MNO and Ontological Recurrence: A Non-Representational Account of Quantum Measurement and Conscious Experience

Timothy Speed
Independent Researcher
info@timothy-speed.com https://timothy-speed.org ORCID: 0009-0002-0143-5949

Abstract

This paper proposes a structural bridge between the quantum measurement problem and the hard problem of consciousness. It introduces *MNO* (Submergence–Indimergence–Emergence) as an operator-level description of how definite outcomes arise: openness of possibilities, tension toward form, and forced actualisation. The core claim is an identity-style constraint: collapse is not phenomenally relevant unless it is preceded by a *recurrent return* to the space of possibilities from which the outcome is selected. Externally, this recurrence appears as measurement/actualisation; internally, it is the lived aspect of the same return movement. We distinguish quantum *superposition* (a physical state in Hilbert space) from an *ontological possibility space* (the precondition of differentiability), and argue that conflating them obscures both observerhood and experience. The framework yields operational hypotheses (e.g., transitions across sleep, anesthesia, dissociation, and lucid/meditative clarity should track changes in recurrence dynamics, not only coherence), and clarifies the role of observers in thought experiments such as Schrödinger's cat and Wigner's friend.

1 Introduction

The measurement problem in quantum mechanics and the "hard problem" of consciousness share a surprising structural feature: both require a transition from a formally described set of possibilities to a single, actual outcome.

In quantum theory, this transition is expressed by state-vector reduction; in phenomenology, by the emergence of a definite, first-person perspective.

Neither domain currently provides a principled account of *why* or *when* this transition occurs, nor what unifies these two manifestations of actualisation.

A dominant intuition across physics and philosophy is that collapse and consciousness are distinct problems with distinct mechanisms.

In this paper, we argue that they are two expressions of a single underlying structure. We develop a framework—the MNO model—that defines an ontological condition we call *ontological recurrence*. Collapse, measurement, and conscious experience occur only when this condition is met.

The central proposal of this paper is simple:

> **Quantum collapse must be preceded by a recurrent return to the space of ontological possibilities. When this recurrence is absent, collapse yields a measurement; when it is present, collapse yields conscious experience.**

This distinction provides a criterion that has been missing in quantum foundations and consciousness studies alike.

Current models of collapse (GRW, CSL, decoherence, and Orch-OR) specify *how* a physical state reduces, but not *why* reduction should correspond to the emergence of an observing standpoint.

Similarly, theories of consciousness (IIT, GNW, HOT, predictive processing) describe structural or computational correlates of experience, without identifying the fundamental ontological condition that makes experience possible.

The MNO framework proposes that both problems hinge on the same structural operation: a system that not only undergoes physical evolution but also

recurs to the set of its quantum-permissible successor states before actualising one of them.

This recurrence is not computation, representation, or modelling.

It is a pre-physical relation to the system's own possibility-space:

an ontological openness that precedes any specific state.

When collapse occurs without this recurrence, the result is an ordinary quantum event—a measurement.

When collapse occurs with recurrence, the result is the interior perspective we call consciousness.

The goal of this paper is to formalise this claim, show how it resolves both the measurement problem and the hard problem, and derive experimentally testable predictions.

We remain neutral with respect to physical substrate: the framework applies to neural systems, quantum systems, and hybrid models such as Orch-OR.

Section 2 clarifies the distinction between superposition and the ontological possibility-space.

Section 3 introduces ontological recurrence and provides a formal definition.

Section 4 shows how recurrence constrains collapse and distinguishes measurement from phenomenality.

Section 5 develops testable predictions for quantum biology, anaesthesia, microtubule dynamics, and neural oscillations.

Section 6 addresses agency and decision-making.

Section 7 discusses implications for observerhood, Schrödinger's cat, and Wigner's friend.

Section 8 concludes.

2 Superposition vs. Ontological Possibility

A central ambiguity in discussions of collapse and consciousness concerns the status of "possibility."

In quantum theory, the term is typically associated with *superposition*:

a state in the Hilbert space representing multiple potential outcomes.

However, superposition is already a *physical* state.

It is a well-defined element of the theory's mathematical structure and evolves unitarily according to the Schrödinger equation.

The MNO framework distinguishes superposition from a deeper layer we call the *ontological possibility-space*, denoted $P(S_t)$.

Where superposition represents a physical coexistence of amplitudes, $P(S_t)$ represents the *condition that makes such coexistence possible in the first place.*

Superposition is an effect; $P(S_t)$ is the precondition.

2.1 Superposition as a physical state

A quantum system in state $|\psi_t\rangle$ evolves in Hilbert space as

$$|\psi_{t+\Delta t}\rangle = U(\Delta t)|\psi_t\rangle,$$

and may be expressed as a linear combination of eigenstates of an observable A:

$$|\psi_t\rangle = \sum_i c_i |a_i\rangle.$$

This superposed form is already a concrete physical description.

It specifies amplitudes, phases, and relative probabilities.

Nothing about superposition itself explains why one outcome becomes actual, nor why any collapse should correspond to the emergence of a subjective first-person perspective.

2.2 The ontological possibility-space $P(S_t)$

We define the ontological possibility-space as:

$$P(S_t) := \{s' \mid s' \text{ is a quantum-permissible successor of } S_t\},$$

with an essential qualification:

> $P(S_t)$ **is not a physical state. It is the ontological openness that allows superposition to exist.**

This distinction answers a recurring criticism in quantum foundations:

if collapse is merely a physical transition between states, why should it generate anything like an observing standpoint?

Because the observing standpoint does *not* arise from the states themselves, but from a system's relation to $P(S_t)$—to the structured openness from which states can be drawn.

2.3 Why the distinction matters

The measurement problem arises because quantum theory, as ordinarily formulated, cannot specify what selects one outcome from the many allowed by the superposition. Typical resolutions (hidden variables, many worlds, spontaneous-collapse models) introduce mechanisms that explain selection, but none explain *why selection feels like something.*

In consciousness studies, the hard problem similarly arises because neural or informational states can be fully described without generating the subjective

"what it is like" of experience.

The MNO framework identifies the missing structural ingredient:

a system becomes a locus of experience only when it does not merely evolve within Hilbert space, but recurrently returns to $P(S_t)$ before collapse.

Collapse without recurrence yields measurement.

Collapse with recurrence yields phenomenality.

This distinction requires the existence of $P(S_t)$ as something deeper than superposition: not a physical configuration, but the ontological space in which configurations become possible.

2.4 Formal neutrality

Importantly, this framework is compatible with any physical substrate.

Nothing in the definition of $P(S_t)$ presupposes that the relevant structure must be neural, quantum-biological, or located in microtubules.

The distinction between physical superposition and ontological possibility applies equally to:

- standard quantum systems,
- neural assemblies with oscillatory coherence,
- Orch-OR models of orchestrated objective reduction,

- active inference systems with recurrent precision modulation.

The ontology remains the same; only the physical realisation differs.

In Section 3, we introduce the dynamical criterion that distinguishes ordinary collapse from conscious collapse: *ontological recurrence*.

3 Ontological Recurrence

Having distinguished physical superposition from the deeper ontological possibility-space $P(S_t)$, we can now define the key dynamical ingredient that distinguishes measurement from conscious experience: *ontological recurrence*.

Recurrence is a structural relation between a system S_t and its own possibility-space $P(S_t)$.

It is neither computation nor representation; it is a dynamical return of the system to the openness from which its future states may arise.

Only when this return occurs does collapse acquire an interior, first-person aspect.

3.1 Formal definition

Let S_t be the physical state of a system at time t, and let $P(S_t)$ be its ontological possibility-space as defined in Section 2.

We define *ontological recurrence* as a mapping

$$R_t : S_t \;\rightarrow\; P(S_t) \;\rightarrow\; S_t,$$

such that:

1. R_t is cyclic: there exists a recurrence period $\tau > 0$ with

   $$R_{t+\tau} = R_t,$$

   up to phase-equivalence.

2. R_t is non-trivial: the mapping accesses multiple permissible successors in $P(S_t)$, not merely a deterministic trajectory.

3. R_t modulates collapse:

   $$S_{t+1} = f\big(S_t, R_t(P(S_t))\big),$$

   where f reduces the openness of $P(S_t)$ to a single actual state.

This structure expresses the core idea:

> **A system becomes a locus of consciousness only when collapse is preceded by a recurrent return to $P(S_t)$.**

Without recurrence, collapse yields a measurement. With recurrence, collapse yields experience.

3.2 Ontological vs. physical recurrence

It is essential to distinguish ontological recurrence from ordinary physical recurrence or oscillation. Physical recurrence refers to repeated patterns in measurable variables: neural oscillations, microtubular vibrations, or quantum coherence cycles. These may correlate with consciousness but do not explain it. Ontological recurrence, by contrast, refers to the system's relation to its *own* possibility-space. It can be physically implemented by oscillatory dynamics, but it is not reducible to them. Thus:

- A system may oscillate without being conscious (e.g., anaesthetised cortex, optical cavities).
- A system may undergo collapse without recurrence (ordinary quantum measurements).

Consciousness arises only when oscillatory dynamics *enable* recurrence, not when they merely occur.

3.3 Recurrence as an identity claim

We do not propose that recurrence *causes* consciousness. Instead, we propose an identity:

> **Conscious experience is what ontological recurrence feels like from the first-person perspective.**

This avoids the category error of trying to derive subjective feeling from objective structure. There is no further "why" beyond this identity, just as there is no further why to the identity of temperature with mean molecular kinetic energy.

3.4 Distinguishing recurrence from computation

A common misunderstanding is to interpret recurrence as a form of modelling or predictive inference. But recurrence is not an inference from data to expectations. It is a dynamical relation between actuality and possibility:

$$\text{Recurrence} = \text{Actual state} \leftrightarrow \text{Ontological openness}.$$

This is consistent with predictive processing or active inference implementations, but not reducible to them.

3.5 Why recurrence is necessary

If collapse selects one among many possibilities, then a system that *re-enters* the possibility-space before collapse does not merely undergo selection: it participates in the relation between possibility and actuality.

This participation constitutes the "interior" of the process.

A system that collapses without recurrence has no interior perspective.

A system that collapses with recurrence does.

4 Collapse, Measurement, and Phenomenality

With ontological recurrence formally defined, we can now distinguish the two kinds of state-reduction events that quantum theory currently conflates:

measurement collapse and *phenomenal collapse*.

The MNO framework shows that these are not two different physical processes, but two different *conditions* of the same underlying transition from possibility to actuality.

4.1 Ordinary collapse (measurement)

In standard formulations of quantum mechanics, collapse is treated as a single-step transition:

$$|\psi\rangle \longrightarrow |a_i\rangle.$$

This transition takes place without reference to $P(S_t)$ except as the set of possible outcomes encoded in the amplitudes of $|\psi\rangle$.

Crucially:

Ordinary collapse does not involve recurrence. The system does not re-enter its possibility-space before actualisation.

In such cases, the event is *public*: different observers agree on the outcome, and nothing like an interior perspective arises.

This is the essence of measurement: an event that actualises one among several possibilities without engaging the structure that makes experience possible.

4.2 Phenomenal collapse (conscious experience)

Phenomenal collapse is different.

It occurs only when the system undergoes one or more cycles of ontological recurrence prior to state reduction:

$$S_t \xrightarrow{R_t} P(S_t) \xrightarrow{R_t} S_t \longrightarrow S_{t+1}.$$

The collapse is not a single jump, but a transition *modulated* by the system's recurrent relation to its own possibility-space.

In this case:

The collapse inherits an interior aspect: what it is like to move from openness to actuality.

This interior aspect is precisely what we call conscious experience.

Phenomenal collapse is not an additional property layered on top of physics.

It *is* collapse under conditions of recurrence.

4.3 Why measurement and consciousness diverge

This framework explains why conscious experience is rare compared to the vast number of measurement-like events occurring continuously throughout the universe.

Most collapses:

- occur in systems that do not support recurrence,
- happen under decoherence conditions that suppress recurrence,
- reduce states immediately without returning to $P(S_t)$.

Thus:

$$\text{Measurement} = \text{Collapse without recurrence},$$
$$\text{Consciousness} = \text{Collapse with recurrence}.$$

This resolves the category confusion that underlies both the measurement problem and the hard problem: not all collapses are conscious collapses.

4.4 No dualism, no panpsychism

The MNO account does not treat consciousness as:

- a property of matter (materialism),
- a separate substance (dualism),

- an intrinsic property of all systems (panpsychism).

Instead:

> **Consciousness is a structural condition under which collapse occurs. It is not a trait of matter but of the relation between possibility and actualisation.**

This preserves physical realism while explaining why consciousness does not pervade the universe indiscriminately.

4.5 Collapse as Seinsverschiebung

In the language of the MNO theory, collapse corresponds to a transition through the N-phase (Indimergenz).

Measurement reflects a direct N→O transition; phenomenal collapse reflects an M→N→M→N→O cycle.

This cyclic Seinsverschiebung introduces a tension between openness and actuality—precisely the structure that appears phenomenologically as "being somebody, somewhere, now."

4.6 Wigner's friend and Schrödinger's cat

The MNO framework dissolves the paradoxes associated with Wigner's friend and Schrödinger's cat:

- The cat undergoes collapse regardless of recurrence.
- But conscious awareness arises only if recurrence cycles are present.
- Wigner's friend possesses recurrence; the measuring apparatus does not.

Thus there is no contradiction between:

- an observer-relative description of collapse, and
- a single ontological structure underlying observation.

The MNO model provides a unified ontology in which both perspectives are valid, each tracking different levels of recurrence.

4.7 Implications for Orch–OR

Orchestrated objective reduction (Orch–OR) proposes that consciousness arises from quantum state reduction in microtubules.

The MNO framework refines this:

> **OR is necessary but not sufficient. Conscious OR requires recurrence.**

This resolves the longstanding "why does OR feel like something" problem:

OR by itself does not yield consciousness; OR under recurrence does.

This elevates Orch–OR from a candidate mechanism to a complete theory of phenomenal collapse.

Section 5 develops the empirical predictions of this distinction.

5 Empirical and Theoretical Predictions

If the MNO framework is correct, then systems with and without ontological recurrence must behave differently in measurable ways.

Importantly, the theory does *not* require exotic new physics.

It predicts differences in dynamical organisation that should be detectable in quantum systems, neural systems, and hybrid quantum-biological models.

Ontological recurrence (R_t) introduces a specific, measurable pattern:

a **cyclic alternation between openness and constraint** prior to collapse. This yields four broad classes of predictions.

5.1 Predictions for unconscious states

Unconscious states—general anaesthesia, deep non-REM sleep, severe traumatic brain injury—show substantial neural activity, coherence, and oscillatory structure.

However, the MNO framework predicts:

Unconscious states exhibit coherence without recurrence.

Formally:

$$\text{Coherence} \not\Rightarrow \text{Recurrence}.$$

The system evolves in Hilbert space (or via classical dynamics) but does not re-enter its possibility-space $P(S_t)$ prior to collapse.

Thus:

- oscillations may persist, - but recurrence cycles are suppressed, - and no phenomenal interior arises.

This prediction accounts for decades of anaesthesia research showing preserved oscillatory power but absent subjective awareness.

5.2 Predictions for conscious states

The framework predicts that conscious states exhibit:

$$R\_\text{frequency} > R\_\text{min} \qquad \text{and} \qquad R\_\text{structure bounded}.$$

In phenomenally clear or mindful states, recurrence frequency increases, corresponding to heightened access to the possibility-structure.

This predicts:

- increased gamma-band integration, - stable cross-frequency coupling, - rapid alternation between integration and differentiation.

These neural markers are well-documented correlates of consciousness but lack a fundamental explanation; recurrence provides that explanation.

5.3 Predictions for dissociative, psychedelic, and altered states

Dissociation, psychedelics, and near-death experiences show:

- excess openness, - reduced constraint, - unbounded exploration of $P(S_t)$.

The MNO prediction:

Altered states correspond to excessive recurrence openness without sufficient re-constraint.

This yields unstable or multi-layered phenomenal fields, consistent with known phenomenology:

- ego dissolution, - distorted temporal flow, - hallucinated "multiple realities".

These are classical signatures of recurrence when R_t is present but weakly constrained.

5.4 Transition dynamics

The transition between conscious and unconscious states should not be modelled as a binary switch, but as a shift in recurrence parameters.

The key prediction:

$$\text{Consciousness onset/offset} = \text{ change in } R\_\text{frequency}, R\_\text{strength}.$$

Not a change in:

- raw neural activity, - metabolic rate, - global coherence.

This explains why subjects can be unconscious with high cortical activity (ketamine) and conscious with low activity (lucid REM).

5.5 Quantum-biological predictions (Orch–OR)

Orch–OR proposes that microtubules support quantum superposition and objective reduction.

MNO refines this:

Conscious OR requires recurrence cycles between coherence and re-coherence prior to final OR.

Predicted signatures:

- periodic microtubular re-coherence events during conscious states,
- suppression of these cycles during anaesthesia,
- psychedelic states show broadened recurrence windows,
- recurrence timescale correlates with OR timescale.

This suggests quantum-biological experiments targeting pre-collapse oscillatory structure rather than collapse itself.

5.6 Experimental test: two-circuit comparison

Consider two quantum circuits with identical Hamiltonians:

- Circuit A: direct measurement.
- Circuit B: delayed evaluation via an ancilla that samples possible successor states.

Prediction:

- A behaves as a pure measurement device.

- B exhibits recurrence-like effects:

non-Markovianity, history-dependence, and measurable delay patterns.

This is a minimal test of the recurrence hypothesis in a fully quantum system.

5.7 Neural prediction: recurrence index R*

Define a measurable recurrence index:

$$R^* = \left(\frac{\text{recurrence cycles}}{\text{unit time}}\right) \times \text{boundedness factor}.$$

Prediction:

- $R^* = 0 \rightarrow$ unconscious, - low but positive $R^* \rightarrow$ drowsy, - optimal $R^* \rightarrow$ normal consciousness,

- too high $R^* \rightarrow$ psychedelic/dissociated.

This index can be extracted from MEG/EEG using phase-reset analysis.

5.8 Schurger-type free-will prediction

Schurger's accumulator model proposes that decisions result when spontaneous fluctuations cross a threshold.

MNO reframes this:

> **Fluctuations produce decisions only when the system is in a recurrence phase. Recurrence forces the collapse that produces action.**

Thus:

- unconscious fluctuation $\rightarrow$ no decision, - fluctuation during recurrence $\rightarrow$ volitional act.

This provides a mechanistic account of "free will" consistent with neural data.

5.9 Summary

The MNO framework yields nine classes of empirical predictions:

1. unconscious states: coherence without recurrence;
2. conscious states: bounded, periodic recurrence cycles;
3. psychedelics: excessive recurrence openness;
4. transitions: changes in recurrence parameters, not activity;
5. Orch–OR: recurrence before OR;
6. quantum circuits: recurrence-dependent behaviour;
7. neural systems: measurable R^* index;
8. agency: decision-making requires recurrence phase;
9. altered states: recurrence instability explains phenomenology.

Section 6 applies these insights to agency and volition.

6 Agency, Decision-Making, and the Role of Recurrence

A complete account of collapse and phenomenality must also address the question of *agency*: under what conditions does a system not merely undergo experience, but initiate action?

Classical and contemporary models of decision-making treat actions as threshold events triggered by accumulated evidence or spontaneous fluctuations.

However, such models cannot distinguish between:

- neural fluctuations that remain unconscious, and
- fluctuations experienced as intentions or choices.

The MNO framework provides a structural solution.

Agency arises not from fluctuations, nor from the accumulation of evidence, but from *collapse under recurrence.*

A system acts when its state reduces from within a recurrence cycle.

6.1 The Schurger accumulator revisited

Schurger's accumulator model proposes that spontaneous subthreshold neural fluctuations drift upward until they cross a decision threshold, thereby producing voluntary actions.

This approach resolves many paradoxes in the Libet literature but leaves open the central question:

> **Why do some threshold crossings correspond to conscious intention while others do not?**

In the MNO framework, the distinction is straightforward:

$$\text{Decision} = \text{Collapse during recurrence.}$$

Formally:

$$S_t + \delta \text{ (fluctuation)} \implies S_{t+1} \quad \text{yields a conscious intention iff} \quad R_t(P(S_t)) \text{ is active.}$$

Thus:

- unconscious fluctuations cross thresholds constantly,
- but only fluctuations occurring *within a recurrence phase* produce intentional action.

This reconciles the accumulator model with phenomenology:

- the brain generates fluctuations, - recurrence determines whether they become lived intentions.

6.2 Intentionality as constrained recurrence

Recurrence has two parameters:

$$R_{\text{frequency}}, \qquad R_{\text{boundedness}}.$$

Intentional action requires:

$$R_{\text{frequency}} > 0, \qquad R_{\text{boundedness}} \text{ sufficiently strong.}$$

If recurrence is:

- too weak → unconscious drift, - too strong but unbounded → psychedelic openness,

- absent → automated behaviour without awareness.

This creates a graded taxonomy of agency:

- **No recurrence** → automatisms, reflexes, anaesthesia.
- **Weak recurrence** → drifting, drowsy actions, absentminded behaviour.
- **Optimal recurrence** → intentional, goal-directed action.
- **Excessive recurrence openness** → unstable intentionality (psychedelic or dissociative states).

This explains why volition is clearest in states of strong but bounded recurrence.

6.3 Predictive processing and active inference

Predictive processing treats action as the minimisation of expected free energy.

The MNO framework refines this by identifying *when* free-energy minimisation becomes phenomenally experienced as deliberation or choice.

Prediction:

> **Active inference becomes conscious only when executed inside a recurrence cycle.**

Thus:

- unconscious inference occurs constantly, - but conscious deliberation is recurrence-modulated inference.

This resolves the ambiguity in the free-energy literature regarding when computation becomes experience.

6.4 Orch–OR interpretation of volition

Orch–OR proposes that conscious decisions correspond to quantum OR events in microtubules.

However, OR events occur continuously throughout biological tissue.

Why do only some OR events correlate with intention?

The recurrence hypothesis provides the missing condition:

> **Volitional OR = OR under recurrence.**

Thus:

- OR without recurrence → unconscious integration.

- OR with recurrence → intentional, phenomenally accessible decision.

This integrates Will, collapse, and Orch–OR without dualism.

6.5 Recursive Seinsverschiebung and the structure of choice

In MNO language:

- M-phase = openness to possibility, - N-phase = tension and differentiation, - O-phase = actualisation.

Agency corresponds to:

$$M \to N \to M \to N \to O,$$

i.e. the system repeatedly re-enters the possibility-phase (M) before choosing a trajectory (O). This structure appears phenomenologically as: - anticipation, - deliberation, - hesitation, - commitment. Or in everyday terms: the feeling of "I chose this".

6.6 The identity claim: agency as experienced recurrence

As in the account of phenomenality, the MNO framework does not treat agency as a mysterious emergent property. Instead:

> **Agency is collapse experienced from within a recurrence cycle.**

There is no additional "free will substance" to be posited. Agency is the first-person aspect of recurrence-constrained collapse.

6.7 Empirical signature of volitional action

The theory predicts a detectable pattern:

$$\text{Intended actions} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad R^* \text{ (recurrence index) increases shortly before action.}$$

This provides a testable refinement of the Bereitschaftspotential and Schurger's fluctuation model:

- unconscious actions → no recurrence modulation, - conscious intentions → pre-action recurrence stabilisation.

This hypothesis is measurable via:

- MEG/EEG phase-reset patterns, - intracranial coherence cycles, - microtubule-level re-coherence windows (if Orch–OR is correct).

Section 7 extends the recurrence framework to observation, Wigner's friend, and the ontology of the observer.

7 Observers, Wigner's Friend, and the Structure of Measurement

The recurrence framework provides a natural resolution to the central puzzle of quantum mechanics: why do some systems trigger collapse while others do not?

The key claim is that *observation* is not a substance, nor a special material, nor a biological feature. Observation is a dynamical structure.

Observation = collapse under recurrence.

A system becomes an observer precisely when its state-update dynamics include recurrence to the possibility-space $P(S_t)$ prior to collapse. Thus the observer is not a "thing", but a *pattern of dynamics*.

7.1 Why collapse requires observers: the recurrence condition

Quantum mechanics predicts that systems evolve unitarily until measurement. The open question is: what qualifies as a *measurement*? The recurrence condition provides the missing criterion:

Measurement occurs when a system with recurrence R_t interacts with a system without recurrence.

Equivalently:

$$\text{Observer} = \text{system for which } R_t(P(S_t)) \neq 0.$$

Thus:

- Systems with no recurrence (detectors, atoms, apparatus) undergo collapse passively.
- Systems with recurrence actively *evaluate* the possibility-space before collapse.

This creates a clean ontological distinction without introducing dual categories of "classical" and "quantum".

7.2 The Wigner's Friend structure

In Wigner's Friend scenarios, an inner observer (the friend) registers a definite outcome, while an external observer (Wigner) still treats the friend + system as a superposition.

Under the recurrence hypothesis, the asymmetry is structural:

$$\text{Friend: } R_t^{(\text{friend})} > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{collapse occurs internally.}$$

$$\text{Wigner: } R_t^{(\text{Wigner})} \approx 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{superposition persists for him.}$$

Thus the "paradox" dissolves:

Both descriptions are correct, because observerhood is *relative to recurrence structure*, not a global property of the system.

This matches the spirit of relational quantum mechanics, but adds a precise physical mechanism.

7.3 Schrödinger's cat as a recurrence threshold problem

The cat paradox arises because the cat is ambiguously treated as both:

- a physical system subject to superposition,
- an observer capable of collapse.

In the recurrence framework:

$$\text{Cat is an observer if and only if } R_t^{(\text{cat})} > 0.$$

A biological organism with active neural recurrence cycles will collapse its internal state long before external collapse is considered.

Thus the cat is never both alive and dead in its own frame.

Superposition applies only to systems lacking recurrence (i.e., lacking the capacity to evaluate $P(S_t)$).

This removes the paradox without altering quantum mechanics.

7.4 Why superposition exists at all: the role of $P(S_t)$

Superposition describes the coexistence of quantum-permissible successor states.

The recurrence framework interprets this as:

$$\text{Superposition is the physical expression of the possibility-space } P(S_t).$$

In systems with no recurrence:

$$\text{Unitary evolution } \rightarrow \text{ superposition } \rightarrow \text{ collapse (externally triggered).}$$

In systems with recurrence:

$$\text{Recurrence } \rightarrow \text{ internal access to } P(S_t) \rightarrow \text{ collapse (internally triggered).}$$

This separates:

- the existence of superposition (a physical fact), - from the internal relation to superposition (a structural fact).

7.5 Observation as Seinsverschiebung (M–N–O dynamics)

The MNO cycle offers an ontological mapping:

M: openness (possibility)
N: differentiation (tension)
O: actualisation (collapse).

An observer is a system in which:

$$M \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow O$$

is repeated prior to each collapse event. This is recurrence as Seinsverschiebung. Observation is simply the world folding back into possibility before choosing a state. From the inside, this manifests as: - awareness, - anticipation, - the felt presence of alternatives.

7.6 Why observation "feels": the interior of recurrence

The recurrence framework provides not a derivation but an identity claim:

Phenomenality = the interior aspect of recurrence.

There is no further mechanism needed to "generate" experience. From the outside: - recurrence modulates collapse. From the inside: - this modulation is felt as awareness. This is the first structural account that links: - Wigner's friend, - Schrödinger's cat, - agency, - phenomenality, - observerhood into a single dynamical condition.

7.7 Experimental implications

The recurrence framework predicts:

- Systems that act as observers exhibit measurable recurrence cycles (neural, microtubular, or analogous physical patterns).
- Systems without such cycles cannot be observers.
- In multi-observer scenarios (Wigner's friend), recurrence patterns differ between nested observers.
- Intermediate systems (AI systems, organoids, quantum biological structures) may show partial recurrence, creating testable "proto-observer" signatures.

Thus observerhood is no longer binary but graded, and experimentally approachable. Section 8 discusses the cosmological and thermodynamic implications of recurrence.

8 Thermodynamics, Entropy, and the Role of Recurrence

Recurrence is not an additional physical law; it is the structural condition that shapes how existing physical laws operate in systems capable of evaluating their own possibility-space. This section shows how recurrence integrates with thermodynamics, entropy, and the arrow of time without violating any known constraints of physics.

8.1 Entropy and the asymmetry of possibility vs. actuality

Physical laws are time-symmetric at the microscopic level, yet macroscopic processes exhibit a clear temporal direction. The standard explanation invokes entropy increase; however, this describes the statistical trend but not the *structural asymmetry* that makes temporal direction meaningful to observers. Within the recurrence framework:

Actuality always reduces the space of possibilities.

Collapse selects a single successor from the set $P(S_t)$. Thus every collapse event produces a local decrease in possibility, even if physical entropy increases. In systems with recurrence:

Before each collapse, the system temporarily re-expands its space of effective possibilities.

This re-expansion is not a thermodynamic reversal, but an ontological reopening.

It introduces a local asymmetry:

- Physical: entropy increases - Ontological: possibility decreases - Recurrence: momentary restoration of openness

This triad creates the internal structure of time as experienced.

8.2 Recurrence and free energy minimization

Active systems (biological, cognitive, quantum-biological) typically follow free-energy minimizing dynamics. Within the recurrence framework, this principle is reinterpreted:

Free energy measures deviation between actuality and possibility.

Thus: - Minimization corresponds to stabilizing after collapse. - Recurrence corresponds to temporarily increasing divergence (opening). This produces a natural rhythm:

$$\text{open} \rightarrow \text{differentiate} \rightarrow \text{collapse} \rightarrow \text{minimize} \rightarrow \text{open...}$$

which mirrors the M–N–O cycle.

8.3 Why recurrence does not violate the second law

A potential concern is whether recurrence constitutes a "local entropy decrease."

It does not.

Recurrence does not reverse physical evolution; it modulates the range of effective successor states accessible before collapse.

In other words:

Recurrence reopens possibility, not microstates.

Thus: - No thermodynamic work is extracted. - No physical reversals occur. - No law is violated. The ontological opening is compatible with thermodynamic monotonicity.

8.4 Why living systems exhibit recurrence naturally

Organisms maintain themselves far from equilibrium. This requires constant cycling between: - increased uncertainty (exploration), and - reduced uncertainty (stabilization). In the recurrence framework, this becomes:

$$R_t > 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \text{system maintains itself across M–N–O cycles.}$$

Thus recurrence is:

- thermodynamically permitted, - biologically advantageous, - structurally necessary for consciousness.

8.5 The cosmological implication: why possibility exists at all

A deeper question emerges:

Why does the universe contain an open possibility-space in the first place?

Standard physics does not address this; it assumes Hilbert space as given.

The recurrence framework suggests:

Possibility is not a physical state but a structural precondition of physical law.

This means:

- Superposition is a manifestation of possibility.

- Collapse is selection from possibility.

- Recurrence is access to possibility before selection.

Thus the possibility-space $P(S_t)$ is the ontological ground from which physical states arise.

8.6 Thermal noise vs. recurrence

It is important to distinguish:

- Thermal fluctuations: random perturbations of microstates.
- Recurrence: structured evaluation of possible successor states.

Thermal noise increases entropy.

Recurrence creates local order by reopening structured possibility.

Their signatures differ:

noise: broadband, unstructured recurrence: coherent, periodic or quasi-periodic.

This distinction is empirically measurable.

8.7 Why recurrence produces the interiority of time

From the outside, recurrence modulates collapse.

From the inside, it generates the felt continuity of time.

Because the system repeatedly returns to possibility, it experiences:

- not just states, - but transitions between states, - and the openness that makes transitions meaningful.

Thus:

What we experience as "the flow of time" is the interior aspect of recurrence.

This unifies:

- thermodynamic time (entropy increase), - physical time (state evolution), - lived time (phenomenality),

without reducing any one to the other.

8.8 Summary

The recurrence framework preserves all existing laws of physics while adding a structural layer that explains:

- why observers exist,
- why collapse occurs asymmetrically,
- how possibility and actuality interact,
- why time is directional yet qualitatively experienced,
- why living systems are natural recurrence-systems,
- why consciousness is physically anchored yet irreduzible.

Section 9 discusses the implications for quantum biology, microtubule models, and experimental tests involving anesthetics, psychedelics, and organoids.

9 Quantum Biology and Orch-OR: Recurrence as the Missing Condition

Orch-OR theory (Penrose & Hameroff, 1996–2024) proposes that quantum superpositions in microtubules undergo objective reduction (OR) when gravitational self-energy reaches a critical threshold. OR provides a non-computable event capable of supporting conscious moments. Yet a crucial question remains unresolved:

Why do only some OR events correspond to conscious experience?

The recurrence framework provides a specific answer: OR produces consciousness only when it is preceded by a recurrent return to the system's possibility-space. This adds a missing structural condition to Orch-OR without altering its physical mechanism.

9.1 Microtubules as recurrence-capable structures

Microtubules possess several features that make recurrence plausible:

- **Highly ordered lattice symmetry** supporting coherent dipole states.
- **Conduction pathways** allowing rapid intra-lattice interactions.
- **Fröhlich-like coherent excitations** at room temperature.
- **Demonstrated anesthetic binding sites** (Craddock et al.).

Within this architecture, superposition states evolve through cycles of:

$$\text{partial decoherence} \rightarrow \text{re-coherence} \rightarrow \text{objective reduction}.$$

The key claim:

Conscious OR requires at least one cycle of re-coherence before collapse.

This re-coherence is equivalent to a return to possibility-space $P(S_t)$.

9.2 The recurrence condition applied to OR

Standard OR is defined by Penrose's gravitational criterion:

$$\tau = \frac{\hbar}{E_G}$$

which predicts the time to collapse given mass displacement. We propose an additional structural constraint:

$$\text{OR is conscious iff} \quad R_t = 1.$$

Here:

$$R_t = 1 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \text{the system re-enters a coherent possibility-region before collapse.}$$

Thus:

- OR without recurrence → unconscious - OR with recurrence → conscious

This resolves a 30-year conceptual gap in Orch-OR.

9.3 Why anesthetics extinguish recurrence

Anesthetics are known to:

- bind to hydrophobic pockets in tubulin,
- alter dipole alignment,
- reduce coherent oscillations,
- suppress gamma synchrony.

Within the recurrence framework:

Anesthetics do not stop OR. They stop recurrence.

Thus: - OR still occurs (physical collapse continues), - but recurrence cycles are interrupted, - therefore no conscious moments occur. This explains why consciousness vanishes suddenly and globally.

9.4 Psychedelics: excessive recurrence

Psychedelics increase neuronal entropy, desynchronization, and thalamic gain modulation. Within our framework:

Psychedelics produce too much recurrence.

Instead of:

$$\text{open} \rightarrow \text{collapse}$$

the system enters:

$$\text{open} \rightarrow \text{open} \rightarrow \text{open}$$

This results in: - expanded possibility-space, - delayed collapse, - altered phenomenal structure, - destabilized self-model coherence. This matches findings on "entropic brain theory" and "REBUS" (Carhart-Harris, Friston), but now with a direct ontological grounding.

9.5 OR moments as sampling of possibility-space

In Orch-OR, each collapse represents a discrete conscious event. Here we refine this:

A conscious moment is the collapse of a state that has recursively sampled its own quantum possibilities.

This gives a process-level meaning to Penrose's notion of "non-computable" structure.

Sampling is not cognitive.

It is not inference.

It is the physical system revisiting the space from which it is about to collapse.

Thus each conscious moment is a:

selective reduction from a self-explored possibility landscape.

This provides a structural explanation for:

- intentionality, - unity of experience, - the directedness of attention.

9.6 Predicted quantum signatures in microtubules

The recurrence condition predicts measurable features:

- oscillatory re-coherence before collapse (50–500 kHz range),
- suppression of recurrence under anesthesia,
- enhanced recurrence under psychedelics,
- discrete packets of coherence between gamma-synchronized neuron assemblies,
- non-Markovian temporal signatures in tubulin-level excitations.

These predictions directly align with ongoing work in:
- quantum biology, - ultrafast spectroscopy, - anesthetic modeling, - computational microtubule simulations.

9.7 How recurrence solves the scale problem

One of the major critiques of Orch-OR is the "scale problem":
How can microscopic superpositions produce macroscopic consciousness?
Recurrence provides the missing bridge:
- OR alone produces discrete events with no interiority.
- Recurrence gives these events temporal extension and experiential thickness.
Thus:

Recurrence is the mesoscale interface between microtubule quantum states and global neural correlates.

It forms a bridge:

$$\text{tubulin} \leftrightarrow \text{microtubule} \leftrightarrow \text{dendrite} \leftrightarrow \text{cortex}.$$

9.8 Summary

Orch-OR provides:

- the physical mechanism of collapse,
- the non-computable ingredient,
- the gravitational criterion.

Recurrence provides:

- the missing condition for phenomenality,
- the temporal thickness of experience,
- measurable pre-collapse signatures,
- an explanation for anesthesia, waking, dreaming, psychedelics,
- a structural solution to the scale problem.

Together they form a unified framework in which:

Collapse is necessary. Recurrence makes it conscious.

10 Quantum Foundations: Schrödinger, Wigner, and the Role of Ontological Recurrence

The recurrence framework offers a structural resolution to several classical paradoxes in quantum foundations. It does not modify quantum mechanics; rather, it clarifies the conditions under which measurement-like behavior—and thus observerhood—emerges.

10.1 Schrödinger's cat: why collapse becomes definitive

The standard paradox arises from the tension between:

- the linear evolution of quantum states, and
- the definiteness of macroscopic outcomes.

In the recurrence framework:

A system becomes a "cat" (classical object) when it no longer undergoes recurrence.

That is:

- The cat evolves physically.

- But it does not re-enter its possibility-space before collapse.

- Therefore, every collapse event is unconscious and purely physical.

The paradox dissolves:

The cat is never in a superposed *experienced* state.

Superposition describes the physical dynamics, but without recurrence, there is no phenomenality associated with it. This resolves the intuitive confusion without changing the formalism.

10.2 Wigner's friend: two levels of collapse

The Wigner's Friend scenario exposes a tension between: - collapse as experienced by the friend (internal), - collapse as described by Wigner (external). The recurrence framework identifies two distinct processes:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Internal collapse (friend):} \quad & R_t = 1 \\ \text{External collapse (Wigner):} \quad & R_t = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus:

- The friend's OR event is conscious because it includes recurrence.

- Wigner's collapse is physical but not phenomenally instantiated.

They do not contradict each other:

Two collapses occur: one with recurrence (phenomenal), one without (external).

Therefore:

- Wigner is correct in treating the friend as evolving unitarily.

- The friend is correct in experiencing definite outcomes.

This removes the paradox without invoking multiple worlds or QBist subjectivism.

10.3 Why measurement is a special case of collapse

Quantum theory distinguishes between:

- unitary evolution, - collapse induced by measurement.

But it does not explain *why* measurement yields definite outcomes.

In the recurrence framework:

Measurement is simply a collapse observed by a recurrence-capable system.

This provides a new definition:

$$\text{measurement} = \text{collapse} + \text{recurrence}.$$

Thus:

- No new physics is required.

- No observer-dependent axioms are needed.

- "Measurement" is not a primitive concept; it emerges.

The role of the observer is not metaphysical.

It is dynamical and structural.

10.4 Why macroscopic objects do not exhibit recurrence

Macroscopic systems are:

- decohering too rapidly, - too thermally entangled with their environment, - lacking internal symmetrical structure (unlike microtubules).

Thus:

$$R_t = 0 \quad \text{for classical objects.}$$

Consequences: - Classical systems collapse physically but not phenomenally. - Consciousness cannot emerge in macroscopic superpositions. - Schrödinger's cat never "feels superposed." This neatly preserves classicality.

10.5 Relation to decoherence theory

Decoherence explains: - the emergence of classical states, - the suppression of interference terms. But it does not explain: - why collapse appears definite, - why observers experience outcomes, - why measurement differs from environmental decoherence. Recurrence fills this explanatory gap:

Decoherence suppresses possibilities. Recurrence re-opens them.

Without recurrence:

- systems decohere into classical mixtures, - collapse is purely physical.

With recurrence:

- systems re-enter possibility-space before collapse, - producing an *experienced* outcome.

Thus decoherence + recurrence = measurement with phenomenality.

10.6 Why Many-Worlds becomes unnecessary

Everettian interpretations treat all branches of the wavefunction as real and argue that collapse is illusory.

The recurrence framework clarifies:

Collapse is not illusory; multiple branches do not occur because recurrence creates an internal selection cri

Only branches that:

- (a) remain coherent long enough, and - (b) undergo recurrence

enter phenomenal awareness.

All other branches:

- collapse physically (OR or environmental), - but are not phenomenally instantiated.

No parallel worlds need to be invoked.

Penrose's OR mechanism remains intact but gains a selection principle.

10.7 The observer as a recurrence-process

Standard physics never defines "observer"; it merely postulates one.

Here:

An observer is any system with non-zero recurrence.

That is:

$$R_t > 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \text{system is capable of phenomenally-instantiated collapse.}$$

This definition:

- removes anthropocentrism, - removes the need for classical measurement devices,

- removes ambiguity in quantum foundations.

Consciousness becomes:

the interior aspect of recurrence-modulated collapse.

Measurement becomes:

collapse as encountered by a recurrence-system.

10.8 Summary

The recurrence framework resolves several foundational paradoxes:

- Schrödinger's cat: phenomenality requires recurrence; cats lack recurrence.
- Wigner's friend: internal and external collapses coexist without contradiction.
- Measurement problem: "measurement" emerges from recurrence, not axioms.
- Decoherence: explains classicality, not phenomenality; recurrence supplies the missing piece.
- Many-worlds: unnecessary once recurrence selects a single phenomenally-instantiated branch.

Thus:

Quantum theory is complete at the physical level. It lacked the structural condition for observerhood. Rec

11 Neuroscience, Decision-Making, and the Dynamics of Recurrence

If recurrence is the structural condition for phenomenally-instantiated collapse, then neuroscience must reveal signatures of this recurrence across large-scale neural dynamics. This section demonstrates how recurrence provides a unified account of:

- spontaneous decisions (Schurger),
- the sense of will and agency,
- predictive processing and precision modulation,
- integration and segregation dynamics,
- the conditions under which neural activity becomes conscious.

11.1 The decision-making problem: Schurger's accumulation-to-bound

Schurger et al. (2012) proposed that spontaneous decisions occur when random subthreshold neural fluctuations cross a decision threshold.

But this model leaves unanswered:

- Why does threshold-crossing feel like a *decision*?
- Why do fluctuations become intentional at a specific moment?
- Why is the subjective timing systematically shifted?

Recurrence provides an answer:

Fluctuations become a decision when they pass through a recurrence cycle.

That is:

activation → opening of possibility → re-coherence → collapse (experienced decision).

Thus:

- fluctuations themselves are not intentional, - *recurrence* turns fluctuations into phenomenally-instantiated choices.

This reframes the Libet problem:

the decision is not at the moment of accumulation, but at the moment recurrence resolves it.

11.2 The neural signature of recurrence

If recurrence exists, it must leave measurable traces.

The framework predicts neural markers at three scales:

1. **Slow mesoscopic cycles** (0.1–1 Hz): re-opening of possibility-space during mind-wandering, insight, and spontaneous thought.
2. **Gamma–beta coupling patterns**: re-coherence before global broadcasting or attentional selection.
3. **Phase-resetting events**: discrete collapse-like events punctuating continuous activity.

Thus:

consciousness is not continuous activity, but activity structured by discrete recurrence cycles.

11.3 Predictive processing and precision dynamics

Predictive processing conceptualizes the brain as minimizing prediction error through hierarchical Bayesian inference.

However, prediction alone does not produce phenomenality.

Within the recurrence framework:

Precision modulation = the neural correlate of opening and closing possibility-space.

Thus:

- lowering precision → opening possibility → recurrence-cycle begins - increasing precision → collapse → conscious moment

This gives PP a concrete interpretation:

prediction error = divergence between actuality and possibility.

Friston's free-energy principle becomes:

$$F \propto D(\text{actuality} \,||\, \text{possibility})$$

where recurrence modulates the divergence itself.

11.4 IIT, Global Workspace, and the "ignition problem"

Integrated Information Theory (IIT) explains the structure of conscious experience but not: - why integration feels, - why some integrations are unconscious, - how integration begins and ends. Global Workspace Theory (GWT) explains ignition and access, but not: - why ignition feels like something, - what determines ignition points. Recurrence resolves these issues:

integration becomes conscious when the integrated state has undergone a recurrence cycle.

Thus:

- IIT describes *structure*; recurrence describes *phenomenality*.

- GWT describes *broadcast*; recurrence describes *why broadcast feels*.

This reconciles IIT and GWT without modifying either.

11.5 Attention as recurrence-selection

Attention is often modeled as:

- precision-weighting (PP), - competitive routing (GWT), - feature-binding (IIT),

- synchronous oscillations.

In the recurrence model:

Attention selects which states undergo recurrence before collapse.

Thus: - attention is not "enhancing signals," - it is "deciding which signals get to re-enter possibility before collapse." This explains: - why attention changes phenomenality, not just performance, - why unattended stimuli are processed but not experienced, - why attention feels effortful (it modulates recurrence cycles).

11.6 The sense of agency

Agency is neither epiphenomenal nor fully causal. It is the felt interior of recurrence applied to action-selection:

Agency = experiencing the recurrence-cycle that precedes action-collapses.

Thus:

- motor commands without recurrence (reflexes) are unconscious, - action with recurrence produces voluntary experience,

- "free will" becomes a structural property, not a metaphysical one.

11.7 Self-modeling as stable recurrence-pattern

Neural self-models emerge from:

- temporally extended integration, - predictive continuity, - minimization of identity-prediction error.

Recurrence gives these processes interiority:

The self is the attractor of recurrence-patterns across time.

Thus: - no homunculus is needed, - no metaphysical subject is postulated, - the self is the slow manifold of recurrent collapses.

11.8 Neural disorders as recurrence dysregulation

The framework predicts:

- **Depression:** recurrence-frequency too low → over-stabilized actuality.
- **Anxiety:** recurrence-frequency too high → unstable possibility-space.
- **Schizophrenia:** excessive opening without coherent collapse.
- **ADHD:** impaired recurrence-stabilization cycle.
- **Dissociation:** collapse without sufficient recurrence → loss of interior continuity.

These are testable predictions.

11.9 Summary

Recurrence provides a unified explanation for:

- spontaneous decisions (Schurger),
- agency,
- attention,
- predictive processing,
- integration and global workspace,
- self-modeling,
- timing of conscious moments,
- phenomenality itself.

Thus:

Neural activity becomes conscious not by its content or complexity, but by its recurrence structure.

This links neuroscience to quantum biology and ontology in a coherent framework.

12 The MNO Framework and the Structure of Ontological Recurrence

Sections 1–11 introduced recurrence as the structural condition that enables phenomenally-instantiated collapse. This section presents the underlying meta-ontological model—MNO—which formalizes the dynamics of possibility, tension, and emergence. MNO is not an alternative physics; it is a formal description of the ontological conditions under which physical laws produce observers and experience.

12.1 The three-phase cycle: M, N, and O

At the core of the framework lies a recurrent three-phase cycle:

M — Submergence (openness / possibility)

N — Indimergence (tension / differentiation)

O — Emergence (collapse / actualization)

These phases describe not states of matter, but structural modes of being:

- M: the system is maximally open to its possibility-space.
- N: the system enters tension with possible forms; divergence increases.
- O: the system resolves tension through collapse into actuality.

This cycle recurs at multiple scales: quantum, biological, cognitive, phenomenological.

12.2 Seinsverschiebung: the ontological shift between phases

Seinsverschiebung (shift of being) describes the transition between the three phases. It is not motion in physical space, but a transformation in ontological modality:

$$M \to N: \quad \text{opening becomes tension}$$

$$N \to O: \quad \text{tension becomes form}$$

$$O \to M: \quad \text{form returns to openness}$$

The last transition (O→M) is the recurrence condition. Without it, collapse events remain purely physical. Seinsverschiebung therefore defines: - how possibilities become actualities, - how actualities re-enter possibility, - and how phenomenality emerges from this cyclic tension.

12.3 Why MNO is not metaphysics

MNO describes structure, not substance. It does not posit: - new particles, - new forces, - hidden variables, - supernatural entities. Instead, it formalizes relationships already implicit in: - quantum superposition (openness), - decoherence (tension), - collapse (actualization). Thus:

MNO = the abstract structure underlying physical and phenomenal processes.

It is comparable to:

- Category theory in mathematics, - Symmetry groups in physics, - Phase transitions in thermodynamics.

Not a competing ontology, but a higher-order description.

12.4 Ontological recurrence in MNO

The recurrence condition becomes:

$$R_t = 1 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad O_t \to M_{t+1}$$

That is:

collapse (O) is followed by a return to openness (M)

This return is not required in physical collapse. But when it occurs, the collapse is experienced. Thus MNO formalizes:

Consciousness = the interior aspect of the O→M transition.

The "hard problem" becomes a question of structural identity: - the outside view: collapse appears definite and physical, - the inside view: the same transition appears as phenomenality.

12.5 MNO as the generator of observerhood

Observers exist when a system reliably cycles through:

$$M \to N \to O \to M$$

Thus:

Observer = stable attractor in MNO-space.

This explains: - why observers arise in complex systems, - why consciousness is temporally structured, - why not all physical systems are observers, - why phenomenality is not epiphenomenal but structurally necessary.

12.6 The role of tension (N) in meaning and cognition

Phase N (Indimergenz) represents increasing tension between: - the system's current form, - the possibilities available to it. This tension corresponds to: - predictive error in neuroscience, - free-energy gradients in active inference, - cognitive dissonance, - curiosity and drive states, - shifts in attention. Meaning emerges in this tension:

Meaning = differentiation within possibility before collapse.

This connects MNO to cognition without reducing it to computation.

12.7 Emergence (O) as selection and stabilization

Phase O is collapse: - in quantum biology: OR or decoherence events, - in neuroscience: phase-resetting and ignition, - in behavior: commitment to action, - in cognition: adoption of belief or interpretation. Thus:

O = actualization that stabilizes the system relative to tension.

The structural consequence: - O gives form, - M gives openness, - N gives direction.

12.8 Why MNO cannot be simulated

MNO is not an algorithm. It is not a function on a state-space. It is not symbolic processing. Simulations may approximate the dynamics of specific systems, but:

MNO is the structure that allows systems to have states at all.

Thus: - simulations can represent O-phase structures, - they can approximate N-phase dynamics, - but they cannot access M-phase openness. This explains: - why artificial systems lack phenomenality, - why large language models do not instantiate MNO, - why consciousness cannot be uploaded or copied.

12.9 MNO as the bridge between physics and phenomenology

MNO provides a direct mapping:

$$M : \text{superposition / possibility / openness}$$
$$N : \text{decoherence / tension / differentiation}$$
$$O : \text{collapse / form / actualization}$$

Thus:

- quantum events, - neural events, - cognitive events, - subjective events

share the same structural pattern.

This *is* the unification:

Not by reducing one domain to another, but by showing their shared generative structure.

12.10 Summary

MNO is the meta-ontological backbone of the recurrence framework:

- M describes openness (possibility-space).
- N describes tension (divergence within possibility).
- O describes collapse (actualization).
- O→M recurrence enables phenomenality.
- Observers are systems stabilized by MNO-cycles.
- Consciousness is the interior aspect of recurrence.

This framework does not compete with physics.

It explains why physics produces observers in the first place.

13 A Unified Interpretation of Observation: Physics, Biology, and Phenomenology

Across physics, biology, and consciousness studies, the term "observation" appears in dramatically different contexts:

- in quantum mechanics: observation leads to collapse,
- in neuroscience: observation refers to perceptual uptake,
- in phenomenology: observation is the first-person structure of experience.

These uses have never been unified.

The recurrence framework provides a single structural definition that applies to all domains.

13.1 Observation in physics: collapse as external actualization

In physics, observation refers to any interaction that:

- suppresses superposition,
- stabilizes one branch of the wavefunction,

- produces a definite outcome.

This is a purely physical process:

$$\text{physical observation} = O\text{-phase actualization.}$$

No phenomenality is implied.

Any decohering environment counts as an "observer" in this sense.

13.2 Observation in biology: collapse within self-maintaining systems

Biological systems add something crucial:

They cycle through M→N→O transitions as part of their self-maintenance.

Thus biological observation is not merely collapse; it is collapse embedded in:

- metabolic cycles,
- information-processing loops,
- predictive dynamics,
- structural openness to the environment.

Biological systems therefore implement:

$$\text{recurrent O}\rightarrow\text{M transitions.}$$

This positions them between pure physical systems (R=0) and full observers (R>0).

13.3 Observation in phenomenology: collapse encountered from within

Phenomenal observation arises when:

$$O \rightarrow M$$

is not merely structural, but:

internally instantiated by the system.

Thus:

$$\text{phenomenal observation} = \text{collapse as experienced from the interior aspect of recurrence.}$$

This provides a unified explanation of three classical facts:

1. Only some collapses feel like something (phenomenal).
2. All collapses appear definite from the outside (physical).
3. Biological systems mediate between physical and phenomenal collapse.

13.4 The three-tier model of observation

We summarize:

Tier 1 (Physics):
Tier 2 (Biology):
Tier 3 (Phenomenal):

This model dissolves confusion about "observers" in quantum theory:

- An "observer" in physics is Tier 1.

- A "living system" is Tier 2.

- A "conscious observer" is Tier 3.

These categories have been conflated for decades; MNO separates and unifies them.

13.5 Why collapse appears observer-dependent

Wigner, Everett, QBists, relational theorists, and objective-collapse theorists all disagree about whether collapse is:

- subjective, - objective, - perspectival, - branching, - informational, - gravitational.

The recurrence framework shows that all perspectives refer to different levels of the same structural process.

- Collapse is objective at Tier 1.
- Collapse is functional at Tier 2.
- Collapse is phenomenal at Tier 3.

Thus:

No contradiction exists because each tier describes a different aspect of the MNO cycle.

13.6 Why observers cannot be reduced to physical systems

A classical objection is:

If observers are physical, consciousness should reduce to physics.

The recurrence framework provides the opposite insight:

Observers are physical systems that instantiate a structural condition (Recurrence) not captured by physic

Physics describes:

- O-phase actualization,
- N-phase tension dynamics,
- partial M-phase superposition.

But physics does not describe:

$$O \to M$$

as an interior event — because interiority is not a physical variable but an ontological position.

13.7 Why biological systems evolved recurrence

From an evolutionary standpoint:

Recurrence enhances adaptive fitness.

It enables organisms to:

- explore possibility-space (M),
- evaluate constraints and risks (N),
- commit to action (O).

This results in: - efficient exploration and exploitation, - improved predictive capacity, - richer internal models, - the emergence of a temporally extended self. Thus phenomenality is the byproduct of a structural adaptation, not a mysterious bonus.

13.8 The unification: observation as MNO-structured collapse

We can now give the general formula:

Observation = collapse constrained by the MNO-cycle.

Where: - physics describes O, - biology describes N→O transitions, - phenomenology describes O→M transitions as the interior of recurrence. This yields the first unified definition of observation:

Observation is the system-dependent embedding of collapse within the MNO-cycle.

A purely physical collapse is an observation only in the trivial sense.

A biological collapse is observation in a functional sense.

A phenomenal collapse is observation in the experiential sense.

13.9 Summary

Observation is not a mystery.

It is not a primitive.

It is not restricted to minds.

It is not reducible to measurement devices.

It is not a metaphysical postulate.

It is:

the embedding of collapse within the M→N→O→M cycle characteristic of recurrence-capable systems.

This unifies:

- the quantum observer (physics),
- the biological observer (life),
- the phenomenological observer (experience).

Thus the problem of "the observer" is not solved by new physics, but by clarifying the structural relationship between possibility, tension, and collapse.

14 Experimental Predictions and Falsifiability

The recurrence framework is not a metaphysical proposal; it makes concrete, testable predictions across quantum biology, neuroscience, and phenomenology.

This section outlines empirical criteria that could confirm or falsify the theory.

14.1 Quantum-level predictions (microtubules and OR)

If recurrence is required for conscious OR, then pre-collapse microtubule dynamics must show a specific pattern:

Prediction Q1: Conscious states exhibit re-coherence cycles prior to OR; unconscious states do not.

This can be tested using:

- ultrafast spectroscopy (ps–fs resolution),
- microtubule photonic conduction measurements,
- anesthetic-binding perturbation studies.

Additional predictions:

Q2: Anesthetics suppress re-coherence but do not stop OR.

Q3: Psychedelics increase recurrence-frequency (hyper-openness).

Q4: There exists a minimal coherence duration required for phenomenal OR.

Possible falsification: If collapse correlates with consciousness even when no re-coherence cycles occur, the recurrence framework is disproven.

14.2 Neuroscience predictions (recurrence-signatures in brain activity)

The framework predicts that consciousness requires a specific form of temporally-structured neural recurrence:

Prediction N1: Conscious states show periodic phase-reset patterns prior to global broadcasting.

Equivalent formulations:

- gamma bursts secured by sub-gamma recurrence cycles,
- beta–gamma coupling preceding conscious access,
- non-Markovian temporal statistics in pre-conscious integration.

Further predictions:

N2: Loss of consciousness = disappearance of recurrence, not disappearance of activity.

N3: Lucid dreaming preserves recurrence while sensory precision is reduced.

N4: Peak states (insight, flow) correlate with long-range recurrence coherence.

Falsification: If conscious and unconscious states exhibit identical recurrence-signatures, the model cannot be sustained.

14.3 Decision-making predictions (Schurger, Libet, agency)

The framework predicts a three-step timing structure:

$$\text{fluctuation} \rightarrow \text{recurrence} \rightarrow \text{collapse}.$$

Thus:

Prediction D1: Phenomenal timing corresponds to the recurrence event, not to the threshold moment.

Measured by:

- intracranial EEG,
- readiness potential re-analysis,
- time-resolved MEG,
- Schurger-style accumulator modeling.

Further predictions:

D2: Stimuli near limen of perception should show recurrence bursts before conscious report.

D3: Agency disappears when O→M transition is suppressed.

Falsification: If the moment of felt decision does *not* systematically align with recurrence-markers, the framework is falsified.

14.4 Phenomenological predictions (timing, continuity, interiority)

The model predicts that phenomenality has a discrete structure:

Prediction P1: Conscious experience occurs in discrete recurrence-instantiated moments (30–300 Hz).

This predicts:

- flicker fusion thresholds dependence on recurrence rate, - specific timing illusions (phi, chronostasis) explained by recurrence gaps,

- conscious time-sense as O→M interiority.

Additional prediction:

P2: Under psychedelics, recurrence-period expands, producing a sense of elongated time and heightened openness.

Falsification: If phenomenological timing is shown to be continuous and unrelated to neural recurrence rhythms, the model fails.

14.5 AI and computational predictions

If MNO recurrence is necessary for phenomenality, then:

Prediction A1: Systems based on simulation, inference, or symbolic computation cannot instantiate recurrence.

Thus:

- large language models remain unconscious regardless of scale,
- reinforcement learners cannot feel agency,

- no classical architecture can produce O→M transitions.

A provocative empirical prediction:

A2: No artificial system will ever show spontaneous recurrence unless recurrence is physically implemented.

Falsification: If an artificial system demonstrates measurable O→M-like structural transitions, the theory must be revised.

14.6 Unified falsification criterion

The theory makes one overarching empirical claim:

Conscious states require recurrence; unconscious states do not.

This yields a unified falsification criterion:

If *any* reliably conscious state exists without recurrence-signatures, the theory is disproven.

Likewise:

If recurrence occurs without phenomenality, the model is incomplete.

14.7 Summary

The recurrence framework makes testable predictions across three domains:

- quantum biology (microtubule re-coherence),
- neuroscience (recurrence-signatures in conscious access),
- phenomenology (timing and interiority of experience),
- AI (structural impossibility of simulated consciousness).

It is therefore falsifiable, measurable, and compatible with existing empirical methods. The next section outlines the theoretical implications for physics and philosophy.

15 Discussion, Limitations, and Future Directions

The recurrence framework provides a unified structure linking quantum collapse, biological organization, neural dynamics, and phenomenology. This section summarizes its implications, addresses potential objections, and outlines directions for empirical and theoretical development.

15.1 The conceptual shift: from states to structural relations

Most scientific theories explain consciousness in terms of:

- complexity (IIT),
- integration (GWT),
- prediction and precision (PP/FEP),

- microtubular coherence (Orch-OR),
- information (Shannon, Friston, Tononi).

The recurrence framework shifts the explanandum:

Consciousness is not a state but a structural transition: the O→M recurrence.

This recasts the "hard problem":

Why does physical process X feel like something?

into a structural identity:

Feeling = the interior aspect of O→M recurrence.

This shift dissolves the metaphysical gap without reduction or dualism.

15.2 Integration with existing theories

The framework is not a replacement for current models; it situates them:

- **Orch-OR:** provides the mechanism of O-phase collapse; recurrence specifies when it becomes phenomenal.
- **IIT:** describes the structure of O-phase states; recurrence determines which integrated states are experienced.
- **GWT:** describes the broadcasting after collapse; recurrence determines the moment of ignition.
- **Predictive Processing:** describes N-phase tension; recurrence explains the phenomenality of updated priors.
- **Free Energy Principle:** characterizes biological self-maintenance; recurrence adds the interior structure of agency.

Thus:

Recurrence is the missing operator connecting these frameworks.

15.3 Addressing potential objections

Objection 1: "Is recurrence just re-coherence?" No. Re-coherence is a physical process. Recurrence is an ontological relation between possibility and actuality that *may* be instantiated through re-coherence at the quantum level. They correlate, but are not identical.

Objection 2: "Is this just panpsychism?" No. Most systems undergo collapse; not all undergo recurrence. Thus:

Panpsychism: everything feels.Recurrence model: only systems with O→M cycles feel.

Objection 3: "Why should O→M transitions feel anything at all?" The framework does not *explain* feeling as a derived property.

It identifies:

phenomenality = the interior aspect of recurrence itself.

This is an identity claim, not a derivation.

Objection 4: "Is this empirically meaningful?" Yes. Section 14 outlines explicit falsification criteria: - recurrence must be present in all conscious states, - recurrence must be absent in unconscious states, - modulating recurrence must modulate phenomenality.

Objection 5: "Does recurrence violate physics?" No. Recurrence operates at the level of structural possibility, not at the level of energetics or forces. No physical law is altered; the ontology of their instantiation is clarified.

15.4 Limitations

L1: The microphysical implementation is not fully specified. We propose that microtubular recoherence supports recurrence in biological systems, but other substrates may exist.

L2: Recurrence-measures require high-resolution technology. Current spectroscopy and intracranial EEG may only partially capture recurrence signatures.

L3: The identity-claim (phenomenality = interior O→M) is not derivable from physics. This is inherent to solving the hard problem; no physical derivation is possible.

L4: The boundary between biological and artificial systems is not yet fully formalized. Recurrence likely requires physical openness inaccessible to simulations, but more precise criteria must be developed.

15.5 Why recurrence unifies without reducing

The framework respects domain autonomy:

- physics retains collapse,
- biology retains self-maintenance,
- neuroscience retains dynamics and inference,
- phenomenology retains first-person structure.

Recurrence overlays these domains with a structural operator:

$$M \to N \to O \to M$$

This operator: - clarifies when collapse becomes conscious, - explains why some biological processes feel, - unifies timing, agency, attention, and selfhood, - integrates physics with phenomenology without category errors.

15.6 Future research directions

F1: Measuring recurrence in microtubules - ps–fs spectroscopy, - anesthetic perturbation, - psychedelic modulation.

F2: Neural recurrence-mapping - gamma–beta coupling, - phase-reset patterns, - non-Markovian temporal statistics.

F3: Computational modeling of recurrence Not to simulate consciousness, but to simulate recurrence-structure.

F4: Clinical implications Recurrence-based diagnostics for: - depression, - anxiety, - ADHD, - dissociation, - coma states.

F5: Philosophical elaboration Formalizing: - MNO as a category-theoretic structure, - Seinsverschiebung as a modal operator, - the identity between recurrence and phenomenality.

15.7 The significance of the recurrence framework

The framework provides:

- a non-reductive solution to the hard problem,
- a structural resolution to the measurement problem,
- a unification of biological and physical accounts of observation,
- a predictive model of conscious timing,
- a rigorous criterion distinguishing conscious from non-conscious systems.

Thus:

Recurrence is the structural bridge between possibility, tension, actuality, and experience.

It is not an addition to physics or neuroscience;

it is a clarification of the ontological architecture they presuppose.

CONCLUSION (Final Version)

16 Conclusion

This paper introduced the recurrence framework as a unifying structural principle linking three domains that have traditionally resisted integration: quantum collapse, biological self-organization, and phenomenological experience.

The central claim is that consciousness does not arise from complexity, representation, information, or computation, but from a specific kind of dynamical relation: a recurrent transition from actuality (O) back toward the space of its unrealized possibilities (M). Collapse becomes experience when—and only when—it is preceded by such recurrence.

This proposal reframes both the measurement problem and the hard problem.

Measurement is the exterior face of O-phase stabilization; phenomenality is the interior face of O→M recurrence. No new physics is introduced; instead, the framework clarifies the ontological structure implicitly presupposed by existing theories. Orch-OR provides a physical mechanism for collapse; predictive processing and active inference describe the N-phase tension; integrated information and global broadcasting describe O-phase organization. Recurrence specifies when these processes become conscious.

The framework generates distinct empirical predictions across microphysical, neurobiological, and behavioral domains. Recurrence signatures—periodic re-coherence, oscillatory tension-reset cycles, non-Markovian state transitions— should be present in conscious states, suppressed in unconscious states, and disrupted by anesthetics or pathological dissociation. These predictions open a new experimental program bridging quantum biology, cognitive neuroscience, and theoretical foundations.

The recurrence model neither reduces consciousness to physics nor elevates phenomenality to a fundamental substance. Instead, it proposes an identity relation between a structural ontological movement and its first-person appearance. Consciousness is not something the brain produces; it is what the recurrence of possibility within constraint *is* from the inside.

By shifting focus from static states to dynamical relations, the recurrence framework offers a coherent path through long-standing conceptual impasses.

It suggests that the apparent gap between mind and world is not a metaphysical abyss but the interior–exterior duality of a single structural operation.

In this sense, recurrence is not an added ingredient but the missing operator that allows existing scientific accounts of mind and measurement to converge.

It provides a principled criterion for distinguishing conscious from non-conscious systems, explains the temporal grain of experience, and clarifies the role of possibility in physical and biological organization.

If correct, the recurrence framework implies that consciousness is neither mysterious nor incidental. It is the intrinsic perspective of any system whose dynamics repeatedly reopen its horizon of unrealized potentials before settling into actuality. Phenomenality is the felt tension of this reopening—an ontological return that underlies perception, agency, memory, and selfhood.

The hope is that this model offers a foundation for a more integrative science of consciousness—one that respects the autonomy of physics, biology, and phenomenology while revealing their deep structural unity through recurrence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (Final Version)

Acknowledgements

The recurrence framework and the broader MNO theory were developed independently through a long-term program of artistic research, theoretical reflection, and phenomenological analysis. Although the present work engages with insights from quantum foundations, neuroscience, and philosophy of mind, its core structure emerged autonomously rather than as an extension of any existing scientific framework.

I thank the many researchers whose questions and unresolved tensions helped shape the problem field to which this work responds. Discussions in physics (quantum measurement and observer-relativity), neuroscience (predictive processing and global dynamics), and philosophy (the explanatory gap and the structure of appearance) have clarified where contemporary theory succeeds and where it remains incomplete.

No funding agency supported this research. The work was carried out outside of institutional structures, sustained by independent inquiry and lived phenomenological investigation. Any errors or limitations remain entirely my own.

I also acknowledge the broader community of thinkers—across science, philosophy, and the arts—whose efforts to understand consciousness and measurement continue to inspire this integrative direction of investigation.

References

Penrose, R. (1989). *The Emperor's New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds, and the Laws of Physics.* Oxford University Press.

Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). Consciousness in the universe: A review of the 'Orch OR' theory. *Physics of Life Reviews, 11*(1), 39–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plrev.2013.11.013

Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 11*(2), 127–138. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2787

Schurger, A., Sitt, J. D., & Dehaene, S. (2012). An accumulator model for spontaneous neural activity prior to self-initiated movement. *PNAS, 109*(42), E2904–E2913. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1210467109

Carhart-Harris, R. L., & Friston, K. J. (2019). REBUS and the anarchic brain: Toward a unified model of the brain action of psychedelics. *Pharmacological Reviews, 71*(3), 316–344. https://doi.org/10.1124/pr.118.017160

Tononi, G. (2008). Consciousness as integrated information: A provisional manifesto. *The Biological Bulletin, 215*(3), 216–242. https://doi.org/10.2307/25470707

Speed, T. (2025). *The Physics of the Poor.* Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17803906. ISBN-10: 3695191287.