

# Recursive Instability Collapse (RIC): A Dynamic Framework for Quantum Measurement, Decision-Making, and Cosmology

Gestan Morgan<sup>\*</sup>

August 20, 2025

**Abstract.** We propose *Recursive Instability Collapse (RIC)* as an adaptive monitoring principle for open quantum systems. A global instability functional  $C(t)$  modulates measurement strengths  $\gamma_k(t)$  relative to a threshold  $C^*$ , while the unconditional dynamics remain linear, completely positive and trace preserving (GKLS). Under *record-only* feedback, RIC is compatible with Born statistics and does not violate no-signaling. We outline testable predictions in quantum trajectories (hazard curves near threshold), neurophysiology (Theta  $\rightarrow$  CPP/LRP), and a heuristic cosmological reading (an effectively homogeneous,  $w \approx -1$  component). Proof sketches and simulation pseudocode are provided in the appendix.

**Keywords:** quantum measurement; GKLS/Lindblad; stochastic Schrödinger equation; measurement feedback; Born rule; no-signaling; emergence; EEG; decision-making; dark energy; cosmology

*Transparency statement.* This manuscript was produced with substantial assistance from AI systems (Claude 4.1 Opus; Gemini 2.5 Pro; GPT-5 Thinking<sup>2</sup>). **Concept & philosophical framework:** Gestan Morgan<sup>\*</sup> (cf. the author's texts *The Path into a New Time – A Stress Test* and *The Dialectical Symphony of Duality*). **Elaboration:** mathematical formalization, drafting and pseudocode were *predominantly AI-generated*, curated and integrated by the author.

---

*Transparency.* This manuscript used AI assistance (Claude 4.1 Opus; Gemini 2.5 Pro; GPT-5 Thinking<sup>2</sup>); concept and philosophical framing by the author; mathematical formalization and drafting largely AI-generated and curated by the author.

*Pseudonym.* The author publishes under a pseudonym; the asterisk marks this.

# Contents

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1 Contribution &amp; Claims (Overview)</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2 Notation</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Main Text</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1 Introduction . . . . .	3
3.2 RIC: intuition in three layers . . . . .	4
3.3 Formal specification . . . . .	4
3.4 Properties (proof sketches in the appendix) . . . . .	4
3.5 Predictions and empirical paths . . . . .	4
3.6 Relation to prior work (concise) . . . . .	5
3.7 Limitations and open questions . . . . .	5
3.8 Minimal example & falsifiability . . . . .	5
3.9 Summary . . . . .	5
<b>A Formal foundations and simulation sketches for RIC</b>	<b>6</b>
A.1 Setting and notation . . . . .	6
A.2 CPTP under adaptive rates: conditions and sketch . . . . .	6
A.3 Born consistency of trajectories . . . . .	6
A.4 No-signaling under local RIC dynamics . . . . .	6
A.5 Simulation sketches (pseudocode) . . . . .	7

# Foreword

## The Cost of Hesitation: A Theory of a Deciding Universe

At the heart of modern physics, neuroscience, and cosmology lies a common puzzle: How does bare possibility become an actual, settled fact? A quantum particle occupies many places until a measurement singles out one. A human mind navigates a maze of potential futures until a decision selects one path. The universe itself rests in a subtle balance that drives its expansion, even though we do not know the source of that driving.

These transitions from undecided to definite — these “collapses” — are usually treated as separate mysteries. The theory proposed here, *Recursive Instability Collapse (RIC)*, offers a simple unifying working hypothesis: *reality emerges because indecision carries physical costs*.

**Mechanism: an economic pressure.** A system in a state of indecision — a spin in superposition, or a brain weighing options — sits in a state of high informational instability. We do not introduce a new law; we stay within open quantum systems. Our claim is that such a state is not passive; it incurs costs. RIC posits a universal feedback:

- **Instability creates pressure:** the more undecided a system, the stronger its coupling to the environment — as if hesitation generated a noise that makes it more observable.
- **Pressure enforces decision:** the reinforced coupling accelerates the process that drives the system into a robust state.

Collapse is not an external intervention, but an internal self-regulation that exits an informationally “expensive” state. Our simulations *suggest* that this dynamics can reproduce Born statistics without postulating them, while respecting no-signaling.

**Neural signature.** If RIC is universal, its echo should appear in the most complex decision system we know. The theory makes a lab-testable prediction: the weighing phase corresponds to elevated neuronal instability (frontal Theta, 4–7 Hz), and the commitment moment corresponds to the collapse of this state (signatures: CPP, LRP). The felt “free will” would be the first-person view of this physical transition.

**Cosmological consequence (heuristic).** As a heuristic reading, the pervasive stream of quantum collapses since the big bang could stabilize an information-thermodynamic fixed point of vacuum energy density. Phenomenologically this behaves like dark energy: homogeneous,  $w \approx -1$ , no clustering. This is a *hypothesis* that requires quantitative confrontation with precision data.

**Conclusion: an invitation to falsification.** RIC provides a unified frame that models quantum collapse, conscious choice, and cosmic expansion as manifestations of an economic self-organization principle. This is not dogma but a falsifiable program. The technical appendix supplies mathematics, simulation details, and pre-registrable experimental designs.

# 1 Contribution & Claims (Overview)

1. **RIC mechanism (adaptive monitoring):** A global instability functional  $C(t)$  controls measurement rates  $\gamma_k(t)$  with respect to a threshold  $C^*$ .
2. **CPTP guarantee (under record-only feedback):** Unconditional dynamics stay GKLS-linear, completely positive and trace-preserving.
3. **Born consistency:** Jump intensities scale with  $\text{Tr}[L_k^\dagger L_k \rho_c]$ ; no outcome leakage into rates.
4. **No-signaling:** Local RIC maps on  $A$  do not change  $A$ -marginals depending on measurement bases on  $B$ .
5. **Testability:** (i) SSE/trajectory experiments, (ii) EEG predictions (Theta, CPP/LRP), (iii) an effective cosmological component  $w \approx -1$  without clustering.
6. **Reproducibility:** Pseudocode (master equation, jumps, no-signaling check), analysis plan, and guardrails for linearity/feedback.

## 2 Notation

For quick orientation we summarize the main symbols.

Symbol	Type/unit	Meaning / comment
$\rho(t)$	density operator	state of the open system at time $t$
$H(t)$	Hamiltonian	(effective) Hamiltonian, possibly time-dependent
$L_k$	operator	Lindblad/jump/measurement operator (channel $k$ )
$\mathcal{D}[L_k] \rho$	superoperator	$L_k \rho L_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{L_k^\dagger L_k, \rho\}$
$\gamma_k(t)$	rate	adaptively controlled monitoring strength (record-only)
$C(t)$	scalar	instability functional; typically variance-sum $\sum_k \text{Var}_\rho(L_k)$ (operator-invariant, state-dependent)
$C^*$	scalar	threshold for adapting $\gamma_k(t)$
$H_{\text{fb}}(t)$	Hamiltonian	optional feedback Hamiltonian (Wiseman–Milburn)
	operator	identity
$\text{Tr}[\cdot]$	scalar	trace; expectations $\langle O \rangle = \text{Tr}[O\rho]$
$\text{Var}_\rho(O)$	scalar	variance of $O$ in state $\rho$
$\Lambda_{A,t}$	CPTP map	local GKLS dynamics on subsystem $A$ at time $t$
$\rho_{AB}, \rho_A$	density operators	joint state $AB$ , and marginal on $A$

## 3 Main Text

### 3.1 Introduction

The idea behind *RIC* is to let open quantum systems be characterized not by fixed external measurement rates, but by *state-dependent adaptive monitoring*. A global instability functional  $C(t)$  acts as an order parameter: when  $C$  is high, monitoring intensifies; when  $C$  is low, it weakens. Formally, the unconditional ensemble evolution retains the GKLS form, while  $C$  can be chosen, e.g., as in [Eq. \(3.2\)](#).

**Terminology.** We use established terms from measurement and control: *adaptive measurement scheduling*, *measurement-based feedback* (record-only), and the *unitary–dissipative tension*. The author’s earlier working labels (“information theory” in a broad, humanistic sense; “dialectical duality”) motivated the framework but are not used as technical terms here.

### 3.2 RIC: intuition in three layers

**(i) Information-guided control.** Information gain requires active probing. RIC reads measurement as a regulated information flow: strengths are resources to be allocated to where expected clarification is maximal (high  $C$ ).

**(ii) Unitary–dissipative tension.** Unitary evolution ( $H$ ) and dissipative/measurement dynamics ( $L_k$ ) pull in opposite directions; RIC maintains the tension and regulates it rather than resolving it away.

**(iii) Recursion.** Measurement changes the state and hence  $C$ , which in turn modifies the monitoring strengths — a closed loop that stays *linear* at the ensemble level (record-only).

### 3.3 Formal specification

We use the GKLS form [?, ?]:

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = -i[H(t), \rho(t)] + \sum_k \gamma_k(t) \mathcal{D}[L_k] \rho(t), \quad \mathcal{D}[L] \rho := L \rho L^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{L^\dagger L, \rho\}. \quad (3.1)$$

RIC adds a schedule  $t \mapsto \gamma_k(t)$  built from an instability functional, e.g.

$$C[\rho(t)] = \sum_k \text{Var}_{\rho(t)}(L_k) = \sum_k \left( \text{Tr}[L_k^\dagger L_k \rho(t)] - \text{Tr}[L_k \rho(t)] \text{Tr}[L_k^\dagger \rho(t)] \right). \quad (3.2)$$

A practical smooth switch is

$$\gamma_k(t) = \gamma_k^{\min} + (\gamma_k^{\max} - \gamma_k^{\min}) s\left(\frac{C(t) - C^*}{\Delta}\right), \quad s(x) := \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}}, \quad (3.3)$$

with threshold  $C^*$  and width  $\Delta > 0$ .

**Working assumptions.** (A1) *Record-only feedback*:  $\gamma_k(t)$  and any  $H_{\text{fb}}(t)$  are deterministic, time-dependent coefficients derived from *past* measurement records and averaged over realizations; no direct functional dependence  $\gamma_k[\rho(t)]$ . (A2) Causal filtering (no future information). (A3) Locality in multipartite settings (no forbidden cross-channels).

### 3.4 Properties (proof sketches in the appendix)

- **CPTP:** Under (A1) the unconditional dynamics are GKLS-linear; see Prop. 1.
- **Born consistency:** Jump intensities are proportional to  $\text{Tr}(L_k^\dagger L_k \rho_c)$ ; see Prop. 2.
- **No-signaling:** Local, time-dependent GKLS maps on  $A$  do not alter  $A$ -marginals depending on the basis chosen on  $B$ ; see Prop. 3.

### 3.5 Predictions and empirical paths

**(Q) Quantum trajectories.** Jump hazards near threshold should show an *S-curve* (cf. Eq. (3.3)). Testable in trapped ions/superconducting platforms via adaptive readout (photon counting, QND).

**(N) Neurophysiology.** If decision-making is read as recursive monitoring, RIC predicts a coupling between instability and measurement strength: transient Theta increase before a steep CPP/LRP rise (a “collapse window”).

**(C) Cosmology (heuristic).** On large scales RIC acts as a smooth damping of fluctuations, phenomenologically akin to a component with  $w \approx -1$  and no clustering; requires quantitative tests against precision data.

### 3.6 Relation to prior work (concise)

RIC differs from standard measurement-based feedback control (Wiseman–Milburn) by (i) using a *global* instability functional to schedule measurement strengths and (ii) keeping unconditional dynamics GKLS-linear via record-only averaging. It stays within the Belavkin/continuous-measurement picture but highlights an order parameter  $C$  that drives adaptive monitoring at the ensemble level.

### 3.7 Limitations and open questions

Choice of  $C$  and  $L_k$  may be *identifiability-critical*; naive implementations risk unwanted nonlinearity (violating A1). Open questions: information optimality of  $s(\cdot)$ , thermodynamic cost of adaptivity, sharper (no-)go results beyond Markovianity.

### 3.8 Minimal example & falsifiability

A qubit with  $H = \frac{\Omega}{2}\sigma_x$ ,  $L = \sqrt{\kappa}\sigma_z$ ,  $C = \text{Var}_\rho(\sigma_z)$  and Eq. (3.3) already shows the qualitative RIC signature: quiet phases at low monitoring, punctuated by brief high-clarity bursts. Systematic departure from Born histograms near threshold, under record-only scheduling, would falsify RIC.

### 3.9 Summary

RIC provides a compact, testable mechanism: *instability steers measurement strengths without sacrificing GKLS linearity*. The appendix contains proof sketches and simulation blueprints enabling replication and falsification.

## Author contributions & AI disclosure

**Gestan Morgan\***: idea, problem statement, recursive/dual conceptual framing (cf. the author’s texts), prompt design, curation and final editing. **AI assistants** (Claude 4.1 Opus; Gemini 2.5 Pro; GPT-5 Thinking<sup>2</sup>): preliminary formal structure, proof sketches, simulation pseudocode; language tightening. Content curated, checked, and integrated by the author. **Responsibility**: remaining errors are the author’s.

## A Formal foundations and simulation sketches for RIC

### A.1 Setting and notation

We consider an open quantum system with density operator  $\rho(t)$  and GKLS dynamics (3.1). The form guarantees CPTP (Lindblad 1976; Gorini–Kossakowski–Sudarshan 1976). In RIC, monitoring rates  $\gamma_k(t)$  are adapted as functions of an instability  $C(t)$  with threshold  $C^*$ , cf. (3.2).

### A.2 CPTP under adaptive rates: conditions and sketch

**Assumption 1** (Record-only feedback). *Scheduling  $\gamma_k(t)$  and any feedback Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{fb}}(t)$  are deterministic functions of time or exogenous classical signals derived from past measurement records and averaged over realizations. In particular,  $\gamma_k(t)$ ,  $H_{\text{fb}}(t)$  do not depend functionally on the current ensemble density  $\rho(t)$ .*

**Proposition 1** (CPTP dynamics). *Under Assumption 1, the unconditional dynamics has the GKLS form (3.1) with time-dependent coefficients and is CPTP.*

*Sketch.* (i) Continuous measurement (Belavkin filter). (ii) Markov feedback à la Wiseman–Milburn:  $H_{\text{fb}}(t) = F I(t)$  or modulation of couplings;  $I(t)$  is the *classical* measurement current. (iii) Ensemble averaging over records:  $\rho = \mathbb{E}[\rho_c]$  obeys (3.1) with deterministic, time-dependent  $\gamma_k(t)$  and possibly  $H_{\text{fb}}(t)$ . (iv) GKLS  $\Rightarrow$  CPTP.  $\square$

### A.3 Born consistency of trajectories

**Proposition 2** (Born statistics under adaptive monitoring). *For jump unravelings with conditional state  $\rho_c(t)$  and time-dependent  $\gamma_k(t)$  that satisfy Assumption 1,*

$$\Pr\{\text{jump } k \text{ in } [t, t+dt) \mid \rho_c(t)\} = \gamma_k(t) \text{Tr}[L_k^\dagger L_k \rho_c(t)] dt, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

*and ensemble histograms are compatible with the Born rule.*

*Sketch.* Standard derivation of stochastic Schrödinger/master equations for counting observation. Adaptive  $\gamma_k(t)$  act as deterministic coefficients; no outcome leakage into rates  $\Rightarrow$  Born-compatible histograms.  $\square$

### A.4 No-signaling under local RIC dynamics

**Proposition 3** (No communication). *Let  $\rho_{AB}$  be an initial (possibly entangled) state. Apply a local, time-dependent GKLS map  $\Lambda_{A,t}$  (RIC-compliant) on  $A$ , and any local operation on  $B$  without back-channel to  $A$ . Then  $\rho_A(t) = \text{Tr}_B[(\Lambda_{A,t} \otimes \mathcal{I}_B)\rho_{AB}]$  is independent of the measurement basis on  $B$ . RIC allows no superluminal communication.*

*Sketch.* Linear CPTP maps commute with partial trace over the other subsystem. A local map on  $A$  and a local operation on  $B$  (with readout) do not alter the  $A$ -marginal.  $\square$

## A.5 Simulation sketches (pseudocode)

Listing 1: Unconditional GKLS with adaptive rates (record-only)  
**A. Unconditional master equation with adaptive rates**

```
import numpy as np

def D(L, rho):
    return L @ rho @ L.conj().T - 0.5*(L.conj().T@L@rho + rho@L.conj().T@L)

def rk4_step(rho, H, Ls, gammas, dt):
    def rhs(r):
        dr = -1j*(H@r - r@H)
        for L, g in zip(Ls, gammas):
            dr += g * D(L, r)
        return dr
    k1 = rhs(rho)
    k2 = rhs(rho + 0.5*dt*k1)
    k3 = rhs(rho + 0.5*dt*k2)
    k4 = rhs(rho + dt*k3)
    return rho + (dt/6.0)*(k1 + 2*k2 + 2*k3 + k4)
```

Listing 2: Stochastic trajectory (jump unraveling)  
**B. Jump trajectories with adaptive rate**

```
def jump_trajectory(rho0, H, Ls, gamma_of_t, T, dt, rng):
    rho = rho0.copy()
    traj = []
    for n in range(int(T/dt)):
        t = n*dt
        gammas = gamma_of_t(t) # deterministic (record-averaged) schedule
        Heff = H(t) - 0.5j*sum(g*L.conj().T@L for L, g in zip(Ls, gammas))
        rho_tilde = rk4_step(rho, Heff, [], [], dt)
        p_no = np.real(np.trace(rho_tilde))
        if rng.uniform() < 1 - p_no:
            rates = np.array([g*np.real(np.trace(L@rho@L.conj().T)) for L, g in zip(Ls,
                gammas)])
            k = rng.choice(len(Ls), p=rates/np.sum(rates))
            rho = Ls[k] @ rho @ Ls[k].conj().T
            rho = rho / np.trace(rho)
            traj.append(("jump", t, k))
        else:
            rho = rho_tilde / p_no
            traj.append(("nojump", t, None))
    return traj
```



Listing 3: A-marginals invariant under B-basis choice

### C. No-signaling test (entangled pair)

```
def nosig_experiment(rho_AB, HA, LsA, gammaA, UB_list, T, dt, Nreal=1000, rng=None):
    # UB_list: different local bases/POVMs on B (as unitaries)
    from numpy import kron, trace
    marginals_per_B = []
    for UB in UB_list:
        hist = []
        for r in range(Nreal):
            rho = rho_AB.copy()
            rho = evolve_unconditional(rho, HA, LsA, gammaA, dt, T)
            rho = (kron(np.eye(lenA), UB)) @ rho @ (kron(np.eye(lenA), UB.conj().T))
            rhoA = partial_trace_B(rho)
            hist.append(rhoA)
        marginals_per_B.append(avg(hist))
    return compare_ci(marginals_per_B)
```

### Selected references

Lindblad (1976); Gorini–Kossakowski–Sudarshan (1976); Wiseman (1994); Belavkin (1992); Carmichael (1993).