

Why Intuitive Physics Engine of Humans Exists, How it Works, and Why It is Beneficial

Yida Niu, 2301112046

Abstract—This essay examines the compelling evidence supporting the existence of an intuitive physics engine in humans, a conceptual framework allowing an innate understanding of fundamental physical laws. It is evidenced by early developmental manifestations in infants and is observable in everyday human behaviors and advanced neuroimaging studies. Despite substantial empirical support for its existence, the underlying mechanisms of how this intuitive system operates remain a subject of extensive research and debate. The exploration is multifaceted, delving into the developmental, cognitive, and evolutionary aspects of intuitive physics and its interaction with acquired knowledge. The essay aims to shed light on the intricacies of this inherent ability and its implications for understanding human cognition and advancing artificial intelligence. Discussions about benefits of intuitive physics engine is also included in this essay.

I. INTRODUCTION

INTUITIVE physics refer to the capability of humans that are able to understand their physical environment and interact with objects and substances that undergo dynamic state changes, making at least approximate predictions about how observed events will unfold (e.g., predicting the trajectory of a thrown ball, the direction that a chopped tree will fall, or the path of a breaking wave) [1].

It implies a natural, often subconscious understanding of the laws governing objects and their movements, enabling individuals to predict outcomes, solve problems, and interact effectively with their environment.

II. EXPERIMENTS AND EVIDENCES FOR EXISTANCE OF INTUITIVE PHYSICS ENGINE

This ability appears early in human development, with infants demonstrating basic understandings of object permanence, gravity, and causality [2]–[4]. To prove that this engine exists in humans without acquisition from knowledge (like Newtonian Principles), researchers have tested violation-of-expectation (VOE) method [5] on infants. This method takes advantage of infants' natural tendency to look longer at events that violate, as opposed to confirm, their expectations. In recent years, several variations of the VOE method have been developed. For example, researchers have found that infants spend more time exploring objects featured in unexpected as opposed to expected events [6], [7] and select unexpected over expected events when allowed to choose what they see next [8]. All of these VOE methods depend on infants' propensity to use their mental model of the world to predict how events will unfold; when an event does not unfold as expected, infants inspect it to glean information for revising their model, so as to better predict outcomes in the future.

Another evidence is that humans can predict the final location of a thrown object or the trajectory of a falling one, without engaging in conscious calculations [9]. Such predictive abilities are quintessential examples of intuitive physics.

There are also experiments about daily tasks, like pouring liquids or stacking objects, which illuminate human's natural understanding of principles such as balance, weight distribution, and fluid dynamics [10].

III. HOW INTUITIVE PHYSICS ENGINE WORKS IN BRAIN

It is still unclear how intuitive physics engine works, but some hypothesis are made to explain the principle. Current research delves deeply into unraveling the mechanics of the human intuitive physics engine, employing an amalgamation of developmental studies, cognitive neuroscience, and comparative analyses. A multitude of studies and experiments underscore the early manifestation of intuitive physics in infants, illuminating their ability to understand fundamental physical laws [11], [12]. Cognitive neuroscience provides insights into the neurological substrates that potentially underlie intuitive physics, revealing specific brain regions activated when humans engage in predicting physical phenomena [13]. Additionally, comparative studies with artificial intelligence highlight the uniqueness and complexity of human intuitive physics, which, despite the advances in technology, AI struggles to emulate [14]. These diverse research avenues collectively enhance our understanding of the nature, origins, and mechanisms of the intuitive physics engine in humans.

While substantial progress has been made, the field continues to be rife with questions and possibilities. Research is ongoing to comprehend the limitations and inaccuracies inherent in intuitive physics and to understand how this intuitive system coexists and interacts with formal, learned physics knowledge [10], [15]. Efforts are underway to explore the evolutionary advantages conferred by the presence of an intuitive physics engine, investigating how it has shaped human survival, adaptation, and interaction with the environment [16]. The dynamic interface between intuitive understanding and formal knowledge holds the promise of unraveling not just the workings of the human mind but also the development of more sophisticated and intuitive artificial intelligence systems. The integration of insights from multidisciplinary research endeavors is pivotal for advancing our comprehension of the intricate tapestry of intuitive physics in humans.

IV. BENEFITS OF INTUITIVE PHYSICS ENGINE FOR HUMANS

The intuitive physics engine empowers individuals to make rapid predictions about the behavior of objects and navigate the physical world efficiently, all without the necessity for conscious calculations or formal education in physics [9]. From early childhood, humans exhibit signs of this inherent understanding of physics principles, with infants demonstrating awareness of object permanence and reactions to violations of physical laws [5]. This innate grasp of physics is continuously honed and refined throughout life as individuals encounter varied physical environments and challenges [12]. Thus, intuitive physics is a foundational element of human cognition, vital for the performance of everyday tasks and efficient navigation of the world.

Furthermore, the benefits of possessing an intuitive physics engine extend beyond mere daily conveniences. It is a critical component for advanced learning and conceptual understanding in various scientific domains, aiding in the development of formal and systematic knowledge in physics and related disciplines [10]. This instinctive comprehension of the physical world also plays a pivotal role in survival, enabling humans to quickly assess and adapt to potential threats and changes in their environment. The evolutionary advantage provided by the intuitive physics engine favors heuristic-based, rapid decision-making processes over slow, detailed analytical thinking in situations where swift responses are crucial [15].

V. CONCLUSION

The interaction of humans with their physical environment through inherent understanding, observable from early childhood to adulthood, strongly corroborates the presence of an intuitive physics engine. The myriad of daily interactions and navigations underscore this inherent, albeit imperfect, understanding, illuminating our ability to survive and operate efficiently within a universe bound by physical laws. On the other hand, the idea of humans possessing an intuitive physics engine is compelling but merits scrutiny. The pervasive role of learned experiences, the evident cognitive biases, the empirical demonstration of limited predictive accuracy, and the influence of cultural variations all challenge the validity of this concept. While humans undoubtedly have a remarkable ability to adapt to and interact with their environment, attributing this ability to an inherent, infallible understanding of physical laws seems an oversimplification. It appears more plausible that our seemingly intuitive grasp of physics is predominantly a byproduct of learned experiences, heuristic-based assessments, and environmental interactions, rather than a testament to an innate, accurate physics engine embedded within our cognition.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. R. Kubricht, K. J. Holyoak, and H. Lu, "Intuitive physics: Current research and controversies," *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 749–759, 2017.
- [2] Y. Lin, M. Stavans, and R. Baillargeon, "Infants' physical reasoning and the cognitive architecture that supports it," *Cambridge handbook of cognitive development*, pp. 168–194, 2022.
- [3] T. D. Ullman, E. Spelke, P. Battaglia, and J. B. Tenenbaum, "Mind games: Game engines as an architecture for intuitive physics," *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 649–665, 2017.
- [4] B. M. Lake, T. D. Ullman, J. B. Tenenbaum, and S. J. Gershman, "Building machines that learn and think like people," *Behavioral and brain sciences*, vol. 40, p. e253, 2017.
- [5] R. Baillargeon, E. S. Spelke, and S. Wasserman, "Object permanence in five-month-old infants," *Cognition*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 191–208, 1985.
- [6] A. E. Stahl and L. Feigenson, "Observing the unexpected enhances infants' learning and exploration," *Science*, vol. 348, no. 6230, pp. 91–94, 2015.
- [7] Y. Zhang and S. Wang, "Violation to infant faulty knowledge induces object exploration by 7.5-month-olds in support events," in *Biennial Meeting of the Cognitive Development Society, Louisville, KY*, 2019.
- [8] K.-s. Jin, J. L. Houston, R. Baillargeon, A. M. Groh, and G. I. Roisman, "Young infants expect an unfamiliar adult to comfort a crying baby: Evidence from a standard violation-of-expectation task and a novel infant-triggered-video task," *Cognitive Psychology*, vol. 102, pp. 1–20, 2018.
- [9] D. R. Proffitt, "Embodied perception and the economy of action," *Perspectives on psychological science*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 110–122, 2006.
- [10] M. McCloskey, "Intuitive physics," *Scientific american*, vol. 248, no. 4, pp. 122–131, 1983.
- [11] R. Baillargeon, "Object permanence in 31/2- and 41/2-month-old infants," *Developmental psychology*, vol. 23, no. 5, p. 655, 1987.
- [12] E. S. Spelke, "Principles of object perception," *Cognitive science*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 29–56, 1990.
- [13] J. Fischer, J. G. Mikhael, J. B. Tenenbaum, and N. Kanwisher, "Functional neuroanatomy of intuitive physical inference," *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, vol. 113, no. 34, pp. E5072–E5081, 2016.
- [14] P. W. Battaglia, J. B. Hamrick, and J. B. Tenenbaum, "Simulation as an engine of physical scene understanding," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 110, no. 45, pp. 18327–18332, 2013.
- [15] A. Shleifer, "Psychologists at the gate: a review of daniel Kahneman's thinking, fast and slow," *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 1080–1091, 2012.
- [16] J. J. Gibson, "The ecological approach to the visual perception of pictures," *Leonardo*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 227–235, 1978.