℓ , if started on the empty tape. Then clearly the functions Q, L, R, P are periodic and Syx and Kyx are periodic in the time-argument x , all of them with phase ℓ and period p . Furthermore, if d is the maximum of all positions scanned by M before time $(\ell+p)$, then at no time t a position $y > d$ will be scanned. It follows that $Kyx \equiv F$, for all x and all $y > d$, and because $Syo \equiv F$ and M never scans beyond d , also $Syx \equiv F$ for all x and all $y > d$. Thus, also K and S are periodic (with phase $\geq \ell, d$ and period p). In other words, the implication from left to right of (2) is valid.

(2) $M \in \text{Cyl} \equiv (\forall yx) \underline{C}$ is satisfiable by periodic predicates in $\langle \mathbb{N}, 0, ' \rangle$.

In the other direction (2) is trivially valid because the only solution of $(\forall yx) \underline{C}$ are the predicates Q, S, K, L, R, P describing the operation of M ; and to say that Q, S, K are periodic (in the time argument) just means that M eventually cycles. Because the modifications 1. and 2. of \underline{C} to C^* to $Z_0 \wedge \underline{M}$ clearly do not affect the validity of (2), this ends the proof of lemma II.

Proof of lemma I: We omit giving a direct proof of lemma 1, since it is well known from the literature. Of the proof of lemma I we present an intuitive sketch:

The block of length ℓ is the tape given by $Iy \equiv (y < \ell)$. It is clear that one can effectively set up a coding function $cd(M)$ which maps one-to-one all machines onto all blocks. A set \underline{X} of blocks is called recursive if there are machines M_1 and M_2 such that for all blocks I ,

$$(a) \quad \begin{array}{ll} I \in \underline{X} & \equiv H_1(M_1, I) \\ I \notin \underline{X} & \equiv H_1(M_2, I). \end{array}$$

A set \underline{Y} of machines is called recursive if the set $cd(\underline{Y})$ of blocks is recursive. As to the equivalence of this to other definitions of "recursive sets," we remark:

1. It is well known that the restriction to two tape-symbols (one of them the blank) and one-way infinite tapes is not a serious one.
2. Machines which print and move at the same time can, by adding new states, easily be modified so as either only to print or only to move in each atomic act.
3. We might have added another command predicate $\underline{H}[X,Y]$, to obtain halt-situations in addition to "running off the tape." But these can be eliminated by adding an additional state B, such that $\underline{H}[X,Y]$ implies that the next state is B, and B requires M to stay in B and move left.

Note that for a machine M to l-cycle simply means that it keeps scanning at the same position. Thus, one can find a predicate $\underline{C}_1[X,Y]$ such that M at time t goes into a l-cycle just in case $\underline{C}_1[X,Y]$ holds for the state X and scanned symbol Y. Let now M' be obtained by adding a new state B with $\underline{Q}[B,Y] = B$, and conjoining \underline{C}_1 to the right-move condition \underline{R} . Then clearly $Hl(M,I) \equiv Hl(M',I)$, but M' never l-cycles. Similarly, one can modify a machine M to M' such that $Hl(M,I) \equiv Cy_1(M',I)$ and M' does not halt on any block I. Thus in the definition of recursive sets of blocks one may replace (a) by

- (b)
- $$I \in \underline{X} \equiv Cy_1(M_1, I), M_1 \text{ does not halt on blocks}$$
- $$I \notin \underline{X} \equiv Hl(M_2, I), M_2 \text{ never l-cycles}$$

It now is possible to combine M_1 and M_2 into one machine M which l-cycles on $I \in \underline{X}$ and halts on $I \notin \underline{X}$. Thus, to every recursive set \underline{X} of blocks there is a machine M_0 such that for all blocks I,

$$(c) \quad \begin{aligned} I \in \underline{X} &\equiv Cy_1(M_0, I) \\ I \notin \underline{X} &\equiv Hl(M_0, I) \end{aligned}$$

By the usual diagonal-argument we now can prove lemma I:

Suppose that \underline{Y} is a recursive set of machines and separates the sets of machines for which $Hl(M, cdM)$ respectively $Cy_1(M, cdM)$, i.e.,

$$Hl(M, cdM) \supset M \in \underline{Y}$$

$$Cy_1(M, cdM) \supset M \notin \underline{Y}.$$

By (c) there is a machine M_0 , such that

$$M_0 \in \underline{Y} \supset Cy_1(M_0, cdM)$$

$$M_0 \notin \underline{Y} \supset Hl(M_0, cdM).$$

Now $M_0 \in \underline{Y}$ implies $Cy_1(M_0, cdM_0)$ implies $M_0 \notin \underline{Y}$, and $M_0 \notin \underline{Y}$ implies $Hl(M_0, cdM_0)$ implies $M_0 \in \underline{Y}$. This is contradictory, and therefore

(d) The sets $\underline{A} = \{M; Hl(M, cdM)\}$ and $B = \{M; Cy_1(M, cdM)\}$

are not separable by a recursive set.

Because there is a recursive mapping f from machines to machines such that

$$Hl(M, cdM) \supset fM \in Hlt$$

$$Cy_1(M, cdM) \supset fM \in Cyl_1$$

it follows from (d) that also Hlt and Cyl_1 are not separable. Finally, because $Cyl_1 \subseteq Cyl$, we conclude that Hlt and Cyl are inseparable.

Proof of lemma 3 and III: We will assume that the matrices \underline{Z} and \underline{M} contain only one predicate-letter R , which is binary. The general case does not present any new problems. Let $\Sigma(R)$ stand for the sentence $(\exists x)\underline{Z}(x) \wedge (\forall x)(\exists u)(\forall y)\underline{M}(x, u, y)$, and $\Sigma^*(a, f, R)$ for its Skolem-transform $\underline{Z}(a) \wedge (\forall xy)\underline{M}(x, fx, y)$.

Now suppose that $\Sigma(R)$ is satisfiable, i.e., has a model $\langle D_1, R_1 \rangle$. By the axiom of choice it follows that there is an $a_1 \in D_1$ and a function $f_1: D_1 \rightarrow D_2$, such that $\underline{D}_1 = \langle D_1, a_1, f_1, R_1 \rangle$ is a model of $\Sigma^*(a, f, R)$. Let D_2 be the smallest subset of D_1 which contains a_1 and is closed under f_1 , let $a_2 = a_1$, $f_2 =$ restriction of f_1 to D_2 , $R_2 =$ restriction of R_1 to D_2 . Because Σ^* is a universal sentence it follows that $\underline{D}_2 = \langle D_2, a_2, f_2, R_2 \rangle$ still is a model of Σ^* . Next we note that $\langle \mathbb{N}, o, ' \rangle$ is the free algebra with one generator and one monadic function. Because $\langle D_2, a_2, f_2 \rangle$ is generated by a_2 and f_2 , it follows that there is a homomorphism h from $\langle \mathbb{N}, o, ' \rangle$ onto $\langle D_2, a_2, f_2 \rangle$. If we now define $R_3xy \equiv R_2(hx)(hy)$, then it is clear that \underline{D}_2 is homomorphic image of $\langle \mathbb{N}, o, ', R_3 \rangle$. Again because Σ^* is universal it therefore follows that $\langle \mathbb{N}, o, ', R_3 \rangle$ is still a model of $\Sigma^*(a, f, R)$. Thus,

(1) Σ is satisfiable $\cdot \supset \cdot$ Σ^* is satisfiable in $\langle \mathbb{N}, o, ' \rangle$.

Suppose now further that the model $\langle D_1, R_1 \rangle$ of Σ is finite. Then clearly the algebra $\langle D_2, a_2, f_2 \rangle$ is finite. It follows that the congruence relation $hx = hy$ on $\langle \mathbb{N}, o, ' \rangle$ is of finite index, and therefore must be of form

$$hx = hy \cdot \equiv \cdot x = y \vee [x = \mathcal{X} \wedge y \geq \mathcal{X} \wedge x \equiv y \pmod{p}]$$

for some \mathcal{X} and $p > 0$. It follows that the relation R_3xy is periodic with phase \mathcal{X} and period p . Thus we have shown

(2) Σ finitely satisfiable $\cdot \supset \cdot$ Σ^* periodically satisfiable in $\langle \mathbb{N}, o, ' \rangle$

The converse to (1) is trivial, so that lemma 3 is established. To establish lemma III it remains only to prove the converse to (2). This goes as follows:

Suppose $\underline{D} = \langle \mathbb{N}, o, ', R_1 \rangle$ is a model of $\Sigma^*(a, f, R)$, whereby R_1 is periodic, say of phase \mathcal{X} and period $p > 0$. The relation

$$x \sim y \equiv x = y \vee [x \geq x \wedge y \geq x \wedge x \equiv y \pmod{p}]$$

is clearly a congruence relation of $\langle \mathbb{N}, 0, ' \rangle$, and because R_1 has phase \mathcal{A} and period p , it is also a congruence relation of R_1 . Consequently one can form the factor \underline{D}/\sim of the relational system \underline{D} . Because Σ^* is universal and \underline{D}/\sim is homomorphic image of \underline{D} , it follows that \underline{D}/\sim is still a model of Σ^* . Furthermore \underline{D}/\sim is finite, because \sim is of finite index. But from any model of Σ^* (a, f, R) one obtains a model of $\Sigma(R)$, if one just omits the interpretations of a and f . Thus Σ has a finite model.

This concludes the proof of the lemmas. We add some further discussion of the results.

General form of lemma III: Without any essential change in the presented proof, one can establish the result for general sentences of \mathcal{Q} . In place of $\langle \mathbb{N}, 0, ' \rangle$ appear the totally free algebras $\underline{F}_n^{m_1}, \dots, \underline{F}_k^{m_k} = \langle \mathbb{N}, o_1, \dots, o_n, f_1, \dots, f_k \rangle$ with n generators and k operations, f_i having m_i arguments. A periodic relation on \underline{F} is one which admits a congruence of \underline{F} of finite index. A Skolem-transform $\Sigma^*(o_1, \dots, o_n, f_1, \dots, f_k, R)$ of an arbitrary sentence $\Sigma(R)$ in \mathcal{Q} is obtained by first writing Σ as a conjunction of prenex sentences, and next replacing existential quantifiers by individual-letters and function letters, in the well-known manner (suggested by the axiom of choice). The general form of lemma III now is

Lemma III: Let $\Sigma(R_1, \dots, R_s)$ be any sentence of \mathcal{Q} , let $\Sigma^*(o_1, \dots, o_n, f_1, \dots, f_k, R_1, \dots, R_s)$ be a Skolem-transform of Σ .

(a) Σ is satisfiable if and only if Σ^* is satisfiable in the totally free algebra $\underline{F}_n^{m_1}, \dots, \underline{F}_k^{m_k}$.

(b) Σ is satisfiable in a finite domain if and only if Σ^* is satisfiable in $\mathbb{F}_n^{m_1, \dots, m_k}$ by periodic relations.

The proof we gave (using the axiom of choice) simply carries one step further Skolem's first proof of Löwenheim's theorem. A more elementary proof of part (a) actually is contained in Skolem's second proof. It may be outlined thus.

The free algebra \mathbb{F} can be built up by levels: $L_0 = \{o_1, \dots, o_n\}$, L_{k+1} is obtained by adding to L_k the elements $fx \dots y$ whereby $x, \dots, y \in L_k$ and f is one of f_1, \dots, f_m . Let Σ be a sentence. Its Skolem-transform Σ^* is a universal sentence, say $(\forall x \dots y) \underline{A}(x, \dots, y)$. For any k we define Σ_k to be the conjunction of all $\underline{A}(u, \dots, v)$ whereby u, \dots, v range over L_k . By a quite elementary argument one shows:

(c) If Σ is satisfiable, then for every k , Σ_k is satisfiable in L_k .

Furthermore, by König's infinity lemma,

(d) If for every k , Σ_k is satisfiable in L_k , then Σ^* is satisfiable in \mathbb{F} .

Because the "if-part" is trivial, this yields a new proof of (a). It makes use of the infinity lemma, while the first proof uses the axiom of choice!

We have not analyzed whether (b) also can be obtained in this second way.

Syntactic version of the Entscheidungsproblem: If in the statement of problem

[X] one replaces "satisfiable" by "formally consistent," one obtains the syntactic version $[X]_0$. By Gödel's completeness theorem it follows that [X] and

$[X]_0$ are equivalent, so that also $[\mathbb{E} \wedge \forall \mathbb{E} \mathbb{V}]_0$ is not recursively solvable. How-

ever, one can prove this more directly by using Herbrand's theorem. It can be stated thus:

(c') Σ is formally consistent if and only if for any k , Σ_k is satisfiable in L_k .

Now (c') and the infinity lemma (d) yield

(a') Σ is formally consistent if and only if Σ^* is satisfiable in \underline{F} .

From lemmas 1, 2, and (a') the unsolvability of $[\exists\forall\exists\forall]_0$ follows.

Reduction: If one does not accept Church's thesis, theorem 1 is of less interest. But our method also yields that $\exists\forall\exists\forall$ is a reduction-type, i.e., the problem $[Q]$ is effectively reducible (in fact 1-1-reducible) to the problem $[\exists\forall\exists\forall]$. This can be seen by using Myhill's theorem, because our proof clearly shows that $[\exists\forall\exists\forall]$ is of unsolvability degree 1. More directly one can obtain a reduction from $[Q]$ to $[\exists\forall\exists\forall]$ as follows.

To the sentence Σ in Q construct a Turing-machine M which, if started on the empty tape, begins by checking Σ_0 for satisfiability in L_0 . M halts if it finds Σ_k not to be satisfiable in L_k , and it proceeds to Σ_{k+1} in case it has found a model of Σ_k . Thus by (c),

$$\Sigma \text{ satisfiable} \equiv M \notin \text{Hlt}$$

The construction of lemma 2 now yields a matrix $\underline{M}(x,u,y)$, which by lemma 2 and 3 is such that

$$M \notin \text{Hlt} \equiv \Delta \text{ satisfiable,}$$

whereby Δ is the sentence $(\exists x)Zx \wedge (\forall x)(\exists u)(\forall y)\underline{M}$. Thus, the effective construction $\Sigma \rightarrow \Delta$ reduces $[Q]$ to $[\exists\forall\exists\forall]$.

Prefix of length four: The unsolvability of $[\forall\forall\exists\forall]$ does not follow from theorem 1, but it can be proved by the same method. (However, to obtain the necessary modified version of lemma 2, the author had to make use of ternary

predicate letters.) We note that all prenex-types with prefix of length 4 are now settled; all except $\forall\exists\forall$ and those falling under $\exists\forall\exists\forall$ and Suranyi's (1959) $\forall\exists\forall\forall$ have a solvable decision problem. There remains the question whether $[\exists\forall\exists\forall]$ is unsolvable if one admits, besides monadic letters, only two (only one) binary predicate letters.

The prefix $\forall\exists\forall$: The really important outstanding question is to prove $[\forall\exists\forall]$ unsolvable. For the first time there now is hope of obtaining this result. All that is missing is the following stronger form of lemma 2.

Problem: To any Turing-machine M to construct a matrix $\underline{M}(x,u,y)$, with individual variables x,u,y , monadic predicate letters, and binary predicate letters, such that $M \not\equiv \text{Hlt}$ if and only if $(\forall xy)\underline{M}(x,x',y)$ is satisfiable in the natural number system $\langle\mathbb{N}, '\rangle$.

In our proof of lemma 2 we fell short of obtaining this stronger result, because in describing the action of M on the empty tape we used special constraints on two axes, namely, the tape-axis and the time-axis. It is important to realize that also in conditions of form $(\forall xy)\underline{M}(x,x',y)$ one still has use of one axis, namely, one can formulate special restraints on the diagonal! In September, 1961, the author explained this situation to Hao Wang. He now claims, in collaboration with A. S. Kahr and E. F. Moore, to have found a construction $M \rightarrow \underline{M}$ as required in the above problem. Thus, even $[\forall\exists\forall]$ seems to be unsolvable, and the unsolvability of $[\exists\forall\exists\forall]$ follows by passing to Skolem-form. These results would settle (up to detailed questions, like number of binary predicate-letters) the Entscheidungsproblem for all generalized prenex types (conjunctions of prenex sentences). It is easy to see that for

every generalized prenex type X either one of the following four alternatives holds:

A₁: Every conjunct of X is of form $\exists^n \forall^m$

A₂: Every conjunct of X is of form $\exists^n \forall^2 \exists^m$

B₁: There is a conjunct of form ... \forall ... \exists ... \forall ... in X.

B₂: There are conjuncts ... \forall ... \forall ... and ... \forall ... \forall ... \forall ... in X.

Thus, there are just two cases:

A: [X] trivially reduces to $\exists^n \forall^m$ or $\exists^n \forall^2 \exists^m$

B: Either $\forall \exists \forall$ or $\forall \exists \wedge \forall \forall \forall$ trivially reduces to [X].

It is well known (see Ackermann, 1954) that $\exists^n \forall^m$ and $\exists^n \forall^2 \exists^m$ are solvable.

Thus, in case A, [X] is solvable, while in case B, depending on the result of Kahr, Moore, and Wang, [X] is unsolvable.

Let us say that a set X of sentences has property Φ , if every sentence of X which is satisfiable also is finitely satisfiable. In other words $\sim \Phi X$ means that X contains an "infinity-axiom." It is well known (see Ackermann, 1954) that $\exists^n \forall^2 \exists^m$ and $\exists^n \forall^m$ both have property Φ , while $\forall \exists \forall$ and $\forall \exists \wedge \forall \forall \forall$ do not. The trivial reductions mentioned preserve property Φ , so that the cases A and B also divide those generalized prenex types X having property Φ from those which do not.

Matrices of special form: We will show now that if in theorem 1 one drops the remark concerning the number of binary predicate-letters, one can in turn add very strong restrictions on the form of the matrices in the $\exists \wedge \forall \exists \forall$ sentences. We note that monadic letters can be eliminated (replace Sv by Sv_v) without changing satisfiability of a sentence. In the following discussion R, S, ...

will stand for vectors of binary predicate-letters. By lemmas 1 and 2 the following is an undecidable problem,

(D) For any matrices $\underline{Z}[\text{Roo}]$ and $\underline{M}[\text{Rxx}, \text{Rxx}', \text{Rxy}; \text{Rx}'\text{x}, \text{Rx}'\text{x}', \text{Rx}'\text{y}; \text{Ryx}, \text{Ryx}', \text{Ryy}]$ to decide whether $\underline{Z}(\text{o}) \wedge (\forall \text{xy})\underline{M}(\text{x}, \text{y})$ is satisfiable in $\langle \text{N}, \text{o}, ' \rangle$.

The following modifications of \underline{M} do clearly not affect satisfiability of $\underline{Z}(\text{o}) \wedge (\forall \text{xy})\underline{M}(\text{x}, \text{y})$:

1. To \underline{M} conjoin $\text{Sxy} \equiv \text{Ryx}$ and make the proper substitutions in \underline{M} to obtain a new matrix of form $\underline{A}[\text{Rxx}, \text{Rx}'\text{x}, \text{Rx}'\text{x}', \text{Rxy}, \text{Rx}'\text{y}, \text{Ryy}] \wedge \underline{B}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ryx}]$.

2. To $\underline{A} \wedge \underline{B}$ conjoin $\text{Sxy} \equiv \text{Rx}'\text{y}$ and make the proper substitutions in \underline{A} to obtain a new matrix of form

$$\underline{A}[\text{Rxx}, \text{Rxx}', \text{Rxy}, \text{Ryy}] \wedge \underline{B}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ryx}] \wedge \underline{C}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Rx}'\text{y}].$$

3. To $\underline{A} \wedge \underline{B} \wedge \underline{C}$ conjoin $[\text{Rxy} \equiv \text{Syx}] \wedge [\text{Sx}'\text{y} \equiv \text{Txy}]$ and make the proper substitutions in \underline{A} to obtain the new matrix of form $\underline{A}[\text{Rxx}, \text{Rxy}, \text{Ryy}] \wedge \underline{B}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ryx}] \wedge \underline{C}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Rx}'\text{y}]$.

4. To $\underline{A} \wedge \underline{B} \wedge \underline{C}$ conjoin $[\text{Sxx} \equiv \text{Rxx}] \wedge [\text{Sx}'\text{y} \equiv \text{Sxy}]$ and in \underline{A} substitute Syx for Rxx , and Sxy for Ryy to obtain a new matrix of form $\underline{W}[\text{Rxx}] \wedge \underline{B}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ryx}] \wedge \underline{C}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Rx}'\text{y}]$.

It therefore follows that the following is still an undecidable problem,

(D') For any matrices $\underline{Z}[\text{Roo}]$, $\underline{W}[\text{Rxx}]$, $\underline{B}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ryx}]$ and $\underline{C}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Rx}'\text{y}]$ to decide whether $\underline{Z}(\text{o}) \wedge (\forall \text{x})\underline{W}(\text{x}) \wedge (\forall \text{xy})\underline{B}(\text{x}, \text{y}) \wedge (\forall \text{xy})\underline{C}(\text{x}, \text{x}', \text{y})$ is satisfiable in $\langle \text{N}, \text{o}, ' \rangle$.

By lemma 3 one now obtains,

Theorem 1': There is no recursive method for deciding satisfiability of sentences of form $(\exists \text{v})\underline{Z}[\text{Rvv}] \wedge (\forall \text{x})\underline{W}[\text{Rxx}] \wedge (\forall \text{xy})\underline{B}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ryx}] \wedge (\forall \text{x})(\exists \text{u})(\forall \text{y})\underline{C}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ruy}]$, whereby R is a vector of binary predicate letters.

Depending on the mentioned result of Kahr, Moore, and Wang the initial condition $\underline{Z}[\text{Roo}]$ may be dropped without making (D) decidable. Correspondingly theorem 1' remains true if " $(\exists v)\underline{Z}[\text{Rvv}]$ " is dropped. The question, whether in addition the axial restraint $\underline{W}[\text{Rxx}]$ can be avoided, remains unanswered.

Domino problems: The reduction (D) to (D') discussed in the previous section can be carried one step further by the following observation. Suppose that the predicates Rxy on N satisfy

$$(1) \quad (\forall xy)\underline{D}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ryx}, \text{Rx'y}].$$

Then clearly the predicates $\text{Pxy} \equiv \text{Rxy}$ and $\text{Qxy} \equiv \text{Ryx}$ satisfy

$$(2) \quad (\forall x)[\text{Qxx} \equiv \text{Pxx}] \wedge (\forall xy)_{x \geq y} \underline{D}[\text{Pxy}, \text{Qxy}, \text{Px'y}] \wedge (\forall xy)_{x > y} \underline{D}[\text{Qxy}, \text{Pxy}, \text{Qxy}']$$

Conversely, if Q and P satisfy (2) then the predicates R defined by $\text{Rxy} \equiv \text{Pxy}$, if $x \geq y$ and $\text{Rxy} \equiv \text{Qyx}$, if $x \leq y$ satisfy (1). Thus, (1) is satisfiable if and only if (2) is satisfiable. Note furthermore that the following formula uniquely defines the predicates $x \geq y$ and $x > y$:

$$(3) \quad x \geq x \wedge \sim [x > x] \wedge [x' > y] \equiv [x \geq y] \wedge [x > y] \supset [x \geq y]$$

Thus, in case $\underline{D}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ryx}, \text{Rx'y}]$ is of form $\underline{B}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ryx}] \wedge \underline{C}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Rx'y}]$ one obtains an (as to satisfiability) equivalent formula of form $\underline{W}[\text{Rxx}] \wedge \underline{U}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Rx'y}] \wedge \underline{V}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Rxy}']$, by conjoining (3) to (2). Consequently the problem (D') reduces to the following,

(D'') For any matrices $\underline{Z}[\text{Roo}]$, $\underline{W}[\text{Rxx}]$, $\underline{U}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Rx'y}]$, $\underline{V}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Rxy}']$ to decide whether $\underline{Z}(o) \wedge (\forall x)\underline{W}(x) \wedge (\forall xy). \underline{U}(x, x', y) \wedge \underline{V}(x, y, y')$ is satisfiable in $\langle N, o, ' \rangle$.

It therefore follows that also this problem is unsolvable, and by lemma 3,

Theorem 1'': There is no recursive method for deciding satisfiability of sentences of form $(\exists v)\underline{Z}[\text{Rvv}] \wedge (\forall x)\underline{W}[\text{Rxx}] \wedge (\forall x)(\exists u)(\forall y). \underline{U}[\text{Rxy}, \text{Ruy}] \wedge \underline{V}[\text{Ryx}, \text{Ryu}]$.

Depending on the result of Kahr, Moore and Wang the conjunct \underline{Z} can be dropped. However, the question whether in this theorem both restraints on $(\exists v)\underline{Z}(v)$ and $(\forall x)\underline{W}(x)$ may be dropped is a challenging unsolved problem. It can be stated thus,

Problem 1: Is there an effective method which applies to any $\langle \underline{S}, \underline{U}, \underline{V} \rangle$, \underline{U} and \underline{V} binary relations on the finite set \underline{S} , and decides whether or not there is a valuation $R: N \times N \rightarrow \underline{S}$ which satisfies the condition $(\forall xy). \underline{U}[Rxy, Rx'y] \wedge \underline{V}[Rxy, Rxy']$. In a slightly different form this was first stated by Wang (1961), and called the domino problem. \underline{U} and \underline{V} may be interpreted as sets of bars of length one, whose ends are marked with colors from a finite set \underline{S} . The problem then takes the following rather appealing form: To decide whether the lattice $N \times N$ can be filled with bars from \underline{U} along the x-direction and bars from \underline{V} along the y-direction, such that the ends of all bars meeting at any lattice point carry the same color.

The domino problem 1 is distinguished from other decision-problems by the complete lack of "initial restraints." This seems to make it very hard to reduce to it any one of the standard unsolvable problems, which all contain initial conditions of one kind or another (empty or finite initial tapes, initial states, axioms = initial theorems). In contrast, such a reduction was possible in the case (D''), which is the domino problem 1 with initial restraints $\underline{Z}[Roo]$ and $\underline{W}[Rxx]$ added. In fact, the claim of Kahr, Moore and Wang is that the domino problem becomes unsolvable even in case only the axial-restraint $\underline{W}[Rxx]$ is added.

Related to the domino problem is the following, also unanswered, question:

Problem 2: Is there a finite set S and binary relations U and V on S such that $(\forall xy). U[Rxy, Rx'y] \wedge V[Rxy, Rxy']$ has a solution R , but none which is periodic?

By lemma III this is simply the question whether or not there still is an infinity-axiom of form $(\forall x)(\exists u)(\forall y). U[Rxy, Ruy] \wedge V[Ryx, Ryu]$, i.e., whether the set $\forall \exists \forall_0$, consisting of all these sentences, has property Φ . As noted by Wang (1961), a negative answer to problem 2 would mean solvability of the domino problem 1. (This corresponds to the well known fact that ΦX implies solvability of $[X]$.) However, we rather expect problem 1 to be unsolvable (possibly not of maximal degree 1, which would explain the mentioned difficulties in setting up reductions of standard unsolvable problems).

An unsolved problem on Turing-machines: We will now present a very natural halting problem on Turing-machines. It came up in connection with $[\forall \exists \forall]$, but seems to be of interest in its own right.

(T_2) To find an effective method, which for every Turing-machine M decides whether or not, for all tapes I (finite and infinite) and all states B , M will eventually halt if started in state B on the tape I .

This problem also displays the feature of lack of initial restraints. Stanley Tenenbaum has shown to the author that (T_2) becomes unsolvable if either one of the following initial restraints is added: 1. Distinguished initial state A , 2. Initially the tape is empty.

References

- A. Church, "A note on the Entscheidungsproblem," Journal of Symbolic Logic, 1 (1936), 40-41, 101-102.
- A. M. Turing, "On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem," Proc. London Math. Soc., ser. 2, 42 (1936-37), 230-265; 43 (1937), 544-546.
- J. Suranyi, Reduktionstheorie des Entscheidungsproblems, Budapest, 1959.
- W. Ackermann, Solvable cases of the decision problem, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1954.
- B. A. Trachténbrot, "Névozmožnost' algoritma dlá problemy razrěšimosti na koněčnyh klassah," Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR, n.s., 70 (1950), 569-572.
- P. Bernays, "Remarques sur les problèmes de la décision en logique élémentaire," Edition de centre nat. de la rech. scient., 13 (1958), Paris, 39-44.
- H. Wang, "Proving theorems by pattern recognition II," Bell System Technical Journal, 40 (1961), 1-41.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

(One copy unless otherwise noted)

<p>Asst. Sec. of Def. for Res. and Eng. Information Office Library Br. Pentagon Building Washington 25, D. C.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Bureau of Ships Department of the Navy Washington 25, D.C. Attn: Code 671 NTDS</p>	
<p>Armed Services Tech. Infor. Agcy. Arlington Hall Station Arlington 12, Virginia</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Bureau of Naval Weapons Department of the Navy Washington 25, D.C. Attn: RAAV Avionics Division</p>	
<p>Chief of Naval Research Department of the Navy Washington 25, D.C. Attn: Code 437, Inf. Syst. Br.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Bureau of Ships Department of the Navy Washington 25, D.C. Attn: Communications Br. Code 686</p>	
<p>Chief of Naval Operations OP-07T-12 Navy Department Washington 25, D.C.</p>		<p>Naval Ordnance Laboratory White Oaks Silver Spring 19, Maryland Attn: Technical Library</p>	
<p>Director, Naval Res. Lab. Tech. Inf. Officer/Code 2000 Washington 25, D.C.</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>David Taylor Model Basin Washington 7, D.C. Attn: Technical Library</p>	
<p>Commanding Officer, Officer of Naval Research Navy. No. 100, Fleet P. O. New York, New York</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Naval Electronics Laboratory San Diego 52, California Attn: Technical Library</p>	
<p>Commanding Officer, ONR Br. Office 346 Broadway New York 13, New York</p>		<p>University of Illinois Control Systems Laboratory Urbana, Illinois Attn: D. Alpert</p>	
<p>Commanding Officer, ONR Br. Office 495 Summer St. Boston 10, Massachusetts</p>		<p>University of Illinois Digital Computer Laboratory Urbana, Illinois Attn: Dr. J. E. Robertson</p>	
<p>Office of Technical Services Technical Reports Section Department of Commerce Washington 25, D.C.</p>		<p>National Security Agency Fort Geo. G. Meade, Maryland Attn: Howard Campaigne</p>	<p>3</p>

Technical Information Officer
US Army Signal Research and Dev. Lab.
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey
Attn: Data Equipment Branch

U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory
Dahlgren, Virginia
Attn: Head, Computation Div.,
G. H. Gleissner

National Bureau of Standards
Washington 25, D.C.
Attn: Dr. S. N. Alexander

Aberdeen Proving Ground, BRL
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland
Attn: J. H. Giese, Chief Computation Lab.

Office of Naval Research
Resident Representative
University of Michigan
146-B Temporary Classroom Bldg.
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Commanding Officer
ONR, Branch Office
John Crerar Library Bldg.
86 East Randolph St.
Chicago 1, Illinois

Commanding Officer
ONR, Branch Office
1030 E. Green Street
Pasadena, California

Commanding Officer
ONR, Branch Office
1000 Geary Street
San Francisco 9, California

National Bureau of Standards
Washington 25, D.C.
Attn: Mr. R. D. Elbourn

Naval Ordnance Laboratory
Corona, California
Attn: H. H. Weider

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Attn: D. W. Baumann
Dynamic Analysis and Control Lab.

Burroughs Corporation
Research Center
Paoli, Pennsylvania
Attn: R. A. Tracey

Hermes Incorporated
75 Cambridge Parkway
Cambridge 42, Massachusetts
Attn: Mr. Reuben Wasserman

Lockheed Missiles and Space Div.
3251 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, California
Attn D. G. Willis

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan
Attn: Dept. of Philosophy,
Prof. A. W. Burks

Census Bureau
Washington 25, D.C.
Attn: Office of Asst. Director for
Statistical Services, Mr. J. L.
McPherson

National Science Foundation
Program Dir. for Documentation Res.
Washington 25, D.C.
Attn: Helen L. Brownson

University of California
Los Angeles 24, California
Attn: Dept. of Eng.,
Prof. Gerald Estrin

Columbia University
New York 27, New York
Attn: Dept. of Physics,
Prof. L. Brillouin

Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel
Attn: Prof. Y. Bar-Hillel

Massachusetts Inst. of Tech.
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Attn: Prof. W. McCulloch

Atomic Energy Commission
Washington 25, D.C.
Attn: Div. of Research, John R. Pasta

Naval Research Laboratory
Washington 25, D.C.
Attn: Security Systems
Code 5266, Mr. G. Abraham

Cornell University
Dept. of Mathematics
Ithaca, New York
Attn: Prof. Mark Kac

Dr. A. M. Uttley
National Physical Laboratory
Teddington, Middlesex
England

Diamond Ordnance Fuze Laboratory
Connecticut Ave. and Van Ness St.
Washington 25, D.C.
ORDTL-012, E. W. Channel

U.S. Army Signal Res. and Dev. Lab.
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey
Attn: M. Tenzer

Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Attn: School of Applied Science
Dean Harvey Brook

The University of Chicago
Institute for Computer Research
Chicago 37, Illinois
Attn: Mr. Nicholas C. Metropolis, Dir.

Wright Air Development Division
Electronic Technology Laboratory
Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio
Attn: WWRNEB Computer and Bionics Br.

Laboratory for Electronics, Inc.
1079 Commonwealth Ave.
Boston 15, Massachusetts
Attn: Dr. H. Fuller

Stanford Research Institute
Computer Laboratory
Menlo Park, California
Attn: H. D. Crane

General Electric Company
Schenectady 5, New York
Attn: Library, L.M.E. Dept.,
Bldg. 28-501

The Rand Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California
Attn: Numerical Analysis Dept.
Willis H. Ware

Hunter College
New York 21, New York
Attn: Dean Mina Rees.

General Electric Research Laboratory
P. O. Box 1088
Schenectady, New York
Attn: Information Studies Section
R. L. Shuey, Manager

Radio Corporation of America
Moorestown, New Jersey
Attn: Missile and Surface Radar Div.
Sidney, Caplan

University of Pennsylvania
Institute of Cooperative Research
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Attn: Dr. John O'Conner

Stanford Research Institute
Menlo Park, California
Attn: Dr. Charles Rosen
Applied Physics Group

Northeastern University
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts
Attn: Prof. L. O. Dolansky

Marquardt Aircraft Company
16555 Saticoy Street
P. O. Box 2013 - South Annex
Van Nuys, California
Attn: Dr. Basun Chang, Res. Sci.

Texas Technological College
Lubbock, Texas
Attn: Paul G. Griffith
Dept. of Electrical Engineering

IBM Corporation
Military Products Division
Owego, New York
Attn: Dr. S. Winkler

Post Office Department
Office of Res. and Eng.
12th and Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington 25, D. C.
Attn: Mr. R. Kopp, Res. and Devel. Div.

Air Force Research Division, ARDC
Computer and Mathematical Sci. Lab., ARCRC
L. G. Hanscom Field, CRBB, Bedford, Mass.
Attn: Dr. H. H. Zschirnt

Office of Chief Signal Officer
Department of the Army
Washington D.C.
Attn: R and D. Div. SIGRO-6D
Mr L. H. Geiger

Bell Telephone Laboratories
Murray Hill Laboratory
Murray Hill, New Jersey
Attn: Dr. Edward F. Moore

National Biomedical Res. Found. Inc.
8600 16th St., Suite 310
Silver Spring, Maryland
Attn: Dr. R. S. Ledley

National Bureau of Standards
Washington 25, D. C.
Attn: Mrs. Frances Neeland

University of Pennsylvania
Moore School of Elec. Eng.
200 South 33rd Street
Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania
Attn: Miss Anna Louise Campion

Varo Manufacturing Company
2201 Walnut Street
Garland, Texas
Attn: Fred P. Granger, Jr.

Data Processing Systems Staff
Department of State
Washington 25, D.C.
Attn: F. P. Dibiasi

Dr. Saul Gorn, Director
Computer Center
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania

Applied Physics Laboratory
Johns Hopkins University
8621 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland
Attn: Supervisor of Tech. Rpts.

Chief, Bureau of Supplies and
Accounts, Navy Department
Washington, D.C.
Attn: CDR. J. C. Busby, Code W3

Auerbach Electronics Corporation
1634 Arch St.
Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania

National Aeronautics and Space
Administration
Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, Maryland
Attn: Chief, Data Systems,
Div. C.V.L. Smith

Federal Aviation Agency
Bureau of Research and Development
Washington 25, D.C.
Attn: RD-375, Mr. Harry Hayman

Mr. Donald F. Wilson
Code 5144
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington 25, D. C.

David Taylor Model Basin
Washington 7, D.C.
Attn: Aerodynamics Laboratory,
Code 628, Miss Cravens

Lincoln Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Lexington 73, Massachusetts
Attn: Library

Dr. C. R. Porter
Psychology Department
Howard University
Washington 1, D. C.

Electronics Research Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley 4, California
Attn: Director

Institute for Defense Analysis
Communications Research Division
Von Neumann Hall
Princeton, New Jersey

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 9015 02651 5034