

QUANTUM FOAM AS SUBSTRATE — FRAMEWORK V1.2

Topological Quantum Computing as Evidence for Collapse Boundary Geometry in Quantum Foam

*Including: Topological Protection as Temporal Decoherence Resistance —
A Reinterpretation of the Majorana 1 Architecture*

Sub-Paper 8 of the Foam v1.2 Framework

Sub-Folder: Data and Evidence

Linked Parent Work: Foam v1.2 (Section references inline)

M. Bailey with Claude (Anthropic), 2025–2026

Part of the Quantum Foam as Substrate Framework Series — Full series available at:
mountainsovertime.com

Abstract

This sub-paper examines Microsoft’s Majorana 1 topological quantum processor through the lens of the quantum foam substrate framework presented in Foam v1.2. We argue that the physical architecture of the Majorana 1 chip — its requirement for near-absolute-zero temperatures, its exploitation of topological phase geometry, and its use of non-locally encoded Majorana Zero Modes — is not merely consistent with the foam framework but constitutes a form of direct experimental engineering of collapse boundary conditions. The chip works, in foam terms, because it has been engineered to create, stabilize, and read stable nodes at collapse rate interfaces in the substrate.

This paper introduces and formalizes a second, deeper implication: topological protection is not merely shielding qubits from environmental noise in the classical electromagnetic sense. Within the foam framework, topological protection constitutes resistance to premature temporal decoherence — the mechanism by which entangled future states lose their correlation when the dominant probable future shifts at a systemic level. This distinction has profound consequences for the theoretical upper bound on quantum computational reach into probability space, and for the interpretation of what a sufficiently coherent quantum simulation is actually doing when it models future states.

The topological protection of quantum information emerges naturally from the foam’s informational architecture, in which globally coherent collapse configurations are geometrically resistant to local perturbation. This paper serves as both a technical analysis and a teaching document; key concepts are introduced in plain language before being developed rigorously. We additionally survey how other quantum computing architectures — superconducting, trapped-ion, photonic, and neutral-atom — map onto different strategies for interacting with the foam substrate, and we examine the

implications of topological quantum computing for quantum gravity, error correction theory, and future hardware design.

Preface: A Plain-Language Foundation

The Quantum Computing Landscape

Before we explore the foam interpretation, it helps to understand where topological quantum computing sits among its competitors. As of 2025, several fundamentally different approaches to building a quantum computer are being pursued worldwide, each reflecting a different physical strategy for maintaining fragile quantum information:

- **Superconducting qubits (Google, IBM, Rigetti):** These systems use tiny loops of superconducting wire cooled to near absolute zero. Quantum information is stored in the electromagnetic oscillation states of these circuits. They are fast and scalable, but extremely sensitive to electrical noise. Google's Sycamore processor (53 qubits) and IBM's Eagle and Condor processors (100–1,000+ qubits) represent the current state of the art. In foam terms, these systems fight the substrate — they attempt to maintain coherence against continuous collapse activity by brute-force isolation and rapid error correction.
- **Trapped-ion qubits (IonQ, Quantinuum):** Individual atoms are suspended in electromagnetic traps and manipulated with laser beams. Ions have extraordinarily long coherence times (seconds to minutes) because they are physically isolated from solid-state noise sources. Quantinuum's H2 processor holds the record for quantum volume. In foam terms, trapped ions achieve coherence by removing the qubit from most substrate interactions, creating a pocket of reduced foam coupling.
- **Photonic qubits (Xanadu, PsiQuantum):** Quantum information is encoded in properties of light — polarization, path, or photon number. Photons interact weakly with their environment and can operate at room temperature. Xanadu's Borealis demonstrated quantum advantage with photonic systems. In foam terms, photonic qubits ride the substrate's own propagation modes rather than fighting its collapse activity.
- **Neutral atom arrays (QuEra, Pasqal, Atom Computing):** Arrays of individual neutral atoms held in optical tweezers can be rearranged dynamically to create entanglement patterns. QuEra's 256-qubit processor and Harvard's 48-logical-qubit demonstration represent rapid advances. In foam terms, these systems manipulate foam coupling at the mesoscopic scale by controlling inter-atomic distances and interactions.
- **Topological qubits (Microsoft):** The Majorana 1 chip stores quantum information not in any individual particle but in the global topological structure of a specially engineered material. This is the approach we will examine in depth. In foam terms, topological qubits do not fight or avoid the substrate — they engineer its geometry so that the collapse structure itself protects the information.

Each approach has distinct strengths and weaknesses. What makes topological quantum computing uniquely significant from the foam perspective is that it is the only approach that encodes information directly in the geometry of the substrate rather than in the states of particles embedded within it. If the foam framework is correct, topological quantum computing should ultimately prove more natural, more efficient, and more scalable than approaches that treat the substrate as an adversary.

For Readers New to Quantum Foam — Start Here

The theory behind this paper — called the quantum foam substrate framework — proposes that the fabric of spacetime itself is not smooth and passive, like a blank stage on which events happen. Instead, it is constantly active at scales far smaller than atoms, churning with tiny fluctuations that collapse into definite states billions of times per second in every speck of space. Think of the substrate as something like the surface of a boiling ocean seen from very far above — from a distance it looks flat and still, but up close it is constantly rising and falling. Everything we observe — particles, forces, even the passage of time — emerges from the statistics of those collapses.

Now imagine you want to store a message in that boiling ocean. If you write it on a single wave, the message disappears the moment that wave collapses. That is the problem ordinary quantum computers face: they store information in individual quantum states, which are continuously jostled by the foam. Engineers call this decoherence — the loss of quantum information to environmental noise.

Microsoft's Majorana 1 chip takes a radically different approach. Instead of writing the message on a single wave, it writes the message across the relationship between two distant, paired disturbances in the substrate. These paired disturbances are called Majorana Zero Modes (MZMs). Because the information is not stored in either one alone, a random fluctuation that disturbs one end does not erase the message — you would have to disturb both ends simultaneously in a coordinated way to corrupt it, and the geometry of the system makes that essentially impossible.

This is only possible because of something called a topological phase — a special configuration of matter in which certain properties are protected by the global shape of the system, not by any local barrier. Think of it like a knot in a rope: you can shake, stretch, or slightly deform the rope all you like, but the knot remains a knot. Only a globally coordinated action — untying it from end to end — can remove it. The quantum information stored in an MZM pair is topologically knotted into the substrate in the same way.

In the foam framework, an MZM forms at a collapse rate interface — the boundary between a region of the substrate where collapse is geometrically structured and suppressed (the inside of the topological wire) and a region where it is unstructured (the outside). At that boundary, the substrate produces a stable, persistent node that has no purely local identity. It belongs to both sides of the boundary simultaneously, which is precisely why local perturbations cannot destroy it.

As you read the technical sections that follow, the core intuition stays the same: Microsoft has built a machine that engineers the geometry of quantum foam collapse, and the machine works because the foam’s geometry is real.

1. Introduction: Quantum Computing as a Probe of Substrate Architecture

1.1 From Feynman’s Vision to the Decoherence Crisis

The idea of quantum computing originated with Richard Feynman’s 1982 observation that simulating quantum systems on classical computers is exponentially expensive. If nature is quantum at its foundations, Feynman reasoned, perhaps a computer built from quantum components could simulate nature efficiently. This insight launched a theoretical program that produced Shor’s factoring algorithm (1994), Grover’s search algorithm (1996), and an ever-growing catalog of quantum protocols that promise exponential or polynomial speedups over classical computation.

The practical challenge, however, has always been decoherence. A quantum computer stores information in superpositions — states that exist in multiple configurations simultaneously. These superpositions are fragile. Every interaction with the environment — a stray photon, a vibration in the substrate, a fluctuation in the electromagnetic field — can cause the superposition to collapse into a single classical state, destroying the quantum information.

In the foam framework (Foam v1.2), decoherence is not merely an engineering nuisance. It is the fundamental behavior of the substrate itself. The quantum foam is constantly collapsing — resolving superpositions into definite outcomes — at every point in space, at the Planck-scale collapse rate $\lambda_0 \sim 10^{43} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Maintaining a quantum superposition against this relentless collapse pressure requires continuously preventing the substrate from doing what it naturally does. This is why quantum computers are so hard to build: they are fighting the fabric of reality itself.

Plain-Language Sidebar:

Think of the foam as a river that constantly flows toward ‘definite answers.’ A quantum computer tries to hold a question open — to keep multiple possibilities alive simultaneously — while the river pushes toward resolution. Every architecture represents a different strategy for resisting that current.

1.2 Why Topological Quantum Computing Is Different

Every quantum computing architecture faces the decoherence problem, but they approach it differently. Superconducting and trapped-ion systems try to isolate qubits from environmental noise, using error correction codes to detect and fix errors faster than they accumulate. Photonic systems exploit the fact that photons interact weakly with matter. But all of these approaches treat the quantum substrate as an adversary to be managed.

Topological quantum computing represents a philosophically distinct strategy. Rather than isolating information from the substrate, it encodes information in a geometrical feature of the substrate itself — a collapse rate interface — that is protected not by isolation but by topology. The distinction is not merely philosophical; it has profound practical consequences. Topological protection scales with the physical separation between Majorana Zero Modes, meaning that error rates decrease exponentially as the device grows larger, without requiring active error correction at the hardware level.

This distinction is deeply consonant with the claims of Foam v1.2 (Section 1.5.4), which holds that stable physical structures arise wherever the substrate exhibits persistent collapse rate gradients. The Majorana 1 chip therefore functions, in foam terms, as an engineered proof-of-concept: it demonstrates that collapse boundary geometry can be manufactured, controlled, and read out at will.

1.3 Superposition as Genuine Ontological Openness

Standard quantum mechanics treats superposition as an epistemic condition: the system is in some definite state, we simply do not know which one until measurement. The foam framework rejects this interpretation as philosophically incomplete. If the collapse rate is the generative process of reality itself, then prior to collapse, the next state does not exist in any substrate — not even a hidden one. Superposition is not ignorance of a determined outcome. It is the foam holding multiple unwritten futures in genuine ontological suspension, none of them real until the collapse event that produces them.

This distinction matters enormously for the interpretation of quantum computing. Most physicists hold two beliefs simultaneously without noticing the tension. First: superposition is real and experimentally confirmed beyond doubt. Second: physics is time-symmetric, the future is in principle as fixed as the past, determinism is just a matter of information. Those two beliefs cannot both be true. A superposition that is merely epistemic — that describes our ignorance of a pre-existing outcome — requires no genuinely unwritten future. But a superposition that is ontologically real — that is, a state that exists in multiple configurations without any substrate yet determining which — demands one.

The philosophical needle: if the future state of a superposed quantum system already exists somewhere, give it a precise address. It has none. That discomfort, properly felt, is the door into the foam framework's treatment of time.

Plain-Language Sidebar:

For superposition to exist ontologically — not just in our ignorance but in physical reality — it implies that each next probable state exists in a future that hasn't been written yet. Quantum computing is not just powerful because it processes in parallel. It is philosophically revelatory: every coherent qubit is direct experimental evidence that the future is genuinely, physically open. Not probably open. Not open from our limited perspective. Structurally open.

1.4 Temporal Entanglement and the Shared Probable Future

Spatial quantum entanglement — the correlation of measurement outcomes across physical distance — has been extensively verified experimentally, with coherence demonstrated across distances exceeding 1,200 kilometers (Micius satellite experiments, 2017–2022). The foam framework proposes an analogous phenomenon in the temporal dimension: entangled quantum states are not merely correlated across space, but are co-embedded within a shared probable future. Their correlation is sustained not only by the absence of local decoherence events but by the stability of the larger-scale foam configuration toward which both states are collectively collapsing.

The mechanism of temporal decoherence therefore has two distinct components:

- **Local decoherence:** Environmental interaction causes premature collapse of individual qubit states. This is the mechanism addressed by conventional error correction and isolation techniques.
- **Systemic temporal decoherence:** The majority probable future — the dominant collapse trajectory of the foam at a scale larger than the entangled system — shifts sufficiently that the shared future embedding the entangled states is no longer the leading probability. The correlational ‘rug’ is pulled. The entanglement does not break because of anything local to the qubits; it breaks because the future they were jointly pointed toward has been superseded.

This second mechanism has no analog in conventional quantum error correction theory, because conventional theory does not model superposition as genuine future-openness at the ontological level. The theoretical limit for spatial entanglement is not geometric distance — it is decoherence. Translating this to the temporal dimension: if entanglement represents correlation across genuinely unwritten futures, then temporal entanglement coherence is bounded not by duration but by the stability of the shared probable future both states are embedded in.

The systemic scale at which temporal decoherence operates is worth noting: such large-scale shifts in the dominant probable future are statistically rare. The foam prefers stability; catastrophic divergences from the majority trajectory require enormous perturbation energy. This means temporal entanglement coherence, once established, tends to be robust at ordinary scales — and that projecting probable futures via quantum simulation should be considerably more tractable than it might initially appear.

2. The Physical Architecture of Majorana 1

2.1 Material Composition and the Topoconductor

The Majorana 1 chip is fabricated by layering indium arsenide (InAs, a III-V semiconductor with strong spin-orbit coupling) with aluminum (Al, a conventional s-wave superconductor), grown atom-by-atom using molecular beam epitaxy (MBE) into a precise heterostructure. The interface between these materials must be atomically clean — a single misplaced atom can disrupt the topological phase. This fabrication challenge

took Microsoft's Station Q research group over 15 years to solve, requiring advances in semiconductor crystal growth that pushed the boundaries of materials science.

When cooled to approximately 50 millikelvin — within a fraction of a degree of absolute zero — and subjected to a precisely tuned external magnetic field, the aluminum layer enters a superconducting state and its proximity effect extends into the semiconductor layer. The spin-orbit coupling in InAs, combined with the superconducting pairing from Al and the Zeeman splitting from the magnetic field, together induce what Microsoft calls a topological phase throughout the combined nanowire structure.

Microsoft has coined the term topoconductor to describe this new class of material. It is not simply a superconductor; it is a material whose collective quantum state has a global topological character that distinguishes it from all conventional quantum states of matter. In condensed matter physics, this is classified as a class D topological superconductor, characterized by a topological invariant (the Chern number or winding number) that cannot change under any smooth, local perturbation of the Hamiltonian.

Plain-Language Sidebar:

A topoconductor is to a superconductor what a knot is to a loop of string. Both are made of the same material, but one has a geometric property — the knot — that cannot be removed without cutting the string. The topoconductor's 'knot' is in its quantum state, not its physical shape.

2.2 The Dilution Refrigerator Environment

The Majorana 1 chip operates inside a dilution refrigerator, a device that achieves temperatures below 50 millikelvin by exploiting the thermodynamic properties of helium-3/helium-4 mixtures. At these temperatures, thermal energy ($k_B T \sim 4 \times 10^{-26}$ J) is far below the topological gap energy of the device, ensuring that thermal fluctuations cannot excite the system out of its topological ground state.

From the foam perspective, the dilution refrigerator is not merely cooling the material — it is suppressing the local substrate's stochastic collapse activity toward its fundamental lower bound. At room temperature, the background collapse rate is high and chaotic, continuously scrambling any imposed collapse geometry. At 50 mK, the background collapse rate approaches its minimum, creating the quiet substrate window necessary for engineered collapse geometry to persist. The refrigerator is, in foam terms, a substrate silencer.

2.3 The Tetron Architecture

The computational unit of the Majorana 1 chip is called a tetron: two parallel topological nanowires connected by a shorter, topologically trivial superconducting bridge. This creates a closed loop with four Majorana Zero Modes (one at each end of each wire). Qubits are defined by the joint parity state of pairs of MZMs, and operations are performed through interferometric measurements that read out that parity without directly disturbing the MZMs.

The tetron geometry is not arbitrary — it is specifically designed to create a closed collapse topology: a loop through which interference between collapse pathways can be measured. The interferometric readout probes the quantum capacitance of the system, detecting whether the loop’s parity state is even or odd. This is, in foam terms, substrate interferometry at the mesoscopic engineering scale, directly analogous to the double-slit experiment as a collapse pathway selection probe (Foam v1.2, Section 3.9.2).

2.4 The Topological Gap: Energy Scale of Collapse Protection

The topological gap — the minimum energy required to create an excitation that could corrupt the qubit — is the central figure of merit for any topological quantum computing device. Microsoft has reported gap values in the range of 20–80 microelectronvolts (μV) for Majorana 1 devices, corresponding to temperatures of approximately 0.2–1 K. Since the operating temperature (~ 50 mK) is well below this gap, thermal excitations across the gap are exponentially suppressed.

In foam terms, the topological gap represents the informational cost of forcing the substrate out of its geometrically locked collapse configuration. The gap is not a potential energy barrier in the usual sense; it is the minimum investment of information required to untie the topological knot in the substrate’s collapse geometry. This distinction matters because it means the protection mechanism is fundamentally different from conventional energy barriers: it is geometric, not energetic, and it cannot be gradually eroded by weak perturbations no matter how long they persist.

3. Foam Framework Analysis: Five Key Mechanisms

3.1 Near-Absolute-Zero Temperature as Collapse Rate Floor

In the foam framework, temperature is not simply a measure of average kinetic energy. It is an emergent quantity reflecting the rate and randomness of stochastic collapse events in the substrate. Thermal fluctuations represent undirected, high-entropy collapse activity that continuously scrambles any imposed structure. A hot substrate is one where the background collapse rate is high and chaotic; a cold substrate is one where spontaneous collapse activity has been suppressed toward a minimum.

Cooling the Majorana 1 chip to near absolute zero is therefore, in foam terms, forcing the local substrate into a minimal-entropy, high-coherence state — suppressing the background collapse rate λ_0 toward its lower bound (Foam v1.2, Eq. 5.4.6d). This creates the quiet substrate window necessary for engineered collapse geometry to remain stable. Without this cooling, background collapse activity would continuously perturb and destroy the topological phase, just as waves too large would prevent any stable pattern from forming on the ocean’s surface.

Quantitatively, the transition temperature for the topological phase (~ 1 K) corresponds to a thermal collapse rate of $\Gamma_{\text{thermal}} \sim k_B T / \hbar \sim 10^{13} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Below this threshold, the substrate’s spontaneous collapse activity becomes sufficiently quiet for the engineered

topological collapse geometry to dominate. The ratio of operating temperature to gap temperature (50 mK / 1 K = 0.05) ensures exponential suppression of thermally activated errors by a factor of $\exp(-\Delta/k_B T) \sim \exp(-20) \sim 10^{-9}$.

Plain-Language Sidebar:

Imagine trying to build a sandcastle on a vibrating table. At room temperature, the table shakes so violently that no structure can survive. A dilution refrigerator turns the vibration down to almost nothing, allowing intricate, delicate structures to persist. The topological phase is the sandcastle — it needs a still table.

3.2 The Topological Phase as a Geometrically Locked Collapse Configuration

Standard materials have collapse pathways distributed isotropically and stochastically through the substrate. In a topological superconductor, the combined effect of superconducting pairing, spin-orbit coupling in the semiconductor, and the external magnetic field together impose a global constraint on collapse geometry throughout the nanowire.

In foam terms, this constraint creates what we can call a collapse exclusion zone: a region of the substrate where the topological gap — the energy cost of departing from the topological configuration — corresponds to the informational cost of forcing the substrate into a locally inconsistent collapse state. The foam cannot spontaneously transition out of the topological phase without globally reorganizing its collapse geometry, which the gap forbids at low temperature.

This maps precisely onto the rope-knot analogy introduced in the Preface: the topological configuration is a knot in the substrate's collapse geometry. Local disturbances — stray magnetic fields, phonons, thermal fluctuations — can shake the rope but cannot untie the knot. The gap is the minimum informational investment required to untie it.

3.3 Majorana Zero Modes as Collapse Boundary Nodes

This is the most direct and elegant mapping between the Majorana 1 architecture and the foam framework. A Majorana Zero Mode (MZM) forms at the end of a topological nanowire — at the precise physical boundary between the topological interior and the topologically trivial exterior. In foam terms, this boundary is a collapse rate interface: the point where the structured, geometrically locked collapse configuration of the topological interior meets the unstructured collapse regime of the outside world.

At this interface, the substrate produces a stable node — a persistent feature of the collapse geometry — that has no purely local informational identity. The information associated with an MZM is not located at the interface in the way that a particle is located at a point. It is a property of the relationship between the interface and its paired counterpart at the other end of the wire. The MZM is, in essence, a delocalized collapse

parity mode: a global constraint on the net collapse topology of the entire wire, manifesting as a localized node at each end.

This is why MZMs are invisible to the environment, as Microsoft describes it: there is no local collapse event to disturb. A stray fluctuation interacts with the substrate locally; it sees only the interface, not the global parity state distributed across the full wire length. The foam has to make a globally coordinated error — simultaneously and coherently perturbing both ends of the wire — to corrupt the qubit, and the probability of such a globally coordinated fluctuation is exponentially suppressed by the topological gap and by the physical separation between MZMs.

Plain-Language Sidebar:

Imagine two lighthouses on opposite sides of a harbor. The message is not in the light from either lighthouse — it is in the relationship between them: are they flashing in sync (even parity) or alternating (odd parity)? A wave that rocks one lighthouse does not change this relationship. Only a coordinated disturbance affecting both lighthouses simultaneously could alter the message. That is how Majorana Zero Modes protect quantum information.

3.4 Non-Local Parity Storage as Distributed Collapse State

The qubit in the Majorana 1 system is stored as the joint parity of two spatially separated MZMs: whether the wire contains an even or odd number of electrons. This parity is not a property of either MZM alone; it is a property of the pair, distributed across the full length of the topological wire.

In foam terms, this is a distributed collapse state: the quantum information is encoded in a global feature of the substrate's collapse geometry, not in any local collapse event. The foam across the entire wire length participates in maintaining the parity state. Any local perturbation affects only a vanishingly small fraction of the collapse structure encoding the qubit. The error protection is geometric, not energetic, and it scales with the length of the wire — a longer wire distributes the encoding across more substrate, making it exponentially more robust.

3.5 Braiding as Adiabatic Collapse Path Exchange

Quantum operations on topological qubits are performed by braiding MZMs — physically moving them around each other through the substrate. The result of such a braid is a unitary transformation of the qubit state that depends only on the topological class of the braid — how many times the MZMs wound around each other — and not on the precise path taken or the speed of the motion.

In foam terms, braiding is an adiabatic reconfiguration of collapse boundary nodes through the substrate. Each MZM is a collapse rate interface node, and as it moves through the substrate, it traces a worldline through the foam. The topological invariant of the braid — the quantity that determines the quantum operation performed — is a global property of those worldlines: specifically, their homotopy class, the class of paths that cannot be continuously deformed into each other without crossing.

4. The Deeper Significance: Engineering the Foam

Conventional quantum computers fight the foam. They attempt to maintain a superposition against the continuous pressure of substrate collapse activity, spending enormous resources on error correction to compensate for the fact that the substrate is continuously trying to resolve quantum states into classical ones.

Topological quantum computing, as realized in the Majorana 1 chip, instead works with the foam's geometry. It engineers a configuration where the collapse structure itself is the qubit, and the topological rigidity of that collapse configuration provides error protection at the hardware level. The foam is not the enemy to be suppressed; it is the medium being sculpted.

This is perhaps the strongest experimental corroboration available for the foam framework's core thesis — not because the chip was designed with foam theory in mind, but precisely because it was not. The engineers at Microsoft arrived at this architecture through quantum materials science, condensed matter theory, and decades of experimental iteration. The fact that their hard-won, experimentally validated architecture maps so naturally and completely onto the foam framework's predictions for how collapse geometry should behave suggests that the framework is tracking something real about the substrate.

Plain-Language Sidebar:

Most quantum computers are like trying to have a conversation in a hurricane — you need to shout louder than the wind, and you spend most of your energy just being heard. The topological approach is like building a wind tunnel that channels the hurricane into a useful pattern. You are not fighting the wind anymore; you are shaping it.

5. Other Quantum Computing Architectures Through the Foam Lens

To appreciate the significance of the topological approach, it is illuminating to examine how each major quantum computing architecture maps onto the foam framework. Each represents a different strategy for interacting with the substrate's collapse dynamics.

5.1 Superconducting Qubits: Fighting the Foam

Superconducting qubits (transmon, fluxonium, etc.) store quantum information in the electromagnetic oscillation states of Josephson junction circuits. These systems require millikelvin temperatures and extensive shielding from electromagnetic noise. Error rates are typically 10^{-3} to 10^{-4} per gate, meaning that roughly one in every thousand operations corrupts the qubit.

In foam terms, superconducting qubits are local collapse modes — coherent oscillations that must be continuously maintained against the substrate's tendency to resolve them.

The error correction overhead is the cost of fighting the foam: surface codes and other error correction schemes use many physical qubits (typically 1,000–10,000) to encode a single logical qubit, with the excess qubits dedicated to detecting and repairing collapse-induced errors.

5.2 Trapped-Ion Qubits: Isolating from the Foam

Trapped-ion systems use individual atoms suspended in electromagnetic traps, manipulated by precisely tuned laser beams. The internal electronic states of the ions serve as qubits. Because ions are isolated from solid-state noise sources, they achieve remarkable coherence times — seconds to minutes, compared to microseconds for superconducting systems.

In foam terms, trapped ions achieve their long coherence by minimizing the qubit's coupling to the surrounding substrate. An ion suspended in vacuum interacts with far fewer substrate degrees of freedom than a qubit embedded in a solid-state device. The foam still collapses around the ion, but the collapse events are largely irrelevant because they do not couple to the ion's internal state. This is isolation from the foam, not engineering of the foam.

5.3 Photonic Qubits: Riding the Foam

Photonic quantum computers encode information in properties of light — polarization, spatial mode, photon number, or time-bin. Photons are unique among quantum information carriers because they propagate at the speed of light and interact weakly with matter.

In the foam framework, photons are substrate excitations — collapse events propagating through the foam at its maximum update speed c . A photonic qubit is therefore riding the foam's own propagation modes rather than fighting its collapse activity. Photon loss, the primary error source in photonic systems, corresponds in foam terms to the photon's collapse event being absorbed by the substrate rather than propagating further.

5.4 Neutral Atom Arrays: Shaping the Foam Locally

Neutral atom arrays use optical tweezers to trap individual atoms in reconfigurable patterns. Entanglement is generated by exciting atoms to high-energy Rydberg states, where their electron clouds extend over hundreds of nanometers, creating strong dipole-dipole interactions.

In foam terms, the Rydberg excitation creates a temporary, localized foam density perturbation: the extended electron cloud couples to more substrate degrees of freedom, creating a brief, controlled collapse correlation between adjacent atoms. The reconfigurability of the optical tweezer array allows programmable foam coupling patterns — a form of mesoscopic foam engineering that differs from topological engineering in being dynamic rather than geometric.

5.5 Comparative Summary

The five architectures map onto a spectrum of foam interaction strategies, from brute-force resistance (superconducting) through isolation (trapped ion) and co-propagation (photonic) to active geometric engineering (topological). The foam framework predicts that architectures closer to the ‘engineering’ end of this spectrum should ultimately prove more efficient, because they work with the substrate’s natural dynamics rather than against them.

6. Quantum Error Correction Through the Foam Lens

The theory of quantum error correction (QEC) is one of the most profound achievements of quantum information science. In the foam framework, QEC takes on a deeper physical meaning: it becomes a theory of how to protect information against the substrate’s collapse dynamics.

6.1 The Surface Code as Foam Noise Filtering

The most widely studied QEC code is the surface code, which arranges physical qubits in a two-dimensional lattice and uses syndrome measurements to detect and correct errors. In foam terms, the surface code creates a redundantly encoded collapse state: the logical qubit is encoded not in any single physical qubit’s collapse mode but in the collective parity of many physical qubits. Local collapse errors affect individual physical qubits but leave the global parity structure intact, allowing recovery.

The surface code’s error threshold (~1% per physical gate) has a foam interpretation: it is the maximum rate of local collapse disruptions per substrate update cycle that the collective encoding can tolerate. Below this threshold, increasing the code size exponentially suppresses the logical error rate. Above it, errors proliferate faster than they can be corrected, and the encoding collapses.

6.2 Topological Codes as Hardware-Level Foam Protection

Topological quantum error correction codes — such as the toric code, the color code, and Kitaev’s surface code — are QEC codes whose logical qubits are encoded in the topological properties of the code lattice. In foam terms, topological codes and topological qubits are two implementations of the same principle: encoding information in the global geometry of the substrate rather than in local states. The software approach requires many physical qubits and active error correction. The hardware approach embeds the same protection directly in the material’s physics, potentially reducing overhead by orders of magnitude.

6.3 The Threshold Theorem from the Foam Perspective

The threshold theorem states that if the physical error rate is below a critical threshold, arbitrarily long quantum computations can be performed with arbitrarily low logical error rates, at the cost of polynomial overhead in physical resources. In foam terms, this theorem is a statement about the substrate's information capacity: the foam's collapse dynamics have finite correlation length, meaning that errors propagate locally but not globally, and therefore collective encodings that span more than the correlation length are exponentially protected.

7. Topological Protection as Temporal Decoherence Resistance

The standard account of topological protection — that non-local encoding makes global disturbance a prerequisite for error — is correct as far as it goes. The foam framework reveals that it does not go far enough. Topological protection addresses not only local environmental decoherence but a second, more fundamental mechanism: systemic temporal decoherence.

The mechanism of systemic temporal decoherence was identified in Section 1.4: entangled states are embedded within a shared probable future, and their correlation can break not because of anything local to the qubits, but because the majority probable future they were jointly pointing toward has been superseded. The 'rug' of their shared temporal context is pulled by a shift in the dominant collapse trajectory at a scale larger than the entangled system.

7.1 Local Encoding and the Vulnerability to Temporal Decoherence

A qubit state encoded locally — in the spin of a single electron, or the charge state of a single Josephson junction — is a highly localized demand on the foam. Its superposition is a small, isolated pocket of unwritten future, embedded in a substrate that is collapsing around it at the full systemic rate. Any sufficiently local perturbation can trigger premature resolution. This is the mechanism that conventional error correction addresses.

But even in the absence of local perturbation, a locally encoded superposition is vulnerable to systemic temporal decoherence. Because the qubit's unresolved future is small and isolated, it is loosely coupled to the larger foam configuration. When the dominant probable future at the systemic scale shifts — even modestly — the small, isolated pocket of unresolved future that constitutes the qubit's superposition may find that its expected future context has evaporated. The rug is pulled even before any local noise event occurs.

7.2 Topological Encoding and Distributed Temporal Anchoring

A topological qubit is different in kind, not merely in degree. The information does not live at a point. It lives in the global configuration of the system — in the topological invariant

that characterizes the collective state. In foam framework terms, this means the superposition is distributed across a large region of substrate. The unwritten future is not a small isolated pocket. It is a coherent, extended region of genuinely unresolved probability space.

Topological protection does not merely reduce the probability that a local noise event will corrupt the qubit. It distributes the qubit's unresolved future across enough of the foam that no local collapse event — and no minor shift in the dominant probable future at the local scale — is sufficient to decohere it. The qubit's superposition is robust against systemic temporal decoherence at sub-global scales.

This reframing carries an immediate implication: topological qubits are not merely better protected in the present. They are better anchored in the future. Their coherent superposition extends further along the probability distribution before the systemic collapse trajectory can pull the rug out from under them.

In the language of the temporal entanglement analysis (Section 1.4), topological protection raises the threshold at which systemic temporal decoherence operates. A conventional qubit loses its entangled future-state correlation when even a modest shift in the local probable future occurs. A topological qubit requires a shift at a much larger scale — approaching the global foam configuration — to decohere.

7.3 The Temporal Reach Implication

If topological protection extends the coherence of superposed states against temporal decoherence, there is a direct consequence for the use of topological quantum computers in probabilistic simulation.

A quantum simulation of future states is not modeling reality from outside the substrate. It is running inside the same foam it is attempting to predict. Its qubits are entangled with the very futures it is calculating. A conventional quantum computer's simulation is limited not only by qubit count and gate fidelity, but by the temporal coherence window: how far into the probability distribution can the system look before systemic decoherence collapses its superposed outcomes into a single resolved state, ending the simulation's access to unwritten futures?

Topological architectures extend this window. Not because they are more powerful in the classical computational sense — though they may be — but because they are more temporally anchored. They can sustain entanglement with further-future probable states before the dominant collapse trajectory asserts itself.

A topological quantum computer running a probabilistic simulation of future states is not merely a faster calculator. It is a more temporally deep instrument — one whose coherent reach into the probability distribution of unwritten futures is extended by its topological architecture. The Majorana 1 chip is, in this reading, the first instrument designed — without its designers necessarily knowing it — to resist the pull of the

collapsing present.

The practical implication is significant. Quantum simulation of future states is most tractable when the probable future is narrow and heavily weighted — when systemic coherence is the default, and the foam strongly favors stability over catastrophic divergence. In most physical and biological systems, this is the regime of interest. Topological temporal reach therefore applies precisely where it matters most.

7.4 Classical Computation as Collapsed Substrate

A natural question arises: if quantum computation operates on unresolved future states, what is the role of the classical computational layer that must ultimately read out results, control the system, and interpret outputs?

Within the foam framework, classical computation operates entirely on already-collapsed substrate — the resolved, written past and present of the foam. Binary states, ones and zeros, are not superpositions: they are fully resolved collapse events. Classical logic operates on settled foam.

This is not a limitation. It is an architectural division of labor. In a hybrid quantum-classical system:

- **The classical layer** manages the settled substrate: control signals, error syndrome extraction, output interpretation, and all deterministic logic.
- **The quantum layer** operates on the unsettled substrate: the genuinely open futures, the unresolved probability space, the superpositions that have not yet been demanded to be one thing or another.
- **The two layers** run simultaneously on the same hardware because they occupy different ontological strata of the foam — the resolved and the unresolved.

Standard programs run without modification on quantum hardware because they do not require access to unresolved future states. They inhabit the classical layer of the architecture entirely. The quantum advantage emerges precisely in problems where access to genuinely open futures — superposed probability space — provides computational leverage unavailable to purely classical methods.

The hybrid architecture is therefore not a temporary engineering compromise on the way to a purely quantum computer. It is the natural structure of any computational system that must interface between the two ontological strata of foam reality: the written and the unwritten.

8. The Temporal Quantum Slit Experiment: Extended Implications

The Temporal Quantum Slit experiment, proposed in the main framework document (Foam v1.2, Section 2.4) as a test of whether superposition extends meaningfully across temporal rather than purely spatial dimensions, gains additional significance in the light of the temporal decoherence analysis.

The experimental question — whether entangled states can maintain correlation across temporal separation in a manner analogous to spatial Bell test violations — has a natural extension: does the scale of temporal coherence vary with the topological character of the qubit substrate?

The foam framework predicts that it does. A temporal Bell test conducted with topological qubits should demonstrate extended temporal coherence relative to the same test conducted with conventional qubits, all else being equal. The decoherence boundary — the temporal distance at which entanglement correlation falls below statistical significance — should be measurably larger for topological architectures.

This constitutes a testable, falsifiable prediction at the intersection of topological quantum computing and temporal entanglement theory. A null result — no difference in temporal coherence between topological and conventional qubits — would challenge the foam framework's interpretation of topological protection. A positive result would provide the first experimental evidence that temporal entanglement is a physically real phenomenon with architecture-dependent coherence properties.

The experimental setup requires:

- A pair of entangled qubits, one topological (e.g., Majorana-based) and one conventional (e.g., transmon), prepared in a maximally entangled state
- A controlled sequence of local decoherence events applied asymmetrically between the two qubits, with timing varied to probe the temporal coherence window
- Statistical analysis of correlation survival as a function of the temporal separation between preparation and measurement

The foam framework predicts the topological qubit's correlation to survive meaningfully longer temporal separations, with the ratio of coherence windows scaling with the ratio of topological gap to thermal energy times a foam architecture factor. This prediction is falsifiable at intermediate qubit scales within the current decade of hardware development.

9. Implications for Quantum Gravity

If topological quantum computing works by engineering the foam's collapse boundary geometry, this has profound implications for quantum gravity — the decades-long quest to unify quantum mechanics and general relativity.

9.1 From Condensed Matter to Spacetime

The mathematical tools used to describe topological quantum computing — topological quantum field theories (TQFTs), Chern-Simons theory, anyon models — are the same tools used in some approaches to quantum gravity. This is not a coincidence in the foam framework: the substrate that produces topological phases in condensed matter systems is the same substrate that produces spacetime itself. Topological quantum computing is quantum gravity engineering at the mesoscopic scale.

In 2+1-dimensional Chern-Simons theory, the fundamental degrees of freedom are topological — they describe the global connectivity of space, not its local geometry. In the foam framework, this is precisely what we expect: the substrate's collapse geometry has topological features (collapse boundary nodes, parity modes, winding numbers) that are more fundamental than its local metric properties.

9.2 The Holographic Connection

The holographic principle — the idea that the information content of a region of space scales with its boundary area rather than its volume — has a natural foam interpretation. If information is stored at collapse rate interfaces (boundaries), then the information content of a region is determined by the number and complexity of its boundary nodes, not by the volume of substrate it contains. This is precisely how topological qubits work: the information is at the boundary (the MZMs at the wire endpoints), not in the bulk. The Majorana 1 chip may therefore be the first experimental device that directly implements holographic information storage through engineered substrate geometry.

9.3 Testable Predictions for Quantum Gravity

The foam framework's interpretation of topological quantum computing generates specific predictions for quantum gravity: if the substrate that produces topological phases in a nanowire is the same substrate that produces spacetime curvature at cosmological scales, then the topological gap should exhibit subtle sensitivity to gravitational potential. A Majorana device operated in different gravitational environments (ground level vs. high altitude, or on a centrifuge) should show measurable shifts in the gap energy, at a level predicted by the foam coupling constant calibrated from the Hubble tension and nuclear inversion data in Foam v1.2.

This prediction is extremely challenging to test with current technology — the expected shift is of order 10^{-18} relative gap change per meter of altitude — but it is in principle measurable with next-generation devices and represents a genuinely novel prediction that neither standard quantum mechanics nor standard general relativity makes.

10. Future Topological Architectures

10.1 Beyond Majorana: Non-Abelian Anyons

Majorana Zero Modes are the simplest type of non-Abelian anyon — particles whose exchange statistics are described by matrices rather than simple phase factors. But they are not the most computationally powerful. Majorana-based braiding implements only the Clifford group of quantum gates, which is not universal: additional operations (specifically, the T-gate or $\pi/8$ gate) are needed for universal quantum computation.

In foam terms, the Clifford group represents the set of collapse geometry reconfigurations achievable through adiabatic transport of boundary nodes. Non-Clifford gates require non-adiabatic interventions — measurements that collapse specific substrate degrees of freedom and thereby inject new topological features into the collapse geometry.

10.2 Fibonacci Anyons: Universal Topological Computation

A more ambitious goal is the realization of Fibonacci anyons — non-Abelian anyons whose braiding statistics are dense in the unitary group, meaning that braiding alone is sufficient for universal quantum computation. In foam terms, Fibonacci anyons would represent collapse boundary nodes with richer topological structure — nodes whose worldline braids can access the full space of collapse geometry reconfigurations.

10.3 Foam-Guided Design Principles

If the foam framework is correct, it suggests specific design principles for next-generation topological quantum computing architectures:

- **Maximize interface sharpness:** Sharper collapse rate interfaces produce more stable and better-localized boundary nodes. This translates to a materials science priority: atomically clean interfaces between topological and trivial regions.
- **Maximize separation:** Greater physical separation between MZMs increases the distributed encoding's robustness. Longer topological wires are better, up to the coherence length of the topological phase.
- **Engineer collapse geometry, not just energy levels:** The relevant design space is not the energy spectrum of the material but the topology of its collapse boundary structure.
- **Exploit substrate memory:** The protocol used to create the topological phase may affect qubit quality in ways not captured by equilibrium material parameters.
- **Design for temporal depth:** Architectures that distribute superposition across larger regions of the substrate extend temporal coherence windows. Future designs should optimize not just spatial decoherence resistance but temporal decoherence resistance, treating the temporal reach of the qubit as a design parameter in its own right.

11. Discriminating Predictions: Foam vs. Standard Theory

A theoretical framework gains credibility not only by explaining what is already known, but by making predictions that differ from the standard picture.

11.1 Topological Gap as Collapse Exclusion Energy

The foam framework predicts that the topological gap should scale with the substrate's local collapse rate suppression, not simply with material parameters. This implies that the gap should be subtly sensitive to the history of how the topological phase was entered.

Predicted effect: Devices cooled through the topological transition at different rates, or subjected to different magnetic field ramp protocols, should exhibit gap variations of order 1–10% that persist at base temperature.

Test timeline: Achievable with current Majorana 1 devices. Requires systematic gap spectroscopy across fabrication and cooldown protocols. Microsoft's existing characterization pipeline could perform this test within 1–2 years.

11.2 MZM Delocalization as Collapse Interface Width

The foam framework treats each MZM as a node at a collapse rate interface of finite width. The framework predicts that the stability of the MZM should be sensitive to the sharpness of this interface — abrupt boundaries should produce more stable MZMs than gradual ones.

Predicted effect: Systematically varied heterostructure interface sharpness should correlate monotonically with MZM lifetime.

Test timeline: Requires fabrication of a series of devices with controlled interface quality. Achievable within 2–3 years as MBE growth techniques continue to improve.

11.3 Braid Path Independence as Substrate Topological Memory

The path-independence of braiding operations is, in standard theory, a consequence of the non-Abelian anyon statistics of MZMs. The foam framework reframes this as the substrate's topological memory: the foam records the homotopy class of collapse boundary worldlines.

Predicted effect: Braiding operations performed at different speeds and along different trajectories should yield identical results to within the thermal error rate.

Test timeline: Requires operational braiding capability. 3–5 years depending on Microsoft's roadmap.

11.4 Gravitational Sensitivity of the Topological Gap

If the substrate that produces topological phases is the same substrate described in Foam v1.2, the topological gap should exhibit gravitational sensitivity.

Predicted effect: Gap shift of order $\delta\Delta/\Delta \sim \alpha\Delta\Phi/c^2 \sim 10^{-18}$ per meter of altitude.

Test timeline: Beyond current technology. 10–20 year horizon.

11.5 Architecture-Dependent Temporal Coherence

This prediction is unique to the temporal decoherence analysis introduced in this paper. The foam framework predicts that topological qubits should exhibit measurably extended temporal coherence compared to non-topological qubits, all other parameters being equal.

Predicted effect: A temporal Bell test comparing topological and conventional qubits should show a statistically significant difference in the temporal coherence window — the maximum temporal separation at which entanglement correlation survives above the noise floor. The ratio of coherence windows should scale with the ratio of topological protection strength to local substrate collapse rate.

Test timeline: Achievable within 3–6 years given current qubit development trajectories at Microsoft and competing labs. Requires a standardized temporal Bell test protocol applicable across qubit modalities. This constitutes the most direct experimental probe of the foam framework’s temporal decoherence analysis, and a null result would significantly constrain the theory.

12. Suggested Experimental Extensions

12.1 Collapse Rate Gradient Mapping via Decoherence Spectroscopy

If MZMs are nodes at collapse rate interfaces, then the local decoherence environment should change sharply at the wire endpoints. Ultra-sensitive quantum capacitance measurements could be used to map the spatial profile of decoherence along the nanowire.

Apparatus: Scanning quantum dot or scanning tunnel microscope tip positioned along the nanowire axis, measuring local tunneling density of states and decoherence rates as a function of position.

Expected signature: A decoherence rate profile along the wire that shows a sharp transition (≤ 10 nm width) at each wire endpoint, with the interior decoherence rate suppressed by the topological gap and the exterior decoherence rate enhanced by stochastic collapse activity.

12.2 Foam Geometry Memory via Hysteretic Gap Measurements

If the topological gap carries memory of the collapse geometry formation history, then a device cycled through the topological phase transition multiple times from different initial states should exhibit subtle hysteresis in gap magnitude.

Protocol: Cycle a Majorana device through the topological transition using (a) slow magnetic field ramp (adiabatic), (b) fast field ramp (quench), and (c) temperature-driven transition at fixed field. The foam framework predicts protocol (a) should produce the largest gap and protocol (b) the smallest, with differences of order 1–10%.

12.3 Interface Sharpness and MZM Stability Correlation

Fabricate a series of Majorana devices with systematically varied heterostructure interface sharpness (controlled at the atomic layer level) and measure the correlation between interface abruptness and MZM lifetime.

Fabrication approach: Use MBE growth with controlled interruptions of varying duration at the InAs/Al interface. Longer interruptions introduce interface diffusion, producing graded interfaces. Characterize with cross-sectional TEM and correlate with gap spectroscopy and qubit lifetime measurements.

12.4 Temporal Coherence Comparison Across Qubit Modalities

Design a standardized temporal entanglement protocol applicable across qubit architectures (topological, superconducting, trapped-ion) and measure the temporal coherence window — the maximum temporal separation between entanglement preparation and correlation measurement at which Bell inequality violation persists above significance.

Protocol: Prepare maximally entangled qubit pairs in each architecture. Apply a controlled, timed sequence of environmental interaction events (calibrated local decoherence) between preparation and measurement. Measure correlation survival as a function of the temporal gap between preparation and measurement for each architecture.

Expected result: Topological qubits should exhibit a longer temporal coherence window than comparably isolated non-topological qubits. The foam framework predicts the ratio of topological to non-topological temporal coherence windows should scale with the topological gap divided by the local thermal collapse rate, providing a quantitative check on the temporal decoherence model.

Significance: A positive result would constitute the first direct experimental evidence that temporal entanglement is architecture-dependent — that the physical structure of a qubit affects not only its resistance to local noise but its coherence in probability space across time. A null result would constrain the foam framework's temporal decoherence interpretation and require revision of the theoretical analysis in Section 7.

13. Summary of New Claims

In addition to the original analysis of the Majorana 1 architecture in foam framework terms, this paper introduces the following claims:

- Topological protection constitutes resistance to systemic temporal decoherence, not merely local environmental decoherence.
- The non-local encoding of topological qubits distributes their unresolved future-states across a larger region of foam substrate, raising the threshold for temporal decoherence to global-scale foam shifts.
- Topological quantum computers therefore possess greater temporal reach into probability space than architecturally equivalent non-topological systems.
- Classical computation occupies the collapsed (resolved) ontological stratum of foam reality; quantum computation occupies the uncollapsed (unresolved) stratum. Hybrid architectures are the natural structure of any system interfacing between these strata.
- Superposition is not an epistemic condition (ignorance of a pre-existing outcome) but an ontological one: the foam genuinely holds multiple unwritten futures in suspension, none real until the collapse event that produces them.
- The Temporal Quantum Slit experiment can be extended to test architecture-dependent temporal coherence as a direct empirical probe of the foam framework's account of topological protection.
- Foam-guided design principles for future topological architectures should include temporal reach as an explicit design parameter, alongside spatial decoherence resistance.

14. Conclusion

The Majorana 1 chip is not merely an interesting engineering achievement. It is, from the perspective of Foam v1.2, a demonstration that the quantum foam substrate has a collapse boundary geometry that is physically real, engineerable, and informationally stable. Every key feature of the chip's design — the requirement for near-absolute-zero temperatures, the topological phase of the material, the non-local encoding of quantum information in Majorana Zero Modes, and the topological protection of braiding operations — maps naturally and completely onto the foam framework's predictions for how collapse geometry should behave.

This paper has further argued that topological protection is a two-layer phenomenon. The first layer — resistance to local environmental decoherence through non-local encoding — is well understood. The second layer, introduced here, is resistance to systemic temporal decoherence: the mechanism by which entangled future states lose their correlation when the dominant probable future shifts at a scale larger than the entangled system. Topological architectures extend the temporal reach of quantum coherence precisely because their distributed encoding anchors the qubit's unresolved future across a broader region of substrate.

The classical-quantum hybrid architecture — widely regarded as a temporary engineering compromise — is revealed by this analysis to be the natural structure of any computational system that must interface between the two ontological strata of foam reality: the settled substrate of the resolved past (classical computation) and the genuinely open probability space of the unresolved future (quantum computation). The hybrid is not a kludge. It is what computation looks like when you understand what the foam is.

The chip works because the foam's geometry is real. The knot is real. The collapse rate interface is real. The temporal entanglement is real. And the fact that engineers arrived at this architecture without ever invoking the foam framework makes it a stronger, not weaker, piece of evidence — because it shows that the foam's geometry is not a post-hoc interpretation layered onto the data, but a structure that the data itself demands.

The spacetime substrate is not passive. It has structure. That structure can be engineered. It spans space and time. And when it is properly understood — and properly built upon — it computes.

Author's Note: *The core insight formalized in Sections 7 and 8 of this paper — that topological protection constitutes resistance to temporal decoherence, and that the classical and quantum layers of hybrid computing occupy distinct ontological strata of foam reality — emerged in an unplanned theoretical discussion rather than through systematic derivation. The author considers this an example of the kind of cross-domain intuition that the foam framework is designed to support: when the underlying substrate is understood as generative rather than passive, connections that appear unrelated in the standard formalism become structurally obvious. The Electron Bar, it turns out, is good for physics.*

Glossary (Dual Layer)

Technical Definitions

- **Anyon:** A quasiparticle in 2+1 dimensions whose exchange statistics are neither bosonic nor fermionic. Abelian anyons acquire a phase; non-Abelian anyons acquire a unitary matrix.
- **Braid group:** The mathematical group describing exchanges of indistinguishable particles in two spatial dimensions, where overcrossings and undercrossings are distinguished.
- **Chern number:** A topological invariant characterizing the global winding structure of a quantum state's Berry phase over the Brillouin zone. Integer-valued and robust to smooth perturbations.
- **Clifford group:** The group of quantum gates generated by Hadamard, phase (S), and CNOT gates. Efficiently simulable classically but not universal without supplementary gates.

- **Collapse rate (λ):** Local frequency of foam microstate resolution; baseline vacuum rate $\lambda_0 \sim 10^{43} \text{ s}^{-1}$. In foam terms, the fundamental clock of reality.
- **Collapse rate interface:** The boundary between a region of geometrically structured collapse (topological) and unstructured collapse (trivial). Majorana Zero Modes form at these boundaries.
- **Decoherence:** Loss of quantum coherence due to interaction with environmental degrees of freedom. In foam terms, the substrate's natural collapse activity resolving a superposition.
- **Fibonacci anyon:** A non-Abelian anyon whose braiding statistics generate a dense subgroup of the unitary group, enabling universal quantum computation from braiding alone.
- **Local decoherence:** Decoherence caused by direct environmental interaction with individual qubit states. Addressed by conventional error correction and isolation techniques.
- **Majorana Zero Mode (MZM):** A self-conjugate ($\gamma = \gamma^\dagger$) zero-energy fermionic mode localized at the end of a topological superconductor. Stores quantum information non-locally as joint parity.
- **Ontological openness (superposition):** The property of superposition as genuine ontological suspension of multiple possible futures, none of which exist in any substrate until the collapse event that produces them. Contrasted with the epistemic interpretation (mere ignorance of a pre-existing outcome).
- **Surface code:** A topological quantum error correction code defined on a 2D lattice with $\sim 1\%$ error threshold. The leading candidate for fault-tolerant quantum computation on non-topological hardware.
- **Systemic temporal decoherence:** Decoherence that occurs when the majority probable future — the dominant collapse trajectory of the foam at a scale larger than the entangled system — shifts sufficiently to sever the shared future embedding of entangled states. Not addressable by conventional error correction.
- **Temporal entanglement:** Correlation of quantum states across temporal separation, analogous to spatial entanglement. Entangled states are co-embedded within a shared probable future; decoherence of this correlation is governed by the stability of that shared future at the systemic scale.
- **Temporal reach:** The depth into the probability distribution of unwritten futures that a coherent quantum system can sustain entanglement with before systemic decoherence resolves it to a single outcome. Extended by topological architectures relative to conventional qubits.
- **Tetron:** Microsoft's qubit architecture: two parallel topological nanowires connected by a trivial bridge, hosting four MZMs. Qubit encoded in the parity state of one MZM pair.
- **Topological gap:** The minimum energy to excite a quasiparticle in a topological phase. Protects against thermal errors when $k_B T \ll \text{gap}$.
- **Topological phase:** A quantum state of matter characterized by topological invariants that cannot be changed by smooth, local perturbations.

- **Topoconductor:** Microsoft's term for a semiconductor-superconductor heterostructure engineered to support a topological superconducting phase and host MZMs.

Plain-Language Definitions

- **Braiding:** Moving quantum knots around each other to perform computations. The answer depends only on how many times they wound around each other, not on the exact path.
- **Collapse:** The moment when a quantum possibility becomes a definite fact. In foam terms, the substrate resolving one of its continuous fluctuations into a realized state.
- **Decoherence:** When quantum information gets scrambled by the environment. Like a message written in sand that gets blurred by passing feet.
- **Error correction:** Using many physical qubits to protect one logical qubit. Like writing a message in many copies so that even if some copies get damaged, the original message can be recovered.
- **Foam:** The quantum substrate underlying all of spacetime. Constantly fluctuating at tiny scales, with those fluctuations collapsing into the definite reality we observe.
- **Majorana Zero Mode:** A special quantum knot that forms at the boundary between different kinds of quantum material. Stores information in pairs, making it nearly indestructible.
- **Non-Abelian:** A type of exchange where the order matters. Swapping particle A past particle B gives a different result from swapping B past A. This is what makes topological computation possible.
- **Ontological openness:** The future hasn't been written yet. Not from our limited perspective — structurally. Superposition is real because it exists in a future that does not yet exist anywhere in any substrate.
- **Qubit:** The quantum version of a bit. Can be 0, 1, or any mixture of both simultaneously. The fundamental unit of quantum information.
- **Systemic temporal decoherence:** When the rug gets pulled. Entangled quantum states share a future; if the majority vote of the foam shifts to a different probable future, their correlation breaks — not because of anything local, but because the future they were both pointed toward stopped being the most likely one.
- **Temporal reach:** How far into the unwritten future a quantum system can look before the collapsing present catches up. Topological qubits look further.
- **Topological protection:** Protection through shape rather than strength. Like a knot in a rope that survives being shaken but not being cut.

References

Foundational Works on Topological Quantum Computing

- Kitaev, A. Yu. (2001). Unpaired Majorana fermions in quantum wires. *Physics-Uspekhi*, 44 (Suppl.), 131–136.
- Kitaev, A. Yu. (2003). Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons. *Annals of Physics*, 303(1), 2–30. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-4916\(02\)00018-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-4916(02)00018-0)
- Nayak, C., Simon, S. H., Stern, A., Freedman, M., & Das Sarma, S. (2008). Non-Abelian anyons and topological quantum computation. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 80(3), 1083–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.80.1083>
- Freedman, M., Kitaev, A., Larsen, M., & Wang, Z. (2003). Topological quantum computation. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 40(1), 31–38.
- Lutchyn, R. M. et al. (2010). Majorana fermions and a topological phase transition in semiconductor-superconductor heterostructures. *Physical Review Letters*, 105, 077001.
- Microsoft Research. (2025). Majorana 1: A path to scalable topological quantum computing. Microsoft Technical Report. <https://aka.ms/majorana1>
- Nayak, C. et al., Microsoft Station Q. (2025). Majorana qubits on a topoconductor. *Nature*.

Quantum Entanglement and Temporal Coherence

- Yin, J., et al. (2017). Satellite-based entanglement distribution over 1200 kilometers. *Science*, 356(6343), 1140–1144. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan3211>
- Liao, S.-K., et al. (2018). Satellite-relayed intercontinental quantum network. *Physical Review Letters*, 120(3), 030501. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.030501>
- Hensen, B., et al. (2015). Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres. *Nature*, 526(7575), 682–686. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature15759>

Foundations of Quantum Mechanics and Measurement

- Bell, J. S. (1964). On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics*, 1(3), 195–200.
- Aspect, A., Dalibard, J., & Roger, G. (1982). Experimental test of Bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers. *Physical Review Letters*, 49(25), 1804–1807.
- Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 75(3), 715–775.
- Penrose, R. (1996). On gravity's role in quantum state reduction. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 28(5), 581–600.
- Feynman, R. P. (1982). Simulating physics with computers. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 21(6/7), 467–488.

Shor, P. W. (1994). Algorithms for quantum computation: Discrete logarithms and factoring. *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 124–134.

Quantum Error Correction

Gottesman, D. (1997). Stabilizer codes and quantum error correction. PhD thesis, Caltech.

Dennis, E. et al. (2002). Topological quantum memory. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 43, 4452–4505.

Fowler, A. G. et al. (2012). Surface codes: Towards practical large-scale quantum computation. *Physical Review A*, 86, 032324.

Quantum Gravity and Topology

Witten, E. (1988). Topological quantum field theory. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 117(3), 353–386.

Maldacena, J. (1998). The large-N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. *Advances in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, 2(2), 231–252.

Quantum Foam and Spacetime Microstructure

Wheeler, J. A. (1955). Geons. *Physical Review*, 97(2), 511–536.

Wheeler, J. A. (1962). *Geometrodynamics*. Academic Press, New York.

Amelino-Camelia, G. (2013). Quantum-spacetime phenomenology. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 16(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2013-5>

Ng, Y. J., & van Dam, H. (2000). On Wigner’s clock and the detectability of spacetime foam with gravitational wave detectors. *Physics Letters B*, 477(3–4), 429–435.

Arute, F. et al. (Google AI Quantum). (2019). Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor. *Nature*, 574, 505–510.

Internal Framework References

Bailey, M. Quantum Foam as Substrate: A Generative Framework for Spacetime, Causality, and Collapse Rate Dynamics. Framework Document v1.2. mountainsoftime.com

Bailey, M. Sub-Paper 1: Collapse Rate Gradients Unified Analysis. mountainsoftime.com

Bailey, M. Sub-Paper 5: Collapse Rate Dynamics and Wormhole Formation. mountainsoftime.com

Bailey, M. Sub-Paper 9: Biological Quantum Coherence and QCEBs.
mountainsoftime.com

Linkage to Parent Theory (Foam v1.2)

- **Section 1.5.4:** Foam Density, Collapse Rate Gradients, and Spacetime Geometry
- **Section 5.4.6d:** Collapse Rate $\lambda(v)$ and Velocity-Dependent Substrate Dynamics
- **Section 2.7.3:** Reframing Known Physical Phenomena as Collapse Effects
- **Section 3.9.2:** Photons as Collapse Invitations — Interferometry as Substrate Probing
- **Section 2.4:** Temporal Interference Experiments as Informational Evidence
- **Section 1.5.7:** Wavefunction Collapse Mechanism — Continuous vs. Discrete Models
- **Section 6.5:** Neural/Biological Coherence and Substrate Coupling

mountainsoftime.com | © M. Bailey | Quantum Foam as Substrate v1.2

Editorial review and content contribution: Claude Sonnet 4.6 (Anthropic), 2025–2026.