

# Generalized Functions & Experimental Methods of Obtaining Statistical Variable-Quantities Which Fully Determine Preferences in Choice-Rich Environments

By Leonid A. Shapiro

“Need for mathematical basis should dominate one’s search for any new theory. Philosophical or physical ideas one has must be adjusted to fit mathematics. Not other way around. One ought to start with mathematical basis. One can tinker with one’s philosophical or physical ideas to adapt them to mathematics, but mathematics cannot be tinkered with. It is subject to rigid rules and is restricted by harsh logic; distrust all philosophical or physical concepts as basis for any theory. One should concentrate on getting interesting mathematics and put one’s trust in a mathematical scheme, even if it does not appear at first sight to be connected with physics. Thus, basic equations of any theory are worked out before their physical meaning is obtained; physical meaning follows behind mathematics. Physical interpretation is obtained only after mathematical basis is obtained” (Dirac 1978; abridged).

Notice: *distributions* such as  $\delta x = 0$  for every  $x \neq 0$ , where  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x \cdot \delta x = 1$ , not *functions*, are mathematical basis of quantum mechanics (Dirac 1927).

**Abstract.** Marginal utility functions, or preference functions may be modeled as distributions generated by generalized functions. Models of decision-making derived from this mathematical basis are not only consistent with results of all experiments in physiology so far, but also quantitatively relate experimentally obtained physiological observables with predictions of economic models so constructed: variable-quantities in such models precisely correspond to observables which determine statistical properties of central nervous system. Generality of such economic models is shown to exceed that of alternative economic models. Graphical method of consistently interpreting and visualizing physiological data within context of economic models is demonstrated.

In perceived environment  $E$ , measuring-system  $M : [\zeta \in E] \rightarrow [\xi \in \mathbb{R}]$  maps different “things” onto distinguishable “labels,” “names,” “stimuli,” different unique real-numbers. Consistent 1-to-1 mapping  $F : [\xi \in \mathbb{R}] \rightarrow [V \in \mathbb{R}]$ , which may be continuous or dispersed, of all distinguishable stimuli  $\xi$  to values  $V$  is generated as limiting sum, across real boundary, of two other analytic functions,  $F_+ : [\xi \in \mathbb{R} + i \cdot \sigma \in \mathbb{C}] \rightarrow [V^* \in \mathbb{R}]$  and  $F_- : [\xi \in \mathbb{R} - i \cdot \sigma \in \mathbb{C}] \rightarrow$

$[V^* \in \mathbb{R}]$ , so that  $F(\xi \in \mathbb{R}) = F^*(\xi^* \in \mathbb{C}) = [F_+(\xi + i \cdot \sigma), F_-(\xi - i \cdot \sigma)] = \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} F_+(\xi + i \cdot \sigma) - F_-(\xi - i \cdot \sigma)$ , and  $F(\xi) = V$  may be invariant to many different transformations  $\varepsilon F \rho$  (Sato 1958; Isao 1991). In other words,  $F$  is marginal utility distribution. That is, preferences, or hierarchical ordinal rankings of any number of distinguishable changes to distinguishable quantities already possessed or anticipated of distinguishable goods, including distinguishable quantities of money, at distinguishable times within future null cone are limiting sum of two continuous functions of complex variable-quantities,  $\xi + i \cdot \sigma$  and  $\xi - i \cdot \sigma$ , respectively. Conversely, every activation-inhibition network of nerve-cells which is observed may be placed in quantitative correspondence with choices people make. These results all follow trivially from well-know theorems about generalized functions, hyper-functions, which generate distributions, and micro-functions, which describe properties of singular points of distributions:

1. every dispersed set output by any mapping  $F$ , including any set which is not any kind of function, say, because its lacks *consistent* segmented “motion”  $(\zeta(\tau), \eta(\tau)) \in F$  transitioning from every  $a \in A$  to  $b \in B$  in  $F: A \rightarrow B$ ,  $A, B \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$  (Menger 1954), e.g., dispersed set of ordered values  $\{V \in \mathbb{R}\}$  hierarchically ranked by real-number metric  $F$  determining distance between any  $V' \in V$  and  $V'' \in V$  is invariant to expansion  $\varepsilon F$ , to restriction  $F \rho$ , to change  $\varepsilon F \rho$  (Cuhel 1907; Bernardelli 1934; 1936; 1938; 1939; 1952), may be treated as *distribution* of elements in real space with no causal quantitative connection in real space, with underlying quantitative causal connection in complex space;

2. every distribution of single real input may be generated as limiting sum of two analytic functions, and differentiation or integration may be applied to such functions; Leibniz’s Law of Continuity is vindicated mathematically, no meta-mathematical assumptions being necessary;

3. every two different generating functions of most general kind,  $F'$  and  $F''$ , have addition defined for them, but multiplication of two different generating functions is not defined at all, and thus, neither product  $F' \cdot F''$  nor sum  $\log F' + \log F'' = \log (F' \cdot F'')$  is defined, so that phase-space with common degrees of freedom does not exist in most general cases, prohibiting inter-personal comparisons of values for lack of common space, again, no extra-mathematical assumptions being necessary (Sato 1958; Kashiwara, Kawai, & Sato 1973; Kashiwara 1980; Isao 1991).

What precisely are  $\xi + i \cdot \sigma$  and  $\xi - i \cdot \sigma$ , physically, in human central nervous system?

Instead of trying to physically interpret  $\xi + i \cdot \sigma$  and  $\xi - i \cdot \sigma$  directly, let us associate indicators to them and “encode”  $\xi + i \cdot \sigma$  and  $\xi - i \cdot \sigma$  onto such indicators, namely,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \alpha \dots + \dots \beta & E^* \xrightarrow{M} & V(\alpha, \beta) \xrightarrow{F(\psi^{-1}, \varphi^{-1})} (V, E) \\ \text{respectively, if } \phi \uparrow & \uparrow \psi & \text{and } \Downarrow & \xrightarrow{(\psi, \varphi) \uparrow} & \Downarrow \\ \xi + i \cdot \sigma & \xi - i \cdot \sigma & E^* \xrightarrow{M} & V(\xi + i \cdot \sigma, \xi - i \cdot \sigma) \xrightarrow{F} & (V, E) \end{array}$$

commutes (e.g., Rosen 1962; 1963; 1983; Bourbaki 1968). That is, if we may physically interpret  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , and  $\varphi^{-1}$  and  $\psi^{-1}$  are shown to exist and we may also interpret physically them, analysis may proceed.

Suppose we try something else, first:

1. for class of ordered bundles or  $N$ -tuples  $(X_{1,I}, \dots, X_{N,I})$  of different goods  $G_1, \dots, G_N$  which satisfy  $U(X_{1,I}, \dots, X_{N,I}, I \in \mathbb{R}) = 0$  for indexes or indifference-curves  $\Phi(X_{1,I}, \dots, X_{N,I}) = I$ , any person values bundles corresponding to  $I'$  less than bundles corresponding to  $I''$  if  $I' < I''$ , and if  $dX_{i,\theta} / d\tau = 0$ , then  $\Phi_{X_{i,I}}(X_{i^* < i, I, \theta}, \dots, X_{i, I}, \dots, X_{i^* > i, I, \theta}) = \frac{dI}{dX_{i,I}} > 0$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^N \Phi_{X_{i,I}} \cdot dX_{i,I} = 0$ ,  $i = \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $i^* = \{1, \dots, N\}$  (Pareto 1906a; 1909).

Surprising problems arise (well explained by original inventor of this method):

1. “Order of consumption (or path followed during consumption) of several economic goods in any bundle may be matter of indifference or may not be matter of indifference. In first case, one has some system of indices of marginal utility which depend on quantities consumed. In second case, one has some system of indices of marginal utility which depend on consumption-paths followed. If consumption-path is not matter of indifference, one assumes individual chooses that consumption-path which gives this individual maximum satisfaction. One individual, following some consumption path, starts at point  $(X_{1,I}, \dots, X_{N,I})$ , and moving from that point, they consume quantities  $(dX_{1,I}, \dots, dX_{N,I})$ . We assume most satisfactory consumption-path for individual, e.g., first they consume  $Y$ , second they consume  $X$ , and so on, or we shall assume, unless stated to contrary, that marginal utility does not dependent upon order of consumption. When total utility and marginal utility are not-dependent on order of consumption of goods, and are dependent only quantities of goods that are consumed, we can

determine marginal utility” (Pareto 1906b; abridged). “If pleasure arising from consumption of  $dX$  only depends on  $X$ , pleasure arising from consumption of  $dY$  only depends on  $Y$ , and so on, or if pleasure arising from consumption of  $dX_{1,I}, \dots, dX_{N,I}$  is different according to order of consumption of  $dX_{1,I}, \dots, dX_{N,I}$ , if we admit that we may experimentally determine order of consumption of  $dX_{1,I}, \dots, dX_{N,I}$ , then we can construct indifference-functions as indices of choices. When order of consumption influences choices, we must necessarily fix order of consumption before we can determine points of equilibrium. When order of consumption of  $X_{1,I}, \dots, X_{N,I}$  is fixed, there exists one function of  $X_{1,I}, \dots, X_{N,I}$  which serves as index of choices” (Pareto 1909; abridged).

What about when bundle is expanded to include every distinguishable equivalence-class  $\zeta \in E$ , or situations represented by combined stimulus  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \xi_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ? We may call this a choice-rich environment, and it is this which is our real world, without simplifying assumptions that introduce difference between predictions of model and behavior modeled.

We cannot assume that order of consumption of perhaps infinitely many different quantities of different goods, within single bundle of goods, does not affect pleasure achieved from consuming such bundle of goods, whereas with fewer numbers of different goods, such assumptions might yet hold. In choice-rich environment, bundles of goods are supposed to be hierarchically ranked, and yet value of bundles is not defined unless order of consumption is defined, but order of consumption, if it is not fixed ahead of time, is simultaneously determined, and change in it determines change in value of bundles equally as much as change in quantities under consideration, yet analysis of bundles of quantities leaves out analysis of order of consumption, and if both are considered, bundles no longer exclusively determine values, and we have dispersed set of hierarchically ranked real-numbers, which is not mathematically tractable in real space if it also supposed to be invariant under monotonic transformations. The larger the number of different elements in any bundle, the less likely assumption that order of consumption is fixed beforehand or simultaneous or not-relevant, and when that assumption disappears, so does our model, and new mathematical basis is required.

What analysis of such bundles struggles with, metric  $F$  overcomes. With metric  $F$ , are we able to ask, for very large number of  $\xi$ 's: supposing  $\zeta \in B$  is behavior, we ask, is there is

a rule which assigns a unique tangent vector  $d\zeta\tau/d\tau$  to each different perceived environment  $E$  which maximizes  $F(\xi)$ ? (Rosen 1980)

If and only if we answer such a question for choice-rich spaces, is any model capable of giving definite behavioral predictions in physical environment  $E^*$  in which we really live.

Human central nervous system is activation-inhibition network of nerve-cells where excitations evoke changes at synapses according to processes at level of dendrites which are superposed over inhibitory background of changing magnitude (Rashevsky 1933; 1934; Hebb 1949; Hayek 1952; Pribram 1986; 2003). Activity and excitation, of course, increases temperature of activation-inhibition network (Gerard & Serota 1938; Serota 1939). Also, volume diffusion transmission of free molecules causes bulk activation or inhibition, or bulk change in rate of activation or inhibition, at lower energy cost, wherever memory-related precision of activation-inhibition networks, is not required, e.g., readiness for motion, sensation of hunger, and so on (Bach-y-Rita 1993; 2005). Individual nerve-cells are spontaneously excited over time with regular frequency generated underlying wave-like processes in dendrites, or may be above and beyond excited or inhibited by environmental stimuli or connected nerve-cells (Rashevsky 1933; 1934; Gerard & Young 1937; Gerard & Libet 1939; 1941).

Central nervous system maps distinguishable equivalence-classes  $\zeta \in E$  onto elements  $\theta \in E^*$  of geometry of physical environment  $E^*$ . It may only code, experiments show, however, auditory, tactile, and visual excitations in response to stimuli distinguished by neuronal model  $M$ , as probability-distribution functions, which are fully described predicted by postulating a barrier beginning at certain height which fluctuates while being approached by random-walk motion as function of proper time  $\tau$  parameterized by a positive drift-coefficient; at that point, one nerve-cell emits signal to any other connected nerve-cell, so that individual time-intervals between excitations are stochastic, code no information, and instead, stimuli distinguishable by neuronal model are represented as distinguishable statistical information about time-intervals, namely, probability-distribution functions with different combinations of barrier and drift-coefficient which generate such time-intervals: “neuron is thus processor of stochastic dendritic events which displays its computed output as statistics of sequence of inter-spike intervals” (Berger et al 1990; Berger & Pribram 1992; 1993; King, Pribram, & Xie 1994).

“Attention” or selective perception of simultaneously present stimuli of different kinds, and “anticipation,” or speculative responsiveness to expected stimuli has been known to exist, but anatomical apparatus involved in such processes occurred was not known (Condillac 1754a; 1754b). Actually, in mammals: afferent nervous fibers in optic nerve transmit excitations from retina to visual cortex in the brain, but efferent fibers optic nerve transmit excitations from central nervous system to retina, changing excitation pattern response to environmental stimuli in the retina as function of neuronal model  $M$ ; for instance, visual stimuli which have already ceased to exist, but earlier were significant cause of excitations, evoke responses in the retina, and auditory and tactile stimuli, which modify neuronal model, then modify excitation patterns in the retina whose cause is visual stimuli (Pribram, Spinelli, & Weingarten 1965; Spinelli & Weingarten 1966a; 1966b). Stimuli which are present may be ignored, and evoke no excitations beyond periphery nerve-cells. Stimuli which are absent may be perceived, and evoke many excitations beyond periphery nerve-cells. As neuronal model  $M$  changes, which stimuli evoke sensations changes; whether or not two different stimuli evoke sensation of single stimuli or two distinguishable stimuli depends on state of neuronal model  $M$  (Hayek 1952; Sokolov 1960).

We see, then:

1. that  $\alpha$  must be height of barrier that must be reached by random-walk model before nerve-cells pass excitation threshold and fire, while  $\beta$  must be drift-coefficient in random walk model; these experimentally measurable variable-quantities and only these are found to fully describe representation of stimuli in any way, and responses to stimuli; there are no other alternatives which have not been excluded;

2. that  $\phi, \psi, \phi^{-1}, \psi^{-1} \in M$ ; in humans,  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are probably determined by activation-inhibition network in temporal cortex, which categorizes more stochastic processes underlying imaging (Pribram 1991), but  $\phi^{-1}$  and  $\psi^{-1}$  are likely determined by activation-inhibition network in frontal cortex, because lesions there much significantly than lesions in posterior cortex impair ability to notice and use visual cues or to associate emotions, such as humor, with sensations of stimuli in order to then use those associations to recall sensations (Pribram & Prigatano 1981).

3. that our perceived environment space  $E$  has statistical metric  $\Delta$  (Menger 1942), because we do not ever have complete or perfect knowledge of  $E^*$ , because  $E^*$  has fundamental physical uncertainty, and because of dispersed and statistical nature of information as it exists within channels in central nervous system of humans and other mammals.

So, central nervous system being such network of nerve-cells, “pleasure is not activity of particular structures in nervous system, nor is it particular kind of pattern of cerebral organization; pleasure is growth or development of cerebral organization” (Hebb 1949). “Satiety” or “emotion,” which determines when behavior “stops” is mostly determined in forebrain, in amygdala; “motivation,” which determines when behavior “begins,” when to “go,” or when to “continue going” is mostly determined in basal ganglia (Hebb 1949; Pribram 2003). In other words, cerebral cortex determines actions, because it determines memory (and thus, perception, pleasure, pain), but it neither initiates behavior, which is done in basal ganglia, nor interrupts behavior and so that other actions may begin, which is done in amygdala.

We see that rankings of equivalence classes which are mapped by central nervous system to its perceived environment are topological, i.e., there is quantitative measure of “nearness” or “distance” between elements in space. Sensation of stimulus diminishes if stimulus is repeated, because “memory” or neuronal model  $M$  of anticipated stimuli, environment, and self is constructed over time by experience through connections and positions of nerve-cells in cerebral cortex, and maps particular sensations to particular stimuli, what parts of environment are perceived and how they are perceived, but widespread lesions to cerebral cortex do not destroy any part of neuronal model already formed; “memory” does not change after lesions, but lesion significantly decrease rate of “learning,” i.e., rate at which neuronal model  $M$  changes (Lashley 1929; Sokolov 1958; 1960; Pribram 1966). When lesions occur, functions of destroyed parts of cerebral cortex, periphery nerves, and visual cortex, unless quantitative damage is very extensive, are moved to another part of brain and gradually return, e.g., “we see with brain, not with eyes” (Lashley 1929; 1948; Frank & Lashley 1934; Hayek 1952; Bach-y-Rita 1967; Bach-y-Rita & Collins 1970; Bach-y-Rita, Tyler, & Kaczmarek 2003).

Thus, “nearness” and “distance” quantitatively determine structure of central nervous system, structure of neuronal model, and products of metabolic and repair processes occurring in central nervous system, but pleasure or pain evoked by any stimulus are totally invariant to quantitative structure and changes in quantitative structure; gross destruction and change in quantitative structure experimentally produce no change in memory, so that pleasure or pain evoked by any environmental stimulus is determined only by change or growth of connections which determine relative position of elements in space, but not upon quantitative differences in relative position of elements in space (Lashley 1929; Hebb 1949; Hayek 1952). Metric  $F$  is

required to indicate “nearness” and “distance” between equivalences-classes of distinguishable things in perceived environment (Rosen 1976; 1977) while satisfying above constraints. This results in hierarchical and ordinal nature of preferences concerning all different permutations of distinguishable stimuli (Cuhel 1907).

Cost, then, is “regret of forgone opportunity,” namely, next greatest preference in immediate future which could have alternatively been satisfied by action and behavior, and must be forgone in immediate future if greatest preference, and present action and behavior is carried out instead of it (Condillac 1754a; 1754b).

Supposedly, activation-inhibition networks also sometimes generate “heterarchies” of values,  $F(\xi') > F(\xi'') > F(\xi''') > F(\xi')$ , or such-and-such entity prefers state  $\xi'$  of perceived environment  $E$  instead of state  $\xi'' \in E$ , prefers  $\xi'' \in E$  instead  $\xi''' \in E$ , but prefers  $\xi''' \in E$  instead of  $\xi' \in E$ , e.g., mouse prefers food over sex, sex over avoidance of electric shock, and avoidance of electric shock over food (McCulluch 1945a; 1945b; 1956). Actually, “coarse” measurement which records physically and perceptually distinguishable changes in quantities of things or different stimuli which evoke distinguishable responses as if they were identical changes in quantities of things or identical stimuli, makes “heterarchies” of values appear to exist. Any “coarse” topology  $F(\xi') > F(\xi'') > F(\xi''') > F(\xi')$ , and hypothetical activation-inhibition network which generates it, through “refinement” of measurement, is revealed to be “finer” topology  $F(v'\xi' = \xi') > F(v'\xi'' = \xi'') > F(v'\xi''' = \xi''') > F(v''\xi' = \xi''')$ , and corresponding activation-inhibition network (e.g., Rosen 1976; 1977). So, this is why David Hume warned that any subjects of inquiry must be quantified: bread is never preferred to water, and water is never preferred to bread; concrete changes in quantities of bread are preferred to concrete changes in quantities of water, but other changes in quantities of water are preferred to other changes in quantities of bread, which is old news (North 1690; Condillac 1776; Lloyd 1834; Gossen 1854; Jevons 1871; Menger 1871).

We may accurately say, pleasure is “network of neurons is becoming more and more organized,” pain is “disruption” of such increasing organization, and emotion is “disruption” of behavior, either to prolong or preserve pleasant stimulus or to avoid or remove painful stimulus (Hebb 1949). We may say neither more nor less.




There is one related model of preferences which is contradicted by such considerations: if actions  $A, B, C, D \in S$  are possible, and over time, any person chooses  $A$  with probability  $P(A, B)$ , but chooses  $B$  with probability  $P(B, A) = 1 - P(A, B)$ , so that  $P(A, B) > 1/2$  means  $A$  is preferred to  $B$ , leading to function  $U$  over space  $S$  where  $[P(A, B) > P(C, D)] = [U(A) - U(B) > U(C) - U(D)]$  (Debreu 1958). Probability is frequency, or infinite wave-train; or, at least, precisely identical choices must be repeated many times for function  $P$  to be defined (Gabor 1946). What contradicts any possibility of function  $P$  and corresponding function  $U$ , in such sense, is that activation-inhibition network is continuously being modified at synapses at level of dendrites after every action and sensation, and inhibitory background, treated as field, is also changing after each and every action and sensation; every situation where choices must be made is unique, and pleasure is “growth” of neural network, which is precisely how learning occurs (Hebb 1949; Pribram 1991). Principle of computational equivalence means we *cannot* simulate *a priori* repetition of events in  $E^*$  and  $E$ , which actually happen uniquely insofar as  $M$  is concerned, to obtain  $P$  and  $U$ , because complex systems cannot have their future output computed in shorter way than trajectory in their underlying dynamics required to obtain such output; “no shortcut is possible” (Hayek 1952; Rosen 1962; Wolfram 1985; Wolfram 2002).

“Complexity” is measured by number  $N$  of alternative models of any system existing which are not isomorphic, all being required to explain behavior or different ways we may interact with that system, and it is very likely to have bifurcations in behavior, much as we see people making radical changes of course (Rosen 1979). For instance, we may measure complexity by  $\log_2 N$ , so that “simple” systems have  $\log_2 1 = 0$ , while  $\log_2 N > 0$  if systems are “complex.” Metric  $F$  lends itself well to describing complex systems, because it may generate sets not at all consistently related in real space but related in complex space.

*We have said something about  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . What about how define  $F_+\phi^{-1}$  and  $F_-\psi^{-1}$ ?* They are closely related. Through determining how people actually rank different ordered pairs  $(\alpha, \beta)$ , we may gather data about form of  $F_+\phi^{-1}$  and  $F_-\psi^{-1}$ . We need not worry, because any data we collect can have  $F_+\phi^{-1}$  and  $F_-\psi^{-1}$  fit to describe such data; every distribution may be described in such way. Interestingly enough, we can do visualize this, at very gross level even:

whole hierarchies of values of infinitely many different stimuli are distinguished by assigning to different ordered pairs  $(\alpha, \beta)$  different diagrams with merely two degrees of freedom:



In what hierarchical order do people prefer stimuli? We see which situations are preferred, and classify them under each of appropriate diagrams. We narrow down our options greatly by experimentally determining what hierarchically-ranked order such diagrams, situations mapped to each of such classes, may be arranged in. By associating different partitions

$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\kappa_1} \xi_i, \bigcup_{i=\kappa_1}^{\kappa_2} \xi_i, \bigcup_{i=\kappa_2}^{\kappa_3} \xi_i, \dots$ , to different diagrams, respectively, and seeing how diagrams their

generating observable-pairs are ranked, we have already learned something about how individual people rank classes of stimuli. By knowing that orienting reflex decreases when stimuli are repeated, which is one reason for decreasing marginal utility rule, we may further narrow down classifications. This is one external observational route which seems open.

Simultaneously, we need to narrow down  $M$ , as it exists in the mind. It exists in form of probability-distribution functions (Menger 1942; Berger & Pribram 1993). Our brain does not rank probabilities of outcomes, because situations are unique, but rather definite outcomes are manipulated in brain as probability distribution of intervals between excitations, in wave-like way. Overall metric of excitations however is responsible for computations, and when it changes, we would infer  $F$  changes to compensate.

We may review statistical metrics and paths through them as preliminary considerations.

If different elements or “slip”  $A = \boxed{Abcd}$ ,  $B = \boxed{aBcd}$ ,  $C = \boxed{abCd}$ ,  $D = \boxed{abcD}$ ,  $X = XX$ ,  $XY = YX$ ,  $Xx = o$  (e.g., Jevons 1870; Yule 1912) are elements of physical space  $E^*$ , namely, points of excitation in cerebral cortex, and have had labels mapped to them, then  $I(A, B) = I(B, A)$  is probability that excitation  $A$  is not-distinguishable from  $B$  in its ability to change  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$ , so that,  $I(A, A) = 1$ ,  $I(A, B) \cdot I(B, C) < I(A, C)$ ;

if we wish to perceive “nearness” and “distance,” in terms of effect upon  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$ , then  $-\log I(A, B) = \Delta(A, B) = \Delta(B, A)$ , so that  $\Delta(A, A) = 0$ ,  $\infty > \Delta(A, B) > 0$ ,  $\Delta(A, B) + \Delta(B, C) \geq \Delta(A, C)$ ;

then again, we may also construct probabilistic ratios of measurable variable-quantities, e.g.,  $I((A, B), C)$ ,  $I((A, B), (C, D))$ ,  $I(((...), ...), ...)$ ,  $\Delta((A, B), C)$ ,  $\Delta((A, B), (C, D))$ ,  $\Delta(((...), ...), ...)$ , and so on, or if our knowledge of relations between elements of metric spaces  $S'$  and  $S''$  (which are sets of elements between which “nearness” and “distance” is actually defined) is not perfect, we may nevertheless determine whether metric spaces  $S'$  and  $S''$  are identical or different by measuring frequencies; they are distinguishable if, for any ordered pair  $(\alpha, \beta)$  of elements  $\alpha \in A$ ,  $\beta \in B$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in S', S''$ , cumulative distribution function  $\Delta_{AB}'$  (which generates  $S'$ ) and cumulative distribution function  $\Delta_{AB}''$  (which generates  $S''$ ) are distinguishable;

$\Delta(X; A, B)$  is probability that distance from element  $A$  to element  $B$  is  $< X$ , so that  $\Delta(X; A, A) = 1$ ,  $X > 0$  (distance between any element and any identical or not-distinguishable element, such as itself, is 0, which is less than any given positive distance  $X$  whatever);

$\Delta(X; A, B) = 0$ ,  $X \leq 0$ , distance between any given element and any different or distinguishable element is neither negative, nor 0 (which is distance between any given element

and any identical or not-distinguishable element, which is itself);  $\Delta(X; A, B) = \Delta(X; B, A)$ , so that distance from  $A$  to  $B$  and distance from  $B$  to  $A$  are identical (Menger 1942; Menger 1951a; Menger 1951b).

If a person behaves differently after environment  $Xy$  is substituted for environment  $xY$ , they prefer  $Xy$  to  $xY$  or they prefer  $xY$  to  $Xy$ , written  $[V(Xy) > V(xY)] \vee [V(Xy) < V(xY)]$ ; if a person behaves identically after environment  $Xy$  is substituted for environment  $xY$ , they do not distinguish environment  $Xy$  from environment  $xY$ , written  $V(Xy) = V(xY)$ . If space of physical environments is  $E^*$ , and space of perceived environments is  $E$ , then: composition  $E = ME^*$  is restriction of  $E^*$  to  $E$  by injection  $E^*$  into neuronal model  $M$ ; composition  $B = ME$  is restriction of  $E$  to space of behaviors by injection  $E$ , again, into  $M$ .

Supposing  $\Delta(X; A, B)$  describes distances in geometry of  $2^N$  such elements all stochastically scattered according to another probability-density function, neuronal model  $M$  is, at one level, physical dynamics realizing edge-function  $G_R$ , according to which, elements whose “distance”  $X$  from each other is  $X < R$  are connected and excite each other (Penrose 2003). Composition  $G_R \Delta(X; A, B)$  must tell us how to specify  $F$  according to internal observation route, which describes channels and connections realizing  $M$ .

### **Conclusion.**

Mathematical basis which applies to choice-rich situations of infinitely many different stimuli, where pleasure is state of mind and so we do not arbitrarily classify preferences as selfish or not selfish, but merely as changes of state of mind as responses to different hierarchically ordered stimuli, where all existing true propositions of economics follow from mathematical basis itself without additional assumptions, is thus presented. Models of decision-making derived from this new mathematical basis are not only consistent with results of all experiments in physiology so far, but also quantitatively relate experimentally obtained physiological observables with predictions of economic models so constructed: variable-quantities in such models precisely correspond to observables which determine statistical properties of central nervous system.

If we eat our food standing up, and then sit down, or if we sit down first and then eat our food; are these not different stimuli which give us different pleasure, and to which we react differently? If we must sometimes do one, and sometimes do other, our model must describe both situations differently.

We wish to model decision-making in our world as it exists, to relax assumptions which prevent our model of decision-making from applying to actual decision-making in our world; we cannot assume, therefore, for instance, that order of consumption of different things is fixed before decisions to consume bundles of very many different quantities of things are made or contents of bundles are determined. We must be able to fill out our model by measuring physiological observables; if we do not incorporate physiological observables into our model, many routes of investigation of human decision-making are not available, and we cannot smoothly pass from model of how brain is working to model of decision-making.

If, however, physiological observables fit fundamentally into our model of decision-making, new experimental, mathematical, statistical are found to become available, and new graphical methods for quick manipulation of large amounts of observational data become possible.

- Bach-y-Rita, Paul. September 1967.** Sensory plasticity & Vision Substitution System. *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica* 43(4):417-426.
- Bach-y-Rita & Collins, Carter. 1970.** Sensory Substitution & Limb Prosthesis. *Advances in External Control of Human Extremities*. Belgrade: Yugoslav Committee for Electronics & Automation.
- Bach-y-Rita, Paul. October 1993.** Nonsynaptic Diffusion Neurotransmission in Brain. *Neurochemistry International* 23(4):297-318.
- Bach-y-Rita, Paul, Tyler, Mitchell, & Kaczmarek, Kurt. Summer 2003.** Seeing With Brain. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 15(2):285-295.
- Bach-y-Rita, Paul. June 2005.** Emerging Concepts of Brain Function. *Journal of Integrative Neuroscience* 4(2):183-205.
- Berger, D., Bridges, C., Pribram, K., & Wild, H. April 1990.** Neural Spike-Train Distributions & Determinants of Response of Visual Cortex Neurons to Changes in Orientation & Spatial Frequency. *Experimental Brain Research* 80(1):129-134.
- Berger, Dale & Pribram, Karl. June 1992.** Gabor Function & Stochastic Model of Inter-Spike Interval Distribution in Responses of Visual Cortex Neurons. *Biological Cybernetics* 67(2):191-194.
- Berger, Dale & Pribram, Karl. 1993.** Stochastic Resonance. *Rethinking Neural Networks: Quantum Fields & Biological Data*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Bernardelli, Harro. October 1934.** Notes on Determinateness of Utility Function. *Review of Economic Studies* 2(1):69-75.
- Bernardelli, Harro. November 1936.** What Has Philosophy to Contribute to Social Sciences & to Economics? *Economica* 3(4):443-454.
- Bernardelli, Harro. May 1938.** End of Marginal Utility Theory? *Economica* 5(2):192-212.
- Bernardelli, Harro. February 1939.** Reply. *Economica* 6(1):88-89.

- Bernardelli, Harro. August 1952.** Rehabilitation of Theory of Marginal Utility. *Economica* 19(3):254-268.
- Bourbaki, Nikolas. 1968.** *Elements of Mathematics, Theory of Sets*. Paris: Hermann.
- Condillac, Ettiennne Bonnot de. 1754a.** *Traite des Sensations. Volume 1*. Paris: L'aine.
- Condillac, Ettiennne Bonnot de. 1754a.** *Traite des Sensations. Volume 2*. Paris: L'aine.
- Condillac, Ettiennne Bonnot de. 1776.** *Commerce & Gouvernement*. Paris: Cellot & Jombert.
- Cuhel, Franz. 1907.** *Zur Lehre von den Bedurfnissen*. Innsbruck: Wagner.
- Debreu, Gerard. July 1958.** Cardinal Utility. *Econometrica* 26(3):440-444.
- Dirac, Paul. January 1927.** Physical Interpretation of Quantum Dynamics. *Proceedings of Royal Society of London, Mathematical & Physical Sciences* 113(1):621-641.
- Dirac, Paul. 1978.** *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Theory*. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Theory*. New York: Academic.
- Frank, Margaret & Lashley, Karl. June 1934.** Mechanism of Vision, Part 10. *Journal of Comparative Neurology* 17(3):355-391.
- Gabor, Dennis. November 1946.** Theory of Communication. *Journal of Institution of Electrical Engineers* 93(26):429-441.
- Gerard, Ralph & Young, John. May 1937.** Electrical Activity of Central Nervous System of Frog. *Proceedings of Royal Society of London, Biological Sciences* 122(1):343-352.
- Gerard, Ralph & Serota, Herman. March 1938.** Localized Thermal Changes in Cat's Brain. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 1(2):115-124.
- Gerard, Ralph & Libet, Benjamin. March 1939.** Control of Potential Rhythm of Isolated Frog Brain. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 2(2):153-169.
- Gerard, Ralph & Libet, Benjamin. September 1941.** Steady Potential Fields & Neuron Activity. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 4(6):438-455.
- Gossen, Hermann. 1854.** *Entwicklung der Gesetze des Menschlichen Verkehrs*. Braunschweig: Vieweg.
- Hayek, Friedrich von. 1952.** *Sensory Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Hebb, Donald. 1949.** *Organization of Behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Imai, Isao. 1991.** *Applied Hyperfunction Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Jevons, William Stanley. January 1870.** General System of Numerically Definite Reasoning. *Memoirs of Literary & Philosophical Society of Manchester* 3(4):330-352.
- Jevons, Stanley. 1871.** *Theory of Political Economy*. London: Macmillan.
- Kashiwara, Masaki, Kawai, Takahiro, & Sato, Mikio. 1973.** *Microfunctions & Pseudo-Differential Equations. Hyperfunctions & Pseudo-Differential Equations*. Berlin: Springer.
- Kashiwara, Masaki. 1980.** *Micro-Local Analysis. Proceedings of International Congress of Mathematicians, 1978*. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- King, Joseph, Pribram, Karl, & Xie, Min. 1994.** Are Neural Spike Trains Deterministically Chaotic or Stochastic Processes? *Origins: Brain & Self-Organization*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Lashley, Karl. 1929.** *Brain Mechanisms, Intelligence, & Injuries to Brain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lashley, Karl. April 1948.** Mechanism of Vision, Part 18. *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 37(2):107-166.
- Lloyd, William. 1834.** *Lecture on Notion of Value*. London: Roake & Varty.
- Menger, Karl. 1871.** *Grundsätze der Volkswirtschaftslehre*. Vienna: Braumüller.
- Menger, Karl. December 1942.** Statistical Metrics. *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of United States of America* 28(12):535-537.
- Menger, Karl. March 1951a.** Probabilistic Theories of Relations. *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of United States of America* 37(3):178-180.
- Menger, Karl. April 1951b.** Probabilistic Geometry. *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of United States of America* 37(4):226-229.
- Menger, Karl. September 1954.** Analytic Functions & General Multifunctions. *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of United States of America* 40(9):819-821.
- McCulloch, Warren. June 1945a.** Heterarchy of Values & Topology of Nervous-Nets. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics* 7(2):89-93.
- McCulloch, Warren. December 1945b.** Letter on Heterarchy of Values & Topology of Nervous-Nets. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics* 7(4):227.
- McCulloch, Warren. September 1956.** Ethical Robots, or Mind-Like Behavior of Artifacts. *Acta Biotheoretica* 11(3):147-156.
- North, Dudley. 1691.** *Discourses Upon Trade*. London: Basset.

- Penrose, Mathew. 2003.** *Random Geometric Graphs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pribram, Karl. 1966.** Some Dimensions of Remembering & Steps Toward Neuropsychological Model of Memory. *Macromolecules & Behavior*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Pribram, Karl, Spinelli, Niko, & Weingarten, Morey. July 1966.** Centrifugal Optic Nerve Responses Evoked By Auditory & Somatic Stimulation. *Experimental Neurology* 12(3):303-319.
- Pribram, Karl & Prigatano, George. December 1981.** Humor & Memory Following Frontal Versus Posterior Brain Lesions. *Perceptual & Motor Skills* 53(3):999-1006.
- Pribram, Karl. April 1986.** Convolution & Matrix Systems As Content-Addressable Distributed Brain Processes in Perception & Memory. *Journal of Neuro-Linguistics* 2(2):349-364.
- Pribram, Karl. 1991.** *Brain & Perception*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Pribram, Karl. May 2003.** Forebrain Psycho-Physiology of Interest & Involvement. *International Journal of Psychophysiology* 48(2):115-131.
- Rashevsky, Nikolas. October 1933.** Excitation & Inhibition. *Protoplasma* 20(1):42-56.
- Rashevsky, Nikolas. October 1934.** Gestalt-Problem. *Philosophy of Science* 1(4):409-419.
- Rosen, Robert. December 1962.** Church's Thesis & Its Relation to Concept of Realizability in Biology & Physics. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics* 24(4):375-393.
- Rosen, Robert. April 1963.** Relational Biology. *Transactions on Military Electronics* 7(2):160-162.
- Rosen, Robert. November 1976.** Structural Stability & Information. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 61(1):19-31.
- Rosen, Robert. March 1977.** Empirical Method for Identifying Observables Involved in Dynamical Interactions. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 39(2):239-244.
- Rosen, Robert. February 1979.** Bifurcations & Biological Observables. *Annals of New York Academy of Sciences* 316(1):178-187.
- Rosen, Robert. November 1980.** Optimal Control. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 42(6):889-897.
- Rosen, Robert. May 1983.** Similarity Principles in Data Extrapolation. *American Journal of Physiology: Regulatory, Integrative, & Comparative Physiology* 244(5):591-599.
- Sato, Mikio. March 1958.** Generalization of Concept of Functions, Part 1. Proceedings of Japan Academy 34(3):126-130.
- Serota, Herman. January 1939.** Temperature Changes in Cortex & Hypothalamus During Sleep. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 2(1):42-47.
- Sokolov, Yevgeniy. 1958.** *Perception & Conditioned Reflex* (in Russian). Moscow: Moscow Government University Press.
- Sokolov, Yevgeniy. 1960.** Neuronal Model & Orienting Reflex. *Central Nervous System & Behavior*. New York: Macy.
- Spinelli, Niko & Weingarten, Morey. July 1966a.** Afferent & Efferent Activity in Single Units of Cat's Optic Nerve. *Experimental Neurology* 15(3):347-362.
- Spinelli, Niko & Weingarten, Morey. July 1966b.** Retinal Receptive Field Change Produced By Auditory & Somatic Stimulation. *Experimental Neurology* 15(3):363-376.
- Wolfram, Stephen. February 1985.** Undecidability & Intractability in Theoretical Physics. *Physical Review Letters* 54(6):735-738.
- Wolfram, Stephen. 2002.** *New Kind of Science*. Champaign: Wolfram.
- Yule, Udney. May 1912.** Methods of Measuring Association Between Two Attributes. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society* 75(6):579-642.