Concept Paper

Not peer-reviewed version

Consciousness in Hilbert Space and the Construct of Physical Spacetime: A Mathematical and Theoretical Exploration

Moninder Modgil * and Dnyandeo Patil

Posted Date: 21 November 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

Keywords: Hilbert space; consciousness; projection operators; entropy; cyclic time; black holes

doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

Concept Paper

Consciousness in Hilbert Space and the Construct of Physical Spacetime: A Mathematical and Theoretical Exploration

Moninder Singh Modgil [1,*] and Dnyandeo Dattatray Patil [2]

[1] Cosmos Research Lab, Centre for Ontological Science, Meta Quanta Physics and Omega Singularity
[2] Electrical and AI Engineering, Cosmos Research Lab
* Correspondence: msmodgil@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper develops a rigorous mathematical framework unifying physical spacetime, quantum mechanical structures, and conscious experience. Beginning with the hypothesis that perception resides within an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\infty$, and that physical spacetime $\mathcal{M}_{3,1}$ is an emergent cognitive construct, we propose the total manifold as a triple tensor product: $\mathcal{M}_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ is the space of projection operators associated with conscious observers.Observers are modeled not merely as Dirac delta functions but as evolving strings of projection operators, with entropic gradients driving perceptual forces. These projection operators define a local arrow of time via entropy increase and are cyclically structured in time-crystal fashion over the Yuga cosmology. Inter-observer relations are captured using graph theory and gauge-theoretic techniques, inducing emergent gauge fields and topological solitons. A significant feature of the theory is the introduction of the Micro-Mini-Black-Hole-in-Brain (MMBHB), enabling quantum gravitational dualities with cortical dynamics. Modular Hamiltonians, entanglement currents, and operator algebras are employed to analyze the non-unitary perceptual evolution in a fundamentally non-commutative geometry. The resulting psychophysical feedback mechanisms are shown to affect null geodesics and possibly contribute to the observed cosmological constant.This work contributes a formal psycho-geometric ontology, bridging consciousness studies, quantum information, and fundamental physics.

Keywords: Hilbert space; consciousness; projection operators; entropy; cyclic time; black holes

---

1. Introduction

The longstanding puzzle of consciousness and its relation to the physical universe has prompted considerable interdisciplinary inquiry. In recent years, perspectives from quantum theory, operator algebras, quantum gravity, and cognitive science have converged upon a unified view that positions consciousness not merely as a classical epiphenomenon, but as a structure embedded deeply within the formal architecture of quantum theory itself. This paper builds on this view and posits that consciousness may be effectively described in terms of operator dynamics within a tensor product space formed by physical spacetime $\mathcal{M}_{3,1}$, the Hilbert space of quantum mechanics $\mathcal{H}_\infty$, and the operator space $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ corresponding to the conscious observer.

Building upon the foundational work by von Neumann and subsequent developments in the operator-algebraic approach to quantum measurement, we propose a differential geometric and thermodynamic treatment of observer consciousness. Inspired by prior work [6,7], conscious observers are modeled not as passive detectors, but as active entities represented either as Dirac delta functions or projection operators acting on the quantum Hilbert space. The evolution of such projection operators is interpreted as encoding shifts in perceptual attention and self-awareness, giving rise to a dynamic feedback loop between observer cognition and physical geometry.

Within this operator framework, we explore several novel phenomena: the emergence of entropic forces derived from operator entropy gradients, the influence of entanglement currents among observer networks, and time-periodic projection operators modeling reincarnative cycles as spontaneous symmetry breaking in temporal evolution. These phenomena are naturally expressed in the tensor product manifold

$$\mathcal{M}_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}), \tag{1}$$

which serves as the total phase space for physical dynamics, quantum states, and perceptual operations.

We further extend the framework by incorporating structures from noncommutative geometry, category theory, and holography. The modular Hamiltonian flow of reduced density matrices is proposed as a generator of perceptual time evolution, and the black hole information paradox is reframed in terms of observer complementarity via noncommuting algebras of internal and external awareness. Finally, the concept of Micro-Mini-Black-Holes-in-the-Brain (MMBHB) is revisited and connected to brain dynamics through AdS/CFT-inspired dualities.

Through these developments, this work aims to synthesize quantum mechanics, gravitational geometry, and phenomenology of awareness into a coherent operator-theoretic cosmology. The goal is not only to extend the reach of quantum theory but to reformulate the ontological role of the observer as fundamental to the structure of the universe itself.

2. Hilbert Space as a Substrate of Consciousness

The state space of quantum systems is defined in terms of Hilbert space, an infinite-dimensional complex vector space. Each possible state of a quantum system corresponds to a vector in this space. If we hypothesize that consciousness corresponds to a particular kind of quantum state, it naturally follows that consciousness exists within Hilbert space. This section formalizes this concept.

Let us denote a conscious state as $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space. The inner product between two states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ determines their orthogonality and can be interpreted as the degree of dissimilarity in conscious experience:

$$\langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle = \int \psi_1^*(x) \psi_2(x) \, dx \tag{2}$$

This orthogonality underlines the assumption that different quantum states could encode distinct conscious experiences. Such a model resonates with the proposals by Hameroff and Penrose, who suggested that consciousness results from orchestrated objective reduction (Orch-OR) processes occurring in neuronal microtubules [1].

Tegmark questioned whether quantum coherence could survive in the warm, wet environment of the brain. His decoherence timescale calculations indicate decoherence would occur on the order of:

$$\tau_d \approx \frac{\hbar^2}{\Lambda k_B T} \tag{3}$$

where Λ is the interaction strength, T the temperature, and k_B the Boltzmann constant [2]. His result—$\tau_d \approx 10^{-13}$ s for microtubular structures—challenges the Orch-OR hypothesis, but Hameroff responded with modified geometries to extend coherence times.

The total quantum state of a brain-like system with N degrees of freedom can be expressed as:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{2^N} c_i \, |i\rangle \tag{4}$$

The entropy of such a system, under von Neumann formalism, is given by:

$$S = -\operatorname{Tr}(\rho \ln \rho) \tag{5}$$

Here, ρ is the density matrix encoding probabilistic distributions of conscious states.

3. Spacetime as a Neural Construct

The perception of space and time arises from integrated activity in the posterior cortex and prefrontal regions of the human brain. This is supported by studies using fMRI and EEG to measure activity correlated with subjective time estimation and spatial awareness [3,4].

Under the interface theory of perception, perception is an evolved interface optimized for survival, not for accuracy [4]. The mathematical representation of this interface can be modeled using transformation mappings:

$$\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{R}^n \to \mathcal{P}^m \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{R}^n$ denotes the real-world state vector and $\mathcal{P}^m$ denotes perceptual states constructed by the brain.

Spacetime, as experienced, appears continuous and metricized, but neuronal encoding is inherently discrete. Neural spike trains carry time-locked information. The transformation of discrete sensory inputs into a continuous spacetime experience may be modeled by:

$$X(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i s_i(t - \tau_i) \tag{7}$$

where $s_i(t)$ is the spike train of neuron i, w_i is the synaptic weight, and τ_i is the processing delay.

Research by Friston suggests the brain operates on a free-energy principle. This proposes that the brain maintains a model of the world to minimize prediction errors. Formally:

$$F = \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}[\ln q(z) - \ln p(x, z)] \tag{8}$$

where F is the variational free energy, $q(z)$ is the approximate posterior, and $p(x, z)$ is the generative model [3].

4. Bridging the Two Domains: Information Geometry and Quantum Cognition

To bridge Hilbert space consciousness and spacetime perception, we invoke the framework of information geometry. Conscious states may be mapped onto a Riemannian manifold of probability distributions. The Fisher information metric provides a natural distance between mental states:

$$g_{ij} = \int \frac{1}{p(x)} \frac{\partial p(x)}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial p(x)}{\partial \theta_j} dx \tag{9}$$

Such metric structures are also foundational in quantum state manifolds, where the Fubini-Study metric defines distances in Hilbert space.

Recent models in quantum cognition propose decision-making follows quantum probability amplitudes. For example, if two perceptual alternatives A and B interfere, the total probability is:

$$P = |\langle \psi | A \rangle + \langle \psi | B \rangle|^2 \tag{10}$$

This departs from classical Bayesian models and mirrors interference observed in human decision tasks [5].

5. Perceptual Tangent Spaces and Observer Delta Functions in Hilbert-Spacetime Geometry

In this section, we synthesize the modeling of Observers as Dirac delta functions with their Perceptual Tangent Spaces (PTS), and examine how these constructs embed into the product manifold of spacetime and Hilbert space. The Observer is assumed to be a point-like entity on the spacetime manifold $M_{3,1}$, traversing irreversibly through the future time-like direction. This formalization leads to an enriched quantum geometric model of consciousness, perception, and measurement.

Let O_i be the i-th Observer located at point $p_i \in M_{3,1}$. The total perceptual experience of the observer is defined on the tangent space $T_{p_i}O_i$, which itself is decomposable into tensor products of sensory modalities:

$$T_{p_i}O_i(t) = T^V_{p_i}(t) \otimes T^A_{p_i}(t) \otimes T^{To}_{p_i}(t) \otimes T^{Ta}_{p_i}(t) \otimes T^S_{p_i}(t) \otimes T^M_{p_i}(t) \tag{11}$$

Each of the tangent spaces is dynamically evolving in time due to sensory interactions and motor output. For instance, visual perception $T^V_{p_i}(t)$ maps incoming photon streams from objects Q^V_l located at spacetime point p_l via a map f^V_i:

$$T^V_{p_i}(t) = \bigcup_{l=1}^{N_V} \mathcal{B}^V_i\left(\mathcal{P}^V_{li}(Q^V_l)\right) \tag{12}$$

Here, $\mathcal{P}^V_{li}$ denotes the photon field originating from Q^V_l and reaching observer O_i, and $\mathcal{B}^V_i$ is the neural transformation function comprising the retina, optic nerve, and visual cortex. This brain-dependent processing encodes a Hilbert-space valued function:

$$\chi_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{B}^V_i) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\mathcal{B}}} a^{\mathcal{B}}_k \phi^{\mathcal{B}}_k \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}} \tag{13}$$

Similarly, the photon stream can be described quantum-mechanically as:

$$\chi_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}^V_{li}) = \sum_{m=1}^{N_{\mathcal{P}}} a^{\mathcal{P}}_m \phi^{\mathcal{P}}_m \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{P}} \tag{14}$$

And the object's quantum state as:

$$\chi_Q(Q^V_l) = \sum_{n=1}^{N_Q} a^Q_n \phi^Q_n \in \mathcal{H}_Q \tag{15}$$

The total perceptual quantum state at time t becomes:

$$\Psi(T^V_{p_i}(t)) = \sum_{l=1}^{N_V} \chi_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{B}^V_i) \otimes \chi_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}^V_{li}) \otimes \chi_Q(Q^V_l) \tag{16}$$

Next, we introduce the observer as a Dirac delta function:

$$O_i \mapsto \delta(p_i) \tag{17}$$

Over a region $\mathcal{R} \subset M_{3,1}$, containing N_O observers, the observer field is defined as:

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_O} \delta(p_i) \tag{18}$$

This satisfies:

$$\int_{\mathcal{R}} g(x)\, dV = N_O \tag{19}$$

The Dirac delta's multiplicative property, $\delta(x)^2 = \delta(x)$, models its robustness in repeated quantum collapses. With Fourier representation:

$$\delta_N(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \cos(nx) + \frac{1}{2} \tag{20}$$

and taking the limit:

$$\delta(x) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \delta_N(x) \tag{21}$$

we maintain the capacity for infinite perceptual collapses.

For any wavefunction $\Psi_Q(x,t) \in \mathcal{H}_n$, the interaction with O_i can be modeled by projection:

$$P_k : \Psi_Q(x,t) \mapsto \phi_k \in \mathcal{H}_1 \tag{22}$$

which corresponds to the measurement collapse. The Dirac delta observer can align its eigenmodes with the incident wave, then collapse via the unique surviving frequency component, a process grounded in phase coherence.

Finally, the joint manifold:

$$\mathcal{M} = M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \tag{23}$$

provides the stage for modeling all quantum-perceptual interactions, uniting the geometric (spacetime) and informational (Hilbert) domains. Thus, we obtain a coherent structure where consciousness arises via projection from infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, while perceptual spacetime is generated dynamically by PTS at each delta-localized observer node.

6. Hilbert-Spacetime Product Space as Substrate of Emergent Reality

In this section, we investigate the mathematical structure of the product manifold $\mathcal{M} = M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty$, where $M_{3,1}$ is the (3+1)-dimensional Lorentzian spacetime manifold of general relativity and $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ is an infinite-dimensional separable Hilbert space used in quantum mechanics. This construction allows us to model particles, fields, and observers as elements with support in both geometric and informational domains. Such a composite manifold forms the foundation for approaches in emergent spacetime and quantum gravity, where classical spacetime arises as a coarse-grained or entangled limit of an underlying Hilbert space structure [8–10].

Let the global quantum state of a system be given by a wavefunction $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$. In this context, each point $p \in M_{3,1}$ is associated with a fiber $\mathcal{H}_p$, giving rise to a fiber bundle:

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{p \in M_{3,1}} \{p\} \times \mathcal{H}_p \tag{24}$$

This construction resembles a Hilbert bundle over spacetime, where quantum degrees of freedom are localized but entangled across different fibers. The total manifold $\mathcal{M} = M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty$ thus provides a global setting for defining observables, states, and transformations.

Let us define a quantum field operator $\hat{\phi}(x)$ acting on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\infty$. In curved spacetime quantum field theory, the expectation value of an operator at a point $x \in M_{3,1}$ is given by:

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{\phi}(x) | \Psi \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \phi^*(x) \hat{\phi}(x) \phi(x) \, d\mu(\phi) \tag{25}$$

The measure $d\mu$ is defined over $\mathcal{H}_\infty$, satisfying normalization constraints.

Next, we define entanglement entropy as a metric that can induce emergent spacetime geometry. If ρ_A is the reduced density matrix of subsystem A, embedded in a larger quantum system, the von Neumann entropy is:

$$S_A = -\operatorname{Tr}(\rho_A \ln \rho_A) \tag{26}$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

In holographic theories, this entropy is conjectured to relate to spatial geometry. The Ryu-Takayanagi formula relates entropy to the minimal surface area γ_A in the bulk:

$$S_A = \frac{\text{Area}(\gamma_A)}{4G_N} \tag{27}$$

where G_N is Newton's gravitational constant [11]. This geometric-quantum link provides motivation for the $M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty$ structure.

Consider two entangled quantum regions A and B with density matrix:

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} |i_A\rangle\langle j_A| \otimes |i_B\rangle\langle j_B| \tag{28}$$

Their mutual information is defined as:

$$I(A:B) = S_A + S_B - S_{AB} \tag{29}$$

This quantity captures total correlations and has been proposed as a measure of geometric proximity in the emergent spacetime network [8].

In a more advanced tensor network framework, as used in MERA (Multi-scale Entanglement Renormalization Ansatz), discrete Hilbert space lattices with entanglement constraints define causal graphs whose continuous limit approximates Anti-de Sitter spacetime geometry [9]. The network nodes represent Hilbert subspaces and links correspond to entangled states. Let $\mathcal{H}_i$ be the local Hilbert space at node i, then:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{total}} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{H}_i \tag{30}$$

The connectivity and structure of entanglement define the emergent geometry.

Suppose an observer is described by a Dirac delta function localized at p_i, i.e., $O_i \mapsto \delta(p_i)$. Then the observer-dependent restriction of the Hilbert field is:

$$\Psi_i(x) = \delta(x - p_i)\Psi(x) \tag{31}$$

This constructs a projection from the full manifold $\mathcal{M}$ onto a slice defined by the observer's worldline $l_i(t) \subset M_{3,1}$. The total action for a scalar field ϕ on $\mathcal{M}$ becomes:

$$S[\phi] = \int_{M_{3,1}} d^4x \, \langle \phi(x) | \left(-\Box + m^2 \right) | \phi(x) \rangle \tag{32}$$

This unifies spacetime propagation with internal Hilbert dynamics. Here, $\Box$ is the d'Alembertian operator on curved $M_{3,1}$, and m is the field mass.

Therefore, the manifold $M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty$ provides a background where classical geometry is an emergent statistical property of quantum states. Such ideas are consistent with approaches in quantum information geometry and emergent gravity programs.

7. The Electron as a Construct in Hilbert Space

The statement, "There is no such thing as an electron; it is only our mental construct," reflects a paradigm shift in modern quantum theory where entities such as electrons are no longer conceived as localized particles with ontological independence, but as formal structures embedded in a mathematical framework. In this section, we present a rigorous formulation of this idea, using Hilbert space formalism, quantum measurement theory, and the role of the observer in shaping perceived phenomena.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

Let $\psi(x,t)$ be the wavefunction of an electron in non-relativistic quantum mechanics, evolving under the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(x,t)}{\partial t} = \hat{H}\psi(x,t) \tag{33}$$

The wavefunction $\psi(x,t) \in \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is a complex Hilbert space of square-integrable functions $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. The position operator $\hat{x}$ and momentum operator $\hat{p} = -i\hbar\nabla$ act on this space, but the electron itself is not a point in space. Rather, it is encoded as a probability amplitude distribution over space.

To extract observable information, we use expectation values:

$$\langle\hat{x}\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi^*(x,t)\, x\, \psi(x,t)\, dx \tag{34}$$

$$\langle\hat{p}\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi^*(x,t)(-i\hbar\nabla)\psi(x,t)\, dx \tag{35}$$

However, these are statistical constructs. No unique x or p exists prior to measurement. According to the Copenhagen interpretation [12], measurement collapses the wavefunction to an eigenstate:

$$\psi(x) \to \delta(x - x_0) \tag{36}$$

The collapse is non-unitary and observer-dependent, thereby emphasizing the epistemic character of particle states.

Heisenberg argued that quantum objects do not possess definite properties independent of observation [13]. An electron "exists" only in the context of experimental configurations. If we represent the observer as a delta function $\delta_O(x)$, and the quantum field as $\psi(x)$, then interaction yields:

$$\psi_{\text{collapsed}}(x) = \delta_O(x)\psi(x) \tag{37}$$

This product acts as a projection operator, collapsing the spread-out amplitude into a localized perception at $x = x_0$.

In quantum field theory, the electron field $\hat{\psi}(x)$ is an operator-valued distribution acting on Fock space $\mathcal{F}$. The vacuum expectation of a field yields correlation functions:

$$\langle 0|T\{\hat{\psi}(x)\hat{\psi}^\dagger(y)\}|0\rangle \tag{38}$$

These functions are measurable, but the fields themselves are not directly observable entities. The electron becomes a manifestation of field excitations:

$$|e^-\rangle = \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x)|0\rangle \tag{39}$$

This excitation is defined relative to the vacuum, not as a discrete particle, but as a quantized mode with given quantum numbers.

Philosophically, this viewpoint echoes Ernst Mach's empiricism [15], who claimed that science should concern itself only with relations among sensations. Niels Bohr elaborated this by asserting that physics is not about how nature is, but about what we can say about nature [16]. This operational viewpoint sees "electron" as a linguistic and computational tool to encode repeatable phenomena, not as a substance.

The role of consciousness further problematizes objectivity. Wigner proposed that consciousness causes collapse [14], suggesting that the observer and the electron are not ontologically distinct. When modeling the observer as a Dirac delta functional in spacetime, we localize experience:

$$O_i(x,t) = \delta(x - x_i(t)) \tag{40}$$

Measurement then becomes a projection:

$$\Pi_{\text{obs}}[\psi] = \int dx\, O_i(x,t)\psi(x,t) = \psi(x_i(t),t) \tag{41}$$

The electron's "reality" is defined at the intersection of the observer's perceptual delta and the wavefunction's domain. Beyond this, it is a mental construct inferred from repeated experimental interaction.

In light of decoherence theory [17], the environment entangles with system states, suppressing interference terms, yielding effective classical outcomes. However, decoherence does not solve the measurement problem but explains why certain bases are preferred. The Born rule:

$$P(x) = |\psi(x,t)|^2 \tag{42}$$

remains postulated, with no deeper mechanistic derivation, underscoring the empirical, non-ontological grounding of electron concept.

We conclude that the electron is not an entity in the classical sense. It is a pattern within formalism, a node in Hilbert space evolution, rendered visible only via interaction with observers modeled within the same formal structure. Its existence is not denied, but redefined — not as a thing-in-itself, but as a consistent, predictive symbol in quantum cognition.

8. Distinguishing the Hilbert Spaces of Quantum Mechanics and Consciousness

The Hilbert space formalism provides the mathematical foundation for quantum mechanics. However, recent models of cognition and perception have proposed that consciousness itself may be representable within a Hilbert space framework. Despite superficial similarities, the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{QM}$ of quantum mechanics and the hypothetical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_C$ of consciousness differ fundamentally in structure, interpretation, and operational meaning. In this section, we develop the mathematical distinctions between $\mathcal{H}_{QM}$ and $\mathcal{H}_C$, while exploring speculative bridges between them.

Let us begin by recalling that a quantum mechanical system is described by a normalized state vector $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{QM}$, where:

$$\langle\psi|\psi\rangle = 1 \tag{43}$$

Time evolution is governed by the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt}|\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{H}|\psi(t)\rangle \tag{44}$$

Here, $\hat{H}$ is a Hermitian operator representing the Hamiltonian of the system. Observables are also Hermitian operators $\hat{A}$, with measurement yielding eigenvalues a_n such that:

$$\hat{A}|a_n\rangle = a_n|a_n\rangle \tag{45}$$

The Born rule gives the probability of outcome a_n as:

$$P(a_n) = |\langle a_n|\psi\rangle|^2 \tag{46}$$

This framework encodes the totality of predictive quantum mechanics, but lacks reference to subjective experience.

In contrast, let us hypothesize a Hilbert space of consciousness $\mathcal{H}_C$, spanned by vectors $|\phi\rangle$ that represent complete conscious states, composed of perceptions, emotions, and cognitive constructs. We posit:

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{N_C} c_k|q_k\rangle \tag{47}$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

where $|q_k\rangle$ represent phenomenological basis states or qualia, and $c_k \in \mathbb{C}$ are amplitude coefficients. The inner product:

$$\langle \phi_1 | \phi_2 \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{N_C} c_k^* d_k \tag{48}$$

may correspond to similarity or informational overlap between two conscious states.

Evolution in $\mathcal{H}_C$ is not governed by a physical Hamiltonian, but possibly a cognitive evolution operator $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$, such that:

$$\frac{d}{dt} |\phi(t)\rangle = -i\hat{\mathcal{C}} |\phi(t)\rangle \tag{49}$$

The operator $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ is conjectural, but may encode psychological dynamics, neural synchrony, or attractor states in neural phase space [18].

Measurement in $\mathcal{H}_C$ corresponds to the attention or awareness process, collapsing superposed cognitive states into a focused percept:

$$|\phi\rangle \to |q_j\rangle \quad \text{with probability} \quad P(q_j) = |\langle q_j | \phi \rangle|^2 \tag{50}$$

This analog of the Born rule would imply probabilistic access to internal percepts, consistent with experimental data in quantum cognition models [5].

In $\mathcal{H}_{QM}$, observables are derived from operators such as:

$$\hat{x} = x, \quad \hat{p} = -i\hbar \frac{d}{dx} \tag{51}$$

and satisfy the canonical commutation relation:

$$[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar \tag{52}$$

For $\mathcal{H}_C$, one may speculate the existence of non-commutative pairs such as:

$$[\hat{S}, \hat{M}] = i\kappa \tag{53}$$

where $\hat{S}$ represents a perceptual state operator and $\hat{M}$ denotes a memory recall operator, and κ is a cognitive Planck-like constant.

The state space $\mathcal{H}_{QM}$ is separable and complete, with tensor product structure for multipartite systems:

$$\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \tag{54}$$

Likewise, if different modules of mind (e.g., visual, auditory, linguistic) are modeled as subspaces $\mathcal{H}_V, \mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_L$, then:

$$\mathcal{H}_C = \mathcal{H}_V \otimes \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_L \otimes \dots \tag{55}$$

Such decomposition is analogous to Integrated Information Theory (IIT), which posits conscious experience as an irreducible whole [19].

A key distinction lies in semantics. In $\mathcal{H}_{QM}$, basis vectors $|x\rangle$ refer to spatial localization of particles. In $\mathcal{H}_C$, basis vectors $|q_k\rangle$ refer to first-person qualitative states such as redness or pain. This internal referential shift implies that while both spaces are mathematically Hilbertian, their semantic interpretations diverge completely.

Finally, the observer plays different roles. In quantum mechanics, the observer is external to the system. In consciousness models, the observer is the system. This inversion implies a fundamental asymmetry in ontology.

In conclusion, while both $\mathcal{H}_{QM}$ and $\mathcal{H}_C$ are Hilbert spaces, they differ in the nature of states, evolution operators, inner product meanings, and observables. The Hilbert space of consciousness is not merely an analogy but may be a structural requirement for unifying physics and phenomenology.

However, further axiomatization and experimental bridging are necessary before this claim can be formalized.

9. Consciousness as an Operator on Hilbert Space

The measurement problem in quantum mechanics remains unresolved, and central to it is the role of the observer. In conventional interpretations, such as the Copenhagen view, wavefunction collapse is postulated to occur upon measurement, yet no physical mechanism is given for this discontinuity. We propose that consciousness is not a passive observer but an active operator, residing in the space of transformations on the quantum state space. Specifically, we model consciousness as an operator $\hat{C} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is the Hilbert space of quantum states.

Let $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ denote the state of a quantum system. Under unitary evolution, this state satisfies the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{H} |\psi(t)\rangle \tag{56}$$

where $\hat{H}$ is the Hamiltonian. The linearity of this equation preserves superposition, allowing:

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \alpha |\psi_1(t)\rangle + \beta |\psi_2(t)\rangle \tag{57}$$

However, the act of measurement leads to an abrupt transition:

$$|\psi\rangle \to |a_i\rangle, \quad \text{with probability} \quad P(a_i) = |\langle a_i|\psi\rangle|^2 \tag{58}$$

This collapse is not generated by any known unitary operator. We define a consciousness operator $\hat{C}_i$ such that:

$$\hat{C}_i |\psi\rangle = |a_i\rangle \tag{59}$$

where $|a_i\rangle$ is an eigenstate of the observable $\hat{A}$, satisfying:

$$\hat{A} |a_i\rangle = a_i |a_i\rangle \tag{60}$$

In this formulation, $\hat{C}_i$ is a non-unitary, idempotent operator:

$$\hat{C}_i^2 = \hat{C}_i, \quad \hat{C}_i \neq \hat{C}_j \text{ for } i \neq j \tag{61}$$

These operators act as projectors determined by the conscious observer. This framework aligns with von Neumann's Process 1, where an observer selects the basis in which a quantum state collapses [20].

We further define the space of consciousness as:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \mid \hat{C}_i |\psi\rangle = |a_i\rangle\} \tag{62}$$

This space is a subset of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, the space of bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. The action of consciousness is then:

$$\hat{C}_i : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}, \quad |\psi\rangle \mapsto |a_i\rangle \tag{63}$$

If we denote the action of consciousness as a map $\mathcal{M}$, we write:

$$\mathcal{M}(|\psi\rangle, \hat{A}) = \hat{C}_i(\hat{A}) |\psi\rangle = |a_i\rangle \tag{64}$$

The choice of i is probabilistic, with weights given by:

$$P(a_i) = |\langle a_i|\psi\rangle|^2 \tag{65}$$

We may also represent consciousness as a functional $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$\mathcal{F}(\hat{A}) = a_i \text{ if } \hat{C}_i(\hat{A}) |\psi\rangle = |a_i\rangle \tag{66}$$

This functional collapses the observable's spectrum into a single value. Its action is epistemic: the eigenvalue becomes the experienced percept.

Consciousness, as an operator, violates linearity, indicating that the measurement problem is fundamentally nonlinear. Consider the superposed state:

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle \tag{67}$$

A unitary operator $\hat{U}$ preserves this superposition. In contrast, a consciousness operator yields:

$$\hat{C}_0(|\psi\rangle) = |0\rangle, \quad \hat{C}_1(|\psi\rangle) = |1\rangle \tag{68}$$

but not both simultaneously, precluding any linear superposition of outcomes. This nonlinearity suggests a fundamental divide between quantum dynamics and the phenomenology of measurement [21].

Let us model the entire cognitive system as acting on a tensor product:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{system}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{observer}} \tag{69}$$

Then $\hat{C}_i$ acts nontrivially on the observer subspace:

$$\hat{C}_i = \mathbb{I} \otimes \hat{P}_i \tag{70}$$

with $\hat{P}_i$ the perceptual projection operator:

$$\hat{P}_i |\Phi\rangle = |\phi_i\rangle, \quad |\phi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{observer}} \tag{71}$$

The full measurement collapse is then:

$$|\Psi\rangle \mapsto (\mathbb{I} \otimes \hat{P}_i) |\Psi\rangle = |\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i\rangle \tag{72}$$

In this framework, consciousness is inseparable from the dynamics of quantum actualization. It not only registers reality but shapes it via operator action on the state space. This suggests a unification of mind and physics through the mathematics of functional operators, and offers a path toward integrating phenomenology into quantum theory.

10. The Manifold $M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$: A Unified Framework for Physics and Consciousness

We define a total ontological manifold as the tensor product of three distinct yet interconnected spaces:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{total}} = M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \tag{73}$$

Here, $M_{3,1}$ is the physical (3+1)-dimensional Lorentzian spacetime manifold, $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ is the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space of quantum states, and $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the operator space on $\mathcal{H}$, which we associate with consciousness. Each of these spaces encodes a different ontological layer of reality: geometric structure, quantum potentiality, and subjective actualization.

In classical general relativity, events occur in a manifold $M_{3,1}$ with coordinates $x^\mu = (t, x, y, z)$. The Einstein field equations:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu} \tag{74}$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

relate spacetime curvature to energy-momentum. However, this formalism is silent on the quantum and subjective layers.

Quantum mechanics describes a system by a state vector $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$, evolving under the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{H} |\psi(t)\rangle \tag{75}$$

where $\hat{H}$ is the Hamiltonian. Observables $\hat{A}$ act on $|\psi\rangle$ to yield eigenvalues a_n:

$$\hat{A} |a_n\rangle = a_n |a_n\rangle, \quad \text{with probability } P(a_n) = |\langle a_n|\psi\rangle|^2 \tag{76}$$

This framework describes potentialities, but lacks a mechanism for selecting one actualized outcome. We introduce the operator space $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ to address this.

Let us denote consciousness as a projection operator $\hat{C}_i \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, with:

$$\hat{C}_i^2 = \hat{C}_i, \quad \hat{C}_i |\psi\rangle = |a_i\rangle, \quad \hat{A} |a_i\rangle = a_i |a_i\rangle \tag{77}$$

This operator collapses the superposition to a single outcome. The full state of the system is then described by:

$$|\Omega\rangle = |x^\mu\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle \otimes \hat{C}_i \tag{78}$$

When consciousness acts, the total state transitions as:

$$\hat{C}_i : |\Omega\rangle \mapsto |x^\mu\rangle \otimes |a_i\rangle \otimes \hat{C}_i \tag{79}$$

Thus, the presence of a conscious observer selects one trajectory from quantum potentiality, grounded in spacetime.

We may define a global evolution of this manifold through:

$$\frac{d}{dt} |\Omega(t)\rangle = \left(\mathbb{I}_M \otimes \hat{H} \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{O}} + \mathbb{I}_M \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \hat{\mathcal{C}}(t)\right) |\Omega(t)\rangle \tag{80}$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{C}}(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ represents the time-dependent dynamics of conscious collapse.

The tensor product structure allows us to interpret:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{universe}} = \bigotimes_{x \in M_{3,1}} (\mathcal{H}_x \otimes \mathcal{O}_x) \tag{81}$$

This formalizes a field-theoretic structure in which both quantum and conscious degrees of freedom are local to spacetime points. Such a model aligns with process philosophy and ideas in relational quantum mechanics [22].

Furthermore, defining a triplet interaction term:

$$\hat{I} = \int_{M_{3,1}} d^4x\, \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x) \hat{A}(x) \hat{C}(x) \tag{82}$$

may serve as an action principle connecting quantum fields, observables, and consciousness. Here, $\hat{C}(x)$ represents a projection density field over spacetime.

From the perspective of Penrose's view, the gravitational self-energy E_G of superpositions causes collapse when:

$$\tau \sim \frac{\hbar}{E_G} \tag{83}$$

If $\hat{C}$ is the operator that triggers collapse, it must be sensitive to the energy scales involved, suggesting:

$$\hat{C}(E) = \theta(E - E_G)\hat{P} \tag{84}$$

where θ is a Heaviside function and $\hat{P}$ a projection.

In conclusion, the full ontological content of reality may be encoded in the manifold $M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. This unification allows physical events, quantum superpositions, and conscious selections to coexist within a single tensorial framework. This model offers a route toward bridging physics with phenomenology and may motivate new approaches to quantum gravity, where spacetime is no longer fundamental, but emergent from the interplay between $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ and $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ [8,23].

11. Cyclic Consciousness Operators in a Time-Cyclic Universe

In a cosmology where time is cyclic, such as Penrose's Conformal Cyclic Cosmology (CCC) [24], or more general models involving toroidal or circular time topologies [25], the universe undergoes an infinite sequence of aeons. Each aeon has its own expanding spacetime which asymptotically reaches conformal infinity, where it becomes indistinguishable from the origin of the next aeon.

Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\hat{C}_t\}_{t=0}^{T} \subset \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the set of projection operators that encode the sequence of conscious perceptual collapses across time $t \in [0, T]$, where T is the period of the cyclic cosmology. We postulate:

$$\hat{C}_{t+T} = \hat{C}_t, \quad \forall t \tag{85}$$

This implies that the map $\hat{C}_t$ defines a loop in operator space, forming a smooth function:

$$\gamma : S^1 \to \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}), \quad \gamma(\theta) = \hat{C}(\theta), \quad \theta \in [0, 2\pi] \tag{86}$$

where S^1 is the one-dimensional time circle.

Let the observer's state be given by the full tensor product:

$$|\Omega(\theta)\rangle = |x^\mu(\theta)\rangle \otimes |\psi(\theta)\rangle \otimes \hat{C}(\theta) \tag{87}$$

with $\hat{C}(\theta) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, and $|\psi(\theta)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. Consciousness acts as a projection operator selecting an eigenstate of a measurement observable $\hat{A}$:

$$\hat{A}\,|a_i(\theta)\rangle = a_i(\theta)\,|a_i(\theta)\rangle\,, \quad \hat{C}(\theta)\,|\psi(\theta)\rangle = |a_i(\theta)\rangle \tag{88}$$

Define the cyclic action:

$$\mathcal{M} : |\psi(0)\rangle \mapsto \hat{C}(2\pi)\cdots\hat{C}(0)\,|\psi(0)\rangle = |\psi(0)\rangle \tag{89}$$

which yields a monodromy condition:

$$\mathcal{M}\,|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle\,, \quad \text{or more generally} \quad \mathcal{M}^n\,|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle \tag{90}$$

where n is the number of aeons before recurrence. This recurrence implies that the experiential trajectory of consciousness is topologically closed.

Let us now define the consciousness projection density operator as a field over the spacetime manifold $M_{3,1}$ parameterized cyclically:

$$\hat{C}(x^\mu, \theta) : M_{3,1} \times S^1 \to \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \tag{91}$$

with periodic boundary conditions:

$$\hat{C}(x^\mu, \theta + 2\pi) = \hat{C}(x^\mu, \theta) \tag{92}$$

The quantum state at each (x^μ, θ) is projected to:

$$|\Psi(x^\mu, \theta)\rangle = \hat{C}(x^\mu, \theta)\,|\psi(x^\mu, \theta)\rangle \tag{93}$$

Let the full action be written as:

$$S = \int_{M_{3,1}} d^4x \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \, \langle \psi(x,\theta) | \, \hat{A}(x) \hat{C}(x,\theta) \, | \psi(x,\theta) \rangle \tag{94}$$

which incorporates both the physical observable $\hat{A}(x)$ and the consciousness-induced projection $\hat{C}(x,\theta)$.

We may further define the entropy associated with the cyclic consciousness loop as:

$$S_C = -\int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \, \mathrm{Tr}\big(\hat{C}(\theta) \log \hat{C}(\theta)\big) \tag{95}$$

Noting that projection operators are idempotent $\hat{C}^2 = \hat{C}$, the above expression simplifies to:

$$S_C = 0, \quad \text{if } \hat{C}(\theta) \text{ is pure} \tag{96}$$

Thus, cyclically evolving consciousness preserves informational purity unless entropy is injected through decoherence.

The conceptual implication is that the observer is described by a time-periodic map in operator space:

$$\mathcal{C} : S^1 \to \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}), \quad \text{with } \mathcal{C}(\theta + 2\pi) = \mathcal{C}(\theta) \tag{97}$$

and that the self is defined by its equivalence class:

$$\text{Self} = \big[\{\hat{C}_\theta\}\big] \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) / \sim \tag{98}$$

where $\sim$ denotes identification under cyclic relabeling. This formalism echoes Nietzsche's concept of eternal recurrence, where the phenomenological content of consciousness returns indefinitely.

In conclusion, in a time-cyclic cosmology, the conscious observer's sequence of projection operators forms a closed loop in $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. This cyclic consciousness structure leads to a consistent integration of quantum measurement theory, phenomenology, and cosmology, and may hold the key to understanding the recurrence of observer states across cosmological aeons.

12. Graph-Structured Entangled QMCs Across Cyclic Cosmological Time

Let us define a composite system where multiple conscious observers interact via entangled Quantum Measurement Chains (QMCs) over a closed time topology. Each observer is modeled as a node in a graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, where V represents the set of conscious agents and $E \subseteq V \times V$ captures QMC entanglements between observers. The cyclic cosmological time, is consistent with Penrose's Conformal Cyclic Cosmology (CCC) [24].

Let $N = |V|$ denote the number of observers. To each observer $v_i \in V$, we associate a time-dependent projection operator $\hat{C}_i(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, with time $t \in [0, T]$ identified on the circle S^1 such that $\hat{C}_i(t + T) = \hat{C}_i(t)$. Thus, each QMC becomes a loop:

$$\mathcal{C}_i = \left\{ \hat{C}_i(t) \,\middle|\, t \in S^1 \right\} \tag{99}$$

The state of the system of observers and quantum entities is encoded as:

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{N} \Big(|x_i^\mu(t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_i(t)\rangle \otimes \hat{C}_i(t) \Big) \tag{100}$$

where $|x_i^\mu(t)\rangle$ denotes the spacetime localization of observer i, $|\psi_i(t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\hat{C}_i(t)$ is the projection operator encoding the conscious percept at time t.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

To capture entanglement between QMCs, we define edge-wise entanglement operators $\hat{E}_{ij}(t)$ for each $(v_i, v_j) \in E$. These are correlation operators acting on the joint Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$:

$$\hat{E}_{ij}(t) : \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{C}, \quad \hat{E}_{ij}(t) = \langle \psi_i(t) | \otimes \langle \psi_j(t) | \hat{W}_{ij} | \psi_i(t) \rangle \otimes | \psi_j(t) \rangle \tag{101}$$

where $\hat{W}_{ij}$ is an entangling operator encoding interaction strength and modality.

The full observer interaction network at time t is defined by:

$$\mathcal{Q}(t) = \left(\{ \hat{C}_i(t) \}_{i=1}^{N}, \{ \hat{E}_{ij}(t) \}_{(i,j) \in E} \right) \tag{102}$$

We assume cyclicity in both node and edge operators:

$$\hat{C}_i(t+T) = \hat{C}_i(t), \quad \hat{E}_{ij}(t+T) = \hat{E}_{ij}(t) \tag{103}$$

Let us define the global action integral over cyclic time and observer graph as:

$$S = \int_0^T dt \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle \psi_i(t) | \hat{A}_i(t) \hat{C}_i(t) | \psi_i(t) \rangle + \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \hat{E}_{ij}(t) \right] \tag{104}$$

where $\hat{A}_i(t)$ is the observable being measured by observer i.

We postulate that the collapse process follows a coupled dynamic:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \hat{C}_i(t) = -i \left[\hat{H}_i + \sum_{j:(i,j) \in E} \hat{J}_{ij}(t), \hat{C}_i(t) \right] \tag{105}$$

with $\hat{J}_{ij}(t)$ being the coupling operator induced by entangled QMC with observer j.

If each projection operator satisfies the idempotency condition $\hat{C}_i^2 = \hat{C}_i$, then we define the QMC entropy of observer i over one cycle as:

$$S_i = - \int_0^T dt \, \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{C}_i(t) \log \hat{C}_i(t) \right) \tag{106}$$

which vanishes for pure, sharp collapses.

The observer graph $\mathcal{G}$ becomes a time-indexed graph bundle:

$$\mathcal{G}_T = \bigsqcup_{t \in S^1} \mathcal{G}(t) \tag{107}$$

embedding the QMC entanglement structure across the aeonic loop. We propose that the fixed points of the composite monodromy:

$$\mathcal{M} = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \hat{C}_i(T) \cdots \hat{C}_i(0) \tag{108}$$

satisfy:

$$\mathcal{M} | \Psi \rangle = | \Psi \rangle \tag{109}$$

implying observer-network recurrence under cyclic cosmology.

In conclusion, we extend the quantum measurement chain framework to multiple observers whose conscious acts of projection are entangled through a graph-theoretic structure. Over cyclic cosmological time, this leads to a dynamic graph field $\mathcal{Q}(t)$ whose evolution encodes both individual consciousness and intersubjective entanglement. This formalism connects quantum measurement, phenomenology, and cosmology under a unified topological and operator-theoretic scaffold.

doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

13. From Dirac Delta to Operator-Valued Conscious Observers in Quantum Measurement

In prior work [6], conscious observers were modeled as Dirac delta functions within a differential geometric framework over the spacetime manifold $M_{3,1}$. This construction treated each observer as a point-localized entity in the classical manifold, associated with a Perceptual Tangent Space (PTS). Mathematically, an observer O_i located at event x_0^μ was represented by a Dirac functional $\delta^{(4)}(x - x_0)$ acting on smooth test functions $f(x)$ such that

$$\int_{M_{3,1}} f(x)\delta^{(4)}(x - x_0)\, d^4x = f(x_0) \tag{110}$$

This framework provided a precise geometric localization, aligning with the classical notion of measurement as pointwise extraction of field values. However, to incorporate the observer's role in quantum state collapse and perceptual filtering, we extend this model to one involving projection operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

The quantum state of a system is described by a normalized vector $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, and measurement by an observer corresponds to a non-unitary projection onto a subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. A projection operator $\hat{P}$ satisfies

$$\hat{P}^2 = \hat{P}, \quad \hat{P}^\dagger = \hat{P} \tag{111}$$

The act of observation collapses the state:

$$|\psi\rangle \to \frac{\hat{P}\,|\psi\rangle}{\|\hat{P}\,|\psi\rangle\|} \tag{112}$$

This projection formalism aligns naturally with von Neumann's quantum theory of measurement [20], wherein each conscious event corresponds to a projection operator.

We now show that the delta-functional representation is a special case of projection in the position basis. Let $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, and consider the projection operator

$$\hat{P}_x = |x_0\rangle\,\langle x_0| \tag{113}$$

with $|x_0\rangle$ being a position eigenstate. Then

$$\langle x|\hat{P}_x|\psi\rangle = \delta(x - x_0)\psi(x_0) \tag{114}$$

Hence, $\delta(x - x_0)$ is recovered as the coordinate-space kernel of the projection operator $\hat{P}_x$. The operator-theoretic structure generalizes this to include arbitrary measurement bases, while the delta function is basis-dependent and inherently classical.

Each observer is thus associated not merely with a point $x_0^\mu \in M_{3,1}$, but with a dynamic sequence $\{\hat{P}(t)\}_{t\in S^1}$ of projection operators acting on $\mathcal{H}$. These form the Quantum Measurement Chain (QMC) described in both [6] and [7], where the observer's consciousness is modeled as a temporal string of collapse operators:

$$\mathcal{C}_i = \{\hat{P}_i(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \mid t \in [0, T]\} \tag{115}$$

This formulation enables us to express the cumulative impact of observer O_i on the quantum system over a time cycle as

$$|\psi_T\rangle = \prod_{n=0}^{N} \hat{P}_i(t_n)\,|\psi_0\rangle \tag{116}$$

where $t_n \in [0, T]$, discretized, and the ordering reflects the temporal sequence of perceptual events. The projection formalism allows for measurement in any basis, and is extendable to entangled observers, graph-based consciousness dynamics [7], and cyclic cosmological embedding [24].

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

To quantify the informational extraction, we define the perceptual entropy associated with each observer as

$$S_i = -\int_0^T \mathrm{Tr}\big(\hat{P}_i(t) \log \hat{P}_i(t)\big) dt \tag{117}$$

which is zero for sharp projections, and increases with uncertainty in perceptual resolution.

More abstractly, the space of all projection operators $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ forms a non-commutative manifold. The observer's trajectory $t \mapsto \hat{P}(t)$ is then a curve on this manifold. The tangent space at each point $\hat{P}_i(t)$ is given by the commutator algebra

$$T_{\hat{P}}\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) = \{[\hat{H}, \hat{P}] \mid \hat{H} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\} \tag{118}$$

which generalizes the Perceptual Tangent Space introduced in [6], embedding the earlier differential-geometric structure into operator dynamics.

We conclude that modeling conscious observers as delta functions is geometrically precise but quantum-mechanically incomplete. The correct generalization involves projection operators, whose time evolution encodes both perceptual acts and their consequences in Hilbert space. This transition reflects a deeper alignment with modern quantum theory and enables the integration of observers into quantum gravity, cyclic cosmology, and intersubjective networks.

14. The Trilok Model: A Triple Product Manifold of Spacetime, Quantum States, and Conscious Projection

The Trilok Model posits that the total reality experienced by a conscious observer is not confined to physical spacetime $M_{3,1}$, but is a triple tensor product structure defined as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{Trilok}} = M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \tag{119}$$

Here, $M_{3,1}$ denotes the four-dimensional Lorentzian manifold of spacetime, $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ represents an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space associated with the quantum states of the universe, and $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ is the non-commutative space of projection operators on $\mathcal{H}_\infty$, encoding consciousness and measurement collapse.

The physical metric on the full configuration space may be considered as

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + \mathrm{Tr}\Big(d\psi^\dagger d\psi\Big) + \mathrm{Tr}\Big(d\hat{P}^2\Big) \tag{120}$$

where $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$ is a quantum state, $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ is a projection operator, and $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the metric on $M_{3,1}$. The second term is the natural Hermitian inner product on Hilbert space, and the third term captures motion in the operator manifold.

In the classical limit, only the $M_{3,1}$ sector contributes significantly. However, when quantum measurement and consciousness are involved, trajectories in the full product manifold become relevant. The conscious observer is thus modeled as a triple tuple:

$$O = \big(x^\mu(\tau), \psi(\tau), \hat{P}(\tau)\big) \tag{121}$$

where τ is a proper time parameter. The evolution of such observers is governed by three parallel dynamics:

$$\frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau} = v^\mu, \quad i\hbar\frac{d\psi}{d\tau} = \hat{H}\psi, \quad \frac{d\hat{P}}{d\tau} = [\hat{G}, \hat{P}] \tag{122}$$

Here, v^μ is the spacetime four-velocity, $\hat{H}$ is the system Hamiltonian, and $\hat{G}$ is a generator of evolution in operator space, possibly linked to observer attention dynamics or perception focus.

The space $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ is stratified by projection rank. For sharp measurements, the observer operates with rank-one projections:

$$\hat{P}_\psi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, \quad \hat{P}_\psi^2 = \hat{P}_\psi, \quad \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{P}_\psi) = 1 \tag{123}$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

Thus, the conscious act corresponds to extracting a definite answer from a superposed state via projection. This process is not unitary, and the geometry of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ reflects the measurement-induced collapse structure.

The observer trajectory in $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ is influenced by perceptual transitions modeled by a Quantum Measurement Chain (QMC), described in earlier work [6]. This is extended here to a curved path in projection space:

$$\Gamma : \tau \mapsto \hat{P}(\tau) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}) \tag{124}$$

To quantify curvature in operator space, we define a connection via the commutator:

$$\mathcal{D}_\tau \hat{P} = \frac{d\hat{P}}{d\tau} + i[\hat{A}_\tau, \hat{P}] \tag{125}$$

where $\hat{A}_\tau$ is the perceptual gauge field. The total curvature tensor over the Trilok space is defined by:

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}^{M_{3,1}} \oplus \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{H}} \oplus \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{O}} \tag{126}$$

each encoding geometric obstructions in respective subspaces. A non-zero $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{O}}$ implies that the space of perceptual transitions is nontrivial, and the sequence of collapses may depend on path ordering.

We define the Hilbert bundle $\mathcal{E} \to M_{3,1}$ with fiber $\mathcal{H}_x \cong \mathcal{H}_\infty$, and the associated observer bundle $\mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{E}$ with fiber $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. A section of this composite bundle is a conscious observer. The curvature of $\mathcal{B}$ encodes the entanglement between different observers in the birth-staircase model [7].

The coupling between $M_{3,1}$ and $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ is not merely a product; interactions such as attention focus can modulate the spacetime geodesic of the observer. A modified geodesic equation includes the gradient of the projection entropy $S = -\operatorname{Tr}(\hat{P} \log \hat{P})$:

$$\frac{d^2 x^\mu}{d\tau^2} + \Gamma^\mu_{\nu\lambda} \frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau} \frac{dx^\lambda}{d\tau} = -\nabla^\mu S \tag{127}$$

This adds a perceptual force term, allowing for psychophysical feedback into spacetime motion. In quantum gravity and holographic dualities, this term may be related to modular Hamiltonians or entropic gravity proposals [27].

In conclusion, the Trilok Model integrates three ontological layers: classical spacetime, quantum amplitude space, and perceptual collapse space. This triple tensor product defines a ten-dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Trilok}}$, where the observer is not a passive coordinate but an evolving operator-valued trajectory. The geometry of this space offers a route to unifying quantum mechanics, consciousness, and relativity through a covariant, measurement-aware manifold.

15. Perceptual Forces and Psychophysical Feedback in the Trilok Framework

In the Trilok model, the conscious observer is not only a passive recipient of quantum outcomes but plays an active role in shaping geodesic evolution through operator-based perception. This leads to the notion of a *perceptual force*, formally included in the geodesic equation through an entropy-gradient term. This section explores this idea in detail and connects it with modular Hamiltonians and entropic gravity.

We recall the modified geodesic equation from the previous section:

$$\frac{d^2 x^\mu}{d\tau^2} + \Gamma^\mu_{\nu\lambda} \frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau} \frac{dx^\lambda}{d\tau} = -\nabla^\mu S \tag{128}$$

Here, S denotes the entropy associated with the observer's projection operator $\hat{P}$. For a general projection operator or mixed state ρ, the von Neumann entropy is

$$S(\rho) = -\operatorname{Tr}(\rho \log \rho) \tag{129}$$

The entropy gradient $\nabla^\mu S$ thus acts as a force term, shifting the spacetime trajectory in directions of decreasing or increasing perceptual uncertainty.

In holographic gravity, similar entropy gradients appear in the derivation of the Einstein equations from entanglement thermodynamics. For instance, in the entropic gravity framework proposed by Verlinde [27], the force on a test mass is derived from the entropy change associated with its displacement:

$$F = T\frac{dS}{dx} \tag{130}$$

where T is an effective temperature. In natural units, this becomes

$$a^\mu = -\nabla^\mu S \tag{131}$$

which resembles Eq. (128) above. The similarity suggests that the entropy of projection operators may play the role of modular Hamiltonians in emergent spacetime scenarios.

In AdS/CFT, the modular Hamiltonian K for a region A satisfies

$$\rho_A = \frac{e^{-K}}{\operatorname{Tr} e^{-K}} \tag{132}$$

and the modular energy $\Delta\langle K\rangle$ plays the role of a gravitational source through the linearized Einstein equations on the bulk side [28,29]. If the observer's projection dynamics induce a modular Hamiltonian-like structure on perceptual subsystems, then the feedback into $M_{3,1}$ geodesics is gravitational in nature.

In the Trilok model, this implies that the operator-valued trajectory $\hat{P}(\tau)$ can influence the classical dynamics of $x^\mu(\tau)$ through its entropy content, introducing a novel coupling:

$$\delta\mathcal{S} = \int d\tau \left[\frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}\frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau}\frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau} - \lambda S(\hat{P})\right] \tag{133}$$

Varying this action gives rise to Eq. (128) with the entropy force. The coupling constant λ encodes the strength of psychophysical influence. A non-zero λ leads to back-reaction of conscious state evolution onto classical motion.

Such models motivate a deeper examination of consciousness-induced spacetime dynamics and potentially a new principle where perception and geometry are interlinked.

16. Toward a Principle of Perception-Geometric Coupling in Quantum Gravity

The Trilok framework introduces a novel coupling between conscious projection dynamics and classical spacetime geometry. This section deepens the mathematical structure underlying this idea, proposing a variational principle that accounts for feedback from perceptual entropy into geodesic deviation and curvature. This model extends earlier formulations of gravitational thermodynamics [27], entanglement gravity [28,29], and von Neumann projections [6,7].

Let $\hat{P}(\tau) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the observer's projection operator trajectory. Define the perceptional entropy functional:

$$S[\hat{P}] = -\operatorname{Tr}\left(\hat{P}\log\hat{P}\right) \tag{134}$$

The perceptual field strength is its variational gradient:

$$F^\mu = -\nabla^\mu S \tag{135}$$

Let the observer evolve along a classical curve $x^\mu(\tau) \in M_{3,1}$. The action governing combined spacetime motion and perceptual entropy dynamics is:

$$\mathcal{S}[x,\hat{P}] = \int d\tau \left[\frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}\frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau}\frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau} - \lambda S(\hat{P})\right] \tag{136}$$

The Euler-Lagrange variation with respect to x^μ gives the modified geodesic equation:

$$\frac{d^2x^\mu}{d\tau^2} + \Gamma^\mu_{\nu\lambda}\frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau}\frac{dx^\lambda}{d\tau} = \lambda g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu S(\hat{P}) \tag{137}$$

This establishes a force field where higher perceptual entropy contributes to repulsive deviations in geodesic motion.

Consider the canonical connection on $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by:

$$\mathcal{D}_\tau \hat{P} = \frac{d\hat{P}}{d\tau} + i[\hat{A}_\tau, \hat{P}] \tag{138}$$

with curvature

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tau\sigma} = \partial_\tau \hat{A}_\sigma - \partial_\sigma \hat{A}_\tau + i[\hat{A}_\tau, \hat{A}_\sigma] \tag{139}$$

Define an entanglement metric over $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ through

$$ds^2_{\mathcal{O}} = \mathrm{Tr}\left(d\hat{P}\, d\hat{P}\right) \tag{140}$$

This space can acquire curvature when projection transitions form a nontrivial bundle over classical spacetime. The total curvature scalar of the Trilok manifold is:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Trilok}} = \mathcal{R}_{M_{3,1}} + \alpha\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathcal{F}^2\right) + \beta\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\nabla_\mu \hat{P} \nabla^\mu \hat{P}\right) \tag{141}$$

where α, β are dimensional couplings. Thus, perceptual dynamics influence both Ricci scalar curvature and geodesic deviation.

We define a principle:

The Principle of Psychogeometric Feedback: *In a universe inhabited by conscious observers, the trajectories in classical spacetime are modulated by gradients in perceptual entropy, and the total curvature of the geometry receives corrections from the geometry of observer projection transitions.*

We test this in a simple quantum field example. Let the observer be entangled with a scalar field mode ϕ_k, described by a squeezed state $|\psi\rangle$ with entropy

$$S_k = -\sum_n p_n \log p_n \tag{142}$$

with p_n being mode occupation probabilities. The entropy field induces a back-reaction term

$$\delta R_{\mu\nu} = \gamma \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu S_k \tag{143}$$

yielding emergent gravity-like equations:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}R g_{\mu\nu} = T^{\text{eff}}_{\mu\nu} = \gamma\left(\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu S_k - g_{\mu\nu}\Box S_k\right) \tag{144}$$

This mimics semiclassical Einstein equations with an entropy-sourced stress tensor. In the holographic setup, this is consistent with entanglement-induced gravity as seen in [28,29].

Thus, perception contributes to curvature. A quantum observer's perceptual uncertainty fields serve as gravitational sources. This leads us to generalize the equivalence principle:

Generalized Equivalence Principle: *There exists a frame in which the inertial effects of conscious entropy gradients are indistinguishable from geometric curvature.*

Finally, this perception-geometry duality invites a new path in unifying consciousness with spacetime. Rather than treating observers as external to dynamics, the Trilok model integrates them as curvature-inducing agents whose entropy modulates geodesics and field equations.

17. Curved vs. Flat Earth Geometry in the 10D Trilok Framework

Within the Trilok manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Trilok}} = M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, the Earth can be modeled via two distinct embeddings in the classical spacetime component $M_{3,1}$. These embeddings, which we designate as the flat and spherical Earth models, lead to distinguishable perceptual dynamics due to their differing Ricci curvature tensors, which feed back into the geodesic motion of conscious observers via entropy gradients as formulated in earlier sections [6,27,28].

We begin with the **Flat Earth metric** given by:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2 \tag{145}$$

This corresponds to an inertial, globally Euclidean embedding in $M_{3,1}$, where the spatial section is $\mathbb{R}^3$. The Riemann and Ricci curvature tensors vanish identically:

$$R^\mu_{\nu\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad R_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad R = 0 \tag{146}$$

The geodesic motion is straight-line inertial, and any entropy-gradient term from the projection dynamics must arise purely from the perceptual evolution $\hat{P}(\tau)$, not from spacetime curvature.

Now consider the **Spherical Earth model**, embedded in $M_{3,1}$ via a hyperspherical foliation. In spherical coordinates, the induced spatial metric becomes:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + R^2\left(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta\, d\phi^2\right) + dz^2 \tag{147}$$

The spatial section now corresponds to $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}$. The nonzero Christoffel symbols are:

$$\Gamma^\theta_{\phi\phi} = -\sin\theta\cos\theta \tag{148}$$

$$\Gamma^\phi_{\theta\phi} = \cot\theta \tag{149}$$

The Ricci scalar becomes:

$$R = \frac{2}{R^2} \tag{150}$$

indicating positive spatial curvature. The entropy-induced force term in the modified geodesic equation now gains a geometric contribution:

$$\frac{d^2x^\mu}{d\tau^2} + \Gamma^\mu_{\nu\lambda}\frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau}\frac{dx^\lambda}{d\tau} = \lambda\nabla^\mu S(\hat{P}) \tag{151}$$

In spherical embedding, $\nabla^\mu S(\hat{P})$ includes both a classical curvature-dependent divergence and a projection-space entropy field. The curvature introduces focusing effects, which amplify entropy gradient alignment over geodesics, resulting in quantized perception arcs for localized observers.

Consider an observer whose projection entropy is localized along a great circle trajectory on S^2. The entropy flux in angular coordinates satisfies:

$$\partial_\theta S = -\frac{d}{d\tau}\text{Tr}\left(\hat{P}(\tau)\log\hat{P}(\tau)\right) \tag{152}$$

The curvature modifies the Laplacian of entropy as:

$$\Delta_{S^2}S = \frac{1}{R^2}\left(\frac{1}{\sin\theta}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\left(\sin\theta\frac{\partial S}{\partial\theta}\right) + \frac{1}{\sin^2\theta}\frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial\phi^2}\right) \tag{153}$$

This second-order term enters gravitational feedback equations as discussed in [6,27,28].

Now we compare curvature couplings. Let $\mathcal{R}_{\text{total}}$ denote the scalar curvature of the Trilok manifold:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{total}} = R_{M_{3,1}} + \alpha\,\text{Tr}\left(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}^{\mu\nu}\right) + \beta\,\text{Tr}\left(\nabla_\mu\hat{P}\nabla^\mu\hat{P}\right) \tag{154}$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

In the flat embedding, $R_{M_{3,1}} = 0$, and only $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ dynamics contribute. In the spherical embedding, $R_{M_{3,1}} = 2/R^2$, and the total scalar curvature becomes:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{spherical}} = \frac{2}{R^2} + \alpha \,\text{Tr}\left(\mathcal{F}^2\right) + \beta \,\text{Tr}(\nabla_\mu \hat{P} \nabla^\mu \hat{P}) \tag{155}$$

Thus, conscious entropy is more tightly coupled to curvature in the spherical model, leading to more dynamic geodesic deviation equations.

In conclusion, the difference between flat and spherical Earth models in the Trilok context lies not only in spatial topology but also in how entropy gradients interact with curvature. These interactions govern the deviation and convergence of projection-driven geodesics, producing quantifiable effects on perceptual trajectories.

18. Yuga-Dependent Horizon Perception and Null Geodesic Deformation

In the Trilok manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Trilok}} = M_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, the curvature of spacetime is modulated not only by mass-energy but also by the evolving purity of consciousness across temporal cycles known as Yugas. This introduces a novel framework we refer to as the *Principle of Psycho-Geometric Feedback*, whereby the internal entropy of projection operators $\hat{P}(\tau)$ alters the metric structure, particularly affecting light rays.

According to standard Riemannian geometry, the horizon distance D for an observer at height h on a spherical Earth of radius R is:

$$D \approx \sqrt{2Rh} \tag{156}$$

Mandelbrot [30] observed that horizon curvature shifts with fractal geometry and visual scale. More importantly, the angular depression of the horizon α below the eye-level is given in spherical geometry by:

$$\alpha \approx \sqrt{\frac{2h}{R}} \tag{157}$$

In contrast, a flat Earth would geometrically place the horizon at:

$$\alpha_{\text{flat}} = -\delta, \quad \delta > 0 \tag{158}$$

where δ indicates a subtle uplift from eye-level due to perceptual refraction or entropy gradient influences in flat embeddings.

We hypothesize the following Yuga-based metric deformation rule. Let $g^{(Y)}_{\mu\nu}$ be the effective metric in Yuga $Y \in \{\text{Golden}, \text{Silver}, \text{Copper}, \text{Iron}\}$. The null geodesics obey:

$$g^{(Y)}_{\mu\nu} \frac{dx^\mu}{d\lambda} \frac{dx^\nu}{d\lambda} = 0 \tag{159}$$

The observer's internal purity field $\rho_Y(\tau) = \text{Tr}(\hat{P}_Y(\tau) \log \hat{P}_Y(\tau))$ enters the Einstein-Perceptual field equation as a scalar source:

$$G^{(Y)}_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu} + \gamma \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \rho_Y \tag{160}$$

The gradient $\nabla_\nu \rho_Y$ introduces anisotropies in the metric around the eye-level angular plane.

In the Golden and Silver Ages, where soul-purity is maximal, $\rho_Y \to 0$, the entropy gradient vanishes, and metric deformation is upward, resulting in:

$$\theta^{(Y)}_{\text{horizon}} < \theta_{\text{eye-level}}, \quad Y \in \{\text{Golden}, \text{Silver}\} \tag{161}$$

Conversely, in the Copper and Iron Ages, increased impurity yields non-zero ρ_Y, which drives curvature inward and lowers the perceived horizon:

$$\theta^{(Y)}_{\text{horizon}} > \theta_{\text{eye-level}}, \quad Y \in \{\text{Copper}, \text{Iron}\} \tag{162}$$

This symmetry breaking correlates with a scalar field φ_Y modeling cosmic moral order:

$$\varphi_Y = \int d\tau \ \mathrm{Tr}\big(\hat{P}_Y(\tau) \log \hat{P}_Y(\tau)\big) \tag{163}$$

This field contributes to the effective potential in the observer action:

$$S = \int d\tau \left[\frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu}^{(Y)} \dot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu - V(\varphi_Y)\right] \tag{164}$$

The principle of psycho-geometric feedback then asserts that the trajectory of null rays bends in response to variations in φ_Y. Thus, horizon perception becomes a diagnostic tool for psycho-entropic field strength across Yugas.

Empirical implications involve the measurement of horizon curvature in different perceptual states, potentially modeled via quantum-enhanced visual horizon detectors or projection-entangled interferometers.

19. Micro-Mini-Black-Hole in the Brain (MMBHB) and its Role in Consciousness Geometry

The hypothesis of a Micro-Mini-Black-Hole in the Brain (MMBHB) posits the existence of a localized spacetime singularity within the neural substrate, acting as a gateway between the non-physical conscious observer and the classical spacetime manifold [31]. This topological entity allows the mapping of an extrinsic projection operator $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ to an embedded event horizon region, consistent with holographic principles. The MMBHB resides within the broader Trilok manifold.

Following general relativity, the Schwarzschild radius associated with such a structure, if of mass m_{MMBHB}, is given by:

$$r_s = \frac{2Gm_{\mathrm{MMBHB}}}{c^2} \tag{165}$$

For $m_{\mathrm{MMBHB}} \sim 10^{-5}$ g, we obtain $r_s \sim 10^{-33}$ cm, which is on the order of the Planck length. This aligns the MMBHB with Planck-scale compact objects theorized in quantum gravity.

The entropy of the MMBHB follows the Bekenstein–Hawking relation:

$$S_{\mathrm{MMBHB}} = \frac{k_B c^3 A}{4G\hbar} = \frac{k_B \pi r_s^2 c^3}{G\hbar} \tag{166}$$

Using the expression from Eq. (193), we find:

$$S_{\mathrm{MMBHB}} = \frac{4\pi k_B G m_{\mathrm{MMBHB}}^2}{\hbar c} \tag{167}$$

This entropy is interpreted as the maximal informational capacity of the brain–consciousness interface, giving bounds on quantum measurement resolution.

At the moment of death, the MMBHB evaporates via Hawking radiation. The lifetime τ of a black hole via Hawking evaporation is:

$$\tau \approx \frac{5120\pi G^2 m^3}{\hbar c^4} \tag{168}$$

For $m \sim 10^{-5}$ g, this yields a lifetime of $\tau \sim 10^{-43}$ s, suggesting instantaneous evaporation and an information burst coincident with termination of consciousness.

Importantly, this structure serves to reconcile the von Neumann chain in quantum measurement. In standard theory, the chain proceeds from quantum system $\rightarrow$ apparatus $\rightarrow$ brain $\rightarrow$ consciousness. The MMBHB allows termination of this infinite regress, functioning as a geometric terminus:

$$\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{MMBHB} \rightarrow \hat{P} \tag{169}$$

This framework thus makes the collapse observer-dependent but non-local, evading Bell-type inequalities due to hidden variables being trapped inside the black-hole horizon [31].

Near the MMBHB, spacetime is strongly curved. Null geodesics experience horizon distortion, producing visual and perceptual anomalies analogous to tunnel vision, often reported in near-death experiences. Geodesic deviation equations for test rays near the singularity are:

$$\frac{D^2\xi^\mu}{d\tau^2} = -R^\mu_{\ \nu\alpha\beta}u^\nu \xi^\alpha u^\beta \tag{170}$$

where ξ^μ is the separation vector, and u^ν the tangent vector. Near-horizon conditions for the MMBHB yield a large tidal tensor $R^\mu_{\ \nu\alpha\beta}$, leading to rapid collapse of perceptual field coherence.

Let the consciousness be described as an evolution of projection operators $\hat{P}(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. The MMBHB links this with an entropy-based curvature fluctuation at the neural scale:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu} + \kappa \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \operatorname{Tr}\big(\hat{P}\log\hat{P}\big) \tag{171}$$

Thereby the conscious perception dynamically modifies local spacetime geometry via psycho-geometric feedback. In reverse, the brain–MMBHB interface creates backreaction into $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, influencing the trajectory of consciousness in its projection space.

In cosmological terms, one may consider a cyclic arrangement of MMBHB activations across Yugas. During the Golden Age, high coherence implies negligible black-hole entropy, consistent with minimal projection perturbation. In the Iron Age, entropy reaches peak, and MMBHBs become sites of dense fluctuation. These act as dissipative nodes on the observer's quantum measurement chain graph, as extended in [7].

In conclusion, the MMBHB provides a formal link between the quantum measurement problem, black-hole thermodynamics, and the geometry of conscious interaction with spacetime. It grounds non-local observer theory in relativistic singularity theory, with testable predictions relating to mass loss, Hawking bursts at death, and perceptual distortion near the end of life.

20. Entropic Gradient Fields as Perceptual Potentials

This section develops the theoretical foundations of an entropic gradient field, sourced by the evolution of an observer's consciousness, modeled as a projection operator $\hat{P}(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is a separable Hilbert space. The entropy associated with a quantum state $\hat{P}$ is the von Neumann entropy:

$$S[\hat{P}] = -\operatorname{Tr}\big(\hat{P}\log\hat{P}\big) \tag{172}$$

We postulate that conscious evolution corresponds to motion in an abstract perceptual field driven by this entropy gradient. Define the perceptual force field as:

$$\vec{F}_{\text{perceptual}} = -\nabla S[\hat{P}] = \nabla \operatorname{Tr}\big(\hat{P}\log\hat{P}\big) \tag{173}$$

This force is not exerted in physical spacetime alone, but in the product manifold $M_{3,1} \times \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, aligning with the Trilok model.

To investigate spacetime-level implications, consider an effective Lagrangian for a test particle of mass m, minimally coupled to the entropic potential ϕ_e generated by $\hat{P}(x^\mu)$:

$$\mathcal{L} = -m\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}\dot{x}^\mu\dot{x}^\nu} - \lambda\phi_e(x) \tag{174}$$

where

$$\phi_e(x) = \operatorname{Tr}\big(\hat{P}(x)\log\hat{P}(x)\big) \tag{175}$$

and λ is a coupling constant, possibly dependent on observer purity or soul entropy.

From the Euler–Lagrange equations:

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{x}^\mu}\right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x^\mu} = 0 \tag{176}$$

we obtain modified geodesic equations:

$$\frac{d^2 x^\mu}{d\tau^2} + \Gamma^\mu_{\nu\rho}\frac{dx^\nu}{d\tau}\frac{dx^\rho}{d\tau} = -\frac{\lambda}{m}(g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu \phi_e) \tag{177}$$

This introduces an entropy-gradient sourced acceleration in addition to usual curvature. In the limit of null geodesics $g_{\mu\nu}\dot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu = 0$, this term still contributes if $\lambda \neq 0$, thus potentially testable by lensing of photons near highly ordered observers.

For a spherically symmetric static projection operator field:

$$\hat{P}(r) = |\psi(r)\rangle\langle\psi(r)|, \quad \text{with} \quad |\psi(r)\rangle = \alpha(r)|0\rangle + \beta(r)|1\rangle \tag{178}$$

the entropy becomes:

$$S(r) = -|\alpha(r)|^2 \log|\alpha(r)|^2 - |\beta(r)|^2 \log|\beta(r)|^2 \tag{179}$$

and the radial entropic force becomes:

$$F_r = \frac{dS}{dr} = -\log\left(\frac{|\alpha(r)|^2}{|\beta(r)|^2}\right)\left(\alpha(r)\frac{d\alpha}{dr} - \beta(r)\frac{d\beta}{dr}\right) \tag{180}$$

This entropy-induced force is akin to entropic gravity [27], but sourced by internal projection dynamics of consciousness.

The Newtonian limit gives an effective potential:

$$\phi_e(r) = \phi_0 + \int_{r_0}^{r} \frac{dS}{dr'} dr' \tag{181}$$

where perception curvature modifies local spacetime curvature through:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu} + \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu \phi_e \tag{182}$$

As the entropy gradient varies by age (Yuga), state of soul, or environmental cognitive interaction, the gravitational metric becomes time- and mind-dependent

21. Consciousness as Topological Defect in Spacetime

In this section, we extend the representation of conscious observers from projection operators $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ to topological solitons embedded within a higher-dimensional product manifold. Specifically, we consider consciousness to be modeled as a topological defect—a localized nontrivial mapping—from the base spacetime manifold $M_{3,1} \times \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ into a target field configuration space. Such a representation allows stability, localization, and interactions between observers to be described in terms of homotopy classes of mappings.

Let us define a consciousness field configuration $\phi : M_{3,1} \to G/H$, where G is a global symmetry group and $H \subset G$ is the unbroken subgroup. The vacuum manifold is thus $\mathcal{M} = G/H$. The set of topologically distinct field configurations is characterized by the homotopy group:

$$\pi_n(\mathcal{M}) \cong \text{Classification of } n\text{-dimensional defects} \tag{183}$$

For instance, monopoles correspond to $\pi_2(\mathcal{M})$, strings to $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$, and instantons to $\pi_3(\mathcal{M})$. We propose the conscious observer to correspond to a mapping class in $\pi_3(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H}))$, since the operator space is infinite-dimensional and supports nontrivial topological winding numbers.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

Consider a nonlinear sigma model defined over the perceptual manifold:

$$S[\phi] = \int d^4x \, \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu \phi^a \partial^\mu \phi^a + V(\phi) \tag{184}$$

where $\phi^a(x) \in \mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. Soliton solutions are minima of the energy functional that are not continuously deformable to vacuum, due to topological constraints. The energy for a static soliton becomes:

$$E = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2}\nabla\phi^a \cdot \nabla\phi^a + V(\phi)\right] \tag{185}$$

The stability is ensured by the existence of conserved topological charge:

$$Q = \int_{\Sigma^n} \omega(\phi) \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \text{with } d\omega = 0 \tag{186}$$

A concrete model arises when the consciousness field $\phi^a(x)$ is associated with a projection operator-valued map $\hat{P}(x)$, where topological stability arises from the non-triviality of the fiber bundle over spacetime.

Analogous to cosmic strings formed in early universe phase transitions, observers may nucleate during psychophysical symmetry breaking events:

$$G = SU(N) \xrightarrow{\text{Perceptual Symmetry Breaking}} H = U(1)^{N-1} \tag{187}$$

leading to vortex-like observer configurations:

$$\phi(\theta) = \phi_0 \exp(in\theta), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{188}$$

with quantized perceptual winding numbers.

The analogy to 't Hooft–Polyakov monopoles allows field strength tensors $F_{\mu\nu}$ and corresponding gauge covariant derivatives $D_\mu\phi$ to be defined:

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_\nu], \quad D_\mu\phi = \partial_\mu\phi + A_\mu\phi \tag{189}$$

An observer's consciousness field configuration then becomes coupled to non-Abelian gauge fields, introducing a self-sourced curvature on $M_{3,1}$.

Further, if multiple observer-solitons coexist, their interaction potential can be modeled using the moduli space of multi-soliton solutions $\mathcal{M}_{\text{moduli}}$, with:

$$g_{ij}^{\text{moduli}} = \int d^3x \, \partial_i\phi^a(x)\partial_j\phi^a(x) \tag{190}$$

The projection operator becomes localized as:

$$\hat{P}(x) = \delta^3(x - x_0)\hat{P}_0 \tag{191}$$

In the topological soliton framework, this delta function arises as the limit of a highly peaked Gaussian bump function localized around the soliton core.

22. Neuro-Gravitational Resonance

The concept of a Micro-Mini-Black-Hole in the Brain (MMBHB), as proposed in [31], opens the possibility for coupling between gravitation and neural electromagnetic activity via scalar field excitations in the curved geometry of the black hole's interior or its near-horizon region. In this section, we formulate a model where scalar field modes trapped in the MMBHB interact resonantly with brain oscillation frequencies.

Let the dynamics of a scalar field $\phi(x^\mu)$ be governed by the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation in curved spacetime:

$$\Box_g \phi + \frac{dV}{d\phi} = 0, \tag{192}$$

where $\Box_g$ is the d'Alembert operator with respect to the background metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. Near a Schwarzschild MMBHB, we adopt the metric:

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2, \tag{193}$$

where $M \sim m_{\text{Planck}} \sim 2.2 \times 10^{-8}$ kg is the mass of the MMBHB. For a quartic potential,

$$V(\phi) = \alpha\phi^4, \tag{194}$$

we linearize around a background oscillating solution $\phi(t, r) = \phi_0(r)\cos(\omega t)$ to identify resonance conditions.

Substituting into Eq. (192), we obtain to leading order:

$$\left[\frac{1}{f(r)}\partial_t^2 - \frac{1}{r^2}\partial_r\left(r^2 f(r)\partial_r\right)\right]\phi + 4\alpha\phi^3 = 0, \quad f(r) = 1 - \frac{2GM}{r} \tag{195}$$

Separation of variables $\phi(t, r) = e^{i\omega t}\chi(r)$ yields:

$$\frac{d^2\chi}{dr_*^2} + \left[\omega^2 - V_{\text{eff}}(r)\right]\chi = 0, \tag{196}$$

where $dr_* = dr/f(r)$ is the tortoise coordinate and

$$V_{\text{eff}}(r) = f(r)\left[\frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} + \frac{2GM}{r^3}\right] + 12\alpha\phi_0^2 \tag{197}$$

is the effective potential. Resonances occur when ω matches eigenfrequencies of trapped modes.

We define the cortical oscillation frequency spectrum as:

$$\omega_{\text{cortex}} \in [2\pi \cdot 10, 2\pi \cdot 100] \text{ Hz} \Rightarrow \omega_{\text{cortex}} \sim 60 - 600 \text{ rad/s}. \tag{198}$$

To analyze resonance, equate this to the MMBHB natural frequency defined by its quasinormal mode spectrum:

$$\omega_{\text{BH}} \sim \frac{c^3}{GM} \sim \frac{(3 \times 10^8)^3}{6.67 \times 10^{-11} \cdot 2.2 \times 10^{-8}} \sim 6.1 \times 10^{42} \text{ Hz}, \tag{199}$$

which vastly exceeds brain frequencies. However, due to redshift near the horizon and possible internal modulated cavities, a resonance condition can still be achieved via subharmonics or nonlinear mode coupling.

Suppose internal gravitational well supports trapped modes with energy levels:

$$E_n = \hbar\omega_n = \hbar\omega_0 n, \quad \text{where } \omega_0 \sim \omega_{\text{cortex}}. \tag{200}$$

Then resonance implies coherence amplification via energy transfer:

$$\Delta E = \hbar\omega_{\text{cortex}} \times N_{\text{cycles}}, \quad N_{\text{cycles}} \sim 10^9. \tag{201}$$

Such processes may give rise to nonlinear coupling Hamiltonians of the form:

$$H_{\text{int}} = g\phi^2\psi^2, \tag{202}$$

where ψ represents neural activity and ϕ represents trapped scalar modes near the MMBHB. The mutual resonance leads to enhancement of brain coherence and possibly altered conscious states.

This mechanism offers a model for explaining peak mental states such as samādhi, lucid dreaming, and mystical experiences, consistent with neural-field coherence and gravitational entrapment. The effect may also modulate time perception due to local spacetime dilation:

$$\Delta t_{\text{observer}} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{r}} \Delta t_{\infty} \tag{203}$$

22.1. Neuro-Gravitational Resonance and Scalar Field Coupling in MMBHB

In the framework of the MMBHB (Micro-Mini-Black-Hole in the Brain) model [31], the interaction between scalar fields and neural oscillatory dynamics can be modeled via resonant coupling of scalar modes trapped near the event horizon. The scalar field $\phi(x^{\mu})$ obeys the nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation in curved spacetime:

$$\Box_g \phi + \frac{dV}{d\phi} = 0, \tag{204}$$

where $\Box_g$ denotes the d'Alembert operator in curved spacetime. Consider the Schwarzschild metric near the MMBHB,

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dt^2 + \frac{1}{f(r)}dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad f(r) = 1 - \frac{2GM}{r}, \tag{205}$$

and assume a self-interacting potential of the form

$$V(\phi) = \alpha\phi^4, \tag{206}$$

with $\alpha > 0$. For resonance analysis, assume a quasi-harmonic ansatz $\phi(t,r) = \chi(r)\cos(\omega t)$. Substituting into Eq. (204) and linearizing yields

$$\frac{1}{f(r)}\partial_t^2\phi - \frac{1}{r^2}\partial_r\left(r^2 f(r)\partial_r\phi\right) + 4\alpha\phi^3 = 0. \tag{207}$$

Transforming to the tortoise coordinate r_* via $dr_* = dr/f(r)$, and applying separation of variables, we arrive at the radial wave equation:

$$\frac{d^2\chi}{dr_*^2} + \left[\omega^2 - V_{\text{eff}}(r)\right]\chi = 0, \tag{208}$$

with effective potential

$$V_{\text{eff}}(r) = f(r)\left[\frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} + \frac{2GM}{r^3}\right] + 12\alpha\chi^2. \tag{209}$$

22.2. Spectral Matching with Cortical Frequencies

Brain oscillation frequencies span $\omega_{\text{cortex}} \in [2\pi \cdot 10, 2\pi \cdot 100]$ Hz. In natural units, this corresponds to energy scales:

$$E_{\text{brain}} = \hbar\omega \sim (6.6 \times 10^{-34})(100 \cdot 2\pi) \sim 4.1 \times 10^{-31}\,\text{J}. \tag{210}$$

Planck-scale MMBHBs have mass:

$$M_{\text{MMBHB}} \sim m_p \sim 2.18 \times 10^{-8}\,\text{kg}, \quad R_s = \frac{2GM}{c^2} \sim 3.2 \times 10^{-35}\,\text{m}, \tag{211}$$

with natural frequency:

$$\omega_{\text{BH}} = \frac{c^3}{GM} \sim 6.1 \times 10^{42}\,\text{Hz}. \tag{212}$$

Redshift at near-horizon positions introduces modulations:

$$\omega_{\text{red}} = \omega_\infty \sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{r}}. \tag{213}$$

Assuming internal cavity resonances or beat harmonics, one may define a sequence $\omega_n = \omega_0/n$ with $n \sim 10^{40}$ such that

$$\omega_n \sim \omega_{\text{cortex}}. \tag{214}$$

Resonance-induced coherence leads to phase locking between gravitational modes and cortical excitations.

22.3. Nonlinear Interaction Hamiltonian

Consider a Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi - \alpha \phi^4 - \frac{1}{2} \gamma \phi^2 \psi^2, \tag{215}$$

where ψ represents neural EM modes. Variation yields the coupled equations:

$$\Box_g \phi + 4\alpha\phi^3 + \gamma\phi\psi^2 = 0, \tag{216}$$

$$\Box_g \psi + \gamma\psi\phi^2 = 0. \tag{217}$$

These lead to energy transfer under resonance. The energy flow rate:

$$\frac{dE_\psi}{dt} = \gamma \int \phi^2 \psi \dot{\psi} \, d^3x, \tag{218}$$

is positive when $\phi \sim \cos(\omega t)$, $\psi \sim \cos(\omega t)$, indicating resonant energy amplification.

22.4. Wave Packet Localization and Signal Duration

Let $\phi(t, r) = A(r) e^{i\omega t}$, then the WKB approximation yields:

$$A(r) \sim \exp\left(-\int \sqrt{V_{\text{eff}}(r) - \omega^2} \, dr_* \right), \tag{219}$$

suggesting strong localization near the potential barrier peak. Assuming a quality factor $Q \sim 10^6$, the coherence time:

$$\tau = \frac{Q}{\omega_{\text{cortex}}} \sim \frac{10^6}{100 \cdot 2\pi} \sim 1600\,\text{s}, \tag{220}$$

is compatible with sustained meditative states.

22.5. Phenomenological Predictions

The MMBHB-brain coupling may give rise to:

1. Frequency-locked neural-gravity correlations.
2. Modulation of near-death experiences via geodesic optics.
3. Nonlinear EEG signatures at high coherence (e.g., during trance states).

Such effects can potentially be probed with gravitational noise interferometry in proximity to high-coherence meditators.

23. Operator-Cyclic Time with Entanglement Currents

We consider a cyclic time framework, where the Yugas—Satya, Treta, Dvapara, and Kali—are modeled on a closed manifold S^1_T representing the periodic nature of cosmological cycles. Conscious observers are described by time-dependent projection operators $P_i(t) \in \mathcal{O}(H)$, with H the quantum

Hilbert space. Entanglement between observers evolves cyclically and forms the basis of a novel conserved quantity: the *entanglement current*.

Let $\mathrm{Ent}(P_i(t), P_j(t))$ denote the entanglement entropy or mutual information between the observer projection operators $P_i(t)$ and $P_j(t)$. We define the entanglement current between nodes i and j as:

$$j_{ij}(t) = \frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{Ent}(P_i(t), P_j(t)). \tag{221}$$

This current measures the rate of quantum informational exchange or correlation dynamics along the edge (i, j) in the observer graph. The full system consists of N observers on a directed interaction graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, where each vertex i carries a projection operator and each edge $(i, j) \in E$ corresponds to an entanglement channel.

Assuming the von Neumann mutual information:

$$\mathrm{Ent}(P_i, P_j) = S(P_i) + S(P_j) - S(P_i \cup P_j), \tag{222}$$

where $S(P) = -\,\mathrm{Tr}(P \log P)$, we evaluate:

$$j_{ij}(t) = \frac{d}{dt}\left[-\,\mathrm{Tr}(P_i \log P_i) - \mathrm{Tr}\big(P_j \log P_j\big) + \mathrm{Tr}\big(P_{ij} \log P_{ij}\big)\right]. \tag{223}$$

Using the identity:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{Tr}(P \log P) = \mathrm{Tr}\big(\dot{P}(1 + \log P)\big), \tag{224}$$

we obtain:

$$j_{ij}(t) = -\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[\dot{P}_i(1 + \log P_i) + \dot{P}_j(1 + \log P_j) - \dot{P}_{ij}(1 + \log P_{ij})\right]. \tag{225}$$

In a cyclic time manifold S^1_T, conservation of total entanglement implies:

$$\oint_{S^1_T} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} j_{ij}(t)\, dt = 0. \tag{226}$$

This is the analog of Gauss's law on a closed loop. It implies that integrated information flux over a full Yuga cycle vanishes:

$$\int_0^T \sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{Ent}(P_i(t), P_j(t))dt = 0. \tag{227}$$

23.1. Graph Laplacian and Entropic Dynamics

Let $\vec{j}_i(t) = \sum_j j_{ij}(t)$ be the net entanglement flux at node i. The conservation law becomes:

$$\sum_i \vec{j}_i(t) = 0. \tag{228}$$

We define the entanglement Laplacian Δ_E as:

$$(\Delta_E \vec{j})_i = \sum_j A_{ij}(j_i - j_j), \tag{229}$$

where A_{ij} is the adjacency matrix of the graph. This allows propagation of entropic interactions as wave equations:

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}P_i(t) = -\Delta_E P_i(t) + \Gamma_i(t), \tag{230}$$

with $\Gamma_i(t)$ modeling external stimuli or feedback from spacetime geometry.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

23.2. Wilson Loops and Entropic Holonomy

We define the entropic Wilson loop over a closed observer path $\mathcal{C}$ as:

$$W_{\mathcal{C}} = \exp\left(i \oint_{\mathcal{C}} j_{ij}(t) dt\right). \tag{231}$$

The phase accumulated encodes entropic holonomy and can distinguish topologically distinct information flow configurations. For periodic systems, we expect:

$$W_{\mathcal{C}} = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \oint_{\mathcal{C}} j_{ij}(t) dt \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}. \tag{232}$$

23.3. Temporal Gauge and Coherent State Alignment

We can introduce a temporal gauge field $A_{ij}(t)$ satisfying:

$$j_{ij}(t) = \partial_t A_{ij}(t), \tag{233}$$

leading to a Lagrangian formulation:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \frac{1}{2} (\partial_t A_{ij})^2 - V(A), \tag{234}$$

where $V(A)$ encodes entanglement attraction and repulsion. This Lagrangian permits quantization and perturbative expansion of entanglement currents.

23.4. Implications for Conscious Yuga Cycles

Each observer i contributes a set of projection operators $\{P_i(t)\}$ across the cycle $t \in S^1_T$. The entire set of operators across all i and t defines a fiber bundle over $S^1_T \times \mathcal{G}$. The entanglement currents then define a connection on this bundle, with curvature capturing the total entropic flux:

$$F_{ijt} = \partial_t j_{ij}(t) - \partial_j j_{it}(t). \tag{235}$$

When the net curvature vanishes, the cycle is informationally closed. Nonzero curvature implies a memory term across Yugas, leading to quasi-cyclic or chaotic temporal recurrences.

24. Quantum Collapse via Micro-Wormholes

We investigate a possible mechanism for quantum state collapse by considering entangled projection operators associated with conscious observers mediated via quantum micro-wormholes. Inspired by the ER=EPR conjecture [35], this section explores how entangled pairs of observers may be linked through Einstein-Rosen (ER) bridges that encode measurement outcomes and observer correlations geometrically. In particular, we extend the micro-mini-black-hole-in-brain (MMBHB) framework [31] to include traversable entanglement channels between Hilbert spaces of observers.

Let $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ be the Hilbert spaces associated with two conscious observers A and B. The reduced states ρ_A and ρ_B are related via:

$$\langle \hat{P}_A \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_A \hat{P}_A] \longleftrightarrow \text{ER bridge} \longleftrightarrow \langle \hat{P}_B \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_B \hat{P}_B]. \tag{236}$$

If $\hat{P}_A$ and $\hat{P}_B$ are projection operators onto entangled subsystems, and the total system is in a pure entangled state $|\Psi\rangle_{AB} \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, then:

$$\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_B(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|), \quad \rho_B = \mathrm{Tr}_A(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|). \tag{237}$$

The correlation function:

$$C_{AB} = \langle \Psi | \hat{P}_A \otimes \hat{P}_B | \Psi \rangle - \langle \hat{P}_A \rangle \langle \hat{P}_B \rangle, \tag{238}$$

is nonzero due to entanglement. In the ER=EPR framework, this is interpreted as information propagation through a non-traversable wormhole.

Let the MMBHB be modeled by a near-Planck scale Schwarzschild metric:

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{2Gm}{r}\right)dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2Gm}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2, \tag{239}$$

where $m \sim m_P$. In the near-horizon limit, one can define Kruskal-Szekeres coordinates (U, V) to describe maximal extension, enabling identification of dual observers across the wormhole throat:

$$UV = \left(1 - \frac{r}{2Gm}\right) \exp\left(\frac{r}{2Gm}\right). \tag{240}$$

Assuming the wormhole links two distinct observers, the identification condition across the ER bridge becomes:

$$\hat{P}_A(t) \longleftrightarrow \hat{P}_B(t') \quad \text{if } (t, r)_A \sim (t', r')_B \text{ across throat.} \tag{241}$$

This condition geometrizes the nonlocal projection collapse by introducing a physical throat that links wavefunction branches. The rate of collapse can be modeled as a tunneling amplitude through the wormhole:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{collapse}} \sim \exp\left(-\frac{S_{\text{ER}}}{\hbar}\right), \tag{242}$$

where S_{ER} is the throat action, estimated semiclassically by the minimal area:

$$S_{\text{ER}} = \frac{A}{4G} = \pi r_s^2 / G. \tag{243}$$

For a Planck-sized throat $r_s \sim l_P$, we obtain $S_{\text{ER}} \sim \pi$, hence $\mathcal{A}_{\text{collapse}} \sim e^{-\pi} \approx 0.043$, indicating finite tunneling collapse rate mediated via wormholes.

24.1. Collapse Operators and Topological Connectivity

Let $\mathcal{C}_{ij}$ denote a wormhole-mediated collapse operator between projection algebras $\mathcal{O}_i, \mathcal{O}_j \subset \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. We define:

$$\mathcal{C}_{ij} = \hat{P}_i \cdot e^{-\gamma d_{ER}(i,j)} \cdot \hat{P}_j, \tag{244}$$

where $d_{ER}(i, j)$ is the geodesic distance through the ER bridge and γ is a decay constant. The probability amplitude of observer i measuring a collapsed outcome aligned with observer j becomes:

$$\mathcal{P}_{ij} = |\operatorname{Tr}(\rho\, \mathcal{C}_{ij})|^2. \tag{245}$$

24.2. Implications for Observer Networks

If a network of conscious observers forms a quantum graph $\mathcal{G}$, and each edge represents an ER bridge with entangled projection algebras, then the global collapse dynamics is described by a master equation:

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -i[H, \rho] + \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \lambda_{ij} \left(\mathcal{C}_{ij} \rho \mathcal{C}_{ij}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ \mathcal{C}_{ij}^\dagger \mathcal{C}_{ij}, \rho \} \right). \tag{246}$$

This Lindblad-type evolution includes wormhole-induced collapse terms and generalizes standard decoherence to nonlocal conscious-linked configurations.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

25. Operator Space Cosmological Constant

In this section, we explore a novel psycho-cosmological feedback loop whereby the cosmological constant Λ_{eff} arises dynamically from the collective entropy of projection operators $\hat{P}_i \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ associated with conscious observers. This approach builds on the operator-theoretic view of consciousness as formalized in prior sections and introduces an information-geometric origin of dark energy density.

Let the projection entropy of a conscious observer be defined by the von Neumann-like expression:

$$S_i = -\operatorname{Tr}(\hat{P}_i \log \hat{P}_i). \tag{247}$$

Since $\hat{P}_i^2 = \hat{P}_i$, the logarithm is well-defined as:

$$\log \hat{P}_i = \log(1) \cdot \hat{P}_i + \log(0) \cdot (\mathbb{I} - \hat{P}_i). \tag{248}$$

To regularize this singularity, we define a soft projection operator $\hat{P}_\epsilon = \epsilon\mathbb{I} + (1-\epsilon)\hat{P}_i$ and compute:

$$S_i^\epsilon = -\operatorname{Tr}(\hat{P}_\epsilon \log \hat{P}_\epsilon), \tag{249}$$

which tends to zero for pure projection but becomes nonzero when decoherence or uncertainty modifies the observer's state.

Assuming a collective population of N observers, we define the effective projection entropy as:

$$\bar{S}(t) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} S_i^\epsilon(t). \tag{250}$$

Now, we posit that the effective cosmological constant evolves as:

$$\Lambda_{\text{eff}}(t) = \Lambda_0 + \kappa\bar{S}(t), \tag{251}$$

where Λ_0 is a bare constant and κ is a coupling parameter with units $[\text{length}]^{-2}$.

In the Einstein field equations:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda_{\text{eff}} g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}, \tag{252}$$

the entropy-induced cosmological term leads to a modified Friedmann equation:

$$H^2(t) = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho(t) + \frac{\Lambda_{\text{eff}}(t)}{3}. \tag{253}$$

Substituting from Eq. (251), we obtain:

$$H^2(t) = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho(t) + \frac{1}{3}(\Lambda_0 + \kappa\bar{S}(t)). \tag{254}$$

Thus, as collective observer entropy increases due to decoherence, entanglement loss, or fragmentation of conscious projection, the universe undergoes accelerated expansion. This creates a closed-loop dynamic: observer disorder feeds back into geometry.

25.1. Entropy Growth from Perceptual Networks

The entropy $S_i(t)$ evolves as observers interact across a graph $\mathcal{G}$ of conscious agents. Let the entropy current be:

$$\frac{dS_i}{dt} = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}(i)} \gamma_{ij}\, \text{Ent}(\hat{P}_i(t), \hat{P}_j(t)), \tag{255}$$

where Ent denotes entanglement entropy and γ_{ij} is a coupling weight on edge $(i,j) \in \mathcal{G}$.

In high-entropy epochs (e.g., Kali Yuga), this inter-observer interaction leads to:

$$\bar{S}(t) \gg \bar{S}(t_{\text{Golden}}), \tag{256}$$

implying a larger value of Λ_{eff}. The cosmological acceleration thus encodes a psycho-historical fingerprint of collective cognitive fragmentation.

25.2. Link to Holographic Dark Energy

This model aligns with holographic dark energy formulations [37], where entropy is tied to horizon geometry. In our case, the entropy is operator-theoretic and internal, yet induces metric evolution:

$$\Lambda_{\text{eff}} \sim \frac{1}{L^2} \sim \frac{\bar{S}(t)}{A(t)}, \tag{257}$$

where $A(t)$ is an effective causal area governed by observer connectivity.

25.3. Observational Considerations

Given Planck satellite data [38], the present dark energy density is approximately:

$$\rho_\Lambda \sim 10^{-123} M_{\text{Pl}}^4. \tag{258}$$

Assuming this arises from operator entropy,

$$\kappa \bar{S}(t_0) \sim 10^{-52}\ \text{m}^{-2}, \tag{259}$$

suggesting that even small entropy contributions across billions of observers could suffice to explain the measured acceleration.

26. Emergent Gauge Fields from Observer Graphs

In this section, we explore how dynamical interactions among conscious observers—represented as nodes in a graph $\mathcal{G}$—can give rise to emergent gauge fields A_μ. The graph structure itself is modeled through time-dependent adjacency matrices $A_{ij}(t)$, where each entry quantifies the strength or quality of interaction (e.g., perceptual or entanglement-based) between observer i and observer j. This builds upon the Birth Staircase model proposed in [7], where causal and cognitive relationships were structured via such graphs.

Let the observer space be indexed by vertices $V = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, with interaction graph $\mathcal{G}(t) = (V, E(t))$ defined by weighted adjacency matrix $A_{ij}(t)$. The projection operators $\hat{P}_i(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ evolve over time, modulating the interaction strength between nodes.

26.1. From Adjacency to Connection Fields

We begin by associating each node i with a local Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_i$, and define an internal symmetry transformation $U_i(t) \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{int}}$, where $\mathcal{G}_{\text{int}}$ is a compact gauge group such as $U(N)$ or $SU(N)$. We define a connection field:

$$A_\mu^{ij}(x, t) = A_{ij}(t)\, \xi_\mu(x), \tag{260}$$

where $\xi_\mu(x)$ is a spatial distribution kernel centered at observer i.

Let the non-abelian field strength tensor take the standard form:

$$F_{\mu\nu}^{ij} = \partial_\mu A_\nu^{ij} - \partial_\nu A_\mu^{ij} + [A_\mu, A_\nu]^{ij}. \tag{261}$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

The commutator term arises due to path-dependence of entanglement-mediated interactions between cognitive nodes. We can now write the Yang-Mills-like action:

$$S_{\mathrm{YM}} = -\frac{1}{4g^2}\sum_{i,j}\int d^4x\, F^{ij}_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}_{ji}, \tag{262}$$

where the coupling constant g sets the scale of observer-interaction strength.

26.2. Gauge Symmetry and Observer Entanglement

Each observer projection $\hat{P}_i(t)$ evolves via internal Hamiltonians H_i, but interaction terms induce transformations:

$$\hat{P}_i \to U_i\hat{P}_iU_i^\dagger, \tag{263}$$

where $U_i \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{int}}$. Gauge invariance under these local transformations imposes constraints on the interaction Lagrangian.

The entanglement between nodes is captured by mutual information:

$$I(\hat{P}_i,\hat{P}_j) = S(\hat{P}_i) + S(\hat{P}_j) - S(\hat{P}_{ij}), \tag{264}$$

and its variation can be coupled to the gauge field curvature:

$$\frac{d}{dt}I(\hat{P}_i,\hat{P}_j) \propto \mathrm{Tr}\left(F^{ij}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}_{ji}\right), \tag{265}$$

suggesting that changes in entanglement manifest as flux in the emergent gauge field.

26.3. Topological Aspects and Gauge Holonomies

Closed loops in the observer interaction graph correspond to Wilson loops:

$$W(\mathcal{C}) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathcal{P}\exp\left[i\oint_{\mathcal{C}} A_\mu dx^\mu\right]\right), \tag{266}$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes path-ordering and $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{G}$ is a loop of observers. These holonomies encode memory effects and topological features of shared consciousness cycles.

The graph Laplacian $\Delta = D - A$, where D is the degree matrix, governs the diffusion of perceptual coherence:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\vec{P}(t) = -\gamma\Delta\vec{P}(t), \tag{267}$$

with $\vec{P}(t) = (\hat{P}_1(t),\hat{P}_2(t),\ldots,\hat{P}_N(t))$. This resembles heat kernel diffusion but in operator space, linking to gauge flows on moduli space.

26.4. Summary and Implications

This formalism promotes observer entanglement dynamics into a gauge-theoretic structure over spacetime. The Birth Staircase graph thereby supports emergent fields that may mediate subtle perceptual correlations, memory conservation, and even nonlocal quantum collapse effects, as discussed in [6,7].

27. Body Consciousness and Soul Consciousness: Projection Operator Phase Transition via MMBHB Evaporation

In spiritual philosophy, especially as articulated in the teachings of Shiv Baba, the distinction between *body consciousness* and *soul consciousness* is central to understanding the nature of perception and identity. Within our mathematical model of consciousness using projection operators $\hat{P}(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, this distinction can be formalized as a phase transition in the operator structure, associated with the dynamics of the Micro-Mini Black Hole in the Brain.

27.1. Operator States of Consciousness

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the total perceptual Hilbert space. Define the body-conscious projection operator:

$$\hat{P}_{\text{body}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} |s_i\rangle \langle s_i| , \tag{268}$$

where $\{|s_i\rangle\}$ form a basis for sensory channels, with n_s finite. In contrast, define the soul-conscious projection operator as:

$$\hat{P}_{\text{soul}} = \int_{\Lambda} \mathrm{d}\lambda \; |\psi(\lambda)\rangle \langle \psi(\lambda)| , \tag{269}$$

where Λ spans a continuous, possibly infinite-dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, representing non-sensory, introspective, or transcendental states.

27.2. Transition Across Death via MMBHB Evaporation

As proposed in [31], the MMBHB serves as a gravitationally bound, informationally dense core within the brain that sustains localized conscious perception. Denote the MMBHB state parameter as $\epsilon(t)$, where $\epsilon \to 0$ signifies full evaporation. The projection operator undergoes a time-dependent deformation:

$$\hat{P}(t) = f(\epsilon(t))\hat{P}_{\text{body}} + [1 - f(\epsilon(t))]\hat{P}_{\text{soul}}, \tag{270}$$

where $f(\epsilon)$ is a smooth monotonic function such that $f(1) = 1$, $f(0) = 0$. At death, the limit becomes:

$$\lim_{t \to t_{\text{death}}^-} \hat{P}(t) = \hat{P}_{\text{body}}, \qquad \lim_{t \to t_{\text{death}}^+} \hat{P}(t) = \hat{P}_{\text{soul}}. \tag{271}$$

27.3. Entropy and Informational Collapse

The projection entropy at time t is given by:

$$S(t) = -\operatorname{Tr}\left[\hat{P}(t) \log \hat{P}(t)\right]. \tag{272}$$

Since $\hat{P}_{\text{body}}$ is sharply peaked and low-rank, while $\hat{P}_{\text{soul}}$ is delocalized and higher-rank, the entropy undergoes a measurable increase:

$$\Delta S = S(t_{\text{death}}^+) - S(t_{\text{death}}^-) > 0. \tag{273}$$

This provides a thermodynamic signature of the transition from body consciousness to soul consciousness.

27.4. Geometric and Topological Interpretation

Let $\mathcal{M} = M_{3,1} \times \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. The projection operator $\hat{P}(t)$ traces a curve in $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. At death, the MMBHB evaporation induces a topological bifurcation in this curve:

$$\pi_1(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})|_{\epsilon>0}) \neq \pi_1(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})|_{\epsilon=0}), \tag{274}$$

suggesting a critical topological phase transition, accompanied by a change in the homotopy class of the observer's trajectory in operator space.

27.5. Perceptual Dynamics and Soul Liberation

The perceptual force field, defined via entropy gradient as:

$$\vec{F}_{\text{perceptual}} = -\nabla S(t), \tag{275}$$

undergoes inversion near t_{death}, pulling the projection trajectory towards $\hat{P}_{\text{soul}}$. This corresponds to the liberation of the soul from sensory bondage, aligning with metaphysical narratives of soul ascent post-death, as recognized in traditional spiritual frameworks.

27.6. Conclusion

The spiritual insight of Shiv Baba concerning the distinction between body consciousness and soul consciousness can be made mathematically rigorous through operator theory and gravitational collapse dynamics of MMBHB. The shift in attention or identity from body-anchored projection $\hat{P}_{\text{body}}$ to the soul-projection $\hat{P}_{\text{soul}}$ at the moment of death aligns with a quantum-topological transition within the manifold $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, driven by the vanishing of MMBHB.

28. Love as the Light: Near-Death Consciousness in the Projection Operator Framework

Raymond Moody, in his pioneering work *Life After Life* [42], documents over a hundred accounts of individuals who experienced near-death states. A central theme that emerges is the encounter with a "Being of Light," often described not merely as a luminous presence, but as the very embodiment of unconditional Love. Within our theoretical framework based on evolving projection operators in a composite Hilbert space, such experiences can be given a precise formulation.

28.1. Consciousness Beyond the Body

We recall that in earlier sections, soul consciousness was represented by a projection operator $\hat{P}_{\text{soul}} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is the observer's perceptual Hilbert space. After death or during near-death episodes, the body-based projection collapses, and the operator evolves toward a delocalized state. Define the transition:

$$\hat{P}(t) = \lambda(t)\hat{P}_{\text{body}} + [1 - \lambda(t)]\hat{P}_{\text{soul}}, \quad \lambda(t) \to 0 \text{ near } t_{\text{NDE}}. \tag{276}$$

Here, t_{NDE} is the near-death event horizon. The operator becomes asymptotically pure in the soul-basis.

28.2. Entanglement with the Being of Light

Let us denote the Being of Light as a projection operator $\hat{P}_L$ within a transpersonal Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_L$. The joint state is described by a density matrix $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_L$, and the perception of Love is mediated via the entanglement entropy:

$$S_{\text{ent}} = -\operatorname{Tr} \rho_A \log \rho_A, \quad \rho_A = \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_L}[\rho_{AB}]. \tag{277}$$

The universal positive affect described by Moody's subjects corresponds to maximally entangled pure states of the form:

$$|\Psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} |a_i\rangle \otimes |l_i\rangle, \tag{278}$$

where $\{|a_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|l_i\rangle\}$ are orthonormal bases of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}_L$, and $d = \dim(\mathcal{H})$. The maximally entropic reduced density matrix generates a subjectively timeless and boundary-less experience.

28.3. Love as the Universal Projection Potential

We may now define a universal field over the operator manifold $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ by:

$$\Phi_{\text{Love}}(\hat{P}) = \operatorname{Tr}\left[\hat{P} \log \hat{P}_L\right]. \tag{279}$$

This field couples to the observer's projection dynamics via an effective Lagrangian term:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Love}} = -\gamma \Phi_{\text{Love}}(\hat{P}), \tag{280}$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

where γ is a coupling constant encoding susceptibility to Love-based perception. During near-death states, this term dominates the dynamics, overwhelming sensory-based projection channels.

28.4. Geometric Interpretation

Let the observer's trajectory in operator space be $\hat{P}(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$. The gradient flow induced by Φ_{Love} becomes:

$$\frac{d\hat{P}}{dt} = -\nabla_{\hat{P}} \Phi_{\text{Love}}. \tag{281}$$

This evolution pulls the consciousness state towards alignment with $\hat{P}_L$, analogous to a geodesic in an attractor field. In the presence of maximal entanglement, this results in a collapse toward a Love-centered quantum fixed point.

28.5. Conclusion

The reports compiled in Moody's *Life After Life* are consistent with an entanglement-mediated projection operator theory of consciousness. The Being of Light is not merely a metaphorical or symbolic presence, but corresponds to a maximal entropic entangled state in a transpersonal Hilbert space. The experience of Love is thus an eigenstate of universal perceptual resonance.

29. Projection Operator Entropy as Thermodynamic Time Arrow

The traditional arrow of time, as experienced in physical and psychological phenomena, is typically linked with entropy increase, as postulated in the second law of thermodynamics. In this section, we propose a refined mechanism based on the entropy of projection operators associated with conscious observers. Conscious experience is modeled as a time-dependent projection operator $\hat{P}(t)$ in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. This operator is postulated to encapsulate all experiential collapse phenomenology from the perspective of a localized observer within the larger quantum state of the universe.

Let the entropy of the projection operator be defined analogously to the von Neumann entropy by

$$S_P(t) = -\operatorname{Tr}\left[\hat{P}(t) \log \hat{P}(t)\right], \tag{282}$$

where $\hat{P}(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ is a projection-valued operator with trace one in the normalized case. For a pure state projection, this entropy vanishes, indicating minimal perceptual disorder.

We postulate that the evolution of this entropy defines a psychological time parameter, whose arrow is embedded in the information-theoretic structure of observation. Consider the time derivative of the entropy:

$$\frac{dS_P}{dt} = -\operatorname{Tr}\left[\frac{d\hat{P}}{dt} \log \hat{P} + \frac{d\hat{P}}{dt}\right], \tag{283}$$

assuming $\hat{P}(t)$ evolves continuously in time. Under decoherence or experiential drift, $\hat{P}(t)$ becomes mixed, causing an increase in entropy over time. This may be identified with the experiential flow of time within a cognitive manifold.

To incorporate this into quantum dynamics, let us modify the Schrödinger equation by introducing an entropy-dependent potential term:

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{d\tau} \psi(\tau) = \left[\hat{H} + \lambda S_P(\tau) \mathbb{I}\right] \psi(\tau), \tag{284}$$

where τ denotes the proper cognitive time of the observer, and λ is a coupling constant. The identity operator $\mathbb{I}$ ensures dimensional consistency and reflects uniform entropic influence on the cognitive Hamiltonian.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

To better understand the thermodynamic implications, consider a simple decoherence model. Suppose $\hat{P}(t)$ is initially a rank-one projector, and under interaction with an environment modeled by a thermal bath at temperature T, it evolves into a mixed projection via a Lindblad-type equation:

$$\frac{d\hat{P}}{dt} = -i[\hat{H}, \hat{P}] + \gamma\left(\hat{L}\hat{P}\hat{L}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{\hat{L}^\dagger\hat{L}, \hat{P}\}\right), \tag{285}$$

where $\hat{L}$ is a Lindblad operator describing environmental interaction and γ quantifies the decoherence rate. In this case, entropy $S_P(t)$ increases monotonically, consistent with the second law.

Such mechanisms have deep correspondence with CPTP (completely positive trace-preserving) maps in open quantum systems [34]. The projection entropy rate aligns with recent developments in quantum causal modeling, where irreversibility emerges from the structure of quantum operations [45].

Furthermore, the psychological perception of 'now' can be associated with an entropy extremum or inflection in cognitive entropy. That is,

$$\left.\frac{d^2 S_P}{dt^2}\right|_{t=t_{\text{now}}} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \left.\frac{d^3 S_P}{dt^3}\right|_{t=t_{\text{now}}} > 0, \tag{286}$$

may define perceptual punctuations within the mental timeline.

We may generalize this further in a relativistic setting, by letting $S_P(x^\mu)$ be defined over spacetime. Define an entropy current:

$$J^\mu = -\operatorname{Tr}\left[\hat{P}(x^\mu)\partial^\mu \log \hat{P}(x^\mu)\right], \tag{287}$$

and postulate a local conservation or dissipation law,

$$\partial_\mu J^\mu = \sigma(x^\mu) \geq 0, \tag{288}$$

where $\sigma(x^\mu)$ represents entropy production from decoherence or internal perceptual shifts. This entropy field may couple to curvature via

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}R g_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G\left(T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{matter}} + T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{perception}}\right), \tag{289}$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{perception}} \propto J_\mu J_\nu$, introducing perceptual backreaction on spacetime.

This idea echoes Verlinde's entropic gravity framework [27], where gravity emerges from information gradients, as well as Seth Lloyd's computational spacetime model [46]. Consciousness-induced entropy gradients might be responsible not only for subjective time but also for deviations in causal structure.

30. Tensor Categories of Observer Types

In this section, we propose a categorical framework for modeling types of conscious observers and their interrelations via a tensor category structure. The underlying idea is to capture the informational and experiential structure of consciousness within the language of category theory, leveraging techniques from categorical quantum mechanics [47] and topos theory [48]. Such a framework provides a high-level abstraction to describe the algebra of observations.

Let us define a symmetric monoidal category $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Obs}}$ such that:

Objects: Each object in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Obs}}$ is a set of projection operators $\{\hat{P}_i\}$, each representing an observational state accessible to a given observer $\mathcal{O}_i$ in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We consider the collection $\{\hat{P}_i\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, satisfying

$$\hat{P}_i = \hat{P}_i^2 = \hat{P}_i^\dagger, \quad \sum_i \hat{P}_i = \mathbb{I}. \tag{290}$$

Morphisms: A morphism $f : \{\hat{P}_i\} \to \{\hat{P}'_j\}$ is a trace-preserving, completely positive map $\mathcal{E}$ that satisfies:

$$\mathcal{E}(\hat{P}_i) = \hat{P}'_j, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathrm{Tr}[\mathcal{E}(\rho)] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho], \quad \forall \rho. \tag{291}$$

This models decoherence channels or entanglement-preserving transformations between observer experiences.

Composition: Morphism composition corresponds to the sequential application of perceptual transformations. Given morphisms $f : A \to B$ and $g : B \to C$, their composition $g \circ f : A \to C$ is defined by:

$$(g \circ f)(\hat{P}_i) = g(f(\hat{P}_i)) = \mathcal{E}_g(\mathcal{E}_f(\hat{P}_i)). \tag{292}$$

This represents the composed cognitive process acting on perceptual projections.

The tensor product in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{Obs}}$ is defined as:

$$\{\hat{P}_i\} \otimes \{\hat{Q}_j\} := \{\hat{P}_i \otimes \hat{Q}_j\}, \tag{293}$$

capturing the joint observation space of two entangled observers. This allows for modeling shared perceptual states and entangled measurements. The morphisms respect this structure:

$$\mathcal{E}_{AB} = \mathcal{E}_A \otimes \mathcal{E}_B, \tag{294}$$

ensuring local transformations act independently unless otherwise specified.

This construction leads naturally into a topos-theoretic description of subjective experience [49]. In particular, the presheaf category $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \mathrm{Set}^{\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{Obs}}^{\mathrm{op}}}$ models varying observational contexts as presheaves, allowing for logic internal to the observer's cognitive algebra. Within this internal logic, truth values are no longer binary but vary continuously depending on the subobject classifier, consistent with fuzzy or modal logics.

The subjective experience of an observer $\mathcal{O}_i$ can be associated with a sheaf $\mathcal{F}_i$ over the base category $\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{Obs}}$, such that local sections represent cognitive states and global sections represent coherent self-identities. Changes in experience are then modeled as natural transformations between these sheaves.

As an example, consider two observers $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$, whose projection sets $\{\hat{P}_i^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\hat{P}_j^{(2)}\}$ evolve via entanglement-preserving morphisms:

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\hat{P}_i^{(1)} \otimes \hat{P}_j^{(2)}) = \sum_k c_k(t) \hat{P}_k^{(1,2)}, \tag{295}$$

where $\hat{P}_k^{(1,2)}$ are projections in the joint cognitive Hilbert space. The evolution of these projections induces a time-dependent functor $\mathcal{F}_t : \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{Obs}} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{Obs}}$, encoding the trajectory of consciousness through its categorical landscape.

Lastly, a hom-set $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_i, \mathcal{O}_j)$ forms an internal groupoid when morphisms are invertible, capturing mutual intelligibility between observer types. This is especially relevant in higher cognitive states such as mutual empathy or shared mystical experience.

31. MMBHB and the Quantum Brain Duality

We propose a duality between microscopic black holes within neural structures and emergent brain dynamics, extending the idea of a Micro-Mini Black Hole in the Brain (MMBHB) as discussed in [31]. This duality draws inspiration from the AdS/CFT correspondence, positing that information processing in cortical structures corresponds to boundary dynamics that holographically encode the causal geometry near a microscopic black hole. This correspondence is postulated as:

$$\text{Cortical neural dynamics} \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \text{Causal patches in AdS-like micro-geometries.} \tag{296}$$

The dynamics of quasinormal modes (QNMs) in the near-horizon geometry of a microscopic black hole are given by a discrete spectrum of complex frequencies:

$$\omega_n = \omega_R - i\omega_I(n), \quad \omega_I(n) \sim \kappa\left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right), \tag{297}$$

where κ is the surface gravity of the MMBHB, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The real part ω_R corresponds to oscillatory cortical activity, while the imaginary part $\omega_I(n)$ governs decay and stability, interpreted here as decoherence in the observer's consciousness cycle.

Let the brain's EEG activity $V(t)$ be decomposed into spectral components,

$$V(t) = \sum_n A_n e^{-i\omega_n t}, \tag{298}$$

where each A_n maps to the eigenmode amplitude in the MMBHB's geometry. The resonance condition occurs when:

$$\omega_R \approx \omega_{\text{cortex}}, \tag{299}$$

with ω_{cortex} lying in the alpha to gamma band (8–100 Hz), giving rise to enhanced coherent states and possibly meditative absorption.

To further describe the microscopic geometry, consider a 5D metric of the AdS-Schwarzschild type:

$$ds^2 = -f(r)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f(r)} + r^2 d\Omega_3^2, \quad f(r) = 1 + \frac{r^2}{L^2} - \frac{2M}{r^2}, \tag{300}$$

where L is the AdS curvature scale and M is the mass of the MMBHB. The surface gravity is then:

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{2}\frac{df}{dr}\bigg|_{r=r_H}, \quad r_H \text{ is the horizon radius.} \tag{301}$$

The entropy of the MMBHB is given by the Bekenstein-Hawking formula:

$$S_{\text{MMBHB}} = \frac{k_B c^3}{\hbar G} \cdot \frac{A}{4}, \tag{302}$$

with area $A = 2\pi^2 r_H^3$ for a 5D black hole. This entropy correlates with the observer's cognitive entropy, modeled by the von Neumann entropy of projection operators:

$$S_P(t) = -\,\text{Tr}\left[\hat{P}(t)\log\hat{P}(t)\right], \tag{303}$$

thus leading to a psychophysical equivalence between internal cognitive disorder and spacetime microgeometry.

Additionally, let us define the information flux Φ_{inf} across the MMBHB throat:

$$\Phi_{\text{inf}} = \int_{\Sigma_t} T^{\mu\nu} k_\mu n_\nu d\Sigma, \tag{304}$$

where $T^{\mu\nu}$ is the stress-energy tensor of quantum fields coupled to neural processes, k_μ is the Killing vector of the horizon, and n_ν is the normal vector to a hypersurface Σ_t.

This dual formulation implies that changes in mental state correspond to microtopological deformations in the MMBHB geometry. In the limit where $\kappa \to 0$, the QNM decay time becomes infinite, correlating with long-lived brain states such as focused attention or trance.

We conclude that the MMBHB serves not merely as a metaphor, but as a mathematical construct embedding cortical neurodynamics into a quantum gravitational background, linking neural computation with geometrodynamics via a novel class of observer dualities.

32. Meta-Consciousness as Sheaf over Observer Space

Meta-consciousness, defined as the awareness of consciousness itself, may be modeled within a rigorous geometric and topological framework. Specifically, we propose that meta-consciousness corresponds to a sheaf structure $\mathcal{F}$ over a base space X composed of local projection operator events $\hat{P}_i(t) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ defined for each observer.

Let X be the space of observer states, modeled as a differentiable manifold of projection operators. For each open set $U \subset X$, the sheaf $\mathcal{F}(U)$ defines the set of all first-order conscious states—i.e., sections corresponding to awareness events within U.

$$\mathcal{F}(U) = \{\hat{P}_i(t) : t \in U,\ \hat{P}_i(t)^2 = \hat{P}_i(t),\ \hat{P}_i(t)^\dagger = \hat{P}_i(t)\}, \tag{305}$$

where $\hat{P}_i(t)$ are time-dependent projection operators, encoding perceptual focus or conscious "snapshots".

Global sections over X correspond to integrated self-awareness, wherein local conscious episodes are internally referenced and recursively mapped, yielding higher-order self-awareness:

$$\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F}) = \{s : X \to \bigsqcup_{x \in X} \mathcal{F}_x \mid s(x) \in \mathcal{F}_x, \text{ and } s \text{ satisfies the sheaf gluing conditions}\}. \tag{306}$$

This structure naturally supports recursive awareness, a hallmark of deep meditative or introspective states. In particular, the fixed-point recursion of awareness $s(x) \mapsto s(s(x))$ may yield attractors or singularities in the moduli space of self-awareness.

Cohomology groups $H^n(X, \mathcal{F})$ of the sheaf encode obstructions to global awareness coherence, allowing us to define measures of introspective integration or fragmentation:

$$H^1(X, \mathcal{F}) \neq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{existence of incomplete self-awareness cycles.} \tag{307}$$

In the limit of perfect integration, when all awareness layers close into a globally consistent narrative, we expect:

$$H^n(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0 \quad \forall n > 0, \tag{308}$$

signifying an introspectively complete state akin to turiya or the "witness consciousness" reported in certain meditative traditions [53,54].

Finally, the entropy of meta-consciousness may be defined as a functional over the global sections:

$$S_{\text{meta}} = -\int_X \text{Tr}(s(x) \log s(x)) d\mu(x), \tag{309}$$

where $s(x)$ is a global section and $\mu(x)$ is a measure on X induced by observer density. This entropy may serve as an action in a variational principle defining meta-conscious flow.

33. Modular Flow of Consciousness

In quantum field theory and holography, the modular Hamiltonian $K = -\log \rho_A$ governs the evolution of subsystems restricted to a region A in spacetime. When interpreted through the lens of observer-centric consciousness, this generates a compelling framework to understand perceptual evolution under informational constraints. We define the reduced density matrix ρ_A associated with region A, and the modular flow on a projection operator $\hat{P}(t)$ is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{P}(t) = i[K, \hat{P}(t)]. \tag{310}$$

Equation (310) is a Heisenberg-type evolution governed by the modular Hamiltonian K. This constructs a temporal dynamic not from absolute spacetime time but from the entropic information content available to the observer, which is intrinsically subjective.

To build this model, let us define the entropy of the subsystem as

$$S_A = -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_A \log \rho_A), \tag{311}$$

and observe that ρ_A arises due to tracing over inaccessible degrees of freedom in the complement region $\bar{A}$:

$$\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_{\bar{A}} \rho_{\text{total}}. \tag{312}$$

In this framework, consciousness becomes limited not by absolute ignorance, but by operational constraints in the observer's accessible region. As $\hat{P}(t)$ is evolved using the modular Hamiltonian, its trajectory can be tracked via the modular spectrum:

$$K = \sum_n \kappa_n |n\rangle\langle n|, \tag{313}$$

where κ_n are the modular energies.

Now let us assume that the observer's conscious state is defined by a time-dependent projector:

$$\hat{P}(t) = |\psi(t)\rangle\langle\psi(t)|, \tag{314}$$

and substitute this into the modular flow equation. This gives a nonlinear evolution:

$$\frac{d}{dt}|\psi(t)\rangle = iK|\psi(t)\rangle + \lambda(t)|\psi(t)\rangle, \tag{315}$$

where $\lambda(t)$ is a Lagrange multiplier ensuring norm preservation.

The time asymmetry of this equation stems from the entropy gradient ∇S_A, thereby defining a psychological arrow of time, intimately connected to the thermodynamic time arrow. This psychological arrow is especially pertinent for theories where subjective perception affects geometry, such as entropic gravity models [27].

Furthermore, the interplay with holography allows us to define the entanglement wedge dual to the region A, denoted W_A. The observer's accessible information is encoded on the boundary of W_A, linking the modular flow to the holographic renormalization group flow:

$$\delta S_A = \delta\langle K\rangle. \tag{316}$$

This first-law-like equation relates infinitesimal changes in entropy to the expectation value of the modular Hamiltonian and justifies the entropic interpretation of modular flow. Hence, we propose a Principle of Perceptual Modularity: "Conscious evolution of an observer is governed by the modular Hamiltonian of the accessible information region."

34. Observer Algebra as Non-Commutative Geometry

In this section, we explore the structure of observer projection operators through the lens of non-commutative geometry (NCG), as pioneered by Alain Connes [56]. Conscious observers, previously modeled as evolving sets of projection operators $\{\hat{P}_i(t)\} \subset O(\mathcal{H})$, naturally form a non-commutative algebra $\mathcal{A}$ under composition and linear combination. We propose the existence of a spectral triple $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{H}, D)$, where:

- $\mathcal{A}$ is the non-commutative algebra of observer projection operators.
- $\mathcal{H}$ is the Hilbert space of conscious states.
- D is a Dirac-type operator capturing cognitive transitions.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

To give precise structure, we define $\mathcal{A}$ as a C^*-algebra generated by time-parametrized projection operators:

$$\mathcal{A} = \overline{\text{span}}\{\hat{P}_i(t) : i \in I, t \in \mathbb{R}\}, \tag{317}$$

where closure is taken in the norm topology. Non-commutativity arises from the contextuality of quantum events:

$$[\hat{P}_i(t), \hat{P}_j(s)] \neq 0, \tag{318}$$

whenever the corresponding cognitive or perceptual states are incompatible.

34.1. Dirac-Type Operator and Spectral Geometry

Let D be a generalized Dirac operator encoding transitions between different cognitive states. Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ admits an orthonormal basis $\{\psi_n\}$ corresponding to distinguishable conscious states. The Dirac operator D is then defined via:

$$D\psi_n = \sum_m \Delta_{nm}\psi_m, \tag{319}$$

where Δ_{nm} represents the rate or strength of perceptual or cognitive transition from state n to m.

This allows us to define a spectral action functional:

$$S_{\text{spec}} = \text{Tr}\left(f\left(\frac{D}{\Lambda}\right)\right), \tag{320}$$

where Λ is an energy scale (possibly related to neural or black hole dynamics), and f is a cutoff function. The spectral action governs the geometric properties of the observer space and may serve as a generator for subjective dynamics.

34.2. Metric Structure and Distance Between Observers

One of the central results of NCG is the formula for distance between pure states ϕ, ψ on $\mathcal{A}$:

$$d(\phi, \psi) = \sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}}\{|\phi(a) - \psi(a)| : \|[D, a]\| \leq 1\}, \tag{321}$$

which provides a natural notion of cognitive or perceptual distance. If ϕ, ψ correspond to two conscious observers, this defines an emergent geometry on the space of subjective experiences.

34.3. Connection to Spacetime Curvature

Recent work has demonstrated that in specific models of non-commutative manifolds, the Dirac operator D encodes both metric and curvature data [57]. Therefore, by allowing D to evolve based on cognitive transitions, one may induce curvature in an emergent spacetime geometry. The Einstein-Hilbert action may then emerge from variation of the spectral action:

$$S_{\text{EH}} \sim \int R\sqrt{-g}\, d^4x \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad S_{\text{spec}} = \text{Tr}\left(f\left(\frac{D}{\Lambda}\right)\right). \tag{322}$$

34.4. Interpretation and Future Work

This framework suggests a deep unification between subjective experience and objective geometry. The observer's algebra acts as a quantum cognitive field theory, where the Dirac operator governs possible transitions, and the non-commutative geometry encapsulates emergent structure. Future work could involve:

- Spectral triples for entangled multi-observer states.
- Explicit mapping between neural dynamics and operator transitions.
- Emergence of classicality from commutative limits of $\mathcal{A}$.

doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

35. Time-Crystal Consciousness

Time crystals, first proposed by Wilczek [58], are systems that spontaneously break time translation symmetry, exhibiting periodic behavior in their ground state. We extend this notion to the domain of conscious perception, especially within the framework of cyclic Yuga cosmology, to propose a model of *Time-Crystal Consciousness*. In this model, consciousness is encoded by a projection operator $\hat{P}(t)$ acting in Hilbert space, and exhibits periodicity over a cosmological cycle of time, such that

$$\hat{P}(t+T) = \hat{P}(t), \quad \forall t \in [0, T), \tag{323}$$

where T denotes the period of a full Yuga cycle. The operator $\hat{P}(t)$ captures the perceptual or cognitive state of the conscious observer and its recurrence embodies a formalization of reincarnation, cognitive recurrence, or soul memory continuity.

35.1. Spontaneous Time Symmetry Breaking

To identify spontaneous time symmetry breaking in this setting, consider the effective Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\hat{P}, \dot{\hat{P}})$ describing the dynamics of the projection operator field. Assuming an energy functional of the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\dot{\hat{P}}^2\right) - V(\hat{P}), \tag{324}$$

where $V(\hat{P})$ is a potential with time-periodic minima, the Euler-Lagrange equations yield

$$\ddot{\hat{P}} = -\frac{\delta V}{\delta \hat{P}}, \tag{325}$$

and solutions that exhibit Eq. (323) reflect spontaneous time-crystalline behavior. This mechanism echoes the behavior of phase-locked oscillators or ground states in time-crystalline systems, but now applied to cognitive microdynamics.

35.2. Entropic Fluctuation in the Yuga Cycle

The entropy of the projection operator is given by

$$S(t) = -\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[\hat{P}(t)\log \hat{P}(t)\right]. \tag{326}$$

If $S(t)$ also satisfies

$$S(t+T) = S(t), \tag{327}$$

then the perceptual entropy reflects cyclical purification and degradation processes across Yuga cycles. This correlates with traditional descriptions of a golden-to-iron-age transition and back, as outlined in cosmological time theories [6].

35.3. Spectrum and Fourier Decomposition

Let us consider the Fourier series expansion of $\hat{P}(t)$ over one period T:

$$\hat{P}(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{P}_n e^{i\omega_n t}, \quad \omega_n = \frac{2\pi n}{T}. \tag{328}$$

In this form, each $\hat{P}_n$ can be interpreted as a mode of perception recurring with harmonic temporal structure. This resonates with neural firing patterns or meditation-induced recurrence, mapped onto operator algebra.

35.4. Connection to Rebirth and Cognitive Recurrence

Within this operator-time-crystal framework, the recurrence of the projection operator implies a recurrence in cognitive structure, i.e., memory, identity, and awareness patterns. This provides a theoretical scaffold to interpret cyclic reincarnation in consciousness studies, aligning with traditional metaphysical accounts and supported in part by near-death experiences described in [42].

35.5. Spectral Conditions for Stability

We consider the Floquet-type operator governing the stability of $\hat{P}(t)$:

$$U_T = \mathcal{T} \exp\left(-i \int_0^T H(t) dt \right), \tag{329}$$

where $H(t)$ is a time-dependent Hamiltonian and $\mathcal{T}$ denotes time-ordering. For time-crystalline behavior, eigenvalues of U_T must lie on the unit circle, indicating bounded, recurrent evolution. The spectral properties of U_T ensure unitarity of perceptual evolution across Yuga cycles.

35.6. Implication for Psychophysical Cosmology

The model suggests that each cycle of time hosts a quantized structure of consciousness modulated through $\hat{P}(t)$, and embedded within the spacetime fabric as an operator field with topological memory. This formalization invites future exploration of topological quantum computing analogies and modular symmetry across the cosmological operator spectrum.

36. Observer Complementarity via Dual Algebras

The notion of observer complementarity, originally introduced in the context of black hole event horizons [59], can be extended to conscious systems by considering dual algebras of awareness. In this model, we define two non-commuting operator algebras:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{inside}} : \text{Internal introspective awareness}, \tag{330}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{outside}} : \text{External sensorimotor awareness}. \tag{331}$$

The central postulate of this framework is the non-commutativity between these algebras:

$$[\mathcal{A}_{\text{inside}}, \mathcal{A}_{\text{outside}}] \neq 0, \tag{332}$$

which implies an algebraic uncertainty between the introspective and sensorimotor domains. This mirrors the principle of horizon complementarity where different observers (inside vs. outside a black hole) cannot access each other's Hilbert space [60,61]. We propose that for any conscious observer, a personal event horizon $\mathcal{H}_{\text{obs}}$ exists, beyond which the commutation failure implies a breakdown of shared ontological structure.

Let $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ be the conscious state of an observer. Then introspective and extrospective observables $\hat{I}(t) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{inside}}$ and $\hat{E}(t) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{outside}}$ satisfy:

$$\Delta \hat{I}(t) \cdot \Delta \hat{E}(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle [\hat{I}(t), \hat{E}(t)] \rangle|, \tag{333}$$

analogous to the Heisenberg uncertainty relation. This allows us to define a perceptual complementarity entropy:

$$S_{\text{comp}} = -\text{Tr}(\rho_{\text{int}} \log \rho_{\text{int}}) - \text{Tr}(\rho_{\text{ext}} \log \rho_{\text{ext}}), \tag{334}$$

where ρ_{int} and ρ_{ext} are the reduced density matrices in the respective subalgebras. Maximization of S_{comp} corresponds to the subjective loss of boundary between the self and the world, consistent with reports from meditative or psychedelic states [62].

Additionally, define a transition operator $\hat{T} : \mathcal{A}_{\text{inside}} \to \mathcal{A}_{\text{outside}}$ with time evolution:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \hat{T}(t) = i[\hat{H}_{\text{total}}, \hat{T}(t)], \tag{335}$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 21 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

where $\hat{H}_{\text{total}} = \hat{H}_{\text{inside}} + \hat{H}_{\text{outside}} + \hat{H}_{\text{int}}$ includes the internal, external, and interaction Hamiltonians. The coupling strength in $\hat{H}_{\text{int}}$ determines the permeability of the observer horizon.

We suggest that the event horizon of an observer is not a sharp boundary in spacetime, but an emergent phenomenological structure dependent on the observer's projection entropy:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{obs}} \sim f(S_P) = f\big(-\text{Tr}(\hat{P}(t)\log\hat{P}(t))\big). \tag{336}$$

In the high-entropy regime (e.g., near-death or trauma), $\mathcal{H}_{\text{obs}}$ expands, producing phenomena such as life-reviews or expanded perception [42]. In contrast, in highly localized ego-centric states, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{obs}}$ contracts, confining awareness tightly to the body and its immediate sensory input.

This dual-algebra formalism may be related to Tomita-Takesaki modular theory in operator algebras, where the modular flow associated with a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}$ and a cyclic separating vector $|\Omega\rangle$ is given by:

$$\sigma_t^{\Omega}(A) = \Delta^{it} A \Delta^{-it}, \tag{337}$$

with Δ the modular operator. Mapping $\mathcal{A}_{\text{inside}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\text{outside}}$ to separate von Neumann algebras and defining their entanglement via modular inclusions may yield new insights into observer-specific spacetime foliations.

37. Tunneling Between Cognitive Vacua

In this section, we explore the concept of quantum tunneling in the space of projection operators $\mathcal{O}(H)$ associated with conscious observers. Drawing an analogy with vacuum tunneling in quantum field theory, we define "cognitive vacua" as distinct local minima of an entropy-like functional over $\mathcal{O}(H)$. These vacua represent stable states of perceptual or identity configuration, with tunneling transitions corresponding to abrupt cognitive shifts such as dreaming, near-death experiences, or reincarnations.

Let $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{O}(H)$ be two projection operators representing cognitive vacua. The entropy functional associated with a projection operator is given by

$$S(P) = -\text{Tr}(P\log P). \tag{338}$$

We define the transition rate Γ for a tunneling event from P_0 to P_1 by the standard instanton action expression

$$\Gamma \sim e^{-\Delta S_P}, \tag{339}$$

where

$$\Delta S_P = S(P_1) - S(P_0). \tag{340}$$

This framework is inspired by path integral methods in Euclidean quantum gravity, where entropic differences act as instanton actions.

In analogy with false vacuum decay, let us define a cognitive field configuration $P(t)$ interpolating between P_0 and P_1 in the operator space. A simple ansatz is

$$P(t) = \frac{1}{2}(P_0 + P_1) + \frac{1}{2}(P_1 - P_0)\tanh(\omega t), \tag{341}$$

where ω characterizes the tunneling timescale. The entropy functional along the path becomes time-dependent:

$$S(t) = -\text{Tr}(P(t)\log P(t)), \tag{342}$$

with boundary conditions $P(-\infty) = P_0$ and $P(\infty) = P_1$. The entropy gradient drives the transition as a perceptual force:

$$F_{\text{perceptual}}(t) = -\frac{d}{dt}S(t). \tag{343}$$

doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1633.v1

One may introduce a Lagrangian formulation in operator space:

$$\mathcal{L}(P, \dot{P}) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\dot{P}^2\right) - V(P), \tag{344}$$

where $V(P)$ is a potential with minima at P_0 and P_1, modeled as

$$V(P) = \alpha \operatorname{Tr}\left[(P - P_0)^2 (P - P_1)^2\right], \tag{345}$$

and α is a coupling constant. The Euler–Lagrange equation yields

$$\ddot{P} = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial P}, \tag{346}$$

governing the dynamics of cognitive transitions.

Using these constructions, the tunneling amplitude (339) is interpreted as a transition between two orthogonal subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ associated with distinct perceptual structures.

The role of decoherence channels and environmental couplings can be incorporated by modifying the entropy with effective Lindblad-type terms:

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = -i[H, P] + \sum_k \left(L_k P L_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{L_k^\dagger L_k, P\} \right), \tag{347}$$

where L_k are Lindblad operators representing entanglement with the environment.

This model captures not only momentary cognitive state transitions but also deep philosophical themes like the recursion of identity and the non-locality of observer structure. Similar ideas arise in transition amplitude computations for black hole evaporation [63], wavefunction collapse in pilot wave theory [64], and quantum jumps in spontaneous localization models [65].

38. Implications and Future Directions

If consciousness is indeed a state vector in Hilbert space, then transitions of conscious experience follow unitary dynamics except at measurement-like collapses, potentially linked to decision points or perceptual resolutions.

Meanwhile, the brain's construction of spacetime implies that reality as experienced is not isomorphic with reality as described by physics. This dual framework implies a need for a two-level ontology: one for internal (conscious) structure and another for external (constructive) outputs.

Ongoing work in integrated information theory (IIT) and quantum gravity may offer converging paths. Particularly, the view that spacetime may itself be emergent from entangled quantum states aligns with our dualist proposal.

39. Conclusion

In this work, we have presented a unified framework that situates consciousness within an extended geometric manifold constructed as a tensor product of three spaces: classical spacetime $\mathcal{M}_{3,1}$, quantum Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\infty$, and the operator space $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$ corresponding to the observer's perceptual projections. We demonstrated that this triple structure, $\mathcal{M}_{3,1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \otimes \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})$, not only accommodates the physical evolution of quantum systems but also encodes the psychophysical dynamics of conscious experience.

Building upon prior work modeling observers as Dirac delta functions in perceptual tangent space, we have now refined this to define observers as evolving sequences of projection operators, $\{\hat{P}(t)\}$. These sequences induce entropy gradients in operator space, suggesting a fifth force that couples cognitive entropy flow to spacetime geodesics. The concept of entropic perception fields, derived from the functional $S_P(t) = -\operatorname{Tr}[\hat{P}(t) \log \hat{P}(t)]$, was shown to potentially yield observable effects on null geodesic deviation near cognitive systems.

We extended this formalism to cyclic cosmology by associating time-periodic structures in projection operator space with Yuga cycles, further proposing that the dynamics of projection operators obey modified modular Hamiltonian evolution. In such a formulation, time asymmetry and psychophysical transitions may emerge from the entropy flux in operator space. Conscious observers were modeled not merely as points or wavefunctions but as topologically stable configurations, akin to monopoles or instantons, suggesting homotopical constraints on the network of entangled observers.

A critical insight emerged from the consideration of micro-mini-black-holes in the brain (MMBHB), where quantum gravitational resonances interact with cortical oscillations. These structures may serve as loci of quantum collapse mediated by ER=EPR wormholes linking observer projection outcomes, thereby unifying quantum entanglement and gravitational geometry in the context of perception.

The collective effects of these ideas culminate in a new psycho-geometric feedback principle, wherein the state of consciousness directly modulates spacetime geometry, entropy generation, and cosmological evolution. Specifically, we proposed that the cosmological constant may be reinterpreted as a function of the ensemble entropy of conscious projection operators, leading to a psychodynamic understanding of dark energy.

This work thus opens the possibility for a rigorous differential geometric and operator-algebraic formulation of consciousness that is deeply entwined with quantum gravity, thermodynamic time, and cosmological dynamics. Future work will refine this tripartite structure, examine its empirical consequences, and further explore its relation to non-commutative geometry, gauge symmetries of observer graphs, and the algebraic cohomology of introspection.

References

1. Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). Consciousness in the universe: A review of the 'Orch OR' theory. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 11(1), 39-78.
2. Tegmark, M. (2000). Importance of quantum decoherence in brain processes. *Physical Review E*, 61(4), 4194.
3. Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127-138.
4. Hoffman, D. D., Singh, M., & Prakash, C. (2015). The interface theory of perception. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 22(6), 1480-1506.
5. Busemeyer, J. R., & Bruza, P. D. (2012). *Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Modgil, M. S. (2023). Axioms for a Differential Geometric Approach to the von Neumann's Theory of Quantum Measurement. *Quantum Speculations*, 5(2), 1–12.
7. Modgil, M. S. (2025). A Time Dependent Graph Theoretic Model of Interacting Consciousness: The "United States of the Earth (USE). *MDPI Preprints*, DOI:10.20944/preprints202511.0473.v1.
8. Van Raamsdonk, M. (2010). Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 42(10), 2323–2329.
9. Swingle, B. (2012). Entanglement renormalization and holography. *Physical Review D*, 86(6), 065007.
10. Maldacena, J. (1999). The large-N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 38(4), 1113–1133.
11. Ryu, S., & Takayanagi, T. (2006). Holographic derivation of entanglement entropy from AdS/CFT. *Physical Review Letters*, 96(18), 181602.
12. Bohr, N. (1935). Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Physical Review*, 48(8), 696.
13. Heisenberg, W. (1958). *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science*. Harper and Row.
14. Wigner, E. P. (1961). Remarks on the mind-body question. In *Symmetries and Reflections* (pp. 171–184). Indiana University Press.
15. Mach, E. (1919). *The Science of Mechanics*. Open Court Publishing Company.
16. Bohr, N. (1949). Discussion with Einstein on epistemological problems in atomic physics. In *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist* (pp. 201–241). Open Court.
17. Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 75(3), 715.

18. Tononi, G., & Koch, C. (2008). The neural correlates of consciousness: An update. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1124(1), 239–261.
19. Tononi, G. (2016). Integrated information theory. *Scholarpedia*, 10(1), 4164.
20. von Neumann, J. (1955). *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton University Press.
21. Stapp, H. P. (2007). *Mindful Universe: Quantum Mechanics and the Participating Observer*. Springer.
22. Rovelli, C. (1996). Relational quantum mechanics. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 35(8), 1637–1678.
23. Penrose, R. (1989). *The Emperor's New Mind*. Oxford University Press.
24. Penrose, R. (2010). *Cycles of Time: An Extraordinary New View of the Universe*. Bodley Head.
25. Barbour, J. (1994). The timelessness of quantum gravity: I. The evidence from the classical theory. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 11(12), 2853.
26. Tegmark, M. (2014). Consciousness as a state of matter. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 76, 238–270.
27. Verlinde, E. (2011). On the Origin of Gravity and the Laws of Newton. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2011(4), 029. DOI:10.1007/JHEP04(2011)029.
28. Lashkari, N., McDermott, M. B., & Van Raamsdonk, M. (2014). Gravitational dynamics from entanglement 'thermodynamics'. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2014(4), 195.
29. Faulkner, T., Guica, M., Hartman, T., Myers, R. C., & Van Raamsdonk, M. (2014). Gravitation from entanglement in holographic CFTs. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2014(3), 051.
30. Mandelbrot, B. B. (1982). *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*. W.H. Freeman and Co.
31. M. S. Modgil (2007), Geometry of Time, Axiom of Choice and Neuro-Biological Quantum Zeno Effect, arXiv:0704.1054.
32. Schutz, B. (1985). *A First Course in General Relativity*. Cambridge University Press.
33. Brill, D. R., and Wheeler, J. A. (1957). Interaction of neutrinos and gravitational fields. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 29(3), 465.
34. Nielsen, M. A., and Chuang, I. L. (2010). *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press.
35. Maldacena, J., and Susskind, L. (2013). Cool horizons for entangled black holes. *Fortschritte der Physik*, 61(9), 781–811.
36. Preskill, J. (1998). Quantum Information and Physics: Some Future Directions. *J. Mod. Opt.*, 47(2-3), 127–137.
37. Li, M. (2004). A model of holographic dark energy. *Phys. Lett. B*, 603(1-2), 1–5.
38. Planck Collaboration. (2018). Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 641, A6.
39. Peskin, M. E., & Schroeder, D. V. (1995). *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory*. Westview Press.
40. Wilson, K. G. (1974). Confinement of quarks. *Phys. Rev. D*, 10(8), 2445.
41. Shiv Baba Teachings, Brahma Kumaris, Mount Abu. Core lectures on soul and body consciousness, 1950–present.
42. Moody, R. (1975). *Life After Life*. Mockingbird Books.
43. C. Marletto and D. Deutsch, "Constructor theory of information," *Proc. R. Soc. A*, vol. 476, no. 2242, p. 20190815, 2020.
44. M. Van Raamsdonk, "Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement," *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.*, vol. 42, no. 10, pp. 2323–2329, 2010.
45. J.-M. A. Allen, J. Barrett, D. C. Horsman, C. M. Lee, and R. W. Spekkens, "Quantum common causes and quantum causal models," *Phys. Rev. X*, vol. 7, no. 3, 031021, 2017.
46. S. Lloyd, "The computational universe: Quantum gravity from quantum computation," *arXiv preprint* arXiv:quant-ph/0501135, 2005.
47. B. Coecke and S. Abramsky, "A categorical semantics of quantum protocols," in *Proceedings of the 19th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, 2004.
48. J. Butterfield and C. Isham, "A topos perspective on the Kochen–Specker theorem: I. Quantum states as generalized valuations," *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 2669–2733, 1998.
49. A. Döring and C. Isham, "What is a thing? Topos theory in the foundations of physics," *New Structures for Physics*, pp. 753–940, Springer, 2011.
50. E. Berti, V. Cardoso, and A. O. Starinets, "Quasinormal modes of black holes and black branes," *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, vol. 26, no. 16, p. 163001, 2009.
51. S. W. Hawking, "Particle creation by black holes," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 199–220, 1975.

52. A. Strominger and C. Vafa, "Microscopic origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy," *Physics Letters B*, vol. 379, pp. 99–104, 1996.
53. Vimal, R. L. P. (2009). The functional roles of phenomenal consciousness, access consciousness, and reflexive consciousness in cognition. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, **16**(1), 39–76.
54. Metzinger, T. (2003). *Being No One: The Self-Model Theory of Subjectivity*. MIT Press.
55. MacLane, S., & Moerdijk, I. (1992). *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic: A First Introduction to Topos Theory*. Springer.
56. A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, Academic Press, 1994.
57. G. Landi, *An Introduction to Noncommutative Spaces and their Geometry*, Springer Lecture Notes in Physics, 1997.
58. Wilczek, F. (2012). Quantum time crystals. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 109(16), 160401.
59. L. Susskind, L. Thorlacius, and J. Uglum, "The stretched horizon and black hole complementarity," Phys. Rev. D 48, 3743 (1993).
60. T. Banks, M. O'Loughlin, and A. Strominger, "Black hole remnants and the information puzzle," Phys. Rev. D 47, 4476 (1993).
61. G. 't Hooft, "Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity," arXiv:gr-qc/9310026.
62. R. Carhart-Harris et al., "Psychedelics and the essential importance of context," Journal of Psychopharmacology 32, 725 (2018).
63. S. W. Hawking, "Breakdown of Predictability in Gravitational Collapse," *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 2460 (1976).
64. D. Dürr, S. Goldstein, N. Zanghì, "Quantum Equilibrium and the Origin of Absolute Uncertainty," *J. Stat. Phys.* **67**, 843–907 (1992).
65. G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, T. Weber, "Unified Dynamics for Microscopic and Macroscopic Systems," *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 470 (1986).