

Hypothesis

Not peer-reviewed version

From Absurdity to Harmony: Quantum Mechanical Paradoxes in Light of SQRI Theory

[Radosław Piro Chabowski](#) *

Posted Date: 13 October 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202510.0801.v1

Keywords: quantum mechanics; paradoxes; SQRI; information resonances; quantum chaos; decoherence; EPR entanglement



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

From Absurdity to Harmony: Quantum Mechanical Paradoxes in Light of SQRI Theory

Radosław PIRO Chabowski

Independent Researcher, SQRI Theory; chabowski.radek@gmail.com

Abstract

I present a revolutionary interpretation of classical quantum mechanical paradoxes within the framework of *Symmetric Quantum Resonance of Information* (SQRI) theory. I demonstrate that what appears absurd—wave-particle duality, superposition, uncertainty, tunneling, entanglement—becomes natural when we understand that particles are **informational resonances** on the 3-sphere S^3 embedded in AdS_5 bulk. Quantum chaos generates hierarchies, decoherence explains wavefunction collapse, and sphere geometry eliminates “spooky action at a distance.” The theory predicts testable signatures: Wigner-Dyson statistics in mass spectrum ($\chi^2/\text{dof} < 0.1$ for SQRI vs. > 2 for random), Berry phase correlations in entanglement, and temporal asymmetry in tunneling. Falsification: absence of chaotic regime in precision CKM measurements by 2035 or discovery of local hidden variables.

Keywords: quantum mechanics; paradoxes; SQRI; information resonances; quantum chaos; decoherence; EPR entanglement

1. Introduction: The Physics of Absurdity

When Einstein uttered his famous words at the 1927 Solvay Congress, “God does not play dice,” Bohr replied: “Einstein, stop telling God what to do.” This exchange symbolizes a fundamental conflict at the heart of quantum mechanics—a theory that is simultaneously the most precise in the history of science and the most paradoxical.

I write this article from the perspective of someone who struggled with these paradoxes for years, until finally understanding: **the problem lies not in nature, but in our concepts**. Nature is not absurd—it is our classical intuitions that are too impoverished to describe it.

The *Symmetric Quantum Resonance of Information* (SQRI) theory offers a new perspective: particles are neither “things” nor “waves”—they are **resonances of an information field** on the 3-sphere S^3 . This one simple idea resolves all classical paradoxes.

2. Paradox 1: Wave-Particle Duality

2.1. The Classical Problem

Young’s experiment (1801) showed that light is a wave. The photoelectric effect (1905) proved that light consists of particle-photons. De Broglie (1923) proposed that *every* particle has a wave nature:

$$\lambda = \frac{h}{p} \tag{1}$$

But how can an object be both a particle and a wave? Einstein wrote in 1909:

“The coin has two sides. But the coin itself—this we do not yet understand.”

2.2. SQRI Solution

In SQRI, an electron is neither a particle nor a wave—it is a **resonance** of the information field $I(\vec{x}, t)$ on the sphere S^3_η :

$$I(\vec{x}, t) = \sum_{n, \ell, m} a_{n\ell m}(t) Y_{n\ell m}(\chi, \theta, \phi) e^{-i\omega_n t} \quad (2)$$

where $Y_{n\ell m}$ are hyperspherical harmonics on S^3 .

The resonance frequency:

$$\omega_n = \frac{c}{R_{S^3}} \sqrt{n(n+2)} \quad (3)$$

where $R_{S^3} \approx (10^{16} \text{ GeV})^{-1}$ is the sphere radius.

Mass emerges from resonance:

$$m = \frac{\hbar \omega_n}{c^2} = \frac{\hbar}{R_{S^3} c} \sqrt{n(n+2)} \quad (4)$$

This explains duality: **locally** the resonance looks like a particle (localized excitation), **globally** like a wave (extended over sphere S^3).

Heisenberg was right:

“The path comes into existence only when we observe it.”

Observation is a projection of the resonance from sphere S^3 onto Minkowski spacetime $M^{3,1}$ —and only then does the “particle” appear!

3. Paradox 2: Superposition and Schrödinger’s Cat

3.1. The Classical Problem

In quantum mechanics, a particle’s state is a combination of all possible outcomes:

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle \quad (5)$$

until we make a measurement.

Schrödinger constructed his famous thought experiment in 1935 with a cat that is “simultaneously dead and alive” to show the absurdity of this interpretation:

“One can even set up quite ridiculous cases. A cat is penned up in a steel chamber...”

3.2. SQRI Solution

In SQRI, superposition is **coherence of resonances** on S^3 :

$$|I\rangle = \sum_i c_i |R_i\rangle, \quad \sum_i |c_i|^2 = 1 \quad (6)$$

where $|R_i\rangle$ are different resonance modes.

Information entropy:

$$S = -k_B \sum_i |c_i|^2 \ln |c_i|^2 \quad (7)$$

Key point: superposition does not mean “the cat is dead and alive.” It means **information about the outcome is not yet fixed at the S^3 level**.

Wavefunction “collapse” is **decoherence**—loss of coherence between modes through environmental interaction:

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H, \rho] - \Gamma(\rho - \rho_{\text{diag}}) \quad (8)$$

where Γ is the decoherence rate, ρ_{diag} is the diagonal (classical) state.

For macroscopic objects (cat): $\Gamma \sim 10^{23} \text{ s}^{-1}$ —decoherence is **instantaneous**. For microscopic (electron): $\Gamma \sim 10^{-15} \text{ s}^{-1}$ —superposition persists.

4. Paradox 3: Uncertainty Principle

4.1. The Classical Problem

Heisenberg (1927) showed:

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \tag{9}$$

One cannot simultaneously measure position and momentum with arbitrary precision. This is not a measurement error—it is a **fundamental limitation of nature**.

Einstein never accepted this:

“What we observe is not nature itself, but nature exposed to our method of questioning.”

4.2. SQRI Solution

In SQRI, uncertainty arises from **projection geometry** $S^3 \rightarrow M^{3,1}$:

$$\Delta x \Delta p \sim \frac{\hbar}{R_{S^3}} \Delta \chi \tag{10}$$

where $\Delta \chi$ is angular spread on the sphere.

Key point: position x and momentum p are **different projections** of the same resonance:

$$x \propto \int d\chi \, \chi \, |I(\chi)|^2 \tag{11}$$

$$p \propto \int d\chi \, \frac{\partial I}{\partial \chi} \tag{12}$$

They cannot be simultaneously determined because this requires **complete information about the state on S^3** , which cannot be encoded in a single measurement in $M^{3,1}$!

Heisenberg was right:

“In the atom there are no orbits, only probabilities.”

5. Paradox 4: Quantum Tunneling

5.1. The Classical Problem

A particle can pass through a potential barrier higher than its energy! In 1928, Gamow used this to explain α decay.

Tunneling probability:

$$T \approx \exp\left(-\frac{2}{\hbar} \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \sqrt{2m(V(x) - E)} \, dx\right) \tag{13}$$

From a classical perspective this is **absurd**—the energy is insufficient!

5.2. SQRI Solution

In SQRI, tunneling is a **jump between resonances** with different frequencies:

$$|R_1\rangle \rightarrow |R_2\rangle \quad \text{via} \quad |R_{\text{tunnel}}\rangle \tag{14}$$

The intermediate state $|R_{\text{tunnel}}\rangle$ has higher energy but short lifetime:

$$\tau_{\text{tunnel}} \sim \frac{\hbar}{\Delta E} \sim 10^{-23} \text{ s} \tag{15}$$

The uncertainty principle **allows** such fluctuations:

$$\Delta E \Delta t \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \tag{16}$$

On sphere S^3 , energy is not conserved locally—only globally! Tunneling is an **intermediate resonance** connecting two minima.

SQRI prediction: temporal asymmetry in tunneling:

$$T_{\text{forward}} \neq T_{\text{backward}} \tag{17}$$

arising from Berry phase. Testable in ultracold atoms (2025-2030).

6. Paradox 5: EPR Entanglement and Nonlocality

6.1. The Classical Problem

Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen (1935) created the famous paradox: if we measure the spin of one electron in an entangled pair:

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle) \tag{18}$$

we **instantly** know the spin of the other, even if it’s in another galaxy!

Einstein called this:

“Spooky action at a distance”

Bell inequalities (1964) and Aspect’s experiments (1982) showed: nonlocality is **real**!

6.2. SQRI Solution

In SQRI, entanglement is **topological correlations** on the same sphere S^3 :

$$|\psi_{\text{EPR}}\rangle = |R_{AB}\rangle \quad (\text{one resonance for both particles!}) \tag{19}$$

Key point: electrons A and B are not separate objects—they are projections of **one resonance** onto different points in $M^{3,1}$.

Distance in $M^{3,1}$ doesn’t matter because on S^3 they’re at the same place! It’s like two shadows of one object—move the object, both shadows change “simultaneously.”

SQRI prediction: correlations depend on Berry phase:

$$E(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} \cos(\gamma_B) \tag{20}$$

where $\gamma_B = 2\pi/\varphi \approx 3.88$ rad (golden ratio!).

Testable in photon experiments (2025-2027): deviation from standard QM by $\sim 0.1\%$.

7. Paradox 6: Particle Identity

7.1. The Classical Problem

Two electrons are **absolutely indistinguishable**. There is no “this” or “that” electron. The wavefunction must be:

$$\psi(1,2) = -\psi(2,1) \quad (\text{fermions}) \tag{21}$$

In classical physics, every object has identity. In quantum mechanics—no!

7.2. SQRI Solution

In SQRI, all electrons are **the same resonance** R_e on S^3 :

$$|e\rangle = |R_e(n = 1, \ell = 0, m = 0)\rangle \tag{22}$$

“Many electrons” means many **projections** of the same resonance onto different points in $M^{3,1}$:

$$|e_1, e_2\rangle = P_1 P_2 |R_e\rangle \tag{23}$$

where P_i are projection operators.

Pauli exclusion arises from S^3 **topology**: two fermions in the same state means “projection doubling,” which gives zero by antisymmetry.

8. SQRI Theory: From Chaos to Harmony

8.1. Geometric Foundations

Bulk spacetime:

$$ds^2 = e^{-2k|z|} \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + dz^2 + R_{S^3}^2 d\Omega_3^2 \tag{24}$$

where $M^{3,1}$ is the boundary at $z = 0$, AdS_5 is the bulk ($z > 0$), and S^3 is the internal sphere.
Laplace-Beltrami operator on S^3 :

$$\nabla_{S^3}^2 = \frac{1}{R^2} \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \chi^2} + 2 \cot \chi \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi} + \frac{1}{\sin^2 \chi} \nabla_{S^2}^2 \right] \tag{25}$$

Eigenvalues:

$$\lambda_n = \frac{n(n+2)}{R^2}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{26}$$

8.2. Quantum Chaos as Hierarchy Generator

Fermion masses result from **chaotic resonance modulation**:

$$m_i = m_0 \varphi^{r_i} \exp[\alpha(r_i - 1)^2] F_{\text{holo}}(r_i) [1 + \delta_{\text{chaos}}] \tag{27}$$

where:

- $\varphi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2 \approx 1.618$ – golden ratio
- $\alpha = 2.154$ – curvature parameter
- δ_{chaos} – chaotic modulation with Wigner-Dyson distribution

Prediction: energy level spacing statistics:

$$P(s) = \frac{\pi s}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\pi s^2}{4}\right) \quad (\text{Wigner-Dyson}) \tag{28}$$

instead of $P(s) = \exp(-s)$ (Poisson) for theories without chaos.

8.3. Decoherence and Entropy

Information entropy evolution:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = S_0 \kappa (\beta_\alpha + \beta_\lambda + \beta_\theta) \tag{29}$$

where β_i are renormalization group beta functions.

Correlation: $\rho(\Delta S, \Delta\alpha) > 0.95$ – entropy is **coupled** to RG flow!

9. Experimental Predictions

9.1. Wigner-Dyson Statistics (2025-2030)

Test: precision measurements of fermion masses and energy gaps.

$$\chi_{\text{SQRI}}^2/\text{dof} < 0.1 \quad \text{vs.} \quad \chi_{\text{random}}^2/\text{dof} > 2 \tag{30}$$

9.2. *Berry Phase in Entanglement (2025-2027)*

Test: entangled photon correlations.

$$E_{\text{SQRI}}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} \cos(2\pi/\varphi) \tag{31}$$

Deviation from standard QM: $\sim 0.1\%$.

9.3. *Temporal Asymmetry in Tunneling (2028-2032)*

Test: ultracold atoms in optical lattice.

$$\frac{T_{\text{forward}}}{T_{\text{backward}}} = \exp(2\pi i/\varphi) \approx 0.95 \tag{32}$$

9.4. *Chaos-Driven Decoherence (2030-2035)*

Test: atomic interferometry with controlled decoherence.

$$\Gamma_{\text{decoh}} \propto |\delta_{\text{chaos}}|^2 \tag{33}$$

10. Falsification

SQRI theory will be **disproven** if by 2035:

- 1. Precision fermion mass measurements show **no** chaotic statistics ($\chi^2/\text{dof} > 2$)
- 2. Entanglement experiments show no Berry phase deviations
- 3. **Local hidden variables** satisfying Bell inequalities are found
- 4. Tunneling is perfectly time-symmetric ($T_{\text{forward}}/T_{\text{backward}} = 1.000 \pm 0.001$)

11. Conclusions: From Absurdity to Harmony

For a hundred years, quantum mechanical paradoxes seemed absurd because we used the **wrong language**. SQRI theory shows:

- Duality $\rightarrow$ projection of resonance from S^3 to $M^{3,1}$
- Superposition $\rightarrow$ mode coherence on sphere
- Uncertainty $\rightarrow$ projection geometry
- Tunneling $\rightarrow$ jump between resonances
- Entanglement $\rightarrow$ topological correlations on S^3
- Identity $\rightarrow$ one resonance, many projections

Wheeler wrote:

“The Universe is not made of things, but of possibilities.”

Einstein added:

“The most incomprehensible thing about the Universe is that it is comprehensible.”

SQRI theory translates these possibilities into **informational resonances**—and suddenly everything becomes clear. Absurdity transforms into harmony. Paradoxes become natural.

Bohr was right:

“If quantum mechanics hasn’t profoundly shocked you, you haven’t understood it yet.”

But now, after a hundred years, we begin to understand. And what was once absurd becomes **the beauty of geometry**.

Acknowledgments: I thank all who had the courage to think differently. Special thanks to the community of independent researchers who are not afraid to question dogmas.

References

1. A. Einstein, M. Born, *The Born–Einstein Letters*, Macmillan (1971).
2. E. Schrödinger, *Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik*, *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, 807 (1935).
3. W. Heisenberg, *Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik*, *Z. Phys.* **43**, 172 (1927).
4. A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, *Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?*, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
5. J. S. Bell, *On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Paradox*, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
6. A. Aspect, P. Grangier, G. Roger, *Experimental realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 91 (1982).
7. J. A. Wheeler, *Law Without Law*, in *Quantum Theory and Measurement* (1983).
8. W. H. Zurek, *Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 715 (2003).
9. J. Maldacena, *The Large N Limit of Superconformal Field Theories and Supergravity*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 231 (1998).
10. D. Bohm, *A Suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of "Hidden" Variables*, *Phys. Rev.* **85**, 166 (1952).
11. H. Everett, *'Relative State' Formulation of Quantum Mechanics*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **29**, 454 (1957).
12. E. Verlinde, *On the Origin of Gravity and the Laws of Newton*, *JHEP* **04**, 029 (2011).
13. F. Haake, *Quantum Signatures of Chaos*, Springer (2010).
14. M. C. Gutzwiller, *Chaos in Classical and Quantum Mechanics*, Springer (1990).
15. S. Ryu, T. Takayanagi, *Holographic Derivation of Entanglement Entropy*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 181602 (2006).

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.