The Ignorant Observer Framework

Concise Summary

Aernoud Dekker

January 2026
Version 1.3

1 Start with the observer as a physical system

An observer is a dynamical system characterized by:

- finite information-processing capacity C_{eff} [bits/s]

The system being tracked (apparatus + environment) has:

- apparatus entropy rate h_{KS} [nats/s]—the information-production rate of the dynamics the observer must track

(In many chaotic systems, h_{KS} equals the sum of positive Lyapunov exponents—the Pesin relation.)

This is not philosophical. It is just: *a physical system cannot represent more information per second than its physical substrate allows.*

Unit convention (important): If C_{eff} is measured in *bits/s*, then the corresponding information rate in *nats/s* is $C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2$.

2 The observer must track its own measurement basis

A real observer does not just record an outcome. It must represent an internal coordinate frame:

$$\mathbf{n}(\theta(t)). \tag{1}$$

$\theta(t)$ is a dynamical variable *inside the observer*. The observer must keep its internal representation of this basis aligned well enough to preserve measurement correlations.

Define the tracking uncertainty (basis error variance) as:

$$\sigma_\theta^2(t). \tag{2}$$

The framework defines **one key threshold**:

$$\kappa := h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2 \qquad \text{(nats/s)} \tag{3}$$

- **Chaos-wins** ($\kappa > 0$): Tracking fails; basis uncertainty grows exponentially. *Testable: visibility depends on observer bandwidth.*
- **Capacity-wins** ($\kappa < 0$): Tracking succeeds; basis uncertainty is suppressed. *No testable difference from standard QM after transient.*

3 Core dynamics

3.1 Chaos-wins regime ($\kappa > 0$)

In the chaos-wins regime, basis error grows multiplicatively. The variance follows:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \ln \sigma_\theta^2(t) = 2\kappa = 2\big(h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2\big), \tag{4}$$

so

$$\sigma_\theta^2(t) = \sigma_{\theta,0}^2 \, \exp\Big(2\kappa t\Big). \tag{5}$$

This is the core prediction: exponential growth of basis uncertainty when chaos outpaces capacity.

3.2 Diffusive regime

If internal dynamics are noisy rather than chaotic, θ undergoes random drift characterized by a diffusion coefficient D_θ [rad^2/s]. Finite capacity imposes a steady-state lower bound:

$$\sigma_\theta^2 \;\geq\; \frac{D_\theta}{C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2}. \tag{6}$$

This "irreducible self-ignorance" floor represents the balance between diffusive injection (rate D_θ) and information acquisition (rate $C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2$).

Testable: visibility floor depends on observer bandwidth C_{eff}. Standard QM predicts no such dependence.

4 Timescales: threshold-defined crossing times

Because the relevant question is *when the error crosses a threshold*, timescales include a log ratio.

4.1 Loss-of-tracking time (defined only when $\kappa > 0$)

Define a target loss threshold $\sigma_{\theta,\text{target}}^2$. If $\kappa > 0$,

$$\tau_{\text{loss}} = \frac{1}{2\kappa} \ln\left(\frac{\sigma_{\theta,\text{target}}^2}{\sigma_{\theta,0}^2}\right). \tag{7}$$

4.2 Recovery / suppression time (capacity-wins, $\kappa < 0$)

(The framework focuses on τ_{loss}; the following is a symmetric construction.)

If $\kappa < 0$, uncertainty is driven downward. A symmetric threshold time to suppress from $\sigma_{\theta,0}^2$ to a target $\sigma_{\theta,\text{target}}^2$ is:

$$\tau_{\text{rec}} = \frac{1}{2|\kappa|} \ln\left(\frac{\sigma_{\theta,0}^2}{\sigma_{\theta,\text{target}}^2}\right). \tag{8}$$

5 Visibility reduction

Quantum correlations depend on the effective relative angle between the observer basis and the system's configuration. With uncertainty σ_θ^2, visibility is reduced by Gaussian averaging:

$$V_{\text{measured}} = V_{\text{QM}} \, e^{-\sigma_\theta^2/2}. \tag{9}$$

Core prediction (chaos-wins):

$$V(t) = V_{\text{QM}} \exp\big(-\sigma_\theta^2(t)/2\big) \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma_\theta^2(t) = \sigma_{\theta,0}^2 e^{2\kappa t}. \tag{10}$$

Diffusive regime (time-independent):

$$V_{\text{measured}} \le V_{\text{QM}} \exp\left(-\frac{D_\theta}{2C_{\text{eff}}\ln 2}\right). \tag{11}$$

When does IOF differ from standard QM?

- **Chaos-wins**: Yes—visibility decays due to self-ignorance, rate depends on C_{eff}
- **Capacity-wins**: No—after transient, $V \to V_{\text{QM}}$
- **Diffusive**: Yes—constant visibility suppression, floor depends on C_{eff}

6 Interpretation: the "Why Gap"

Critical distinction: This is not merely classical angle jitter being added as external noise. The internal basis $\theta(t)$ can evolve deterministically (there is a definite value at each time), yet the observer cannot keep a full causal trace of how that value arose because representational capacity is limited relative to internal information-production (h_{KS} for chaotic dynamics, D_θ for diffusive dynamics). The epistemic opacity is structural.

7 Neuro timescales (illustrative)

The following are order-of-magnitude estimates, not rigorous derivations.

Different cognitive layers correspond to different effective $(C_{\text{eff}}, h_{\text{KS}}, D_\theta)$. The relevant times are threshold-crossing times of the form

$$\tau \sim \frac{1}{2|\kappa|}\ln(\text{threshold ratio}), \qquad \kappa = h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}}\ln 2,$$

not a single universal $1/\kappa$ constant.

For humans (illustrative):

- raw scale: $1/\kappa \sim 23$ ms (benchmark order)
- threshold crossing: $\tau_{\text{SK}} \sim 50$–70 ms (includes $\ln(\sigma_{\text{th}}/\sigma_0) \sim 2$–3)
- hierarchical ignition: 200–300 ms
- Conscious Action (Libet): ≈ 350 ms

8 Connection to Penrose objective reduction

The framework's timescale can be compared with Penrose's gravitational Objective Reduction (OR):

- **Penrose OR:** $\tau_{\text{OR}} = \hbar/E_G \sim \hbar s/(Gm^2)$, where m is mass and s is spatial separation
- **This framework:** $\tau_{\text{loss}} \approx 1/\kappa = 1/(h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}}\ln 2)$

For mesoscopic masses ($m \sim 10^{-15}$ kg) with separations of 100 nm–1 μm, Penrose predicts $\tau_{\text{OR}} \sim 10$–100 ms. For typical apparatus parameters ($h_{\text{KS}} \approx 50$ nats/s, $C_{\text{eff}} \approx 10$ bits/s), the framework predicts $\tau_{\text{loss}} \approx 50$–70 ms.

Numerical proximity, orthogonal predictions:

- Penrose: τ depends on mass geometry, independent of observer bandwidth
- IOF: τ depends on observer bandwidth, independent of mass geometry

Experimental discrimination: Vary observer power P at fixed mass—Penrose predicts no effect; IOF predicts τ_{loss} increases with P.

9 Preliminary empirical evidence

Forensic analysis of existing datasets reveals populations consistent with the chaos-wins regime ($\kappa > 0$):

- **Superconducting qubits (Google Sycamore):** ~18% of stable cosmic-ray recovery events show delayed-geometry (hesitation) dynamics, distinct from immediate exponential recovery
- **Gravitational-wave detectors (LIGO):** ~56% of glitch recovery events show hesitation signatures

The two populations—fast recovery vs. delayed onset—occupy distinct regions of curvature-delay phase space. Null simulations with matched noise statistics produce delayed fractions below 5%, confirming the observed signatures cannot be attributed to pipeline artifacts.

Finding similar two-regime structure in systems as different as superconducting qubits and km-scale interferometers suggests the phenomenon is not hardware-specific.

10 One-sentence summary

Finite capacity limits the observer's ability to stably represent and causally reconstruct its own measurement basis; the resulting basis uncertainty reduces visibility exactly via Gaussian averaging.

"When we finally understand quantum mechanics, we will wonder how we ever missed something so simple."

— John A. Wheeler