

# Formulation of downward causation in the brain: whole beats its parts

Yoshiyuki Ohmura and Yasuo Kuniyoshi

July 4, 2024

## Abstract

Downward causation is self-causation: the causal effect from the whole at the macro level to its parts at the micro level, and is regarded as a solution to the mind–brain problem. However, no actual example of downward causation has not been proposed. Here, we argue that a feedback control of micro-level neural mechanisms using macro-level algebraic structure information between neural network modules that is physically composed of neurons is a model of downward causation in the brain. We speculate that downward causation causes mathematical structure in our perceptual experience by controlling algebraic structure in the brain.

**Keywords**— mind–brain problem, downward causation, beyond reductionism, algebraic structure control

## 1 Introduction

The mental causation problem in the mind–body problem asks how the mind can affect the body or brain. Mental causation is required for all mental phenomena, including conscious experience, and free will, to avoid epiphenomenalism (Baumeister et al. (2011), Baumeister et al. (2018)). But the concept of mental causation suffers from a trilemma between the following three arguments. We do not define the mind metaphysically, but the trilemma is described as independent of the definition of the mind. A1: In physics, the causal object (the cause) and the affected object (the effect) are different physical entities, and two different objects occupy different spaces. A2: The mind has a causal effect on the body or the brain. A3: The mind is not an entity that does not share the space with the brain, because we have no evidence for the physical mind. Descartes argued that the nature of the mind (i.e., a thinking, non-extended thing ) is completely different from the nature of the body (i.e., an extended, non-thinking thing), where the extended thing occupies the space. But Princess Elisabeth pointed out that causality requires something to push and something to be pushed, and that the non-extended thing cannot affect the body. Our three arguments describe the Descartes’ mind–body problem more generally. A1 corresponds to Elisabeth’s point. And A3 corresponds to Descartes’ point. At present, many philosophers and scientists do not support substance dualism, but they do support A3. If we accept A3, then we must reject A1 in order to accept mental causation. To reject A1, we need to clarify the mechanism of self-causation, where we define self-causation as the causation in which the cause and the effect share the same physical entity. When the boundary of the physical system is clearly defined, the concept of self-causation has the same meaning as “intrinsic” cause, because intrinsic cause can affect the outside of the system by changing the system itself. For example, intrinsic rewards (i.e., the organism’s own reason (Cleeremans and Tallon-Baudry (2022))) can affect the environment after a change in behavior. In contrast, a non-living physical system cannot move without an external cause. Therefore, we can believe that mental causation is one of the defining features of mental phenomena, including conscious experience (Cleeremans and Tallon-Baudry (2022)). Regardless of the importance, no theoretical formulation of self-causation has not been proposed. Downward causation or configurational force is believed to be one of the solutions to clarify the unknown mechanism of self-causation.

A configurational force is a novel force of a certain type of aggregate not generated by any pair of elementary particles (McLaughlin (1992)). British emergentism contended that the whole could have emergent properties possessed by none of their parts. Subsequently, Sperry (1964) argued that electrical, atomic, molecular, and cellular forces and laws are superseded by the configurational forces of higher macro-level mechanisms, including perception, cognition, reason, and judgment in the brain. These configurational forces are intrinsic forces that can only be exerted by certain types of particle configurations (McLaughlin (1992)) or by the overall configurational properties of the group of molecules (Sperry (1964)).

As mentioned by Sperry (1987), mind–brain concepts were revised in the 1970s, when the preferred model shifted from behaviorism to mentalism. Mentalism posits that subjective mental and cognitive phenomena play

a causal or interactional role in the brain (Sperry (1987)). Sperry (1987) believed that the interaction between mind and brain required a new macro-determinist view which included configurational forces as opposed to reductionist micro-determinism.

The brain is composed of a vast number of neurons, yet the experience of consciousness is integrated (Tononi and Edelman (1998)). If we assume that the body is an interconnected causal network of micro-components, the boundaries of the causal network are not clear because the world outside the body is also connected to the causal network. This problem of boundary determination is called the problem of many (Simon (2017)). Furthermore, if the causal network contains many circular causal paths, we cannot determine the unified "self" without clear physical structure. Importantly, biological systems are highly structured and have clear boundaries. To define self-causation, we assume a modular structure in the biological system at the physical level. Modular structures are common in the hierarchical structure of the organism. Since the whole organ and its component parts share the same physical entity in the modular structure, the causal effect from the more integrated whole to its parts is a plausible explanation for self-causation.

Downward causation is the causation from the whole at the macro level to its parts at the micro level, by configurational forces, in biological organization (Sperry (1991)). Traditional micro-determinism reduces all biological phenomena to physics and chemistry, and this reductionism assumes that all macro-level facts and laws can be deduced from micro-level laws and the initial conditions. From the reductionist view, downward causation is not possible, because the whole system is completely determined at the micro level. Reductionists assume that conscious experience lacks causal power and is epiphenomenal. In contrast to the traditional view, downward causation accepts that the whole system, which is physically composed of parts, has primordial causal power over its parts. As Sperry (1991) suggests, "*any action of the mind upon the brain is merely an instance of downward causation*".

McLaughlin (1992) argued that downward causation from either the biological or chemical level, as claimed by British emergentists, is incorrect. Chalmers (2006) considered that downward causation was theoretically reasonable but that no examples of downward causation are known in the actual world. More recently, Hoel et al. (2013) proposed a quantification method of macro to micro causation effectiveness, but their example system has no hierarchical organization and proper causation from the macro to the micro does not exist, which is different from the actual downward causation. Rosas et al. (2020) provides a new interpretation of downward causation, but it is causation from the macro to the micro, not that from the whole to its parts, which is also different from self-causation.

In downward causation, the whole must have causal power over its parts to explain self-causation. If the cause at the macro is outside a group of micro-elements that are affected by the macro, and there is no downward causation from the macro to its component parts, then causation from the macro to the external micro requires uncanny remote causal effects, because the causal path from the macro, its parts, to the external micro cannot work. In order to eliminate such uncanny remote interactions between the macro and the external micro, downward causation must be defined in the whole-parts relations.

This article provides a novel and simple formulation of downward causation in the brain. A defining characteristics of downward causation is that the whole structure has causal power over its parts to make an example of a self-causation mechanism. To our knowledge, downward causation has been considered as a puzzling phenomenon because the generation of new causal forces that cannot be explained by the lower micro-level law of interaction is unclear in principle (Kim (2006)). The hard problem in downward causation is "does the brain have causal power over its neurons" or "do I have causal power over my brain or my body".

According to Sperry (1992), downward causation is "*causal control by irreducible emergent macro properties over their component parts*". Sperry (1992) assumed that the emergent macro properties were both conscious and unconscious subjective mental features or events such as cognition, reason, and judgment, not the summary information of the microstates. The summary information can be computed from all the microstates, but such information loses detailed structural information and cannot be used to explain mental phenomena. New information that is irreducible to micro-information must be useful for cognitive functions such as representation and decision. In this article, we assume that the macro is a functional module for the cognitive process, not the summary information of the microstates, and the emergent properties are not addressed.

The conventional "macro beats micro" model (Hoel et al. (2013); Rosas et al. (2020)) assumes that the micro mechanism is fixed, with an unchanging transition matrix from state to state, so the macro-level information cannot cause the change in the micro mechanism by any proper causality measure. But we assume that neurons are systems (not physical states) that can control their synapses through feedback control. And we propose that the macro-level information, which cannot be described at the micro level alone, can cause the change in the micro mechanism itself through feedback control at the micro level. Therefore, the transition from state to state is not fixed. Importantly, our formulation of downward causation is not related to self-organization and emergence in dynamical systems or non-linear complex systems (Gershenson et al. (2020)), as was the original concept of downward causation (Sperry (1964)). The original concept of downward causation was constructed by Sperry (1964), inspired by the classical British emergentists, before emergence and self-organization were linked. In non-linear complex systems, the state-to-state transition under the fixed micro mechanism is often the focus, but we address the developmental changes in the micro mechanisms under

the interaction with macro-level information.

The goal of typical feedback control is to converge a signal derived from measurement of the system output to a reference signal (equal to the desired output). The feedback error is the difference between the reference and the actual output signal. The reference is often provided from outside the system, so the typical feedback error is not intrinsic information. In downward causation, the feedback error must be intrinsic information at the macro level. Therefore, the generation mechanism of macro-level intrinsic information in the brain needs to be clarified.

In this article, we propose that feedback control from the macro-level intrinsic information to the micro mechanisms, when the macro structure is physically composed of its micro mechanisms, is true downward causation. Additionally we propose a generation mechanism of the macro-information that is irreducible to the micro-level mechanisms alone, but plausible in brain-like systems. Our contribution is to define the intrinsic information at the macro level and to propose a plausible mechanism of downward causation in the brain. Finally, we discuss the relationship between our downward causation model and the mathematically structured conscious experience.

## 2 Presuppositions

Our downward causation formulation is based on three assumptions: no causal closure of the microphysics, modular structure in the brain, and an algebraic structure composed of the neural network modules at the macro level.

**No causal closure of the microphysics** Reductionists argue that physical and chemical micro mechanisms are causally complete and support the causal closure of the micro-physics. This position is reductive physicalism. However, this view excludes causal power at the macro level because macro-level causality implies “overdetermination,” suggesting that the law of the mind at the higher level is an epiphenomenon; therefore, the macro structure cannot exert new causal power over the micro parts. This “causal exclusion” argument is often applied to argue against the possibility of mental causation beyond physical causation (Kim (2000)), but it can be applied to all cases of supervenience, including the hierarchy of sciences (Bontly (2002)) and the biological structural hierarchy to define downward causation. According to Bontly (2002), Kim’s position actually implies that only the properties of fundamental physical particles at the micro level are causally effective. To support downward causation, we must reject Kim’s argument. Our position is non-reductive physicalism, which means that there is no causal closure of the “micro” physics, and a system with downward causation can be governed by both the physical law and macro-level law.

Kim (2006) assumed that higher level properties (corresponding to the macro) must directly cause the lower base properties (corresponding to the micro), without micro-level help, in downward causation. However, we consider that the possibility that the micro base components actively control themselves to follow macro information, rather than being passively controlled or superseded by the macro. Feedback control is not found in molecules and is unique to the system. In systems such as animals and robots, information can be translated into force by an information–force transaction. A transaction from macro-level information to micro-level forces is a plausible mechanism for generating configurational forces. Here, we propose that the macro level information can be used for micro-level feedback control. This mechanism is an indirect causal path from the macro-level information to the micro-mechanism. Kim (2006) did not consider the possibility that micro-level systems would regulate their activity by observing macro-level information.

We assume that the macro level supervenes on the micro level: differences in information at the macro level always have corresponding differences in physical states at the micro level. This argument does not imply that “sameness” at the macro level is always explained by “sameness” at the micro physical states. In fact, the “same” information is often represented by the different physical states, which is captured by the term multiple realizability. The “sameness” of information is arbitrary, and need not be derived from micro-physical laws alone. If “sameness” is defined at the macro level that cannot be described at the micro level, it can indirectly influence the micro mechanism through feedback control to satisfy the sameness at the macro level. Importantly, the intrinsic information described at the macro level need not supervene on the micro level law, because supervenience is a constraint on the difference, not on sameness in whole–parts relations.

We hypothesize that the intrinsic information is a feedback error to regard different things as the same at the macro level. This means that the feedback error must be derived from an equation that defines “sameness” at the macro level. The cause of the same information is not determined by microphysical laws alone, leaving room for free determination at the macro level. The determination of the equation at the macro level to calculate the feedback error does not supervene on the micro level properties, even though the calculation of the feedback error can be fully implemented by the physical parts.

A system that is governed by both the macro-level law and the micro-physical law is natural, just as a computer designed by humans is governed by the computational law and the micro-physical law. The difference

between such cases and downward causation is that in downward causation the macro-level law is generated within the system at the macro level.

We assume feedback errors about the system itself, which can only be defined at the macro level, produce a configurational force through the information–force transaction. The fact that the cause of the information is inside the system, at the macro level, rather than outside the system, makes self-causation possible. As in the original integrated information theory (Tononi (2008)), we focus on the production of intrinsic information. We propose that the brain system can use mathematics to make "intrinsic" information at the macro level.

**Modular structure in the brain** von Bertalanffy (1969) distinguished two biological hierarchies: structure and function. An example of a biological structural hierarchy is the organization of the molecule, cell, tissue, organ, organism, population, and species. Meanwhile, a functional hierarchy is exemplified by the organization of the primary visual cortex, the secondary visual cortex, the association cortex, and the prefrontal cortex in the brain.

The biological structural hierarchy relates the whole to its parts. Since the whole is physically composed of its micro-level parts, no additional material is required. Such a structural hierarchy defines downward causation. How the higher level acquires new intrinsically generated configurational power is an open question, since this situation seems to be inconsistent with reductionism.

A functional hierarchy, on the other hand, assumes different physical systems or agents at both the higher and lower levels, so that causation from the higher to the lower level is not self-causation. Examples of the higher level system controlling the lower level system in the functional hierarchies are commonplace: a computer program in read-only memory controls a processor and memory outside the memory for the program, the central nervous system controls the peripheral nervous system, the motor cortex controls the muscle, and so on. To distinguish it from downward causation, causation from the higher to the lower levels in the functional hierarchy is here called top-down causation (Ellis (2012), Ellis (2019)). The development of top-down causation and the construction of a functional hierarchy through evolution and development (Polanyi (1966)) are important issues, but are not the focus of this article. The way to distinguish downward causation from top-down causation is to note whether the physical entity is shared by higher and lower levels in the hierarchy (e.g., motor cortex and muscle are different physical entities in the functional hierarchy). The difference between downward causation and top-down causation is similar to the difference between an inner voice and a typical interpersonal communication.

To formulate downward causation, we assume a structural hierarchy in the brain. The brain is physically composed of neurons and several types of glial cells. For simplicity, we will focus only on neurons. A higher level organization must be physically composed of neurons and their synapses without any additional material to share the physical entity between higher and lower levels in the hierarchy. Here, we assume the modular structure of the brain. Modular structures are most commonly found in the structural hierarchy of living organisms, and the modules at the macro level are composed of iterated units of micro mechanisms. In the brain, the modules are neural networks, which are physically composed of neurons and synapses. In this case, the macro level is composed of a group of neural network modules, and the micro level is composed of neurons and synapses within all the modules.

We argue that the macro-level relationships between neural network modules provide intrinsic information and that the macro information can be used for feedback control at the micro mechanisms. A plausible scenario is that interactions between columnar structures (Mountcastle (1997)), or memory engrams (Josselyn and Tonegawa (2020)), in the cerebral cortex generate new intrinsic information at the macro level, which is then fed back to the neurons that make up the column, or engrams, resulting in the regulation of synaptic weights. In this case, the whole (columnar structures, or memory engrams) beats its parts (neurons within modules).

### **Algebraic structure composed of the neural network modules at the macro level**

We assume that the brain has multiple neural network modules. Each neural network module is a mathematical function or map with plasticity. A relationship between the input and output of the neural network module can be regulated by the synaptic weights at the micro level. Note that neural network module "alone" cannot regulate the neurons and synapses that make up the module itself, because the difference in the neural network module at the macro level is determined by the difference in the neurons and synapses at the micro level. New information cannot be defined by any single module at the macro level because only the identity equation  $f = f$  can be defined by the function  $f$  alone. Therefore, we assume a macro-level equation between two formulas described by multiple neural network modules to see the formulas as the same. Then, multiple neural network modules can regulate the neurons and synapses that make up the modules themselves to satisfy the equation through feedback control.

An algebraic structure is defined by a set  $S$  with operation "." in mathematics. We assume that a set is composed of the neural network modules labeled by lowercase letters  $\{ f, g, h \dots \}$ . A binary operation combines any two elements  $f$  and  $g$  of  $S$  to form an element of  $S$ , denoted  $f \cdot g$ . We assume that a binary

operation  $\circ$  is a function composition between neural network modules.

An algebraic structure satisfies several requirements, known as axioms. The axioms are usually described in terms of equations. In mathematics, the axioms are used to define mathematical objects such as a "category" or a "group". To define such axioms, the function composition operation is required between the neural network modules. To satisfy this condition, the neural network modules must be transformations whose inputs and outputs are elements of a set such as vectors with the same dimension. We assume that an input and output for the neural networks are elements of a set and labeled by bold letters  $\{ \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \dots \}$ .

The axioms are defined by a set of neural network modules and the binary operations, and are satisfied among all inputs. This means that the axioms between neural network modules can only be defined at the macro level because the modules are defined at the macro structure. Therefore, the algebraic structure information cannot be defined at the micro neuron level. Furthermore, the algebraic structure information is intrinsic because the axioms can be described by the information of the system itself alone, since the axioms are satisfied independently of the inputs.

In this article, we argue that the brain system (the whole) can evaluate an algebraic structure of itself to regulate neural mechanisms of its parts.

### 3 A formulation of downward causation in the brain

In this section, we propose that algebraic structural information between neural network modules can be used for intrinsic macro-level information about the system itself. We assume that the neural network module is mathematically modeled as a function. And the relationships between functions are defined by the algebraic axioms in mathematics. The algebraic structural information can be used for feedback control from the macro level to the micro level and this information cannot be defined at the micro-level. Then, the feedback control can cause the development of micro-mechanisms.

In mathematics, axioms are prerequisites, but we think of axioms as control targets that are satisfied in the relationships between neural network modules as a result of feedback control.

The algebraic structure between neural network modules, without feedback control, is not limited to the mathematical structures we commonly know. For example, commutativity is not satisfied by all algebraic structures. Commutativity satisfies products of integers and real numbers, but not matrices. If commutativity holds between neural networks, it is because the brain has developed to satisfy the axiom through feedback control.

In the brain, the axioms that are the target for feedback control can only be defined at the macro level. Therefore, a feedback error can only be evaluated at the macro level. Regulating its synaptic mechanisms to reduce the feedback error is all the component neuron mechanisms do. The master controller to determine the target axioms and feedback error is derived at the macro level. This mechanism enables the neuron-level mechanism to be superseded by the higher macro-level configuration (i.e. macro-determinism). We call this mechanism an algebraic structure control.

By controlling an algebraic structure, the algebraic structure can be converged to a target in the brain. In the initial state, the target axiom is not satisfied between neural network modules. To satisfy the target axiom, a feedback error is defined as an error between the current algebraic structure and the target. The feedback error signal is used to control the synaptic weights. Feedback control at the micro mechanism reduces the feedback error. As a result, the algebraic structure between neural network modules converges to the target. The target axiom can be described by the neural network modules alone without any reference signal from outside the system. Therefore, the feedback error between the target and the current algebraic structure is considered to be intrinsic.

By definition, the lower-level synaptic changes by higher-level feedback error are a form of downward causation. In machine learning, these synaptic weights changes are enabled by gradient descent such as error back propagation (Rumelhart et al. (1986)). For example, consider commutativity axiom as a feedback error to satisfy a target algebraic structure and assume that  $\mathbf{x}$  is input to two neural network modules,  $f$  and  $g$ . The feedback error is intrinsically defined as  $(f \cdot g(\mathbf{x}) - g \cdot f(\mathbf{x}))^2$  (Ohmura et al. (2023)). To satisfy commutativity (which is not generally satisfied), the synaptic weights must be adjusted at the micro level. In this situation, the intrinsic information about the relationships between neural network modules,  $f$  and  $g$ , can be used to regulate the synaptic weights within the modules themselves at the micro level. This downward causation mechanism is logically plausible in the brain.

In conventional learning, the loss function is defined by a reference signal supplied from the outside of the system (Figure 1 A). In supervised learning, the labels of the data are given as a reference. In predictive learning, the data at different times are used as a reference. In unsupervised learning, this is often done to approximate the data distribution to a probability distribution, such as a Gaussian distribution. To move set  $X$  closer to a target, the target must be a different set than set  $X$ . Therefore, the error between  $X$  and target is not intrinsic.




Figure 1: The difference between conventional learning and proposed algebraic structure control. (A) In conventional learning, the loss function is defined by a reference signal from the outside of the system. (B) In algebraic structure control, the error feedback is defined by axioms to satisfy a target algebraic structure such as commutativity between neural network modules,  $f$  and  $g$ . Both can update synaptic weights by error back propagation.

In algebraic structure control, a feedback error is derived from the axioms to satisfy a target algebraic structure such as commutativity (Figure 1 B). A unique feature of algebraic structure control is that the feedback error is defined by the relations between the functions (i.e. neural network modules) that are the components of the algebraic structure without the reference signals from outside the system. Furthermore, the relations must be independent of the input of the functions. This feature makes it possible to generate intrinsic information at the macro level. And the error information can be evaluated inside of the system without need of reference signals from outside. Thus, through algebraic structure control, the whole structure has causal power over its parts.

## 4 Conclusions

We propose that downward causation is a feedback control of the micro-mechanisms using the macro-level algebraic structure information of the system itself. The neurons are systems that can modify their synaptic weights using the macro-level information about the system itself. Algebraic structure provides such information, and is defined only at the macro level by the relations between neural network modules. The development of the micro-mechanisms can be caused by the intrinsic macro-level algebraic information.

Algebraic structure cannot be described at the micro-level. This situation is similar to the contextual emergence (Atmanspacher and Bishop (2007)). The example of contextual emergence is that the macro temperature cannot be described mathematically from the micro thermodynamics alone. New macro-level contextual information is needed to describe the temperature. The contextual information is similar to our intrinsic information at the macro-level, but the contextual emergence differs from our model in that the macro-level contextual information cannot change the micro-mechanism because molecules are not systems and they cannot change their mechanism through feedback control. Thus, contextual emergence is not related to downward causation. But neurons are systems that can change their mechanisms through feedback control. In our formulation, the macro-level information that cannot be described at the micro-level can change the micro-mechanism itself.

Conventional downward causation models (Rosas et al. (2020)) assume that the micro-mechanisms are fixed, and they analyze the state-to-state transition of the fixed micro-mechanism and the development of the micro-mechanisms is not addressed. In the "macro beats micro" model (Hoel et al. (2013); Rosas et al. (2020)), they assume a map from a group of the micro states to the (virtual) macro states, indicating that the macro states are assumed to be a summary information of the micro states. Furthermore, a modular structure to define a hierarchical organization was not assumed in the conventional models (Hoel et al. (2013); Rosas et al.

(2020)). This is different from our whole–parts relationship.

In whole–parts relationship, physical entities must be shared by the whole at the macro level and its parts at the micro level to explain self-causation. Neural network modules and their component neurons satisfy such a relation. The macro information is not a function output or summary information from the micro states (e.g., average of the micro states), but the relationship between the neural network modules at the macro level, and this information is fed back to the micro level. Furthermore, the algebraic structure information is derived at the macro level without a reference signal from outside the system. The reference signal is not intrinsic information at the macro level. Therefore, the reference signal is not suitable for the ”whole beats its part” model of downward causation. In algebraic structure control, only relations between the neural network modules are used to control the system itself.

In the proposed mechanism, a neural network module  $f$  supervenes on neural mechanisms within  $f$ , and the module  $f$  alone cannot change the neural mechanisms within  $f$ , because only the identity equation  $f = f$  can be defined at the macro level using the function  $f$  alone. But a relationship between neural network modules,  $f$  and  $g$ , can change the neural mechanisms within both  $f$  and  $g$ . Using relationships between modules is crucial to defining downward causation. Algebraic structure can be used to define such relationships between neural network modules.

Although our formulation of downward causation in the brain lacks evidential support, evidence that would refute the formulation is also lacking. Downward causation has been considered as mysterious because no actual examples have been found, whereas reductive physicalism provide commonsense explanations of all phenomena. However, all higher-level facts and laws cannot be deduced from lower-level laws and initial conditions. The algebraic structure can be defined only at the macro-level structure, and we believe that the development of the algebraic structure at the macro level cannot be derived from the law of micro-physics alone without feedback error from the macro level.

The proposed formulation applies only to the brain or brain-like systems and is not generalizable to other objects because we assume that the micro-element is an information processing system, rather than a molecule or a physical state. The system can perform feedback control using its observation, but the molecules cannot. In a dynamical system, the focus is on the transition from state to state, and feedback control is not addressed because it has been believed that feedback control requires a reference signal from outside the system. The reference signal is not suitable for modelling the autonomous systems such as biological organisms and conscious brains. Here, we proposed a new feedback control system using intrinsic information at the macro level without the reference signal from outside the system. Thus, feedback control from higher macro level to lower micro level is suitable for the autonomous system model without self-organization. In the self-organization system, the interaction between particles at the same hierarchical level is the focus and the interaction between the whole and its parts in modular structure is not addressed.

In the study of consciousness, the generation of intrinsic information is currently debated (Mørch (2019)). Tononi (2008) and Oizumi et al. (2014) assume that the neural system is the dynamical system that has a fixed state-state transition. But the fixed dynamical system model is not plausible because neural dynamics are strongly influenced by the short-term plasticity that occurs on short (from milliseconds to seconds) time scales (Fujiwara et al. (2008)). Therefore, we assume that the synaptic weights in the brain can be regulated on short time scales. In logic gates, which is the example system in Oizumi et al. (2014), the downward causation proposed never occurs because the logic gates have no plasticity. We believe that the feedback control from the higher-level algebraic structure information to the lower-level neural mechanisms is a promising model to define intrinsic information in the integrated information theory of consciousness (Tononi (2008)).

Finally, our model of downward causation can be implemented in the computer simulation (Ohmura et al. (2023)). And the result of the visual representation is changed by the target algebraic structure in downward causation. If the mathematically structured conscious experience (Yoshimi (2007); Tallon-Baudry (2002); Stanley (1999)) can be explained by the simulation of downward causation, we can validate both the mathematical model of experience and our model of downward causation. We believe that a bootstrap process between the clarification of the mathematical structure of experience and the verification of the structure by computer simulation is a promising method for establishing the mathematical theory of consciousness.

In this article, we provide the first self-causation model. We cannot rule out the possibility that other self-causation mechanisms exist, but the existence of self-causation is sufficient to believe in mental causation because we can reject the AI argument. We expect that this research will lead to future understanding of higher-order laws, including the laws of conscious experience and the law of psychology, and to the search for evidence of downward causation in living organisms.

## References

Atmanspacher, H. and Bishop, R. (2007). Stability conditions in contextual emergence. *Chaos and Complexity Letters*, 2:139–150.

- Baumeister, R., Lau, S., Maranges, H., and Clark, C. (2018). On the necessity of consciousness for sophisticated human action. *frontiers in Psychology*, 9.
- Baumeister, R., Masicampo, E., and D.Vohs, K. (2011). Do conscious thoughts cause behavior? *The Annual Review of Psychology*, 62:331–361.
- Bontly, T. (2002). The supervenience argument generalizes. *Philosophical Studies*, (109):75–96.
- Chalmers, D. (2006). Strong and weak emergence. In Clayton, P. and Davies, P., editors, *The Re Emergence of Emergence*, pages 244–254. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cleeremans, A. and Tallon-Baudry, C. (2022). Consciousness matters: phenomenal experience has functional value. *Neuroscience of Consciousness*, pages 1–11.
- Ellis, G. (2012). Top-down causation and emergence: Some comments on mechanisms. *Interface Focus*, 2:126–140.
- Ellis, G. (2019). Top-down effects in the brain. *Phys. Life Rev.*, 31:11–27.
- Fujiwara, S., Amarasingham, A., Harrison, M., and Buzsáki, G. (2008). Behavior-dependent short-term assembly dynamics in the medial prefrontal cortex. *Nature Neuroscience*, pages 823–833.
- Gershenson, C., Trianni, V., Werfel, J., and Sayama, H. (2020). Self-organization and artificial life. *Artificial Life*, pages 391–408.
- Hoel, E., Albantakis, L., and Tononi, G. (2013). Quantifying causal emergence shows that macro can beat micro. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 110:19790–19795.
- Josselyn, S. and Tonegawa, S. (2020). Memory engrams: Recalling the past and imaging the future. *Science*, 367:eaaw4325.
- Kim, J. (2000). *Mind in a Physical World: An Essay on the Mind-Body Problem and Mental Causation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kim, J. (2006). Emergence: Core idea and issues. *Synthese*, 151:547–559.
- McLaughlin, B. (1992). The rise and fall of british emergentism. In Beckermann, A., Folhr, H., and Kim, J., editors, *Emergence or Reduction?: Prospects for Nonreductive Physicalism*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Mørch, H. (2019). Is consciousness intrinsic? a problem for the integrated information theory. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 26:133–162.
- Mountcastle, V. B. (1997). The columnar organization of neocortex. *Brain*, 120:701–722.
- Ohmura, Y., Shimaya, W., and Kuniyoshi, Y. (2023). An algebraic theory to discriminate qualia in the brain. *arXiv:2306.00239*.
- Oizumi, M., Albantakis, L., and Tononi, G. (2014). From the phenomenology to the mechanisms of consciousness: Integrated information theory 3.0. *PLOS Computational Biology*.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The Tacit Dimension*. London and New York: Routledge and Doubleday and Company.
- Rosas, F., Mediano, P., Jensen, H., Seth, A., Barrett, A., Carhart-Harris, R., and Bor, D. (2020). Reconciling emergences: An information-theoretic approach to identify causal emergence in multivariate data. *PLOS Comp. Biol.*
- Rumelhart, D., Hinton, G., and Williams, R. (1986). Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *Nature*, 323:533–536.
- Simon, J. (2017). The hard problem of many. *Philosophical Perspectives*, 31:449–468.
- Sperry, R. (1964). Problems outstanding in the evolution of brain function. In *James Arthur Lecture*. New York: American Meuseum of Natural History.
- Sperry, R. (1987). Structure and significance of the consciousness revolution. *J. Mind Behav.*, 8:37–65.
- Sperry, R. (1991). In defence of mentalism and emergent interaction. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 12:221–245.



- Sperry, R. W. (1992). Turnabout on consciousness: A mentalist view. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 13:259–280.
- Stanley, R. (1999). Qualia space. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 6:49–60.
- Tallon-Baudry, C. (2002). The topological space of subjective experience. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 26:1068–1069.
- Tononi, G. (2008). Consciousness as integrated information: a provisional manifesto. *Biol. Bull.*, 215:216–242.
- Tononi, G. and Edelman, G. (1998). Consciousness and complexity. *Science*, 282:1846–1851.
- von Bertalanffy, L. (1969). *General system theory; foundations, development, applications*. New York: G. Braziller.
- Yoshimi, J. (2007). Mathematizing phenomenology. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 6:271–291.

**Author Contributions** Conceptualization, Y.O.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Y.O.; Writing – Review & Editing, Y.K.; Supervision, Y.K.

**Conflict of Interest** The author declare no conflict of interest.