

Quantum Cosmology: Theory of General System (III)

Zhen Wang

Physics Department, Liaoning Normal University, Dalian, 116029, P.R. China

Abstract

The concepts of the perfect system and degeneracy are introduced. A special symmetry is found which is related to the entropy invariant. The inversion relation of system is obtained which is used to give the opposite direction of time to classical second law in thermodynamics. The nature of time is discussed together with causality relation. A new understanding of quantum mechanics is put forward which describes a new picture of the world.

I. Introduction

We have introduced the concept of uncertainty quanta in our theory. Superficially, this seems to indicate that this is a rough theory. But in fact this gives us a new altitude to carry out our research. Admission of limitation means overcoming it. Quantum mechanics gives a very good example in this aspect. It abandons the deterministic (though it is found now to be special) character of classical mechanics and takes the uncertainty principle, which has no classical feature at all, as the basis to establish new mechanics. It is the quantum mechanics that has given us so deep understanding about the world that we never had before.

Philosophy is our general view about this world. If it is not established on the scientific basis, philosophy would lose connection with reality. Then it would not be helpful to us to form general understanding about the world and also a firm belief on it. The first thing is to admit that the world can be understood. If there were some supernatural power deciding human destiny, which were permanently beyond human comprehension, all the science and culture we have today would have no sense at all, because such supernatural power might function at any time or in any case so that there would be no laws at all. This is obviously contradictory with our practical experience. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to give a logical proof to show that there is a permanent limitation in human knowledge, because the proof itself would also be restricted by the limitation in such case. Therefore agnosticism is logically unreasonable.

There is an absurd yet very popular psychological tendency to take individual experience as group experience. What can be certain is that there may be some common or similar part in the experiences of different individuals. But there have never been enough proof

or logical reasoning to show that this can be extrapolated to the whole experience. There may be much more difference than similarity in the experiences of different individuals. Therefore the comparison of experiences is relative. In such a view, we can not talk about some objective reality without indicating the subject. We have not known all the ways that a system interacts with its environment, so we can not say there is objective reality independent of experiences of all subjects. What's more, such statement is also apparently preposterous. The subjective system may have limitation, which is revealed by the fortuity in its environment. This fortuity does not imply the existence of objective reality independent of subjective system, but rather that the system has not grasp all its relation with its environment because of its limitation.

Quite a lot of our knowledge has been acquired through finite induction. In other words, They are accepted because no negative evidences have been found. But obviously finite induction is precarious. This is because the world is an integrated whole and the uncertainty in the outer environment, which arises from the limitation of the system, will give uncertain result at uncertain time and in an uncertain way. So no matter how reasonable the conclusion of a finite induction may seem, it only works within some range that is sometimes hard to define. Thus such a conclusion is undependable because of the lack of a firm basis. The essence of this kind of mistakes is that a system with limitation tries to give a general conclusion that only the perfect system, which has no limitation (See below), can give. Knowledge comes from experience. But when it comes to form a theory, it has to face logical inspection first. A theory must first be logically self-consistent if it tries to correctly describe the law of the world.

In this paper I shall take some risk to discuss a few problems that have been most controversial and most sensitive. Therefore I have to make careful inspection for my guiding ideology and theoretical basis to avoid making liable logical mistakes and losing our target. The greatest point of all human culture is such scientific spirit: venerate fact and truth, rather than to be affected by emotion, prejudice and other unscientific factors. In fact such scientific spirit has already become the common belief of mankind. It is only this scientific spirit that can help us overcome the limitation of all human cultures and become the basis of the directing thought in future for mankind.

II. The Degeneracy of a System

It seems to me that some researchers of cosmic problems have ignored a very important fact in their study. That is, the universe has no boundary and we can not talk about things outside the universe and, most important, the talking itself is also a process in the universe. They seem to be talking about the evolution of the universe from an angle independent of and outside the universe. But who is the observer for such independent universe? Putting

forward such a basic philosophical question is very likely to cause lots of dispute. But if we are going to think about such profound questions as the nature of life and the universe, we have to be very careful about the philosophical basis of our theoretical frame.

The level of the synergistic function of a system can be expressed with three uncertainty quanta: the mass quantum is the smallest mass unit that the system can identify; time quantum is the smallest time unit; space quantum is the basic unit of space. Since a system can not decide the structure inside its uncertainty quanta, these quanta actually endow the system some kind of quantum feature. Just as what is done in quantum mechanics, we express the state of the system or/and the environment on a time quantum with such a linear superposition:

$$A = \sum_i a_i \psi_i; \quad a_i = 1; 0; \quad (1)$$

where ψ_i is one of the possible states of the system or/and the environment, $\psi = \{\psi_i\}$ is the set of all possible states, therefore a complete set. Any state of a system or/and the environment can be expressed with a subset of ψ . We call A the common complete set, the meaning of which will be discussed later. The elements in the subset A are the choices that the system can make in the state represented by A . Thus they also represent the part of the environment that the system can recognize, i.e. the inner environment. Elements that A does not contain, or in the complement of A , represent states that the system can not realize or identify, i.e. the outer environment. We call such two systems with complementary state sets conjugate systems. Usually A is not the common complete set. This gives rise to the limitation of an ordinary system.

When we take the system and its environment as a whole, it's straight forward to see a complementary relation between their state sets. So once the state of the system is fixed, the state of its environment is also fixed through the complementary relation. We got the same conclusion through the discussion on EPR paradox in the first paper "System and Its Uncertainty Quanta". It is also the basis of the entropy conservation relation in my second paper "Where Has Entropy Gone". But we also have another stand to see the relation of system and its environment. Note, the two stands are not contradictory. Since there is an one-to-one correspondence between the system and its environment, both the state of the system and that of its inner environment can be expressed with the same state set A , the complement of which A' represents the outer environment as well as the conjugate of the system. Strictly, what we called a system formerly is the inner system which corresponds to inner environment. The conjugate of the system is called the outer system which corresponds to the outer environment. Obviously the inner and outer environments are conjugates to each other in such stand. As shown in Figure 1, there are following relations in the two different stands:

First stand

$$\text{system} + \text{environment} =$$

$$\text{system} = \text{in:sys:} + \text{out:sys:}$$

$$\text{environment} = \text{in:env:} + \text{out:env:}$$

Second stand

$$\text{inner world} + \text{outer world} =$$

$$\text{inner world} = \text{in:sys:} + \text{in:env:}$$

$$\text{outer world} = \text{out:sys:} + \text{out:env:} \quad (2)$$

It's easy to see that the entropy conservation relation we got in the paper "Where Has Entropy Gone" is only a view in the first stand. In the special case $A = \emptyset$, the system has no limitation, therefore no outer environment. Because there is only one common complete set, the system and its environment are identical in such case.

Because the system and its environment are made up of the same basic physical units, it's easy to see that both the system and the environment are described with the elements in

They are separated by a seeming boundary surface. Since the states in the two sides of the boundary are in one-to-one correspondence, it doesn't matter that which side is called the system and which side the environment. The same is true of the case in inner and outer world. On the other hand, a system can have state described with the set A , as well as state described with the A' set. In other word, there is system described with A as well as system described with A' . The two states are all possible and must coexist. In this sense, conjugate systems are symmetric and equivalent. Both are the epitomes of limitation for each other.

For any given state A of a system, all the elements in A are equivalent. The more elements in set A , the more choices the system can make, therefore the stronger selecting ability the system has. So the set A represents the richness of the system in choices in. We call such richness the degeneracy of the synergistic function of the system. Apparently the system with high degeneracy has abundant environment. Degeneracy is not only the symbol of symmetry but also the symbol of order for a system, since a highly degenerated system has more choices thus less uncertainty against changes of its environment, and this

just means the system has strong selecting ability and high symmetry. As I said above, the outer system corresponds to the outer environment, which symbolizes the limitation of the system. Obviously, the higher the degeneracy of the system, the lower the degeneracy of its conjugate. Thus we found a profound relation: the uncertainty in the environment of a system is the result of the degeneracy of its conjugate, the outer system. A more ordered system has more ordered environment. In such case we say the inner world is more ordered while the outer world is correspondingly less ordered.

Here it's necessary for me to give an explanation for the doubt among some readers. In the second paper "Where Has Entropy Gone" we concluded that more ordered system has less ordered environment. But in this paper we now get the opposite conclusion that more ordered system has more ordered environment. Where is the problem? In fact, it is only a matter of stands. Different stands give different opinions on the problem of order or disorder because it is relative. In the first stand, the limitation of the system is embodied in the relationship between the system and its environment, i.e., the inequality between the system and its environment. Thus we have virtually made a presumption that there are no outer system and outer environment, and what we discuss is the whole system or the whole environment. But in the second stand, the limitation of the system is embodied in the relationship between the system and the outer system, while the system and its environment are equal. Here we have also virtually made a presumption that there are no inner environment and outer environment, which belong respectively to (inner) system and outer system, and what we discuss is the whole inner world or outer world. So two different stands give two different opinions. If you can understand the profound meaning of relativity here, then you can understand this theory.

Here we see again the correspondence and transformation between order and disorder. They are relative and have common basis, the common complete set. Order and disorder are interdependent and transformative. Discussion on their relation has no sense unless it is with respect to a specific system and environment. From such viewpoint we can think over again the meaning of the universe. With skin to be the boundary, we regard ourselves to be systems. All the things outside the system compose the environment, i.e. the universe in the case of the whole human system. We have learned that a system and its environment can change roles. In the same way we can discuss the similarity and relationship of the two system, man and the universe. A man has life, he can change his environment selectively and on purpose. Thus for the environment (which is also a system), the man's behaviour and also the result of it can not be decided, therefore is in the outer environment of the universe. Reversely, a man also has outer environment and (perhaps more) uncertainty, for which we can not exclude the possibility that it is also selective and on purpose. This means the universe has degeneracy of its own. In the second paper "Where Has Entropy Gone" we discussed the nature of life. So in the sense of our theory, the universe also has life feature. Therefore it has life.

Of course the word "life" here is in a more general sense. In the frame of this theory of general system life is a common phenomenon. Degeneracy is an important property of system, as well as the basic feature of life. It reveals in a profound way the relationship between order and disorder. The environment usually has some degeneracy therefore some life feature as long as the system has outer environment. What we have discussed here is the relative meaning of life. Only for the perfect system, with the common complete set as the state set, life gains perfect and absolute meaning.

III. The Perfect System

A system is called the perfect system if it has zero mass and time quanta but in finite space quantum. Zero mass quantum means that there is no forms of matter in the environment that can not be identified. All energy in the environment has been changed into the form of mass which can be completely fixed. That means the energy of the system has reached the maximum: literally it can even fix particles with zero mass. Zero time quantum means that the clock of the system has stopped. So the system has got rid of all the time arrows like the second law of thermodynamics. All causality relations have become completely symmetric, reversible and complementary. The finite space quantum indicates that all points in space are completely equal, or you may say the system and its environment are now at one point in such a space that has no other points at all. So the perfect system has actually gained all the order, i.e. in the formula

$$S + S^0 = 0; \quad (3)$$

$$S = 1; S^0 = 1$$

Let's see what kind of state set such perfect system has. There is no energy in the environment of the perfect system, so the states of particles (remember that the basic mass unit is zero) are determined by their space coordinates. But now all points in space are equal, or because the speed of signal transmission is finite, all points in space are now connected together just as one point. (Have you been aware this is quite reminiscent of the Big Bang irregularity? We'll come to this point later.) Thus the state set of the perfect system contains all the states of all particles and the system is completely degenerated. Therefore the state set must be the common complete set. Because the common complete set contains finite elements, therefore it possesses the property of an infinite set, i.e. it is contained as an element in itself. This property is very important in understanding this theory.

We first discussed the meaning of (3) in my second paper "Where Has Entropy Gone". But only after the introduction of the common complete set can we discuss a crucial problem hiding in it, i.e. the problem of symmetry and invariant. It is well known in physics that there is always an invariant behind some kind of symmetry and vice versa, which is, in fact,

crucial in the development of modern basic physics. In this theory, (3) actually gives an invariant, i.e. the total entropy of system and its environment on any time quantum. Then, what is the symmetry related to this invariant?

We know that order and disorder coexist and can transform into each other. The degeneracy is the basis of order and disorder. All the possibilities in the degenerated state set are completely equal and indistinguishable. As a matter of fact such degeneracy just epitomizes the symmetry related to (3). Since (3) involves all entropy of the system and its environment, the symmetry should refer to such a fact that all elements in the common complete set are completely equal and indistinguishable for the perfect system. We can discuss the symmetry further through the relation between the system and the environment. As shown in Figure 1, the system A is composed of inner system, which we usually simply refer to as system, and outer system. Its conjugate is composed of inner and outer environment. For the inner system, the outer system represents its limitation, and all the states in its outer environment are undecidable but something it has to be affected and respond. Thus what results the states in the outer environment will bring about is totally uncertain for inner system and depends on the environment system B. This means the outer system of A is just the inner environment of B system. Because the inner system of A can select and fix the inner environment at its will, this part of environment is just what B system can not decide. Therefore it is in the outer environment of the B system. So we have found an extremely wonderful and profound relation: the inner and outer environments of a system and its environment system are just the opposite to each other. We call this important relation the inversion relation of system. It's easy to see that with the inversion relation and also the consideration of the symmetry in the inner and outer environment, we may also get the invariant in (3). So no matter what changes may happen to the system and its environment, the total entropy remains constant. The symmetry corresponding to this invariant is: all elements in the common complete set, which is the state set of the perfect system, are completely equal and indistinguishable. After understanding such concept of equal probability which is in a more general sense and based on the perfect system and the common complete set, we can have a clearer view of the limitation of the postulate of equal probability in classical thermodynamics. Though there was not enough clarity for the concepts of system and environment, yet the postulate of equal probability was still a very ingenious assumption. Did the master physicist Boltzmann once have some vague ideas about the profound things hiding behind it? We know that there is a correspondence between the system and its environment on any time quantum. There is nothing outside the system and the environment. The most familiar systems for us are ourselves, with the universe as the environment. When we look at the universe from such an angle, we can not help being amazed at the systems of ourselves. How wonderful the universe is! But no matter how rich in form and change it is, it always has corresponding states in our body systems. On one time quantum, some states are in the outer environment of our body system, which are also expressed with the elements in the common complete set just as the

inner environment, but these states may get into our inner environment in the unfolding of time quanta. The far may become the near; the future may become the present. This tells us that the outer environment in its nature can be recognized by us. On the other hand, it's easy to see that our environment, therefore our body system, contains infinite number of states. We can make infinite selections theoretically. But we know only the perfect system may have environment containing infinite states. We learn also from experience that for any specific uncertainty we can finally understand its causality and overcome it. In fact, this is not only a conclusion from experience, but also the only logically correct conclusion. If we made such a conclusion that we would never completely overcome our own limitation, then, because of the limitation, how could we get the above generally negative conclusion? Thus we see from the above discussion that we have the property of the perfect system, and we have constantly all the possibilities in the common complete set.

But the difference between the perfect system and ordinary systems is apparent. Though an ordinary system possesses the property of the perfect system and can correspond to any state of its environment, the correspondence seems only to be realized in the unfolding of different time quanta. Thus on the contrary of the perfect system, an ordinary system has non-zero time quantum, therefore it has to face the inhumane arrow of time. Where does the time arrow originate?

IV. The Arrow of Time

The great achievements of classical physics has made the spirit of pursuing perfectness an atmosphere in physics research. I believe this spirit is the soul of physics and such an atmosphere is just where the intelligence of physics comes from. It is a symbol of maturity of physics. Such spirit culminated in Einstein. The anguish he and other idealistic physicists suffered is the most touching story. Among all objects of physical research, time perhaps is the most perplexing one. Einstein once said that time is a delusion.

Einstein was not wrong, but he did not analyze the mechanism of the hallucination. From the above discussion we now can clearly see how the time arrow originates. We know that, as systems, we have property of the perfect system that has the common complete set as the state set. Thus at any time we can choose a subset A from for the time quantum that corresponds to the selection A , leaving a complementary set A' . But as we know, both the elements in A and in A' are completely symmetric and equal for the perfect system. Thus such selection breaks the symmetry of the perfect system locally or temporarily. To keep the whole symmetry of all elements, A' will appear on some time quantum later, thus gives rise to the arrow of time. Therefore the emergence of time arrow is the result of the incomplete selection from the complete set.

To study further the secret of time, we need to inspect our idea of causality. As a matter

of fact, it is causality that gives us the sense of time. It seems that the science today is just trying to find out all causality relations to balance our hearts that are so much depressed by the sensation of time. In my theory, a pair of causality relation is relative and symmetric. It's the two sides of one coin. This conclusion is apparent if we consider the symmetry relation of the elements for perfect system. The selection of the set A will inevitably leave the state A' to come, and vice versa. Such relation can be shown clearly in Figure 2 (a). The states A and A' are integrated to give . They are totally symmetric and the causality to each other.

With Figure 2 (a), we can clear up a misled notion. Some readers might ask why there are so many things in our environment that we don't like if we are the perfect system? In fact this is just the evidence to show that we have the property of the perfect system: the complete set, which we choose our present environment from, contains not only the subset we choose but also its complementary. Because of the complete symmetry property of the perfect system, we can not select a subset without leaving its complementary set which may come true on later time quanta. Thus on any time quantum, we are in a background of preenvironment which is the complementary subset of the selection we made earlier. Such preenvironment does not act on the perfect system because of its complete symmetry but may act on imperfect systems. We fix our environment on the background with our synergistic function, though we need not to choose only within the subset of the preenvironment since we possess the symmetry property of the perfect system. In making such a selection we leave another background for our future. Figure 2 (b) clearly shows the case.

Here we shall also discuss the problem of the relation between causality and reversibility. In the second stand I said above, the inner system and inner environment can be expressed with a same set A, and the outer system and outer environment can be expressed with the complementary set A'. According to our discussion above, it's easy to see that a causality is a pair of states or subsets in , which are complementary to each other. They are symmetric and reversible for the perfect system. Choose one and then you have to face the other. They are causes and results of each other. If there is such a pair of complementary states in the subset A, then there is a kind of reversibility for the system. We call such a pair of states a complete causality. Thus when we find a complete causality, we find a kind of reversibility in time. Compared with the perfect system, the system A has limitation because it leaves out the elements in A'. Thus A and the elements in A' give incomplete causalities. So we see incomplete causality always accompanies uncertainty which is just the mark of irreversibility. Irreversibility occurs when the system evolves from an uncertain state to a certain state creating information, or from a certain state to an uncertain state losing information. Therefore irreversibility is the result of incomplete causality. Once we find a group of complete causality, we can then in principle establish a group of equations describing it, if we have mathematical theory good enough (See the first paper "System and Its Uncertainty Quanta"). All precise scientific theories are reversible because they describe

complete causalities.

This can be shown with an example. We know that the two-body problem in classical mechanics may have precise solution, therefore a deterministic problem. But actually this is not coincidence. In such case we take one as the system, then the other will be the environment. All information about the environment can be derived through the analysis of the state of the system. We know all causality relations in the system and its environment. So there is no uncertainty, therefore no irreversibility in this example. But in three or even more-body problems, we can not get all the information on the environment by analyzing the system, no matter how we define the system and the environment. That is, the system, e.g. which is composed of one body, does not contain all the causality relations. It's easy to see that the system will interact with the whole environment but lose grasp for the details of the environment. It is these details that will bring about long term influence to the movement of the system and in some cases provide some kind of innate time scale. So incomplete causality is usually embodied by irreversibility. The relations of time with the common complete set, causality, inner and outer environment and time quantum can be clearly shown in Figure 3. So not only is time the expression and result of the symmetry in the common complete set, but also it contains the latter on any time quantum. Time does not exist for the perfect system, thus all points of time for an imperfect system are equivalent for the perfect system.

There are many places in physics that reveal the arrow of time. Besides the second law of thermodynamics, the expansion of the universe and the collapse of wave function in quantum mechanics, the CPT symmetry in particle physics also gives rise to an important time arrow. A theorem points out that physics process is invariant under integrated CPT operation. In most processes of particles, CP symmetry is obeyed thus the T symmetry is obeyed. But in some special radioactive events CP symmetry is broken. In such case time symmetry is also broken and irreversibility of time comes out. This arrow of time is believed to be closely related to the unsymmetry of matter and antimatter.

We can get some new understanding on the CPT symmetry in this theory of general system. As we know, a system X and its inner environment can be expressed with a subset A of the common complete set, with the complementary A' expressing the outer system X' as well as the outer environment. According to the inversion relation we got earlier, X and X' have just the opposite inner and outer environment, i.e. A' is the inner environment of X' while A is its outer environment. On the other hand A and A' is a pair of causality, so that X will have to face A' after choosing A . But just as X makes its selections, its conjugate system X' makes the exactly opposite order of selections, i.e. A' then A . So X and X' , or rather the inner and outer worlds have just the opposite directions of time. As shown in Figure 4, physical processes in X and X' are totally symmetric. When we study a complete causality relation like P and Q , we do not introduce time arrow. But if our research involves an incomplete causality relation like P and R , then time symmetry, therefore CP symmetry according to CPT theorem, is broken. In such case there is some kind of mixing between

the three properties. Actually, the time symmetry will be broken when our state set is not the common complete set. As long as the mass quantum in our system or theory is not zero, then there will be uncertainty therefore incomplete causality. Thus the symmetry of time is destined to be broken.

Here some readers might have already seen that the opposite arrow of time which we mentioned in the second paper "Where Has Entropy Gone" now has emerged. Though conjugate systems all obey the second law of thermodynamics, the time arrows in their environment are just in the opposite directions. According to the inversion relation of systems, conjugate systems have just the opposite inner and outer environments, i.e., the opposite arrow of time exists in the outer environment of the system. Thus for any system, the second law of thermodynamics works in just the opposite ways in inner and outer environments. In the inner environment the I expression functions and things develop toward disorder, while in outer environment D expression works and order grows out naturally. So the classical second law, which has been the best epitome of the unsymmetry of time, turns out to work only in our inner environment. This demonstrates again our view that time arrow is the result of our selection of inner and outer environment, or the choice of an incomplete state set. So we have found a wonderfully beautiful symmetry relation with the inversion relation, in which order goes to disorder and at the same time disorder generates order. Time is circulating. Now we can face the changes of nature with a broader mind.

In physics time is not measurable variable. We may calibrate events of the past and the future with a time instrument called clock, but as a matter of fact it's impossible to find an absolutely accurate clock. Thus no clock can give the nature of time. They are also incidents in the background of time. On the other hand from the point of our subjective feeling, time is really a kind of delusion. The past has disappeared in an invisible ocean and the future has not come out of it. What's more, the present does not exist either. Every present connects so closely with the past and the future that it is just as elusive as a drop of water in the ocean.

In my theory there is an apparent symmetric relation between the system and the environment. They are the two sides of one thing and are defined totally arbitrarily for the perfect system. When we study the relation of space and time we find a similar symmetry. We know that if two points are connected with signals transmitted at infinite speed, then there is in fact no distance between the two points. That means the space can be defined with time. The futility in defining time will inevitably lead to the futility of defining space. Conversely time can also be defined through the relationship between points in space in the environment. So we see that time and space transform into each other and together they form a whole. We can still make it further by saying that the present relation of space and time is only human characteristic and they may have other form of combination. For the perfect system there is no time and all points in space are equal. In that case time and space have no sense at all.

V. Quantum Cosmology

From above we know that only two-body problems can have accurate solutions because they have no information losses as in many-body problems. System and environment can not exist without each other, and they integrate into a whole in the perfect system. When we study the basic problem of the genesis of the universe, we should first see the essence of the problem that this is a two-body problem, a problem of relationship between a system and its environment. We can not talk about the existence of the universe without an observer. The universe is our environment when we regard ourselves as the system. But here we have two systems. Apparently an individual and the human being are two different systems. An ordinary individual can not have the sight of an astronomical telescope and the power of a nuclear reactor, which belong to the human system. Obviously neither an ordinary individual nor the human system is perfect system. Both of them can be involved in our discussion when we start our discussion from the stand of the perfect system. All imperfect systems have limitations. This theory of general system just tries to overcome the limitation from the stand of the perfect system.

Now we can think again the correspondence relation between the system and the environment after the introduction of the concept of the perfect system. In the first paper "System and Its Uncertainty Quanta" with the aid of the statement in modern cosmology that the universe originated from primal point of irregularity, we got the conclusion that all particles in the universe are correlated. This then helped us to come to the conclusion that the system and its environment have definite correspondence relation all the time. Now we can get this same conclusion with the concept of the perfect system. In fact we don't need the primal point of irregularity epitomizing the beginning of time. At any point of time we have the property of the complete symmetry of the perfect system. We choose our state set from the common complete set. The correspondence between the universe and ourselves is in the sense of the perfect system and exists permanently. Therefore it is the fundamental correspondence. Mathematically, the relation between system and the environment is the relation between a subset of the common complete set and its complementary in the first stand. So the correspondence is evident. We know the perfect system has zero mass and time quanta but in finite space quantum. That means the correspondence between system and its environment is at the supreme level, i.e. at the same point of space and time and at the next level of matter. Thus the correspondence is certain and has no randomness at all.

Such correspondence between system and its environment is crucial in our understanding for the genesis of the universe. According to the predominant view of present cosmology our universe originated from the Big Bang irregular point, which was at such high temperature and density that present cosmological theory goes futile at this point. The experimental cornerstone of this theory is the expansion of the universe. Though many people have adopted

or been used to such a model of universe with irregularity, some still feel uncomfortable about the existence of the irregularity. Where did this eccentric irregular point come from? This is doubtful no matter what amendments have been made to the theory. The irregularity does not necessarily mean the existence of the primal Big Bang. It shows that our theory goes wrong when dealing with the genesis of the universe.

Actually the expansion of the universe is not necessarily the result of the Big Bang. In my theory the universe to us is just the environment to the system. We know a system changes while its environment changes in accordance. The order level of the system can be represented with the three uncertainty quanta. The space quantum is the smallest unit of distance inside which all points are equal. More ordered system has larger space quantum and the perfect system has infinite space quantum so that the whole space is just equal to one point for it. In the second paper "Where Has Entropy Gone" we got the conclusion from the angle of environmental diversity that the entropy in our human system is increasing (we shall discuss this again later). The embodiment of this order decreasing in the structure of space is just the reduction of space quantum. Because all points inside the space quantum are indistinguishable, the reduction of the space quantum means that the equal distance is reduced, so that it seems some extra spacial distance is produced from each point in space. This gives rise to the expansion of the universe. Obviously such expansion is homogeneous. It is the expansion of the unequal space itself and also the symbol of reduction of order of the observer system.

A system may select its state set from the common complete set wilfully at any time. That means the uncertainty quanta may change with time. Thus when we study the history of a system and its environment, especially the history of the universe, we must remember that the structure of space and time might have had substantial changes. What's more, the nature or connotation of the environment might have changed. This is certain in my theory. Therefore it is not dependable to extrapolate present theory to the far past and future. The Big Bang that supposed to give birth to the universe and time itself did not exist. The beginnings of time are everywhere and all connected with the perfect system. A unique beginning of time does not exist, yet the problems of genesis are not completely nonsense.

A system recognizes its environment with its synergistic function. It can only recognize things in its inner environment because of limitation. Different systems have different inner and outer environments. But some systems may have similar environments or quite large similar part. As shown in Figure 5, there are four kinds of relations between two systems. We usually regard our "sub" to be low calibre life or inanimate. Plant usually can be seen as our "sub" and animals to be our "alien". Only in the case of the "peer", two systems may have similar environment. Similar environment means similar synergistic level. Thus the problem of genesis of environment is actually a problem of history of the synergistic function. It contains two meanings here. One is why our individual system came to be a member of the group in which we are at present. The other one is what the common

environment of our peer systems was like in the past. These may seem to be two different routes of evolution. But after you understand my theory you will see that they are of the same problem. Both originated from the perfect system. Strictly speaking, no system can know the environments of other systems. We should not even talk about other systems. There is only one system of ourselves and all other things are in the environment of this system. This is the meaning of the concept of self-centred system in my first paper "System and Its Uncertainty Quanta". The universe we know is the common environment of us mankind. When we talk about its genesis, more problems of genesis are involved, e.g. the genesis of human being, life, time, space, mass and so on. The science today has understood many laws of this world, and more important, it begins to get aware of its limitation. This limitation emerges when we try to extrapolate our present scientific theory to the far past or future, and it is closely related with some unsolved enigmas. We don't think there was the Big Bang that gave birth to everything. But the problem itself makes sense because it is a key to understand the property of the perfect system.

But if we think that we were perfect system long before but not now, we would fall back to the embarrassment of the Big Bang theory and have to explain something which is in principle inexplicable. In fact, for perfect system time does not exist because its time quantum is zero. So there is no past, present and future. It exists permanently and corresponds to our inner and outer system in the unfolding of time that only belongs to our inner system. Here we see again that we have the property of the perfect system. A unique beginning of time does not exist. Rather, the beginnings of time are everywhere and this is the property of our system. But apparently our present system is not the perfect system and the difference will lead to a view of the world with the feature of quantum mechanics. For a long time the collapse of wave function has been one of the most controversial problems in quantum mechanics, in which measurement clearly introduces some irreversibility. The most famous example is the Schrodinger Cat. The pitiful cat is locked in a room in which a source of poisonous gas is in the control of a single radioactive incident. If the incident happens, the gas will be released and the cat will be killed. Otherwise the cat will live. So according to quantum mechanics, the cat is in a state of superposition of "dead" and "live" for an observer outside the room before he looks into the room. But we have never seen such a state of superposition in reality. Once we look into the room, the wave function of the cat will collapse from the superposition state to the state of either "dead" or "live". Why is the collapse of the wave function? This problem may help us to understand why we are not the perfect system though we have its property.

If we insist in dividing the world into the so-called subjective and objective, such result will be inevitable. In my theory, the system and the environment, the subjective and the objective, correspond to each other in constant change. Reversible equations describe a group of complete causality relations, in which time is symmetric. These equations are deterministic. The Schrodinger equation just describes a group of complete causality relations.

Strictly speaking this equation has nothing to do with our reality, which we choose with our synergistic function. Because we have the symmetry property of the perfect system, we have to face the background left from our former incomplete selection. If Schrödinger equation contains complete causality relations, it will correctly describe the evolution of the background. So there is no problem of the collapse of wave function.

But it would be very difficult to understand the great achievements of quantum mechanics if the world described by the quantum wave function had nothing to do with the reality. This relation will be discussed in next chapter. Here let's come back to the Schrodinger cat. Every imperfect system has its own inner and outer environment, and the system can only recognize things in the inner environment but not outer environment. Thus in the example of the Schrodinger cat, the observer can not recognize the state of the cat before looking into the room, because the cat is apparently in the outer environment of the observer. In this case, the observer even doesn't know what kinds of and how many eigenstates the cat has, how could he talk about the "dead" or "live" states of it? Only a cat in the inner environment of a human observer has the two separate eigenstates of "dead" and "live". How could we talk about or even classify things in the outer environment with respect to the eigenstates that makes sense only in the inner environment? In fact, it is just the limitation in the observer system, which makes the difference of inner and outer environments, that gives rise to the two separate eigenstates of "dead" and "live" for the cat. This is actually a very meaningful point in quantum mechanics that has been ignored.

One of the most distinctive features of quantum mechanics is the separate eigenvalues which are the probable results of our measurements. But we have made an important assumption when we calculate the eigen equations, i.e., the wave function vanishes at the finite, or other like restrictions. We can not get the separate eigenvalues without such assumptions. What's the deeper meaning of these assumptions? You can see at the altitude of this theory of general system that these assumptions actually introduce some kind of limitation. It stipulates the inequality and unsymmetry of space, therefore it implies the occurrence of the concept of space quantum in my theory. This assumption is reasonable because our human system does have limitation and the assumption correctly describes the property of our environment. So we get a profound conclusion that the separate eigenvalues arise from the limitation in the observer system.

The eigenvalues of measurable variables in quantum mechanics represent the results of observation we make of the world. Different eigenvalues means different states of the environment. Now we see the difference in our environment turns out to be the result of our limitation. So in our environment a flower is not a bomb just because we respond to them in different ways for limitation. This may be staggering to someone but an undoubted conclusion in this theory. For the perfect system, the system and the environment integrates into a inseparable whole, all possibilities in its state set, the common complete set, are equal, symmetric and indistinguishable. An imperfect system has uncertainty quanta because of

its incomplete selection. Then difference arises from the destroyed symmetry. A less order system has less symmetry, thus lower state degeneracy. This in turn means more difference in its environment. Of course the problem of boundary conditions is related with the mathematical tools. Therefore I believe that further detailed knowledge of the problem depends on a new and deeper understanding of the concept of mathematical continuity. The new mathematics (See the first paper "System and Its Uncertainty Quanta") will bring about great improvement for physics, therefore great blessing for human being.

V I. Birth and Death

Up to now we have given a complete theoretical frame. But for readers who have not recovered from the shock, we have to make some more explanations, which are actually involved in former discussion. We see that the second law in classical thermodynamics has been put into a wonderful symmetry relation. Thus the dour entropy turns out to have also a tender side. When the system or the inner world goes to chaos and disorder, the environmental system or the outer world flourishes. It is very meaningful that all these changes are merely possibilities, which are well represented by our two expressions of the second law. In spite of this theoretical conclusion, the entropy in the environment of human being keeps increasing. Our theory should be able to give explanation for this phenomenon. We know that the perfect system is represented by the common complete set, in which all elements are equal, symmetric and indistinguishable. We also know that our own system has the symmetry property of the perfect system. Thus when we choose a state set from to make our selection, we temporarily or locally destroy the complete symmetry. The broken symmetry will inevitably be made up for with the unfolding of time, so that the selection leaves a background that is described by the complementary set of the chosen state set. Apparently this background is not the complete set.

Think of our living style, we will understand why the entropy increases. We all live in a background left from former incomplete selections, which make no difference for the perfect system. For us ordinary systems the background can show various differences. We are fond of some background but dislike some others. Different systems may have different likes and dislikes, and peer systems tend to have similar likes and dislikes. It is usually true that most systems tend to select the state they like and evade what they dislike. Of course these are selections, too. But the crucial point here is: it is from the background that we make these further selections. For this reason the Schrodinger equation can describe the probability of our measurement because it just describes the evolution of this background. Not only does present technical civilization tend to fix the environment at a more and more detailed level, but also most individuals are likely to make more and more delicate selections that they are fond of. Who doesn't want to savor every drop of beauty to the full extent

? Beautifulness always accompanies ugliness. This means we are selecting a still smaller state set from an incomplete set. Smaller state set describes a system with lower degeneracy, therefore a less ordered system. So we get more and more chaotic and disordered in our happier and happier selections.

Actually if we think over the connotation of the concept "beautiful", we will see that the human pursuit for beautifulness is just the embodiment of the expression of the second law. In our social life, our culture naturally forms up various standards for us to assess the beautifulness of behaviour, spirit, appearance, art, scenery and so forth. Things are beautiful if they are close to the standards. But aesthetics tells us that there is a quite objective principle in forming the standards of beautifulness, i. e., the beautiful things are those which are most common or popular. Thus our pursuit for beauty is actually a selection for the state with the largest weight. Isn't this the case of the second law in thermodynamics? This is why we are in an environment that goes to less ordered state.

Many physicists are sick at the fact that we have to make our selection from the possibilities described by wave function. It seems we are quite passive in the selection in quantum mechanics because we can not decide the result. As a matter of fact, it is this unjust that reveals our limitation. We do not know, let alone control, every details in the process of our selection, e.g. measuring device, so we can not decide the results of the details. It is the same in the macroscopic reality. We can not decide the results of every details of our behaviour. Once we can exhaust the microscopic world, there will be no macroscopic world. The whole world would integrate into an infinitely big spot with infinite states. Then the microscopic and the macroscopic, the finite and the infinite would completely unite.

I don't hope that my theses are viewed as religious doctrine or occult imagination. But I really have to give a view on the problem of birth and death according to this theory, because it has already involved this problem. I must declare first that the view I give here might be wrong, because I have not yet had the experience of death or been able to recall any experience of my former existence. So this is only a view from the coherency of this theory. In fact, a theory is doomed to have to give explanation about the problem of birth and death if it tries to understand the nature of time, because birth and death give the basic and also the most important arrow of time. We all experience lots of things in our lives. Some change a lot while some have so little change that we almost can not notice the change in all of our life. We know now that only the perfect system has no change, which permanently has infinite equal states. Apparently we are not perfect system and can not have permanent things in our environment. But there are certainly some things in our environment which have so little change during our life time that we can not believe the complementary set of these things would be embodied in the invisible change. What's more, how many wishes we have in our life that never come true? So all our selections during our life must leave some background that we have got no time to experience or that is occult to our present environment. We know we have the symmetry property of the perfect system,

thus time, therefore birth and death, appears to us to embody the symmetry. In such a view, before birth or after death, we were or shall be experiencing another background. Of course this background is in the outer environment of our present system, so that we can not understand with present knowledge. Otherwise we transcend birth and death. This is just the two kinds of meaning of life we discuss in my second paper "Where Has Entropy Gone". At any point of time we are perfect system, and life is absolute. But on any time quantum we are in the environment we select and with the consciousness developed from the inner system and inner environment. Life is then relative.

From this theory, it's straightforward to come to the conclusion: to take care of animals and to help others will directly benefit ourselves. In the first stand we hope our body system can get as much negative entropy as possible from the environment. Apparently an environment abundant with lives has more possible states, therefore is less ordered. Thus when biological diversity in our environment reduces, especially when the reduction is our intentional choice, the quality of our life or our synergistic level will be lowered down. In the other stand we get the same conclusion. All things in the environment have correspondence in our body system. Thus helping others and raising the life quality of the environment is just equal to raising our own quality or level. In fact, our body and the environment are also relative, symmetric and equal. Are we inside the skin or outside it? This doesn't matter. What matters is: the environment and ourselves are a whole, the human being are a whole and all lives are a whole.