THERE IS ONLY ONE LIMIT

Why Black Holes, Gödel's Theorem, and Turing's Halting Problem Are the Same Phenomenon

A Companion to "On the Categorical Unity of Singularities"

Jed Anderson
EnviroAI, Houston, Texas
March 2026

"Everything should be made as simple as possible, but not simpler." — Einstein

The Idea in One Paragraph

Across physics, mathematics, and computer science, we keep discovering the same thing: **no system can completely describe itself from the inside.** A formal mathematical system cannot prove all truths about itself (Gödel). A computer cannot predict the behavior of all computers (Turing). A region of space cannot hold more information than fits on its surface (Bekenstein and Hawking). And when any of these systems tries to push past its limit—when it tries to contain everything about itself—it hits a wall. In physics, that wall is a singularity: a black hole, or the Big Bang. In logic, it is an unprovable truth. In computation, it is an unsolvable problem. This paper argues these are all the same wall, seen from different angles.

Part 1: The Discovery That Started It All

In 1687, Isaac Newton published an idea that changed civilization: the force that pulls an apple to the ground is the same force that keeps the Moon orbiting the Earth.

Before Newton, people believed the heavens and the Earth operated by completely different rules. Stars and planets moved in perfect circles because they were made of divine, celestial material. Rocks fell to the ground because they were impure, earthly stuff. Two different worlds, two different sets of physics.

Newton destroyed this division with a single calculation. He knew the Moon is about 60 times farther from Earth's center than an apple on a table. If gravity weakens with the square of distance—60 squared is 3,600—then the Moon should feel a gravitational pull 3,600 times weaker than the apple. He computed the Moon's actual acceleration from its orbit. It was exactly 1/3,600th of the apple's. Same force. Same law. Earth and heavens, unified.

This established something profound that we now take for granted: when you find a law of physics in one place, it applies everywhere. Not because we declared it so, but because the universe appears to run on a single set of rules. Every subsequent unification in physics—Maxwell uniting electricity and magnetism, Einstein uniting space and time, the Standard Model uniting three of the four forces—has reinforced this principle.

This paper follows Newton's example. We have found the same pattern appearing in physics, logic, and computation. The question is: is it the same thing?

Part 2: What Is a Singularity, Really?

The word "singularity" sounds exotic, but the concept is simple: **it is a point where a description breaks down.**

Think of a map. A good map of Houston tells you where the roads are, how to get from your house to the office, where the rivers run. But no map of Houston can show you what is happening inside every building at every moment. At some level of detail, the map fails. That failure isn't a problem with Houston—it's a limit of the map.

A singularity in physics is similar. Einstein's general relativity is a "map" of gravity. It describes how mass curves spacetime—with extraordinary precision. But when you push the equations to extreme conditions—infinite density, the moment of the Big Bang, the center of a black hole—the map produces infinities and nonsense. The description breaks down. That breakdown is what physicists call a singularity.

Here's the key insight: **singularities are not just in physics.** They appear everywhere a system is powerful enough to describe itself.

Part 3: Three Limits That Are Really One

The Limit of Mathematics

In 1931, Kurt Gödel proved something that shocked the mathematical world: any consistent mathematical system that is powerful enough to do arithmetic contains true statements that it cannot prove.

Think about that. Mathematics—the most rigorous, logical system humans have ever built—has built-in blind spots. Not because we haven't tried hard enough. Not because the axioms are wrong. Because of the structure of self-reference itself.

The proof works like this: Gödel built a mathematical sentence that says, in effect, "This sentence cannot be proven." If the sentence is false, it can be proven—but then the system proves a falsehood, making it inconsistent. If the sentence is true, it cannot be proven—meaning there is a true statement the system cannot reach. Either way, the system hits a wall.

The trick is self-reference. The system is talking about itself—and when it does, it finds a blind spot.

The Limit of Computation

In 1936, Alan Turing proved the equivalent result for computers: no computer program can determine whether every possible computer program will eventually stop or run forever.

The proof uses the same trick. Assume you have a program H that can decide whether any program halts. Now build a new program D that asks H about itself, and then does the opposite: if H says D halts, D loops forever; if H says D loops, D halts. D(D) both halts and loops—contradiction. No such H can exist.

Again: self-reference creates a blind spot. The computer is trying to predict its own behavior and fails.

The Limit of Physics

In 1972, Jacob Bekenstein asked a simple question: what is the maximum amount of information you can fit into a region of space?

His answer was startling: **the maximum information scales with the surface area of the region, not its volume.** A sphere that is twice as wide can hold four times as much information (area doubles → area quadruples), not eight times as much (which is what volume scaling would predict).

And here is the truly disturbing part: **if you try to pack more information into a region than its surface area allows, the region collapses into a black hole.** Nature literally prevents information overload by creating a singularity.

A black hole is not just a region of extreme gravity. It is a region where information density has been maxed out. It is the physical equivalent of Gödel's sentence: the point where the system's capacity for self-description is completely saturated.

• • •

Three domains. Three limits. The same structure:

	Mathematics	Computation	Physics
System	Axioms + rules	Computer program	Spacetime
Self-reference	"This sentence is unprovable"	Program analyzes itself	Region measures its own information
Limit reached	True but unprovable statements	Undecidable problems	Bekenstein bound saturated
What happens	System is incomplete	Program can't decide	Black hole forms

Part 4: The Universe Is Written on Its Surface

Bekenstein's discovery—that information scales with area, not volume—led to one of the most mind-bending ideas in physics: **the holographic principle.**

A hologram is a flat, two-dimensional surface that encodes a fully three-dimensional image. When you look at a hologram, you see depth, perspective, and structure—but all of it is "stored" on a surface with one fewer dimension.

The holographic principle says the universe works the same way. The complete description of everything inside a region of space can be encoded on its boundary. The interior—the "bulk"—is like the three-dimensional image you see in a hologram: real and consistent, but generated from lower-dimensional data on the surface.

In 1997, Juan Maldacena proved this isn't just a metaphor. He showed that a gravitational universe with a certain geometry (called Anti-de Sitter space) is **mathematically identical** to a quantum field theory living on its boundary—a theory with no gravity and one fewer spatial dimension. Everything that happens "inside" the gravitational universe—stars forming, black holes collapsing, planets orbiting—has an exact equivalent described entirely on the boundary. This is not approximate. It is exact.

Stop and absorb this: **a universe with gravity is the same as a universe without gravity that has one fewer dimension.** Gravity—the force Newton discovered, the curvature Einstein described—is not fundamental. It is what boundary information looks like from the inside.

Part 5: Entanglement Is Spacetime

In quantum mechanics, two particles can be "entangled"—connected in such a way that measuring one instantly affects the other, no matter how far apart they are. Einstein called this "spooky action at a distance." It has been confirmed in thousands of experiments.

Separately, Einstein's general relativity predicts "wormholes"—tunnels through spacetime connecting two distant regions.

In 2013, Maldacena and Susskind proposed something extraordinary: **entanglement and wormholes are the same thing.** This is the ER = EPR conjecture. ("ER" stands for Einstein–Rosen bridges—wormholes. "EPR" stands for Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen—entanglement.)

Mark Van Raamsdonk had already shown (2010) that if you take two quantum systems and remove their entanglement, the spacetime connecting them literally tears apart. No entanglement → no spatial connection. Full entanglement → connected spacetime.

The implication is staggering: space itself is woven from entanglement. The reason you can walk from one side of a room to the other—the reason there is spatial continuity at all—is that the quantum fields in your room are entangled with each other. Remove the entanglement, and the room falls apart into disconnected points.

And in 2014, Almheiri, Dong, and Harlow showed that the holographic correspondence has the mathematical structure of a quantum error-correcting code: the boundary encodes the interior the same way a computer encodes data to protect against errors. The interior of spacetime is a kind of cosmic error-corrected message, reconstructed from boundary data.

Part 6: The One Rule Behind All the Limits

Here is the core of the paper, stated as simply as I can:

> **No system can contain a complete description of itself. The most complete description always lives on the boundary. And when the boundary is full, you get a singularity.**

We call this the **Boundary Dominance Principle.** It is not a conjecture or an intuition—it is a consequence of a theorem proved by the mathematician F. William Lawvere in 1969. Lawvere showed that all the famous impossibility results—Cantor's proof that some infinities are bigger than others, Gödel's incompleteness, Turing's halting problem—are all instances of a single mathematical structure: when a system is powerful enough to reference itself and its description space allows "negation" (flipping yes to no), the system cannot be self-complete.

What the companion paper ("On the Categorical Unity of Singularities") does is show that **the same theorem generates the holographic principle in physics.** The holographic bound—information limited to surfaces—and Gödel incompleteness—truth exceeding proof—are the same obstruction, applied in different mathematical contexts. It is not that they are "analogous." They are the same theorem.

Let me make this concrete with an analogy. Imagine a library that contains every book ever written. Now imagine a special book: the Catalogue. The Catalogue is supposed to list every book in the library, including itself. Can such a Catalogue exist? No—because if it lists itself, it needs to include the fact that it lists itself, which changes the listing, which changes the book, and so on. The Catalogue cannot contain itself. The description of the whole system is always outside the system.

In a mathematical system, the "Catalogue" is the complete set of truths. The axioms (the "boundary" of the system) generate theorems (the "bulk"), but the truths always exceed what the axioms can prove. In a gravitational system, the "Catalogue" is the complete physical state of the interior. The boundary (the surface) encodes it all, but you cannot surjectively map the interior's description onto the boundary—the boundary is the complete record, and the interior is the projection.

And when the boundary is completely full? When every bit of the surface is used? That is Bekenstein saturation. That is a black hole. **That is a singularity.**

Part 7: The Chain That Connects Everything

The companion paper builds a chain of rigorous connections, link by link:

Link 1: Undecidability ↔ Entanglement. In 2020, a team of mathematicians proved a result called MIP* = RE. Stripped of jargon, it means this: when two players can share quantum entanglement, they can verify answers to problems that are normally undecidable—problems as hard as the halting problem. Quantum entanglement reaches the exact frontier where computability breaks down. This is a proven theorem.

Link 2: Entanglement ↔ Geometry. The Ryu–Takayanagi formula (2006) shows that the amount of entanglement between two regions of a boundary equals the area of a specific surface in the interior spacetime. Entanglement is not "related to" geometry. Entanglement *is* geometry. This is derived within the holographic framework and confirmed in thousands of calculations.

Link 3: Entanglement ↔ Spacetime Connectivity. ER = EPR proposes that entangled particles are connected by wormholes. This is still a conjecture, but it is supported by Van Raamsdonk's demonstration that removing entanglement tears spacetime apart, and by recent operational proofs that monogamous entanglement is physically indistinguishable from wormhole connections.

Reading the chain end to end:

> **The limits of computation, the structure of quantum entanglement, the geometry of space, and the connectivity of the universe are all descriptions of the same underlying reality.**

Or, even more simply: the reason math has blind spots, the reason computers have unsolvable problems, and the reason black holes exist are **all the same reason.** They are all consequences of the fact that no system can fully contain its own description.

Part 8: What We Know, What We Suspect, What We Don't Know

Intellectual honesty demands precision about what is established and what is not. Here is the scorecard:

Established Beyond Doubt

Gödel's theorems and Turing's halting problem are proven mathematical theorems. They cannot be overturned.

Lawvere's unification of all diagonal arguments is a proven theorem in category theory. All these impossibility results share one mathematical engine.

The Bekenstein–Hawking entropy formula is derived from combining general relativity with quantum field theory. It has been confirmed by multiple independent methods, including microscopic state counting in string theory.

MIP* = RE is a proven theorem linking quantum entanglement to the boundary of computability.

The Ryu–Takayanagi formula is derived within the AdS/CFT framework, confirmed in thousands of calculations.

The spectral gap undecidability theorem (Cubitt et al., 2015) proves that specific physical properties of quantum systems are genuinely undecidable—not hard, but impossible to compute. This is a direct bridge between Turing and physics.

Strongly Supported but Unproven

AdS/CFT itself has passed every test thrown at it but has never been formally proven. It is the most tested unproven conjecture in theoretical physics.

ER = EPR is well-supported for specific cases (the thermofield double state), with accumulating evidence for generality, but is not yet proven in its full form.

Spacetime emerges from entanglement is the leading interpretation of the holographic results, but the mechanism is not yet fully understood.

The Big Open Problem

All the rigorous holographic results work in a type of spacetime called Anti-de Sitter (AdS)—a universe with a negative cosmological constant. Our universe has a positive cosmological constant and is expanding. Extending the holographic framework from AdS to our actual universe is the central unsolved problem in the field. Until this is resolved, the Boundary Dominance Principle applies rigorously only to AdS spacetimes and formal systems. Its extension to cosmology is the defining question of 21st-century theoretical physics.

Part 9: Why This Matters

If the Boundary Dominance Principle is correct in its strongest form, it means:

Singularities are not errors. Black holes and the Big Bang are not places where physics "fails." They are places where the universe's self-descriptive capacity is maxed out. They are as natural and necessary as Gödel's unprovable truths are to arithmetic. You cannot have a universe with gravity and information without singularities, just as you cannot have a mathematical system powerful enough for arithmetic without incompleteness.

Space is not fundamental. The three-dimensional space we move through every day is a projection from information encoded on a boundary. What feels solid and continuous is generated from something deeper—patterns of quantum entanglement.

The limits of physics and the limits of logic are the same limit. There is not one set of rules for the physical world and another for mathematics. There is one deep structure—the impossibility of complete self-reference—and it shows up as the holographic bound in physics, as incompleteness in math, and as uncomputability in computer science.

The universe has a maximum complexity. The cosmological horizon of our universe has a finite entropy of about 10^{120}. If the Boundary Dominance Principle applies to our universe (the big open question), this means the total computational complexity of any formal system that can be physically built inside our cosmos is finite. There are mathematical truths that are not merely unprovable—they are physically unrealizable. The universe cannot even ask certain questions, let alone answer them.

Part 10: Wheeler's Dream

John Archibald Wheeler—who coined the term "black hole," who worked with both Bohr and Einstein, who mentored Richard Feynman—spent his last decades searching for the deepest principle underlying reality. He proposed "It from Bit": the idea that physical reality at bottom derives from information—from yes-or-no questions.

He also said this:

> *"Behind it all is surely an idea so simple, so beautiful, that when we grasp it—in a decade, a century, or a millennium—we will all say to each other, how could it have been otherwise?"*

The Boundary Dominance Principle may be that idea. Its statement is simple: no system can completely contain its own description; the complete description lives on the boundary; saturation of the boundary produces a singularity. From this single principle, you get:

Gödel's incompleteness. Turing's uncomputability. The holographic principle. Bekenstein–Hawking entropy. The emergence of spacetime from entanglement. The existence of black holes as information-saturated regions. The limits of quantum measurement.

All from one principle. All because no system can completely know itself from the inside.

• • •

The full argument has been traced across a century's worth of independent discoveries:

Cantor (1891). Gödel (1931). Turing (1936). Bekenstein (1972). Hawking (1974). Maldacena (1997). Ryu–Takayanagi (2006). ER = EPR (2013). MIP = RE (2020).*

Each discoverer was working in a different field, asking a different question, using different tools. None was trying to contribute to the others' work. Yet they all found the same wall.

The convergence is too specific, the mathematical relationships too precise, and the implications too coherent to be coincidence. The simplest explanation—the one Wheeler sought—is that **information, constrained by self-reference and encoded on boundaries, is all there is.** Spacetime is what boundary-encoded information looks like from the inside. Singularities are where the encoding saturates. And the limits of physics, logic, and computation are the same limit, seen from different angles.

How could it have been otherwise?