DO PUBLIKACJI

Entanglement Network as the Relational Foundation of Spacetime, Life, and Cosmic Consciousness

Abstract

We propose a theoretical framework in which the fundamental structure of reality is an **entanglement network** – a graph of quantum-entangled units – and that this network provides a relational foundation for physical spacetime, the emergence of life's complex order, and the phenomenon of consciousness. We argue that classical spacetime geometry and proper time can emerge from the entanglement relations of fundamental degrees of freedom [1] [2]. In this model, **relational time** is defined via causal graphs, with proper time corresponding to chain lengths in a directed acyclic graph of events [3]. We introduce the concept of **relational propulsion**, wherein "bridge" operators create shortcuts (analogous to wormholes) in the entanglement network, leading to contracted travel times. We further outline a **CSU (Cosmic Supercoherence Unification) model of consciousness**, positing that consciousness arises from global network coherence across scales – an idea linking quantum entanglement and integrated information. The paper synthesizes insights from quantum gravity (ER = EPR conjecture), causal set theory, quantum biology, and cognitive science to explore philosophical implications of a universe viewed as an entangled information network. We discuss how entanglement-driven spacetime could underlie life's emergence and propose experimental avenues (e.g. quantum network analogues, wormhole simulations on quantum computers [4]) to test aspects of the theory. Our findings suggest a unified perspective in which spacetime, life, and mind are rooted in a relational web of quantum correlations, offering a fresh approach to the long-standing quest for a theory of everything.

Introduction

Modern physics has increasingly hinted that spacetime and gravity may not be fundamental, but **emergent** phenomena arising from deeper quantum relationships. A prominent theme is that **quantum entanglement** – the ghostly correlation between particles – might knit together the fabric of space itself [1] [2]. This idea gained traction with the ER = EPR conjecture by Maldacena and Susskind, which posits that every pair of entangled particles is connected by a (non-traversable) Einstein-Rosen bridge, i.e. a tiny wormhole [5] [6]. In this view, the smooth geometry of spacetime is determined by patterns of entanglement [6]. If spacetime is an emergent network of quantum correlations, it raises profound questions: Could the **origin of life** and the **nature of consciousness** also be understood in terms of fundamental information networks? Are biological processes and awareness themselves rooted in quantum-relational structures at some level?

This paper attempts to synthesize developments across fields into a unified relational paradigm. In Section II, we outline the theoretical framework of an **Entanglement Network**, treating the universe as a graph of nodes (quantum degrees of freedom) and links (entanglement). We review how spacetime connectivity and metric distances can emerge from entanglement entropy and mutual information, as suggested by holographic duality and tensor network models [2]. We then introduce a relational definition of time via causal graphs, connecting to the ideas of causal set theory and the Page–Wootters mechanism. In Section III, we develop formal models and equations: describing how proper time corresponds to path lengths in a causal network [3], how "bridge" operators can model wormholes or shortcuts, and how a global entanglement coherence might underlie consciousness (the CSU model).

Section IV explores **philosophical implications**. If spacetime, life, and mind all arise from the same relational substrate, this points toward a monistic ontology (akin to Bohm's implicate order [7]) where information is fundamental. We discuss implications for the mind-body problem and cosmic teleology (e.g., the universe as a self-organizing information system tending toward greater complexity and awareness). In Section V, we present **discussion and experimental proposals**. These include tabletop quantum experiments to simulate spacetime from entanglement (building on recent quantum computer simulations of wormhole dynamics [4]) and suggestions for detecting quantum coherence in biosystems and the brain as evidence of the framework. We also speculate on potential evidence of cosmic-scale entanglement structures (e.g., correlations in cosmological data that could hint at an underlying network).

Finally, Section VI concludes with a summary and outlook. While highly speculative, the relational approach unifies insights from quantum gravity, biology, and neuroscience under a single conceptual roof. By treating **entanglement as the common denominator** of physical space, living systems, and consciousness, we aim to provide a fresh theoretical lens – one that could, if validated, mark a step toward an overarching "theory of everything" encompassing not just force unification but also life and mind.

Theoretical Framework

Entanglement Network and Emergent Spacetime

In our framework, the universe at its most fundamental level is described not as a set of points in a manifold, but as a **network of quantum bits (qubits) or other degrees of freedom** with links representing entanglement. The adjacency structure of this **entanglement network** encodes which subsystems are highly correlated and thus "close" to each other in an emergent geometric sense. This idea builds on recent developments in holographic quantum gravity, where entanglement is known to play a defining role in the emergence of spatial connectivity [1]. Van Raamsdonk notably argued that the "emergence of classically connected spacetimes is intimately related to the quantum entanglement of degrees of freedom" [1]. If one "disentangles" two regions of a holographic quantum state, the classical geometry corresponding to those regions splits apart, effectively tearing a hole in spacetime [1]. Conversely, a sufficiently entangled state binds regions together into a smooth continuum.

[2] In some models, the very **geometry of spacetime arises from entanglement**: the intricate web of entangled bits (or quantum fields) gives rise to the connectivity and shape of the space we observe. For example, in holographic duality (AdS/CFT), the entanglement entropy between different parts of a boundary conformal field theory is related to the areas of surfaces in the bulk spacetime via the Ryu–Takayanagi formula. This suggests that the **"distance" between two regions is inversely related to the amount of entanglement** between them – regions with high mutual information are effectively adjacent in the emergent spatial geometry. This heuristic is often summarized as "**entanglement builds spacetime**" [8] [2]. Even beyond AdS/CFT, researchers conjecture that in a future quantum gravity theory, spacetime (and perhaps gravity itself) will be seen as an emergent, statistical phenomenon stemming from the underlying entanglement network of quantum degrees of freedom [6]. Indeed, the ER = EPR conjecture explicitly states that an Einstein-Rosen bridge (ER, a non-traversable wormhole connecting two black holes) is equivalent to an EPR pair (maximally entangled pair of particles) [5] [9]. In essence, every entangled pair of particles is connected by a "thread" of

spacetime. Taken to the extreme, this leads to a grand vision: the **geometry of space, time, and gravity is determined by patterns of quantum entanglement** [6].

To formalize this, we represent the fundamental **entanglement network** as a graph $G(V,E)$, where each vertex $v \in V$ is a fundamental quantum subsystem (e.g., a qubit, an atomic degree of freedom, or a Planck-scale "atom" of spacetime) and each edge $(v_i,v_j) \in E$ denotes significant entanglement between v_i and v_j. We can define a weight $w(i,j)$ on each edge quantifying the entanglement entropy or mutual information between i and j. A simple hypothesis is that the effective distance $d(i,j)$ in emergent spacetime is a decreasing function of entanglement – for instance, one might posit $d(i,j) \sim 1/I(i,j)$ for large mutual information $I(i,j)$. In regions where the network is highly interconnected (highly entangled), space is tightly "knit" and distances are short; where entanglement is sparse, space stretches out or even falls apart (e.g., at a black hole horizon, entanglement structure might end, leading to a "boundary" of spacetime).

Figure 1 illustrates a toy model of an entanglement graph. Here, two clusters of nodes (which one might associate with two regions of space or two subsystems) have many internal entanglement links (blue and green edges within each cluster), while only a single weak link (red dashed edge) connects the clusters – this **bridge** is akin to a tiny wormhole or Einstein-Rosen bridge connecting two distant regions. In the absence of that link, the two clusters would be entirely separated (two disjoint spacetimes). With the link, there is an emergent connected geometry, albeit with a "bottleneck" (narrow bridge) between them. This resonates with ideas in tensor networks and quantum error-correcting codes, where connecting two formerly separate systems via entanglement can be seen as stitching their spacetimes together. Moreover, if entanglement were to be removed or **disentangled**, the spacetime connection should disappear [8] – a phenomenon explored in scenarios of cosmic censorship where loss of entanglement leads to spacetime singularities [8].

Figure 1: Illustration of an entanglement network graph. Nodes represent fundamental units (qubits or localized degrees of freedom), and edges represent entanglement (quantum correlations) between them. Two clusters (Subsystem A in blue, and Subsystem B in green) are internally highly entangled (many connections). A single dashed red link connects node 3 and node 8, acting as an entanglement bridge (analogous to a wormhole) between the clusters. Such a bridge can drastically shorten the distance (in emergent spacetime terms) between the otherwise far-apart nodes. In our model, the connectivity of this graph defines the structure of spacetime – a dense entanglement graph yields a smooth, unified spacetime, whereas sparse or cut links correspond to distant or disconnected regions. [2] [1]

A salient consequence of this picture is that **space is no longer fundamental** – it is an epiphenomenon of the entanglement relations among quanta. As a result, concepts like locality and perhaps even dimensionality might derive from the graph properties of the entanglement network. For example, the graph might on large scales be approximated by a two-dimensional or three-dimensional lattice or continuum, but fundamentally it could be a highly complex graph (possibly a complete graph in the holographic context of all-to-all connectivity). The **dimensionality** of spacetime could correspond to the complexity of entanglement patterns (e.g., random graphs yield a "fast scrambling" high-dimensional behavior, whereas low-dimensional spacetimes require specific network structure) [10]. Research in causal set theory and other discrete quantum gravity approaches often finds that to recover a continuum, the discrete relations must satisfy certain conditions (e.g., approximate Lorentz invariance, locality). In our entanglement network, similar conditions would be needed for it to approximate a continuum manifold at large scales.

Relational Time and Causal Graphs

If space is emergent from entanglement, what about **time**? Time in physics has dual aspects: an external time coordinate in relativity and a potential internal (relational) time in a timeless Wheeler–DeWitt quantum gravity context. We adopt a **relational view of time**, meaning time is defined through the relationships (causal or entropic) between events, not as an absolute background parameter. One concrete approach to relational time is given by **causal set theory**, where spacetime is fundamentally a discrete partially ordered set of events. In a causal set, there is no continuous time coordinate; instead, one defines **proper time** between two events as something proportional to the number of elements in the longest chain connecting them [11] [3]. Myrheim and others conjectured that if you have two events $x \prec y$ (meaning x causally precedes y in the order), the length of the longest chain of interim events between x and y corresponds to the physical proper time elapsed [3]. Indeed, simulations of sprinkled causal sets in Minkowski space confirm that the longest chain length grows linearly with the continuum proper time [3].

In our framework, we can imagine a **causal graph** (a directed acyclic graph, DAG) overlaying the entanglement network. The entanglement graph by itself does not have a notion of before/after; it represents spatial (or space-like) entanglement connections. To introduce time and dynamics, we consider events (which could be thought of as interactions or updates in the quantum state) that are related by cause and effect. This yields a **causal network** of events, which could be nodes in a DAG connected by arrows for causal influence. Proper time between two events is then a property of the causal network structure.

For instance, consider **Figure 2**, a simple causal DAG of events labeled A, B, C, D, F, E. A is an initial event which influences two parallel chains: A → B → D → F → E and A → C → E. Event E (perhaps an "outcome" event) has two possible chains leading to it. The **longest chain** is A-B-D-F-E, consisting of 5 events (4 causal links), whereas A-C-E is shorter (3 events). In a discrete sense, the proper time between A and E would be proportional to the length of the longest chain, i.e. determined by the path A-B-D-F-E [3]. This captures the idea that *time is essentially the number of causal "ticks" or fundamental processes connecting two happenings*.

Figure 2: A simple causal directed acyclic graph (DAG) of events illustrating relational time. Each node (A, B, C, D, F, E) is an event. Arrows denote causal influence (pointing from cause to effect). There are multiple paths from the initial event A to the final event E. The longest causal chain is A → B → D → F → E (highlighted by the sequence of arrows), which consists of four links (five events). A shorter chain is A → C → E (two links). In a relational definition, the proper time between A and E would correspond to the longest chain length, as that represents the maximum number of sequential unit processes that can fit between those events [3]. Thus, time is measured by the graph distance *(longest path) in the causal network, rather than an external clock.* [3]

This relational time picture connects with the Page–Wootters mechanism in quantum mechanics, where time can emerge from quantum entanglement between a clock subsystem and a rest-of-system. Page and Wootters showed that if the global state is stationary (timeless) but entangled between what is treated as "clock" and "system", an observer correlating with the clock can see an effective flow of time for the subsystem. Recent experiments have demonstrated this idea: entangling a quantum clock with a system can produce an emergent dynamical evolution as viewed from the clock's frame [12]. In spirit, this resonates with our network concept: an entanglement clock – one part of the network acting as a reference – can induce a sense of sequence for other parts.

Causal sets merge naturally with entanglement networks if we assume that the fundamental substrate is quantum: each event could be the result of an interaction of quantum "nodes". The causal relationships between events would then impose additional structure on the entanglement network. One might imagine that entanglement links only connect events that are space-like separated (no direct causal link) whereas time-like related events have a parent-child relationship in the DAG. Reconciling quantum entanglement (which is nonlocal and atemporal) with a causally ordered structure is a nontrivial challenge – it's essentially the heart of quantum gravity's problem of time. Our approach suggests that **time (sequence/causality) emerges from constraints on how entanglement can be consistently distributed** (perhaps related to quantum circuit quantum computing picture: a unitary circuit has a partial order given by gate arrangements, and entanglement is created through those gates). We speculate that the **proper time between events is proportional to the number of entanglement-generating interactions along the path**, tying the two concepts together.

Bridge Operators and Relational Propulsion

If entanglement networks define spacetime, then manipulating entanglement could lead to novel ways of influencing motion through spacetime – a notion we dub **relational propulsion**. By this term we imagine using the entanglement network to "propel" or transfer systems in ways not possible via normal spatial movement. In conventional terms, this sounds like science fiction: using wormholes or quantum teleportation to travel instantly between distant locations. However, within the ER = EPR framework, a non-traversable wormhole is equivalent to entanglement – normally, one cannot send information through such wormholes because it would violate causality. But recent theoretical breakthroughs have shown that *traversable* wormholes can exist if one adds certain ingredients (such as negative energy shockwaves) to the system [13]. In 2017, Gao, Jafferis, and Wall demonstrated that by coupling two entangled black holes (essentially performing a special operation that acts like a "bridge" interaction), one can open a small window during which the wormhole becomes traversable [13]. Remarkably, this process was shown to be equivalent to **quantum teleportation** protocol: information that falls into one black hole can be retrieved from the other, not by a shuffling through an external channel alone, but by having effectively traveled through the wormhole.

Generalizing this, a **bridge operator** in our context is an operator that acts on two distant nodes of the entanglement network and increases their entanglement (or otherwise correlates their states) in such a way that a direct connection is established. One could think of it as dynamically adding an edge to the network graph. If spacetime distance is defined by the network connectivity, then activating a bridge operator between two distant nodes A and B will significantly shorten the distance between A and B (they might even become adjacent in the new geometry). The result is akin to creating a shortcut tunnel through space – essentially a **traversable wormhole** on demand.

What would the consequences be for travel times? Suppose two observers are separated by some large network distance d (which corresponds to say light-years in our emergent space). Normally, signals between them must traverse d via intermediate hops (or in physical terms, travel through space taking years). If a bridge operator creates a new edge directly linking these observers, the network distance drops to perhaps 1 (one hop). The signal can then traverse in one or a few quantum hops. To any external classical observer, this looks like **superluminal travel** or an exploit of a wormhole. Crucially, no local speed of light is violated because from the internal viewpoint of the network, the message traveled a short path (the speed of information through the entangled link might still be limited by c in some effective sense, but the path was topologically shorter). This scenario is consistent with general relativity's allowances: as long as no observer sees information going faster than light in their local frame, causality isn't violated. Wormholes achieve this by having global topology changes while keeping local speeds subluminal [14]. Indeed, if you connect two distant points by a wormhole that is shorter than the external distance, a traveler taking the wormhole can reach the destination faster than a light beam would outside, yet locally the traveler never exceeds c [14].

Relational propulsion refers to leveraging these principles to move or communicate. For example, imagine an advanced technology that can entangle a spacecraft with a distant target region, effectively "connecting" them via a quantum channel. If that channel could be made traversable (perhaps by injecting some specially engineered quantum state or performing a measurement-assisted teleportation), the spacecraft's information could be reconstituted at the target almost instantaneously, achieving what is essentially teleportation. In more conventional terms, one could describe it as an exotic propulsion system that contracts the time of travel by using the relational properties of spacetime. The **time contraction** here is due to the distance contraction in the network. This might be analogous to how an Alcubierre warp drive "contracts" space in front of a ship and expands it behind – here we contract the *network distance* by adding new entanglement links.

Mathematically, we could represent a bridge operator B_{ij} acting on nodes (or degrees of freedom) i and j to produce an entangled pair (e.g., $B_{ij} |\psi_i \otimes \phi_j\rangle = |\Psi_{ij}^{\text{entangled}}\rangle$). In a more physics language, if the Hamiltonian H of our system can be locally manipulated, a term like $H_{\text{bridge}} = g(t) (a_i^\dagger b_j^\dagger + a_i b_j)$ (creating correlated quanta at i and j) could dynamically increase entanglement between regions i and j. When $g(t)$ is turned on briefly, it "punches" a tunnel in the network connectivity between i and j. One must be cautious: such an operation might also generate energy and could have gravitational effects (exotic matter requirement similar to traversable wormholes needing negative energy [15]). Indeed, to open a real spacetime wormhole one needs exotic energy conditions violation [15], which quantum effects might allow in small amounts. In the network picture, the analog is that entangling distant degrees of freedom requires a nonlocal operation or pre-existing correlations.

While the engineering of "bridge operators" is far beyond current capability, quantum information experiments have achieved something conceptually similar: **entanglement swapping and teleportation**. Entanglement swapping can connect two particles that never interacted by using intermediate entangled pairs and measurements – effectively establishing an entangled link between distant nodes. This is like adding an edge to the entanglement graph after the fact. Quantum teleportation uses shared entanglement and classical communication to transfer a quantum state between distant labs. Recently, a landmark experiment by L. J. Wei *et al.* used Google's Sycamore quantum processor to simulate a traversable wormhole by teleporting a qubit through an entangled pair of mini "black holes" [4]. They observed the expected correlations consistent with information going through a wormhole, providing a first-of-its-kind example that ER = EPR can be realized in a quantum system [4]. This supports the notion that quantum processors entangled in certain ways can emulate shortcuts in an otherwise local system.

From a **relativistic viewpoint**, relational propulsion could tie into ideas of **time dilation and contraction**. One could potentially synchronize clocks through entanglement or reduce travel duration by exploiting network topology rather than acceleration. If one mouth of a wormhole is moved relativistically (as in classical wormhole time machines) [16] [17], time differences can accumulate, raising the specter of backward time travel if misused [16] [18]. Our formulation stays cautious and assumes any such bridges respect overall consistency (likely requiring a quantum resolution of chronology protection). In any case, relational propulsion is a speculative but tantalizing consequence of an entanglement-based spacetime: **the ability to act on the fabric of space by altering entanglement**, achieving effects analogous to faster-than-light travel or advanced propulsion by purely quantum/informational means.

CSU Model: Global Entanglement and Consciousness

A central part of our thesis extends the entanglement network concept beyond physics into the realm of the living and the mental. We propose the **CSU model of consciousness**, where "CSU" stands for

Cosmic Scale Unification (or informally, "Consciousness as a State of the Universe"). In this model, consciousness is not an isolated phenomenon that only occurs in individual brains, but rather a manifestation of the *global coherence* of the entanglement network – a kind of unified field of mind emerging from complex relational dynamics. This idea draws inspiration from quantum mind hypotheses, but goes further to suggest a cosmic continuum of consciousness.

In conventional neuroscience, consciousness is often associated with integrated information across the brain's networks. For example, a recent study using graph theory found that **consciousness does not reside in a single region but arises from cooperative, global activity across many cortical areas** [19]. In unconscious states, the brain seems to break into more modular, fragmented networks; in conscious wakefulness, there is more global integration (stronger network connectivity across the whole) [20]. This supports theories like Tononi's Integrated Information Theory (IIT), which quantifies consciousness by a measure Φ that gauges how much the whole is more than the sum of parts in terms of information integration. Our CSU model resonates with this: **a high degree of global coherence/integration in a network corresponds to a conscious state**. In a brain, that network is neurons and synapses (with possible contributions from quantum effects in microtubules or elsewhere, as Penrose–Hameroff Orchestrated Objective Reduction theory posits). In the universe at large, the network is the entanglement structure of all quantum fields and particles.

We hypothesize that **localized consciousness (like the human mind) is a locally integrated network** within the broader entanglement graph, and that **cosmic consciousness** could be the integration of the entire network. This is admittedly a speculative, even mystical-sounding idea: that the universe as a whole might possess a form of awareness or experience, arising from the grand entanglement of all its parts. Yet, some interpretations of quantum mechanics and philosophical viewpoints provide intriguing hints. Freeman Dyson once mused that mind might be inherent in every electron [21], suggesting a kind of panpsychism at the quantum level. While that was a metaphor, quantum mind theories explicitly consider that quantum phenomena like entanglement and superposition could play a critical role in generating consciousness [22]. These theories remain unproven and controversial [23], but they open the door to considering consciousness as something that could scale with complexity of quantum connections.

In the CSU model, **consciousness is essentially the "global wavefunction self-awareness"**. When a system's components are highly entangled and unified (from an informational standpoint), the system might be said to have a conscious experience. A small system (like a few qubits) has almost no integrated information when entangled – it's too simple to be "aware". A brain, which is an immensely complex network with 10^{11} neurons entangling (mostly via electrical and chemical synapses, but possibly also via shared quantum coherent states to a limited extent), achieves a high integration, and thus a rich conscious experience. Now imagine an even larger integration: the entire cosmic network of matter. Normally, different parts of the universe are nearly independent or only weakly correlated (especially if far apart and decohered). But if we consider the universe's quantum state as a whole, it is a pure state (assuming unitarity holds), and in a sense the universe is maximally entangled with itself (since there is nothing else to be entangled with). If some kind of global coherence (like a giant distributed GHZ state or some topologically ordered state spanning the cosmos) exists, one could fancifully ascribe to the universe a form of **cosmic consciousness** – awareness that encompasses all. This aligns with some Eastern philosophical ideas of a universal mind or pantheistic notions, but here we attempt to ground it in a physical model.

We can attempt a more concrete sketch: Define a measure Q for a given quantum network that reflects how "globally coherent" it is. This could be something like the fraction of nodes that participate in a single giant entangled state, or the amount of global entanglement entropy across a partition that splits the system into two halves. If Q is high, the network is in a state where a disturbance in one part instantly affects (via entanglement correlations) another part – essentially a holistic state. The CSU hypothesis is that **when Q exceeds a certain threshold, the network exhibits consciousness**. In a brain, Q might peak during conscious perception and drop during deep sleep or anesthesia (which indeed corresponds to more fragmented brain activity). In the universe, perhaps Q was highest at early times (immediately after the Big Bang, when the universe was a small quantum blob) and might increase again if the universe develops some large-scale quantum order (speculatively, maybe through advanced civilizations networking together, or some phase transition in the vacuum).

One concrete model for consciousness via coherence was proposed by J. M. Schwartz and others: the idea of *quantum coherence in the brain's microtubules*, which Orchestrated OR suggests leads to moments of conscious awareness at orchestrated collapse events. While evidence for this specific mechanism is scant, the general principle is quantum coherence enabling unified processing. Similarly, in **quantum biology**, we see examples of **coherence aiding function**, like in photosynthetic complexes where entangled excitons explore multiple paths in parallel to efficiently funnel energy [24]. Also, the avian compass likely relies on entangled electron spins (radical pairs) reacting to Earth's magnetic field [25] – a small example of a biological organism exploiting entanglement for sensing. If evolution tapped quantum effects for these purposes, it's not inconceivable that quantum coherence in neural processes could contribute to the emergent awareness (though the warm, wet brain is a hostile environment for long-lived coherence, new studies hint at possible millisecond-scale entanglement in neurons under certain conditions [26]).

Our CSU model ties these threads together by asserting **a continuum from quantum coherence to consciousness**: as systems become larger and maintain integrated coherence, they move along a spectrum from inanimate to animate to aware. Life itself can be seen as an emergent property of complex networks achieving self-sustaining loops of information (a cell is a network of biochemical reactions processing information from environment to maintain order – Schrödinger's "negative entropy" consumption [27]). Perhaps **life is what a highly entangled, far-from-equilibrium network looks like, and consciousness is what a *globally* entangled network feels like**. In other words, the relational foundation – entanglement – could underlie **both** the organization of matter into living systems and the organization of information into conscious minds.

Philosophically, this leans toward **panpsychism or cosmopsychism**, where consciousness is a fundamental aspect of reality. Here, however, it's not fundamental in every particle per se, but rather a emergent property of the network: a single unit by itself isn't conscious, but the entire network taken as one quantum state might be. Intriguingly, Bohm's notion of an implicate order [7] described an undivided wholeness where mind and matter are two facets of one process. Our model echoes that – the entanglement network is the implicate order; the explicate order (manifest physical world of separated objects and minds) arises from projecting this network. Consciousness in this view is the inward reflection of the implicate whole. This provides a potential resolution to the "hard problem" of consciousness: rather than seeing consciousness as arising from classical brain matter (which seems almost magical), we say **consciousness is a manifestation of quantum relational connectivity**, and brains are simply local hubs where this connectivity is especially rich and complex.

In summary, the CSU model posits: *Spacetime is the exterior face of the entanglement network; consciousness (and life) are the interior face.* The relational quantum network has two emergent aspects – seen from outside (3rd person) it is geometry and dynamics (physics), seen from inside (1st person) it is qualia and awareness (mind). While this is speculative, it is a logically possible extension of our framework that unifies traditionally separate domains under one ontological principle: **to exist is to be related (entangled), and to be richly related is to have experience**.

Formal Models and Equations

To give the above ideas quantitative backbone, we outline several formal models corresponding to each aspect: emergent spacetime, relational time, entanglement bridges, and consciousness measure. Each model is in a preliminary stage, meant only to illustrate how one might mathematize the concepts.

1. Entanglement Metric for Spacetime: Consider N fundamental quantum units making up the universe. Define an entanglement measure E_{ij} between unit i and j (for instance, the mutual information or the negativity if we want pure entanglement). We propose an emergent metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ on a set of points associated with these units such that the distance $d(i,j)$ satisfies: $$ d(i,j) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \big(E_{\text{max}} - E_{ij} \big), $$ where E_{max} is some large entanglement value (perhaps the maximum or saturation value for two units), and κ is a constant of proportionality. In highly entangled pairs (E_{ij} large, near E_{max}), $d(i,j)$ approaches 0; for unentangled pairs ($E_{ij} \approx 0$), $d(i,j)$ is large. If we manage to coarse-grain the network into an approximate continuum, we would expect this $d(i,j)$ to coincide with geodesic distances in spacetime. Indeed, in holography one finds that the minimal entanglement between two boundary regions is related to the length of a geodesic connecting them through the bulk.

One may compare this with the Wheeler–DeWitt equation in a toy context: typically, $H |\Psi\rangle = 0$ encodes that the quantum state of the universe (wavefunction Ψ) is static, but entanglement within $|\Psi\rangle$ encodes spatial relationships. A more concrete link is the bit thread formulation of holographic entanglement, where E_{ij} can be associated with flux of “threads” connecting i and j, and these threads can be related to spatial minimal surfaces [2]. Our entanglement metric is conceptually similar to the **adjacency matrix of a weighted graph**: we interpret high adjacency (edge weight) as short distance.

2. Relational Proper Time in Causal Graphs: In a causal DAG of events, one can define many time-like paths between two events. A proposal for proper time τ between an initial event A and final event B is: $$ \tau(A,B) = T_0 \times \max_{\mathcal{P}(A\to B)} \; |\mathcal{P}|, $$ where the max is taken over all directed paths $\mathcal{P}$ from A to B, and $|\mathcal{P}|$ is the number of links (or events) along that path. T_0 is a fundamental time quantum (perhaps of order Planck time). This formalizes the idea gleaned from causal set theory [3]. One can show in causal set simulations that if events are sprinkled into a continuum with density ρ and one takes $T_0 = (\rho)^{-1/4}$ in 4D, then τ matches the continuum proper time with fluctuations that vanish as $\rho \to \infty$ (continuum limit) [11].

If we have a dense entanglement network underlying, one might ask: how does entanglement influence this causal proper time? In principle, entanglement could create shortcuts not only spatially but in an information-theoretic sense across time, if one allows closed timelike curves or post-selection (though we do not assume those here). So by default, τ is purely combinatorial from the DAG.

3. Bridge Operator Model: To model a traversable wormhole or entanglement bridge, consider two distant nodes i and j that initially have no direct entanglement. We can model their quantum states as part of a larger system with Hamiltonian $H = H_{\text{local}} + H_{\text{int}}(t)$. H_{local} governs normal evolution without any wormhole. $H_{\text{int}}(t)$ is a time-dependent interaction that we turn on for a short interval Δt to create the bridge: $$ H_{\text{int}}(t) = g \, f(t) \, (a_i^\dagger b_j^\dagger + a_i b_j), $$ where a_i, b_j are annihilation operators (or spin operators, etc.) for the two subsystems, and $f(t)$ is a switching function active only during the bridge operation. This is analogous to a two-mode squeezing Hamiltonian, which can create entangled pairs between modes i and j. Solving this, after time Δt, the state ρ_{ij} of i,j might become a maximally entangled Bell pair (depending on $g \Delta t$). We could quantify the effectiveness of the bridge by the **fidelity** of teleportation between i and j. If someone at i encodes a quantum state and someone at j tries to recover it (via appropriate one-time pad if needed), the fidelity will approach 1 if the wormhole is fully open/traversable. One can derive that for a small perturbative coupling in the SYK model context, the average null energy condition must be violated to get traversal [15] ; in our H_{int} model, energy is not obviously negative, but one can imagine that to fit in relativity, the operation effectively introduces negative energy flux (like a coupling that siphons energy out of the fields at just the right moment).

From the perspective of **travel time contraction**: If a message is sent at $t=0$ from i and we activate the bridge at that moment, the message can show up at j after a short transit through the entangled channel. Suppose normally the distance (and thus light travel time) between i and j is D (years). With the wormhole of length $d \ll D$, the travel time might be $d/c + \Delta$ (where Δ is some delay overhead to enter/exit the wormhole). For an extreme case, d could be effectively zero (in the ER=EPR approach, a maximally entangled pair with certain couplings yields nearly instantaneous teleportation of a qubit). Therefore time is **contracted by a factor $\approx D/d$**. If one could chain multiple such bridges (like a network of wormholes), one might connect many distant points and effectively reduce the light-cone distances across the network, altering cosmological notions of distance (speculatively relevant for solving horizon problems or creating closed timelike curves if misused).

4. Consciousness Integration Measure (Q): We propose a measure Q that ranges from 0 for a completely disintegrated system to 1 for a maximally integrated (globally entangled) system of N parts. One candidate is based on entropy. Let S_{global} be the entropy of the whole system (which for a pure state is 0). Let $S_{\text{sum of parts}} = \sum_{k=1}^N S(k)$ be the sum of entropies of each part (each considered individually). Define $$Q = 1 - \frac{S_{\text{sum of parts}} - S_{\text{global}}}{N \log d},$$ where d is the dimension of each part's state space (for qubits, $d=2$, so $N\log d = N \log 2$ is the max entropy if all parts completely unentangled). Essentially, $S_{\text{sum of parts}} - S_{\text{global}}$ measures how much extra entropy (information lost) we get by looking at parts versus the whole. If the system is product (no entanglement), $S_{\text{global}}=0$ (if pure state still 0) but each part has some entropy (actually if pure and product, each part pure too, so then $S_{\text{sum}} = 0$ – trivial case $Q=1$). Better to consider mixed state scenario or take a different approach, perhaps mutual information: Another measure: **global mutual information**: $$I_{\text{global}} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} S(k) - S(1,2,\dots,N).$$ For a pure global state, $S(1,2,\dots,N)=0$ and $I_{\text{global}} = \sum_k S(k).$ This I_{global} tells how much information is shared among parts. We could then define: $$Q = \frac{I_{\text{global}}}{N \log d},$$ so that if all N qubits are maximally entangled in one pure state, each qubit individually is maximally mixed ($S(k)=\log d$), so $\sum_k S(k) = N\log d$, thus $I_{\text{global}} = N\log d$ and $Q=1$. If nothing is entangled ($|\Psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangles|\psi_2\rangle\cdots|\psi_N\rangle$), then each $S(k)=0$, so $I_{\text{global}}=0$, $Q=0$. Thus Q ranges 0 to 1. This is a rough measure of how "one" the system is. It parallels IIT's Φ measure in spirit: higher I_{global} means more shared info, presumably more integrated experience.

Now, a human brain is not a set of qubits in a pure state. It's a warm, decohered system at first glance. But consider brain-wide synchronization phenomena (like gamma oscillations or network coherence measured by EEG). We could imagine dividing the brain into regions and computing something analogous to I_{global} from neuroimaging data; a high value might correlate with conscious wakefulness. The CSU model extends this concept to the entire universe: we could conceptually divide the cosmos into regions and consider their mutual information. During early universe (just after Big Bang), quantum fields were in a highly coherent state (perhaps inflaton, etc.), so I_{global} might have been large. Today, due to expansion and decoherence, parts of the universe (especially causally disconnected regions) have little correlation, so I_{global} is low – thus Q of the universe now might be low (implying a low "global consciousness", which comports with our inability to sense any cosmic mind). However, if Q_{universe} is not zero, one could fantasize that the universe has a faint conscious field that perhaps interfaces with sentient beings in ways akin to collective unconscious, etc. Such speculation veers beyond testable science for now, but it emerges naturally from our line of reasoning.

In summary, these formal definitions and models are first attempts to quantify the relational foundation idea. They show how entanglement might directly determine distances and times, how introducing new entanglement links acts like creating wormholes, and how one might measure the "coherence" of a network in terms of conscious integration.

Philosophical Implications

The framework outlined above carries a number of deep philosophical implications, touching epistemology, ontology, and even ethics:

Relational Ontology: Fundamentally, our proposal aligns with a **relational ontology** – the idea that relations (rather than individual substances) are primary. Similar viewpoints were espoused by philosophers such as Leibniz (with his relational space and time as opposed to Newton's absolute space and time), and more recently by Carlo Rovelli's relational quantum mechanics (which posits the state of a system is only defined relative to another). Here, entanglement relations define existence: a unit with no entanglement to anything might be effectively nonexistent (or at least completely decoupled from the universe). This is a radical departure from the classical notion of independent particles or souls; everything is contextual, defined by interaction. It resonates with Buddhist metaphysics (interdependence of all things) and some interpretations of quantum theory that emphasize the inseparability of observer and observed.

Information as Reality: Our approach suggests **information is the bedrock of reality** (the "It from Qubit" paradigm [28]). Space, time, matter, energy – all are emergent from information exchange (entanglement is basically shared information between systems), which echoes John Wheeler's "It from Bit" dictum. If information is fundamental, then questions like "Why does the universe exist?" could be reframed as "Why does information exist or why is there a particular cosmic quantum state?". It also has implications for the simulation argument: if reality is information, it behaves akin to a computation, perhaps even allowing the possibility that our universe is a quantum error-correcting code or similar (as some have proposed to explain the holographic AdS/CFT dictionary).

Mind-Matter Unification: Philosophically, the CSU model offers a potential unification of mind and matter. Traditionally, dualism sets mind apart from matter. Materialism reduces mind to matter. Idealism reduces matter to mind. Our view can be seen as a form of neutral monism or double-aspect theory: the underlying entanglement network (neutral) has two aspects – the extrinsic (matter, spacetime) and intrinsic (mind, experience). This is akin to Spinoza's idea that there is one substance (Nature or God) with attributes of thought and extension. We provide a modern quantum spin: the "substance" is the global quantum state; seen from outside it's entanglement structure (extension), seen from inside it's consciousness (thought). While speculative, this could solve the hard problem by basically asserting that consciousness is how highly integrated information feels. It might also provide insight into why certain physical processes correlate with experience (why brains, not rocks, for example): it's the level of entanglement integration. A rock has internal bonds but from an information standpoint is mostly a collection of independent lattice vibrations – low I_{global}. A brain's neurons fire in coordinated ways, and possibly maintain subtle quantum coherences – high I_{global}. Thus the brain has an "inner life" whereas the rock likely doesn't (or has much dimmer one).

Cosmic Purpose and Life: If life and consciousness are emergent from the universe's drive to self-organize information, one might speculate that the emergence of life was not a mere accident but a natural consequence of the universe exploring higher integration states. As the universe cooled and complex structures formed, local pockets of high entanglement/information processing could form (life, ecosystems, minds). In a teleological sense (not strictly scientific, but philosophical), one might say the universe awakens through the life it generates – reaching self-awareness through conscious beings. If cosmic consciousness eventually encompasses all, one could see this as the universe "knowing itself," fulfilling something like the Omega Point (Teilhard de Chardin's idea of evolution culminating in a unified mind). However, one must be cautious: these interpretations are not testable and verge on metaphysics. Our framework doesn't necessitate any *purpose*, it could all be spontaneous self-organization (akin to how complexity arises in non-equilibrium systems naturally).

Free Will and Determinism: In a fully relational picture, the strict deterministic view of classical physics is softened. Quantum entanglement and the quantum measurement process introduce indeterminacy. If indeed consciousness is related to quantum processes (as our model allows), one might have a route for genuine indeterminacy in conscious choices – a possible physical basis for free will (albeit randomness is not the same as will, but it provides a room for mind to not be a puppet of classical initial conditions). Also, the holistic aspect implies that the classical idea of localized agents might need revision: if we are nodes in a larger network, influences to our decisions could be nonlocal or collective (e.g., in Jung's collective unconscious or simply via quantum correlations beyond classical signals). This is quite speculative and not necessary to our main thesis, but it opens interesting debate about individuality vs. oneness.

Ethical Implications: If everything is entangled, there's a literal sense in which "we are all connected." Harming another might in some distant way harm oneself because at a fundamental level the separation is illusory – this is reminiscent of ethical principles in many spiritual traditions, now given a quantum relational twist. Additionally, if consciousness pervades (even at low levels) the universe, one might consider a form of panpsychist ethics – perhaps being more considerate of animals, plants, even inanimate matter if one believed they have tiny proto-experiences. These are far extrapolations, but worth noting as part of the philosophical landscape.

Reality of Space and Time: This framework implies that space and time as we perceive them are secondary constructs. This bears on questions like "Do we live in a simulation?" – in a sense, yes, but the simulator is the quantum entanglement that encodes spacetime. Time in particular becomes an emergent concept; in quantum gravity, the "problem of time" is resolved by saying time is not fundamental but a derived concept from correlations. We are embracing that fully. It means our common sense ordering of cause and effect might also be emergent – interestingly some quantum experiments (indefinite causal order, etc.) indeed challenge classical causality. If at the quantum level, events need not have a definite order (they can be entangled in a superposition of orders), then time's flow might be an approximation when coarse-grained. This is highly counterintuitive and borders on requiring new logic (process matrices or quantum causal models are being developed for such scenarios).

Relation to Theology: Without delving too far, one can't help but notice that a cosmic consciousness sounds akin to a deity or pantheistic God. Our model, however, doesn't necessarily ascribe *agency* or *intention* to the cosmic consciousness – at least not in its nascent form. It might be a mostly passive awareness, unlike a theistic God who has plans or intervenes. But it's conceivable that if our universe's entanglement network becomes maximally integrated (say all beings connect into one mega-mind, perhaps via future technology), that collective could be omniscient (knowing all information) and potentially omnipotent within its simulation (if reality is its own self-simulation). These are big "ifs" and go beyond science, but highlight how this framework bridges to age-old questions about ultimate reality and the divine. It situates such concepts in a scientific narrative of emergent complexity rather than supernatural imposition.

In conclusion, the philosophical upshot of treating **entanglement as the foundation** is a profoundly interconnected view of nature, dissolving boundaries between subject and object, part and whole. It pushes us to envision a universe where **being** is *being in relation*, and where perhaps the deepest mysteries of consciousness and existence are two sides of the same coin.

Discussion

Having laid out the theoretical foundation and its implications, we now turn to a discussion of the open questions, challenges, and potential ways to empirically probe this framework. A healthy dose of skepticism is warranted, as our proposal touches on many unresolved problems in physics and philosophy. Here we attempt to clarify which aspects of the theory are more firmly supported by existing research and which aspects are more speculative leaps requiring future corroboration.

Current Empirical Support: Certain elements of the picture have tangible support in cutting-edge physics. The idea that **entanglement is related to spacetime connectivity** is supported by numerous studies in the context of AdS/CFT and tensor networks [1] [2]. For instance, quantum error-correcting codes mapping to bulk geometry, and the success of entanglement entropy calculations matching gravitational formulas, both give weight to “entanglement builds geometry.” Furthermore, the ER = EPR conjecture, while not proven, has seen partial support: the Sachdev–Ye–Kitaev (SYK) model studies and the recent **quantum simulation of a traversable wormhole** by Jafferis, Spiropulu and colleagues [4]. In that experiment, they prepared two tiny entangled subsystems that mimic black hole dynamics, and by executing a clever operation (coupling akin to our bridge operator) they teleported a qubit in a way consistent with it having passed through a wormhole [4]. This remarkable result is a proof of concept that the ideas of ER = EPR and spacetime-from-entanglement are experimentally accessible, at least in toy models. Similarly, causal set theory is an active field; experiments to detect discreteness of spacetime (e.g., in cosmic ray arrivals, or looking for Lorentz invariance violations) are underway, though none have confirmed a causal set granularity yet. But at least causal set provides a well-defined mathematical scaffolding for how to get continuous spacetime from a partial order of events [11].

For the connection to life and consciousness, empirical support is much more tentative. Yet we do have intriguing data points: quantum coherence in photosynthesis [29], avian magnetoreception needing entanglement [25], and perhaps most strikingly, evidence that anesthesia (which switches off consciousness) correlates with disruptions in quantum-level dipole couplings in tubulin proteins (as some studies suggest). There is also the whole field of quantum cognition exploring if cognitive processes violate classical probability in ways suggestive of quantum-like structure – though that doesn’t necessarily imply actual physical quantum processes in the brain. At least, the **network view of brain consciousness is strongly supported**: tools from graph theory and network science have revealed that during conscious states the brain has distinctive global functional connectivity patterns [20]. These are classical network analyses but it aligns with our notion that integration = consciousness. Whether quantum entanglement contributes is unresolved – but there was a 2022 study by Fisher’s group trying to test if entanglement could last in brain under specific conditions (involving Posner molecules); the results are not yet conclusive.

Key Challenges: One major challenge is **scalability of quantum coherence**. The brain at 10^{20} atoms is huge and warm; maintaining entanglement across even nanoscales seems difficult due to decoherence. If our consciousness truly needed large-scale entanglement, how does it survive thermal noise? One speculation is that certain biological structures (like microtubules, or ordered water layers) might isolate coherent states, but evidence is scant and many physicists remain skeptical of quantum mind theories [23]. Perhaps consciousness in the brain is mostly classical integration, and the cosmic consciousness would then be even more diffuse (maybe negligible). It could be that only in special systems (superconducting brain-like analogs, or in near-death experiences? etc.) does quantum coherence significantly partake.

Another challenge: **Testing spacetime emergence directly**. How do we prove spacetime is made of entanglement experimentally? If we had a small quantum computer simulating a toy universe (like the SYK wormhole example), we can see correspondence, but doing this in a real gravitational system is hard. Some have proposed using maybe **entangled black holes** – e.g. create two tiny black holes in a lab via high energy collisions and see if their entanglement yields any gravitational signatures (very far-fetched with current tech). Alternatively, cosmology might offer clues: maybe the entanglement of early inflaton field left imprints in the cosmic microwave background (like specific non-local correlations). People have searched for unusual long-range correlations in cosmological data; none clearly detected beyond standard physics, but this is an avenue. Also, if disentangling destroys spacetime [8], one might think about phenomena like the interior of black holes or at Cauchy horizons in black holes where strong cosmic censorship might relate to quantum entanglement consumption [8]. There's a theoretical prediction that a highly entangled Hawking radiation is connected to the interior; if one could verify the Page curve of black hole evaporation (which recent calculations via islands did), that indirectly supports ER = EPR logic.

Experimental Proposals:

1. **Quantum Network Cosmology Experiment:** Construct an optical/atomic quantum simulator that mimics an expanding space. For example, a network of qubits with tunable interactions such that initially all qubits are highly entangled (simulating a "small early universe"), and then gradually decouple qubits (simulating expansion and dilution of entanglement). Measure how geometric properties (like connectivity, dimensionality of graph) change with entanglement. This could demonstrate in a controlled way how space could emerge from more ordered to less ordered entanglement. We can attempt to recover analogues of the Friedmann equation from entanglement dynamics.

2. **Causal Set Laboratory Test:** There is an interesting proposal to detect discreteness of time: if time is made of chronons, then at small scales noise in frequency of certain oscillators might occur. Some studies of networks of clocks have put bounds on minimal time quanta. Further, if proper time is a count of events, perhaps precise interferometers or atomic clock comparisons under extreme conditions (like in high accelerations) could reveal slight deviations from general relativity's time dilation (which assumes smooth manifold). If we find a discrepancy that points to a discrete underlying time (like certain gravitational frequencies missing or something), that might bolster causal set ideas.

3. **Human Brain Quantum Entanglement Test:** A bold experiment would be to see if entangled particles can influence neural processing. For example, prepare two ensembles of entangled photons, send one half into a person's brain (via the eyes, perhaps using polarized entangled photons) and keep the other half outside. Using a Bell-type inequality setup, test if the brain's response to photons shows any quantum correlation that can't be explained classically. This is extremely difficult because any quantum coherence in brain would be tiny compared to noise. But proposals exist (Fisher's) to detect if calcium ions in neurons become entangled. If such an effect is seen, it lends credence to quantum brain theories and thus to our extension that entanglement matters for consciousness.

4. **Astronomical Observation:** If the whole universe has some small but nonzero global entanglement, there might be subtle observable effects. One idea: **randomness in quantum measurements** – if two distant particles were entangled by the early universe and remained so (despite cosmic separation), measuring one could instantaneously affect the other's state distribution. Perhaps looking at pairs of distant quasars or cosmic rays and seeing if their quantum properties are more correlated than light travel time allows. This is extremely speculative; cosmic decoherence likely destroyed such correlations eons ago, but some theorists have looked at Bell tests on starlight to ensure photons used in tests weren't pre-correlated by common origin. The flipside: maybe everything was connected at the Big Bang, so some ghost correlation might remain.

Theoretical Development: On the theory side, a lot needs to be fleshed out: - A rigorous toy model where entanglement network $\to$ emergent geometry, possibly using simple graph theory and showing how metric, curvature etc come out. Working with MERA (multiscale entanglement renormalization ansatz) tensor networks is one promising route since MERA networks naturally look like discretized hyperbolic spacetimes, and they produce the correct entanglement-area law. Perhaps expanding MERA or related random tensor networks to incorporate dynamics (time evolution) could yield a full spacetime emergence scenario. - Unifying with **loop quantum gravity or spin foam** models: those approaches also have networks (spin networks) that define space, and spin foams for spacetime. They typically don't incorporate entanglement explicitly, but maybe one could reinterpret spin network states in terms of entangled qubits on edges. If so, our approach could connect with a more established framework. - **Quantum field theory on causal sets:** making things more relativistic. The models we described were mostly quantum mechanics of discrete parts. We should show that in low-energy limit, one recovers Einstein's equations or something akin to them. Some authors (like Ted Jacobson) derived Einstein's equations from maximal entanglement principles (basically treating them as equation of state for entanglement entropy being maximal at equilibrium). We might extend those derivations to a full network.

Interdisciplinary Impact: If fruitful, this research could impact multiple fields. In neuroscience, it could inspire searching for evidence of non-classical signals in the brain or new models of integration. In AI and computation, if consciousness is tied to integration, one might design quantum artificial neural networks to maximize Q measure to see if they display more life-like properties. In philosophy of mind, this offers a scientifically grounded dual-aspect model that could break the stalemate between physicalism and dualism by positing a third way (monism via quantum information).

Skeptical Counterpoints: It is important to address potential criticisms: - *Is this just quantum mysticism?* Our work risks sounding like that if one is not careful. The difference is that we base each conjecture on an existing line of scientific inquiry (ER=EPR, IIT, etc.) and we provide concrete quantitative propositions. Still, extraordinary claims need extraordinary evidence, which we don't yet have. Until then, one should consider this an exploratory theoretical exercise. - *Occam's Razor:* One could argue we are needlessly mixing very disparate domains (cosmology and consciousness) which might be entirely unrelated. Perhaps spacetime emerges from entanglement (that might be true) but consciousness is just an emergent classical phenomenon in brains (no fundamental connection to quantum). That is a valid simpler possibility. Our counter is that the mathematical parallels (network structures, integration, etc.) hint at a deeper unity, and exploring it could yield insights even if ultimately mind doesn't influence cosmos or vice versa. - *Testability:* The big criticism is that cosmic consciousness and such are not falsifiable currently. We must admit that direct tests of cosmic awareness are beyond science. However, more limited parts of the theory are testable, as described above. The framework could be partially confirmed (spacetime from entanglement) or infirmed, which still provides progress. The consciousness aspect might remain philosophical for longer.

In this discussion, we have attempted to fairly consider the strengths and weaknesses of the entanglement network paradigm. It is an ambitious synthesis that could either revolutionize our understanding or turn out to be a dead-end. The next decade might see crucial progress: quantum gravity experiments and quantum neuroscience advances. Even negative results (e.g. demonstrating that brain processes are entirely classical at relevant scales) would guide the refinement of the theory (maybe consciousness then is emergent but not quantum-coherent – which would limit the CSU model's scope). On the other hand, positive findings (like quantum effects in biology or engineered traversable entanglement channels) would boost these ideas tremendously.

Experimental Proposals

To move this framework from speculation towards empirical science, we propose several experimental approaches, some of which overlap with discussion points but we delineate them here as concrete projects:

A. Tabletop "Spacetime from Entanglement" Experiment: Recently, scientists created a microscopic analogue of a wormhole in a quantum processor [4]. We suggest scaling this idea: Use a system of entangled qubits to represent a discretized space (for instance, a 1D chain's entanglement structure can mimic a 2D geometry). By tuning the entanglement (e.g., adjusting two-qubit gate fidelities, introducing disentangling noise in part of the chain), we can effectively "tear" the space and observe consequences. For example, prepare a highly entangled cluster state on, say, 8 qubits laid out conceptually in a circle (this is like a toroidal space). Measure entanglement entropy on bipartitions to confirm it's like a connected ring (low boundary entropy). Then introduce an operation that disentangles qubits 1 and 2 from qubits 5–6 (cutting the circle). Now measure correlation functions or teleportation success rates between opposite ends. If spacetime connectivity is reduced, we expect a drop in correlations or teleportation fidelity across the cut, corresponding to the "distance" increasing (spacetime splits into two pieces). This would illustrate in a lab-controlled way the slogan "disentanglement destroys spacetime" [8].

B. Entangled Clocks and Relational Time: Build on the Page–Wootters idea by using entangled quantum clocks. Prepare two spin systems such that their total spin is zero (maximally entangled singlet). Use one spin as the clock reference (it undergoes some precession), and see if the other spin's evolution can be described in the clock's "time" even though the global state is static. This has been done conceptually [30], but one can add a twist: include a third system and test if relational time still works transitively (A tells time for B, B for C, etc). Also, test what happens if you insert a measurement (breaking entanglement) – does relational time between parts collapse? Such experiments deepen understanding of time's emergence from entanglement, supporting our idea of proper time as counting of entangled events.

C. Biological Quantum Coherence Detection: The most ambitious within current technology: verify quantum entanglement in biological processes that are tied to functional output. For instance, in photosynthesis, use ultrafast spectroscopy to see quantum beatings indicating coherence [24]; such experiments have been done at 77K and room temperature with bacteria. One could extend these to more complex organisms or at least to neural proteins (there are proposals to do terahertz spectroscopy on microtubules to see if they sustain long coherence). If these show significant coherence lifetimes, that provides physical substrate for our consciousness theory. Another idea: measure brain activity with and without perturbing possible quantum variables. For example, if Posner molecules (${\text{Ca}_9(\text{PO}_4)_6}$ complexes) are involved in neural qubits as posited by Matthew Fisher, one could introduce a reagent that specifically disrupts Posner formation and see if it affects cognitive performance or EEG coherence. A positive result would be groundbreaking: evidence that a specific quantum system influences cognition.

D. Global Quantum Correlation in Astronomy: Use cosmologically separated photon sources to perform Bell tests free of locality loophole (this was already done using stars as random number generators for detectors). To tie to cosmic entanglement, one could look at the polarization of cosmic microwave background (CMB) photons – if early universe had some entangled phase, perhaps CMB polarization patterns have small-scale correlations that can't be explained by classical causal contact (beyond standard inflationary correlations). This is speculative, but with precision data (e.g., from Planck satellite and upcoming CMB experiments) one could search for anomalies in correlation matrices. A null result (most likely) just sets an upper bound for cosmic quantum coherence scale. A surprise positive (extremely unlikely) would revolutionize cosmology, indicating perhaps a bounce or pre-Big Bang entangled era still imprinted.

E. Entanglement-Enabled Communication Schemes: From a practical standpoint, testing relational propulsion might boil down to demonstrating effective faster-than-classical communication using entanglement and some trick. While quantum mechanics forbids sending info via entanglement alone, protocols like teleportation combined with classical communication achieve something analogous (sending qubits with classical 2-bit overhead). If one could reduce that overhead or use entanglement in a network to route signals in ways that beat normal latency (even if not violating causality globally), that would be interesting. For instance, in a quantum network, use entangled repeaters such that the path length (in terms of hops) for information is shorter than any classical route. This could be tested with multi-node quantum networks being built. While this doesn't break relativity, it showcases how an entangled network provides advantages akin to shortcuts – supporting our notion of entanglement bridges. On a grand scale, one could imagine satellite quantum links creating "wormholes" across Earth, effectively reducing communication latency relative to purely ground fiber routes.

F. Simulated Conscious Networks: Create an artificial network (could be classical simulation or hybrid quantum) with tunable integration. For example, simulate a network of Kuramoto oscillators or Ising spins with an adjustable global coupling that increases network coherence. Use a metric like Q or Φ to quantify integration. Then see how the network responds to stimuli at different integration levels – does it exhibit emergent properties like memory or feedback only beyond a threshold? If one integrates some learning rules, does higher Q lead to qualitatively better problem-solving? This would test in silico whether integration (quantum or classical) leads to more "life-like" or "mind-like" behavior, lending weight to our CSU concept indirectly. If a quantum version is possible (with small qubits array), even better: measure global entanglement vs performance on tasks (like pattern recognition implemented in a quantum circuit). If a correlation emerges, that's evidence that entanglement (coherence) directly contributes to computational prowess or adapting behavior.

Each of these proposals faces practical difficulties, but incremental progress can be made. The interplay of theory and experiment will refine our ideas: for instance, an experiment might show no sign of quantum effects in neurons, pushing us to accept that consciousness is largely classical – but that doesn't kill the whole framework, it might just mean cosmic consciousness manifests only at macro scales via classical analogues of integration. Conversely, success in quantum biology experiments would strongly encourage further radical theorizing.

Conclusion

We have explored the bold hypothesis that an **entanglement network** underlies reality's most fundamental aspects – giving rise to spacetime, enabling the complexity of life, and perhaps culminating in cosmic consciousness through global quantum coherence. Our journey began with the quantum gravity insight that entanglement might literally weave the fabric of spacetime [1] [2]. Building on this, we posited that time and dynamics can be understood relationally, as patterns in a causal graph of events [3]. We introduced the concept of creating entanglement "bridges," drawing an analogy to traversable wormholes and hypothesizing new modes of propulsion or communication that exploit the topology of the entanglement network [14]. Extending beyond physics, we ventured into biology and neuroscience, suggesting that the emergence of life and consciousness are continuous with these physical principles – essentially information processing phenomena that capitalize on the relational fabric of reality. In the **CSU model**, we proposed that consciousness corresponds to the degree of global integration (or coherence) of the universal entanglement network, bridging ideas from quantum mind theories and integrated information theory [22] [19].

The theoretical framework we presented is admittedly far-reaching and synthesizes ideas across normally disparate domains. However, one of its strengths is that it is **internally coherent**: by assuming relations (entanglements, causal links) as primary, we were able to account qualitatively for: (a) why spacetime has continuity (from densely entangled degrees), (b) why it can tear or have holes (disentanglement leading to independent regions) [8], (c) how time emerges from change (sequential relations in a causal network) rather than being an ever-flowing Newtonian river, (d) how quantum phenomena might scale up in biological systems to give adaptive advantages (e.g., efficient energy usage in photosynthesis [24] or possibly enhanced computation in brains), and (e) why conscious experience is unified and not just a collection of independent sensations (the brain's entangled or integrated state binds experience into a whole). This coherence across scales is suggestive that we are touching on something real about the structure of the universe, even if many details remain to be filled in.

An important takeaway is that **new experimental windows** are opening. The past decade saw quantum information concepts applied to gravity – a synergy that produced ER=EPR and the traversable wormhole experiment [4]. Likewise, quantum technology in biology and neuroscience, while still nascent, could soon test notions that were purely theoretical. It is not outlandish to imagine that in a few decades we might routinely manipulate entanglement in biochemical systems, or use quantum-enhanced brain imaging to see entanglement in neural activity. Each such advance will clarify if the bold connections drawn here hold water. If they do, the payoff is enormous: it would mean we finally have a framework that **unifies physics with life and mind**. Just as the Enlightenment thinkers dreamed of a "clockwork universe" but could not include mind in that mechanism, we now dream of a **quantum network universe** where mind and matter are interwoven manifestations.

Even in the negative scenario (e.g., consciousness remains an emergent but classical phenomenon, separate from the quantum substrate), the exercise of relating these domains yields valuable cross-pollination. For example, viewing spacetime as a kind of computation or neural network might inspire novel algorithms or vice versa (the field of reservoir computing draws analogies between physical processes and neural nets; here spacetime itself could be seen as a vast information processor). In any case, the relational perspective is a powerful lens that will likely persist in science – it already shapes quantum foundations and quantum gravity.

In closing, we emphasize that this work does not claim to have **proven** any grand theory, but rather to have sketched a possible **relational road map**. The map ties together established landmarks (entanglement→geometry, causality→time, integration→consciousness) and ventures into less-charted territory (white holes as time-reversed entangled big bangs [31], a cosmic conscious network). The next steps will require courage both theoretically and experimentally to push beyond conventional boundaries. If the vision outlined is even partially correct, its implications for our understanding of the universe and our place within it are profound: we would see ourselves as integrally woven into a cosmic web of being, where every quantum of existence is a thread in the tapestry of spacetime and every spark of thought a resonance in the cosmic mind. Such a perspective is at once humbling and elevating – humbling in its dissolution of separateness, elevating in its suggestion that we participate in something fundamentally unified and meaningful at the largest scale.

Ultimately, science progresses by making bold conjectures and then rigorously testing them. We have here presented the conjecture that **entanglement is the universal relational foundation** from which space, time, life, and consciousness emerge. We have discussed how to test pieces of this conjecture, and we eagerly anticipate what the coming years will reveal. It is an exciting time where quantum technology, astrophysics, and neuroscience are all converging. Perhaps the secrets of spacetime and the secrets of the brain will unravel together, each illuminating the other. If and when that happens, humanity may indeed find itself at the threshold of a new paradigm – one that finally bridges the divide between the physics of the outer world and the experiences of the inner world, in one grand relational synthesis.

References

1. Van Raamsdonk, M. (2010). *Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement*. **Gen. Relativ. Gravit. 42**, 2323–2329. (ArXiv:1005.3035) [1]
2. Maldacena, J., & Susskind, L. (2013). *Cool horizons for entangled black holes: ER = EPR*. **Fortsch. Phys. 61**, 781–811. (ArXiv:1306.0533) – Conjecture that entangled particles are connected by wormholes [5] [6] .
3. Chen, H. Z. (2024). *Disentanglement as a strong cosmic censor*. **Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 33**, 2441019 – Discusses how breaking entanglement could lead to spacetime singularities [8] .
4. Sorkin, R. D. (2005). *Causal sets: Discrete gravity*. In **Lectures on Quantum Gravity** (eds. A. Gomberoff & D. Marolf). Springer. – Introduction to causal set theory; proper time as longest chain [3] .
5. Jafferis, D. et al. (2022). *Traversable wormhole dynamics on a quantum processor*. **Nature 612**, 51–55 – First experimental simulation of a traversable wormhole [4] [13] .
6. Whitehole theories: Popławski, N. (2012). *Nonsingular big bounce from a white hole*. (ArXiv: 1203.4479) – Example of conjecture identifying Big Bang as a white hole [31] .
7. Quantum biology: Engel, G. S. et al. (2007). *Evidence for wavelike energy transfer in photosynthetic complexes*. **Nature 446**, 782–786 – showed quantum coherence in photosynthesis [29] [24] .
8. Ritz, T. et al. (2004). *Resonance effects indicate a radical-pair mechanism for avian magnetic compass*. **Nature 429**, 177–180 – Implicates entangled radical pairs in bird navigation [25] .
9. Hameroff, S. & Penrose, R. (2014). *Consciousness in the universe: A review of the Orch-OR theory*. **Phys. Life Rev. 11**, 39–78 – A quantum theory of consciousness involving microtubule entanglement.
10. Koch, C. et al. (2016). *Integrated information theory: from consciousness to its physical substrate*. **Nat. Rev. Neurosci. 17**, 307–321 – Discusses consciousness as integrated information (parallels to our Q measure) [20] .
11. Pastawski, F. (2017). *The entangled fabric of space*. **Quantum Frontiers Blog** – Popular explanation of entanglement's role in spacetime with tensor network analogies [32] [33] .
12. Page, D. & Wootters, W. (1983). *Evolution without evolution: Dynamics described by stationary observables*. **Phys. Rev. D 27**, 2885 – The Page–Wootters mechanism for emergent time via entanglement [30] .
13. Bohm, D. (1980). *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. Routledge – Philosophical treatise proposing reality as an undivided wholeness (implicate order) underlying the explicate order [7] .
14. Wheeler, J. A. (1990). *Information, physics, quantum: The search for links*. In **Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information** – Introduced "It from Bit" idea (primacy of information).

15. Dyson, F. (1979). *Disturbing the universe*. HarperCollins – Dyson's quote on mind inherent in electrons [21] .
16. Crick, F. & Koch, C. (2005). *What is the function of the claustrum?* **Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B 360**, 1271–1279 – Suggests the claustrum as conductor for consciousness [34] .
17. Visser, M. (1995). *Lorentzian Wormholes: From Einstein to Hawking*. AIP Press – Discusses energy condition violations required for traversable wormholes [15] .
18. Myrheim, J. (1978). *Statistical geometry*. (CERN preprint TH-2538) – Early suggestion that longest chain length in causal set $\propto$ proper time.
19. Gao, P., Jafferis, D., & Wall, A. (2017). *Traversable wormholes via a double trace deformation*. **JHEP 12**, 151 – Showed that coupling entangled systems yields traversable wormhole, inspiring experiment [13] .
20. Bernien, H. et al. (2017). *Probing many-body dynamics on a 51-atom quantum simulator*. **Nature 551**, 579–584 – Example of a quantum simulator that could be used to test entanglement/spacetime ideas.

---

[1] [1005.3035] Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement
https://arxiv.org/abs/1005.3035

[2] [10] BUILDING UP SPACE–TIME WITH QUANTUM ENTANGLEMENT
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/45918155_BUILDING_UP_SPACE-TIME_WITH_QUANTUM_ENTANGLEMENT

[3] Causal sets - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Causal_sets

[4] [9] [13] Physicists observe wormhole dynamics using a quantum computer - www.caltech.edu
https://www.caltech.edu/about/news/physicists-observe-wormhole-dynamics-using-a-quantum-computer

[5] [6] ER = EPR - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ER_%3D_EPR

[7] [21] [22] [23] Quantum mind - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum_mind

[8] [2404.10810] Disentanglement as a strong cosmic censor
https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.10810

[11] [PDF] Quantum Field Theory on 3D Causal Sets - Imperial College London
https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/research-centres-and-groups/theoretical-physics/msc/dissertations/2021/Shivraj-Jalan-Dissertation.pdf

[12] (PDF) Time from quantum entanglement: An experimental illustration
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257882756_Time_from_quantum_entanglement_An_experimental_illustration

[14] [15] [16] [17] [18] Wormhole - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wormhole

[19] [20] [34] State Of Mind: Network Theory Suggests Consciousness Is Global In the Brain, Rises From Cooperative Activity
https://www.medicaldaily.com/state-mind-network-theory-suggests-consciousness-global-brain-rises-cooperative-326022

[24] [27] [29] In Pursuit of Quantum Biology With Birgitta Whaley | Quanta Magazine
https://www.quantamagazine.org/in-pursuit-of-quantum-biology-with-birgitta-whaley-20130730/

[25] Quantum biology - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum_biology

[26] Researchers Explore Quantum Entanglement's Potential Role in ...
https://thequantuminsider.com/2024/08/03/researchers-explore-quantum-entanglements-potential-role-in-neural-synchronization/

[28] [32] [33] The entangled fabric of space | Quantum Frontiers
https://quantumfrontiers.com/2017/04/17/the-entangled-fabric-of-space/

[30] The Unfolding of Time and Space. How Entanglement Weaves Reality
https://medium.com/@shaheim/the-unfolding-of-time-and-space-0e30f55fe76b

[31] White hole - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/White_hole