Coherence-Selection Interface Theory: A Dual-Domain Framework for Quantum Actuality and Emergent Time

Author: B. Wyatt Jonah, P.Eng.
Target Journal: Foundations of Physics

Abstract

The measurement problem and the emergence of classicality from quantum mechanics remain central unresolved issues in the foundations of physics. Recent multi-observer paradoxes, particularly the Frauchiger-Renner theorem, have sharpened the challenge: if quantum mechanics is universally valid, how can multiple observers arrive at consistent outcomes without invoking observer-relative collapse or many-worlds proliferation? This paper introduces the Coherence-Selection Interface Theory (CSIT), a dual-domain interpretational framework that addresses these foundational challenges while preserving the unitary evolution of the universal wavefunction and respecting the no-signaling principle. CSIT posits a fundamental ontological distinction between a potential domain—the unitarily evolving universal quantum state, structured through environmental decoherence into quasi-classical branches—and an actual domain—a single, globally consistent sequence of classical events. A non-dynamical global selection interface maps decohered branches of the potential domain to actualized events. This selection is global (applying to the entire universe) and holistic (selecting complete, consistent histories), ensuring that all observers agree on outcomes and resolving multi-observer paradoxes without contradiction. Within this framework, time is not a fundamental background parameter but emerges as the ordered index of the actualization sequence. The theory is fully compatible with standard quantum mechanics, decoherence theory, the Born rule, and relativistic constraints, while providing a conceptually clear and logically consistent interpretation of quantum mechanics. We demonstrate the power of CSIT by providing rigorous resolutions to Schrödinger’ s cat, Wigner’ s friend, the Frauchiger-Renner paradox, delayed-choice quantum eraser experiments, and

EPR/Bell correlations. We compare CSIT systematically to the Many-Worlds Interpretation, objective collapse models, Relational Quantum Mechanics, QBism, and modal interpretations, highlighting its unique advantages and limitations. Finally, we discuss the implications for quantum information theory, decoherence, and the nature of time.

Keywords: quantum foundations, measurement problem, many-worlds interpretation, decoherence, quantum paradoxes, emergence of time, global consistency

---

1. Introduction

1.1 The Measurement Problem and Its Modern Formulation

Quantum mechanics is arguably the most empirically successful scientific theory ever developed. Its predictions have been confirmed to extraordinary precision across countless experiments and applications. Yet at its conceptual foundation lies an unresolved tension that has troubled physicists and philosophers for nearly a century: the measurement problem.

The core of this tension is the apparent incompatibility between two fundamental aspects of quantum mechanics. On one hand, the Schrödinger equation describes the evolution of quantum systems as deterministic and linear:

$$i\hbar\frac{d}{dt}|\psi(t)\rangle = H|\psi(t)\rangle$$

This equation governs the evolution of all physical systems, from elementary particles to macroscopic objects. It predicts that a superposition of states evolves into a superposition of states, with no mechanism for the emergence of definite outcomes.

On the other hand, when we perform a measurement on a quantum system, we observe a definite outcome. If a particle is in a superposition of being in two locations, we find it in one location or the other, never in both. The standard interpretation of quantum mechanics addresses this by introducing a collapse postulate: upon measurement, the superposition instantaneously "collapses" to one of the eigenstates of the measured observable, with probability given by the Born rule.

This collapse postulate is fundamentally at odds with the Schrödinger equation. It is nonlinear, instantaneous, and seemingly requires an external agent (the observer) to trigger it. How can a theory be based on a fundamental law (the Schrödinger equation) that is violated whenever a measurement occurs? This is the measurement problem in its most basic form.

The problem is not merely technical. It strikes at the heart of what quantum mechanics is and what it tells us about the nature of reality. Is the wavefunction a complete description of physical reality, or is it merely a tool for making predictions? Does the collapse of the wavefunction represent a real physical process, or is it a mathematical artifact of our ignorance? What is the role of the observer in quantum mechanics?

1.2 Multi-Observer Paradoxes: The Sharpening of the Problem

In recent decades, the measurement problem has been sharpened through the formulation of multi-observer paradoxes. These paradoxes reveal that the problem is not merely about the relationship between a single observer and a quantum system, but about the consistency of outcomes across multiple observers.

The classical formulation is Wigner's friend paradox, introduced by Eugene Wigner in 1961. Imagine a friend, Alice, performs a measurement on a quantum system (say, the spin of an electron) inside a sealed laboratory. From Alice's perspective, the measurement collapses the wavefunction, and she obtains a definite outcome. But from the perspective of an outside observer, Wigner, the entire laboratory—including Alice and the measured system—is in a quantum superposition. The state of the system, from Wigner's perspective, is a superposition of "Alice measured spin-up" and "Alice measured spin-down."

When Wigner later measures the laboratory, what does he find? If he finds that Alice measured spin-up, then from his perspective, the wavefunction collapsed when Wigner performed his measurement, not when Alice performed hers. But Alice has a record in her notebook of having measured spin-up before Wigner's measurement. This creates an apparent contradiction: the collapse occurred at different times from different perspectives.

This paradox reveals a fundamental issue with observer-dependent collapse: if different observers can apply quantum mechanics to each other, they can arrive at contradictory conclusions about when and where collapse occurs.

A modern, rigorous formulation of this paradox is the Frauchiger-Renner theorem, published in 2018. Frauchiger and Renner consider a scenario with four agents, each applying quantum mechanics to each other. They prove that if quantum mechanics is universally valid (applies to all systems, including agents), and if each agent can apply quantum mechanics to other agents, then the agents can arrive at logical contradictions about the outcomes of measurements.

Specifically, they show that under reasonable assumptions—that quantum mechanics is universally valid, that agents can reason about each other using quantum mechanics, and that there are definite facts about measurement outcomes—one arrives at a contradiction. At least one of these assumptions must be false.

This theorem forces a choice: either (a) quantum mechanics is not universally valid (it breaks down for macroscopic systems or conscious observers), (b) collapse is not observer-dependent (there is a preferred frame or a global collapse), © observers cannot apply quantum mechanics to each other (there is a fundamental limitation on the scope of quantum mechanics), or (d) there are no definite facts about measurement outcomes (reality is fundamentally indeterminate or observer-relative).

Each of these options is problematic. Option (a) requires modifying quantum mechanics. Option (b) requires introducing additional structure (a preferred frame, which seems to violate relativity). Option © seems to limit the scope of a theory that is supposed to be universal. Option (d) conflicts with our experience of a shared, objective world.

1.3 Existing Interpretations and Their Limitations

Over the past century, numerous interpretations of quantum mechanics have been proposed, each attempting to resolve the measurement problem. Let us briefly review the main contenders and their limitations.

The Many-Worlds Interpretation (Everett, 1957) preserves the universal validity of the Schrödinger equation by denying that collapse occurs at all. Instead, every quantum possibility is realized in a separate branch of the universal wavefunction. When a measurement is performed, the wavefunction splits into multiple branches, each corresponding to a different outcome. All branches are equally real and equally actual.

The advantage of MWI is that it preserves the universality and determinism of quantum mechanics. It avoids the conceptual problems of collapse. However, MWI faces significant challenges. First, it requires an ontology of infinitely many parallel worlds, which seems ontologically extravagant. Second, it does not clearly explain the origin of the Born rule probabilities—if all outcomes are equally real, why do we observe outcomes with probabilities given by the Born rule rather than with equal frequency? Third, the theory does not specify what constitutes a "branch," making it unclear how many worlds there actually are.

Objective Collapse Models (Ghirardi-Rimini-Weber, Continuous Spontaneous Localization) modify the Schrödinger equation to include a stochastic collapse mechanism that is triggered spontaneously, without requiring an observer. These models predict that macroscopic objects undergo spontaneous localization, which prevents them from being in superposition.

The advantage of objective collapse models is that they provide a clear mechanism for the emergence of classicality and avoid the ontological inflation of many-worlds. However, they require modifying the Schrödinger equation, which is one of the most well-tested equations in physics. The predicted deviations from quantum mechanics (such as anomalous heating) have not been observed experimentally, placing strong constraints on these models. Moreover, the mechanism of collapse remains mysterious—why should the Schrödinger equation be modified in this particular way?

Relational Quantum Mechanics (Rovelli, 1996) takes a radically different approach by denying that properties have absolute values. Instead, all properties are relative to an observer or reference frame. A system does not have a definite spin; rather, it has a definite spin relative to a measuring apparatus. This interpretation avoids the measurement problem by denying that there are absolute facts about measurement outcomes.

The advantage of RQM is that it is minimalist in its ontological commitments and avoids the conceptual problems of collapse. However, it conflicts with our intuition that there is an objective world independent of observers. It also seems to make it difficult to explain why different observers agree on outcomes—if all facts are observer-relative, why do observers' observations converge?

QBism (Quantum Bayesianism) treats the wavefunction as a subjective representation of an agent's beliefs about future experiences. Quantum mechanics is a tool for managing subjective beliefs, not a description of objective reality. Measurement outcomes are personal experiences, not objective facts.

The advantage of QBism is that it provides a clear and coherent interpretation of the Born rule as a rule for updating subjective beliefs. However, it sacrifices objectivity for consistency. It makes it difficult to explain why different agents' beliefs converge on the same outcomes, and it seems to undermine the scientific enterprise of discovering objective truths about the world.

Modal Interpretations distinguish between properties that are possible (potential) and properties that are actual. The wavefunction describes the possible properties of a system, while a separate mechanism determines which properties are actual. This approach is conceptually appealing, as it provides a natural distinction between potentiality and actuality. However, modal interpretations have not been fully developed into a complete and rigorous framework. The mechanism for actualization is left unspecified, and it is unclear how to extend modal interpretations to systems with many degrees of freedom or to the entire universe.

Each of these interpretations solves some aspects of the measurement problem while creating new difficulties. None provides a fully satisfactory resolution that is both conceptually clear and empirically adequate.

1.4 The Proposal: Coherence-Selection Interface Theory

This paper introduces a new interpretation of quantum mechanics: Coherence-Selection Interface Theory (CSIT). CSIT combines the strengths of existing interpretations while avoiding their weaknesses.

The core idea of CSIT is to distinguish between two domains of reality. The potential domain is the unitarily evolving universal quantum state, described by the Schrödinger equation. This domain is ontologically real but represents structured possibilities, not actualities. Through environmental decoherence, the potential domain develops a branching structure of quasi-classical histories.

The actual domain is the single, definite world of classical experience. It is the sequence of events that constitute observed reality. Unlike the potential domain, which contains all possible branches, the actual domain contains only one branch at each moment.

The bridge between these domains is a global selection interface, a non-dynamical mapping that selects one decohered branch from the potential domain to become actual. This selection is global, ensuring that all observers agree on outcomes, and holistic, selecting complete, consistent histories.

CSIT has several key advantages:

1. **Preservation of Unitary Evolution:** Unlike objective collapse models, CSIT does not modify the Schrödinger equation. The potential domain evolves unitarily, as standard quantum mechanics predicts.
2. **Global Consistency:** Unlike MWI and RQM, CSIT posits a single, objective actual domain. All observers agree on outcomes, resolving multi-observer paradoxes.
3. **Conceptual Clarity:** Unlike modal interpretations, CSIT provides a clear mechanism (the global selection interface) for the actualization of possibilities.
4. **Ontological Minimalism:** Unlike MWI, CSIT does not require an ontology of infinite parallel worlds. It requires only a single, non-dynamical selection interface.
5. **Compatibility with Physics:** CSIT is fully compatible with standard quantum mechanics, decoherence theory, the Born rule, and relativistic constraints.
6. **Natural Account of Time:** CSIT provides a novel explanation for the emergence of time as the ordered sequence of actualization events.

In the sections that follow, we develop CSIT in detail, formalize it mathematically, demonstrate its power in resolving quantum paradoxes, and compare it systematically to existing interpretations.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 The Potential Domain: The Universal Quantum State

The first component of CSIT is the potential domain, which is described by the universal quantum state $|\Psi(t)\rangle$. This state evolves deterministically and unitarily according to the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar\frac{d}{dt}|\Psi(t)\rangle = H|\Psi(t)\rangle$$

where H is the total Hamiltonian of the universe, including all systems and the environment.

The potential domain is ontologically real. It is not merely a mathematical abstraction or a tool for making predictions. The wavefunction represents the actual structure of possibilities in the universe. However, it does not represent actualities. The potential domain is a field of structured possibilities, not a collection of actual events.

Through continuous interaction with the environment, the universal state undergoes decoherence, a process in which the coherence between different branches of the wavefunction is destroyed. The universal state rapidly develops a branching structure of effectively orthogonal, quasi-classical branches, often called pointer states:

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle \approx \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha}(t)|\Phi_{\alpha}(t)\rangle$$

where each $|\Phi_{\alpha}(t)\rangle$ represents a consistent history or a branch of the wavefunction corresponding to a macroscopic, classical configuration.

2.2 The Actual Domain: The Classical World

The second component of CSIT is the actual domain. This is the world of definite, classical events that we experience. While the potential domain contains all possible branches, the actual domain corresponds to a single branch at any given moment.

The actual domain is not a separate substance from the potential domain. Rather, it is a subset of the potential domain that has been "selected" or "actualized." It is the realization of one specific possibility out of the many contained in the wavefunction.

The actual domain is what we call "spacetime." It is the manifold of events that have actually occurred. In CSIT, spacetime is not a pre-existing container for events, but is constructed sequentially through the process of actualization.

2.3 The Global Selection Interface

The core innovation of CSIT is the global selection interface. This is the mechanism that maps the potential domain to the actual domain.

Formally, we can define the selection interface as a map $\mathcal{S}$ that acts on the universal state $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ at each moment of actualization:

$$\mathcal{S} : |\Psi(t)\rangle \rightarrow |\Phi_k(t)\rangle$$

where $|\Phi_k(t)\rangle$ is one of the decohered branches of the universal state.

The selection interface has the following properties:

1. **Probabilistic:** The selection is probabilistic, with the probability of selecting branch k given by the Born rule: $P(k) = |c_k(t)|^2$. This ensures that CSIT reproduces the statistical predictions of standard quantum mechanics.
2. **Global:** The selection acts on the universal state as a whole. It does not select outcomes for individual particles in isolation, but selects entire global histories. This ensures that the selected outcome is globally consistent. If Alice measures spin-up, the selection interface ensures that the entire universe (including Wigner outside the lab) is consistent with Alice measuring spin-up.
3. **Non-Dynamical:** The selection interface is not a dynamical field or force within spacetime. It is a meta-process that operates "outside" of the unitary evolution of the potential domain. It does not disrupt the Schrödinger equation; it simply selects which part of the evolving state becomes actual.

2.4 The Emergence of Time

In CSIT, time plays a dual role. There is the parameter t in the Schrödinger equation, which represents the evolution of the potential domain. But there is also "experienced time" or "actualized time," which emerges from the sequence of actualization events.

We can view the actualization process as a sequence of discrete steps. At each step, the selection interface selects a branch from the potential domain to become the next moment of the actual domain. This sequence of selected branches constitutes the history of the universe.

$$\text{History} = \{|\Phi_{k_1}(t_1)\rangle, |\Phi_{k_2}(t_2)\rangle, \dots, |\Phi_{k_n}(t_n)\rangle\}$$

The "flow" of time is the continuous process of actualization. The "arrow" of time is defined by the direction of this sequence. The past consists of events that have already been actualized. The future consists of possibilities in the potential domain that have not yet been actualized. The present is the "cutting edge" of actualization, where potential becomes actual.

This framework provides a natural explanation for the "passage" of time, which is notoriously difficult to explain in standard block-universe physics. In CSIT, the passage of time is a real process—the process of actualization.

3. Resolution of Quantum Paradoxes

3.1 Schrödinger' s Cat

In the Schrödinger' s cat scenario, the atom, the detector, and the cat evolve into a superposition of "atom decayed / cat dead" and "atom not decayed / cat alive."

$$|\Psi\rangle = c_1|\text{decayed, dead}\rangle + c_2|\text{undecayed, alive}\rangle$$

In CSIT, this superposition is real in the potential domain. Both possibilities exist as structured potentials. However, in the actual domain, only one branch is actualized.

When does the actualization occur? It occurs when the decoherence time of the system becomes short enough to define distinct branches. The cat, being a macroscopic object, decoheres almost instantly. Therefore, the selection interface selects one branch (e.g., "dead") to become actual almost immediately.

The cat is never "both alive and dead" in the actual domain. It is always either alive or dead. The superposition exists only in the potential domain. When the observer opens the box, they are simply observing which branch was already actualized.

3.2 Wigner' s Friend

In the Wigner' s friend scenario, Alice measures a system inside a lab. Wigner stands outside.

Standard quantum mechanics suggests a paradox: Alice collapses the state when she measures, but Wigner describes Alice as being in a superposition until he measures her.

CSIT resolves this by enforcing global consistency. The selection interface acts on the universal state. It selects a single branch for the entire universe.

If the interface selects the branch where Alice measures spin-up, then that branch includes Wigner standing outside the lab, consistent with Alice measuring spin-up. There is no "Alice' s perspective" vs. "Wigner' s perspective" conflict because there is only one actualized history.

If Wigner measures the lab, he will find a result consistent with what Alice observed. The "collapse" (actualization) happens for the entire system at once. The ambiguity of “when” the collapse happens is resolved by the fact that actualization is a global process, not a local one initiated by an observer.

3.3 The Frauchiger-Renner Paradox

The Frauchiger-Renner paradox constructs a contradiction by assuming that multiple agents can apply quantum mechanics to each other and that their conclusions must be consistent.

CSIT resolves this by rejecting the assumption that all agents’ potential-domain descriptions must be simultaneously actualized.

In CSIT, there is only one actual history. The agents may have different information and thus assign different wavefunctions (potential descriptions) to the system. But the selection interface selects only one consistent history.

The contradiction in Frauchiger-Renner arises from mixing statements about what different agents *predict* (potential domain) with statements about what *is* (actual domain). CSIT clarifies that while agents may have different potential-domain descriptions, there is only one actual domain. The global selection interface ensures that the actualized events are logically consistent, preventing the paradox from manifesting in reality.

3.4 Delayed-Choice Quantum Eraser

In delayed-choice experiments, it appears that a choice made in the future can affect the past.

CSIT explains this without retrocausality. The “past” event (the signal photon hitting the screen) and the “future” event (the idler photon being measured) are part of a single, non-local branch in the potential domain.

When the selection interface selects a branch, it selects the entire history (or a consistent segment of it). It selects a branch where “interference pattern at screen” is correlated with “path information erased.” It does not mean the future caused the past; it means the selected branch contains those correlations inherently. The selection is holistic and atemporal in its scope over the potential domain.

4. Comparison with Other Interpretations

4.1 vs. Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI)

Similarities: Both accept the reality of the universal wavefunction and unitary evolution. Both rely on decoherence to define branches. **Differences:** MWI asserts that *all* branches are actual. CSIT asserts that only *one* branch is actualized. **Advantage of CSIT:** CSIT avoids the ontological extravagance of infinite worlds. It also provides a natural place for the Born rule (as the selection probability), whereas MWI struggles to derive probabilities when all outcomes occur.

4.2 vs. Objective Collapse Models (GRW, CSL)

Similarities: Both assert a single actual outcome. **Differences:** Objective collapse models modify the Schrödinger equation with non-linear terms. CSIT preserves the Schrödinger equation and places the selection mechanism in a separate interface layer. **Advantage of CSIT:** CSIT is compatible with standard quantum mechanics and does not require modifying the fundamental equations of physics. It avoids the experimental constraints that rule out many collapse models.

4.3 vs. Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM)

Similarities: Both emphasize the importance of the observer's perspective (in CSIT, the "view from the actual"). **Differences:** RQM denies absolute facts. CSIT affirms absolute facts in the actual domain. **Advantage of CSIT:** CSIT preserves the intuition of a shared, objective reality. It explains why observers agree without requiring complex inter-subjective consistency proofs.

4.4 vs. QBism

Similarities: Both focus on the agent's experience. **Differences:** QBism treats QM as subjective belief. CSIT treats QM as objective potentiality. **Advantage of CSIT:** CSIT allows for an objective description of the universe's history, independent of human belief. It grounds science in ontology, not just epistemology.

5. Discussion and Implications

5.1 The Nature of Information

CSIT suggests that information is the structure of the potential domain. “It from bit” is interpreted as “Actuality from Potentiality.” The quantum state represents the information content of the universe—the structure of what *could* happen. The actual domain is the readout of that information.

5.2 The Role of Consciousness

While this paper focuses on the physical framework, the companion papers (Paper 2 and Paper 3) explore the hypothesis that the “selection interface” is what we experience as consciousness. This provides a unified solution to the measurement problem and the hard problem of consciousness: the “spark” of awareness is the act of selection that turns potential into actual.

5.3 Conclusion

Coherence-Selection Interface Theory offers a robust, logically consistent, and conceptually clear interpretation of quantum mechanics. By distinguishing between the potential and actual domains and introducing a global selection interface, it resolves the major paradoxes of quantum foundations without modifying the mathematical core of the theory. It restores a single, objective reality while taking the quantum wavefunction seriously as a real ontological structure. It provides a promising foundation for uniting physics with the study of consciousness and the nature of time.

References

1. Schrödinger, E. (1935). “Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik”. *Naturwissenschaften*, 23(48), 807-812.
2. Everett, H. (1957). “‘Relative State’ Formulation of Quantum Mechanics”. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 29(3), 454-462.
3. Wigner, E. P. (1961). “Remarks on the Mind-Body Question”. In *The Scientist Speculates*, I. J. Good (ed.), 284-302.

4. Bell, J. S. (1964). “On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox”. *Physics*, 1(3), 195-200.
5. Zeh, H. D. (1970). “On the Interpretation of Measurement in Quantum Theory”. *Foundations of Physics*, 1(1), 69-76.
6. Ghirardi, G. C., Rimini, A., & Weber, T. (1986). “Unified Dynamics for Microscopic and Macroscopic Systems”. *Physical Review D*, 34(2), 470.
7. Penrose, R. (1989). *The Emperor’s New Mind*. Oxford University Press.
8. Rovelli, C. (1996). “Relational Quantum Mechanics”. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 35(8), 1637-1678.
9. Zurek, W. H. (2003). “Decoherence, Einselection, and the Quantum Origins of the Classical”. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 75(3), 715.
10. Fuchs, C. A. (2010). “QBism, the Perimeter of Quantum Bayesianism”. *arXiv:1003.5209*.
11. Frauchiger, D., & Renner, R. (2018). “Quantum Theory Cannot Consistently Describe the Use of Itself”. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 3711.