Structural Resonance: A Metaphysical Companion to a Conditional Born-Rule Derivation

Aernoud Dekker

June 2026

Abstract

This companion paper explains how a structural reading of the *Katha Upanishad* guided the search that led to the conditional Born-rule derivation in finite observer record geometry. It does not claim that the Upanishad proves quantum mechanics, that ancient authors anticipated the Born rule, or that metaphysical language can replace mathematical derivation. The claim is narrower and methodological: Vedantic analysis of subject, object, witness, and finite cognition supplied a disciplined structural filter. It suggested which mathematical invariances were worth looking for: pushforward-only access, contextual fibres with noncontextual operational descent, invariance under admissible changes of resolution, and fixed-point behaviour under refinement. The technical derivation itself is carried by classical probability, Markov morphisms, Cencov's uniqueness theorem, Fisher–Rao geometry, and the BLQC scalar-threshold homogeneity that pins the laboratory basis coordinate to the Fisher arclength. The Upanishadic contribution is therefore not derivational authority but search architecture: it helped identify the shape of the problem before the mathematics made that shape precise.

1 Purpose

The conditional Born-rule paper [1] is written in the language of mathematical physics. It starts from finite observer records, treats admissible changes of resolution as Markov maps, invokes Cencov's theorem to select Fisher–Rao geometry, and obtains the binary Born form as the calibrated square-root geometry of a binary record. Its central formula is

$$p(\theta) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right),$$

where θ is the physical basis coordinate of a laboratory measurement — not a Hilbert-space angle. The geometric identity $p(s) = \cos^2(s/2)$ is recovered for the Fisher–Rao arclength s on observer-record space; the identification $s = \alpha\theta$ is then made by the scalar form of the BLQC threshold.

This paper asks a different question: how did the structural path to that derivation become visible? The answer, historically and conceptually, is that the Ignorant Observer Framework (IOF) [2] did not begin as a search for a clever probability identity. It began as an attempt to formalize a very old subject-object insight: an observer embedded in what it observes cannot completely objectify the conditions of its own observation.

The *Katha Upanishad*, as taught in Swami Sarvapriyananda's lecture series [3], was useful because it gives a compact structural grammar for that situation. Its language is metaphysical, but the structure is precise enough to constrain a mathematical search. It distinguishes the empirical subject from the witness, describes cognition as outward-facing and layered, treats the witness as unobjectifiable, and uses *Om* as a support that resists finite grasp. Those motifs do not prove any equation. They do, however, point toward a particular class of equations: equations invariant under finite resolution, projection, and refinement.

2 What This Paper Does Not Claim

The boundary is important. This paper does not claim:

- that Vedanta contains quantum mechanics in coded form;
- that the *Katha Upanishad* is evidence for the Born rule;
- that Sanskrit terms should be treated as physical postulates;
- that metaphysical insight can substitute for proof;
- that the conditional Born derivation establishes full quantum mechanics.

The claim is instead that contemplative traditions can sometimes preserve structural observations about observation itself. When these structures are translated carefully, they can function as search heuristics. The test of the heuristic is not textual authority. The test is whether it points toward mathematical constraints that independently do real work.

In the present case, the constraints that did real work were not mystical. They were ordinary mathematical objects: pushforwards of probability measures, Markov kernels, sufficient statistics, Fisher–Rao geometry, square-root coordinates, and the scalar-threshold calibration condition of BLQC.

3 The Problem the Katha Helped Filter

The Born-rule problem inside IOF initially had too many degrees of freedom. One could try to define an admissible-history measure μ_A and then ask whether its finite-observer pushforward produces the Born rule. But this is dangerous. If μ_A is chosen because it produces $|\langle\psi, e\rangle|^2$, the Born rule has merely been inserted under another name.

The search therefore needed non-circular structural constraints. The useful question became:

$$\text{Which operational probability rule survives finite observer projection}$$

$$\text{without depending on arbitrary hidden context or resolution choices?}$$

This is where the Upanishadic reading mattered. It did not say what the probability should be. It pointed toward the kind of rule one should seek: a rule stable under the passage from contextual depth to operational surface.

That instruction is metaphysical in vocabulary but mathematical in shape. It says: do not ask what the hidden object is; ask what remains invariant when the observer's access is finite, outward-facing, and structurally unable to grasp its own witness-condition as an object.

4 Five Structural Translations

4.1 The Senses Face Outward: Pushforward Discipline

The *Katha Upanishad* states that the senses are directed outward. The inward turn is not the default operation of the apparatus; it is a reversal against the grain of ordinary cognition. Structurally, this is a statement about access direction.

In the Born-rule search, this became a proof discipline. The finite observer does not invert its record map. It receives operational records as a pushforward:

$$p_C(m|\lambda) = \mu_\lambda\{a \in A : R_C(a) = m\}.$$

The hidden fibre $R_C^{-1}(m)$ is not available as a single object. It is a fibre of unresolved histories. Therefore a valid IOF derivation must proceed forward from admissible histories to records, not backward from observed outcomes to imagined hidden states.

This prevented a common failure mode: treating the hidden preimage of an outcome as if it were a function rather than a fibre. The Upanishadic metaphor did not prove the measure theory, but it made the directionality non-negotiable.

4.2 Two Selves in One Cave: Fibre and Base

The *Katha* speaks of two in the cave: the empirical self that acts and receives the fruits of action, and the deeper witness. Read structurally, this is not a claim about two substances. It is a distinction between two levels of description occupying one locus.

In IOF terms, this became the distinction between contextual microstructure and operational record. The appropriate mathematical object is not merely a noisy projection but a fibration:

$$\pi : A_\psi \to M.$$

Contextual histories live in the fibres $\pi^{-1}(m)$. Operational event weights live on the base M. A probability rule is stable only if it descends from the fibres to the base without requiring an arbitrary choice of fibre measure.

This was one of the clearest places where the metaphysical structure became mathematically useful. It suggested that the hard problem was not to remove contextuality, but to let contextuality remain in the fibre while recovering noncontextual operational weights on the base. In later toy checks, Born-like weights were precisely the ones that descended without extra context weighting; non-Born alternatives retained dependence on how the unobserved fibre was weighted.

4.3 One Ladder, Two Readings: Record Geometry and State Geometry

The *Katha* presents layered accounts of cognition and reality: senses, mind, intellect, the great principle, the unmanifest, and the Self. The same ladder can be read psychologically and cosmologically. The structural claim is that inner and outer are not two unrelated hierarchies; they are two readings of one ordering.

This suggested the most important mathematical target: the observer's statistical distinguishability geometry and the geometry normally assigned to quantum states should not be unrelated.

The technical Born paper expresses this conservatively. It does not assume Hilbert geometry. It starts from record probabilities and obtains Fisher–Rao geometry:

$$ds^2_{\mathrm{FR}} = \sum_i \frac{dp_i^2}{p_i}.$$

Then the square-root map

$$q_i = \sqrt{p_i}$$

turns this record geometry into spherical geometry:

$$ds^2_{\mathrm{FR}} = 4 \sum_i dq_i^2.$$

In the binary case, this immediately gives

$$p(s) = \cos^2\left(\frac{s}{2}\right).$$

Thus the old "one ladder, two readings" motif became a search for a single geometry seen from two sides: observer-record distinguishability from below, and quantum-state distinguishability from above. The conditional Born-rule derivation [1] proves the record side and, via the BLQC bridge, pins the laboratory basis coordinate to the Fisher arclength on that record manifold. The further identification with complex Hilbert-state geometry remains a later problem.

4.4 *Kutastha*: Invariance Under Admissible Resolution

The term *kutastha* carries the sense of standing without bending. In metaphysical language it names the unchanging witness. Structurally, it suggests invariance: what is real at the witness level is not deformed by ordinary changes of empirical framing.

In the technical derivation this became the demand that distinguishability should not depend on arbitrary finite-resolution changes. If a refinement merely splits an outcome by parameter-independent weights, it should not change the geometry of the observer's model. If a coarse-graining merely forgets distinctions, it should act by a Markov map. These are exactly the conditions under which Cencov's theorem becomes relevant.

Cencov's theorem then supplies the mathematical content:

$$g_p(u, v) = c \sum_i \frac{u_i v_i}{p_i}.$$

That is, Fisher–Rao geometry is selected not because one wants the Born rule, but because it is the unique classical statistical geometry invariant under sufficient Markov morphisms. The metaphysical term *kutastha* did not enter the proof. It helped identify invariance under admissible observer-resolution as the correct target.

4.5 *Om* as *Alambana*: The Fixed Point of Refinement

In the *Katha*, *Om* is presented as a highest support, an *alambana*. The important structural feature is not sound symbolism. It is that the support resists objectification. It gives the mind something by which to orient, but not another finite object to grasp.

This suggested a fixed-point reading. A finite observer can refine its description, coarsen it, recalibrate it, and try again. A rule that still changes under the right admissible refinement has not reached the level of stable operational form. The target is therefore a rule with no further resolution-dependent correction to give.

In the exploratory work, this appeared as a resolution-coarsening fixed-point idea. Naive blur does not preserve Born; it attenuates visibility, as unresolved reference information always does — an observer-relative phase-averaging effect on the unconditioned record, recoverable in principle once the missing reference information is supplied. But a coarsening map that includes eigenstate recalibration makes Born a fixed point and drives tested non-Born rules toward it. This remains more conditional than the Fisher–Rao part, because the coarsening operator itself must be justified from IOF rather than chosen because it works.

The metaphysical lesson is therefore disciplined: the *alambana* motif suggested the fixed-point question, but did not settle which operator is physically admissible.

5 How the Structural Reading Became the Conditional Born-Rule Derivation

The technical Born paper can now be read as the cleaned-up mathematical residue of this search. The metaphysical path did not survive as premise; it survived as architecture.

First, the outward-facing apparatus motif forced the derivation to begin with finite records rather than hidden inversions. A record is a probability vector

$$p = (p_1, \ldots, p_n).$$

Second, the finite-resolution theme forced admissible record changes to be Markov and sufficient. Nested projections induce Markov kernels. Sufficient refinements preserve model distinguishability. This made Cencov's theorem relevant.

Third, the *kutastha* motif pointed toward invariant distinguishability geometry. Cencov's theorem selected Fisher–Rao geometry as the unique candidate.

Fourth, the one-ladder/two-readings motif suggested that square-root record geometry was not an arbitrary trick. It is how Fisher–Rao geometry appears when expressed as spherical geometry. In the binary calibrated case, probabilities become squares of spherical coordinates.

Fifth, the finite-rate basis-tracking side of IOF — formalised as Bandwidth-Limited Quantum Control (BLQC) — supplied the calibration question. The BLQC threshold

$$\kappa = h_{\mathrm{KS}} - C_{\mathrm{eff}} \ln 2$$

is written as a scalar: one threshold across the calibrated basis range. Under the Fisher capacity bridge — the assumption that useful C_{eff} is capacity for reducing operational distinguishability error in finite records — the scalar form becomes a calibration consistency claim: equal increments of the lab basis coordinate θ must impose equal Fisher cost. Equivalently, the constant-Fisher-information condition

$$I(\theta) = \alpha^2$$

holds across the calibrated range. Combined with the binary Fisher identity and the endpoint calibrations $p(0) = 1$, $p(\pi) = 0$ on the first monotone interval, this fixes $\alpha = 1$ and yields

$$p(\theta) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$$

in the laboratory basis coordinate. Constant $I(\theta)$ is also what standard quantum mechanics predicts for an ideal binary measurement family, so the condition functions as a calibration consistency claim, not as a discriminator between the bridge and quantum mechanics. The *alambana* motif's "support that does not deform under finite reframing" reads naturally as this uniformity-of-calibration claim: the scalar threshold is the structural support, and homogeneity of Fisher cost along θ is its operational consequence.

This sequence is the precise sense in which the Upanishadic analysis inspired the conditional derivation. It did not provide the equations. It made the correct mathematical pressure points visible.

6 Why This Is Not Quantum Mysticism

The phrase "structural correspondence" is easy to abuse. In this context it has a strict meaning. Two traditions correspond structurally when they independently isolate the same abstract constraints, even if they describe them in different languages and for different purposes. The "resonance" in this paper's title is the evocative register; the operative relation here, and throughout the broader corpus, is *structural correspondence* in this strict sense.

The correspondence claimed here is not:

Katha says Born rule.

It is:

Katha analyzes observation as finite, outward-facing, layered,

and unable to objectify its witness-condition.

When translated into mathematics, this points toward pushforwards, fibres, invariance under admissible resolution, and fixed points of refinement. Those are legitimate mathematical structures. They either help or they do not.

The fact that the resulting search led to Fisher–Rao geometry matters because Fisher–Rao geometry is not a private metaphysical invention. It is a standard object in information geometry. The fact that Cencov's theorem selects it matters because the selection is mathematical, not textual. The fact that the binary square-root geometry gives the Born form matters because it is an elementary consequence of the selected metric. And the BLQC scalar-threshold reading of the lab basis coordinate matters because the pinning of θ to the Fisher arclength is a calibration claim with a definite consistency check: a measured non-constant $I(\theta)$ across the calibrated range would refute it. The expected outcome — constant $I(\theta)$ — is also the standard quantum-mechanical prediction, so the check probes the consistency of the calibration rather than discriminating the bridge from quantum mechanics.

This is the correct division of labour:

Vedantic analysis: structural heuristic;

information geometry: mathematical selection;

physics: empirical and operational interpretation.

7 What Remains Open

The companion paper should not make the technical result look stronger than it is. Several burdens remain.

First, the conditional Born-rule paper [1] derives the binary Born form in the laboratory basis coordinate θ under two explicit bridge assumptions — the Fisher capacity bridge and scalar-threshold homogeneity. It does not derive complex Hilbert space, tensor products, unitary dynamics, the multi-outcome Born rule, or the full Hilbert-space geometry of quantum states. The central burden is foundational: justifying the two bridge assumptions theoretically rather than postulating them. BLQC's Fisher-homogeneity module provides a consistency check — a non-constant $I(\theta)$ would refute the calibration — but its expected positive outcome is also predicted by standard quantum mechanics, and therefore lends no evidential weight to the bridge.

Second, the full IOF admissible-history measure remains open. The fibre/base picture clarifies the object to be constructed, but does not yet construct it.

Third, the fixed-point route remains promising but operator-dependent. The correct coarsening/refinement operator must be derived from finite observer projection, not selected because it has Born as a fixed point.

Fourth, the metaphysical language must remain downstream of mathematical discipline. If a proposed Sanskrit-to-math translation does not lead to a clear invariant, map, measure, metric, or variational principle, it should not enter the physics paper.

8 Conclusion

The *Katha Upanishad* helped the Born-rule route by making the structure of observation sharper. Its useful contribution was not a formula but a set of constraints: finite outward access, layered mediation, non-invertibility of the observed record, contextual depth beneath operational surface, invariance of the witness condition, and stability under refinement.

When translated into contemporary mathematics, these constraints pointed toward a finite-observer record geometry. That path led to Markov maps, sufficient refinements, Cencov uniqueness, Fisher–Rao geometry, square-root coordinates, and the BLQC scalar-threshold calibration that pins the laboratory basis coordinate to the Fisher arclength. Those tools then produced the conditional binary Born form in the companion paper [1].

The metaphysical companion therefore has a modest but real role. It explains why this route was searched, why these constraints were selected, and how a contemplative science of observation can inspire a mathematically disciplined reconstruction without becoming a substitute for it.

References

[1] Aernoud Dekker. The born rule from finite observation: A conditional derivation of the binary born form. 2026. doi: 10.17605/OSF.IO/U5RDE. June 2026.

[2] Aernoud Dekker. The ignorant observer: Formalizing ignorance as a physical constraint on observation. 2026. doi: 10.17605/OSF.IO/FCDSN. June 2026.

[3] Swami Sarvapriyananda. Katha upanishad | swami sarvapriyananda. Lecture series, Vedanta Society of New York, YouTube playlist. `https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLDqahtm2vA72naWj1foEqGFQiN_bRI5my`.

[4] Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan. *The Principal Upanishads.* George Allen & Unwin, 1953.

[5] Nikolai N. Cencov. *Statistical Decision Rules and Optimal Inference*, volume 53 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs.* American Mathematical Society, 1982.

[6] Shun-ichi Amari and Hiroshi Nagaoka. *Methods of Information Geometry*, volume 191 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs.* American Mathematical Society, 2000.

[7] William K. Wootters. Statistical distance and hilbert space. *Physical Review D*, 23:357–362, 1981. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.23.357.