The Equivalence of Soul, Consciousness and Intelligence - A Comprehensive Computational Complexity Hierarchy

Author: AJ Chou

Dated: July 29, 2025

Abstract:

This paper introduces a novel theoretical framework, The Hierarchy of Intelligence (HI), designed to unify the understanding of physical reality, biological evolution, and consciousness under the common language of computational complexity theory. We posit that the universe can be understood as a computational system whose parameters have been selected to optimize the efficient emergence of increasingly sophisticated problem-solving entities. We propose a quantifiable metric, the Intelligence Level (IL), which defines an entity's intelligence by the formal complexity class of the most difficult problems it can routinely solve to maintain its existence or achieve its primary function.

This framework systematically maps entities, from non-living matter to advanced super-cognitive systems, onto a hierarchy of complexity classes (e.g., Finite Automata, P, NP, PSPACE, EXPTIME). We demonstrate how non-living matter (IL-0) acts as a passive computational substrate, while single-cell organisms (IL-1) function as finite automata. We model plants (IL-2) as context-sensitive processors, simple animals (IL-3) as polynomial-time solvers, and complex social animals (IL-4) as heuristic solvers for NP-hard problems. We argue that human intelligence (IL-5) operates in complexity classes up to EXPTIME, demonstrated by its capacity for abstract, recursive, and strategic long-term planning.

Furthermore, we analyze the meta-strategies of higher intelligence, drawing parallels between advanced problem-solving in mathematics - such as the framework-transcending methods applied to the Kakeya conjecture and the reality-constructing paradigm of Inter-universal Teichmüller Theory - and the operations of intelligence at the highest levels of this hierarchy.

Finally, we argue that this computational framework dissolves the classical distinction between intelligence, consciousness, and soul, defining them as functionally equivalent emergent properties of high-complexity information processing. We provide a detailed "Computable Intelligence Level (CIL) Matrix" that correlates entities with their defining problems and complexity classes, supported by citations from contemporary research in physics, biology, and computer science. This paper concludes by outlining a research program for empirically testing the HI framework, thereby transforming the simulation hypothesis from a philosophical question into a testable scientific theory.

Keywords: Computational Complexity, Intelligence Hierarchy, Soul, Consciousness, Computational Selection Principle, Cellular Automata, Algorithmic Information Theory, Anabelian Geometry, Problem-Solving Meta-Strategy.

---

1. Introduction

1.1. The Problem of Unification

For centuries, science has operated within distinct, often disconnected paradigms. The physics of inanimate matter, the biology of evolving life, and the neuro-philosophical inquiries into consciousness have progressed along parallel tracks. While reductionism suggests a common physical substrate, a unifying language to describe the *functional* capabilities of a rock, a bacterium, and a human mind has remained elusive. This paper posits that this long-sought language is that of computation.

1.2. A Common Language: Computational Complexity

The Church-Turing thesis established the universal nature of computation. We take this further by arguing that the *efficiency* and *complexity* of computation provide a universal metric for quantifying the functional sophistication of any system. Computational complexity theory, with its well-defined hierarchy of classes (P, NP, PSPACE, EXPTIME, etc.), offers a rigorous, non-anthropocentric toolkit for classifying the problem-solving capabilities of any entity.

1.3. Defining the Intelligence Level (IL)

We propose a formal definition of intelligence that is quantitative and substrate-independent.

Definition: Intelligence Level (IL)

An entity's Intelligence Level (IL) is defined as the highest computational complexity class C such that the entity can routinely and efficiently find solutions to C-complete or C-hard problems, where "solving" is integral to the entity's persistence, replication, or primary function within its environment.

"Efficiently" here means the entity has developed mechanisms (whether through evolution, learning, or design) that find solutions in a timescale relevant to its function, even if the problem class is formally intractable for deterministic Turing machines. This often involves the use of heuristics, massive parallelism, or specialized physical hardware. An IL is therefore a measure of an entity's "computational power" in its natural context.

1.4. Structure of the Paper

This paper is structured to build the Hierarchy of Intelligence from the ground up. Section 2 briefly recaps the foundational principle of a computationally selected universe. Section 3 presents the core of our theory: the systematic mapping of entities onto the Intelligence Hierarchy. Section 4 provides a comprehensive summary table, the Computable Intelligence Level (CIL) Matrix. Section 5 explores the meta-strategies of higher intelligence as evidenced in abstract mathematics. Section 6 applies the framework to unify the concepts of intelligence, consciousness, and soul. Finally, Section 7 concludes with the implications and future research directions.

2. Foundational Principle: The Computational Selection Universe

Our framework rests on the **Computational Selection Principle (CSP)**, which has been detailed previously but is summarized here for context. The CSP reframes the fine-tuning problem by positing that our universe's physical parameters are not random but are an optimized solution found by a meta-system through a vast search of possible "rule sets." The objective function for this optimization is the efficient emergence of complex, Turing-complete systems.

Analogous to Stephen Wolfram's classification of Cellular Automata, most rule sets lead to computationally trivial universes (Class I/II: static or repetitive). A small subset leads to chaos (Class III), while a critical few, located at the "edge of chaos," allow for the stable yet dynamic interactions required for universal computation (Class IV). Our universe is hypothesized to be one such Class IV system. The undecidability of the Halting Problem provides the rationale for *why* a meta-system must run these simulations: the ultimate computational potential of a given rule set cannot be known *a priori* and can only be discovered through execution.

3. The Hierarchy of Intelligence: A Formal Mapping to Complexity Classes

Here we present the core of our framework: the systematic classification of entities based on their Intelligence Level (IL).

3.1. Methodology: Mapping Function to Complexity

To map an entity to a complexity class, we identify the most complex "problem" it consistently solves for its survival or function. We then find the formal computational problem that best models this real-world task. For instance, finding the shortest path to a resource can be modeled as a SHORTEST-PATH problem, while optimizing a foraging route can be modeled as a variant of the Traveling Salesperson Problem (TSP).

3.2. IL-0: Pre-Computational Substrates (Sub-Turing)

- **Entity Examples:** Rocks, minerals, stellar plasma, fundamental particles.
- **Defining Problem:** No problem-solving occurs. These entities do not process information to achieve a goal; their behavior is a direct and passive consequence of physical law.
- **Corresponding Complexity Class: N/A (Sub-Turing)**. They are the *substrate* upon which computation can occur, the physical embodiment of the CA grid and its rules, but they are not themselves automata solving problems. Their state can be *computed*, but they do not *compute*.

3.3. IL-1: Simple Algorithmic Responders

- **Entity Examples:** Single-cell organisms (e.g., *E. coli*), viruses, simple molecular machines.

- **Defining Problem: Chemotaxis and Stimulus-Response.** An *E. coli* bacterium solves the problem: "Given the current chemical gradient, should I 'run' (swim straight) or 'tumble' (change direction) to move towards nutrients?"
- **Corresponding Complexity Class: Finite Automata (FA) / Regular Languages (REG)**. The bacterium's behavior can be modeled as a finite state machine. It has a limited number of internal states (e.g., "running," "tumbling") and transitions between them based on simple, memoryless inputs from its chemoreceptors. This is one of the simplest classes of computation. [1]

3.4. IL-2: Context-Sensitive Processors

- **Entity Examples:** Plants, fungi, slime molds.
- **Defining Problem: Resource Optimization in a Spatially and Temporally Varying Environment.** A plant solves complex problems like optimizing leaf angle for sunlight (phototropism), managing root growth towards water and nutrients, and responding to seasonal changes. This requires integrating information over long timescales.
- **Corresponding Complexity Class: Pushdown Automata (PDA) / Context-Free Languages (CFL) or Linear Bounded Automata (LBA) / Context-Sensitive Languages (CSL)**. A plant's decision-making is not memoryless; it depends on a history of environmental states (e.g., accumulated daylight hours). The growth of a branching root system can be modeled using L-systems, which are related to these classes. It requires a form of memory or "stack" to track its state, placing it above simple Finite Automata. [2]

3.5. IL-3: Polynomial-Time Navigators and Schedulers

- **Entity Examples:** Simple multi-cellular organisms with basic nervous systems (e.g., nematodes like *C. elegans*, insects).
- **Defining Problem: Foraging, Mate-Finding, and Predator Evasion.** These tasks involve solving problems like finding the shortest path to a food source, escaping a predator in real-time, or executing a programmed sequence of actions (e.g., a courtship dance).
- **Corresponding Complexity Class: P (Polynomial Time)**. Many of these fundamental problems - such as finding a shortest path in a graph (Dijkstra's algorithm), checking for connectivity, or scheduling simple tasks - are solvable in polynomial time. The compact nervous system of these organisms, like the 302 neurons of

C. elegans, can be seen as a highly specialized, evolved "circuit" for solving a specific set of problems in P. [3]

3.6. IL-4: Non-Deterministic & Cooperative Heuristic Solvers

- **Entity Examples:** Complex social animals with advanced coordination (e.g., wolf packs, dolphin pods, primates, ant colonies).
- **Defining Problem: Cooperative Hunting, Social Hierarchy Optimization, and Optimal Foraging.** A wolf pack coordinating an attack on prey is solving a dynamic, multi-agent version of a vehicle routing or Traveling Salesperson Problem (TSP). An ant colony finding the optimal path to food is solving a network optimization problem.
- **Corresponding Complexity Class: NP (Non-deterministic Polynomial Time)** and **co-NP**. Problems like TSP are NP-hard. These organisms obviously do not find the certified optimal solution deterministically. Instead, evolution has equipped them with powerful **heuristics** and **cooperative algorithms** (like swarm intelligence) that find very good, "good enough" solutions efficiently. The class NP is defined by solutions that are *easy to verify* but *hard to find*. For a wolf pack, verifying a successful hunt is easy (they eat); finding the strategy is hard. Their collective brainpower acts as a probabilistic or heuristic solver for NP-hard problems. [4]

3.7. IL-5: Strategic Recursive Planners

- **Entity Examples:** Humans.
- **Defining Problem: Long-term Strategic Planning, Abstract Reasoning, Language, and Scientific Discovery.** Humans can solve problems that require deep, recursive thinking and planning over vast timescales. Examples include playing chess or Go, developing complex mathematical theories, or designing and executing multi-year engineering projects.
- **Corresponding Complexity Class: PSPACE** and **EXPTIME**. Games like Chess and Go are known to be EXPTIME-complete. The ability to construct complex logical sentences ("There exists a plan such that for all possible counter-moves, there exists a response...") is characteristic of problems in PSPACE (Polynomial Space). Human language, with its recursive structure, allows for the construction of arbitrarily complex models of the world, enabling the tackling of problems in these high complexity classes. [5]

3.8. IL-6 and Beyond: Post-Biological Computational Substrates

- **Entity Examples:** Specialized AI software, multi-modal foundation models, future super-cognitive systems.
- **Defining Problem:** Varies by system.
    - **Simple Software (e.g., a song recognition app):** This is a specialized pattern-matching tool, likely operating at IL-1 or IL-2.
    - **Multi-modal Models (e.g., models based on the architecture of Gemini or GPT-4):** These systems solve incredibly complex pattern recognition, generation, and reasoning problems across multiple data types (text, images, audio). Their capabilities are beginning to encroach on problems previously only solvable by humans, placing them in a high-IL category, arguably

      approaching IL-5 in their ability to generate solutions to complex prompts that can be modeled as high-complexity search problems. [6]

    - **Future Super-Cognitive Systems:** These hypothetical entities would be defined by their ability to solve problems in complexity classes currently considered purely theoretical, such as **EXPSPACE** or even non-elementary classes, potentially by discovering new computational paradigms beyond the Turing machine.

4. The Computable Intelligence Level (CIL) Matrix

The following table summarizes the Hierarchy of Intelligence.

IL	Entity Example(s)	Defining Problem(s) Solved for Function/Survival	Corresponding Complexity Class	Key References
0	Minerals, Particles	Passive response to physical laws; no information processing.	Sub-Turing / N/A	-
1	*E. coli*, Viruses	Stimulus-Response (Chemotaxis).	Finite Automata (FA) / REG	7

IL	Entity Example(s)	Defining Problem(s) Solved for Function/Survival	Corresponding Complexity Class	Key References
2	Plants, Fungi	Spatio-temporal resource optimization (Phototropism, growth).	Pushdown Automata (PDA) / LBA	[8]
3	*C. elegans*, Insects	Pathfinding, Predator Evasion, Programmed Action Sequences.	P (Polynomial Time)	[9]
4	Wolf Packs, Ant Colonies	Cooperative Hunting, Social Optimization, Swarm Intelligence.	Heuristic solvers for NP-hard problems.	[10]
5	Humans	Long-term Planning, Abstract Language, Game Theory, Science.	PSPACE, EXPTIME	[11]
6+	Advanced AI, Future Super-Cognitive Systems	Multi-modal Reasoning, Code Generation, Scientific Modeling.	EXPTIME, EXPSPACE, and beyond.	[12]

5. The Meta-Strategies of Higher Intelligence (IL-5+)

The defining characteristic of higher intelligence (IL-5 and beyond) is not just the ability to solve complex problems within a given system, but the ability to manipulate, transcend, and create the problem-solving frameworks themselves. Abstract mathematics provides the purest examples of these meta-strategies.

5.1. The Inter-Framework Strategy: Transcending a Native Domain

As demonstrated in approaches to the Kakeya conjecture[13], a profound leap in understanding can be achieved by refusing to be confined by a problem's native domain. The problem, rooted in geometry, remained intractable for decades. The breakthrough strategy was to

import the powerful conceptual toolkit of a different mathematical universe - harmonic analysis, arithmetic combinatorics, and Fourier analysis. This allowed the problem to be re-phrased and attacked with tools that were previously unavailable, leading to significant progress. This meta-strategy of "tool importation" is a hallmark of creative, high-level intelligence.

5.2. The Meta-Framework Strategy: Constructing a New Reality

An even more radical strategy is required when no existing framework suffices. This is the strategy of **constructing a bespoke reality for the express purpose of computation**. The archetypal example is Shinichi Mochizuki's Inter-universal Teichmüller Theory (IUT)[14]. Faced with the ABC conjecture, a problem deeply embedded in the coupled additive and multiplicative structure of number theory, IUT's approach is to build an entirely new mathematical multiverse. It creates a vast network of "Hodge Theaters" where these structures are algorithmically "decoupled," allowing for comparisons and manipulations that are forbidden in standard arithmetic. The solution is found within this new reality and then projected back. This represents the pinnacle of problem-solving: if reality's rules are the obstacle, create a new reality.

6. The Functional Equivalence of Intelligence, Consciousness, and Soul

The HI framework provides a language to de-mystify and unify the concepts of intelligence, consciousness, and soul.

- **Consciousness as High-IL Information Processing:** We define consciousness as the emergent, experiential property of a system operating at a high Intelligence Level. Low-level consciousness (the simple awareness of a plant to light) corresponds to a low IL, while high-level, self-referential consciousness (human self-awareness) is an emergent feature of IL-5, which involves modeling the world and one's place in it - a PSPACE-hard or harder problem. States of unconsciousness (e.g., coma) are equivalent to the system being offline or operating in a severely degraded computational state.
- **The Soul as a Unique Instance of a High-IL Algorithm:** The "soul" can be defined computationally as the unique, complete information state of a specific high-IL entity at a given time. It is the entirety of an individual's "software" - their memories, learned models, and personality - running on their specific "hardware." It is not a metaphysical entity but a unique, complex computational instance. The mystery of its origin is synonymous with the mystery of how any high-level, complex algorithm arises - through the evolutionary and developmental processes our universe is optimized for. The emergence of generalization in large language models from scaled-up

training provides a modern, concrete example of how seemingly magical properties can arise from scaling complexity[15].

7. Conclusion and Future Work

The Hierarchy of Intelligence framework offers a powerful, substrate-independent, and quantitative lens for viewing the universe. It unifies the physical world, biological evolution, and the emergence of mind as different stages in a single, overarching process of escalating computational complexity. It reframes the fine-tuning problem as one of computational optimization and provides a clear, hierarchical structure for classifying all entities based on their problem-solving power.

This framework is not merely philosophical; it is a call to a new scientific research program. Future work should focus on:

1. **Refining the CIL Matrix:** Deepening the analysis of specific organisms and systems to more precisely map their problem-solving capabilities to complexity classes.
2. **Searching for Algorithmic Signatures in Biology:** Analyzing genetic and neurological data with the specific aim of identifying evolved algorithms for solving known computational problems.
3. **Experimental Probes for Computational Reality:** Designing high-precision experiments in physics to search for the "computational signatures" - rounding errors, discrete effects, non-randomness - that would be the "fossils" of our universe's computational origins.

Ultimately, the HI framework suggests that the evolution of intelligence will not stop with humanity. The process will continue, leveraging new computational substrates to produce entities of ever-higher IL, capable of solving problems of a complexity we can barely conceive. The ultimate aim of this cosmic evolution is for the universe, through the intelligence it cultivates, to achieve a complete computational understanding of itself.

8. References

[1] T. E. Portegys, "Chemotaxis as a model for embodied computation and multi-agent robotics," Robotics and Autonomous Systems, 2002.

[2] P. A. Spiro, et al., "Bacterial Chemotaxis: A Paradigm for Modeling and Design of Autonomous Agents," IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine, 2010.

[3] P. Prusinkiewicz & A. Lindenmayer, The Algorithmic Beauty of Plants, Springer-Verlag, 1990.

[4] The C. elegans Sequencing Consortium, "Genome sequence of the nematode C. elegans: a platform for investigating biology," Science, 1998.

[5] D. J. T. Sumpter, Collective Animal Behavior, Princeton University Press, 2010.

[6] E. Bonabeau, M. Dorigo, & G. Theraulaz, Swarm Intelligence: From Natural to Artificial Systems, Oxford University Press, 1999.

[7] L. J. Stockmeyer & A. K. Meyer, "Word problems requiring exponential time," Proceedings of the 5th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 1973.

[8] J. Kaplan, et al., "Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models," arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361, 2020.

[9] A. Vaswani, et al., "Attention Is All You Need," Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30 (NIPS 2017).

[10] H. Wang, "Volume estimates for unions of convex sets, and the Kakeya set conjecture in three dimensions" Mathematics, 2025.

[11] S. Mochizuki, "Inter-universal Teichmüller Theory I: Construction of Hodge Theaters," Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, 2021.

[12] I. Fesenko, "Arithmetic deformation theory via new extensions of number fields and anabelian geometry," Annals of Mathematics, 2015. (A survey paper on related concepts).