Are Human Brains Quantum Computers? Why Quantum Cognition Says Yes

Shan Gao

Research Center for Philosophy of Science and Technology,
Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, P. R. China
E-mail: gaoshan2017@sxu.edu.cn.

August 2, 2019

Abstract

Based on the PBR theorem about the reality of the wave function, we show that the wave function assigned to a cognitive system, which is used to calculate probabilities of thoughts/judgment outcomes in quantum cognitive models, is a representation of the cognitive state of the system. In short, quantum cognition implies quantum minds. Furthermore, the principle of psychophysical supervenience requires that a quantum mind must supervene on a quantum brain.

1   Introduction

Quantum cognition is a theoretical framework for constructing cognitive models based on the mathematical principles of quantum theory. Due to its success in explaining paradoxical empirical findings in cognitive science, quantum cognition has been the subject of much interest in recent years (see Wang et al, 2013; Yearsley and Busemeyer, 2016 for helpful reviews). However, it is still unknown what quantum cognitive models tell us about the underlying process of cognition. It is widely thought that quantum cognition is only an effective theory of cognition, where the actual brain processing may take place in an essentially classical way. In this paper, we will show that this cannot be true. Based on the recent advances in the research of quantum foundations, especially the PBR theorem about the reality of the wave function, we will show that the wave function assigned to a cognitive system such as our brain, which is used to calculate probabilities of thoughts/judgment outcomes in quantum cognitive models, is a real representation of the cognitive state of the system. In short, quantum cognition implies quantum minds. Moreover, the principle of psychophysical supervenience further implies that our brain is a quantum computer.

1

2   The PBR theorem

Quantum theory, in its minimum formulation, is an algorithm for calculating probabilities of measurement results. The theory assigns a mathematical object, the so-called wave function or quantum state, to a physical system prepared at a given instant, and specifies how the wave function evolves with time. The time evolution of the wave function is governed by the Schrödinger equation, whose concrete form is determined by the properties of the system and its interactions with environment. The connection of the wave function with the results of measurements on the system is specified by the Born rule, which roughly says that the probability of obtaining a particular result is given by the modulus squared of the wave function corresponding to the result.

At first sight, quantum theory as an algorithm says nothing about the actual state of a physical system. However, it has been known that this is not true due to the recent advances in the research of the foundations of quantum mechanics (see Leifer, 2014 for a comprehensive review). First, a general and rigorous approach called ontological models framework has been proposed to determine the relation between the wave function and the actual state of a physical system (Spekkens 2005; Harrigan and Spekkens 2010). The framework has two fundamental assumptions. The first assumption is about the existence of the underlying state of reality. It says that if a physical system is prepared such that the quantum algorithm assigns a wave function to it, then after preparation the system has a well-defined set of physical properties or an underlying ontic state, which is usually represented by a mathematical object, λ. In general, the wave function assigned to a physical system ψ corresponds to a probability distribution $p(\lambda|\psi)$ over all possible ontic states of the system.

In order to investigate whether an ontological model is consistent with the quantum algorithm, we also need a rule of connecting the underlying ontic states with measurement results. This is the second assumption of the ontological models framework, which says that when a measurement is performed, the behaviour of the measuring device is determined by the ontic state of the system, along with the physical properties of the measuring device. Concretely speaking, for a projective measurement M, the ontic state λ of a physical system determines the probability $p(k|\lambda, M)$ of different results k for the measurement M on the system. The consistency with the quantum algorithm then requires the following relation: $\int d\lambda p(k|\lambda, M)p(\lambda|\psi) = p(k|M, \psi)$, where $p(k|M, \psi)$ is the Born probability of k given M and the wave function ψ.

Second, several important ψ-ontology theorems have been proved in the ontological models framework (Pusey, Barrett and Rudolph, 2012; Colbeck and Renner, 2012, 2017; Hardy, 2013), the strongest one of which is the Pusey-Barrett-Rudolph theorem or the PBR theorem (Pusey, Barrett and

Rudolph, 2012). The PBR theorem shows that when assuming independently prepared systems have independent ontic states, the wave function assigned to a physical system must be a representation of the ontic state of the system in the ontological models framework. This auxiliary assumption is called preparation independence assumption.

The basic proof strategy of the PBR theorem is as follows. Assume there are N nonorthogonal states ψ_i ($i=1, \ldots, N$), which are compatible with the same ontic state λ.[1] The ontic state λ determines the probability $p(k|\lambda, M)$ of different results k for the measurement M. Moreover, there is a normalization relation for any N result measurement: $\sum_{i=1}^{N} p(k_i|\lambda, M) = 1$. Now if an N result measurement satisfies the condition that the first state gives zero Born probability to the first result and the second state gives zero Born probability to the second result and so on, then there will be a relation $p(k_i|\lambda, M) = 0$ for any i, which leads to a contradiction.

The task is then to find whether there are such nonorthogonal states and the corresponding measurement. Obviously there is no such a measurement for two nonorthogonal states of a physical system, since this will permit them to be perfectly distinguished, which is prohibited by quantum theory. However, such a measurement does exist for four nonorthogonal states of two copies of a physical system. The four nonorthogonal states are the following product states: $|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$, $|0\rangle \otimes |+\rangle$, $|+\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$ and $|+\rangle \otimes |+\rangle$, where $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$. The corresponding measurement is a joint measurement of the two systems, which projects onto the following four orthogonal states:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi_1 &= \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle + |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle), \\
\phi_2 &= \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \otimes |-\rangle + |1\rangle \otimes |+\rangle), \\
\phi_3 &= \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|+\rangle \otimes |1\rangle + |-\rangle \otimes |0\rangle), \\
\phi_4 &= \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|+\rangle \otimes |-\rangle + |-\rangle \otimes |+\rangle),
\end{aligned}
\tag{1}
$$

where $|-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$. This proves that the four nonorthogonal states are ontologically distinct. In order to further prove the two nonorthogonal states $|0\rangle$ and $|+\rangle$ for one system are ontologically distinct, the preparation independence assumption is needed. Under this assumption, a similar proof for every pair of nonorthogonal states can also be found, which requires more than two copies of a physical system (see Pusey, Barrett and Rudolph, 2012 for the complete proof).

Here it is worth emphasizing that the PBR theorem only involves prepare-and-measure experiments, in which a system is prepared in a wave function and is then immediately measured. Thus it is independent of how the wave

---

[1]It can be readily shown that different orthogonal states correspond to different ontic states. Thus the proof given here concerns only nonorthogonal states.

function changes after a measurement. In other words, the PBR theorem is independent of whether the collapse postulate is true or not, and it applies to the quantum algorithm with the collapse postulate or without the collapse postulate.

To sum up, the PBR theorem shows that quantum theory as an algorithm also says something about the actual state of a physical system. It is that under the preparation independence assumption, the wave function assigned to a physical system, which is used for calculating probabilities of results of measurements on the system, must be a representation of the actual state of the system in the ontological models framework.

There are two possible ways to avoid the result of the PBR theorem. One is to deny the preparation independence assumption. Although this assumption seems very natural, it may be rejected in some ontological models (Lewis et al, 2012). The other is to deny that an isolated system has a real physical state, which is objective and independent of other systems including observers, i.e. dening the first assumption of the ontological models framework. Indeed, this assumption is rejected by Quantum Bayesianism or QBism (Fuchs et al, 2014) and other pragmatist approaches to quantum theory (Healey, 2017), where the wave function represents information about possible measurement results or it is only a calculational tool for making predictions concerning measurement results.

3 Implications for quantum cognition

Let's now analyze the possible implications of the PBR theorem for understanding quantum cognition.

In its most conservative form, quantum cognition is only an algorithm for calculating probabilities of thoughts/judgment outcomes. In order to understand the underlying process of cognition in the brain, we need a similar ontological models framework for cognitive systems. The first assumption of the framework is about the existence of cognitive states. It says that when quantum cognition assigns a wave function to a cognitive system, the system has a well-defined cognitive state, which can be represented by a mathematical object, λ_c. This assumption is accepted by quantum cognitive models explicitly or implicitly. If one denies this assumption, then it will be impossible to understand the underlying process of quantum cognition.[2]

The second assumption is that when a measurement/judgment is made, the behaviour of a cognitive system is determined by the cognitive state of

---

[2]Note that denying this realistic assumption will pose more serious difficulties for understanding macroscopic cognitive systems than for understanding microscopic physical systems such as atoms. We cannot directly perceive the microscopic objects after all. But we can directly perceive macroscopic objects, and we also have self-awareness. Thus it is arguable that QBism and other pragmatist approaches to quantum theory are not applicable here.

the system, along with the concrete measurement setting such as asked questions or evidence presentation. Concretely speaking, for a measurement M, the underlying cognitive state λ_c of a cognitive system determines the probability $p(k|\lambda_c, M)$ of different results k for the measurement M on the system. The consistency with the quantum algorithm in quantum cognitive models then requires the following relation: $\int d\lambda_c p(k|\lambda_c, M)p(\lambda_c|\psi) = p(k|M, \psi)$, where $p(k|M, \psi)$ is the Born probability of k given M and the wave function ψ. This assumption is necessary for connecting the underlying cognitive states with the results of measurements. If denying this assumption, then we cannot investigate whether an ontological cognitive model is consistent with the quantum algorithm, and as a result, we cannot understand why the quantum algorithm works and what it tells us about the underlying process of cognition.

In addition, there is also an auxiliary assumption besides the above ontological models framework for cognitive systems, namely the preparation independence assumption. It says that independently "prepared" cognitive systems have independent cognitive states. This assumption holds true in quantum cognitive models.[3]

Then, quantum cognition satisfies the three preconditions of the PBR theorem, namely (1) the quantum algorithm; (2) the ontological models framework; and (3) the preparation independence assumption. Thus, like the proof of the PBR theorem, we can prove that the wave function assigned to a cognitive system such as our brain, which is used to calculate probabilities of thoughts/judgment outcomes in quantum cognitive models, is a real representation of the cognitive state of the system. This means that human minds and their dynamics are not classical but quantum in quantum cognition (Wendt, 2015).

We may go further by resorting to the principle of psychophysical supervenience, which says that the mental properties of a system cannot change without the change of its physical properties.[4] By this principle, if the mental state of a brain obeys the quantum dynamics, then the underlying physical state of the relevant part of the brain will also obey the quantum dynamics. In other words, our brain is a quantum computer (Hameroff and Penrose, 1996; Hagan et al., 2002; Fisher, 2015).

4   Conclusions

Based on the ontological models framework and the PBR theorem, we have shown that the wave function assigned to a cognitive system such as our

---

[3]It has been argued that the reality of the wave function can also be proved without resorting to this assumption (Gao, 2017, 2018).

[4]Here supervenience is used in its standard definition. A set of properties A supervenes on another set B in case no two things can differ with respect to A-properties without also differing with respect to their B-properties (McLaughlin and Bennett, 2014).

brain in quantum cognitive models is a real representation of the cognitive state of the system. In short, quantum cognition implies quantum minds. Moreover, when assuming the principle of psychophysical supervenience, a quantum mind must supervene on a quantum brain.

This result is surprising and beyond the expectations of most people working in quantum cognition. There exist two possibilities. One is that quantum cognitive models turn out to be true. This seems to be supported by recent work (Wang et al, 2014). In this case, the validity of these models will imply that our brain is indeed a quantum computer. The other is that quantum cognitive models turn out to be false. In this case, these models will have no implications on the nature of our mind and brain. In our view, the second possibility cannot yet be excluded. We hope a crucial experiment in cognition and decision making, like the double-slit experiment in physics, can be made in the near future to determine whether or not quantum cognition is real.

Acknowledgments

References

[1] Colbeck, R. and Renner, R. (2012). Is a system's wave function in one-to-one correspondence with its elements of reality? Physical Review Letters, 108, 150402.

[2] Colbeck R. and Renner R. (2017). A system's wave function is uniquely determined by its underlying physical state. New J. Phys. 19, 013016.

[3] Fisher, M. P. A. (2015). Quantum Cognition: The possibility of processing with nuclear spins in the brain. Annals of Physics 362, 593-602.

[4] Fuchs, C. A., N. D. Mermin, and R. Schack (2014). An Introduction to QBism with an Application to the Locality of Quantum Mechanics. American Journal of Physics, 82(8): 749-54.

[5] Gao, S. (2017). The Meaning of the Wave Function: In Search of the Ontology of Quantum Mechanics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[6] Gao, S. (2018). Why protective measurement establishes the reality of the wave function. http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/14977/.

[7] Hagan, S, Hameroff, SR, Tuszynski, JA (2002). Quantum computation in brain microtubules: Decoherence and biological feasibility. Phys Rev E 65(6), 061901.

[8] Hameroff, SR, Penrose, R (1996). Conscious events as orchestrated spacetime selections. J. Conscious Stud 3(1), 36-53.

[9] Hardy, L. (2013). Are quantum states real? International Journal of Modern Physics B 27, 1345012.

[10] Harrigan, N. and Spekkens, R. (2010). Einstein, incompleteness, and the epistemic view of quantum states. Foundations of Physics 40, 125-157

[11] Healey, R. (2017). Quantum-Bayesian and Pragmatist Views of Quantum Theory, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/ spr2017/entries/quantum-bayesian/.

[12] Leifer, M. S. (2014). Is the quantum state real? An extended review of ψ-ontology theorems, Quanta 3, 67-155. arXiv:1409.1570.

[13] Lewis, P. G., Jennings, D., Barrett, J., and Rudolph, T. (2012). Distinct quantum states can be compatible with a single state of reality. Physical Review Letters 109, 150404.

[14] McLaughlin, B. and Bennett, K. (2014). Supervenience, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/supervenience/.

[15] Pusey, M., Barrett, J. and Rudolph, T. (2012). On the reality of the quantum state. Nature Phys. 8, 475-478.

[16] Spekkens, R. W. (2005). Contextuality for preparations, transformations, and unsharp measurements. Physical Review A 71, 052108.

[17] Wang, Z, Busemeyer, JR, Atmanspacher, H, and Pothos, EM (2013). The potential of using quantum theory to build models of cognition. Top Cogn Sci 5(4), 672-688.

[18] Wang, Z, Solloway, T, Shi rin, RM and Busemeyer, JR (2014). Context effects produced by question orders reveal the quantum nature of human judgments. PNAS, 111, 9431.

[19] Wendt, A. (2015). Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physical and Social Ontology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[20] Yearsley, JM and Busemeyer, JR (2016). Quantum cognition and decision theories: A tutorial. Journal of Mathematical Psychology, 74, 99-116.