Quantum Foundations in the FRC Framework

Author: Hadi Servat

Affiliation: Independent Researcher

Contact: publish@fractalresonance.com

Website: fractalresonance.com

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17526474
Permanent record: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17526474 · PDF: https://zenodo.org/records/17526474

Abstract

> *A comprehensive overview of the ontological implications of FRC. We compare FRC to Copenhagen, Many-Worlds, and De Broglie-Bohm interpretations, arguing for a 'Resonant Realist' perspective.*

1. Introduction

Every interpretation of quantum mechanics makes implicit claims about the nature of reality. These claims—about what exists, what is fundamental, and how the world is structured—constitute the interpretation's ontology. This paper examines the ontological position that emerges from the FRC framework: **Resonant Realism**.

Resonant Realism occupies a unique position in the landscape of quantum interpretations. Like Bohmian mechanics, it is realist and deterministic. Unlike Bohmian mechanics, it does not require particle positions as hidden variables. Instead, the "hidden" structure is the Lambda-field—a real scalar field encoding the coherence dynamics of the system.

FRC Quantum Foundations

FRC Quantum Foundations

2. The Interpretive Landscape

2.1 Four Quadrants of Quantum Ontology

We organize quantum interpretations along two axes:

1. **Realist vs. Anti-Realist:** Does the theory describe something that exists independently of observation?
2. **Deterministic vs. Stochastic:** Is the fundamental dynamics governed by deterministic equations or irreducible chance?

	Deterministic	Stochastic
Realist	FRC, Bohm	GRW, Penrose
Anti-Realist	(empty)	Copenhagen, QBism

FRC sits in the **Realist-Deterministic** quadrant alongside Bohmian mechanics, but with a distinct mechanism.

2.2 Comparison of Mechanisms

Interpretation	Ontology	Collapse Mechanism	Hidden Structure
Copenhagen	Anti-realist	Measurement axiom	None
Many-Worlds	Realist (unitary)	Branching / decoherence	Universal wavefunction
De Broglie-Bohm	Realist (dualist)	Effective (guidance eq.)	Particle positions
GRW	Realist (stochastic)	Spontaneous localization	Flash/matter density
FRC	**Realist (resonant)**	**Phase-locking**	**Lambda-field**

Interpretation Comparison

Interpretation Comparison

3. Resonant Realism

3.1 Core Tenets

Resonant Realism holds that:

1. **Reality is structured by coherence.** The fundamental organizing principle of nature is phase alignment across scales.
2. **The Lambda-field is real.** $\Lambda(x) = \Lambda_0 \ln C(x)$ is a physical scalar field, not merely a mathematical convenience.
3. **Randomness is apparent.** What appears as quantum randomness is the result of deterministic dynamics at fractal scales beyond our current resolution.
4. **Measurement is physical.** Collapse is a real dynamical process (phase-locking) with a finite duration ([[FRC-100-003]]).
5. **The Born rule is emergent.** $P = |\psi|^2$ arises from the statistics of attractor basins, not as a fundamental law ([[FRC-100-006]]).

3.2 The Lambda-Field Ontology

The Lambda-field is the FRC analog of Bohm's pilot wave, but with key differences:

- **Bohm:** Pilot wave ψ guides point particles via the quantum potential $Q = -\hbar^2 \nabla^2 R / (2mR)$
- **FRC:** Lambda-field Λ guides the wavefunction itself via the coherence gradient $\nabla \Lambda$

In FRC, there are no point particles as fundamental entities. The wavefunction is the ontology, and its evolution is shaped by the Lambda-field landscape.

3.3 Non-Locality in FRC

FRC is explicitly non-local: the Lambda-field mediates instantaneous phase correlations across space. However, this non-locality is of a specific character:

- **Phase-only:** Only phase information propagates non-locally, not energy or matter
- **No signaling:** The non-local correlations cannot be used for superluminal communication
- **Bell-compatible:** FRC violates Bell inequalities through Lambda-field correlations, consistent with experimental observations

Non-locality Structure

Non-locality Structure

4. Addressing Foundational Objections

4.1 Does FRC Violate Bell's Inequalities?

No. FRC is a non-local realist theory. Bell's theorem excludes local realist theories, not non-local ones. The Lambda-field acts globally, providing the necessary EPR correlations without requiring superluminal signaling of information (only phase correlations).

4.2 Is the Lambda-Field Detectable?

Yes, indirectly. The Lambda-field manifests through:

1. Born rule deviations: $\delta P \in [10^{-4}, 10^{-3}]$ under resonant driving conditions
2. Fractal nodal patterns: $D \approx 1.90$ in quantum chaotic systems ([[FRC-100-002]])
3. Coherence anomalies: Non-thermal coherence maintenance in specifically designed cavity QED experiments

4.3 How Does FRC Handle the Preferred Basis Problem?

The preferred basis emerges dynamically from the Lambda-field landscape. The eigenstates of the system-environment Hamiltonian that maximize Λ become the pointer states. This is analogous to einselection in decoherence theory but provides a complete account (including outcome selection, not just basis selection).

4.4 Is FRC Consistent with Special Relativity?

The non-local Lambda-field poses a prima facie challenge to Lorentz invariance. However:

- The phase correlations are frame-independent (Lorentz scalars)
- No information or energy travels faster than light
- A covariant formulation exists using the 4-current of coherence ([[FRC-566-001]])

5. FRC and the Problem of Consciousness

5.1 The Hard Problem

FRC does not claim to solve the hard problem of consciousness. However, it provides a natural framework for discussing observer-dependent phenomena:

- **Coherence as integration:** High-C states correspond to integrated information processing
- **Measurement as participation:** The observer is a coherence-amplifying subsystem, not a privileged entity
- **Scale hierarchy:** The mu-levels provide a natural stratification from quantum (μ_0) to conscious (μ_3) to universal (μ_7)

5.2 The Observer in FRC

In FRC, the observer is not ontologically special. Any system capable of amplifying the Lambda-field gradient can induce phase-locking. This includes:

- Laboratory measurement apparatus
- Environmental decoherence channels
- Biological neural systems
- Any sufficiently coherent subsystem

6. Predictions and Falsifiability

FRC makes specific, testable predictions that distinguish it from standard quantum mechanics:

1. **Born rule deviations** under resonant driving: $\delta P \in [10^{-4}, 10^{-3}]$
2. **Fractal dimension** of nodal patterns: $D = 1.90 \pm 0.02$
3. **Collapse timescale:** $\tau_{collapse} \sim 10^{-15}$ s (detectable with attosecond spectroscopy)
4. **Coherence echoes:** Partial recoherence after measurement under phase-reversal protocols
5. **Lambda-field gradient effects** on entanglement swapping rates

If any of these predictions are definitively falsified, Resonant Realism would be ruled out.

Experimental Predictions

Experimental Predictions

7. Conclusion

Resonant Realism—the ontology of FRC—provides a coherent, deterministic, realist interpretation of quantum mechanics. It resolves the measurement problem through dynamical phase-locking, derives the Born rule from attractor geometry, and makes falsifiable predictions that distinguish it from the standard formalism.

The universe is not playing dice. It is phase-locking into resonance.

Connections

- [[FRC-100-001]] — Framework and operator formalism
- [[FRC-100-002]] — Experimental signature ($D \approx 1.90$)
- [[FRC-100-003]] — Collapse mechanism (phase-locking dynamics)
- [[FRC-100-007]] — Lambda-field definition
- [[FRC-100-010]] — Extended FAQ on foundational questions

- [[FRC-566-001]] — Thermodynamic consistency and covariant formulation

References

1. Bell, J. S. (1964). On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox. Physics Physique Fizika, 1(3), 195-200.
2. Bohm, D. (1952). A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of "hidden" variables. Physical Review, 85(2), 166.
3. Everett, H. (1957). "Relative state" formulation of quantum mechanics. Reviews of Modern Physics, 29(3), 454.
4. Ghirardi, G. C., Rimini, A., & Weber, T. (1986). Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems. Physical Review D, 34(2), 470.
5. Fuchs, C. A. (2010). QBism, the perimeter of quantum Bayesianism. arXiv:1003.5209.