Can Noncommutativity Be Emergent?

Mir H. S. Quadri | The Lumeni Notebook | 23rd October 2024

Abstract

This essay explores the concept of emergence within the framework of noncommutative systems, challenging traditional views that tie emergent behaviour to commutative rule sets. Emergence typically refers to the phenomena where higher-level complexity arises from the interactions of simpler components, often under deterministic and commutative systems. However, noncommutative systems, where the order of operations affects the outcome, introduce a unique layer of complexity that complicates this understanding. By examining the properties of noncommutative systems through formal mathematical analysis and exploring case studies from quantum mechanics, this essay investigates whether emergence can genuinely arise under noncommutative conditions. The findings suggest that noncommutative rule sets lead to a richer and more intricate form of emergent behaviour, characterised by path dependence and sequence sensitivity. This challenges our existing models of complexity and opens up new pathways for understanding emergent phenomena in both physical and cognitive systems. The implications of this analysis extend beyond theoretical curiosity, suggesting that emergent properties may exist in unexpected and non-linear domains, reshaping our perception of order, chaos, and complexity.

Introduction

Emergence, as a concept, has been on my mind for the past few months. Recently, my work with the Complex Emergent Model of Language Acquisition (CEMLA) has prompted me to revisit this idea through a different lens. The question I find myself asking is, *Can emergent properties arise from complex systems governed by noncommutative rules?*

Emergence seems to go hand in hand with commutative systems. This assumption holds for many classical systems, from flocking behaviour in birds to neural activity in the brain. **But what happens when the rules**

aren't so straightforward? What if the operations don't commute, i.e., the sequence of interactions becomes crucial? **Does this undermine emergence as we understand it, or does it reveal a deeper layer of complexity?** In this essay, I intend to explore and answer this using Quantum Mechanics as the paradigm.

Properties of Emergent Systems

Emergent systems, by their very nature, defy reductionism. The whole is more than the sum of its parts, and understanding the parts in isolation does not necessarily allow us to predict the behaviour of the whole. When we analyse emergence formally, certain properties consistently appear, each critical to understanding how these systems evolve and organise themselves. Below, I outlined the core properties of emergent systems from a mathematical standpoint. This is a bit difficult to do as there are no set criteria on which there is unanimous agreement. However, after going through the works of various experts, here's what I could gather.

Unpredictability

Despite having deterministic rules governing the interactions at the micro-level, the macro-level behaviour can be **highly unpredictable.** This unpredictability often arises from the sensitivity of these systems to initial conditions, much like in chaotic systems. Consider a system with state variables $\mathbf{x}(t)$ evolving according to a set of differential equations.

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = f(\mathbf{x}, t)$$

Even small variations in the initial state $\mathbf{x}_0$ can lead to very different outcomes. If you've ever studied or even keenly observed dynamical systems, then you know what I am talking about. Emergent behaviour does not arise from pure randomness. It arises from a web of deterministic interactions that are too complex to untangle at the micro-level.

Non-linearity

Emergent systems are almost always non-linear. **The system's output is not proportional to its input,** and the interactions between components are often multiplicative rather than additive. Consider a function $f(x)$ that is not simply the sum of its parts.

$$f(\alpha x + \beta y) \neq \alpha f(x) + \beta f(y)$$

This nonlinearity gives us feedback loops, which then amplify small effects and the suppression of others, making it impossible to directly trace the output to a specific input. This is why emergent behaviour tends to *surprise* us so to speak.

Hierarchical Organisation

As a complex system evolves it tends to *self-organise* into layers or levels of behaviour. Each of these layers or levels may have their own set of rules. The rules governing interactions at higher levels of organisation cannot be easily *reduced* to the rules at lower levels, which leads to what is often called **strong emergence.**

The *state* of the system at level n can be given as $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$, which evolves according to its own set of rules $f^{(n)}$.

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}^{(n)}}{dt} = f^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}, t)$$

Here, $\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}$ is the state of the system at the lower level, showing how each layer builds upon the previous one without being *reducible* to it.

Multiple Temporal and Spatial Scales

Not to get all quantum here but emergent systems do tend to operate across multiple temporal and spatial scales. The interaction of components at the micro-scale often influences behaviour at the macro-scale. What is important to keep in mind is that these scales are **not independent.** They interact dynamically, with small, rapid changes at the micro-level potentially having slow, large-scale effects. We can use multi-scale modelling to show this.

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}_{\text{macro}}}{dt} = g(\mathbf{x}_{\text{micro}}, t), \quad \frac{d\mathbf{x}_{\text{micro}}}{dt} = h(\mathbf{x}_{\text{macro}}, t)$$

Such systems require complex, often iterative, techniques to solve, as changes at one scale propagate to others in non-trivial ways. This is basically what makes complex emergent systems adaptable.

Sensitivity to Initial Conditions and Path Dependency

This is a very important trait to keep in mind. Not only is this relevant in terms of the discussion here, but it is going to matter a lot as we research these ideas more deeply in the coming weeks. **Emergent systems exhibit sensitivity to initial conditions,** similar to chaotic systems. Even infinitesimally small differences in the initial state can lead to drastically different outcomes, making prediction at the macro-level exceedingly difficult. We can use *Lyapunov exponents* λ to show this. λ measures the rate of separation of infinitesimally close trajectories in phase space.

$$\Delta\mathbf{x}(t) \approx \Delta\mathbf{x}(0)e^{\lambda t}$$

If $\lambda > 0$, even small initial differences $\Delta\mathbf{x}(0)$ will grow exponentially over time, leading to vastly different states at later times.

Noncommutative Systems

So we have covered what I think are the major properties of complex emergent systems. Now let us talk briefly about noncommutative systems. For your reference, I published a detailed primer on noncommutative algebra on my substack Arkinfo Notes. If you'd like to cover this topic in-depth, I highly recommend checking it out.

In a commutative system, the order in which operations are applied does not affect the final result. This simplicity allows for straightforward analysis and prediction of emergent phenomena. But noncommutative systems are the opposite of that.

In mathematics, an operation . is said to be *commutative* if for any two elements a and b in the system,

$$a \cdot b = b \cdot a$$

A system is *noncommutative* if there exists at least one pair of elements a and b such that,

$$a \cdot b \neq b \cdot a$$

If you like to study complex fields of study like quantum mechanics, you will have to get used to approaching noncommutative systems. Here, the order of operations fundamentally alters the result.

Noncommutative Algebra

As I already mentioned, I have discussed noncommutative algebra in detail over at Arkinfo Notes. So I will very briefly introduce this field here and move onto noncommutative geometry next.

In the simplest of terms, *noncommutative algebra* is a branch of mathematics where multiplication is NOT assumed to be commutative. The general structure used to model noncommutative systems is an *algebra* A over a *field* F, where multiplication satisfies associativity but not commutativity.

$$a \cdot (b \cdot c) = (a \cdot b) \cdot c, \quad \forall a, b, c \in A$$

For example, matrices under multiplication form a *noncommutative algebra,* as matrix multiplication depends on the order of the factors. Remember the noncommutativity property that they taught you in high school when you studied matrices? Yeah, this is exactly that.

In a more abstract setting, *operator algebras,* such as those used in quantum mechanics, further explain how noncommutativity can shape the structure and behaviour of a system.

Noncommutative Geometry

So, this is basically the same continuation of the algebra that we discussed earlier, only now we are dealing with spaces. Noncommutative geometry, pioneered by Alain Connes, extends these ideas to spaces where **the coordinates themselves do not commute.** In classical geometry, the coordinates x and y in Euclidean space commute.

$$xy = yx$$

However, in noncommutative geometry, we allow the coordinates to follow noncommutative rules. A key concept in noncommutative geometry is the *spectral triple,* defined as a set (A, H, D), where,

- \- A is a noncommutative algebra,
- \- H is a Hilbert space on which A acts,
- \- D is a Dirac operator that encodes the geometry of the space.

Confused? Don't worry about all this for now. This is not our core focus of the essay anyway. Just keep in mind that these *spectral triples* allow us to *generalise* geometric concepts to *noncommutative* settings.

Emergence in Noncommutative Systems

So, we have covered the properties of emergence and (somewhat covered) the properties of noncommutative systems as well. Now we finally bring this all together and dial down on the primary question of this essay. **If a complex system adheres to noncommutative rules on the micro-level, will it foster or hinder emergent behaviour in the system?** Let's take this step by step.

Commutative Systems

First, let's get the easy stuff out of the way. What happens when a complex system follows commutative rules at the base? In a commutative system, the behaviour of components aggregates predictably. Operations like $a \cdot b$ and $b \cdot a$ yield the same result, allowing for linear and straightforward *emergent behaviour.* This predictability simplifies the process of understanding how micro-level interactions lead to macro-level properties. For example, in a classical flocking model (like Reynolds' equations for bird flocking), the overall behaviour is predictable based on the alignment, separation, and cohesion rules that apply uniformly to each agent in the system.

Noncommutative Rule Sets and Emergence

So what happens when the rule sets are noncommutative? One of the key distinctions is that **noncommutative systems are less likely to exhibit *simple emergent phenomena*** that can be easily reduced to underlying rules. Instead, they tend to give rise to more complex, context-sensitive emergent behaviours.

Consider a noncommutative algebra A where two operations a and b interact under the rule,

$$a \cdot b - b \cdot a = [a, b] \quad \text{(noncommutator relation)}$$

This equation describes the noncommutator relationship between a and b. Such systems evolve according to rules that are inherently dependent on the order of operations. The emergent behaviour E such a system must now account for this noncommutativity.

$$E(t) = \int_0^t [a(\tau), b(\tau)] d\tau$$

This integral represents the *cumulative emergent behaviou*r over *time,* influenced by the noncommutative interactions between a and b. As a result, the emergent properties are path-dependent, meaning that slight variations in the sequence of operations can lead to vastly different outcomes.

Quantum Mechanics as a Paradigm for Noncommutative Emergence

Quantum mechanics is the most ideal framework for understanding noncommutative emergence. In quantum systems, the noncommutative nature of operator interactions (such as *position* and *momentum*) gives rise to emergent phenomena like *quantum entanglement* and *superposition*. These properties do not exist at the level of individual particles but arise from the collective behaviour of the system, shaped by noncommutative interactions.

Consider a system of two quantum particles entangled in such a way that their combined state is governed by a noncommutative algebra of operators. The emergent property, i.e., *entanglement,* arises from the interactions between the individual particles. This interaction is noncommutative, i.e., the outcome of measurements on the system depends on the order in which operations are performed.

To formalise this, let's use the quantum mechanical operators for *position* $\hat{x}$ and *momentum* $\hat{p}$, which follows the commutation relation.

$$[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar$$

The noncommutative nature of this relationship leads directly to the *uncertainty principle,* which, by and on itself, is an *emergent* property of quantum systems that places fundamental limits on the precision with which we can simultaneously know a particle's *position* and *momentum*. The emergent behaviour here, i.e., *uncertainty,* arises from the noncommutative interaction between $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{p}$, which in turn affects the system's evolution over time.

Do we understand the underlying principles at play here? No, we are far from it. That's why I said earlier, that noncommutative interactions introduce a new level of complexity, where emergent properties are not *simply aggregative* but instead depend on the complex, sequence-sensitive interactions between components.

So to answer the question, **YES.** Complex systems that follow noncommutative underlying rules can not only foster emergence, but actually lead to a rich and complex form of emergence, which, not only might surprise us but also perplex us.

Further Reading

1. Connes, A. (1994). Noncommutative Geometry. Academic Press.
2. Waldrop, M. M. (1992). Complexity: The Emerging Science at the Edge of Order and Chaos. Simon & Schuster.
3. Peres, A. (1993). Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
4. Juarrero, A. (1999). Dynamics in Action: Intentional Behaviour as a Complex System. MIT Press.

About The Author

Mir H. S. Quadri is the founder of Arkinfo, an innovative platform at the forefront of artificial intelligence research and development. With a background in computer science and a passion for linguistics, Mir's work intersects the technical with the theoretical, exploring how advancements in AI can inform and be informed by the nuances of human language and interaction. He has written for reputed scientific publications with over 100,000 readers globally.

In addition to his technological pursuits, Mir's academic interests include the study of the impact of language on cognitive processes and the development of intelligent systems that mimic human learning patterns. His multidisciplinary approach reflects a commitment to bridging gaps between technology, linguistics, and cognitive science.

Mir shares his research findings and explorations through Arkinfo Notes and The Lumeni Notebook engaging a diverse audience in discussions on technology, philosophy, language, and cognition.
