Quantum Collapse of Indeterminate States: An Alternative Framework for Division by Zero

Bryce Petofi Towne

Department of Business Management,

Yiwu Industrial Commercial College, Yiwu, China[*]

(Dated: Written on October 1st, 2024; Modified on UTC+8 07:52 a.m. October 3rd, 2024)

Abstract

Division by zero, specifically $\frac{0}{0}$, has been considered undefined due to its indeterminate nature [1]. In this paper, we propose treating $\frac{0}{0}$ as an indeterminate state U, which belongs to a set of undefined states $\mathcal{S}$. Drawing an analogy with quantum mechanics, specifically the concepts of superposition and wavefunction collapse [2, 3], we explore how such mathematical indeterminacies might behave similarly to quantum states prior to measurement. We introduce several types of "collapse"—conjugate, symmetric, asymmetric, and random—to describe the potential resolutions of U into definite states. The framework presented here demonstrates mathematical consistency in representing and manipulating indeterminacies through $\frac{(U_1 \cdot 0)}{0} = U_2$. Additionally, we propose hypotheses connecting this framework to quantum phenomena such as entanglement, the uncertainty principle, and cosmological singularities, suggesting that this approach may offer new insights into both mathematics and quantum theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

$\frac{0}{0}$ has been considered undefined in mathematics due to the infinite number of possible solutions to equations like $x \times 0 = 0$ [1]. This indeterminate nature poses a significant challenge, as it prevents assigning a unique value to $\frac{0}{0}$. However, the concept of indeterminacy is not unique to mathematics—it plays a central role in quantum mechanics, where systems exist in multiple states simultaneously until measured, a phenomenon known as superposition [2, 4]. Inspired by this parallel, we propose that $\frac{0}{0}$ be interpreted as an undefined state U, belonging to a set of indeterminate states $\mathcal{S}$.

By drawing an analogy between mathematical indeterminacies and quantum systems in superposition, we introduce the idea of "collapse" as a means to resolve such undefined expressions. In quantum mechanics, measurement forces a system to collapse into a definite state from its superposed possibilities [3]. Similarly, we suggest that mathematical indeterminacies like $\frac{0}{0}$ may collapse into a specific value upon observation or 'measurement'. We categorize different forms of collapse—conjugate, symmetric, asymmetric, and random—and explore how these concepts might provide a new framework for understanding division by zero.

* brycepetofitowne@gmail.com

This paper aims to formalize the treatment of $\frac{0}{0}$ as an indeterminate state and demonstrate its consistency within mathematical operations. Additionally, we hypothesize that this framework may offer insights in quantum mechanics, including quantum entanglement, measurement uncertainty, and cosmological singularities. By merging concepts from mathematics and physics, we hope to open new avenues for investigating indeterminacy in both fields.

A. Notation and Terminology

To facilitate clarity in this discussion, we introduce the following notations:

U: Represents an undefined or indeterminate state ($\frac{0}{0}$), and it belongs to a set of undefined states $\mathcal{S}$.

D: Upon measurement or observation, U collapses into a specific value, referred to as a constant D. Mathematically, this collapse can be expressed as

$$U \xrightarrow{\text{measurement}} D, \tag{1}$$

where D can take values from any number system, including real, complex, or imaginary numbers [1].

$\mathcal{S}$: Denotes the set of all possible undefined states that U can occupy before measurement, i.e.,

$$U \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{2}$$

$\mathcal{R}$: Denotes the set of all possible definite values that U can collapse into upon measurement, i.e.,

$$D \in \mathcal{R}. \tag{3}$$

Collapse: The process where U resolves from a state in $\mathcal{S}$ into definite values (definite states) in $\mathcal{R}$, such as D_1, D_2.

The collapse of U into definite values can be categorized as follows:

Conjugate Collapse: Both indeterminate states collapse into the same value, $D_1 = D_2$.

Symmetric Collapse: The states collapse into opposite values, $D_1 = -D_2$.

Asymmetric Collapse: The states collapse into distinct, unrelated values, $D_1 \neq D_2$.

Random Collapse: The states collapse into random values from predefined sets, e.g.,

$$D_1 \in \mathcal{R}_1, \quad D_2 \in \mathcal{R}_2, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ are subsets of $\mathcal{R}$.

II. TREATMENT OF DIVISION BY ZERO

A. Representing $\frac{0}{0}$ as an Undefined State U

As the expression $\frac{0}{0}$ is left undefined because any number multiplied by zero equals zero, resulting in infinitely many solutions, we introduce the notation

$$\frac{0}{0} = U, \tag{5}$$

where U represents the undefined state. To further structure this idea, we assume that U belongs to a set of all possible undefined states, denoted as $\mathcal{S}$ [1]. This allows us to explore the behavior of indeterminate states within a predefined set of possibilities:

$$U \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{6}$$

Upon measurement, U collapses into a value within a separate set $\mathcal{R}$, which contains all possible definite values:

$$U \xrightarrow{\text{measurement}} D, \quad D \in \mathcal{R}. \tag{7}$$

This interpretation allows us to draw parallels between mathematical indeterminacies and quantum mechanical indeterminacies, where a system exists in superposition before it collapses upon measurement [3].

B. Constraints by Quantum Mechanics

We limit the possible values of U to discrete or continuous sets, analogous to quantum systems. For example, in a spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ system, we limit U to

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{+\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\right\}, \tag{8}$$

similar to how spin measurements collapse into one of two outcomes [3].

In systems with continuous probability distributions (e.g., position or momentum), U follows a probability distribution $\mathcal{P}(x)$ over $\mathcal{R}$, constrained by the system:

$$U \sim \mathcal{P}(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{9}$$

This approach reflects how quantum measurements yield discrete or continuous outcomes from an initially indeterminate state [4].

III. FORMALIZATION OF THE INDETERMINATE STATE U

A. Mathematical Consistency of the Equation $\frac{(U_1 \cdot 0)}{0} = U_2$

We consider the equation

$$\frac{(U_1 \cdot 0)}{0} = U_2, \tag{10}$$

where U_1 and U_2 represent indeterminate states within the set $\mathcal{S}$, i.e., $U_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, and $(U_1 \cdot 0)$ is an inseparable unit.

Multiplying both sides of Eq. (10) by 0, we obtain

$$(U_1 \cdot 0) = U_2 \cdot 0. \tag{11}$$

This manipulation results in an equation that is valid under standard arithmetic rules.

B. Collapse to Definite Values

Upon measurement, the indeterminate states U_1 and U_2 collapse to definite values D_1 and D_2, respectively:

$$U_1 \xrightarrow{\text{measurement}} D_1, \quad U_2 \xrightarrow{\text{measurement}} D_2, \quad D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{R}. \tag{12}$$

Substituting these definite values into Eq. (11), we get

$$(D_1 \cdot 0) = D_2 \cdot 0. \tag{13}$$

Since any number multiplied by zero equals zero, Eq. (13) simplifies to

$$0 = 0. \tag{14}$$

This equality holds true for any values of D_1 and D_2 in $\mathcal{R}$, ensuring that the equation remains valid after the collapse. Therefore, the manipulation demonstrates that the original Eq. (10) is mathematically consistent within this framework.

C. Implications for the Relationship Between D_1 and D_2

The fact that Eq. (13) reduces to $0 = 0$ implies that the specific values of D_1 and D_2 do not affect the validity of the equation. This allows for various types of collapses (conjugate, symmetric, asymmetric, random) without violating mathematical consistency.

For example:

Conjugate Collapse:

$$D_1 = D_2 \in \mathcal{R}. \tag{15}$$

Symmetric Collapse:

$$D_1 = -D_2, \quad D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{R}. \tag{16}$$

Asymmetric Collapse:

$$D_1 \neq D_2, \quad D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{R}. \tag{17}$$

Random Collapse:

$$D_1 \in \mathcal{R}_1, \quad D_2 \in \mathcal{R}_2, \quad \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{R}. \tag{18}$$

In all cases, Eq. (13) remains valid, as both sides reduce to zero.

IV. APPLICATIONS IN QUANTUM MECHANICS

A. Pre-Measurement State

In quantum mechanical systems, before measurement, particles exist in a state of superposition [2]. Similar to how U belongs to the set $\mathcal{S}$ before collapsing, we assume quantum systems also have an indeterminate state space, denoted as $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{QM}}$. The possible states of a quantum system can therefore be represented as

$$U_{\mathrm{QM}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{QM}}. \tag{19}$$

Let U_1 and U_2 represent the states of particle 1 and particle 2, respectively. The relationship between the two particles before measurement is given by the equation

$$\frac{(U_1 \cdot 0)}{0} = U_2, \tag{20}$$

where U_1 and U_2 represent the uncertain, pre-measurement states of the two particles within $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{QM}}$.

B. Post-Measurement State

After measurement, the indeterminate states U_1 and U_2 collapse into definite values, denoted by constants D_1 and D_2, respectively, where D_1,D$D_2 \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{QM}}$. Substituting into Eq. (11), we have

$$(D_1 \cdot 0) = D_2 \cdot 0. \tag{21}$$

Simplifying Eq. (21) yields

$$0 = 0. \tag{22}$$

This equality confirms that the equation remains valid regardless of the specific values of D_1 and D_2 in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{QM}}$. Therefore, the type of collapse (conjugate, symmetric, asymmetric, or random) does not affect the mathematical consistency of the relationship in quantum mechanical systems.

Most current quantum mechanical experiments, particularly those involving entangled particles, suggest that the relationship between D_1 and D_2 often follows the symmetric collapse rule, where $D_1 = -D_2$ [5]. This section may provide a formalization in mathematics for this type of quantum behavior.

V. HYPOTHESES

In this section, we introduce hypotheses regarding the undefined state $U = \frac{0}{0}$, which is analogous to a quantum superposition. Equation (10) may represent a new framework for understanding indeterminate states in quantum systems and the early universe. These hypotheses may provide alternative insights into quantum entanglement, measurement, uncertainty, and cosmological singularities.

A. Division by Zero and Quantum Superposition

We hypothesize that the undefined state $\frac{0}{0}$, denoted as U, behaves similarly to a quantum system in superposition. In quantum mechanics, superposition refers to a system existing in multiple states simultaneously until measured [2, 4]. Analogously, the state $U \in \mathcal{S}$, representing $\frac{0}{0}$, remains indeterminate until "collapsed" into a definite value through a measurement-like process. This superposition analogy suggests that mathematical indeterminacies could have a physical interpretation in quantum systems, particularly in systems where undefined or unknown states exist prior to observation.

B. Division by Zero and Quantum Entanglement

We further hypothesize that the concept of undefined states can be extended to quantum entanglement. Entangled particles share quantum states that remain indeterminate until measured [5]. We propose that in certain entangled systems, these states may follow a structure similar to $\frac{0}{0}$, where the measurement of one particle leads to the collapse of an undefined state U across the entire system, as shown by Eq. (10). This collapse could follow one of several forms:

- **Conjugate Collapse**: Both entangled particles collapse to the same value, i.e., $D_1 = D_2$. This form of collapse would correspond to a situation where measurement results for two entangled particles yield identical outcomes.

- **Asymmetric Collapse**: The entangled particles collapse to distinct and unrelated values, i.e., $D_1 \neq \mathrm{D}_2$. This could represent an unexplored form of entanglement where measurement outcomes are independent of each other, yet still correlated in a non-classical manner.

- **Random Collapse**: The particles collapse into random values from predefined sets, i.e., $D_1 \in \mathcal{R}_1$ and $D_2 \in \mathcal{R}_2$, where $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ are subsets of the possible outcomes $\mathcal{R}$. This collapse aligns with probabilistic interpretations in quantum mechanics and could account for the inherent randomness of quantum measurements [4].

- **Extended Collapse in Quantum Fields**: We propose a potential extension to non-classical fields, where multiple particles or subsystems collapse in a more complex, collective manner, governed by quantum field dynamics. This extension may provide insights into interactions within quantum fields that extend beyond pairwise entanglement.

C. Division by Zero and the Uncertainty Principle

Another hypothesis links the undefined state $U = \frac{0}{0}$ to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle. The uncertainty principle states that certain pairs of physical properties, such as position and momentum, cannot both be precisely measured simultaneously [3]. We propose that this uncertainty can be modeled using undefined states such as $U = \frac{0}{0}$, which naturally reflect indeterminacy. The collapse of U upon measurement, as formalized in Eq. (10), may correspond to the "trade-off" between the precision of conjugate variables. This approach may offer a new mathematical formalism for understanding the limits of precision in quantum measurements, potentially providing an alternative perspective in addition to the current understanding of the uncertainty principle.

D. Division by Zero in Cosmology

Finally, we hypothesize that the concept of undefined states may provide a new framework for understanding cosmological singularities, such as the initial conditions of the Big Bang. Specifically, we propose that the universe, prior to the Big Bang, could be modeled as an undefined state $U = \frac{0}{0}$, existing in a form of "cosmic superposition" [4]. The Big Bang would then represent the collapse of this indeterminate state into a definite universe through Eq. (10). This interpretation parallels the quantum mechanical wavefunction collapse but on a cosmological scale. It may offer a potential new lens for understanding the nature of spacetime and the initial conditions of the universe.

E. Conclusion

In summary, we have hypothesized several mathematically and theoretically possible forms of collapse, including conjugate, asymmetric, and random collapses. Moreover, we proposed hypotheses that may offer new perspectives on quantum entanglement, measurement, the uncertainty principle, and the early universe. Through possible future experimental verification, these hypotheses may have the potential to expand the current understanding of quantum mechanics and cosmology, offering new mathematical and physical insights into the nature of the universe. As most current quantum mechanical experiments relating to entangled particles have followed the symmetric collapse rule, where $D_1 = -D_2$ [5], this may validate Eq. (10) and suggest that the formalization through Eq. (10) and Eq. (11) provides a 'code of the universe,' determining how entangled particles function.

VI. A COMPUTATIONAL INTERPRETATION OF QUANTUM ENTANGLEMENT AND INDETERMINACY

In this section, we explore an alternative interpretation of quantum entanglement and mathematical indeterminacies, proposing that they may be manifestations of an underlying computational framework—a "universal code" governing the universe. This approach offers a perspective on the nature of indeterminate states and their collapse into definite values, suggesting that both quantum phenomena and mathematical operations like division by zero could be pre-determined by an implicit set of rules embedded in the fabric of reality.

A. A "Universal Code" Hypothesis

Inspired by the deterministic behavior of computer algorithms, we hypothesize that quantum states—particularly entangled particles—do not "choose" their outcomes through random, non-local influences. Instead, these outcomes are dictated by a universal code, akin to how variables in a computer program take specific values based on pre-programmed instructions.

For instance, in the case of two entangled particles, such as those involved in a spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ system, the relationship between their states before measurement can be formalized as:

$$\frac{(U_1 \cdot 0)}{0} = U_2, \tag{23}$$

where U_1 and U_2 are indeterminate states before measurement. Upon measurement, these states collapse into definite values D_1 and D_2, governed by the symmetric collapse rule $D_1 = -D_2$, which is often observed in quantum mechanical experiments [5]. Rather than invoking an instantaneous signal that "transmits" the state of one particle to the other, we propose that the collapse is predetermined by a universal computational framework, encoded as:

$$D_1 = -D_2. \tag{24}$$

Thus, when one particle is observed to be in the state $D_1 = +\frac{1}{2}$, its entangled counterpart must automatically adopt the state $D_2 = -\frac{1}{2}$, without any need for physical interaction or communication. This deterministic behavior parallels how variables in computer programs interact based on predefined conditions [**?**].

B. Implications for Quantum Non-Locality

This "universal code" hypothesis provides an alternative explanation for the phenomenon of quantum non-locality. In the traditional interpretation, two entangled particles are thought to share information instantaneously, regardless of the distance separating them. This idea of "spooky action at a distance," as Einstein once described it [**?**], has been a topic of philosophical and scientific debate.

However, by assuming that entanglement is encoded in a pre-existing computational structure, we eliminate the need for faster-than-light communication. The behavior of the particles is determined by the same underlying code, similar to how distant elements of a computer program are linked by a central algorithm, even though no physical signal is transmitted between them [**?**].

C. A Code for Mathematical Indeterminacies

Extending this idea to mathematical indeterminacies such as $\frac{0}{0}$, we propose that the same universal code may govern the resolution of undefined expressions. The collapse of an indeterminate state U into a definite value D, analogous to the collapse of quantum superpositions, can be interpreted as the execution of a pre-existing rule within the code.

In this view, division by zero does not represent an "impossible" operation, but rather an expression of indeterminacy that resolves deterministically when triggered by a specific condition or observation. This idea mirrors the behavior of quantum systems, which remain in superposition until measured [2].

D. Potential Experimental and Theoretical Implications

The “universal code” hypothesis is speculative, yet it offers potential implications for future experimental research. If quantum phenomena and mathematical operations are governed by a hidden code, new experiments could be designed to test the deterministic nature of entanglement and other indeterminate states. For example, we could explore whether certain patterns of particle behavior or quantum collapses align more closely with algorithmic predictions than with purely random quantum processes.

Furthermore, this framework may offer a unified explanation for a variety of physical and mathematical phenomena, ranging from quantum entanglement to cosmological singularities, as discussed in the following section.

VII. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we propose a mathematical framework for treating the indeterminate expression $\frac{0}{0}$ as an undefined state U, which belongs to a set of indeterminate states $\mathcal{S}$. By drawing analogies to quantum mechanics, specifically superposition and wavefunction collapse [2–4], we introduce the idea of mathematical collapse, where indeterminate states resolve into definite values. This framework allows 0 as a divisor to be not only conceptually valid but also mathematically consistent, overturning the notion that division by zero is impractical.

By treating $\frac{(U_1 \cdot 0)}{0} = U_2$ as an equation that remains consistent after the collapse of indeterminate states, we show that operations involving division by zero can conform to arithmetic rules, provided that the collapse process is properly defined. This idea may provide a fresh perspective on how these expressions can be understood.

Moreover, by drawing analogies to quantum mechanical superposition and collapse, we suggest that mathematical indeterminacies, like quantum states, exist in a range of possible outcomes until measured or calculated. This framework might contribute to our understanding of quantum phenomena in physics.

While this paper presents a conceptual framework, it is purely speculative. Future research could further explore the nature of $\mathcal{S}$ and its relationship to $\mathcal{R}$ in various mathematical contexts. Additionally, the specific mechanism by which measurement collapses an undefined state from $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathcal{R}$ remains an open question, which may require the development of new mathematical tools or models.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During the preparation of this work, the author used ChatGPT 4.0 to cite literature, proofread, and improve the language clarity and structure of this report. ChatGPT 4.0 also wrote the paper (in LaTeX format). The conceptual framework remains the author's own, and any limitations are the sole responsibility of the author. After using this tool/service, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

[1] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*, 3rd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1976).

[2] D. J. Griffiths, *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics* (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1995).

[3] J. J. Sakurai, *Modern Quantum Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1995).

[4] R. P. Feynman, R. B. Leighton, and M. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1965).

[5] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, "Experimental Realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment: A New Violation of Bell's Inequalities," Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 91 (1982).