A Constructive View of Continuity Principles

Robert S. Lubarsky
Florida Atlantic University
joint work with Hannes Diener

CCA 2012
Cambridge, UK
June 24-27, 2012

An Analysis of Continuity

Definition

CONT = "Every map from a metric space to a metric space is continuous."

An Analysis of Continuity

Definition

CONT = "Every map from a metric space to a metric space is continuous."

If a) every such map is sequentially nondiscontinuous, and
b) every sequentially nondiscontinuous map is sequentially continuous, and
c) every sequentially continuous map is continuous,
then clearly CONT follows.

An Analysis of Continuity

Definition

CONT = "Every map from a metric space to a metric space is continuous."

If a) every such map is sequentially nondiscontinuous, and
b) every sequentially nondiscontinuous map is sequentially continuous, and
c) every sequentially continuous map is continuous,
then clearly CONT follows.

Theorem

(Ishihara) (Countable Choice)
a) iff ¬WLPO (Weak Limited Principle of Omniscience)
b) iff WMP (Weak Markov's Principle)
c) iff BD (Boundedness Principle)

BD and BD-N

Definition

A subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ is *pseudo-bounded* if every sequence (a_n) of members of A is eventually bounded by the identity function: $\exists N \, \forall n > N \; a_n < n$ (equivalently, $\lim_n a_n/n = 0$).

BD and BD-N

Definition

A subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ is *pseudo-bounded* if every sequence (a_n) of members of A is eventually bounded by the identity function: $\exists N \, \forall n > N \; a_n < n$ (equivalently, $\lim_n a_n/n = 0$).

Example

Any bounded set.

BD and BD-N

Definition

A subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ is *pseudo-bounded* if every sequence (a_n) of members of A is eventually bounded by the identity function: $\exists N \; \forall n > N \; a_n < n$ (equivalently, $\lim_n a_n/n = 0$).

Example

Any bounded set.

BD: Every inhabited pseudo-bounded set (of natural numbers) is bounded.

BD and BD-N

Definition

A subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ is *pseudo-bounded* if every sequence (a_n) of members of A is eventually bounded by the identity function: $\exists N \, \forall n > N \; a_n < n$ (equivalently, $\lim_n a_n/n = 0$).

Example

Any bounded set.

BD: Every inhabited pseudo-bounded set (of natural numbers) is bounded.

BD-N: Every countable pseudo-bounded set is bounded.

BD and BD-N

Definition

A subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ is *pseudo-bounded* if every sequence (a_n) of members of A is eventually bounded by the identity function: $\exists N \, \forall n > N \; a_n < n$ (equivalently, $\lim_n a_n/n = 0$).

Example

Any bounded set.

BD: Every inhabited pseudo-bounded set (of natural numbers) is bounded.
BD-N: Every countable pseudo-bounded set is bounded.
(Ishihara) BD-N iff every sequentially continuous function from a separable metric space to a metric space is continuous.

The Truth of BD-N

Where is BD-N true?
Ans: classically, intuitionistically, computably

The Truth of BD-N

Where is BD-N true?
Ans: classically, intuitionistically, computably
Where is BD-N false?
Ans: certain realizability and topological models

The Truth of BD-N

Where is BD-N true?
Ans: classically, intuitionistically, computably
Where is BD-N false?
Ans: certain realizability and topological models
The topological model: Put the right topology on the space of (pseudo-)bounded sequences. This is effectively taking a generic pseudo-bounded sequence, which will not be bounded.

Anti-Specker Spaces

(Specker) There is a computable, strictly increasing sequence of rationals in [0,1] with no computable limit.

Anti-Specker Spaces

(Specker) There is a computable, strictly increasing sequence of rationals in [0,1] with no computable limit.
So computably [0,1] is not compact.

Anti-Specker Spaces

(Specker) There is a computable, strictly increasing sequence of rationals in [0,1] with no computable limit.
So computably [0,1] is not compact.

Definition

A metric space X satisfies the anti-Specker property if, for every sequence $(z_n)(n \in \mathbb{N})$ through $X \cup \{*\}$, if (z_n) is eventually bounded away from each point in X, then (z_n) is eventually *.

Anti-Specker Spaces

(Specker) There is a computable, strictly increasing sequence of rationals in [0,1] with no computable limit.
So computably [0,1] is not compact.

Definition

A metric space X satisfies the anti-Specker property if, for every sequence $(z_n)(n \in \mathbb{N})$ through $X \cup \{*\}$, if (z_n) is eventually bounded away from each point in X, then (z_n) is eventually *.

Theorem

(Bridges) BD-N implies that the anti-Specker spaces are closed under products.

Q (Bridges): Does the converse implication hold?

Anti-Specker Spaces

(Specker) There is a computable, strictly increasing sequence of rationals in [0,1] with no computable limit.
So computably [0,1] is not compact.

Definition

A metric space X satisfies the anti-Specker property if, for every sequence $(z_n)(n \in \mathbb{N})$ through $X \cup \{*\}$, if (z_n) is eventually bounded away from each point in X, then (z_n) is eventually *.

Theorem

(Bridges) BD-N implies that the anti-Specker spaces are closed under products.

Q (Bridges): Does the converse implication hold? A: No.

Anti-Specker Spaces

(Specker) There is a computable, strictly increasing sequence of rationals in [0,1] with no computable limit.
So computably [0,1] is not compact.

Definition

A metric space X satisfies the anti-Specker property if, for every sequence $(z_n)(n \in \mathbb{N})$ through $X \cup \{*\}$, if (z_n) is eventually bounded away from each point in X, then (z_n) is eventually *.

Theorem

(Bridges) BD-N implies that the anti-Specker spaces are closed under products.

Q (Bridges): Does the converse implication hold? A: No.
Q: Is the closure of the AS spaces under product provable outright?

Anti-Specker Spaces

(Specker) There is a computable, strictly increasing sequence of rationals in [0,1] with no computable limit.
So computably [0,1] is not compact.

Definition

A metric space X satisfies the anti-Specker property if, for every sequence $(z_n)(n \in \mathbb{N})$ through $X \cup \{*\}$, if (z_n) is eventually bounded away from each point in X, then (z_n) is eventually *.

Theorem

(Bridges) BD-N implies that the anti-Specker spaces are closed under products.

Q (Bridges): Does the converse implication hold? A: No.
Q: Is the closure of the AS spaces under product provable outright? A: No.

The Riemann Permutation Theorem

(Riemann) Every conditionally, not absolutely convergent series can be re-arranged to converge to any given number.

The Riemann Permutation Theorem

(Riemann) Every conditionally, not absolutely convergent series can be re-arranged to converge to any given number.

Definition

The Riemann Permutation Theorem is the statement that if every permutation of a series converges then the series is absolutely convergent.

The Riemann Permutation Theorem

(Riemann) Every conditionally, not absolutely convergent series can be re-arranged to converge to any given number.

Definition

The Riemann Permutation Theorem is the statement that if every permutation of a series converges then the series is absolutely convergent.

Theorem

(Berger, Bridges, Diener) BD-N implies the Riemann Permutation Theorem.

Q (BBD): Does the converse implication hold?

The Riemann Permutation Theorem

(Riemann) Every conditionally, not absolutely convergent series can be re-arranged to converge to any given number.

Definition

The Riemann Permutation Theorem is the statement that if every permutation of a series converges then the series is absolutely convergent.

Theorem

(Berger, Bridges, Diener) BD-N implies the Riemann Permutation Theorem.

Q (BBD): Does the converse implication hold? A: No.

The Riemann Permutation Theorem

(Riemann) Every conditionally, not absolutely convergent series can be re-arranged to converge to any given number.

Definition

The Riemann Permutation Theorem is the statement that if every permutation of a series converges then the series is absolutely convergent.

Theorem

(Berger, Bridges, Diener) BD-N implies the Riemann Permutation Theorem.

Q (BBD): Does the converse implication hold? A: No.
Q: Is RPT provable outright?

The Riemann Permutation Theorem

(Riemann) Every conditionally, not absolutely convergent series can be re-arranged to converge to any given number.

Definition

The Riemann Permutation Theorem is the statement that if every permutation of a series converges then the series is absolutely convergent.

Theorem

(Berger, Bridges, Diener) BD-N implies the Riemann Permutation Theorem.

Q (BBD): Does the converse implication hold? A: No.
Q: Is RPT provable outright? A: No.

Partially Cauchy Sequences

Definition

A sequence (a_n) is partially Cauchy if for every $g \geq Id$ $\text{diam}(a_n, a_{n+1}, ..., a_{g(n)}) \to 0$.

Partially Cauchy Sequences

Definition

A sequence (a_n) is partially Cauchy if for every $g \geq Id$ $\text{diam}(a_n, a_{n+1}, \ldots, a_{g(n)}) \to 0$.

Theorem

(Richman) BD-N implies that every partially Cauchy sequence is Cauchy.

Q: Does the converse implication hold?

Partially Cauchy Sequences

Definition

A sequence (a_n) is partially Cauchy if for every $g \geq Id$ $\text{diam}(a_n, a_{n+1}, ..., a_{g(n)}) \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem

(Richman) BD-N implies that every partially Cauchy sequence is Cauchy.

Q: Does the converse implication hold? A: No.

Partially Cauchy Sequences

Definition

A sequence (a_n) is partially Cauchy if for every $g \geq Id$ $\text{diam}(a_n, a_{n+1}, ..., a_{g(n)}) \to 0$.

Theorem

(Richman) BD-N implies that every partially Cauchy sequence is Cauchy.

Q: Does the converse implication hold? A: No.

Q: Is partially Cauchy implying Cauchy provable outright?

Partially Cauchy Sequences

Definition

A sequence (a_n) is partially Cauchy if for every $g \geq Id$ $\text{diam}(a_n, a_{n+1}, \ldots, a_{g(n)}) \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem

(Richman) BD-N implies that every partially Cauchy sequence is Cauchy.

Q: Does the converse implication hold? A: No.

Q: Is partially Cauchy implying Cauchy provable outright? A: No.

The Model for $\neg$BD-$\mathbb{N}$

Let T be the set of bounded sequences of natural numbers.

The Model for ¬BD-ℕ

Let T be the set of bounded sequences of natural numbers. A basic open set p is given by a function g_p which:
i) fixes finitely many entries in the sequence (the stem), and
ii) bounds the values of the other entries with a non-decreasing, unbounded function.

The Model for $\neg$BD-$\mathbb{N}$

Let T be the set of bounded sequences of natural numbers. A basic open set p is given by a function g_p which:
i) fixes finitely many entries in the sequence (the stem), and
ii) bounds the values of the other entries with a non-decreasing, unbounded function.

Let G be the canonical generic:
$p \Vdash G(n) = x$ iff $n < stem(p)$ and $g_p(n) = x$.

The Model for $\neg$BD-$\mathbb{N}$

Let T be the set of bounded sequences of natural numbers. A basic open set p is given by a function g_p which:
i) fixes finitely many entries in the sequence (the stem), and
ii) bounds the values of the other entries with a non-decreasing, unbounded function.

Let G be the canonical generic:
$p \Vdash G(n) = x$ iff $n < stem(p)$ and $g_p(n) = x$.

Theorem

$T \Vdash rng(G)$ is countable, pseudo-bounded, but not bounded. Also, $T \Vdash DC$.

The Model for ¬RPT

Let T be $\{(a_n) \mid a_n$ is eventually 0 and the terms sum to $0\}$.

The Model for $\neg$RPT

Let T be $\{(a_n) \mid a_n$ is eventually 0 and the terms sum to $0\}$. A basic open set p is given by:
i) finitely many real intervals $I_0, I_1, ..., I_N$, as approximations to the first few entries of the sequence, and

The Model for ¬RPT

Let T be $\{(a_n) \mid a_n$ is eventually 0 and the terms sum to $0\}$. A basic open set p is given by:
i) finitely many real intervals $I_0, I_1, ..., I_N$, as approximations to the first few entries of the sequence, and
ii) finitely many permutations σ, with associated $\epsilon > 0$ and $M_{\sigma,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$, meaning $(a_{\sigma(n)})$ has converged to within ϵ by entry $M_{\sigma,\epsilon}$.

The Model for $\neg$RPT

Let T be $\{(a_n) \mid a_n$ is eventually 0 and the terms sum to $0\}$. A basic open set p is given by:
i) finitely many real intervals $I_0, I_1, ..., I_N$, as approximations to the first few entries of the sequence, and
ii) finitely many permutations σ, with associated $\epsilon > 0$ and $M_{\sigma,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$, meaning $(a_{\sigma(n)})$ has converged to within ϵ by entry $M_{\sigma,\epsilon}$.

Let G be the canonical generic:
$p \Vdash G(n) \in I_n$.

The Model for ¬RPT

Let T be $\{(a_n) \mid a_n$ is eventually 0 and the terms sum to $0\}$. A basic open set p is given by:
i) finitely many real intervals $I_0, I_1, ..., I_N$, as approximations to the first few entries of the sequence, and
ii) finitely many permutations σ, with associated $\epsilon > 0$ and $M_{\sigma,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$, meaning $(a_{\sigma(n)})$ has converged to within ϵ by entry $M_{\sigma,\epsilon}$.

Let G be the canonical generic:
$p \Vdash G(n) \in I_n$.

Theorem

$T \Vdash rng(G)$ is a counter-example to the RPT.

The Model for $\neg$"partially Cauchy implies Cauchy"

Let T be the set of Cauchy sequences.

The Model for ¬"partially Cauchy implies Cauchy"

Let T be the set of Cauchy sequences. A basic open set p is given by:

i) finitely many real intervals $I_0, I_1, ..., I_N$, as approximations to the first few entries of the sequence, and

The Model for ¬"partially Cauchy implies Cauchy"

Let T be the set of Cauchy sequences. A basic open set p is given by:
i) finitely many real intervals $I_0, I_1, ..., I_N$, as approximations to the first few entries of the sequence, and
ii) finitely many functions g and $\epsilon > 0$, with associated $M_{g,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$, meaning $\text{diam}(a_n, ..., a_{g(n)}) < \epsilon$ for $n > M_{g,\epsilon}$.

The Model for ¬"partially Cauchy implies Cauchy"

Let T be the set of Cauchy sequences. A basic open set p is given by:
i) finitely many real intervals $I_0, I_1, ..., I_N$, as approximations to the first few entries of the sequence, and
ii) finitely many functions g and $\epsilon > 0$, with associated $M_{g,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$, meaning $\mathrm{diam}(a_n, ..., a_{g(n)}) < \epsilon$ for $n > M_{g,\epsilon}$.

Let G be the canonical generic:
$p \Vdash G(n) \in I_n$.

The Model for ¬"partially Cauchy implies Cauchy"

Let T be the set of Cauchy sequences. A basic open set p is given by:
i) finitely many real intervals $I_0, I_1, ..., I_N$, as approximations to the first few entries of the sequence, and
ii) finitely many functions g and $\epsilon > 0$, with associated $M_{g,\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$, meaning $\text{diam}(a_n, ..., a_{g(n)}) < \epsilon$ for $n > M_{g,\epsilon}$.

Let G be the canonical generic:
$p \Vdash G(n) \in I_n$.

Theorem

$T \Vdash rng(G)$ is a partially Cauchy sequence which is not Cauchy.

The Model for $\neg$"A-S spaces are closed under products"

Let T be $\{(z_n) \mid$ finitely many z_n are pairs of reals $\langle x_n, y_n \rangle$, the rest are $*\}$.

The Model for $\neg$"A-S spaces are closed under products"

Let T be $\{(z_n) \mid$ finitely many z_n are pairs of reals $\langle x_n, y_n \rangle$, the rest are $*\}$. A basic open set p is given by:
i) a finite sequence α_n ($n < N$), each entry of which is either $*$ or a pair of finite open intervals $\langle I_n, J_n \rangle$, and

The Model for ¬"A-S spaces are closed under products"

Let T be $\{(z_n) \mid$ finitely many z_n are pairs of reals $\langle x_n, y_n \rangle$, the rest are $*\}$. A basic open set p is given by:
i) a finite sequence α_n ($n < N$), each entry of which is either $*$ or a pair of finite open intervals $\langle I_n, J_n \rangle$, and
ii) an assignment to each of finitely many closed and bounded sets C_i ($i \in I$) in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of a natural number M_i, meaning that beyond M_i the entries $\langle I_n, J_n \rangle$ have to avoid C_i.

The Model for $\neg$"A-S spaces are closed under products"

Let T be $\{(z_n) \mid$ finitely many z_n are pairs of reals $\langle x_n, y_n\rangle$, the rest are $*\}$. A basic open set p is given by:
i) a finite sequence α_n $(n < N)$, each entry of which is either $*$ or a pair of finite open intervals $\langle I_n, J_n\rangle$, and
ii) an assignment to each of finitely many closed and bounded sets C_i $(i \in I)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of a natural number M_i, meaning that beyond M_i the entries $\langle I_n, J_n\rangle$ have to avoid C_i.

$p \Vdash G(n) = *$ if $\alpha_n = *$, $G(n) \in I_n \times J_n$ otherwise.
Let X and Y be the projections of the $G(n)$'s onto the first and second coordinates.

The Model for $\neg$"A-S spaces are closed under products"

Let T be $\{(z_n) \mid$ finitely many z_n are pairs of reals $\langle x_n, y_n \rangle$, the rest are $*\}$. A basic open set p is given by:
i) a finite sequence α_n ($n < N$), each entry of which is either $*$ or a pair of finite open intervals $\langle I_n, J_n \rangle$, and
ii) an assignment to each of finitely many closed and bounded sets C_i ($i \in I$) in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of a natural number M_i, meaning that beyond M_i the entries $\langle I_n, J_n \rangle$ have to avoid C_i.

$p \Vdash G(n) = *$ if $\alpha_n = *$, $G(n) \in I_n \times J_n$ otherwise.
Let X and Y be the projections of the $G(n)$'s onto the first and second coordinates.

Theorem

$T \Vdash X$ and Y are A-S spaces, whereas G is a counter-example to $X \times Y$ being an A-S space.

Questions

- What is the computational content of these theorems? That is, in the various realizability models of $\neg$BD-N, which of these hold?
- More generally, are any implied by Countable Choice? Do they hold for sequences or spaces of rational numbers?

Questions

- What is the computational content of these theorems? That is, in the various realizability models of $\neg$BD-N, which of these hold?
- More generally, are any implied by Countable Choice? Do they hold for sequences or spaces of rational numbers?
- What continuity (or other) principles are they equivalent with?
- How can they be reformulated to look more like BD-N?

Questions

- What is the computational content of these theorems? That is, in the various realizability models of $\neg$BD-N, which of these hold?
- More generally, are any implied by Countable Choice? Do they hold for sequences or spaces of rational numbers?
- What continuity (or other) principles are they equivalent with?
- How can they be reformulated to look more like BD-N?
- Are they independent of each other?
- What other non-provable statements are strictly weaker than BD-N?

The Fan Theorem

Definition

A set B of nodes of a tree T is a *bar* if every path through T intersects B.

The Fan Theorem

Definition

A set B of nodes of a tree T is a *bar* if every path through T intersects B.

Example

In Baire space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $\{\sigma \mid length(\sigma) = \sigma(0) + 1\}$.

The Fan Theorem

Definition

A set B of nodes of a tree T is a *bar* if every path through T intersects B.

Example

In Baire space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $\{\sigma \mid \mathit{length}(\sigma) = \sigma(0) + 1\}$.

Definition

A bar B is *uniform* if there is a length n such that every node of length n has an initial segment in B.

The Fan Theorem FAN: For $T = 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, every bar is uniform.

The Fan Theorem

Definition

A set B of nodes of a tree T is a *bar* if every path through T intersects B.

Example

In Baire space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $\{\sigma \mid length(\sigma) = \sigma(0) + 1\}$.

Definition

A bar B is *uniform* if there is a length n such that every node of length n has an initial segment in B.

The Fan Theorem FAN: For $T = 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, every bar is uniform.
The contrapositive: "If a set of nodes is not uniform, then it's not a bar." Classically, "if a set of nodes does not cover a whole level, then there's a path avoiding it," that is, (Weak) König's Lemma.

Variations of FAN

By applying FAN to fewer bars, strengthening the hypothesis, we get weaker statements.

Variations of FAN

By applying FAN to fewer bars, strengthening the hypothesis, we get weaker statements.

D-FAN: Every decidable (i.e. detachable) bar is uniform.

Variations of FAN

By applying FAN to fewer bars, strengthening the hypothesis, we get weaker statements.

D-FAN: Every decidable (i.e. detachable) bar is uniform.

Π^0_1-FAN: Every bar which is a countable intersection of decidable bars is uniform.

Variations of FAN

By applying FAN to fewer bars, strengthening the hypothesis, we get weaker statements.

D-FAN: Every decidable (i.e. detachable) bar is uniform.

Π^0_1-FAN: Every bar which is a countable intersection of decidable bars is uniform.

c-FAN: Every bar of the form $\{\sigma \mid \forall\tau \; \sigma * \tau \in \hat{B}\}$, $\hat{B}$ decidable, is uniform.

Variations of FAN

By applying FAN to fewer bars, strengthening the hypothesis, we get weaker statements.

D-FAN: Every decidable (i.e. detachable) bar is uniform.

Π^0_1-FAN: Every bar which is a countable intersection of decidable bars is uniform.

c-FAN: Every bar of the form $\{\sigma \mid \forall\tau \; \sigma * \tau \in \hat{B}\}$, $\hat{B}$ decidable, is uniform.

What do these have to do with continuity?

Some Equivalences

(Berger) c-FAN iff every continuous $f : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}$ is uniformly continuous.

Some Equivalences

(Berger) c-FAN iff every continuous $f : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}$ is uniformly continuous.

(Diener & Loeb) Π^0_1-FAN iff every equicontinuous sequence of functions from [0,1] to $\mathbb{R}$ is uniformly equicontinuous.

Some Equivalences

(Berger) c-FAN iff every continuous $f : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}$ is uniformly continuous.

(Diener & Loeb) Π^0_1-FAN iff every equicontinuous sequence of functions from [0,1] to $\mathbb{R}$ is uniformly equicontinuous.

(Julian & Richman) D-FAN iff every uniformly continuous, positively valued function from [0,1] to $\mathbb{R}$ has a positive infimum. Also, under Dependent Choice, D-FAN and c-FAN are equivalent.

Some Equivalences

(Berger) c-FAN iff every continuous $f : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}$ is uniformly continuous.

(Diener & Loeb) Π^0_1-FAN iff every equicontinuous sequence of functions from [0,1] to $\mathbb{R}$ is uniformly equicontinuous.

(Julian & Richman) D-FAN iff every uniformly continuous, positively valued function from [0,1] to $\mathbb{R}$ has a positive infimum. Also, under Dependent Choice, D-FAN and c-FAN are equivalent.

Easily, $FAN \Rightarrow \Pi^0_1 - FAN \Rightarrow c - FAN \Rightarrow D - FAN$.

Some Equivalences

(Berger) c-FAN iff every continuous $f : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}$ is uniformly continuous.

(Diener & Loeb) Π^0_1-FAN iff every equicontinuous sequence of functions from [0,1] to $\mathbb{R}$ is uniformly equicontinuous.

(Julian & Richman) D-FAN iff every uniformly continuous, positively valued function from [0,1] to $\mathbb{R}$ has a positive infimum. Also, under Dependent Choice, D-FAN and c-FAN are equivalent.

Easily, $FAN \Rightarrow \Pi^0_1 - FAN \Rightarrow c - FAN \Rightarrow D - FAN$.
Question: Are any arrows reversible? Provable outright?

Established Results

(Kleene) There is an infinite computable binary tree with no computable path.

Established Results

(Kleene) There is an infinite computable binary tree with no computable path.

So in Reverse Mathematics, $\mathrm{RCA}_0 \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{WKL}_0$. For us, $\mathrm{IZF} \not\vdash$ D-FAN.

Established Results

(Kleene) There is an infinite computable binary tree with no computable path.
So in Reverse Mathematics, $\mathrm{RCA}_0 \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{WKL}_0$. For us, IZF $\not\vdash$ D-FAN.

(Fourman-Hyland) There is a Heyting-valued, almost topological, model in which FAN fails.

Established Results

(Kleene) There is an infinite computable binary tree with no computable path.
So in Reverse Mathematics, $RCA_0 \not\Rightarrow WKL_0$. For us, IZF $\not\vdash$ D-FAN.

(Fourman-Hyland) There is a Heyting-valued, almost topological, model in which FAN fails. In fact, Π^0_1-FAN holds there. So Π^0_1-FAN $\not\Rightarrow$ FAN.

Established Results

(Kleene) There is an infinite computable binary tree with no computable path.
So in Reverse Mathematics, $RCA_0 \not\Rightarrow WKL_0$. For us, $IZF \not\vdash$ D-FAN.

(Fourman-Hyland) There is a Heyting-valued, almost topological, model in which FAN fails. In fact, Π^0_1-FAN holds there. So Π^0_1-FAN $\not\Rightarrow$ FAN.

(Berger) Under classical logic, and a weak meta-theory, D-FAN iff WKL_0. Also, $\{\sigma \mid \forall\tau\ \sigma * \tau \in \hat{B}\}$ is enough to code the Turing jump of $\hat{B}$.

Established Results

(Kleene) There is an infinite computable binary tree with no computable path.
So in Reverse Mathematics, $\mathrm{RCA}_0 \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{WKL}_0$. For us, $\mathrm{IZF} \nvdash$ D-FAN.

(Fourman-Hyland) There is a Heyting-valued, almost topological, model in which FAN fails. In fact, Π^0_1-FAN holds there. So Π^0_1-FAN $\not\Rightarrow$ FAN.

(Berger) Under classical logic, and a weak meta-theory, D-FAN iff WKL_0. Also, $\{\sigma \mid \forall\tau\ \sigma * \tau \in \hat{B}\}$ is enough to code the Turing jump of $\hat{B}$. So c-FAN iff the Turing jump is total iff ACA_0.

Established Results

(Kleene) There is an infinite computable binary tree with no computable path.
So in Reverse Mathematics, $\mathrm{RCA}_0 \not\Rightarrow \mathrm{WKL}_0$. For us, IZF $\not\vdash$ D-FAN.

(Fourman-Hyland) There is a Heyting-valued, almost topological, model in which FAN fails. In fact, Π^0_1-FAN holds there. So Π^0_1-FAN $\not\Rightarrow$ FAN.

(Berger) Under classical logic, and a weak meta-theory, D-FAN iff WKL_0. Also, $\{\sigma \mid \forall\tau\ \sigma * \tau \in \hat{B}\}$ is enough to code the Turing jump of $\hat{B}$. So c-FAN iff the Turing jump is total iff ACA_0. Hence D-FAN $\not\Rightarrow$ c-FAN.

Trouble Extending these Results

Berger's: Weak meta-theory unsatisfactory.

Trouble Extending these Results

(Fourman-Hyland) Every topological model satisfies full FAN.

Trouble Extending these Results

(Fourman-Hyland) Every topological model satisfies full FAN. They considered $K(T)$, the Heyting algebra of co-perfect open sets, in particular $K([0,1] \times [0,1])$.

Trouble Extending these Results

(Fourman-Hyland) Every topological model satisfies full FAN.
They considered $K(T)$, the Heyting algebra of co-perfect open sets, in particular $K([0,1] \times [0,1])$.
Most $K(T)$ satisfy full FAN.

Trouble Extending these Results

realizability:

Trouble Extending these Results

realizability:
(Longley) Under mild restrictions on a pca A, the realizability model over A either satisfies full FAN or falsifies D-FAN. Furthermore, the same holds for all known extensional realizability models.

A Kripke Model of $\neg$ D-FAN

Force (in classical ZF) to get a binary tree with labels IN (the bar), OUT (of the bar), and ∞ (really out of the bar).

A Kripke Model of $\neg$ D-FAN

Force (in classical ZF) to get a binary tree with labels IN (the bar), OUT (of the bar), and ∞ (really out of the bar).

Include at the bottom node of the Kripke model all those terms that do not distinguish between OUT and ∞.

A Kripke Model of $\neg$ D-FAN

Force (in classical ZF) to get a binary tree with labels IN (the bar), OUT (of the bar), and ∞ (really out of the bar).

Include at the bottom node of the Kripke model all those terms that do not distinguish between OUT and ∞. Generically, all such paths will hit the bar at some point.

A Kripke Model of $\neg$ D-FAN

Force (in classical ZF) to get a binary tree with labels IN (the bar), OUT (of the bar), and ∞ (really out of the bar).

Include at the bottom node of the Kripke model all those terms that do not distinguish between OUT and ∞. Generically, all such paths will hit the bar at some point.

Successor nodes are based on an ultrapower of V[G].

A Kripke Model of $\neg$ D-FAN

Force (in classical ZF) to get a binary tree with labels IN (the bar), OUT (of the bar), and ∞ (really out of the bar).

Include at the bottom node of the Kripke model all those terms that do not distinguish between OUT and ∞. Generically, all such paths will hit the bar at some point.

Successor nodes are based on an ultrapower of V[G].
In all possible ways, change hyper-finitely many non-standard nodes by moving them from out of the generic to in the generic.

A Kripke Model of D-FAN $+ \neg$ c-FAN

Hide a tree like the previous one so that it's at best c-definable.

A Kripke Model of D-FAN + $\neg$ c-FAN

Hide a tree like the previous one so that it's at best c-definable.
At the bottom node, the decidable tree contains everything.

A Kripke Model of D-FAN + $\neg$ c-FAN

Hide a tree like the previous one so that it's at best c-definable. At the bottom node, the decidable tree contains everything. Successor nodes are based on an ultrapower of V[G], and omit from the decidable tree a non-standard point labeled ∞. So the induced c-set at the bottom node looks like the generic.

A Kripke Model of D-FAN + $\neg$ c-FAN

Hide a tree like the previous one so that it's at best c-definable. At the bottom node, the decidable tree contains everything. Successor nodes are based on an ultrapower of V[G], and omit from the decidable tree a non-standard point labeled ∞. So the induced c-set at the bottom node looks like the generic. Include only those terms definable from the decidable tree.

A Kripke Model of c-FAN + $\neg\Pi^0_1$-FAN

Hide a tree like the previous one so that it's at best Π^0_1-definable.

A Kripke Model of c-FAN + $\neg\Pi^0_1$-FAN

Hide a tree like the previous one so that it's at best Π^0_1-definable. At the bottom node, the decidable sequence of trees contains everything.

A Kripke Model of c-FAN + $\neg\Pi^0_1$-FAN

Hide a tree like the previous one so that it's at best Π^0_1-definable.
At the bottom node, the decidable sequence of trees contains everything.
Successor nodes are based on an ultrapower of V[G], and omit from a tree with non-standard index a binary sequence either if it's labeled ∞ or has non-standard length. So the induced Π^0_1-set at the bottom node looks like the generic.

A Kripke Model of c-FAN + $\neg\Pi^0_1$-FAN

Hide a tree like the previous one so that it's at best Π^0_1-definable.
At the bottom node, the decidable sequence of trees contains everything.
Successor nodes are based on an ultrapower of V[G], and omit from a tree with non-standard index a binary sequence either if it's labeled ∞ or has non-standard length. So the induced Π^0_1-set at the bottom node looks like the generic.
Include only those terms definable from the decidable sequence.

A Kripke Model of Π^0_1-FAN + $\neg$ full FAN

The easiest of all, because the tree does not have to be decidable.

A Kripke Model of Π^0_1-FAN $+ \neg$ full FAN

The easiest of all, because the tree does not have to be decidable. At the bottom node, the tree looks like the generic (the IN nodes).

A Kripke Model of Π^0_1-FAN $+ \neg$ full FAN

The easiest of all, because the tree does not have to be decidable. At the bottom node, the tree looks like the generic (the IN nodes). Successor nodes need no ultrapower. For each binary sequence labeled ∞, there is some successor node at which that binary sequence and its predecessors are the only nodes not in the tree. Include only those terms definable from this tree.

Goals

- To determine the computational content of these principles. Find computational/realizability models separating them. Perhaps there are complexity issues involved.

Goals

- To determine the computational content of these principles. Find computational/realizability models separating them. Perhaps there are complexity issues involved.
- Find the canonical models, if any.

Goals

- To determine the computational content of these principles. Find computational/realizability models separating them. Perhaps there are complexity issues involved.
- Find the canonical models, if any.
- Study the weak versions of these principles, by which the bar is concluded not to be uniform but rather to take up (at least) half of a level.

References

- on BD-N: Hajime Ishihara, “Continuity properties in constructive mathematics,” **Journal of Symbolic Logic**, v. 57 (1992), p. 557-565
- on anti-Specker: Josef Berger and Douglas Bridges, “The anti-Specker property, a Heine-Borel property, and uniform continuity,” **Archive for Mathematical Logic**, v. 46 (2008), p. 583-592
  Douglas Bridges, “Inheriting the anti-Specker property”, preprint, University of Canterbury, NewZealand, 2009, submitted for publication
- on the Riemann Permutation Theorem: Josef Berger, Douglas Bridges, Hannes Diener, and Helmut Schwichtenberg, “Constructive aspects of Riemann's permutation theorem for series,” in preparation
- on the BD-N-related models: Robert Lubarsky, “On the failure of BD-N and BD, and an application to the anti-Specker property,” **Journal of Symbolic Logic**, to appear
  Robert Lubarsky and Hannes Diener, “Principles weaker than BD-N,” submitted for publication, available at math.fau.edu\Lubarsky\pubs.html
- on fragments of the Fan Theorem: Josef Berger, “The logical strength of the uniform continuity theorem,” in *Logical Approaches to Computational Barriers , Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (Beckmann, Berger, Löwe, and Tucker, eds.), Springer, 2006, p. 35 - 39
  Josef Berger, “A separation result for varieties of Brouwer's fan theorem,” in *Proceedings of the 10th Asian Logic Conference (ALC 10), Kobe University in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan, September 1-6, 2008* (Arai et al., eds.), World Scientific, 2010, p. 85-92
  Hannes Diener, “Compactness under constructive scrutiny,” Ph.D. Thesis, 2008
  Michael P. Fourman and J.M.E. Hyland, “Sheaf models for analysis,” in *Applications of Sheaves, Lecture Notes in Mathematics Vol. 753* (M.P. Fourman, C.J. Mulvey, and D.S. Scott, eds.), Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1979, p. 280-301
- on the Fan Theorem-related models: Robert Lubarsky and Hannes Diener, “Separating the Fan Theorem and its weakenings,” available at math.fau.edu\Lubarsky\pubs.html