

JULY 31, 2026 · V2.1

QNFO Consilient Synthesis v2.0: The Shared Adelic Kernel

Rowan Brad Quni-Gudzin

QNFO-ULA-2.1

ABSTRACT

QNFO Consilient Synthesis v2.0: the shared adelic kernel (valuation → tree boundary → Ostrowski → adeles). Applies all 7 corrections (C1–C7) from the 2026-07-25 red-team audit, restructured kernel-first with honest kernel-membership table and mandatory symmetry sections.

CITE AS Quni-Gudzin, R. B. (2026). QNFO Consilient Synthesis v2.0: The Shared Adelic Kernel. QNFO Preprint v2.1.

Author: Rowan Brad Quni-Gudzin (QNFO Research) | **Date:** 2026-07-31 **Version:** 2.0 | **Supersedes:** 2026-07-24 synthesis (v1.0) **License:** QNFO-ULA

Correction provenance: This v2.0 synthesis incorporates all 7 corrections (C1–C7) mandated by the 2026-07-25 red-team audit of the "Shared Mathematical Kernel: The Adelic Core" note (R2: qnfo-releases/audits/2026/07/adelic-core-note-redteam-2026-07-25.md), and is restructured around the kernel-first spine the audit judged superior: **valuation** → **tree boundary** → **Ostrowski** → **adeles**.

Executive Summary

QNFO research in 2025–2026 converges on a single structural insight: **non-Archimedean (ultrametric) mathematics — p-adic valuations, Bruhat–Tits trees, Ostrowski’s theorem — provides the correct state-space geometry for fundamental physics, quantum computation, and optimization.** The Archimedean (real-number, continuous) description is the ∞-place readout of a richer ultrametric structure.

Four research programs engage the shared kernel directly; one (Qubit Delusion) connects by consilient interpretation. This synthesis presents the kernel as the organizing spine — each of its four elements (valuation, tree boundary, Ostrowski, adeles) examined once, with per-pillar evidence beneath it — rather than the v1.0 program-by-program layout.

Honest kernel-membership summary (audit K1, K3):

Pillar	Kernel membership	Basis
Adelic Physics (ZBW P1–P7)	FULL	v_p channelwise, Bruhat–Tits tree, Ostrowski, adeles
Ultrametric Foundations	FULL	v_p^max classification, Mahler spectra, Kodaira–Néron
Silent Radix / SRE	WEAKER	v_b ultrametric only; composite b escapes Ostrowski [established, audit K3]
PBO / Autaxys	INTERPRETIVE	1 of 3 ontologies touches valuations [established, audit K1]
Qubit Delusion series	INTERPRETIVE	No explicit kernel use — consilient reading [my conjecture]

Core claim (locked, falsifiable): A single non-Archimedean valuation-theoretic structure ($v_p \rightarrow$ Bruhat–Tits boundary ultrametric $\rightarrow$ Ostrowski completion classification $\rightarrow$ adelic restricted product) is **necessary and sufficient** to derive the central results of at least three of the five pillars, and its removal breaks each derivation at an identifiable step. [my conjecture]

Disconfirmed if: any pillar's central result can be re-derived using only Archimedean structure with no loss of content, OR if the claimed shared-kernel steps are shown to be decorative (removable without breaking the derivation).

Explicitly NOT claimed: that all five pillars use an *identical* kernel (audit K3: Silent Radix uses the strictly weaker ultrametric/positional kernel), or that α 's numerical value has been derived (audit T4).

Part I. The Kernel-First Spine

Element 1 — Valuation (v_p, v_b)

Definition. For a prime p , the p -adic valuation $v_p: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ maps $x = p^k \cdot (a/b)$ with $p \nmid a, b$ to k . It satisfies the strong (ultrametric) triangle inequality:

Where the pillars use it:

- **Adelic Physics** uses v_p channelwise on ZBW transition data: each prime channel carries its own p -adic valuation, and the transition graph's hierarchical structure reflects valuation-level distinctions. [CODE-EXECUTED, ZBW P1 <https://papers.qnfo.org/papers>]
- **Ultrametric Foundations** classifies quantum error-correcting codes by $v_p^{\max}$ statistics: *optimal code families* achieve $v_p^{\max} = 28$ vs. 4 for random ensembles — a $7\times$ discriminant. [computationally verified, Conjectures C2.1', C5.1, C7.3']
- **Silent Radix** uses v_b for the positional base b (its own example: decimal transport with $b \sim 2^{128}$). [verified – *silent-radix-synthesis §1.2* defines $d(x, y) = b^{\{-v_b(x-y)\}}$ with the strong triangle inequality]

Constraining note (audit K1, C1/C3): $v_\infty(x) = -\log|x|$ is an *Arakelov-theory convention*, not a valuation in the Krull sense — the ∞ -place carries an absolute value. This synthesis uses "valuation" for the non-Archimedean cases only, and "absolute value" for the Archimedean place.

PBO/Autaxys and Qubit Delusion do NOT use valuations in their own content — see the kernel-membership table above. Their connection is consilient interpretation, labeled [my conjecture – consilient reading] throughout.

Element 2 — Tree Boundary (Bruhat–Tits $\partial_\infty \mathcal{T}$)

Definition. The Bruhat–Tits tree $\mathcal{T}_p$ is the $(p+1)$ -regular tree whose vertices are homothety classes of lattices in $\mathbb{Q}_p^2$. Its boundary at infinity $\partial_\infty \mathcal{T}_p$ is canonically $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. The vertex set realizes the quotient $\mathrm{PGL}(2, \mathbb{Q}_p)/\mathrm{PGL}(2, \mathbb{Z}_p)$.

Where the pillars use it:

- **Adelic Physics:** the ZBW transition graph has Bruhat–Tits structure; its Gromov hyperbolicity parameter $\delta \rightarrow 0$, indicating 0-hyperbolicity. [CODE-EXECUTED, P1]
- **Ultrametric Foundations:** self-dual ultrametric trees under Bruhat–Tits embedding correspond to CSS codes. [computationally verified – theorem target, C2.1']

- **QLoF / STC:** reality as a Bruhat–Tits tree of distinctions; passive geometric fault tolerance via the ultrametric inequality (small perturbations cannot accumulate). [my conjecture – mathematical argument, Ch. 17]

Correction C1 (audit K2 — math error fixed): v1.0 stated "distance is ultrametric" for the tree's vertex metric. This is **false**: the graph-geodesic metric on a tree is 0-hyperbolic but does NOT satisfy the strong triangle inequality (three collinear vertices violate it). Correct formulation used here:

The boundary metric (via the Gromov product) is ultrametric; the tree is its 0-hyperbolic geometric realization. The ZBW P1 finding $\delta \rightarrow 0$ measures the *transition graph's* 0-hyperbolicity — correctly distinct from the boundary's ultrametricity.

Falsifiability: the "ZBW graph is ultrametric" reading is disconfirmed if the vertex metric's computed $\delta > 0$ while the boundary Gromov-product metric satisfies the strong triangle inequality to machine precision (this is the ACRP-02 experiment, pending).

Element 3 — Ostrowski's Theorem

Theorem (Ostrowski, with the C2 qualifier). Every **non-trivial** absolute value on $\mathbb{Q}$ is equivalent either to the Archimedean absolute value $|\cdot|^\infty$ or to a *p-adic absolute value* $|\cdot|_p$ for a unique prime p .

Where the pillars use it:

- **Adelic QEC (P5):** no Archimedean perturbation can move a p-adic fixed point $\rightarrow$ intrinsic qubit protection with $O(1)$ overhead. [my conjecture – formal proof sketch provided] The Adelic QEC paper states Ostrowski correctly with the "non-trivial" qualifier and builds the mutual-singularity argument on it. [verified]
- **Ultrametric Foundations:** the completeness of each $|\cdot|_p$ determines the code-classification spectrum.
- **Silent Radix — WEAKER KERNEL (correction C2):** for **composite base b**, $\mathbb{Q}$ with the b-adic metric completes to $\mathbb{Z}_b \cong \prod_{p|b} \mathbb{Z}_p$ — a ring with zero divisors, **not a field, and not one of Ostrowski's completions**. v_b for composite b is not even a valuation (it fails multiplicativity). The honest formulation: Silent Radix lives in the *ultrametric/positional-notation* kernel (the strong triangle inequality survives composite b), which is **strictly weaker** than the Ostrowski/adelic kernel. The claim "all five pillars are different facets of taking Ostrowski's theorem seriously" fails for the pillar whose defining parameter is an arbitrary base.

Element 4 — The Adelic Ring

Definition. The adèle ring $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the restricted product $\prod_p' \mathbb{Q}_p \times \mathbb{R}$ with respect to $\mathbb{Z}_p$: all but finitely many components lie in $\mathbb{Z}_p$.

Where the pillars use it:

- **Adelic Physics / Adelic Anyons:** physical states are adelic tuples; anyons are adelic patterns manifesting differently at each completion. [speculative – the framework's central conjecture, per audit K4]
- **ATQC:** the adelic braid group $B_n(\mathbb{A})$ is a restricted product of place-specific braid groups; the adelic Verlinde algebra factorizes $\mathcal{V}(\mathbb{A}) \cong \prod_p \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{Q}_p) \otimes \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{R})$. [my conjecture – formal construction]

Correction C7 (audit K4): "Physical states are adelic tuples" carries the [speculative] label throughout this synthesis, and its falsifiability conditions are cross-referenced to Adelic Cross-Domain v3.2 §8.4 (<https://papers.qnfo.org/papers>).

Part II. The Four Consilience Threads (with audit verdicts)

T1 — Archimedean/Non-Archimedean Duality [PARTIAL FAIL – corrected]

Corrected framing (C4): v1.0's "Silent Radix exploits the gap between decimal (∞) and secret-base (p) valuations" was a **category error**. Decimal is **not** the Archimedean place — base-10 is itself a positional (non-Archimedean-flavored) encoding with composite radix $10 = 2 \cdot 5$. The gap SRE exploits is between two *radix interpretations* (10 vs b), i.e., **intra-ultrametric**, not Archimedean-vs-non-Archimedean. The ∞ -place appears nowhere in SRE's own framing (Eve's problem is unknown-weight knapsack over digit strings).

Where the duality does hold: Adelic Physics / ZBW p -adic channels PASS; Ultrametric Foundations v_p statistics PASS.

Qubit Delusion attribution (C3): v1.0 claimed the Qubit Delusion "diagnoses the ∞ -place projection error." The Qubit Delusion series **never mentions valuations** — its actual diagnosis is particle ontology / map-territory confusion / institutional incentives. This synthesis writes it as: "*the Qubit Delusion series diagnoses the gate-model QC failure in terms that a consilient reading connects to the ultrametric alternative*" [my conjecture – consilient reading] — not as what the paper "diagnoses."

T2 — $O(1)$ Code Protection [QUALIFIED PASS – corrected]

Correction C5: v1.0's "Silent Radix's base ambiguity naturally resists **factorization**" stated the **wrong hardness assumption**. SRE security reduces to a variant of the integer **knapsack** problem with unknown weights b^i (paper §Abstract), not integer factorization. These have different complexity profiles and different quantum vulnerability (Shor breaks factoring; knapsack variants are a different story). Corrected statement:

SRE security reduces to an unknown-weight knapsack variant — not to integer factorization. [established – paper §Abstract]

Where $O(1)$ protection is genuinely proposed:

- **Adelic QEC (P5):** replaces active correction with incommensurability via Ostrowski. The core protection claim is labeled [my conjecture – formal proof sketch] in the paper itself — this synthesis does not launder it into established fact.
- **$v_p^{\max}$ classification** PASS; **QEC-overhead-as-economic-failure** PASS (surface-code overhead + \$35B/zero-viable-machines forensics, [established – derived from Landauer + ML bounds]).
- "Protection should be structural, not additive" — fair consilient summary, labeled [my conjecture].

T3 — The Substrate IS the Algorithm [PASS – intact]

The strongest thread: genuinely present in all five sources.

- **Problem-Substrate Mapping** (substrate determines capability) PASS
- **Silent Radix** exploits intrinsic notation properties PASS
- **Adelic QEC** uses intrinsic $\mathbb{Q}_p$ topology PASS
- **$v_p^{\max}$** intrinsic to valuation PASS
- **PBO/Autaxys** pattern-process inseparability PASS (Syntactic Generation)

Thread 3 passed red-team verbatim across all five pillars — the strongest consilience result in the corpus. Its formal elevation is deferred to ACRP-05 ("The Substrate Is the Algorithm" formalization).

T4 — π and α as Consequences, Not Inputs [FAIL as stated – corrected]

Correction C6: v1.0 claimed the α - π -Helix program "demonstrates that α and π emerge from vortex geometry and p-adic completions." The fine-structure cross-ratio paper (<https://papers.qnfo.org/papers/fine-structure-constant-cross-ratio/>) explicitly "proposes a geometric understanding" and "reframes" α as $\text{CR}(r_e, \lambda_C; 0, \infty) = r_e / \lambda_C$ — an algebraic restatement of α 's definition, not a derivation of its value from prior geometry. Corrected statement:

The α - π -Helix program *proposes* that α and π are projections of geometric structure [speculative]; the cross-ratio reframing is *consistent with* this but does not derive α 's numerical value. The paper includes its own falsifiability section (§8.4) precisely because the emergence claim is not yet demonstrated.

Part III. Mandatory Symmetry (KIF-18)

Where External Literature Supports the Kernel Framing

- Bruhat–Tits tree theory is standard (Serre *Trees*; Bridson–Haefliger for Gromov hyperbolicity) — the boundary $\partial_\infty \mathcal{T}_p \cong \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ identification is textbook.
- p-adic / ultrametric methods in physics have an established literature: Volovich's p-adic string hypothesis, Vladimirov–Volovich–Zelenov *p-adic Analysis and Mathematical Physics*, Khrennikov's ultrametric probability.
- Ultrametricity in information-processing contexts has documented precedents (Murtagh's ultrametric analysis of data, Bradley–Murtagh cosmology work).

Where External Literature Constrains or Contradicts the Kernel Framing

- **No experimental confirmation of p-adic physical channels exists.** All known physical noise is Archimedean; the question "what physical processes produce non-Archimedean perturbations?" (Q9) is an open theoretical gap, not a solved problem.
- **The single-collective problem:** all QNFO research originates from one research collective. Convergence across QNFO programs does **not** constitute independent confirmation. [significant limitation – all findings should be treated as originating from a single research program until external replication occurs]
- **Archimedean competitors exist and are simpler:** the "ultrametric" structure of ZBW transition graphs may be a generic property of hierarchical or tree-like graphs, not evidence for p-adic ontology. No published external analysis has established that the claimed ultrametric signatures are absent in Archimedean-only models.
- **The 3-smooth mass-ratio claim (Cross-Domain v3.2) may be a look-elsewhere artifact:** $\mathcal{P} = \{2^a 3^b 5^c\}$ is dense enough in $\mathbb{R}^+$ that a 2% fit could arise by chance; the ACRP-04 statistical audit is designed to decide this. Until that audit reports, the claim is [UNTESTED] for its statistical significance.

Part IV. Calibration Register

Part V. Open Questions (carried forward)

| Question | Source | Domain | Status |

|:--|:-----|:-----|:-----| | Q1 | Is $\mathcal{O}_{\text{ZBW}}$ measurable in real materials? | Adelic Physics | Physics | OPEN — protocols designed (P3), not executed | | Q2 | Does Majorana T_2 scale independently of Archimedean noise amplitude? | P5 | Physics | OPEN — predicted, unmeasured | | Q3 | Do CMB data show log-periodic oscillations at predicted frequencies? | QLoF | Cosmology | OPEN — prediction made, analysis pending | | Q5 | Can the Kodaira–Néron classifier be proved formally? | Ultrametric Found. | Math | OPEN — theorem target | | Q9 | What physical processes produce non-Archimedean perturbations? | All | Physics | OPEN — theoretical gap | | Q18 | Can joules-per-solution be applied to adelic QEC architectures? | Qubit Delusion | CS/Econ | OPEN — not yet analyzed |

Part VI. Summary: Kernel → Pillars → Deliverables

Kernel element	Fully engages	Weakly engages	Interpretive
Valuation v_p/v_b	Adelic Physics, Ultrametric Found.	Silent Radix (v_b)	—
Tree boundary $\partial\infty\mathcal{T}$	Adelic Physics, Ultrametric Found.	—	QLoF (Ch. 17 argument)
Ostrowski	Adelic QEC (P5)	—	—
Adeles $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}$	Adelic Anyons, ATQC	—	—

Program-level next actions (ACRP):

1. **ACRP-01** (this document) → corrections applied, kernel-first restructure, publication pipeline.
2. **ACRP-04** (parallel-eligible, P0): Pythagorean semigroup mass-ratio statistical audit — outcome-neutral; may strengthen or bound the v3.2 claim.
3. **ACRP-02/03** (P1, after ACRP-01): boundary ultrametricity formalization; composite-radix theory repair.
4. **ACRP-08** (P2): paradigm forecast superseding the provisional priority table.

Version History

Version	Date	Changes
1.0	2026-07-24	Initial synthesis from KG survey + D1 full-text retrieval
2.0	2026-07-31	C1–C7 corrections applied (audit 2026-07-25); restructured kernel-first (valuation → tree boundary → Ostrowski → adeles); honest kernel-membership table; 5-pillar → 4-kernel-element summary; mandatory symmetry sections added; certainty calibration throughout