

Quantum Entanglement, Cognition & The Processes of Inference

R. Chakraborty^{1, a} I. Mitra^{2, b}

^a *Rashmandir Vidyalaya,*

BK -61, Salt Lake City, Kolkata-91

^b*Department of Physics, New Alipore College*

L Block, Kolkata 700 053, India

Abstract

Church's hypothesis and Godel's theorem may provide constraints on mental processes. As a relief quantum entanglement may lead to a definite proposal as regards the nature of reality and how much of it we are able to know and how do we know it. We deal with these questions and have devised a Gedanken Experiment showing the redundancy of principle of reality. We thereby propose a model describing the processes of making conclusions from a given set of premises though without the reference of neurobiological processes at present. We argue thereafter that the physical laws of nature may not be universal as it seems, being dependent on some physical processes namely computation and the states of neural cognitive states which may be governed yet by some other rule.

¹mitrarc@yahoo.com

²indranil@theory.saha.ernet.in

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to investigate in general terms the observed phenomena, nature of reality and the way we reach conclusions from a set of premises. For the development of any scientific discovery the initial set of patterns account for most of the observations and experiments which are fundamental to its realizations. Further development can be achieved by the construction of elaborate equipment, techniques, esoteric vocabulary and skills. The scientific method encompasses both the mathematical and empirical sciences, and we briefly discuss why it is necessity that drives science and determines what we mean by the scientific method. By necessity we mean laws of nature and of human thought that scientific theories have to try and explain. By the statement that science is driven by necessity, we mean that the discipline of science as such addresses aspects of reality that are governed by necessity. Scientific research is open ended and exploratory, and finding new and unexplained phenomena is the main objective. Mathematical sciences - which include mathematics, computer science, simulations and so on - consist of purely symbolic structures that are freely produced by the human mind. Of course all of language consists of signs and words as well, in that the word is not a thing but can only signify to what it represents. A mathematical theorem necessarily follows from the axioms of the subject. It does not depend on the subjectivity of any mathematician, since all mathematicians will be able to reproduce the same (universal) result. Evidence in mathematics consists of the derivation of the result. There are instances when there are plausible theorems for which no such evidence is available, and such theorems are called conjectures. Only when a proof is offered is the matter resolved. Mathematics is that component of human thought that is entirely and completely determined by necessity. Mathematical theorems are unconditionally valid - in all circumstances and for all time. Empirical sciences - which include physics, chemistry, biology, astronomy, geology and so on - are theories and explanations of nature based on empirical verification. Such verification entails producing evidence - for or against the theory - in the form of data which is presented to sense perception, and is external to the mind. Scientific data cannot be something that is produced by the human mind. Once empirical evidence - namely, data - has been procured, the mind can then analyze such data to interpret, verify or falsify various scientific theories.

The methodology of science, it's so called mode of inquiry, is determined by necessity. The most powerful aspect of the sciences is its ability to predict how nature will behave in the future, or in new and unknown circumstances. Technology is rooted on devices and instruments that are made based on scientific principles, which can then successfully manipulate nature. Science can even predict the existence of phenomena that were hitherto unknown. For example, the mathematics of quantum physics predicted in 1929 [1] that an electron would have an anti-particle as its counterpart. Anti-particles had never even been thought of until then, let alone

having been detected. And sure enough, when guided by this theoretical prediction, anti-electrons were experimentally found in 1935. There are numerous such examples in science. The question naturally arises, are there mathematical structures essential for theory that do not have any measurable manifestation? Richard Feynman has the following to say. “It is not true that we can pursue science completely by using only those concepts which are directly subject to experiment. In quantum mechanics itself there is a probability amplitude, there is a potential, and there are many constructs that we cannot directly measure.” [2] Are there theoretical constructs in physical theories that have absolutely no physical consequence, but are nevertheless required by the mathematical structure of the theory? One can only make some conjectures. In quantum mechanics, the answer to this question, in principle, seems to be yes. The predictive power of science is completely based on the universality and “objectivity” of mathematics. The result of mathematical calculations yield new symbols and structures that are then identified, by a leap of imagination, with physical objects and processes. As we proceed we will be tackling in detail the terms “imagination” etc. The route essentially depends on a suitable process of computation.[3] So as a whole we see if we can link the discovery of physical theories to be synthetic truths, then the process of computation may be the crucial component for the theory of knowledge.

As it can very well be understood that at this stage of development the analysis will be mainly speculative and we will be considering a mechanism from a purely kinematical point of view. The question merely rests on the age old question raised by Kant as to the efficacy of pure mathematics and its methodology. The answer by pure empiricists that our mathematical knowledge is derived by induction from particular instances seems to be inadequate as the validity of the inductive hypothesis itself cannot be proved by induction. As we all would possibly agree that mathematical knowledge is general. It seems strange that that we should be able to know some truths in advance about particular things of which we yet have no experience. Again the observable world around us which are in general our experiences based on perceptions which gives rise to knowledge which is particular. But the amazing fact which has remained is that the application of mathematics to the observable world has produced general statements regarding it. We are avoiding at present more general questions regarding the status of statements and their relation to the world of universals. Now it is a obvious observation as we have already stated that the scientific theories do heavily rely on mathematics. The mode of operation of mathematics and its progress has been on the other hand entirely dependent on the process of computation.

At this point we are led into several viewpoints as regards its functionality. The so called proponents of strong AI [4] which claim that any sort of thinking is computation. Apart from dealing with the questions of awareness and consciousness which we don't intend to address at

present (we would mention some of its implication on our theory in the conclusions ³) we have a feeling that essentially any conceivable idea of reaching conclusions is apparently through a set of rules and methods which is essentially a computation. Though as has been proposed by Penrose [6] that appropriate physical action of the brain may not be simulated computationally. We are not yet sure about the proposal yet, the Godel [7] Turing arguments as regards the incompleteness of mathematical reasoning does not quite guarantee that some sort of process which is completely non computational may make it complete. May be incompleteness is the truth itself. Penrose's hypothesis regarding quantum gravity making a route to solve the riddles seems an attractive proposal nonetheless seems to be driven by a sole motivation to bind the nature into a single whole.

One of the important aspects of scientific research is to ask reasonable questions. In the context of analysing physical theories the fundamental objects under scrutiny is the measurement procedure and algorithm themselves. So as a matter of fact whether some computational process is stoppable or not as has been advocated in [8] is mainly a technical problem. Analysing measurement processes immediately leads us to the world of quantum mechanics. As we all know the paths of quantum mechanics tries to see nature in terms of of the observer and the observed the construction of physical theories is inevitably linked to both the segments as we will look in due course. The next object under analysis is the corresponding computational process and algorithms. Surprisingly devising algorithms will bear new fruits rather than generating them.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review the Church's Thesis and Godel Turing arguments applied to the mental processes. In Section 3 we will discuss a short review of Quantum entanglement and the basic idea which we will require in the last section-the central theme of the paper. Section 4 deals in devising a Gedanken Experiment demonstrating nature of reality and its relation to our Observed world. The last section is concerned with a proposal of a model as regards the description of the physical universe and the way we reach various conclusions, which in turn give rise to physical theories.

2 Church Turing hypothesis & Godel's Theorem

Whenever we are into the arena of discussing theories of processing information we are inevitably led to discuss Church's thesis. We mainly follow [9],[10].

³A good reference for all these ideas may be in [5]

2.1 Church's Thesis :

- (a) A function f is semicomputable iff it is partial recursive.
- (b) A function f is computable ⁴iff both f and $\chi_{D(f)}$ ⁵ are partial recursive.

Definition :

- (a) A sequence of partial functions f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n is called partial recursive description of the function

$$f_N = f$$

if

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} f_1, \quad \text{belongs to family of basic functions;} \\ f_i, \quad i \geq 2 \text{ either belong to family of basic functions or obtained by recursion} \end{array} \right\}$$

- (b) A function is called partial recursive if it admits a partial recursive description.

Church's thesis is used for a definition of algorithmic undecidability. Suppose we have a countable sequence of mathematical problems P_1, P_2, \dots . Furthermore suppose that such a problem has a yes or no answer and that the conditions on P_n are written effectively as a function of n . We associate to such a problem a mapping,

$$f : Z^+ \rightarrow Z^+$$

$$D(f) = \{i \in Z^+ \mid P_i \text{ has yes for an answer} \}$$

$$f(i) = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad i \in D(f)$$

The problem P is called algorithmically decidable if the functions f and $\chi_{D(f)}$ are partial recursive. Otherwise P is called algorithmically undecidable. Church's thesis allows us to solve such equations in two stages: (1) finding an informal solution using any intuitive algorithms we need. (2) formalising the solution. The Church-Turing thesis concerns the notion of an effective or mechanical method in logic and mathematics. A method, or procedure, M , for achieving some desired result is called effective or mechanical just in case M is set out in terms of a finite number of exact instructions, M will, if carried out without error, produce the desired result in a finite number of steps; M can be carried out by a human being unaided by any machinery. M demands no insight or ingenuity on the part of the human being carrying it out. Statements that there is an effective method for achieving such-and-such a result are commonly expressed by saying that there is an effective method for obtaining the values of such-and-such a

⁴ $x \in Z^{+m}$ as input gives $f(x)$ as output if $x \in D(f)$ or 0 otherwise. Computational functions are semi computable

⁵Characteristic function of $X \subset Y \Rightarrow \chi_X : Y \rightarrow Z^+$ s.t $\chi_X(x) = 1$ if $x \in X$ and 2 otherwise.

mathematical function. For example, that there is an effective method for determining whether or not any given formula of the propositional calculus is a tautology e.g. the truth table method is expressed in function-speak by saying that there is an effective method for obtaining the values of a function, call it T , whose domain is the set of formulae of the propositional calculus and whose value for any given formula x , written $T(x)$, is 1 or 0 according to whether x is, or is not, a tautology.

2.2 Turing's Hypothesis :

The notion of an effective method is an informal one, and attempts to characterise effectiveness, such as the above, lack rigour, for the key requirement that the method demand no insight or ingenuity is left unexplicated. One of Turing's achievements in his paper of 1936 [11] was to present a formally exact predicate with which the informal predicate can be calculated by means of an effective method may be replaced. Church did the same (1936a)[12] . The replacement predicates that Turing and Church proposed were, on the face of it, very different from one another, but they turned out to be equivalent, in the sense that each picks out the same set of mathematical functions. The Church-Turing thesis is the assertion that this set contains every function whose values can be obtained by a method satisfying the above conditions.

The formal concept proposed by Turing is that of computability by Turing machine. He argued that whenever there is an effective method for obtaining the values of a mathematical function, the function can be computed by a Turing machine. The converse claim is easily established, for a Turing machine program is itself a specification of an effective method: without exercising any ingenuity or insight, a human being can work through the instructions in the program and carry out the required operations. If Turing's thesis is correct, then talk about the existence and non-existence of effective methods can be replaced throughout mathematics and logic by talk about the existence or non-existence of Turing machine programs.

2.3 Godel's Incompleteness Theorem :

Let $T \subset S(A)$ be the set of true expressions where A is the finite or countable alphabet and let $S(A)$ be the set of expressions in A . $D \subset S(A)$ is the set of provable or deducible expressions. The incompleteness principles of Godel are enumerated as follows: (i) The set D is enumerable. (ii) The set T is not enumerable if the semantics of truth is rich enough to include elementary arithmetic.

So as we see Godel's Theorem can be succinctly be stated as:

All formal theories of mathematics satisfy the above incomplete principles of (i) & (ii). Therefore if a theory be sufficiently rich, it always contains true expressions which are not provable.

The above methodology may be now turned on to see how the process may be applied to

mental processes. The conclusion of Godel's argument implies that there are allowed brain process P that can never stop in spite of the fact that no system operating according to the rules by which the brain operates could ever reach the conclusion that P can never stop. As a matter of fact that there exists a k such that $C(k, k)$ stops iff $C(k, k)$ can never stop is knowable cannot be proved within the finitistic type of model described above. The finite type computer X which can in principle simulate the mechanical activity of the human brain can be imbedded in a computer Y whose rules of operation included implementation of the concept for $\forall n$, and to which the Godel/Turing argument can be applied. Then the mind M that could comprehend both the rules of operation of C and also the logic of the Godel/Turing proof would be able to compute a value k such that the proposition that " $C(k, k)$ stops iff $C(k, k)$ can never stop is knowable", where knowable means information by virtue of the outputs of Y. The mind M knows that P_k is true can know also that X is knowable entails that X is true, and can therefore conclude that $C(k, k)$ can never stop. Thus M can know more than what is knowable. This is the analog of Godel's theorem and is not a contradiction. On the other hand the human mathematician can know only the output of X. He will be able to reason on the basis of what hypothetical, M is able to know, that there exists some k, such that $C(k, k)$ can never stop. However it has not been proved that the only way that he could know this is by virtue of the stopping of $C(k, k)$. The stopping of $C(k, k)$ may be the unique process which gives the strong result that $C(k, k)$ can never stop is knowable.

3 Quantum Entanglement, A Short review:

One of the key issue in the foundations of quantum mechanics for all these years has been the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen argument [13] regarding the incompleteness of a quantum theory though mainly the Copenhagen interpretation. The basic argument can be stated as

Every element of the physical reality must have a counterpart in the physical theory

The proposal has been analysed from various contexts and the notable among them been the Bohmian mechanics, [14] Bell's Theorem [15] and Gleason's Theorem [16]. We will not go into the details here but mainly discuss the most notable feature which the argument has led us into, the idea of Quantum Entanglement. As we will see in Section 5 our main construction is very much related to the argument and the idea of entangled states. Our discussion mainly is on the same lines with [17]

A simple description of the essential non-classical nature of quantum entanglement is given in Entangled Choices. For a more detailed and technical analysis, consider the quantum spin of an electron (or any spin-1/2 particle), which is always found to have either the value $+\hbar/2$ or $-\hbar/2$ in the direction of measurement, regardless of the direction we choose to measure. Thus an electron manifests one of only two possible spin states, which we may call spin up and

spin down. It's convenient to represent these states as orthogonal unit vectors. In general an electron's spin state, Y , at any instant can be represented by a linear combination of those two possible observable states. The choice of a measurement direction is equivalent to choosing a basis for expressing the spin components of the state Y . For any particular basis we can express the state in the form

$$|\Psi\rangle = c_1|+\rangle + c_2|-\rangle$$

where c_1 and c_2 are complex constants. These constants encode the probability that the chosen measurement will yield either result. The probability is simply the norm of the respective coefficient. We have

$$c_1^*c_1 + c_2^*c_2 = 1$$

In quantum mechanics, each possible measurement basis is associated with an operator whose eigenvalues are the possible results of the respective measurement. For a given xyz basis of orthogonal space coordinates we can represent the three principle measurements (i.e., measurements along the three axes) by the Pauli spin matrices $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$. The eigenvalues of the measurement operator corresponding to whichever measurement direction we choose determine the coefficients c_1 and c_2 , which represent the probabilities of the possible outcomes. To see how this works, suppose $|\theta\rangle$ is the initial state vector of the electron, and we decide to perform a spin measurement corresponding to a particular operator \mathbf{U} . The result is given by applying \mathbf{U} to $|\theta\rangle$, using ordinary matrix multiplication, to give the new state vector $|\beta\rangle$ as shown below:

$$\mathbf{U}|\theta\rangle = |\beta\rangle$$

If $|\beta\rangle$ is either pure spin up or pure spin down (basis states) in the direction of measurement represented by \mathbf{U} , it follows that a subsequent measurement in the same direction must yield the same result, so $|\beta\rangle$ must be such that

$$\mathbf{U}|\beta\rangle = q|\beta\rangle$$

for some constant q (since state vectors are equivalent up to length). Thus the constant q is an eigenvalue of the measurement operator, and $|\beta\rangle$ is the corresponding eigen-vector.

Since the arbitrary initial state $|\theta\rangle$ is not in general an eigenvector of \mathbf{U} , it can yield either of the eigenvectors of the basis states. This reveals the probabilistic aspect of quantum mechanics.

The eigenvectors constitute a basis for the space of possible state vectors, so $|\theta\rangle$ can be expressed as a linear combination of those eigenvectors. If we let $|\beta\rangle$ & $|\delta\rangle$ denote the eigenvectors, then we can express $|\theta\rangle$ as

$$c_1|\beta\rangle + c_2|\delta\rangle = |\theta\rangle$$

Again, the norm of each complex coefficient gives the probability that applied to $|\theta\rangle$ will lead to the respective eigenstate.

The same analysis can be extended to three or more principle direction spin operators as presented above. Each pair of eigenvectors constitutes a basis for the state space, so we can express the electron's state vector as a linear combination of the basis vectors for the desired measurement, and the coefficients give the probability of that measurement yielding either spin up or spin down. We can think of these probabilities as the projections of the initial state vector onto the orthogonal axes of the chosen measurement basis. Of course, we aren't restricted to measurements along one of the principle axes. We can measure the spin of the electron along any spatial axis, and each such measurement is represented by an operator. We also note that these directions are purely relative to the state of the particle in question.

These quantum mechanical predictions have some remarkable implications. An experiment can be performed by examining the spins of two spin-1/2 particles emitted in opposite directions from the decay of a singlet state with zero total spin. In such a case conservation of angular momentum requires that the spin state vectors of the individual particles are precisely opposite, so if we measure the spin of one of these particles along a certain direction and find spin up in that direction, then the other particle must have pure spin down in that direction. Thus, by measuring the spin of one particle and reducing its state vector to one of the eigenvectors of the chosen measurement basis, we automatically collapse the wavefunction of the other particle onto this same basis.

At first sight this process may not seem very mysterious, since it's easy to imagine that the two coupled particles are programmed with opposite spins, such that they will always give opposite results when measured along any given direction. However, a detailed analysis of the quantum mechanical predictions for all possible combinations of measurement angles reveals the need for a profound change in the classical view of the world.

If the measurement of one particle along a fixed direction (in the xz plane) yields spin down, then the other particle is purely spin up in that direction. Consequently if we perform a measurement on the other particle along a direction at an angle of α from the first measurement, we will see that the probability of spin up is $\frac{1}{2}\cos(\alpha/2)$ and the probability of spin down is $\frac{1}{2}\sin(\alpha/2)$. In a similar way we can show that if the measurement of the first particle yields spin up, then the other particle is purely spin down along that direction, and a measurement of that other particle along a direction at an angle α relative to the first will yield spin up with probability $\frac{1}{2}\sin(\alpha/2)$ and spin down with probability $\frac{1}{2}\cos(\alpha/2)$.

Hence the probability that the measurements of these two particles at angles differing by α will both give the same result (both up or both down) is $\frac{1}{2}\sin(\alpha/2)$, and the probability that

they will yield opposite results (one up and one down) is $\frac{1}{2}\cos(\alpha/2)$. The angle α between the two measurements can be expressed as $x - y$ where x is the angle of the measurement performed on one of the particles and y is the angle of the measurement performed on the other. The two particles emitted from a singlet state are said to be entangled, because regardless of how far apart they travel before the spin measurements are made, the joint results will exhibit these joint probabilities.

From a classical standpoint we would imagine that each particle emerges from the singlet state with, in effect, a set of programmed instructions for what spin to exhibit at each possible angle of measurement, or at least what the probability of each result should be. The usual approach to analyzing these phenomena classically is to stipulate that a particle's programmed instructions for responding to a measurement at a given angle must be definite and unambiguous (rather than probabilistic) because we classically regard the two measurement angles as independent, which implies that the measurement on the other particle could be at the same angle as our measurement of this particle, and the particles must give opposite results in that case. Likewise the measurement on the other particle could be 180 degrees away from our measurement of this particle, and the particles must give equal results in that case. Of course, the individual measurements can each be either spin up or spin down in both of these cases, so in principle they could still be probabilistic tendencies, but classically we have no way of ensuring perfect correlation (or perfect anti-correlation) of the joint results of spacelike separated events other than by definitely programming the spins of each particle for each possible measurement angle.

From this assumption it follows that the instructions to one particle are just an inverted copy of the instructions to the coupled particle. In other words, for each measurement angle from 0 to 2π the programmed response to a spin measurement for one particle is the opposite of the programmed response of the other particle at that angle. Furthermore, since we have perfect correlation if our measurements are at angles that differ by 180 degrees, it follows that the programmed instructions for each particle are individually anti-symmetric at a phase angle of 180 degrees. For example, if a particle's programmed response for a measurement at angle a is spin up, then the programmed response of that same particle for a measurement at angle $a + \pi$ must be spin down. Hence we can fully specify the instructions to both particles by simply specifying the instructions to one of the particles for measurement angles ranging from 0 to π .

For the sake of completeness it will be worthwhile to state in brief some of the resolutions of the problem. Numerous discussions of quantum entanglement discuss hidden variables,[18] [19]and they derive inequalities involving the correlations as functions of these so called variables. In a sense, these variables are redundant, because the essence of the so-called local realistic premise is that each particle emerges from the singlet state with definite instructions for the spin it will exhibit for each possible measurement angle. This implies that the only

relevant free variable is the reference orientation, since the instruction profile can be oriented in any direction relative to the measurements with uniformly distributed probability. Integrating the product of spins over the entire angular range with a fixed difference angle must yield the correlation of the two spin measurements.

It might be argued that we need not assume any single particle exhibits the quantum mechanical probabilities, because these probabilities can only be evaluated by performing multiple measurements, so we might imagine that it's necessary to evaluate the results over a sequence of particle pairs, rather than just a single pair. Moreover, we might think that this sequence could possess memory,[20] making the results of successive pairs dependent. However, in principle a large number of particle pairs can be prepared in an identical way, in spacelike-separated locations, and perform measurements on the pairs independently. According to quantum mechanics we would still expect the combined results to satisfy the same correlations. This implies that each particle pair must embody the overall propensities that we expect to find manifested in multiple trials.

4 A Gedanken Experiment




Figure 1: Observed & Real Worlds

The figures depicted above is a diagram for the simple thought experiment which we describe below. In both Fig A and Fig B Part Y are identical, as shown enclosed within a dashed

box are to be taken inaccessible to any observer which we term as reality in a sense that the phenomena of the observable part X and X' of world will be dependent on them. So X & X' are the only parts which the observers are aware of. So part Y of both the diagrams do not exist in relation to the observer. The experiment is designed as follows.

Let us first describe Part Y of the diagrams. As we have stated earlier part Y is a hypothetical entity which are non existent to any observer. It consists of an enclosure which contain two massive balls, which may move or collide in the enclosure producing observable effects on part X & X' of the systems. Some readers may be sceptical about the dynamics of the motion of the balls etc, but we are not interested in it as the observer will only observe Part A.

In Fig A the part X of the diagram describes a simple container containing a liquid. As it is clear from the previous consideration the effect of part Y on part X is to produce some disturbance in the liquid and the motion of the surface of the liquid, inside the container. But the observer being unaware of the part B of the apparatus has to interpret the motion. One of the possible explanation of the motion may be given by the assumption of an existence of a density function $\rho(x, y, z)$ inside the liquid. To describe a definite model to explain the effective motion of the liquid it may be assumed a non uniform distribution of particles along the length of the enclosure as to say

$$\rho(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{z}$$

This implies that there are large number of the particles at the surface of liquid which continually decrease as one goes along the liquid upwards till the liquid surface. So the large number of particles at the bottom may influence some pressure and thereby force on the next layer of particles which continually goes on to produce an appreciable motion of the liquid surface.

So essentially the success of the model essentially depends on a suitable choice of the density function which will correctly describe the motion of the surface of the liquid as has been observed.

In Fig B Part X' of the diagram denotes again a simple box which has a charged particle placed on the floor of the box. That the particle is a charged one has been tested previously in a lab by suitable electrical experiments(say). Now again as in the previous case the Part Y of the figure will influence the Part X' and will in turn effect the motion of the charged particle. So as it is clear by now that the observer will have to describe the motion of the charged particle., though the observer is absolutely unaware of Part Y. The charged particle may be undergoing arbitrary motions and the observer accounts for it by ascribing an existence of an electric field

$E(x, y, z)$ inside the container. The correct description of the charged particle will eventually depend on the suitable choice of the electric field.

So now the two gedanken experiments give rise to some interesting consequences. First of all it is not necessary that the observed world may match with the real world. The most important fact related to this is that a single real world may give rise to many observable situations and thereby to many descriptions of the observable world. and the same reality. Now at this stage a question may be asked that so what the big deal is this, as in any case we cannot observe the real world and may be cannot really aspire to know about it why not rename the observable world as the real one. Well as far naming is concerned it may not be a big problem, but can we sure whether it will not induce any effects on the observable world, perhaps not. This is the line of attack we will take up in the next section where we argue that the real world though absolutely unobservable and inaccessible yet may be crucial as far development of physical theories and thereby knowledge is concerned. We will be giving an example to illucidate our point.

5 A proposed model for the mechanism of generating physical theories:

The basic aim of this section is not the the content of knowledge or it's one of the manifestations, physical theories. On the contrary we are interested in finding whether there are any schemes about which we infer conclusions or to be specific enough to go on to discover physical theories, mathematical theorems etc. The Godel Turing argument analysed in Section 2 clearly shows that computational processes may be insufficient to bear all fruits. Penrose claims that there may be noncomputational [21] [22] [23]process linked with brain activities. The model we want to describe here though satisfies the Godel's incompleteness theorem, yet we invoke some different methods which do not need that the brain activities need to be noncomputational in principle. the arguments are furthur enhanced by the Gedanken experiment performed in Section 4.

So in order to describe the model, the observed world is essentially demarcated from the real world which is completely inaccessible to the observer. The only role the real world has is in producing observable effects to the observed world as we have seen in the thought experiment described in section 4.

The information content corresponding to the observed world is encapsulated in the semantics, mathematical tools, symbols and logical & semantic connectives. [24]

Let a be the set of alphabets and the rule of syntax, m corresponds to the sets of mathematical

symbols and the rules of inference, q denotes the set of logical and semantic connectives.

Now,

$$L = \{s(l)|l \in a, s(l) \equiv \text{statements and propositions of linguistics}\} \quad (1)$$

$$M = \{s(m)|m \in m, s(m) \equiv \text{statements and propositions of mathematics}\} \quad (2)$$

$$C = \{s(c_l, c_m)|c_l, c_m \in q, s(c_l, c_m) \equiv \text{statements of the connectives}\} \quad (3)$$

So as we can all understand that the full information of the observable world is encoded in the above constructed sets. To be more specific any information regarding the observable world is nothing but a statement or proposition obeying the formal rules of mathematics and linguistics.

So if we construct the direct product of sets [25]

$$L \otimes M \otimes C$$

we can be assured that any statement regarding the observable world is contained as a true statement $p(z)$ contained in a set

$$P = \{p(z)|z \in L \otimes M \otimes C \text{ s.t } p(z) \text{ is true}\}$$

So the maximum information accessible to any observer is encoded in the set P . It is the set of objects which are knowable to any observer. Hence in order to discuss the discovery of physical theories it is quite necessary to study the possible evolutions of the set P . How can such a possible evolution be achieved is a dynamical question also completely dependent on the structures of the set P , which at this stage is pretty difficult to answer. We on the other hand will be mainly concerned with the mechanical model of what may be the possible sorts of evolution.

Borrowing our notations from Dirac's notation. we claim that the set P corresponding to the observable world is associated a state $|P\rangle$. The state $|P\rangle$ encodes the information about the observed world. Now as we have got a glimpse of the basic scheme we now state our basic propositions.

Proposition 1:

The observed states is the effect of the interaction between the observer (brain states) [26] and the real world states. The interaction is in particular a form of entanglement, in a sense that the real world states may influence the observer (brain) states and therefore correlated .⁶

⁶For notational convenience we term the Observer + apparatus as the brain states. The symbolism should not be misunderstood with the connotation of associated consciousness.

So symbolically,

$$|P\rangle \equiv \sum_k c_k |B_k\rangle |R_k\rangle \text{ } ^7$$

Proposition 2:

Corresponding to $i \in I$ where I is an indexing set, there exists a class of states $|B_i\rangle |R_i\rangle$ which correspond to different class of observed states given by $|P_\lambda\rangle$ where $\lambda \in \Delta$ where Δ is a different indexing set.

Proposition 3:

Reaching Conclusions from a given state $|P_i\rangle$ will be induced by at most two inequivalent processes, which are marked as X and O . The process X denotes a computational process and the process O which is not computational. At this stage the terms computational and non computational are defined ostensively.

Proposition 4:

The brain states $|B\rangle$ are associated to the observer and do correspond to the brain functions which is essentially the seat for undergoing computational processes.

Now to describe the evolution of the state $|P_\lambda\rangle = |B_i\rangle |R_i\rangle$ to a completely different non trivial state $|\tilde{P}_\lambda\rangle = |\tilde{B}_i\rangle |\tilde{R}_i\rangle$ is denoted schematically by

$$|P_\lambda\rangle \xrightarrow{X \& O} |\tilde{P}_\lambda\rangle$$

Proposition 5:

The Gedanken experiment which we performed gives rise to another conclusion which we state as a proposition. Same set of real world states may give rise to different observable states for the same brain states. Different sets of real world states may also correspond to different observed states for the same set of brain states.

Symbolically,

$$|P_\lambda\rangle = |B_i\rangle |R_i\rangle \qquad |P'_\lambda\rangle = |B_i\rangle |R'_i\rangle$$

This is a consequence of the third proposition which entails that any conclusion whatsoever from a definite information state corresponding to the observed world evolves into any other

⁷For simplicity of notations from now onwards we don't include the sum though we represent an entangled state.

information state by 2 fundamental inequivalent processes. At this point it is imperative to attend to the basic problem of measurement as it is in quantum mechanics. As it is clear that we have associated the basic knowledge about the observed world as a class of entangled information states. So essentially any gain in information is but an evolution of the associated state. Though we will propose a model for the evolution but the nature is not yet clear. If it is a state collapse then the role of observer is pretty ambiguous. For some alternative proposals London & Bauer [27] has an interesting suggestion, though they unlike us do not have a construction of the real world states. According to their proposals that states of the observer satisfy vectorial relations required by ordinary quantum mechanics, but do not evolve temporally in the quantum mechanical sense. Though in a sense it is a strange proposal, extending quantum theory somewhat into the domain of psychology, nevertheless a consistent theory. In other words the proposal claims an inclusion of the observer to be somewhat essential for the state vector collapse.

Another pretty different but interesting idea stems from Von Neumann [28]

the so-called principle of psycho-physical parallelism -that it must be possible so to describe the extra physical process of the subjective perception as it were in reality in the physical world-i.e, to assign to its parts equivalent processes in the objective environment, in physical space.

In accordance with this argument whenever there is a measurement, the world is divided into two parts, one part comprising the system being observed and the other the observer. The boundary between these parts is arbitrary. According to Von Neumann if the formalism of quantum mechanics is applied to the observed part of the world, the predictions obtained are independent of the location of the boundary.

At present we will not analyze the above issues any further. Our point has been to state how to model an observer in our context and we argue that there may be various alternative approaches which may be undertaken but the issue is very well unsettled at present.

Equipped with these propositions let us now try to find out in detail how to obtain conclusions from a set of premises. As it is obvious the set of premises do form a definite state obtained from the set P.

Any conclusion is thereby defined to be the implementation of a series of states

$$|P_\lambda\rangle \longrightarrow |\tilde{P}_\lambda^1\rangle \longrightarrow |\tilde{P}_\lambda^2\rangle \longrightarrow \dots$$

Now say we start with an information which corresponds to an observed state

$$|P_\lambda\rangle = |B_i\rangle |R_i\rangle$$

By Proposition 4, the $|B_i\rangle$ states transform by the computational process X through a series (the accessible states)

$$|B_i\rangle \xrightarrow{X} |B'_i\rangle$$

This may in turn give rise to a new observed state

$$|P'_\lambda\rangle = |B'_i\rangle |R_i\rangle$$

So preceding as above we may get a series of states

$$|P_\lambda\rangle \longrightarrow |P^1_\lambda\rangle \longrightarrow |P^2_\lambda\rangle \longrightarrow \cdots |P^n_\lambda\rangle$$

which are connected with each other by the transformation of the brain states via a computational process.

At this stage we link th other process which is fundamentally different from the computational one in a sense that they are nonlocal and stochastic in nature and denote a jump of the states which may not be determined. In this context it will be interesting to point out the question of the quantum jumps has been previously being considered by [29]. The process is marked by the special property that the real world states may influence the brain states to deliver a jump.

$$|P_\lambda\rangle \equiv |B_i\rangle |R_i\rangle \xrightarrow{X} |B'_i\rangle |R_i\rangle \longrightarrow |B'_i\rangle |R'_i\rangle$$

The last step of the transformation has been in accordance with the Fifth Proposition which entails that there exists states for the same brain states but different real world states.

The next process which we show is another assumption on the basis of Proposition 3 where we give a concrete scheme for non-computational process.

$$|B_i\rangle |R'_i\rangle \xrightarrow{O} |\ddot{B}_i^o\rangle |R'_i\rangle$$

Thereby the $|\ddot{B}_i^o\rangle$ are not accessible from the $|B_i\rangle$ state by any computational process.

So now we conclude that any sort of nontrivial conclusions is being generated by the following sequence

$$|P_\lambda\rangle \equiv |B_i\rangle |R_i\rangle \xrightarrow{X} |B_i^1\rangle |R_i\rangle \xrightarrow{X} |B_i^2\rangle |R_i\rangle \equiv |B_i^2\rangle |R'_i\rangle \xrightarrow{O} |\ddot{B}_i^o\rangle |R'_i\rangle \xrightarrow{X} |\ddot{B}_i^1\rangle |R'_i\rangle \rightarrow |\ddot{B}_i^1\rangle |R''_i\rangle$$

So the state $|\ddot{B}_i^1\rangle |R''_i\rangle$ can be identified with the non trivial final state $|\ddot{P}_\lambda\rangle$. The states are generated by a series of computational & non-computational processes. We propose that for gaining information which is not encoded in the initial state the computational processes are not enough, though we have assumed that the brain states are connected by those only.

Now we give an example from computational geometry [30] illustrating our scheme. We took this particular example in particular to show that though we may be inclined to think that this is wholly a computational problem but essentially we show here that how can our scheme may be implemented in this case and this in turn also shows how noncomputational processes play pivotal role in the theory of inferences.

In essence computational geometry is the study of designing and analysis of algorithms in the context of problems from geometry. In view of the above analysis we would like to see how the above mechanism of generating conclusions translate to the case of closest pair problem.

The Premise:

Let there are given points in a plane. What are conclusions which we can reach from these set of data.

The Analysis:

We will be mainly concerned with the simplest solution for the above problem in accordance with the model proposed by us.

As the premise consists of given points on a plane it is the concerned observed state $|P_\lambda\rangle$. As we have already discussed this state is an entangled state of the corresponding real world and brain states. So,

$$|P_\lambda\rangle = \sum_i c_i |B_i\rangle |R_i\rangle^8$$

So qualitatively the points are designated as an entangled state corresponding to some real world which cannot be determined and the brain world states.

So to get some non trivial conclusions from the initial state $|P_\lambda\rangle$ we get at first the following sequence.

$$|P_\lambda\rangle \equiv |B_i\rangle |R_i\rangle \xrightarrow{Q} |\ddot{B}_i\rangle |R'_i\rangle \equiv |P_\lambda\rangle$$

So here a non computational process which transforms the brain state $|B_i\rangle$ into a brain state $|\ddot{B}_i\rangle$ which is the state which registers the concept of a distance between the points in the plane or may be also the number of points in the plane. It should be noted here that this is already a complex process which has other parameters too. In order to give a simplified model for the aforesaid scheme we keep the complexities to a minimum. So in brief the noncomputational process gives rise to a state which may now effectively give rise to some non trivial conclusions which are not encoded in the initial state which may be described as follows.

The transformed brain state $|\ddot{B}_i\rangle$ in this case of the simplified model is the seat for generating nontrivial computational processes which we may depict as

⁸We made an exception here with respect to our earlier remarks. Again we state that for simplicity from now onwards we don't include the sum though we represent an entangled state.

$$|P_\lambda\rangle \equiv |\ddot{B}_i\rangle|R'_i\rangle \xrightarrow{X} |P'_\lambda\rangle$$

So essentially as with the closest pair problem, state which has been obtained by a noncomputational process now gives rise to a state which via some computational processes only give rise to some entangled real and brain world states which corresponds to some observed state. The computational process as it can be guessed can be generated by an algorithm. We are not interested here to analyze the efficiency of the algorithm

6 Conclusion

So as a matter of fact the main objective of this paper has been to go through in detail the process by which we may make definite conclusions which has been speculative and we proposed a model as regards to it. The accuracy of the model will nevertheless be dependent on correct theories of computation, quantum aspects and neural networks. The theory of cognitive neuroscience [31] and computational neurobiology [32] will be immensely helpful in deciphering neural network models which may be in turn be focused to predict a model for cognitive function. The problem which we feel here is that in computational correlates of brain function and associated aspects models may be constructed at various stages which may be consistent with each other. For example the Hopfield [33] neural network model along with back propagation and classical theory of computation may be used to give rise a specific model for perception. In the context of information-processing approaches mental or cognitive events are abstract and cannot be reduced to neurological phenomena. Perception, memory learning etc may be mapped in terms of their functions and processes without concern for their neurological causes. Though at this point it will be worthwhile to ask whether neural activities of brain can be modeled by quantum mechanics but some recent arguments more or less tries to answer the scepticism in the negative [34][35][36][37]. As far as the computational viewpoint is concerned a logical theory machine [38] has been constructed for the first mathematical proof conducted by a machine, there are also claims of General Problem Solver to study and simulate human problem solving. On the extreme of these viewpoints there has been connectionist [39] approaches which has close ties to the neurological perspective that the mind is powered by the brain where a serial processing of information sequential, or in parallel, processes in the reception and transformation of information signals. In this context it will be interesting to remark at this stage that for a specific model of memory we believe that there exists some optimal physical process, though we feel it will be quite remarkable if something like Grover's algorithm [40] has any role to play there. We hope to construct a category based model of perception and thought in our next endeavor.

The model we have proposed here essentially underpinnes a noncomputational process which

we at this stage have defined ostensively. But we believe that some appropriate neurobiological process should be accounted for that. As a remark it is felt that the sacred laws of physics which govern nature may not be universal but relative to the cognitive system. As an example two different neural models may give rise to completely different perception and modes of inference processing on account which they both may differ in their corresponding world views.

Acknowledgements:

I.Mitra would like to acknowledge the hospitality of Theory Group,Saha Institute Of Nuclear Physics, and Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata for this work.

References

- [1] P.A.M.Dirac “Quantum Mechanics (1958) *Clarendon Press*
- [2] F. Schwabl “Quantum Mechanics” (1992) *Springer Verlag*
- [3] R. M. Karp “Reducibility among Combinatorial Problems” *In Complexity of Computer Computations* (1972) Plenum Press 85
- [4] M. L. Minsky “Computation: Finite and Infinite Machines” (1967) *Prentice-Hall*
- [5] M. Lockwood “Mind, Brain and the Quantum: Compound I” (1992) *Oxford Blackwell*
- [6] R. Penrose “Shadows of The Mind” (1994b) *Oxford University Press*
- [7] R. M. Smullyan “Godel’s Incompleteness Theorems” (1992) *Oxford University Press*
- [8] H. P. Stapp “Are Superluminal Connections Necessary” *Il Nuovo Cimento* **40B** (1977) 191
- [9] J. Malitz “Introduction to Mathematical logic” (1979) *Springer Verlag*
- [10] P. Suppes “Logic and Probability in Quantum Mechanics” (1971) *Riedel*
- [11] A. M. Turing “On Computable numbers, with an Application to the *Entscheidungsproblem*” *Proc. Lond. math. Soc.* **2** **42** (1936) 230
- [12] A. Church “An Unsolvable Problem of Elementary Number Theory” *Am. J. Math* **58** (1936) 345
- [13] A. Einstein, N. Rosen and B. Podolovsky “Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality be Considered Complete” *Physical Review* **47** (1935) 777

- [14] D. Bohm “Quantum Theory as an Indication of New Order in Physics” *in B. d’Espagnat* (1971) 412
- [15] J. S. Bell “On the Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **38** (1966) 447
- [16] A. M Gleason “Measures on the Closed Subspaces of Hilbert Spaces” *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics* **6** (1957) 885
- [17] G. Mackey “Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics” (1963) *New York: Benjamin*
- [18] N. D. Mermin “Hidden Variables and the Two Theorems of John Bell” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **65** (1993) 803
- [19] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker “The Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics” *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics* **17** (1967) 59
- [20] G. Scheler “Memorization in a Neural Network with Adjustable Transfer Function and Conditional Gating” *q-bio.NC/0403011*
- [21] R. Penrose “The Large, the Small and the Human Mind” (1999) *Cambridge University Press*
- [22] T. Rado “On Non-Computable Functions” *Bell System Tech. J* **41** (1962) 877
- [23] M. Davis “Computability and Unsolvability” (1982) *Dover*
- [24] H. B. Enderton “A Mathematical Introduction To Logic” (1972) *Academic Press*
- [25] P. R. Halmos “Naive Set Theory” (1974) *Springer Verlag*
- [26] I. Nemenman “How is Sensory Information processed” *q-bio.NC/0402029*
- [27] F. London and E. Bauer “*La Theorie de l’Observation en Mecanique Quantique*” (1939) *Hermann*
- [28] J. von Neumann “Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics” (1955) *Princeton University Press*
- [29] Ghirardi, G.C., Rimini, A., and Weber, T. “Unified Dynamics for Microscopic and Macroscopic Systems” *Phys Rev D* **34** (1986) 470
- [30] M. Minsky and S. Papert “Perceptrons: an Introduction to Computational Geometry” (1968) *MIT Press*

- [31] L. K. Samuelson, and L. B. Smith “ Early noun vocabularies: Do Ontology, Category Structure and Syntax Correspond?” *Cognition* **73** (1999) 1
- [32] W. Bialek “Thinking about the Brain” *physics/0205030*
- [33] J. J. Hopfield “Neural Networks and Physical Systems with Emergent Collective Computational Abilities” *Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences* **79** (1982) 2554
- [34] A. A. Samoletov “A Biological Junction with Quantum Like Characterstics” *physics/9910045*
- [35] C. A. Trugenberger “Quantum Pattern Recognition” *quant-ph/0210176*
- [36] J. Faber, R. Portugal and L. P. Rosa “Information Processing in Brain Microtubules” *q.bio-SC/0404007*
- [37] M. Tegmark “The Importance of Quantum Decoherence in Brain Process” *quant-ph/9907009*
- [38] L. M. Adleman “Computing with DNA” *Sci. Am* **279** (1998) 54
- [39] D. O. Hebb “The Organization of Behavior” (1949) *John Wiley & Sons*
- [40] L. K. Grover “Quantum Mechanics helps in searching for needle in a haystack” *quant-ph/9706033*