HAMILTONIAN CHAOS and STATISTICAL MECHANICS

The specific examples of chaotic systems discussed in the main text—the logistic map, the damped, driven pendulum, and the Lorenz equations—are all dissipative. It is important to recognize that nondissipative Hamiltonian systems can also exhibit chaos; indeed, Poincare made his prescient statement concerning sensitive dependence on initial conditions in the context of the few-body Hamiltonian problems he was studying. Here we examine briefly the many subtleties of Hamiltonian chaos and, as an illustration of its importance, discuss how it is closely tied to long-standing problems in the foundations of statistical mechanics.

We choose to introduce Hamiltonian chaos in one of its simplest incarnations, a two-dimensional discrete model called the standard map. Since this map preserves phase-space volume (actually area because there are only two dimensions) it indeed corresponds to a discrete version of a Hamiltonian system. Like the discrete logistic map for dissipative systems, this map represents an archetype for Hamiltonian chaos.

The equations defining the standard map are

\[ p_{n+1} = p_n - \frac{k}{2\pi} \sin(2\pi q_n), \]
\[ q_{n+1} = q_n + p_{n+1}, \]

where, as the notation suggests, \( p_n \) is the discrete analogue of the momentum, \( q_n \) is the analogue of the coordinate, and the discrete index \( n \) plays the role of time. Only the fractional parts of \( p_n \) and \( q_n \) are kept; hence the motion is on a torus, periodic in both \( p \) and \( q \). For any value of \( k \), the map preserves the area in the \((p, q)\) plane, since the Jacobian \( \frac{\partial (q_{n+1}, p_{n+1})}{\partial (q_n, p_n)} = 1 \).

The preservation of phase-space volume for Hamiltonian systems has the very important consequence that there can be no attractors, that is, no subregions of lower phase-space dimension to which the motion is confined asymptotically. Any initial point \((p_0, q_0)\) will lie on some particular orbit, and the image of all possible initial points—that is, the unit square itself—is again the unit square. In contrast, dissipative systems have phase-space volumes that shrink. For example, the logistic map (Fig. 5 in the main text) at \( \lambda = 3.1 \) has all initial points in the interval \((0, 1)\) attracted to just two points.

Clearly, for \( k = 0 \) the standard map is trivially integrable, with \( p_n = p_0 \) being constant and \( q_n \) increasing linearly in time \((n)\) as it should for free motion. The orbits are thus just straight lines wrapping around the torus in the \( q \) direction. For \( k = 1.1 \) the map produces the orbits shown in Figs. 1a-d. The most immediately striking feature of this set of figures is the existence of nontrivial structure on all scales. Thus, like dissipative systems, Hamiltonian chaos generates strange fractal sets (albeit “fat” fractals, as discussed below). On all scales one observes “islands,” analogues in this discrete case of the periodic orbits in the phase plane of the simple pendulum (Fig. 2 in the main text). In addition, however, and again on all scales, there are swarms of dots coming from individual chaotic orbits that undergo nonperiodic motion and eventually fill a finite region in phase space. In these chaotic regions the motion is “sensitively dependent on initial conditions.”

Figure 2 shows, in the full phase space, a plot of a single chaotic orbit followed through 100 million iterations (again, for \( k = 1.1 \)). This object differs from the strange sets seen in dissipative systems in that it occupies a finite fraction of the full phase space: specifically, the orbit shown takes up 56 per cent of the unit area that represents the full phase space of the map. Hence the “dimension” of the orbit is the same as that of the full phase space, and calculating the fractal dimension by the standard method gives \( d_f = 2 \). However, the orbit differs from a conventional area in that it contains holes on all scales. As a consequence, the measured value of the area occupied by the orbit depends on the resolution with which this area is measured—for example, the size of the boxes in the box-counting method—and the approach to the finite value at infinitely fine resolution has definite scaling properties. This set is thus appropriately called a “fat fractal.” For our later discussion it is important to note that the holes—representing periodic, nonchaotic motion—also occupy a finite fraction of the phase space.

To develop a more intuitive feel for fat fractals, note that a very simple example can be constructed by using a slight modification of the Cantor-set technique.
THE STANDARD MAP

Fig. 1. Shown here are the discrete orbits of the standard map (for $k = 1.1$ in Eq. 1) with different colors used to distinguish one orbit from another. Increasingly magnified regions of the phase space are shown, starting with the full phase space (a). The white box in (a) is the region magnified in (b), and so forth. Nontrivial structure, including "islands" and swarms of dots that represent regions of chaotic, nonperiodic motion, are obvious on all scales. (Figure courtesy of James Kadtke and David Ungerger, Los Alamos National Laboratory.)
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described in the main text. Instead of deleting the middle one-third of each interval at every scale, one deletes the middle \((1/3)^n\) at level \(n\). Although the resulting set is topologically the same as the original Cantor set, a calculation of its dimension yields \(d_f = 1\); it has the same dimension as the full unit interval. Further, this fat Cantor set occupies a finite fraction—amusingly but accidentally also about 56 per cent—of the unit interval, with the remainder occupied by the “holes” in the set.

To what extent does chaos exist in the more conventional Hamiltonian systems described by differential equations? A full answer to this question would require a highly technical summary of more than eight decades of investigations by mathematical physicists. Thus we will have to be content with a superficial overview that captures, at best, the flavor of these investigations.

To begin, we note that completely integrable systems can never exhibit chaos, independent of the number of degrees of freedom \(N\). In these systems all bounded motions are quasiperiodic and occur on hypertori, with the frequencies (possibly all distinct) determined by the values of the conservation laws. Thus there cannot be any aperiodic motion. Further, since all Hamiltonian systems with \(N = 1\) are completely integrable, chaos cannot occur for one-degree-of-freedom problems.

For \(N = 2\), non-integrable systems can exhibit chaos; however, it is not trivial to determine in which systems chaos can occur; that is, it is in general not obvious whether a given system is integrable or not. Consider, for example, two very similar \(N = 2\) nonlinear Hamiltonian systems with equation of motion given by:

\[
\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = -x - 2xy, \tag{2}
\]
\[
\frac{d^2y}{dt^2} = -y + y^2 - x^2, \tag{3}
\]

Equation 2 describes the famous Henon-Heiles system, which is non-integrable and has become a classic example of a simple (astro-) physically relevant Hamiltonian system exhibiting chaos. On the other hand, Eq. 3 can be separated into two independent \(N = 1\) systems (by a change of variables to \(z = x - y\) and \(\eta = x + y\) and hence is completely integrable.

Although there exist explicit calculational methods for testing for integrability, these are highly technical and generally difficult to apply for large \(N\). Fortunately, two theorems provide general guidance. First, Siegel’s Theorem considers the space of Hamiltonians analytic in their variables: non-integrable Hamiltonians are dense in this space, whereas integrable Hamiltonians are not. Second, Nekhoroshev’s Theorem leads to the fact that all non-integrable systems have a phase space that contains chaotic regions.

Out observations concerning the standard map immediately suggest an essential question: What is the extent of the chaotic regions and can they, under some circumstances, cover the whole phase space? The best way to answer this question is to search for nonchaotic regions. Consider, for example, a completely integrable \(N\)-degree-of-freedom Hamiltonian system disturbed by a generic non-integrable perturbation. The famous KAM (for Kolmogorov, Arnold, and Moser) theorem shows that, for this case, there are regions of finite measure in phase space that retain the smoothness associated with motion on the hypertori of the integrable system. These regions are the analogues of the “holes” in the standard map. Hence, for a typical Hamiltonian system with \(N\) degrees of freedom, the chaotic regions do not fill all of phase space: a finite fraction is occupied by “invariant KAM tori.”

At a conceptual level, then, the KAM theorem explains the nonchaotic behavior and recurrences that so puzzled Fermi, Pasta, and Ulam (see “The Fermi, Pasta, and Ulam Problem: Excerpts from 'Studies of Nonlinear Problems'”). Although the FPU chain had many (64) nonlinearly coupled degrees of freedom, it was close enough (for the parameter ranges studied) to an integrable system that the invariant KAM tori and resulting pseudo-integrable properties dominated the behavior over the times of measurement.

There is yet another level of subtlety to chaos in Hamiltonian systems: namely, the structure of the phase space. For nonintegrable systems, within every regular KAM region there are chaotic regions. Within these chaotic regions there are, in turn, regular regions, and so forth. For all non-integrable systems with \(N > 3\), an orbit can move (albeit on very long time scales) among the various chaotic regions via a process known as “Arnold diffusion.” Thus, in general, phase space is permeated by an Arnold web that links together the chaotic regions on all scales.

Intuitively, these observations concerning Hamiltonian chaos hint strongly at a connection to statistical mechanics. As Fig. 1 illustrates, the chaotic orbits in Hamiltonian systems form very complicated “Cantor dusts,” which are nonperiodic, never-repeating motions that wander through volumes of the phase space, apparently constrained only by conservation of total energy. In addition, in these regions the sensitive dependence implies a rapid loss of information about the initial conditions and hence an effective irreversibility of the motion. Clearly, such wandering motion and effective irreversibility suggest a possible approach to the following fundamental question of statistical mechanics: How can one derive the irreversible, ergodic, thermal-
equilibrium motion assumed in statistical mechanics from a reversible, Hamiltonian microscopic dynamics?

Historically, the fundamental assumption that has linked dynamics and statistical mechanics is the ergodic hypothesis, which asserts that time averages over actual dynamical motions are equal to ensemble averages over many different but equivalent systems. Loosely speaking, this hypothesis assumes that all regions of phase space allowed by energy conservation are equally accessed by almost all dynamical motions.

What evidence do we have that the ergodic hypothesis actually holds for realistic Hamiltonian systems? For systems with finite degrees of freedom, the KAM theorem shows that, in addition to chaotic regions of phase space, there are nonchaotic regions of finite measure. These invariant tori imply that ergodicity does not hold for most finite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems. Importantly, the few Hamiltonian systems for which the KAM theorem does not apply, and for which one can prove ergodicity and the approach to thermal equilibrium, involve “hard spheres” and consequently contain non-analytic interactions that are not realistic from a physicist’s perspective.

For many years, most researchers believed that these subtleties become irrelevant in the thermodynamic limit, that is, the limit in which the number of degrees of freedom (N) and the energy (E) go to infinity in such a way that $E/N$ remains a nonzero constant. For instance, the KAM regions of invariant tori may approach zero measure in this limit. However, recent evidence suggests that non-trivial counterexamples to this belief may exist. Given the increasing sophistication of our analytic understanding of Hamiltonian chaos and the growing ability to simulate systems with large N numerically, the time seems ripe for quantitative investigations that can establish (or disprove!) this belief. (For additional discussion of this topic, see “The Ergodic Hypothesis: A Complicated Problem of Mathematics and Physics.”)

Among the specific issues that should be addressed in a variety of physically realistic models are the following.

- How does the measure of phase space occupied by KAM tori depend on N? Is there a class of models with realistic interactions for which this measure goes to 0? Are there non-integrable models for which a finite measure is retained by the KAM regions? If so, what are the characteristics that cause this behavior?
- How does the rate of Arnold diffusion depend on N in a broad class of models? What is the structure of important features—such as the Arnold web—in the phase space as N approaches infinity?
- If there is an approach to equilibrium, how does the time-scale for this approach depend on N? Is it less than the age of the universe?
- Is ergodicity necessary (or merely sufficient) for most of the features we associate with statistical mechanics? Can a less stringent requirement, consistent with the behaviour observed in analytic Hamiltonian systems, be formulated?

Clearly, these are some of the most challenging, and profound, questions currently confronting nonlinear scientists.