

March 8, 2022

LBL-37163rev

The Hard Problem: A Quantum Approach. *

Henry P. Stapp

*Theoretical Physics Group
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720*

Contents

1. Introduction: Philosophical Setting.
2. Quantum Model of the Mind/Brain.
3. Person and Self.
4. Free-Will.
5. Qualia.
6. Meeting Baars's Criteria for Consciousness.

Prepared for a special issue of the Journal of Consciousness Studies.

*This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00098.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor The Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial products process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or The Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or The Regents of the University of California and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory is an equal opportunity employer.

Introduction: Philosophical Setting

In the keynote paper David Chalmers has defined “the hard problem” to be the problem of integrating consciousness, per se, into our conception of nature. “Consciousness”, per se, consists of *experiences*, such as an actual experience of a pain, or of a sorrow, or of a redness. It includes a *visual experience* of a table in a room as distinguished from an essentially theoretical construct, “the table itself” that we conceive, or imagine, or believe to exist even when no one is experiencing it.

John Searle (1992) in his recent book “The Rediscovery of the Mind” has given a brief account of the recent history of an important movement in the philosophy of mind, namely materialism, which tries to evade the problem of consciousness by denying either the existence of consciousness, or its relevance philosophy and science, or by trying to reduce consciousness to something else, for example to “matter”—as matter is conceived of in classical mechanics—or to some functional entity, such as the logical structure of a computer program. Searle gives brief arguments, and cites more detailed ones, which seem to show that all materialist approaches tried so far have failed, essentially because they do not include an essentially irreducible component of reality, namely consciousness, to which he ascribes a first-person or subjective mode of existence. This mode of beingness he distinguishes from a third-person or objective mode of existence, which is the mode ascribed by classical mechanics to the particles and fields that constitute the irreducible elements of that particular conceptualization of the world.

To explain this notion of a third-person, or objective, mode of existence we recall that classical mechanics was created to explain the motions of planets and falling apples, etc. During early childhood each of us forms the theoretical idea that certain things, such as his playthings, exist independently of their being experienced by himself or anyone else. Classical mechanics is predicated precisely on the related notion that there are, similarly, tiny invisible objects (particles), and also unseen wave-like structures (fields), that are similar to planets in that they can be conceived to exist independently of anyone’s experiences. Thus an object, such as a human brain, for example, is represented within this idealized conception of nature, classical mechanics, as being *completely made up of*

these particles and fields that are supposed to exist independently of anyone's experience.

The likely inadequacy of this simple idealization is, of course, manifest from the outset. An alert human brain is normally connected to someone's experience. Thus there is no *á priori* reason to assume that we should be able to adequately conceptualize this complex organ as merely a simple aggregation of tiny localized entities that, like planets, can be imagined to exist independently of anyone's experience. Rather, one would naturally expect that certain properties of an actual brain might become lost, or impossible to comprehend, within the framework of such an idealization.

Searle's proposed solution of the problem of consciousness has three main points:

Point 1

"Consciousness is just an ordinary biological feature of the world" (p. 85)

"The brain causes certain mental phenomena, such as conscious mental states, and these are simply higher-level features of the brain." (p. 14)

Point 2

"Conscious mental states and processes have a special feature not possessed by other natural phenomena, namely subjectivity." (p. 95)

"What more can we say about this subjective mode of existence? Well, first it is essential to see that in consequence of its subjectivity, the pain is not equally accessible to any observer. Its existence, we might say, is an irreducibly first-person ontology" (p. 95)

Point 3

"What I want to insist upon, ceaselessly, is that one can accept the obvious facts of physics—for example that the world is made up entirely of particles in fields of force—without in any way denying the obvious facts about our existence—for example that we are all conscious and that our conscious states have quite specific irreducible phenomenological properties." (p. 28)

"One can be a thorough-going materialist and not in any way deny the existence of (subjective, internal, intrinsic, and often conscious) mental states." (p. 54)

Points 1 and 2 are plausible enough: consciousness could quite conceivably be a natural property of the brain that is ‘higher-level’, in the sense that it is left out of the classical idealization of the brain, and hence is not reducible to the third-person ontology that characterizes classical mechanics.

Point 3 is also plausible, to the extent that one does not try to comprehend the particles, fields, and matter of Searle’s thorough-going materialism as the classical-mechanics idealizations of these things. For these idealizations have, by virtue of the way in which they are conceived of and defined in classical mechanics, a purely third-person beingness. The causal laws of classical mechanics can cause these particles and fields, as they are conceptualized in classical mechanics, to coalesce into all sorts of causally efficacious functional entities, but nothing within those classical laws, as they are conceived of in classical mechanics, can cause the emergence of some “new mode of beingness” that goes beyond the beingness of aggregates of particles and fields. This is because classical mechanics is a theory that was based, from the outset, on the idea that everything is nothing more than an aggregations of things that have only third-person beingness: first-person beingness was explicitly excluded at the outset, and all causal connections are explained within classical mechanics in terms of aggregates of third-person things acting in concert. Since all functional entities constructed in this way are *causally* reducible to third-person entities there is no rational place in the theory for the re-introduction of first-person beingness.

The conclusion that ought to be drawn from Searle’s conclusion—which is that there are two different modes of beingness, with first-person beingness not reducible to third-person beingness, but constituting, nevertheless, a natural feature of organs such as brains—is that the idealizations upon which classical mechanics was based are not adequate to describe such organs: a new kind of mechanics is needed; one that naturally ascribes two different modes of beingness to such organs.

This conclusion drawn from Searle’s philosophic analysis might seem at first to conflict with science. Indeed, the motivation of the materialists was evidently to bring philosophy into accord with science, which in the nineteenth century meant classical mechanics, with its monistic ontology. But we now know that classical mechanics fails to describe correctly the properties of materials such as, for example, the tissues of a human brain. Classical mechanics has been

superceded by quantum mechanics, which is characterized, above all, by the fact that it is dualistic: the single monistic ontology of classical mechanics is replaced by an ontology consisting two very different kinds of beingness. One kind of beingness is the kind enjoyed by the quantum mechanical analog of the “matter” of classical mechanics. This part of nature, namely the deterministically evolving wave function, is like the matter of classical mechanics in the sense that it is represented as an aggregation of localized properties, and the temporal evolution of each of these properties is determined exclusively by neighboring properties, in accordance with equations of motion that are direct analogs of the corresponding equations of classical mechanics. However, this is only half the of the quantum story: there is necessarily a second component of the quantum ontology, one that pertains to *choices* between alternative possible *experiences*.

Searle, when, confronted by the suggestion that quantum theory, with its inherent dualistic ontology, is important to the resolution of the mind-brain problem, says that he will wait until quantum theorists come into agreement among themselves about the interpretation of the theory. But that misses the point completely. All interpretations agree on the need for a dualistic ontology, with one aspect being the quantum analog of *matter*, and the other aspect pertaining to *experiences*. Thus the whole debate among quantum theorists is essentially a debate about the mind-matter connection. This debate is precisely where an input from philosophy of mind should enter. To wait until the quantum debate is over is to miss the whole mind-matter ball game.

This point is important enough to elaborate upon, at least briefly. I shall therefore describe here the five main approaches to quantum theory, focussing on the dualistic and mind-versus-matter aspects of each.

The most orthodox of the interpretations of quantum theory is the Copenhagen interpretation, as expressed in the words of Niels Bohr. The key idea is encapsulated in two quotations:

“In our description of nature the purpose is not to disclose the real essence of phenomena but only to track down as far as possible relations between the multifold aspect of our experience” [Bohr, 1934]

“Strictly speaking, the mathematical formalism of quantum theory and electro-dynamics merely offers rules of calculation for the deduction of expecta-

tions pertaining to observations obtained under well-defined conditions specified by classical physical concepts.” [Bohr, 1958]

Bohr is emphasizing here that science, in the end, has to do with correlations among our experiences: experiences are the ultimate data that science must explain. Thus he can renounce the classical ideal of giving a mathematical description of the objective world itself in favor of constructing a set of mathematical rules that allow us to compute expectations pertaining to certain kinds of experiences. Thus, in contrast to the the ideas of classical physics, human experiences have an essential place in the theory. Yet the mathematical formulation of the “rules of calculation” is based on a description of the “matter-like” aspect mentioned above.

This approach is dualistic because the two things that it deals with are, on the one hand, our *experiences* (of a certain special type, namely classically describable perceptions) and, on the other hand, a set of mathematical rules that allow us to compute expectations pertaining to these experiences, and these rules are expressed in terms of a generalization of the mathematical structure that occurred in classical mechanics, and that represented, in that idealization, the “objective world of particles and fields”.

Bohr’s pragmatic approach was revolutionary in its day, and was firmly opposed by most of the senior scientists of that time. In Einstein’s opinion:

“Physics is an attempt conceptually to grasp reality as it is thought independently of its being observed” [Einstein, 1951, p.81]

and quantum theory, as formulated by Bohr,

“offers no useful point of departure for future developments” [Einstein, 1951, p.87]

Bohr admitted, in fact, that his form of the theory would not work for biological systems. That, of course, was the origin of a logical gap between the two parts of his orthodox formulation of the theory, i.e., between the subjective (experiential) part associated with our brains, and the objective (material) part associated with the experiments that human scientists perform on atomic systems.

Under the pressure of diverse goals (e.g., to expand the scope of the theory to include biological and cosmological systems, or to firm up the logical foun-

ditions) a number of “ontological formulations” of quantum theory have been created. They attempt to give a picture of the entire world itself, not just a set of rules that allow us to form expectations about our future experiences.

The simplest ontology is that of David Bohm (1952). In the orthodox (Bohr) theory one spoke of the complementary “particlelike” and “wavelike” aspects of a quantum system. That was confusing because particles stay confined to tiny regions while waves spread out: the two concepts contradict each other, physically. This is what forced Bohr into his epistemological stance, and his idea of “complementarity”.

For a world consisting of a single quantum entity Bohm’s model would have both *a particle* and *a wave*: the particle rides like a surfer on the wave. One easily sees how the puzzling double-slit experiment is explained by this model: the wave goes through both slits and influences the motion of the particle, which goes through just one slit. This model is dualistic in the sense of having both a particle and a wave. But this dualism is basically a mind/matter dualism, because the function of the “particle”, or more specifically its generalization to the many-particle universe, is basically to specify what *our experiences* will be. There is a huge gap in quantum theory between the information contained in the “wave” and the information contained in our experience. The purpose of, and need for, the particle, and its generalization to the many-particle universe, is basically to supply the information—not contained in the wave (function)—that specifies *which one* of the many mutually incompatible experiences allowed by quantum theory the observer actually has. If there were no need to describe the *experiential* aspects of reality, which are very different in character from what the deterministically evolving wave (function) describes, there would be no need for the “particle-part” of Bohm’s ontology. The critical assumption in Bohm’s model is precisely the assumption that even though the “wave” (i.e., wave function of the universe) might describe a superposition of many different brains of some one particular scientist, say Joe Smith, and although each these different superposed “brains” would correspond to his perceiving a different result of some experiment that he is performing, only one of these brains will actually be illuminated by the light of consciousness, and this particular brain, the one that possesses consciousness, is picked out by the “particle” aspect of the theory, in a specified mechanical way.

To explain how this (and also the other models) work, I shall often use the term “branches of the wave function”. To visualize these branches, imagine a large pond with an initially smooth surface (no waves). A source of waves is placed at the center, but is surrounded by a barrier that has some gaps. These gaps allow ripples to spread out only along certain beam-like regions, with most of the surface of the pond remaining smooth. These well separated beam-like regions of propagating ripples I call “branches”, or “branches of the wave (function)”.

The surface of a pond is only two dimensional. But the quantum-mechanical wave that corresponds to a universe consisting of N particles would be a wave in a $3N$ -dimensional space. The “branches of the wave (function)” will typically be relatively narrow beams of waves in this $3N$ -dimensional space, and each beam will correspond, in a typical measurement situation, to some particular “classically describable” result of the measurement. For example, one beam may describe, at some late stage, a particle detector having detected a particle; *and* a corresponding pointer having swung to the right to indicate that the detector has detected the particle; *and* the eye and the low-level processing parts of the brain responding to the light signal from the pointer in the swung-to-the-right position; *and* the top-level neural activity that corresponds to the observer’s perceiving the pointer in the swung-to-the-right position: the other branch would describe the particle detector’s having failed to detect the particle; *and* the pointer remaining in the center position; *and* the eye and low-level processing parts of the brain responding to the light signals coming from the pointer in the center position; *and* the top-level neural activity corresponding to the observer’s perceiving the pointer in the center position. The fact that *both* branches of the wave are present simultaneously is not surprising once one recognizes that the wave represents essentially only a *probability for an experience to occur*: there is, in a typical measurement, a possibility for each of several possible experiential results to occur, and the probability function (or wave function) will then have a “branch” corresponding to each possibility.

Of course, the observer, Joe Smith, will see only one of the two possibilities: he will see *either* the pointer swung-to-the-right *or* the pointer remaining at the center position. To accommodate this empirical fact Bohm introduces his “surfer” in the $3N$ -dimensional space. The surfer is merely a point in the $3N$ -

dimensional space that move always in a direction defined by the shape of the $3N$ -dimensional wave at the place where this point is, and this rule of motion for the surfer ensures that the surfer will end up in one branch or another, not in the intervening “still” part of the $3N$ -dimensional space. Each branch corresponds to one of the possible experiences. If the “surfer” (which is just the moving point in the $3N$ -dimensional space) ends up in the branch that corresponds to the experience “I see the pointer in the swung-right position” then, according to Bohm’s theory, this perception of the pointer “swung-to-the-right” is the experience that actually occurs: only the single branch in which the surfer ends up will be “illuminated”; all others “remains dark”. Bohm’s rules for the motion of the surfer ensure that if the various possible initial conditions for the surfer are assigned appropriate “statistical weights” then the statistical predictions of his theory about what observers will experiences will agree with the those given by the orthodox (Bohr) rules. In this way Bohm’s deterministic model reproduces the quantum statistical predictions about what our experiences will be.

The two parts of Bohm’s ontology, namely the wave in the $3N$ -dimensional space and the ‘surfer’, can both be considered ‘material’, yet they are essentially different because the waves describe all the possibilities for what our actual experiences might be, and therefore has a beingness that is essentially “potential”, whereas the trajectory of the surfer specifies the actual choice from among the various alternative possibilities, and therefore has a beingness that represents “actuality” rather than mere “potentiality”: the wave generates all the *possible* experiences, whereas the trajectory defined by the surfer specifies which one of these possible experiences actually occurs.

Bohm’s model is very useful, but as a model of reality it has several unattractive features. The first is the “empty branches”: once two branches separate they generally move further and further apart in the $3N$ -dimensional space, and hence if the “surfer” gets in one branch then all of the alternative ones become completely irrelevant to the evolution of experience: the huge set of empty branches continues to evolve for all of eternity, but has no effect upon anyone’s experience.

A more parsimonious ontological theory, not having these superfluous empty branches, was described by Heisenberg (1958). It also involves a reality consisting of two kinds of things. His two kinds of things are “actual events”, and

“objective tendencies for those events to occur”. The objective tendencies can be taken to be represented by the wave on the $3N$ -dimensional pond, and the actual events can be represented by sudden or abrupt changes in this wave. Each such change “collapses the wave” to one of its branches. Thus Bohm’s “surfer”, which specifies a *choice* between branches, is replaced by an “actual event”, which also specifies a choice between branches. But whereas Bohm’s surfer has no back-reaction on the wave, each of Heisenberg’s actual events obliterates all branches but one. The big problem with Heisenberg’s theory is to find a reasonable criterion for the occurrence of these actual events.

Wigner (1961) and von Neumann (1932), noting that there is nothing in the purely material aspect of nature that singles out where the actual events occur, suggest that these events should occur at the points where consciousness enters: i.e., in conjunction with conscious events. This is the most parsimonious possibility: all of the known valid predictions of quantum theory can be reproduced by limiting the actual events to brain events that correspond to experiential events. An argument based on survival of the species [Stapp, 1995a] provides support for the idea that actual events occurring in human brains will tend to occur at the brain-wide level of activity that corresponds to conscious events, rather than at some microscopic (e.g., molecular, or individual-neuron) level.

This Wigner-von-Neumann version of Heisenberg’s theory will be discussed presently in some detail. But first a few remarks about the final major interpretation are needed.

In the Everett many-minds theory the basic quantum mechanical equation of motion, the Schroedinger equation, holds uniformly: there are no sudden collapses of the wave function; all branches continue to exist. Moreover, it is assumed that, because all of the branches exist, all of the corresponding streams of conscious must also occur.

Since the various branches propagate into different parts of the $3N$ dimensional space they will evolve independently of each other: the physical “memory banks”, associated with one branch will not effect the brain activities specified by another branch. Hence each different branches can be considered to define different “self”, or “psyche”, with each of these selves continually dividing into different extentions of itself into the future.

At first sight this idea seems to allow the whole theory to be reduced to just one entity, the evolving wave, with the different psychological persons being just “aspects” of corresponding brain activities on different branches. But that is not correct. The branches of the wave function appear as parts of a *conjunction* of branches: all branches on the ‘pond’ exist simultaneously, even though they evolve independently. But the predictions of quantum theory are an essential part of the theory, and these statistical predictions pertain to experiences that are ‘this experience’ *or* ‘that experience’, not ‘this experience’ *and* ‘that experience’. To speak of probabilities one needs something with an *or* character: something that can become associated with *either* this branch *or* that branch, not both simultaneously. Just as the different branches of the wave on the pond are conjunctively present and do not, by themselves, provide any ontological basis for assigning different probabilities to these simultaneously present things, so also is the quantum wave by itself insufficient for this task.

In Bohm’s theory this extra element of the theory was the ‘surfer’, which determined the experiences of the observers; in Heisenberg’s theory the extra things were the actual events, which also determined the experiences of the observers. In the Everett interpretation the only existing things besides the waves are our experiences, and there is supposed to be a separate experience for with each branch. Thus we end up again with a dualistic theory; with a world that is composed of the one “material” universe represented by the wave function, which evolves always according to the the Schroedinger equation, plus, for each named person, an great profusion of many minds, or streams of consciousness: the stream of consciousness of Joe Smith must be continually splitting into different separate branches, with at least one for each of the perceptibly different results of any experiment that he performs. Consequently, the proponents of the theory need to develop, in order to complete this interpretation, some coherent dualistic ontology involving, for each of us, a profusion of branching minds, each known only to itself.

In summary, all the major ontological interpretations of quantum theory are dualistic, in the sense that they have one aspect or component that can be naturally identified as the quantum analog of the *matter* of classical mechanics, and a second aspect that is associated with *choices* from among the possible *experiences*. All interpretations are, in this sense, basically similar to

the Wigner-von-Neumann interpretation to be explored here, but are less parsimonious, in that they involve either existing but unobserved branches (Bohm), or existing but unobserved actual events (Heisenberg), or existing but unobserved minds (Everett). (Parenthetically I note that the one great virtue of the Everett interpretation, namely that requires no faster-than-light influences, will probably evaporate when the theory is completed by the construction of the needed consistent theory of the observing minds, for the theory will then run up against the nonlocality theorems: See Mermin, 1994)

I now return to philosophy—from this digression pertaining to the dualistic character of quantum theory—and comment briefly upon one of the principal contemporary versions of materialism, namely ‘eliminative materialism’, as expounded in the recent book *Neurophilosophy* by P.S. Churchland (1986). There it is noted that there are familiar examples in the history of physics where a theory dealing with one realm of phenomena, for example thermodynamics or optics, has been reduced to a ‘more basic’ theory, for example statistical mechanics or electrodynamics. So why cannot psychology be likewise reduced to brain physiology, and ultimately to the basic physics of matter? Searle answers that in all of these familiar reductions the psychological part of the problem was “carved off” before the reduction was achieved, so the analogy is not apt: no new kind of beingness has ever been obtained from the third-person beingness of classical physics. Churchland avoids this ontological issue of the nature or quality of the beingness by restricting the notion of reducibility to the *causal* properties of the theories in question, thereby skirting the issue that Searle focusses upon. However, she must eventually face the issue in the form of the problem of explaining the seemingly huge difference between, on the one hand, things such as pains, desires, beliefs, and other experiential things, and, on the other hand, material particles. She deals with this problem by suggesting that the psychology of the future may be very different from the ‘folk psychology’ of today: it may not contain such things as pains, perceptions, and other experiential things. However, as Chalmers emphasizes in his keynote paper, that kind of ‘solution’ eliminates the very facts to be explained by psychological theory, and in fact, as stressed by Bohr, by physical theory as well. As Searle maintains, an adequate theory of the future ought to represent experiences as natural features of biological organs, rather than explaining them away.

Achieving Searle's desideratum requires no waiting for some unknown theory-of-the-future, for quantum theory, combined with some rather standard ideas from neuro-science, already presents us with an ideal psycho-physical framework.

2. Quantum Model of the Mind/Brain

The main features of the mind/brain theory proposed in Stapp (1993) are now briefly described.

1. Facilitation: The pattern of neurological activity associated with any occurring conscious thought is "facilitated", in the sense that the activation of this pattern causes certain physical changes in the brain structure, and these changes *facilitate* subsequent activations of this pattern.

2. Associative Recall: The facilitation of patterns mentioned above is such that the excitation of a part of a facilitated pattern has a tendency to excite the whole. Thus the sight of an ear tends to activate the pattern of brain activity associated with a previously seen face of which this ear was a part.

3. Body-World Schema: The physical body of the person in its environment is represented within the brain by certain patterns of neural and other brain activity. Each such pattern has *components*, which are sub-patterns that represent various parts or aspects of the body and its environment, and these components are normally patterns of brain activity that have been facilitated in conjunction with earlier experiences.

4. Executive-Level Template for Action: A main task of the alert brain at each moment is to construct a template for the impending action of the organism. This template is formed from patterns of neural and brain activity that, taken together, represent a coordinated plan of action for the organism. This representation is implemented by the brain by means of an automatic causal spreading of neural excitations from the executive level to the rest of the nervous system. This subsequent activity of the nervous system causes both motor responses and lower-level neural responses.

The executive-level templates are based on the body-world schema, in the following sense. There are two kinds of templated actions: attentions and intentions. Attentions *up date* the body-world schema: they bring the brain's representation of the body in its environment up to date. Intentions are for-

mulated in terms of a *projected* (into the future) body-world schema: they are expressed in terms of an image of how the body in its environment is intended to be at a slightly future time. (Thus, for example, the tennis player imagines how he will strike the ball, or where the ball he is about to hit will land in his opponent’s court).

5. Beliefs and other Generalizations: The simple Body-World Schema, with attentional and intentional templated actions, is the primitive level of brain action: it gives the general format. However “beliefs” can be added to the landscape. Also, each templated action has both intentional and attentional aspects.

6. Quantum Theory: The features mentioned above are key elements of this theory. But they are aspects that hold at the level corresponding to a particular classically described ‘branch’. However, classical mechanics cannot account for the properties of the materials (such as tissues and membranes) from which the brain is made. Hence, within the basic theory, these classically describable aspects must be coherently imbedded in a correct quantum mechanical description if one is to have an adequate account of the behavior of the brain.

7. Superposition of Templates: An analysis [Stapp, 1993, 1995b] of processes occurring in synapses shows that if there were no quantum collapses occurring in brains then a brain evolving according to the quantum laws must evolve, in general, into a state that contains a superposition of different “branches”, with each of these branches specifying the template for a different macroscopic action: each of these different templates for action will evolve into a different response of the nervous system, and consequently into a difference macroscopic response of the organism.

8. The Reduction Postulate: Following the Wigner-von-Neumann approach, I postulate that the quantum collapse of the brain state occurs at the level of the template for action: the (Heisenberg-picture) state (of the universe) undergoes the collapse

$$\Psi_i \rightarrow \Psi_{i+1} = P_i \Psi_i,$$

where P_i is a projection operator that acts on appropriate macroscopic variables associated with the brain: it picks out and saves, or “actualizes”, *one* of the alternative possible templates for action, and eradicates the others. Hence

the organism will then proceed automatically to evolve in accordance with this one particular plan of action, rather than evolving (à la Everett) into a superposition of states corresponding to *all* of the different possible macroscopically distinguishable courses of action that were formerly available to it. Thus the “quantum event”, or “collapse of the wave function”, *selects* or *chooses* one of the alternative possible coherent plans of action—previously generated by the purely mechanical functioning of the brain—by actualizing the executive-level pattern of brain activity that constitutes *one* of the alternative possible templates for action.

This collapse of the wave function is to be understood not as some anomalous failure of the laws of nature, but rather as a natural consequence of the fact that wave function does not represent actuality itself, but rather, in line with the ideas of Heisenberg, the “objective tendencies” for the next actual event.

Each such event is represented, within the Hilbert space description, as a sudden shift in the wave function, or state Ψ_i , to a new form that incorporates the conditions or requirements imposed by the new actual event.

These collapse events in the Hilbert space are not things introduced willy-nilly: they are needed to block what will otherwise automatically occur, namely the evolution of the wave function to a form that directly contradicts collective human experience: all of us who see the pointer agree that the pointer does not both swing to the right *and* also remain motionless. Under the conditions of the measurement it does one thing *or* the other, and all of us who witness what it does, and are able communicate our findings to each other, agree about which one of these two possible things actually occurs.

9. The Basic Postulate: Adhering to the Wigner-von-Neumann approach, I postulate that this physical brain event, namely the collapse of the wave function to the branch that specifies one particular template for action, is the brain correlate of a corresponding psychological or experiential event. Thus the psychological experience of “intending to raise the arm” corresponds to the physical event that actualizes the template for action that “tends to raise the arm”. The psychological event of “intending to do x ” is paired to the physical event that “tends to do x .”

Attending is a special kind intending: the intention, in the case of attending,

is to up-date the body-world schema.

Different locutions can be used here. One can say that the brain event is an image in the world of matter of the conscious event, or that the conscious event is the image in the world of mind of the brain event, or that the conscious event and brain event are two aspects of one and the same actual event. But the essential point is that the quantum-mechanical description of nature in terms of the deterministically evolving wave function is fundamentally incomplete: some ontological element that is structurally different and distinct from the local-deterministically evolving wave function, which represents the quantum analog of matter, is needed to specify the *choices between alternative possible experiences*. This added ontological element is *logically needed* in order to provide a basis for the core property of quantum mechanics, namely its capacity to predict *probabilities for classically describable experiences to occur*.

10. The Efficacy of Consciousness: In this model the choices associated with conscious events are dynamically efficacious: each such event *effects* a decision between different templates for action, and these different templates for action lead to different distinguishable responses of the organism.

11. Consciousness and Survival: It is often claimed that consciousness comes into being because it aids survival. For this to be so consciousness must be efficacious. Yet (just as in classical physics) consciousness is not efficacious in the Bohm and Everett models: everything is completely pre-determined. Consciousness would be nonefficacious also in the Heisenberg model if we did not follow Wigner-von-Neumann in associating (at least some of) the actualizing events with conscious events.

I am *not* assuming that *all* actual events are associated with physical events in human brains: other events may also occur. The assumption, rather, is that every conscious event is efficacious and hence corresponds to a physical event. One must expect, in an organism whose physical structure is determined in large measure by considerations related to survival of the species, that these physical events will in fact occur primarily at the level of the actualizations of the top-level templates for action, because this placement provides the optimal survival advantage.[Stapp, 1995a, 1995b]

12. Conscious Events and Unconscious Processing: The general temporal

development in the brain proceeds by periods of unconscious processing punctuated by conscious events. A conscious event actualizes a template for action that, by the automatic spreading of top-level neural activity to the rest of the nervous system, controls motor action, the collection of new information (including the monitoring of ongoing processes), and the formation of the next template for action.

Classically only a single “next template” would be formed. This could be achieved either by the formation of a resonant state that sucks energy from competing possibilities, or by inhibitory signals, or by dropping into the well of an attractor. But in any case the quantum uncertainties entail that the quantum brain will necessarily evolve into a superposition of branches corresponding to the different alternative possible classical templates for action. Next the quantum event in the brain selects one of these templates for action, and then the automatic (unconscious) neural processes proceed to carry out the instructions encoded in the template. Thus we have an alternation between discrete conscious events—each of which decides between the alternative possible allowed templates for action generated by the automatic action of the local deterministic laws of quantum mechanics, and hence between the different associated macroscopic responses of the organism—and periods of unconscious activity controlled by the local deterministic laws.

3. Person and Self

According to William James:

“Such a discrete composition is what actually obtains in our perceptual experience. We either perceive nothing, or something that is already there in a sensible amount. This fact is what is known in psychology as the law of the ‘threshold’. Either your experience is of no content, of no change, or it is of a perceptible amount of content or change. Your acquaintance with reality grows literally by buds or drops of perception. Intellectually and on reflection you can divide these into components, but as immediately given they come totally or not at all.” [James, 1910, p. 1062]

“... however complex the object may be the thought of it is one undivided state of consciousness.” [James, 1890, p. 276]

“The consciousness of Self involves a stream of thought, each part of which as ‘I’ can (1) remember those that went before, and know the things they knew; and (2) emphasize and care paramountly for certain ones among them as ‘*me*’, and *appropriate* to these the rest... This *me* is an empirical aggregate of things objectively known. The *I* that knows them cannot itself be an aggregate. Neither for psychological purposes need it be considered to be an unchanging metaphysical entity like the Soul, or a principle like the pure Ego, viewed as “out of time”. It is a *Thought*, at each moment different from that of the last moment, but *appropriative of the latter*, together with all that the latter called its own ... *thought is itself the thinker*, and psychology need not look beyond...” (James. 1890, p. 401)

In line with these ideas of James, and those of the preceding section, the conception of a ‘person’ that emerges here is that of a sequence of discrete psychological (i.e., experiential or conscious) events bound together by a matter-like structure, namely the brain/body, which evolves in accordance with the local deterministic laws of quantum mechanics. Each conscious event is a new entity that rises from the ‘ashes’ of the old, which consists of the propensities for its occurrence carried by the brain/body.

A felt sense of an enduring ‘self’ is experienced, and hence it must, within this theory, be explained as an aspect of the structure of the *individual* discrete conscious events. The explanation is this: each conscious event has a “fringe”

that surrounds the central image, and provides the background in which the central image is placed. The slowly changing fringe contains the consciousness of the situation within which the immediate action is taking place; the historical setting including purposes (e.g., getting some food to eat). The sense of feeling of self is in this fringe. It is not an illusion, because the physical brain/body is providing continuity and a reservoir of memories that can be called upon, even though each thought is, according to this model, a separate entity. As explained by James—see also Stapp (1993)—each thought, though itself a single entity, has components that are sequentially ordered in a psychological time, and hence each thought has within its own structure an aspect that corresponds to the flow of physical time.

4. Free-Will

Among the qualia that we experience is the feeling that we are, in some sense, free. That is an accurate feeling. The whole organism is free to make high-level choices. Its fate is not predetermined, and its actions are not controlled by mechanical local deterministic laws in a way that would make that feeling of freedom a complete illusion.

It might be objected that we are not free because, according to quantum theory, our choices are determined by blind chance. That misses the point. In the first place the choices are not blind. If the quantum events in the brain occurred at the level of the neurons then the choices would be blind, for the consequences of each individual choice would be screened from view by the inscrutable outcomes of billions of similar independent random choices. But the choices being made by the organism, acting as a unit, are choices between plans for actions that have clear and distinctive consequences for the organism as a whole, in terms of its future behavior. The choice is made at the level of the organism as a whole, and the event has a distinctive ‘feel’ that accurately portrays its consequences for the organism as a whole. The conditioning for this event is an expression of the the values and goals of the whole organism, and the choice is implemented by a unified action of the whole organism that is normally meaningful in the life of the organism. And this meaning is felt as an essential aspect of the act of choosing.

The final ‘random’ decision between the alternative possible distinctive actions of the organism is not some wild haphazard stab in the dark, unrelated to the needs or goals of the organism. It is a choice that is governed essentially by the number of ways in which the mechanistic aspect of the organism, which has been honed to construct templates for action concordant with the needs of the organism within its environment, can come up with that particular template. Thus the choice is not like the throw of an unconditioned die. It is a carefully crafted choice that tends to be the “optimally reasonable” choice under the conditions defined by the external inputs, and the needs and goals of the organism. Each of the alternative possible templates for a coherent and well-coordinated action of the organism emerges from the quantum soup, and is given, by the quantum mechanism, a weighting that reflects the interests of the

organism as a whole, within the context in which he finds himself. The choice is conditioned by these personally molded weights, and therefore tends to be a decision that is optimally reasonable from the point of view of the organism. This arrangement avoids both the Scylla of a fate ordained and sealed at the birth of the universe by a microscopically controlled blind mechanism, and also the Charybdis of a haphazard wild chance that operates at a microscopic level, and is therefore blind as regards likely consequences, and their evaluations from the perspective of the organism. The intricate interplay of chance and determinism instituted by quantum mechanics effectively frees the organism to pursue, in an optimal way, its own goals based on its own values, which have themselves been created, from a wealth of open possibilities, by its own earlier actions. Each human being, though never in full control of the situation in which he finds himself, does create both himself and his actions, through a process of a microscopically controlled deterministic evolution punctuated by organic meaningful choices that are top-down in the sense that each one is instituted by an actualization event that selects as a unit, and feels as a unit, an entire top-level plan of action.

[Within the contemporary framework of quantum theory that I am adhering to here there remains, in the end, an element of ‘pure chance’ that selects one of the templates for action ‘randomly’. Whether this occurrence of pure chance is a permanent feature of basic physical theory, or merely a temporary excursion, no one knows. In my own opinion this occurrence pure chance a reflection of our state of ignorance regarding the true cause, which must in any case be nonlocal, and hence both difficult to study and quite unlike the local causes that science has dealt with up until now. In another place [Stapp, 1995b] I have described in more detail the technicalities of the actualization process, and also the possibility of replacing the element of pure chance by a nonlocal causal process that makes the felt psychological subjective ‘I’, as it is represented within the quantum-theoretic description, rather than pure chance, the source of the decisions between one’s alternative possible courses of action.]

5. Experience/Consciousness

The ‘Hard Problem’ is the problem of *conscious experience*: What is it? Why is it present at all? Why is it so different from the other part of Nature, namely the objective aspect of reality? Why is it personal, or subjective? Why is it so fleeting, whereas matter is permanent and conserved? Can it be ‘reduced’ to matter? Can any purely physical account explain it? Is the material of which the brain is made crucial, or is it only the functional aspect that is critical? Why is it so closely connected to function? How do functional aspects become ontological aspects, i.e. how does function become being? How can anything, and in particular consciousness, be added to the already closed laws of physics? Is experience a fundamental element of nature, or derivative, or emergent? What are the *bridging laws* that connect mind to matter?

Chalmers asks these questions, and says that right now we have no candidate theory that answers these questions. But we do!

Chalmers suggests that perhaps there is a small loop-hole in quantum theory that might provide an opening for consciousness. But there is not just a small loop-hole: there is a gigantic lacuna, which consists of fully *half of the theory*, and this hole provides an ideal home for consciousness. For quantum dynamics consists not only of the mechanical process that is governed by the Schroedinger equation, which controls the matter-like aspect of nature, but also an entirely different ‘second process’, which constitutes a beingness of an entirely different order. This second process fixes the actual experiential aspect of nature, as contrasted to the potential aspect. It fixes what our experiences actually will be. And in the most parsimonious of the available interpretations it *consists* of actualizations of precisely the functional states that we “feel” are being actualized by our intentional mood. This second process is, in comparison to the ontological structures upon which classical mechanics was based, something completely new and different: it actualizes things that formerly were mere potentialities, and hence has an ontological status that is different from the ontological status of matter in both classical mechanics and quantum mechanics. It is a ‘doer’, and what it does is just what our thought do, or at least feel that they do: it initiates physical and mental actions. As an initiator of body/brain action it is indistinguishable from a stream of efficacious conscious thoughts.

How does this theory answer the questions raised above about consciousness?

What is consciousness? It is a sequence of actualizations of functional patterns of brain activity. These functional patterns are expressed in terms of a projected body-world schema, and each actualized pattern is ‘facilitated’ for use in later executive events.

Why are these actualizations present at all? Because the laws of physics demand it. Without such actualizations (or, in other interpretations, some substitute for them) quantum theory would be devoid of empirical significance, and essentially incomplete. The actualizations are not epiphenomenal! They are efficacious, and hence can play an important role in the survival of the organism.

Why is consciousness so different from the other part of Nature, namely the objective aspect of reality? The objective part of reality has a different kind of beingness: it is mere ‘potentia’, whereas consciousness is a doer; it is a process of actualization.

Why is consciousness subjective? It is an actualization that has many components that are all integral parts of the whole. The totality contains the fringe of the experience that constitutes the ‘I’, or ‘psyche’, that is felt as the experiencing subject and actualizer. The experiencing subject is part of the thought: if it were not part of the thought then there would be in the thought no awareness of ‘I’ as the background relative to which the focus of the thought is the foreground. So it not that the thought belongs to the ‘I’, but rather that the ‘I’ belongs to the thought.

Why is the thought so fleeting, whereas matter is permanent and conserved? Because a thought is event-like, whereas matter is the continuously evolving potentia for an event to occur.

Can consciousness be ‘reduced’ to matter? “Matter” is mere potentia for an event. But each conscious event is represented within matter (i.e., within the wave) as the collapse of the wave (function) to a form that embodies the actualized functional structure. The actualization cannot be expressed outside of the matter that embodies it, yet, by virtue of its being an actualization, it is not a mere potentia for such an actualization

Can any purely physical account explain it? If by a physical account one

means a quantum mechanical account then the actualization is an integral part of the physical account, and is thus explained by that account. But it cannot be explained within the ontology of classical mechanics. For classical mechanics has no events that are actualizations of potentia, and no concept of a potentia that is a mere objective tendency for an actualization to occur.

Is the material of which the brain is made crucial, or is it only the functional aspect that is critical? The material must support the quantum theoretic generation of the possible templates, and the actualization of one of them. The conscious process is a real process of quantum actualization, not a simulation of that process in which this actualization does not actually occur.

Why is consciousness so closely connected to function? In the specific theory described here this close connection arises because the conscious event is an actualization of a template for action. The biological reason for this link of actualization to function is undoubtedly the survival advantage it confers: a species constructed so that the actualizations create functionally effective and reinforced actions will fare better than one in which the created patterns lack functional content.

How do functional aspects become ontological aspects? Actualizations endow structures with beingness. Conscious actualizations in human brains endow functional structures with material beingness: i.e., with the capacity to tend to make certain later actualizations occur.

How can consciousness be added to the already closed laws of physics? Nothing efficacious could be added if the laws were already complete! But the quantum laws are grossly incomplete before consciousness, or some stand-in, is added.

Is experience a fundamental element of nature, or is it derivative, or emergent? An actualizing element that converts potentia to actuality is needed to complete quantum theory. A coherent role for experience is also needed. Quantum theory allows these two needs to be satisfied together.

What are the *bridging laws* that connect mind to matter? These laws have been described here, and in more detail in my book.

6. Meeting Baars's Criteria for Consciousness.

Baars (1995) has formulated a set of empirical constraints that any sensible

theory of consciousness has to fit.

The first thing that the theory must account for is the fact that there is a great deal of unconscious processing that is akin to consciousness, but is not conscious. For example, there are below-threshold and masked stimulations that seem to be being processed in ways akin to our conscious processing, but which do not rise to consciousness.

As described in Stapp (1993), the key units in brain processing are patterns of excitations that have been previously facilitated and are called “symbols”. The task of the brain is to assemble some subset of these symbols into a coherent pattern of brain activity that constitutes a coordinated template for action. This template is expressed in a ‘body-world schema’, which is the brain’s representation of the body-in-its-environment, or a natural generalization of this schema.

In the process of forming the next template for action the input stimuli begin to excite various symbols. But a great deal of automatic (i.e., unconscious) processing occurs before there emerges from the welter of competing symbols a single coherent combination of them that fits together into single coordinated body-world schema. The symbols activated by weak stimuli, can *influence* this competitive process of creating the next template, without these symbols becoming actually represented in the final template itself: they become squeezed out by the requirement that the actualized template must form a single coherent body-world schema. This picture of the general mode of operation of the unconscious process of constructing the next template seems to provide an adequate basis (though, of course, not the specific details) for understanding the effects of weak or masked stimulations that Baars cites.

Perceptual processes are understood in the same way: the various symbols that have been activated all feed into a (quantum) mechanical brain process that must extract from this welter of symbols, each of which tends to excite other symbols, a coordinated combination of them that fit together to form a single coherent body-world schema, before any conscious event can occur. The collection of inputs excite symbols that act as a set of clues from which a single coherent schema must be formed. The fading from consciousness of stimuli that call for no attentional or intentional action is accounted for by the fact that

the conscious events correspond exactly to events that either up-date or project the body-world schema, or some natural generalization of it. Symbols that lack the energy, or the relevancy as defined by the whole active mass of competing symbols, to be included in a current template for action will not be experienced.

Why are unaccessed interpretations of ambiguous interpretations not also present in consciousness? The reason is that an up-dating takes the form of an actualization of a coherent body-world schema. A coherent body-world schema must have definite qualities assigned to various points in a spacetime grid; all ambiguities must be resolved before the body-world schema comes into being.. One can surmise that a coherent body-world schema has the internal dynamical self-consistency that allows it to persist long enough for facilitation to occur.

Why is processing slowed down when two alternative interpretations are closely balanced in likelihood? The reason is that the various stimuli excite the associated symbols and these patterns tend to expand to fill out the body-world schema. But if there are balanced tendencies coming from two incompatible alternatives then the mechanical process requires more time in order resolve the conflict and produce a single coherent body-world schema.

Another set of constraints mentioned by Baars are the contextual constraints on perceptions. Again, in the process of constructing the next template for action all the stimuli tend to produce their corresponding symbols (patterns). These various symbols all enter into the unconscious process of constructing a template for action that fills the requirements of being a single coherent body-world schema. Expectations, and the needs of the organism, are all represented by input symbols, and this collection of symbols constitutes an initial set of competing patterns that must be resolved by the brain's automatic machinery. This machinery must, if the organism is to act effectively, create an appropriate template for a coordinated action that meets the pressures (i.e., tendencies) that are represented in the various initially excited symbols.

Another category of questions raised by Baars concerns not percepts but *images*, for example the visual images that we can bring to mid when our eyes are closed.

Where is our image of yesterday's breakfast before we bring it to mind? Answer: In the patterns of activity that were facilitated yesterday at breakfast,

and hence exist as symbols that can be activated by the excitation of some of its components, but that are not currently excited.

Why after a brief exposure to a visual matrix can we access more information than we can report? Answer: because the symbols associated with the parts of the matrix are all present in our low-level brain response, but the processing of this information that leads to an up-dating of the body-world schema is conditioned by the “need” of the organism as defined by other input stimuli and the “mental set” defined by the preceding conscious events, which issue the instructions that are directing the construction of the next template. Only a small part of the welter of input symbols makes it through the filter provided by the symbols that represent the current contextual situation to become parts of the next template for action.

I can go through the list given by Baars and show that all of his conditions can be met, *at this level of general principle*—as distinguished from a description of specific mechanisms at the neuronal level—by using the ideas used above. More generally, this quantum picture of the mind/brain seems *compatible*, at this level of general principle, with all of the mind/brain data that I have encountered in my perusal of the literature. This perusal is not exhaustive, but I think covers enough data to make it likely that the general ideas described here will adequately comprehend, at this general level of description, what is now known. Of course, working out a detailed neuronal machinery that will implement these general notions is a huge problem. But in approaching that huge problem it should be helpful to have a rational general conception of how things could work in a theory of the mind/brain that encompasses in a coherent way the fact that classical physics does not give a correct account of the behaviour of the materials out of which brains are made.

References

- Baars, Bernard (1995), 'A Thoroughly Empirical Approach to Consciousness', *PSYCHE: an interdisciplinary journal of research on consciousness* 1039-723X/93.
- Bohm, David (1952), 'A Suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of Hidden Variables' I and II, *Phys. Rev.* **85**, pp. 166-93
- Bohr, Niels (1934), *Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, p. 18.
- Bohr, Niels (1958), *Essays 1958/1962 on Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge*, (Wiley, New York), 1963, p. 60.
- Churchland, Patricia S. (1986), *Neurophilosophy*, (MIT Press, Cambridge).
- Einstein, Albert (1951), in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, P. A. Schilpp (ed.), (Tudor, New York).
- Everett III, Hugh (1957), 'Relative State Formulation of Quantum Mechanics', *Rev. of Mod. Phys.* **29**, pp. 454-62
- Heisenberg, Werner (1958), *Physics and Philosophy*, (Harper and Row, New York) Chap. III.
- James, William (1890), *The Principles of Psychology*, (Dover, New York, 1950) Vol. 1.
- James, William (1910), *William James: Writings 1902-1910*, (The Library of America, Viking, New York, 1987), p. 1061. (From: Some Problems of Philosophy, Ch X).
- N. David Mermin (1994), 'Quantum Mysteries Refined', *American Journal of Physics* **62**, 880-887.
- Searle, John (1992), *The Rediscovery of the Mind*, (MIT Press, Cambridge).
- Stapp, Henry P. (1993), *Mind, Matter, and Quantum Mechanics*, (Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Berlin, New York). Chapter 6
- Stapp, Henry P. (1990), 'Quantum Measurement and the Mind-Brain Connection', *Symposium on the Foundations of Modern Physics 1990*, P. Lahti and P. Mitterstaedt eds., (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991).
- Stapp, Henry P. (1995a), 'Quantum Mechanical Coherence, Resonance, and Mind', To appear in the Proceedings of the Norbert Wiener Centenary Congress

(Edited by V. Mandrekar and P.R. Masini) to be published in the American Mathematical Society Series Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics (PSAPM) Also to appear in PSYCHE. Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory Report LBL-36915.

Stapp, Henry P. (1995b) ‘Chance, Choice, and Consciousness: The Role Of Mind in the Quantum Brain. (For Tucson II and Psyche)

von Neumann, John (1932), *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1955, Chap. VI.

Wigner, Eugene (1961), ‘Remarks on the Mind-Body Problem’ *The Scientist Speculates*, I.J. Good, ed., (Heinemann, London)