

Schizophrenia and Quantum Logic: What is the appropriate field? or,  
"Onward toward Genuine Intelligence!"

by

Eddie Oshins, SLAC and Stanford Neuropsychology Laboratories

Thursday, April 23, 1981, 8:00 p.m.

SLAC, Green Room, Central Labs.

Copyright Eddie Oshins ©1981

All rights reserved to the Author

---

Several "competing" schools of thought that attempt to describe schizophrenic cognition as a logical phenomenon will be presented (e.g., Von Domarus/Arieti/Boyd Principle of Identification of Predicates; Bateson et al, Double Bind Theory; Matte Bianco's Principle of Symmetry). The "apparent" controversy will be discussed.

Visual tools and models will be developed to visually depict the structuring and ordering relations between concepts that admit empirical, distinguishable resolution. Some variant logics and some psychological phenomena will be illustrated and discussed. We will look at some of the differences involved. Particular emphasis will be made on differences between a (non-distributive) quantum logic and its special case of classical logic. Some psychological support for what I have called the Genuine Stupidity Logic paradigm will be mentioned (e.g. Pribram's Holographic of Coherence Hypothesis of distributed memory storage, Shepard's Mental Rotations, Bernstein's motion impletion studies, von Békésy's neuronal superpositions).

Some history of Quantum Logic will be summarized. Some distinctive interpretations from Yuri Orlov's "Wave Logic of Consciousness" will be mentioned. The Double Bind Theory of Schizophrenia will be contrasted with an Orlovian Doubt State. I will attempt to distinguish between the two based upon the locus of control over the representational frame of the discriminator (concept former). My model attempts to interpret the former as precipitous of pathogenic ambivalence and the latter as allowing for the ambiguity that permits creativity.

A unified characterization of the phenomenon of schizophrenia will be put forth whereby the mental representation in schizophrenia is in terms of the real field instead of the complex field. The role of imaginary numbers in providing for uncertainty relations, whereby one construct restricts the availability of another, will be discussed. Some speculation as to neurophysiological and neurochemical mechanisms will be put forth. The direction will be toward a synaptic hyperpolarization/depolarization impairment in the ability to form stable coherent, irreducible images (such as "To be or not to be" in distinction to "I am and I am not") - bound cathexis. The "controversy" will be clarified.

In that there will be, hopefully, several specialists in among us, we will try to encourage comments, discussion, and interactions. I will try to put forth some of my own lackings in understanding and misgivings in search for further representational improvements.