

Quantum mechanical Universal constructor

Arun K. Pati^(†) and Samuel L. Braunstein

Informatics, Bangor University, Bangor LL57 1UT, UK

^(†)*Institute of Physics, Sainik School Post,*

Bhubaneswar-751005, Orissa, India

(September 5, 2018)

Abstract

Arbitrary quantum states cannot be copied. In fact, to make a copy we must provide complete information about the system. However, can a quantum system self-replicate? This is not answered by the no-cloning theorem. In the classical context, Von Neumann showed that a ‘universal constructor’ can exist which can self-replicate an arbitrary system, provided that it had access to instructions for making copy of the system. We question the existence of a universal constructor that may allow for the self-replication of an arbitrary quantum system. We prove that there is no deterministic universal quantum constructor which can operate with finite resources. Further, we delineate conditions under which such a universal constructor can be designed to operate deterministically and probabilistically.

The basis of classical computation is the Church-Turing thesis [1,2] which says that every recursive function can be computed algorithmically provided the algorithm can be executed by a physical process. However, fundamental physical processes are not governed by classical mechanics, rather by quantum mechanical laws. The possibility of performing reversible computation [3] and the fact that classical computers cannot efficiently simulate quantum systems [4,5] gave birth to the concept of the quantum Turing machine [6]. This led to a flurry of discoveries in quantum computation [7], quantum algorithms [8–11], quantum simulators [12], quantum automaton [13] and programmable gate array [14]. In another development, von Neumann [15] thought of an extension of the logical concept of a universal computing machine which might mimic a living system. One of the hall-mark properties of a living system is its capability of self-reproduction. He asked the question: Is it possible to design a machine that could be programmed to produce a copy of itself, in the same spirit that a Turing machine can be programmed to compute any function allowed by physical law. More precisely, he defined a ‘*universal constructor*’ as a machine which can reproduce itself if it is provided with a program containing its own description. The process of self-reproduction requires two steps: first, the constructor has to produce a copy of itself and second, it has to produce the program of how to copy itself. The second step is important in order that the self-reproduction continues, otherwise, the child copy cannot self-reproduce. When the constructor produces a copy of the program, then it attaches it to the child copy and the process repeats. Unexpectedly, working with classical cellular automaton it was

found that there is indeed a universal constructor capable of self-reproducing.

In a sense, von Neumann’s universal constructor is a “Turing test of life” [16] if we attribute the above unique property to a living system, though there are other complex properties such as the ability to self-repair, grow and evolve. From this perspective, the universal constructor is very useful model to explore and understand under what conditions a system is capable of self-reproducing (either artificially or in reality). If one attempts to understand elementary living systems as quantum mechanical systems in an information theoretic sense, then one must first try to find out whether a *universal quantum constructor* exists. In a simple and decisive manner, we find that an all-purpose quantum mechanical constructor operating in a closed universe with a finite resource cannot exist.

The quantum world is fundamentally different in many respects than any classical world. There are many kinds of machines which are possible classically but impossible quantum mechanically. Wigner was probably the first to address the question of replicating machines in the quantum world and found that it is infinitely unlikely that such machines can exist [17]. It is now well known that the information content of a quantum state has two remarkable properties: first, it cannot be copied exactly [18,19] and second, given several copies of an unknown state we cannot delete a copy [20]. For example, if one could clone an arbitrary state then one could violate the Heisenberg uncertainty relation, and moreover, using non-local resources one could send signals faster than the speed of light [19]. In addition, non-orthogonal quantum states cannot be perfectly copied whereas orthogonal quantum states can be. [21]. The extra information needed to make a copy must be as large as possible — a recent result known as the stronger no-cloning theorem [22]. The no-cloning and the no-deleting principles taken together reveal some kind of ‘permanence’ of quantum information.

First, we observe that merely copying of information is *not the self-replication*. Therefore, with the quantum mechanical toolkit, we must formalize the question of a self-replicating machine. Let A be a universal construction machine. If $|\Psi\rangle$ is the state of a species that would self-replicate, then by furnishing a suitable description of the instructions U to produce $|\Psi\rangle$ (in accordance with the stronger no-cloning theorem we have to supply the full information about $|\Psi\rangle$) then A will construct a copy of $|\Psi\rangle$. However, this A is not yet self-reproducing, because A has produced a copy of $|\Psi\rangle$ but without a copy of U . If we add the description of U to itself it will not solve the problem, as this would lead to infinite regression. In von Neumann’s spirit we can imagine that there exists an additional quantum system B that stores the instructions U and can make a copy of them. Another ancillary system C , called the control unit, will insert the copy of U into $|\Psi\rangle$ and then will separate from the composite system $A + B$.

A quantum mechanical universal constructor may be completely specified by a quadruple $\mathcal{UC} = (|\Psi\rangle, |P_U\rangle, |C\rangle, |\Sigma\rangle)$, where $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^N$ is the state of the (artificial or real) living system that contains quantum information to be self-replicated, $|P_U\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^K$ is the program state that contains instructions to copy the original information, i.e., the unitary operator U needed to copy the state $|\Psi\rangle$ via $U(|\Psi\rangle|0\rangle) = |\Psi\rangle|\Psi\rangle$ is encoded in the program state, $|C\rangle$ is the state of the control unit, and $|\Sigma\rangle = |0\rangle|0\rangle \cdots |0\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^M$ is a collection of blank states onto which the information and the program will be copied. Let there be n number of blank states and if each of $|0\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^N$, then the dimension of the blank state Hilbert space is $M = N^n$. Without loss of generality we may assume that the blank state $|0\rangle$ may belong to a Hilbert space of dimension equal to N . It is assumed that a *finite* string of blank states

are available in the environment in which the universal constructor is operating (they are analogous to the low-entropy nutrient states that are required by a real living system). The justification for finite number of such states comes from the fact that in the universe the total energy and negative entropy available at any time is always finite [17]. To copy the program state the machine uses m blank states in one generation, so $K = N^m$. Thus M is finite but $M \gg N, K$. The initial state of the universal constructor is $|\Psi\rangle|P_U\rangle|C\rangle|\Sigma\rangle$. A universal constructor will be said to exist if it can implement copying of the original and the stored program by a fixed linear unitary operator \mathcal{L} acting on the combined Hilbert space of the input, program, control and $(m + 1)$ blank states that allows the following transformation

$$\mathcal{L}(|\Psi\rangle|0\rangle|P_U\rangle|0\rangle^{\otimes m}|C\rangle)|0\rangle^{\otimes n-(m+1)} = |\Psi\rangle|P_U\rangle\mathcal{L}(|\Psi\rangle|0\rangle|P_U\rangle|0\rangle^{\otimes m}|C'\rangle)|0\rangle^{\otimes n-2(m+1)}, \quad (1)$$

where $|C'\rangle$ is the final state of the control unit. It is worth emphasizing that (1) is not a cloning transformation. It is a *recursively defined transformation* where the fixed unitary operator \mathcal{L} acts on the initial (parent) configuration and the same acts on the final (child) configuration after the copies have been produced. This definition is required in order that the self-replication proceeds in an *autonomous* way until the blank states are exhausted. The fixed unitary operator will not act on the child configuration unless $(m + 1)$ nutrient states are available in the universe. Once the transformation is complete, the control unit separates the original information from the program states (parent information) so that the off-spring exists independently. (i.e. there is no quantum entanglement between the parent and the child information). It then continues to self-reproduce.

If such a universal constructor exists, then when it is fed with another state $|\Phi\rangle$ and a suitable program $|P_V\rangle$ to create it via $V(|\Phi\rangle|0\rangle) = |\Phi\rangle|\Phi\rangle$ then it will allow the transformation

$$\mathcal{L}(|\Phi\rangle|0\rangle|P_V\rangle|0\rangle^{\otimes m}|C\rangle)|0\rangle^{\otimes n-(m+1)} = |\Phi\rangle|P_V\rangle\mathcal{L}(|\Phi\rangle|0\rangle|P_V\rangle|0\rangle^{\otimes m}|C''\rangle)|0\rangle^{\otimes n-2(m+1)}. \quad (2)$$

If such a machine can make a copy of any state along with its program in a unitary manner, then it must preserve the inner product. This implies that we must have

$$\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle\langle P_U|P_V\rangle = \langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle^2\langle P_U|P_V\rangle^2\langle C'|C''\rangle \quad (3)$$

holds true. However, the above equation tells us that the universal constructor can exist only under two conditions, namely, (i) either $\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle = 0$ and $\langle P_U|P_V\rangle \neq 0$ or (ii) $\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle \neq 0$ and $\langle P_U|P_V\rangle = 0$. The first condition suggests that for orthogonal states as the carrier of information, there is no restriction on the program state. This means that with a finite dimensional program state and finite number of blank states orthogonal states can self-replicate. Such a universal constructor can exist with a finite resources. This corresponds to the realization of a classical universal constructor, and is consistent with von Neumann's thesis, that a self-reproducing general purpose machine can exist, in principle, in a deterministic universe [15]. However, the second condition tells us that for non-orthogonal states, the program states have to be orthogonal. This means that to perfectly self-replicate a collection of non-orthogonal states $\{|\Psi_i\rangle\}$ together with their program states $\{|P_{U_i}\rangle\}$, ($i = 1, 2, \dots$) one requires that the set $\{|P_{U_i}\rangle\}$'s should be orthogonal. Since an arbitrary state such as $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i \alpha_i|i\rangle$ with the complex numbers α_i 's varying continuously can be viewed as an

infinite collection of non-orthogonal states (or equivalently the set of non-orthogonal states for a single quantum system is infinite, even for a simplest two-state system such as a qubit), one requires an infinite-dimensional program state to copy it. In one generation of the self-replication the number of blank states used to copy the program state is $m = \log_2 K / \log_2 N$ and when $K \rightarrow \infty$ the nutrient resource needed also becomes infinite. As a consequence, to copy an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space program state one needs an infinite collection of blank states to start with. Furthermore, the number of generations g for which the self-reproduction can occur with a finite nutrient resource is $g = \log_2 M / (\log_2 KN)$. When K becomes infinite, then there can be no generations supporting self-reproduction. Therefore, we surmise that *with a finite-dimensional program state and a finite nutrient resource there is no deterministic universal constructor for arbitrary quantum states*. However, if one is interested in self-replication of a finite number K of the non-orthogonal states with K the dimension of the program Hilbert space, then it may be possible to design a universal constructor with finite resources. Because, one may find K mutually orthogonal program states that span the program Hilbert space.

One may ask is it not possible to rule out the nonexistence of deterministic universal constructor from no-cloning principle? The answer is ‘no’ for two reasons. First, a simple universal cloner is *not* a universal constructor. Second, in a universal constructor we provide the complete specification about the input state, hence it should have been possible to self-reproduce, thus reaching an opposite conclusion! Even though Eq.(3) may look the same to what one gets in the cloning operation, the transformation defined in Eq.(1) is not. One similarity for example, is that if one stores the information in an orthonormal basis states $\{|\Psi_i\rangle\}$, ($i = 1, 2, \dots, N$), then the cloning and the self-replication both are allowed. The surprising and remarkable result is that when we ask to self-replicate any arbitrary living species, then it cannot. By providing complete information of a quantum system, one may think that it should be able to self-replicate. Because when we *know* the state completely then we can design a program to copy the state. If a universal quantum constructor exist then, the program is supposed to contain the description of the species, i.e. the information about $|\Psi\rangle$. So it should have been able to self-replicate. But The perplexity of the problem lies when we allow the program to be copied. If it has to self-replicate then it violates unitarity of quantum theory.

This result may have immense bearing on explaining life based on quantum theory. One may argue that after all if everything comes to the molecular scale then there are variety of physical actions and chemical reactions which might be explained by the basic laws of quantum mechanics. However, if one applies quantum theory, then as we have proved quantum mechanical living organism cannot self-replicate. Interpreting differently, we might say that the present structure of quantum theory cannot model a living system as it fails to mimic a minimal living system. *For quantum mechanizing a living system seems to be an impossible task*. If that holds true, then this conclusion is going to have rather deep implication on our present search for ultimate laws of nature encompassing physical and biological world. On the other hand, because the self-reproducible information must be ‘classical’ the replication of DNA in a living cell can be understood purely by classical means. Having said this, our result does not preclude the possibility that quantum theory might play a role in explaining other features of the living systems [23]. For example, there is a recent proposal that quantum mechanics may explain why the living organisms have

four nucleotide bases and twenty amino acids [24]. It has been also reported that the game of life can emerge in the semi-quantum mechanical context [25].

Though we have ruled out the existence of deterministic universal constructor with finite resource, one can construct probabilistic universal constructor for non-orthogonal species states $\{|\Psi_i\rangle\}$ with certain probability of success, given a finite dimensional program state $\{|P_{U_i}\rangle\}$ and a finite collection of blank states. It is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}(|\Psi_i\rangle|0\rangle|P_{U_i}\rangle|0\rangle^{\otimes m}|C\rangle|M\rangle)|0\rangle^{\otimes n-(m+1)} = \\ & \sqrt{p_i}|\Psi_i\rangle|P_{U_i}\rangle\mathcal{L}(|\Psi_i\rangle|0\rangle|P_{U_i}\rangle|0\rangle^m|C'\rangle|M'\rangle)|0\rangle^{\otimes n-2(m+1)} + \sqrt{1-p_i}|X_i\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where p_i is the probability of success that the universal constructor works, $|M\rangle$ is the initial probe state and $|M'\rangle$ is the final probe state whose measurement can tell that it really succeeds, and $|X_i\rangle$ is the failure component of the whole constructor. It can be proved that the above transformation can exist if and only if the set $\{|\Psi_i\rangle|P_{U_i}\rangle\}$ is linearly independent [26]. This implies that the quantum species states need not be necessarily linearly independent. It is only sufficient to have that condition satisfied. The error in the probabilistic self-replication process of two non-orthogonal states $|\Psi_i\rangle$ and $|\Psi_j\rangle$ is bounded by

$$f_{ij} \geq \frac{|\langle\Psi_i|\Psi_j\rangle||\langle P_{U_i}|P_{U_j}\rangle|}{1 + |\langle\Psi_i|\Psi_j\rangle||\langle P_{U_i}|P_{U_j}\rangle|}. \quad (5)$$

From the above it is clear that there is no error introduced in the self-replicating process of any two orthogonal states, even if the program states are not orthogonal.

Implications of our results are multifold for physical and biological sciences. It is beyond doubt that progress in the burgeoning area of quantum information technology can lead to revolutions in the machines that one cannot think of at present. If a quantum mechanical universal constructor would have been possible, future technology would have allowed quantum computers to self-replicate themselves with little or no human input. That would have been a complete autonomous device — a truly marvelous thing. However, a deterministic universal constructor with a finite resources is impossible in principle. One has to look for probabilistic universal constructors which can self-replicate with only limited probability of success, similar to probabilistic cloner [26]. This could still have great implications for the future. With complete specification such a machine could construct copies based on its own quantum information processing devices. Future lines of exploration may lead to the design of approximate universal constructors in analogy with approximate universal quantum cloners [27].

How life emerges from inanimate quantum objects has been a conundrum [28–30]. What we have shown here is that quantum mechanics fails to mimic a self-reproducing unit in an autonomous way. Nevertheless, if one allows for errors in self-replication, which actually do occur in real living systems, then an approximate universal constructor should exist. Such a machine would constitute a quantum mechanical mutation machine. It would be important to see how variations in ‘life’ emerge due to the errors in self-replication. From this perspective, if quantum mechanics is the final theory of nature, our result indicates that the information stored in a living organism are copied imperfectly and the error rate may be just right in order for mutation to occur to drive Darwinian evolution. In addition, one could study how the quantum evolution of species leads to an increase in the level of

complexity in living systems. Since understanding these basic features of life from quantum mechanical principles is a fundamental task, we hope that the present result is a first step in that direction, and will be important in the areas of quantum information, artificial life, cellular automaton, and last but not least in the biophysical science.

Acknowledgments: We thank C. Fuchs for bringing the paper of E. P. Wigner to our attention. AKP wishes to thank C. H. Bennett, S. Lloyd, I. Chuang and D. Abbott for useful discussions. This work started during AKP's stay at Bangor University during 1999 and was completed during a visit to MSRI, University of Berkeley, in 2002. SLB currently holds a Wolfson-Royal Society Research Merit Award.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Church, Am. J. Math. **58** 345-363 (1936).
- [2] A. M. Turing, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **42**, 230-265 (1936).
- [3] C. H. Bennett, IBM Journal of Research and Development, **17**, 525-532 (1973).
- [4] R. Feynman, Int. J. Theo. Phys. **21**, 467-488 (1982).
- [5] P. Benioff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1581-1585 (1982).
- [6] D. Deutsch, Proc R. Soc. Lond A **400**, 97-117 (1985).
- [7] R. Feynman, Found. Phys. **16**, 507-531 (1986).
- [8] E. Bernstein, and U. Vazirani, Proc. 25th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 11-20 (1993).
- [9] D. Deutsch, & R. Jozsa, Proc. R. Soc. London A **449**, 553-558 (1992).
- [10] P. Shor, SIAM J. Comput. **265**, 1484-1509 (1997)
- [11] L. K. Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 325-328 (1997).
- [12] S. Lloyd, Science **263**, 1073-1078 (1996).
- [13] D. Z. Albert, Phys. Lett. A **98**, 249-252 (1983).
- [14] M. A. Nielsen, & I. Chuang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 321-324 (1997).
- [15] J. von Neumann, The Theory of Self-Replicating Automata. *University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL* (1966) (work by J. von Neumann in 1952-53).
- [16] C. Adami, Artificial Life **1**, 429-438 (1995).
- [17] E. P. Wigner, The Probability of the Existence of a Self-Reproducing unit. *The Logic of Personal Knowledge: Essays Presented to Michael Polanyi on his Seventieth Birthday* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London) 231-238 (1961).
- [18] W. K. Wootters, & W. H. Zurek, Nature **299**, 802-803 (1982).
- [19] D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A **92**, 271-272 (1982).
- [20] A. K. Pati, & S. L. Braunstein, Nature **404**, 164 (2000).
- [21] H. P. Yuen, Phys. Lett. A **113**, 405-407 (1986).
- [22] R. Jozsa, Quant. Ph., 0204153 (2002).
- [23] R. Penrose, Shadows of the Mind. *Oxford University Press, Oxford*, (1994).
- [24] A. Patel, J. of Bioscience **26**, 145-151 (2001).
- [25] A. P. Flitney, & D. Abbott, Quant. Ph., 0208149 (2002).
- [26] L. M. Duan, & G. C. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4999-5002 (1998).
- [27] V. Bužek, & M. H. Hillery, Phys. Rev.A **54**, 1844-1852 (1996).
- [28] E. Schrödinger, What is life . *Cambridge University Press, London*, (1944).
- [29] W. M. Elsasser, The Physical Foundation of Biology, *Pergamon Press, London*, (1958).
- [30] G. J. Chaitin, ACM SICACT News **4**, 12-18 (1970).