

**The Attralucian Essays:**  
Exploring the Finite



First Edition

Copyright © 2026 by Kevin R. Haylett. All rights reserved.

This work is shared under the Creative Commons Licence.

Creative Commons CC BY-ND 4.0 License.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>

This work is intended for academic and research use. Any unauthorized distribution, modification, or commercial use beyond the creative use license is strictly prohibited. Typeset in

L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X

# The Attralucian Essays



Quantum Decoherence and Classicality:  
A Geofinitist Reinterpretation

Kevin R. Haylett

# Quantum Decoherence and Classicality: A Geofinitist Reinterpretation

## Overview

Quantum decoherence describes how interactions with an environment suppress quantum coherence, leading to the emergence of classical behavior. While widely accepted as a key mechanism in the quantum-to-classical transition, decoherence does not by itself resolve foundational questions such as outcome selection or the measurement problem.

This paper does not propose a new interpretation of quantum mechanics. Instead, it offers a Geofinitist reinterpretation: decoherence is treated as an *operational, measurable phenomenon*, grounded in finite systems, uncertainty, and reproducible experimental procedures. Classicality is reframed as a *stability band*—a regime in which coherence is suppressed, records become redundant, and quantum effects are no longer recoverable within experimental limits.

## **From Idealised Dynamics to Measured Processes**

Standard quantum theory models systems in a Hilbert space with density operators  $\rho$  evolving under unitary or open-system dynamics. These models are powerful abstractions. However, experimental access is always finite:

- states are reconstructed via tomography with uncertainty,
- dynamics are inferred from finite data,
- measurements are coarse-grained and noisy.

Geofinitism treats these limitations not as imperfections, but as defining features of the problem.

## **Geofinitist Principles Applied**

### **1. Finite Container Space**

Hilbert-space models provide a continuous, often high-dimensional description. In practice, experiments probe finite subspaces determined by preparation, measurement, and energy constraints. Observed dynamics are therefore trajectories within a finite, measurable container.

## **2. Measurement and Uncertainty**

Quantum states are not directly accessible. They are reconstructed as measured objects:

$$\rho_t^{\text{M}} = (\rho_t, \varepsilon_{\rho,t}),$$

with uncertainties arising from sampling noise, calibration error, and finite statistics.

## **3. Layered Emergence**

Classical behavior does not arise in a single step. It emerges through a cascade:

- microscopic quantum dynamics,
- interaction with environment,
- formation of macroscopic records,
- observation and interpretation.

## **4. Contextual Validity**

Concepts such as “wavefunction collapse” or “preferred basis” depend on experimental context. Geofinitism treats them as operational constructs, defined by measurement and stability rather than metaphysical necessity.

## 5. Finite Constraints

All observations occur under finite time resolution, energy bounds, and measurement precision. Continuous-time and infinite-precision descriptions are limiting abstractions.

## Operational Decoherence

Let  $\rho_t^{\text{M}}$  be a measured density operator at time  $t$ , and  $\Lambda_{\Delta t}^{\text{M}}$  a measured dynamical map.

Define coherence relative to a basis  $B = \{b_i\}$ :

$$C_B(t) = \sum_{i \neq j} |\rho_t^{(ij)}| \pm \varepsilon_{C,t}.$$

Define a basis-invariant alternative via relative entropy:

$$C_{\text{rel}}(t) = S(\rho_t^{\text{diag}}) - S(\rho_t) \pm \varepsilon_{S,t}.$$

## Pointer Basis Selection

Rather than assuming a preferred basis, we define it operationally.

Let  $B$  be a candidate basis. Define a robustness functional:

$$\mathcal{R}(B) = \mathbb{E}_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \left[ \sum_i \text{Var}_t(b_i \rho_t b_i) - \lambda \sum_{i \neq j} |\rho_t^{(ij)}|^2 \right].$$

The pointer basis  $B^*$  maximizes  $\mathcal{R}(B)$  within measurement tolerances.

## **Operational Decoherence Criterion**

Fix thresholds  $(\tau_C, \tau_S)$  and a time window  $\mathcal{W}$ .

A system is said to decohere in basis  $B$  over  $\mathcal{W}$  if:

$$\max_{t \in \mathcal{W}} C_B(t) \lesssim \tau_C, \quad \max_{t \in \mathcal{W}} C_{\text{rel}}(t) \lesssim \tau_S.$$

## **Environmental Redundancy and Classicality**

Let  $\{E_k\}$  be environmental fragments. Define redundancy:

$$\mathcal{R}_O(t) = |\{k : I_{\mathbb{M}}(O : E_k)_t \geq \iota\}|,$$

where  $I_{\mathbb{M}}$  is measured mutual information.

Large redundancy indicates the emergence of objective classical records.

## **Recoverability and Irreversibility**

Define recoverability under intervention:

$$\text{Rec}(\Delta) = F(\rho_t, \rho_{t+\Delta}^{\text{echo}}) \pm \varepsilon_{\text{rec}}.$$

- High recoverability  $\Rightarrow$  reversible coherence loss,

- Low recoverability  $\Rightarrow$  effective decoherence.

## **Classicality Band**

Classical behavior is defined as a stability regime where:

- coherence is suppressed ( $C_B \leq \tau_C$ ),
- observables are stable,
- environmental redundancy is high,
- recoverability is low.

If these conditions are not jointly satisfied within uncertainty bounds, the system is classified as INDETERMINATE.

## **Interpretation**

In this framework:

- Decoherence is not a metaphysical collapse,
- Classicality is not a binary event,
- Measurement is a finite, auditable process.

Quantum-to-classical transition is thus a measurable pattern of:

- coherence suppression,
- basis stability,
- redundancy of records,

- irreversibility under intervention.

## **Conclusion**

The standard theory of decoherence remains intact as an abstract framework. Geofinitism reframes it within finite, measurable regimes.

This yields a practical methodology: identify classical behavior through measurable thresholds, robustness criteria, and reproducible experiments, without committing to a particular interpretation of quantum mechanics.

**Context.** Decoherence is treated as an operational phenomenon: suppression of coherence, stabilization of basis, and emergence of classical records under finite measurement conditions.

**Measured States.**

$$\rho_t^{\text{M}} = (\rho_t, \varepsilon_{\rho,t})$$

**Measured Dynamics.**

$$\Lambda_{\Delta t}^{\text{M}} = (\Lambda_{\Delta t}, \varepsilon_{\Lambda})$$

**Coherence.**

$$C_B(t) = \sum_{i \neq j} |\rho_t^{(ij)}|$$

**Decoherence Criterion.**

$$C_B(t) \leq \tau_C, \quad C_{\text{rel}}(t) \leq \tau_S$$

**Pointer Basis.**

$$B^* = \arg \max_B \mathcal{R}(B)$$

**Redundancy.**

$$\mathcal{R}_O(t) = |\{k : I(O : E_k) \geq \iota\}|$$

**Recoverability.**

$$\text{Rec}(\Delta) = F(\rho, \rho^{\text{echo}})$$

**Decision.** Classicality holds within tolerance; otherwise abstain.