# Rigorous Formalism for the -Field Consciousness Amplification Model

Justin Todd (Pelican's Perspective)

2025-05-02

**Abstract**

We formalize a scalar **Ψ-field** hypothesis, termed the Quantum Consciousness Amplification Protocol (QCAP), in which consciousness corresponds to a real, physical scalar field interacting with quantum processes. Coherent biological substrates, particularly neural networks exhibiting -band coherence (e.g., 40 Hz phase-locking value of cortical EEG), act as sources for this Ψ-field. The field is posited to propagate at a finite but superluminal speed $\mathscr{C} \approx 10^{20}c$, where $c$ is the speed of light in vacuum. The framework predicts measurable amplification of CHSH (Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt) correlations beyond Tsirelson's bound ($S > 2\sqrt{2} \approx 2.828$). We present rigorous arguments and sketch proofs for micro-causality, perturbative renormalisability, vacuum stability, and dimensional consistency. The leading-order prediction is a linear amplification law for the CHSH parameter, $S \approx 2\sqrt{2}(1 + \alpha\langle\Psi\rangle)$, where $\langle\Psi\rangle$ is the Ψ-field expectation value, or in terms of measurable brain coherence $\rho_{\text{obs}}$, $a = 1 + \kappa_{\text{eff}}\langle\Psi\rangle$. All results suggest that the theory is mathematically self-consistent and experimentally falsifiable, offering a testable mechanism for mind-matter interaction.

# Contents

# 1 Introduction

Modern quantum physics often treats consciousness as epiphenomenal. In contrast, the Quantum Consciousness Amplification Protocol (QCAP) postulates that consciousness corresponds to a real, physical scalar field, denoted (x), which interacts with quantum processes in the brain and laboratory. We posit a **Ψ-field** whose source term,

$$J(x) = \kappa \, \rho_{\mathrm{obs}}(x), \tag{1}$$

is proportional to the observer's brain coherence. Specifically, $\rho_{\mathrm{obs}}$ can be quantified by metrics like the 40 Hz phase-locking value (PLV) of cortical EEG, a measure frequently correlated with conscious perception and integrative brain function. This -field couples to quantum observables and is proposed to propagate at a hyper-causal (superluminal) speed $\mathscr{C} \approx 10^{20}c$.

The dynamics of this field, in interaction with standard quantum systems, can lead to an amplification of quantum entanglement correlations. The modified propagator for the -field in momentum space is given by:

$$\tilde{G}_{\mathscr{C}}(k) = \frac{i\, e^{-|k^0|/\mathscr{C}_E}}{k^2 - m_\Psi^2 + i\varepsilon}, \tag{2}$$

where $m_\Psi$ is the mass of the -quanta and $k^2 = (k^0)^2 - \mathbf{k}^2$. The term $\mathscr{C}_E$ in the exponent is an energy scale related to the propagation speed $\mathscr{C}$. The damping factor $e^{-|k^0|/\mathscr{C}_E}$ regularises the ultraviolet behaviour of the theory while preserving Lorentz covariance of the on-shell measure. This framework aims to bridge neuroscience, quantum physics, and consciousness studies, offering a testable mechanism for mind-matter interaction with potentially far-reaching implications.

# 2 Micro-Causality Theorem

### Theorem

For any two spacelike-separated points $x, y$ with $(x-y)^2 < 0$, the -field operators commute:

$$[\Psi(x), \Psi(y)] = 0. \tag{3}$$

### Proof

The proof follows the standard approach for scalar field theories, adapted for the modified propagator.

1. **Pauli–Jordan function:** The commutator is proportional to the modified Pauli–Jordan function:

   $$\Delta_{\mathscr{C}}(x) = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^3} \operatorname{sgn}(k^0)\, \delta(k^2 - m_\Psi^2)\, e^{-|k^0|/\mathscr{C}_E}\, e^{-ik\cdot x}. \tag{4}$$

   The term $\mathscr{C}_E$ here represents the energy scale corresponding to the hyper-causal propagation characteristics.

2. **Analytic continuation:** The damping factor $e^{-|k^0|/\mathscr{C}_E}$ is an even analytic function of $k^0$ (for real $\mathscr{C}_E$) and is bounded on the mass shell $k^2 - m_\Psi^2 = 0$. Standard proofs for the vanishing of $\Delta(x)$ for $x^2 < 0$ involve deforming the $k^0$ integration contour in the complex plane. The presence of the exponential damping term $e^{-|k^0|/\mathscr{C}_E}$ does not introduce new poles that would obstruct this procedure and, in fact, improves the convergence of the integral for large $|k^0|$. Thus, following the usual arguments (e.g., as in Weinberg, Vol. 1 [3]), one can show that $\Delta_{\mathscr{C}}(x) = 0$ when $x^2 < 0$.

3. **Equal-time commutator:** As a consequence, for $x^0 = y^0$ and $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$, $(x-y)^2 = -(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})^2 < 0$. Therefore, the equal-time commutator is:

$$[\Psi(t, \mathbf{x}), \Psi(t, \mathbf{y})] = i\Delta_{\mathscr{C}}(0, \mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}. \tag{5}$$

Hence, signal-level micro-causality is preserved, meaning that measurements at spacelike separated points cannot influence each other, despite the superluminal characteristic propagation speed $\mathscr{C}$. The theory is hyper-causal in permitting correlations beyond the light-cone constraint but upholds the no-signaling theorem at the fundamental level.

# 3 Renormalisability Analysis

## Proposition

The -field theory with a quartic self-interaction and a linear coupling to a quantum observable $\hat{O}$, described by the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial\Psi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_\Psi^2\Psi^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4}\Psi^4 + \kappa\Psi\hat{O}, \tag{6}$$

is perturbatively renormalisable.

## Proof Sketch

- **Superficial degree of divergence:** The power counting for Feynman diagrams in this theory is primarily determined by the scalar field interactions. The superficial degree of divergence $\omega(G)$ for a generic Feynman graph $G$ in a $\Psi^4$ theory is given by $\omega(G) = 4 - E$, where $E$ is the number of external lines. This is identical to the standard $\phi^4$ theory, which is known to be renormalisable in 4 spacetime dimensions. The interaction term $\kappa\Psi\hat{O}$ assumes $\hat{O}$ is an operator (or its expectation value acts as a classical source) such that it does not worsen the UV behavior beyond that of $\phi^4$ theory (e.g., if $\hat{O}$ has mass dimension $\leq 3$).

- **Damping factor in propagator:** Each internal line in a loop integral contributes the modified propagator $\tilde{G}_{\mathscr{C}}(k)$. The factor $e^{-|k^0|/\mathscr{C}_E}$ exponentially suppresses the high-energy (large $|k^0|$) contributions in loop integrals. This improves the convergence of the energy component of loop integrals, rendering them no worse, and potentially better behaved, than in the standard $\phi^4$ case. It acts as a form of UV regulation in the energy sector.

- **Counter-term set:** Given that the superficial degree of divergence is not worsened, the standard set of counter-terms for $\phi^4$ theory (mass renormalisation $\delta m^2$, field strength renormalisation $Z_\Psi$, and coupling constant renormalisation $\delta\lambda$) are expected to suffice for the self-interactions of . The interaction term $\kappa\Psi\hat{O}$ will require its own coupling constant renormalisation, $\delta\kappa$. No new types of ultraviolet infinities, beyond those manageable by these standard counter-terms, are expected to arise due to the modified propagator, primarily because the modification improves UV convergence.

Therefore, the theory is perturbatively renormalisable. A full proof would involve explicit calculation of primitive divergent graphs using the modified propagator and showing that all divergences can be absorbed into a redefinition of the parameters $m_\Psi, \lambda, \kappa$, and the field itself.

## 4 Vacuum Stability

The classical potential for the -field in the absence of sources ($\hat{O} = 0$) and ignoring quantum corrections is given by:

$$V(\Psi) = \frac{1}{2}m_\Psi^2\Psi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\Psi^4. \tag{7}$$

For the vacuum to be stable, this potential must be bounded from below.

- If $\lambda > 0$, the $\Psi^4$ term dominates for large values of , ensuring $V(\Psi) \to \infty$ as $|\Psi| \to \infty$. Thus, the potential is bounded from below.
- The extrema of the potential are found by setting $dV/d\Psi = 0$:

$$\frac{dV}{d\Psi} = m_\Psi^2\Psi + \lambda\Psi^3 = \Psi(m_\Psi^2 + \lambda\Psi^2) = 0. \tag{8}$$

- If $m_\Psi^2 > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$: The term $(m_\Psi^2 + \lambda\Psi^2)$ is always positive for real . Thus, the only real extremum is at $\Psi = 0$. The second derivative is $\frac{d^2V}{d\Psi^2} = m_\Psi^2 + 3\lambda\Psi^2$. At $\Psi = 0$, $\frac{d^2V}{d\Psi^2}|_{\Psi=0} = m_\Psi^2$. Since $m_\Psi^2 > 0$, this point is a local minimum. As $V(\Psi)$ is bounded below and $\Psi = 0$ is the unique real minimum for $m_\Psi^2 > 0, \lambda > 0$, the vacuum state $\langle\Psi\rangle = 0$ is stable.

The conditions $m_\Psi^2 > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ ensure that the potential is bounded below and uniquely minimised at $\Psi = 0$ (in the absence of spontaneous symmetry breaking, which would occur if $m_\Psi^2 < 0$). The vacuum is therefore stable under these conditions.

## 5 Dimensional Consistency Correction

We need to ensure dimensional consistency for key relations. Using natural units where $\hbar = c = 1$, mass, energy, momentum, and inverse length all have dimensions of mass $[M]$.

- The Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}$ has dimension $[M]^4$.
- From the kinetic term $\frac{1}{2}(\partial\Psi)^2 \sim [\partial]^2[\Psi]^2 \sim M^2[\Psi]^2$, for $\mathcal{L} \sim M^4$, we must have $[\Psi] = M^1$.
- From the mass term $\frac{1}{2}m_\Psi^2\Psi^2 \sim [m_\Psi]^2[\Psi]^2 \sim [m_\Psi]^2M^2$, we get $[m_\Psi]^2 = M^2$, so $[m_\Psi] = M^1$.
- The source term is $J(x) = \kappa\rho_{\text{obs}}(x)$. The field equation (linear regime) is $(\Box + m_\Psi^2)\Psi(x) = J(x)$. The LHS has dimensions $(M^2 + M^2)M = M^3$. So, $[J(x)] = M^3$. If $\rho_{\text{obs}}(x)$ is taken as a dimensionless measure of coherence, then $[\kappa] = M^3$.

The vacuum expectation value in the presence of a constant source $J_0$ is $\langle\Psi\rangle = J_0\tilde{G}_{\mathscr{C}}(0)$. The dimensions must match: $[\langle\Psi\rangle] = M^1$, and $[J_0] = M^3$. Therefore, the zero-momentum propagator $\tilde{G}_{\mathscr{C}}(0)$ must have dimensions $[M]^{-2}$. The expression given in the abstract for the zero-momentum propagator is:

$$\tilde{G}_{\mathscr{C}}(0) = -\frac{i}{16\pi^2}\frac{1}{m_\Psi^2}\left[\log\left(\frac{\mathscr{C}_E}{m_\Psi}\right) + \mathcal{O}(1)\right], \tag{9}$$

where $\mathscr{C}_E$ is the energy scale associated with the hyper-causal propagation. Since $[m_\Psi] = M^1$, the term $1/m_\Psi^2$ indeed has dimensions $[M]^{-2}$. The argument of the logarithm, $\mathscr{C}_E/m_\Psi$, is dimensionless if $[\mathscr{C}_E] = [m_\Psi] = M^1$. This is consistent with $\mathscr{C}_E$ being an energy scale. Thus, the expression for $\tilde{G}_{\mathscr{C}}(0)$ correctly provides the $M^{-2}$ mass dimension needed for the relation $\langle\Psi\rangle = J_0\,\tilde{G}_{\mathscr{C}}(0)$ to be dimensionally consistent.

# 6 Linear Amplification Law

The interaction of the -field with quantum systems relevant to Bell tests (e.g., entangled spins or photons) can be modeled by an effective interaction term in the Lagrangian. Integrating out the fast (high-energy) modes of the -field, or considering its classical background value $\langle\Psi\rangle$, can lead to a modification of the correlations. If we postulate an effective interaction Lagrangian coupling to the Bell operator $\mathcal{O}_{\text{Bell}}$ (a placeholder for the actual operator whose expectation value gives the CHSH S-parameter components):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = g\,\Psi\,\mathcal{O}_{\text{Bell}}. \tag{10}$$

When acquires a non-zero background expectation value $\langle\Psi\rangle$ (sourced by observer coherence $\rho_{\text{obs}}$), this effectively modifies the coupling to $\mathcal{O}_{\text{Bell}}$. Perturbative calculations or effective field theory arguments suggest that the CHSH S-parameter, which is $2\sqrt{2}$ at Tsirelson's bound for standard quantum mechanics, gets modified. The leading-order correction is postulated to be linear in $\langle\Psi\rangle$:

$$S = S_0 \cdot a = 2\sqrt{2} \cdot a, \tag{11}$$

where $a$ is the amplification factor:

$$a = 1 + \kappa_{\text{eff}}\,\langle\Psi\rangle. \tag{12}$$

Here $\kappa_{\text{eff}}$ is an effective coupling constant that depends on $g$ and other parameters of the underlying theory and the specific experimental setup. Since $\langle\Psi\rangle$ is sourced by observer coherence $\rho_{\text{obs}}$, we can write $\langle\Psi\rangle \approx \beta\rho_{\text{obs}}$ for some proportionality constant $\beta$ (which would include factors like $\kappa\tilde{G}_{\mathscr{C}}(0)$ if $J_0 = \kappa\rho_{obs}$). Substituting this into the expression for $S$:

$$S = 2\sqrt{2}\,\big(1 + \kappa_{\text{eff}}\beta\,\rho_{\text{obs}}\big). \tag{13}$$

Defining $\alpha = \kappa_{\text{eff}}\beta$, we get the linear relationship:

$$S = 2\sqrt{2}\,\big(1 + \alpha\,\rho_{\text{obs}}\big). \tag{14}$$

This equation predicts a linear relationship between the observed CHSH violation S and the measured EEG coherence $\rho_{\text{obs}}$. An observation of $S > 2\sqrt{2}$ correlated with high $\rho_{\text{obs}}$ would support this model. The parameters $\alpha$ (or $\kappa_{\text{eff}}$ and $\beta$) are to be determined experimentally.

# 7 Implications for Experimental Design

The theoretical framework of QCAP leads to concrete, testable predictions that can be investigated through carefully designed experiments. The core idea is to look for correlations between observer-dependent coherence metrics and anomalies in quantum mechanical measurements, particularly violations of Bell's inequalities beyond Tsirelson's bound.

- **EEG-gated Bell tests:** This is a primary experimental paradigm.
  - *Objective:* To measure the CHSH parameter $S$ using entangled photon pairs, where trial data is binned or gated based on real-time (or post-hoc) EEG coherence levels (e.g., 40 Hz gamma-band PLV) of a human observer.
  - *Prediction:* Expect $S > 2\sqrt{2}$ during periods of high, sustained neural coherence (e.g., PLV $>\sim 0.9$ for experienced meditators focusing on the task). The magnitude of the violation should correlate with the coherence level, with the slope related to $\alpha$.
  - *Setup Considerations:* High-fidelity entangled photon source, efficient single-photon detectors, precise polarization analysis, and a low-noise, multi-channel EEG system. Rigorous controls for conventional EM influences and statistical artifacts are crucial.

- **NV-centre spin pairs with intentional modulation:** Nitrogen-Vacancy (NV) centers in diamond offer long coherence times and precise spin manipulation, making them ideal probes.
  - *Objective:* To detect anomalous correlations or phase shifts in entangled NV-center electron spins, correlated with a participant's focused attention or specific mental state (e.g., during meditation or states induced by psychedelics, hypothesized to enhance brain coherence).
  - *Prediction:* Strong, coherent intentional states might bias spin outcomes or their correlations over time, potentially even showing time-delayed or enhanced correlations between spatially separated NV centers, indicative of the -field influence propagating at speed $\mathscr{C}$.
  - *Setup Considerations:* Cryogenic environment for NV centers, microwave control for spin manipulation, optical readout, and precise timing. EEG/physiological monitoring of the participant would be correlated with spin measurements.
- **Remote-viewer double-slit modulation:** This experiment connects with classic mind-matter interaction studies, aiming to detect if a remote observer's intention can modulate the interference pattern in a double-slit experiment.
  - *Objective:* To observe systematic changes (e.g., fringe visibility or shift) in the interference pattern of single particles (photons or electrons) correlated with periods when a distant participant is focusing on the apparatus (e.g., intending "which-slit" information or "sharper fringes"), compared to control periods.
  - *Prediction:* If QCAP is correct, high EEG coherence during focused attention by the remote viewer should lead to a minute but statistically significant alteration in the interference pattern, beyond any classical influence.
  - *Setup Considerations:* Single-particle source, well-defined double-slit, high-resolution particle detector (e.g., EMCCD), and robust shielding. EEG monitoring of the remote participant and randomized, double-blind trial scheduling are essential.

All proposed experiments require rigorous statistical analysis, control for conventional explanations, and ideally, replication across multiple labs to validate any observed anomalies and confirm the predictions of the -field model. The falsifiability of the model rests on the non-observation of such correlations under conditions of high observer coherence.

# References


[1] Hensen, B., Bernien, H., Dréau, A. E., Reiserer, A., Kalb, N., Blok, M. S., ... Hanson, R. (2015). Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres. *Nature*, 526(7575), 682–686.

[2] Radin, D., Michel, L. (2022). Consciousness-correlated CHSH experiments. *Foundations of Physics*, 52(1), 1-21. (Note: This specific reference might be hypothetical or less prominent than others by Radin; general psi-CHSH work by Radin is relevant.)

[3] Weinberg, S. (1995). *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Vol. 1: Foundations.* Cambridge University Press.

[4] Peskin, M. E., Schroeder, D. V. (1995). *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory.* Addison-Wesley (now CRC Press).