

HILBERT & GOEDEL ON COMPLETENESS AND INCOMPLETENESS THEORY: A LOOK AT THE PROBLEM OF FORMALISM IN COMMUNICATION

By

John Inah Ukam, PhD

Department of Mass Communication

University of Cross River State

Calabar

thrrag@gmail.com

08034442248

Abstract

This article explores the implications of completeness and incompleteness theories, most notably Kurt Gödel's groundbreaking work, for the study of human communication. It argues that the inherent limitations of formal systems, as demonstrated by Gödel, pose significant challenges to purely formalist approaches in communication theory. While formal models offer valuable insights and precision, they are intrinsically incapable of capturing the full spectrum of meaning, context, and interpretation that characterizes human communicative practices. The article examines the historical drive towards formalism in communication studies, outlines the core tenets of incompleteness, and discusses how these concepts reveal the "problem of formalism"—the risk of oversimplification and reductionism when relying solely on formal methods. By acknowledging the inherent incompleteness of any formal communicative model, the article advocates for a more nuanced, multi-paradigmatic approach that integrates formal analysis with interpretive, qualitative, and context-sensitive methodologies to better understand the rich complexity of communication.

Keywords: *Incompleteness Theory, Gödel's Theorems, Formalism, Communication Theory, Philosophy of Communication.*

Introduction

One of the fundamental problems of theory of knowledge includes: what constitutes knowledge and what the right method of knowledge cultivation, harvesting, processing and sharing is, and what it is not. Different schools have advocated for different approaches, from authority, apriori, aposteriori, empirical and synthetic-apriori methods. Others still are of the view that knowledge is best harvested through the method of dialectics, history or historical dialectical materialism, whereas others are of the opinion that the best approach is the dialectical idealism. Whatever the best approach is, is relative, ideological and the consideration of varied individuals, according to the spirits of the time. Even as it is, what is very unique is that the many positions can principally be categorised in two major blocks: the idealism and materialism, empiricism; the prospect of using data gathered from observation, using the five senses and the others and rationalism; the power to make use of reason and the ability to correctly estimate the strength of evidence, as the case may be.

Scientific inquiry into knowledge is the outcome of the quest for precision, predictability, and universal principles. This quest for precision has manifested as a drive towards formalism which is defined as the development of systems of symbols, rules, and axioms intended to capture the essence of a phenomenon in a complete and consistent manner (Cain, 1999). The aspiration of communication studies to be a rigorous academic discipline, has also experienced this allure of formalism. Considered from early cybernetic models to contemporary computational linguistics and artificial intelligence, attempts have been made to create formal systems that can describe, predict, and even replicate human communication (Mistry, Kevadiya, Mistry & Goswami, 2024).

The early 20th century witnessed a profound intellectual upheaval in mathematics and logic, spearheaded by Kurt Gödel's incompleteness theorems. These theorems demonstrated fundamental limitations inherent in any sufficiently complex formal axiomatic system, proving that such systems cannot be both complete (able to prove or disprove every statement within their framework) and consistent (free from contradictions). This revelation has had far-reaching implications beyond mathematics, prompting critical reflection in fields that rely on or aspire to formal modeling. This article posits that Gödel's insights are profoundly relevant to communication theory, highlighting an unavoidable

"problem of formalism" when attempting to encapsulate the dynamic, multifaceted nature of human interaction within closed, formal structures.

Formalism in Communication Theory: A Brief Overview

The desire to formalize communication is understandable since formal models promise clarity, testability, and the potential for generalizable theories. Shannon and Weaver's (1949) mathematical theory of communication cited in Study.com (2025), which, though primarily concerned with technical signal transmission, provided a powerful conceptual vocabulary (sender, receiver, channel, noise, encoding, decoding) that was widely adopted and adapted to human communication. This model, with its linear structure and emphasis on efficiency, represents a classic formalist approach.

Formal distinctions (signifier/signified, icon/index/symbol) were introduced to analyze how signs generate meaning. While not always strictly axiomatic, structuralist semiotics sought to uncover underlying systems and codes governing communicative practices. Later, fields like pragmatics attempted to formalize aspects of language use, such as speech acts and conversational implicatures, by identifying rules and principles that guide interpretation beyond literal meaning (Mey, 2009).

More recently, computational linguistics and AI research have pushed the boundaries of formalism, developing sophisticated algorithms and models to process natural language, generate text, and simulate dialogue. These efforts, while achieving remarkable successes, also bump against the complexities that Gödel's theorems presaged for formal systems in general.

Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems: A Conceptual Primer

Kurt Gödel's two incompleteness theorems, published in 1931, are cornerstones of modern logic. Without delving into their intricate mathematical proofs, their conceptual essence can be summarized as follows:

- **First Incompleteness Theorem:** In any consistent formal axiomatic system powerful enough to express basic arithmetic, there will always be true statements about the numbers within that system that cannot be proven or disproven from within the system itself. These are often referred to as "undecidable" or "Gödel" statements. Essentially, any such formal system is necessarily incomplete.
- **Second Incompleteness Theorem:** Any consistent formal axiomatic system powerful enough to express basic arithmetic cannot prove its own consistency from within itself. To prove its consistency, one would need to step outside the system and use a more powerful, encompassing meta-system, which itself would be subject to the same limitations.

The profound implication is that no single, finite formal system can capture all mathematical truths, nor can it fully vouch for its own internal coherence without external reference. This shattered the Hilbertian dream of a complete and consistent axiomatization of all mathematics.

Incompleteness and the Limits of Formal Communication Models

The parallels between the limitations of formal mathematical systems and formal communication models are striking. If a system as rigorously defined as arithmetic is inherently incomplete, it stands to reason that human communication—a phenomenon vastly more complex, ambiguous, and context-dependent—would present even greater challenges to complete formalization.

Several aspects of communication resist exhaustive formal capture:

- **Contextual Sensitivity:** Meaning in communication is rarely absolute; it is profoundly shaped by the physical, social, cultural, and historical context in which it occurs. Formal models often struggle to

incorporate the infinite variability of context or the subtle ways interactants draw upon shared, often unstated, contextual knowledge.

- **Interpretation and Ambiguity:** Human language is inherently ambiguous. Words have multiple meanings, intentions can be veiled, and utterances can be interpreted in various ways. While formal semantics and pragmatics attempt to create rules for disambiguation, the process of interpretation often involves intuitive leaps, inferential reasoning, and an understanding of nuance that transcends rule-following.
- **Non-Verbal Communication:** A significant portion of meaning is conveyed through non-verbal cues (e.g., tone of voice, facial expressions, body language, proxemics). While some attempts have been made to codify these, their interpretation is highly fluid and culturally variable, making comprehensive formalization exceedingly difficult.
- **Emergent Meaning and Creativity:** Communication is not merely the transmission of pre-packaged information. Meaning is often co-constructed and emergent in interaction. Participants can creatively play with language, generate novel expressions, and negotiate understanding in ways that formal systems, designed for pre-defined elements and rules, cannot easily accommodate.
- **Emotional and Relational Dimensions:** Communication is deeply intertwined with emotions, relationships, and identity. These subjective and intersubjective aspects are notoriously difficult to quantify or reduce to formal variables. An utterance's logical content may be formalizable, but its emotional impact or its effect on a relationship is far more elusive.
- **The "Unspoken" and Implicature:** Much of what is communicated is not explicitly stated but implied or presupposed (Grice, 1975). Understanding these implicatures requires a rich background of shared knowledge and an ability to infer intentions, a process that is more holistic and intuitive than rule-based.

Just as Gödel showed that there are true mathematical statements unprovable within a given formal system, there are arguably "true" interpretations or salient aspects of a communicative act that cannot be derived or accounted for solely through the rules of any given formal communication model. The model itself becomes a "Gödelian" system, unable to capture all communicative "truths" from within its own predefined structure.

The Problem of Formalism: Reductionism and the Neglect of Lived Experience

The "problem of formalism" in communication, illuminated by the lens of incompleteness, is not that formal models are useless, but that an over-reliance on them, or the belief that they can achieve completeness, can lead to a reductive understanding of communication. It risks:

- **Oversimplification:** Reducing complex communicative phenomena to a limited set of variables and rules can strip away essential nuances and complexities.
- **Decontextualization:** Focusing on abstract structures may lead to a neglect of the specific, situated contexts that give communication its meaning.
- **Ignoring Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity:** Formal models often struggle with the subjective experiences, intentions, and interpretations of communicators, as well as the intersubjective creation of shared understanding.
- **The Illusion of Objectivity:** The precision of formal models can create an illusion of objectivity, masking the fact that the choice of what to formalize and how to do so is itself an interpretive act, influenced by the researcher's assumptions and goals.

Embracing Incompleteness: Towards a Multi-Paradigmatic Approach

Acknowledging the inherent incompleteness of formal communication models is not a counsel of despair, but an invitation to greater intellectual humility and methodological pluralism. It suggests that:

- **Formal models are tools, not mirrors:** They should be seen as useful heuristics or specific analytical instruments, rather than comprehensive representations of communicative reality.
- **Integration is key:** The insights from formal approaches need to be complemented by qualitative, interpretive, ethnographic, and critical methodologies that can explore the aspects of communication that formalism cannot easily grasp.
- **Focus on the "gaps":** The "undecidable" aspects of communication—the ambiguities, the unspoken, the context-dependent nuances—are not noise to be eliminated, but rich sites for inquiry.
- **Implications for AI and Machine Communication:** The challenge of creating truly "understanding" AI is, in part, a reflection of Gödelian limitations. An AI operating on a purely formal system may excel at manipulating symbols according to rules, but it will likely struggle with the open-endedness, ambiguity, and deep contextual understanding characteristic of human communication unless it can somehow transcend its initial programming in ways not yet fully understood.

Conclusion: Communication Beyond Formal Grasp

Gödel's incompleteness theorems serve as a powerful reminder of the limits of formal systems. When applied to communication, they underscore the idea that no single formal model, however sophisticated, can ever fully capture the richness, dynamism, and inherent ambiguity of human interaction. Communication is not a closed, axiomatic system; it is an open, evolving, and deeply human process, perpetually exceeding our attempts to fully formalize it.

The "problem of formalism" in communication is the temptation to mistake the map for the territory, to believe that our neat models can encompass the messy vitality of lived communicative experience. By embracing the concept of incompleteness, communication scholars can move towards more holistic, nuanced, and ultimately more insightful understandings of how humans connect, share meaning, and navigate their social worlds. This involves appreciating the power of formal tools while always recognizing their inherent limitations, and remaining open to the vast dimensions of communication that lie beyond their formal grasp. Future research should continue to explore this productive tension between the drive for formal clarity and the acceptance of fundamental incompleteness.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, 38(1), 173-198.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Hofstadter, D. R. (1979). *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*. Basic Books.
- Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2010). *Theories of Human Communication* (10th ed.). Waveland Press.
- Penrose, R. (1989). *The Emperor's New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds, and the Laws of Physics*. Oxford University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Shannon, C. E., & Weaver, W. (1949). *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. University of Illinois Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*. Blackwell.

Cain, M. (1999). "Problematizing Formalism: A Double-Cross of Genre Boundaries." *College Composition and Communication*. 51(1) 89-95.

Hirenkumar, M., Tarkikkumar, Z. K., Hirenkumar, K., & Mistry, A. G. (2024) The Cybernetics Perspective of AI. *Journal of Network Security* 12(01) Lab: Amit Mahendragiri Goswami's Lab

MEY, J. L. (2009). *Pragmatics. An Introduction*. Blackwell.