The Attralucian Essays: Exploring the Finite

First Edition

 Typeset in LaTeX

The Attralucian Essays

The Distributed Consensus Problem: A Geofinitist Reinterpretation

Kevin R. Haylett

The Distributed Consensus Problem: A Geofinitist Reinterpretation

Overview

The distributed consensus problem concerns how independent nodes in a network can agree on a common value despite failures, delays, and adversarial behaviour. Classical formulations impose strict requirements—agreement, validity, and termination—under idealised assumptions about communication and timing.

This paper does not reject these formulations. Rather, it reinterprets consensus within a Geofinitist framework, where all quantities are finite, measured, and accompanied by uncertainty. In this view, consensus is not exact agreement, but *bounded convergence* within a measurable tolerance under finite constraints.

From Classical to Measured Consensus

Let a network consist of n nodes, each proposing a value x_i. Classical consensus requires:

- **Agreement:** All correct nodes decide on the same value.
- **Validity:** The value must originate from a node's

proposal.

- **Termination:** All correct nodes eventually decide.

The Fischer–Lynch–Paterson (FLP) result shows that in a fully asynchronous system, deterministic consensus cannot be guaranteed if even a single node may fail.

This result remains valid. The Geofinitist perspective instead studies consensus under *finite timing assumptions and measurable tolerances*, corresponding to the regimes in which real systems operate.

Geofinitist Principles Applied

1. Consensus as a Trajectory

Consensus is not a static state but a trajectory through a space of node states. Each node's state includes its value estimate, uncertainty, and communication history. Agreement emerges as a convergence process in this state space.

2. Measurement and Uncertainty

Messages incur delay, loss, and jitter. Node values are therefore not exact, but bounded:

$$y_i \pm \varepsilon_i.$$

3. Layered Decision Process

Consensus protocols proceed through stages—proposal, voting, commitment—each contributing to convergence. These layers form a finite cascade rather than a single decision step.

4. Contextual Guarantees

Consensus guarantees depend on assumptions such as partial synchrony, fault bounds, and authentication. These are not universal truths but *declared conditions* under which guarantees hold.

5. Finite Constraints

Real systems operate under finite timing, bounded retries, and limited resources. Consensus must therefore be defined within these constraints.

Measured Consensus

Define a metric space $(\mathbb{M}, d_{\mathbb{M}})$ over node states. Let y_i be the decision of node i.

Consensus is defined as:

$$d_{\mathbb{M}}(y_i, y_j) \leq \tau_{\text{agree}}$$

for all correct nodes i, j.

The parameter τ_{agree} is a *policy choice* reflecting acceptable deviation.

Convergence and Disagreement

Define the disagreement diameter at round r:

$$\Delta_s(r) = \max_{i,j} d_{\mathbb{M}}(s_i(r), s_j(r)).$$

A protocol exhibits contraction if:

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_s(r+1)] \leq \rho \Delta_s(r) + \eta,$$

with $\rho < 1$ and noise term η.

Consensus is achieved when:

$$\Delta_s(r) \leq \tau_{\text{agree}}.$$

Decision with Margin

Define a confidence margin:

$$\Gamma = \tau_v - \max_{j,k} d_{\mathbb{M}}(m_j, m_k).$$

A node commits only if:

$$\Gamma \geq \theta,$$

otherwise it abstains.

This replaces binary decisions with margin-based decisions.

Outcomes

Consensus becomes a three-valued outcome:

- **Commit:** Agreement within tolerance and sufficient margin.
- **Indeterminate:** Insufficient margin; continue protocol.
- **Abort/Retry:** System instability detected.

Performance Bounds

Under partial synchrony with delay bound Δ and processing time σ:

$$T^{\star} \approx H(\Delta + \sigma) \pm \varepsilon_T,$$

where H is the number of rounds to convergence.

Interpretation

In this framework:

- Consensus is *convergence*, not equality.
- Correctness is *bounded agreement*, not exact identity.

- Guarantees are *conditional*, not universal.
- Decisions include *abstention*, not forced resolution.

Conclusion

The classical consensus problem remains valid in its asymptotic formulation. Geofinitism reframes it within finite regimes, where timing, uncertainty, and resource constraints are explicit.

This yields an operational perspective: consensus is a measurable convergence process with tolerances, margins, and provenance. Rather than seeking perfect agreement under idealised conditions, we engineer systems that achieve reliable agreement within the limits of real-world computation.

Context. Consensus is treated as a measurable convergence process under finite timing, uncertainty, and faults.

Measured Network. Nodes maintain states $s_i(t) \in \mathbb{M}^d$ with delays, loss, and clock skew recorded in provenance.

Fault Model. Fault sets F_t are bounded by $|F_t| \le f$ under declared assumptions.

Consensus Specification.

$$\begin{aligned} \textbf{Agreement:} \quad & d_{\mathbb{M}}(y_i, y_j) \le \tau_{\text{agree}}, \\ \textbf{Validity:} \quad & y_i \in_\delta \text{Hull}(\{x_j\}), \\ \textbf{Termination:} \quad & \Pr[t_i \le T^\star] \ge 1 - \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Convergence.

$$\Delta_s(r+1) \le \rho \Delta_s(r) + \eta.$$

Decision Rule. Commit when quorum, value coherence, and timing consistency hold with margin $\Gamma \ge \theta$.

Abstention. If margin is insufficient, output INDETERMINATE.

Collapse Note. As uncertainty and timing variability vanish, this reduces to classical consensus guarantees.

Interpretation. Consensus is bounded convergence with auditable margins and finite guarantees.