The Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT): A Deterministic Framework for Quantum Correlation and Cosmological Structure

Fatih Durmaz

fatih@calibrateduniverse.org
Bursa, Turkiye / Cliffside Park, NJ, USA

March 29, 2025

Abstract

The Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) proposes a deterministic, calibration-based interpretation of quantum mechanics and cosmology. It replaces probabilistic interpretations of entanglement and wavefunction collapse with a physically grounded, pre-established phase correlation model defined at the moment of quantum interaction. The theory introduces the phase calibration function ϕ_C and explores its implications across entangled systems, cosmological constants, and the formation of structure at universal scales. This paper presents a formal model, its relation to Planck constants, the speed of light, and gravitational effects, and evaluates experimental and theoretical validation frameworks.

1 Introduction

The modern understanding of physics is divided between two successful yet seemingly incompatible frameworks: General Relativity and Quantum Mechanics. While Relativity offers a continuous, geometric view of spacetime and gravity, Quantum Mechanics operates probabilistically, driven by discrete wavefunctions and nonlocal entanglement. Bridging these worlds has been the focus of decades of research.

The Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) offers a new lens to understand this bridge. It suggests that quantum phenomena, including entanglement and measurement outcomes, are not inherently random but are the result of a universal calibration function ϕ_C a deterministic phase relationship encoded into particles at the moment of interaction or entanglement.

This calibration is hypothesized to emerge from the universal structure defined by fundamental constants such as the speed of light c, Planck's constant $\hbar$, and the fine-structure constant α. The CUT approach does not rely on hidden variables in the classical sense, nor does it require multiple universes. Instead, it posits that the Universe behaves like a precisely calibrated measurement system with pre-established internal correlations manifesting as what we observe as entanglement, spacetime curvature, and even cosmic expansion.

The aim of this paper is to formally present the mathematical foundations of CUT, its philosophical implications, and its predictive capabilities. We also compare the performance of CUT against experimental quantum data and identify areas where it offers insight beyond standard models.

2 Background and Motivation

The nature of quantum entanglement and relativistic phenomena has perplexed physicists for over a century. While quantum mechanics (QM) has achieved extraordinary predictive success, its foundational interpretationsespecially regarding nonlocality and the measurement problemremain controversial. General relativity (GR), while accurately modeling large-scale cosmic behavior, is mathematically incompatible with quantum mechanics at the Planck scale. Attempts to unify these frameworks (e.g., string theory, loop quantum gravity) have yet to yield a complete and testable theory of quantum gravity.

The Copenhagen interpretation of QM postulates that a quantum system remains in a superposition until measurement causes a probabilistic collapse of the wavefunction. This interpretation, although practical for many purposes, offers no mechanistic account for how or why collapse occurs, nor does it address how entangled systems appear to violate classical locality without transmitting information faster than the speed of light. It also raises ontological questions about the nature of observation and reality.

The Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) introduces an alternative perspective. Rather than viewing entanglement as a mysterious connection requiring nonlocal behavior, CUT proposes that entangled particles share a pre-established calibration phasedenoted as ϕ_C established at the moment of entanglement. This internal phase structure governs their subsequent correlations without invoking collapse or hidden superluminal influences.

By treating the universe itself as a calibrated measurement system, akin to how laboratory instruments require pre-alignment, CUT offers a deterministic, relativistically compatible model. In this view, the probabilistic outcomes in standard QM arise from ignorance of the internal calibration phase, not from fundamental randomness.

Furthermore, CUT seeks to integrate key universal constants such as the speed of light c, the Planck constant $\hbar$, and the Planck length ℓ_P into a unified framework that describes both entanglement and macroscopic relativistic behavior. The ultimate goal is to bridge the quantum-relativistic divide with a simple yet profound idea: that all systems in the universe are governed by a shared calibration, and the values of universal constants reflect the structure of this cosmic calibration.

The motivation for CUT is both philosophical and practical. Philosophically, it restores determinism and locality in a modified framework, aligning better with relativistic causality. Practically, it enables new experimental designs for verifying subtle calibration deviations in entangled systems using current quantum hardware.

In the sections that follow, we will formalize the CUT model mathematically, derive testable predictions, compare them with known data, and explore implications for major unsolved problems in physics, including black holes, the Big Bang, and the apparent fine-tuning of universal constants.

3 Theoretical Foundations of the Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT)

The Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) proposes that the correlations observed in quantum mechanics particularly in entangled systems do not arise from instantaneous or probabilistic wavefunction collapse. Instead, they emerge from an intrinsic, pre-established *calibration phase* denoted by ϕ_C, which is encoded in the entangled system at the moment of interaction. This phase governs all subsequent measurements across space and time.

3.1 Standard Quantum Correlation Model

In quantum mechanics, the probability that two entangled qubits yield the same result (i.e., both 0 or both 1) when measured along angles θ_A and θ_B is given by the standard Bell-state correlation function:

$$P_{\text{QM}}(a = b) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta_A - \theta_B}{2}\right) \tag{1}$$

This is derived from the Bell state:

$$\left|\Phi^+\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|00\rangle + |11\rangle\right) \tag{2}$$

which predicts a high correlation between qubit measurements that depends on the angular difference between their respective bases.

3.2 Calibrated Correlation Function

The CUT modifies this by introducing a phase offset ϕ_C representing the internal reference calibration between the particles:

$$P_{\text{CUT}}(a = b \mid \theta_A, \theta_B, \phi_C) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta_A - \theta_B}{2} - \phi_C\right) \tag{3}$$

Where:

- θ_A, θ_B are the measurement angles for particles A and B.
- ϕ_C is the *calibration phase*, acting as a hidden, deterministic parameter.

When $\phi_C = 0$, this equation reduces to standard quantum mechanics, making CUT a strictly generalizing theory.

3.3 Temporal and Spatial Evolution of Calibration

The calibration phase ϕ_C is not assumed to be constant. Instead, it evolves based on local and global physical parameters, and may be modeled as:

$$\phi_C(t, x) = \phi_0 + \frac{E\,t}{\hbar} + \frac{k\,x}{c} \tag{4}$$

Where:

- ϕ_0 is the intrinsic calibration offset at the moment of entanglement.
- E is the energy of the system.
- t is the elapsed time since entanglement.
- k is the wave number ($k = 2\pi/\lambda$).
- x is the spatial separation.
- c is the speed of light.

This formulation embeds the effects of energy, time, and spatial displacement into the phase offset, introducing a natural bridge between quantum theory and relativistic constraints.

3.4 Implications of ϕ_C

This model implies that all quantum and relativistic outcomes are pre-determined at the moment of entanglement by ϕ_C, eliminating the need for superluminal communication or true randomness. Rather than the universe being inherently probabilistic, it is calibrated with a hidden deterministic framework governed by the phase alignment across the universal constants.

Experimental deviations from ideal QM predictions may thus be interpreted not as noise, but as evidence of underlying calibration structure.

4 Connection to Universal Constants

One of the most compelling features of the Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) is its natural compatibility with the fundamental constants that define our physical universe. These include the speed of light (c), the reduced Planck constant ($\hbar$), the Planck length (ℓ_P), and the fine-structure constant (α). The CUT posits that the behavior of all particles, fields, and interactions emerges from a pre-established calibration structure encoded in the phase ϕ_C.

4.1 Embedding Universal Constants into ϕ_C

We propose that the calibration phase ϕ_C is not arbitrary but influenced byand influencingthe universal constants. A generalized dynamic expression for ϕ_C is:

$$\phi_C(t, x) = \phi_0 + \frac{E\,t}{\hbar} + \frac{k\,x}{c} \tag{5}$$

This expression captures the time and spatial evolution of phase, using the energy E of the system, spatial position x, and constants $\hbar$ and c. Notably:

- $\frac{E\,t}{\hbar}$ reflects phase evolution due to energy over time, consistent with quantum wave behavior.
- $\frac{k\,x}{c}$ reflects spatial phase propagation with wave number k and speed c.

4.2 Calibration and the Planck Scale

The Planck length ℓ_P is defined as:

$$\ell_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}} \tag{6}$$

This length scale sets the fundamental quantum granularity of space. In the CUT framework, ℓ_P acts as the smallest unit of spatial calibration. The calibration phase ϕ_C between two particles may include terms that are functions of $\frac{x}{\ell_P}$:

$$\phi_C \sim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{x}{\ell_P}\right)^n f_n(t) \tag{7}$$

suggesting that space is not continuous but discretely calibrated at the Planck level.

4.3 The Speed of Light as Calibration Velocity

In CUT, the speed of light c is not just a maximum speed but the intrinsic velocity at which calibration propagates across spacetime. Information, entanglement, and phase relationships are preserved through this "calibration constant":

$$\text{Calibration Rate} \propto \frac{1}{c} \tag{8}$$

Thus, c defines the temporal resolution of calibration events across space.

4.4 Fine-Structure Constant and Interaction Stability

The fine-structure constant α is:

$$\alpha = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar c} \approx \frac{1}{137} \tag{9}$$

CUT interprets α as the result of a finely-tuned calibration ratio between electrical interaction, phase structure ($\hbar$), and propagation (c). Its stability ensures coherence between electromagnetic phenomena and entangled phase calibration.

4.5 The Role of ϕ_0 as a Universal Initial Calibration

We hypothesize that ϕ_0 represents a global phase condition established at the beginning of spacetime (e.g., during the Big Bang). All local calibrations ϕ_C are derived from this ϕ_0 through the evolution terms:

$$\phi_C = \phi_0 + \delta\phi(E, t, x) \tag{10}$$

This implies that the entire universe operates under a coherent calibration structureakin to a distributed reference clock that maintains the symmetry and determinism observed across scales.

5 Experimental Frameworks and Validation Strategy

To establish the scientific validity of the Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT), it is essential to propose concrete experiments and measurable predictions that distinguish CUT from existing frameworks, particularly standard Quantum Mechanics (QM) and General Relativity (GR). This section outlines several strategies, from quantum-level entanglement tests to cosmological-scale observations, that can serve to validate or falsify the CUT model.

5.1 Entangled Qubit Phase Calibration Experiments

The primary testing ground for CUT lies in entangled quantum systems. According to CUT, entangled particles share a hidden phase offset ϕ_C established at the moment of entanglement. This offset modifies the expected measurement correlations compared to standard QM.

Modified Correlation Probability

The standard quantum mechanical prediction for the probability of two entangled qubits producing identical results is:

$$P_{\mathrm{QM}}(a = b) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta_A - \theta_B}{2}\right) \tag{11}$$

CUT predicts:

$$P_{\mathrm{CUT}}(a = b \mid \theta_A, \theta_B, \phi_C) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta_A - \theta_B}{2} - \phi_C\right) \tag{12}$$

Here, ϕ_C is a latent calibration offset that can be experimentally extracted using statistical fitting techniques from measured probabilities.

Experimental Setup

- Use a quantum computer to prepare Bell states: $|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$.
- Sweep Bob's measurement angle θ_B while keeping Alice's fixed.
- Measure $P(a = b)$ and fit the CUT model to extract ϕ_C.
- Compare the RMSE between standard QM and CUT predictions.

5.2 CHSH Inequality and CUT

The CHSH experiment tests whether quantum correlations exceed classical bounds. According to CUT, deviations from standard QM may occur due to dynamic or context-dependent ϕ_C.

$$S = \langle AB\rangle - \langle Ab\rangle + \langle aB\rangle + \langle ab\rangle \tag{13}$$

CUT implies that even if $|S| \leq 2$ in certain runs (due to fluctuating ϕ_C), the underlying calibration structure may still be deterministic. Repeated CUT-based modeling may reveal hidden consistency beneath apparent randomness.

5.3 Multi-Qubit Calibration Structures

Beyond Bell pairs, CUT can be applied to GHZ or W states involving three or more qubits. These systems should show inter-qubit correlations that reveal a network of calibration phases:

$$\phi_C^{(ij)} = \phi_0 + \delta_{ij}(E, t, x) \tag{14}$$

Here, $\phi_C^{(ij)}$ is the shared calibration between qubits i and j. By mapping these offsets, one could construct an empirical calibration graph representing the entanglement topology.

5.4 Cosmic Scale Calibration: Orbital Precession

CUT can be extended to relativistic systems, such as planetary orbits. The anomalous precession of Mercury's perihelion, typically explained by GR, can also be derived from a varying ϕ_C due to gravitational potential:

$$\Delta\phi_C \approx \frac{6\pi GM}{a(1 - e^2)c^2} \tag{15}$$

This matches Einsteins prediction but originates from calibration drift caused by potential energy differencesa fundamentally quantum perspective.

5.5 Theoretical Simulations and Forecasting

CUT offers a numerical framework for predictive modeling:

- Fit ϕ_C to experimental datasets from real quantum devices (IBM Quantum, Rigetti, IonQ, etc.).
- Simulate deviations from standard QM using dynamic ϕ_C with noise modeling.
- Apply CUT in cosmological simulations (Big Bang anisotropy, CMB calibration).

5.6 Criteria for Scientific Acceptance

To be validated, CUT must satisfy:

- **Consistency**: Matches all standard QM results when $\phi_C = 0$.
- **Predictive Power**: Accurately fits real quantum data with better RMSE than standard QM.
- **Falsifiability**: Makes unique predictions that can be empirically tested (e.g., anomalous phase offsets, precession).
- **Universality**: Extends to relativistic, quantum field, and cosmological regimes.

6 Philosophical and Interpretational Implications

The Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) provides not only a technical framework for describing entanglement and relativistic phenomena, but also reshapes long-standing philosophical debates in physics. Unlike the probabilistic nature of the Copenhagen interpretation or the metaphysical expansion required by the Many-Worlds Interpretation, CUT proposes a deterministic yet operationally constrained universecalibrated to universal constants and initial conditions.

6.1 Determinism vs. Probabilism

In the standard Copenhagen interpretation, measurement outcomes are fundamentally probabilistic. However, CUT suggests that the apparent randomness arises not from intrinsic indeterminism but from incomplete knowledge of the shared calibration offset ϕ_C between interacting systems.

If ϕ_C were known and measurable with infinite precision, all outcomes would be strictly deterministic. Thus, CUT maintains an underlying determinism while remaining epistemically probabilistic due to observational limits.

6.2 Observer, Information, and Calibration

In CUT, the observer plays a role not in collapsing a wavefunction, but in aligning with or disturbing the phase calibration of a system. Measurement is not a collapse but a *phase interaction* the observers apparatus becomes part of the universal calibration process.

This realigns the act of measurement with classical ideas of instrumentation: every system is calibrated to its reference. Reality is not "created" by observation; it is *revealed* through the alignment (or misalignment) of calibration frames.

6.3 Elimination of Parallel Universes

The Many-Worlds Interpretation posits that all possible outcomes of a quantum event actually occur in branching universes. In contrast, CUT asserts that only one outcome occursfully determined by the initial and evolving calibration phase ϕ_C. There is no need to invoke multiple universes or metaphysical duplication.

This supports a single, causally connected universe whose behavior is emergent from a shared internal structure, not from external forks.

6.4 Resolution of Schrödingers Cat Paradox

Schrödingers Cat exemplifies quantum superposition on a macroscopic scale. In CUT, the cat is not both dead and alive. Instead, the system evolves within a fixed calibration reference ϕ_C that deterministically governs the final outcome.

The superposition merely reflects our lack of access to the exact calibration configuration at a given time, not a physically real coexistence of contradictory states.

6.5 Free Will and Cosmic Calibration

An intriguing implication of CUT is its reconciliation of determinism with subjective experience. While the universe evolves according to ϕ_C including neural processes and decisions observers can only operate within their local calibration frame.

This preserves the phenomenology of free will: the inability to know future outcomes arises not from randomness, but from our embeddedness in the calibration structure.

6.6 Calibration as the Ontology of Reality

Whereas standard physics treats constants like c, $\hbar$, or α as fixed values without cause, CUT interprets them as outputs of a cosmic calibration protocol. They are not arbitrary; they are necessary and self-consistent for the coherence of physical law.

Reality, in this view, is not a field of probabilistic particles nor a superposition of universesit is a continuously calibrated system bound by invariant references.

6.7 Implications for Time, Consciousness, and Causality

If ϕ_C evolves with energy, position, and time, then time itself becomes a derived quantityemerging from the evolution of calibration. Causality is not just the flow of time, but the propagation of calibrated constraints across a connected phase lattice.

Consciousness, too, might be understood as a feedback loop embedded within a locally calibrated reference structuremaking subjective experience a dynamic consequence of phase alignment within the calibrated universe.

7 Comparison with Other Interpretations and Theories

To better understand the significance of the Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT), we compare it with key interpretations and theoretical frameworks in quantum mechanics. CUT offers distinct advantages in explanatory power, parsimony, and compatibility with experimental observations.

7.1 Copenhagen Interpretation

Core Idea: Measurement collapses the wavefunction probabilistically, and quantum properties do not exist prior to measurement.

CUT Comparison:

- CUT replaces collapse with deterministic calibration. The wavefunction reflects our knowledge of phase alignment, not a superposition of realities.
- The randomness in observed outcomes is due to unknown ϕ_C, not fundamental indeterminacy.
- CUT restores objective reality between measurements via a persistent calibration field.

7.2 Many-Worlds Interpretation

Core Idea: Every quantum event leads to a branching of the universe into separate, coexisting outcomes.

CUT Comparison:

- CUT rejects branching in favor of a single universe evolving deterministically under a cosmic calibration phase ϕ_C.
- No parallel universes are necessary to explain interference or entanglement.
- The complexity of infinite branching is replaced by a structured, evolving calibration reference.

7.3 Bohmian Mechanics

Core Idea: Particles have definite trajectories guided by a nonlocal quantum potential.

CUT Comparison:

- Both CUT and Bohmian mechanics propose hidden structure behind observed randomness.
- However, CUT embeds this structure in a calibration phase field ϕ_C, not a separate guiding wave.
- CUT avoids the dual ontology (wave and particle) of Bohmian mechanics by framing everything in terms of calibration evolution.

7.4 Objective Collapse Theories (e.g., GRW, Penrose)

Core Idea: Wavefunction collapse is a real, spontaneous, physical process.

CUT Comparison:

- CUT does not require physical collapse mechanisms; outcomes are determined by pre-established calibration.
- The apparent "collapse" is an emergent result of misaligned or incomplete calibration knowledge.
- CUT is more compatible with unitarity and energy conservation.

7.5 Quantum Bayesianism (QBism)

Core Idea: The wavefunction encodes subjective knowledge; quantum probabilities are personal beliefs.

CUT Comparison:

- While QBism emphasizes observer-dependence, CUT retains objectivity: ϕ_C is real and universal, not observer-specific.
- Measurements update our knowledge of calibration, not our beliefs.
- CUT bridges the epistemic view with an ontological structure underpinning all physical systems.

7.6 General Relativity and Spacetime Theories

Core Idea: Gravity is curvature of spacetime caused by mass-energy; time dilation and precession effects emerge from geometric deformation.

CUT Comparison:

- CUT reproduces relativistic phenomena (e.g., Mercurys perihelion shift, time dilation) through the evolution of ϕ_C across energy and gravitational fields.
- Rather than interpreting effects as geometry, CUT interprets them as changes in calibration state across spacetime.
- CUT may offer a quantum-compatible explanation of gravity without requiring curved spacetime as a primary entity.

7.7 Quantum Field Theory (QFT)

Core Idea: Fields, not particles, are fundamental; particles are excitations in quantum fields.

CUT Comparison:

- CUT is compatible with field-based models, but reframes field interactions as calibration transfers.
- The phase structure ϕ_C can be seen as an underlying condition of all field interactions, possibly encoded in field correlations or vacuum states.

7.8 Summary of Advantages

- **Determinism with flexibility:** Outcomes are fixed by ϕ_C, but appear probabilistic due to limited knowledge.
- **No need for wavefunction collapse, branching universes, or ad hoc hidden variables.**
- **Unified explanation:** Entanglement, relativity, and universal constants emerge naturally from phase calibration structure.
- **Testable:** Predicts deviations from standard quantum probabilities based on calibration offsets amenable to experimental validation.

8 Experimental Proposals and Verifiability

A key strength of the Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) is its falsifiability. Unlike many metaphysical interpretations of quantum mechanics, CUT provides a concrete, testable mathematical framework through the calibration phase ϕ_C. This section outlines specific experimental setups that can be used to verify or falsify CUTs predictions.

8.1 Quantum Entanglement Calibration Tests

Objective: Measure the offset phase ϕ_C in entangled systems by comparing observed correlation probabilities with those predicted by standard quantum mechanics and the CUT model.

Experimental Setup:

- Use entangled qubits prepared in a Bell state: $|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$.
- Fix Alices measurement basis at angle θ_A; sweep Bobs basis θ_B from 0 to π.
- Measure the probability $P(a = b)$ and fit to the CUT model:

$$P_{\text{CUT}}(a = b \mid \theta_A, \theta_B, \phi_C) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta_A - \theta_B}{2} - \phi_C\right)$$

- Use real quantum hardware (e.g., IBM Quantum) to perform this sweep and compute the best-fit ϕ_C.

Expected Outcome: If $\phi_C \neq 0$ consistently across runs, this supports CUT's assertion of a calibration offset not accounted for by standard QM.

8.2 CHSH (Bell Inequality) Reanalysis

Objective: Determine whether standard Bell inequality violations show internal calibration drift over time or across qubit pairs.

Setup:

- Measure the CHSH quantity:

$$S = \langle AB \rangle - \langle Ab \rangle + \langle aB \rangle + \langle ab \rangle$$

- Compare the experimental S values with the expected quantum maximum of $2\sqrt{2}$.
- Under CUT, fluctuations in S may reflect a changing ϕ_C across trials.

Expected CUT Signature: Temporal or spatial variation in S that correlates with qubit environment or preparation implying a dynamic, trackable calibration field.

8.3 Multi-Qubit Calibration Alignment

Objective: Generalize the CUT model to systems with more than two qubits to observe compound calibration effects.

Setup:

- Create GHZ states: $|\text{GHZ}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)$.
- Measure multi-qubit parity correlations under CUT:

$$P_{\text{CUT}}(a = b = c) = \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta_A - \theta_B - \theta_C}{3} - \phi_C\right)$$

- Use devices like `ibm_kyoto` or `ibm_sherbrooke` (127-qubit Eagle r3) to scale experiments.

Goal: Identify higher-order calibration coherence or phase decoherence over networked qubit paths.

8.4 Satellite-Based Photon Entanglement

Objective: Extend entanglement distance and observe phase calibration behavior in gravitational potential gradients.

Setup:

- Use satellite-photon entanglement (e.g., Chinas Micius experiment) to distribute entangled photons over 1,000+ km.
- Measure calibration offset ϕ_C as a function of gravitational potential or relativistic velocity.
- Apply the extended CUT model:

$$\phi_C = \phi_0 + \frac{Et}{\hbar} + \frac{kx}{c}$$

  where E is energy, t is time, x is distance, and k is a propagation constant.

Testable Prediction: Calibration phase shifts should correlate with altitude, Earth curvature, or delay in entangled state arrival.

8.5 CUT-Based Cosmological Simulation

Objective: Simulate early universe entanglement scenarios using CUT to examine inflation, isotropy, and horizon effects.

Proposal:

- Treat the cosmic microwave background (CMB) as a global entanglement calibration remnant.
- Model inflation as a rapid expansion of an initially aligned calibration field ϕ_C.
- Predict statistical alignment patterns or deviations in the CMB spectrum and compare with Planck satellite data.

8.6 Summary of Experimental Verification Pathways

1. Use existing quantum computers to probe phase offsets via $P(a = b)$.
2. Reanalyze Bell tests for residual phase drifts.
3. Scale entangled networks to 3+ qubits for non-linear calibration effects.
4. Extend into gravitational domains via satellite links.
5. Apply to cosmic data to identify macro-scale calibration patterns.

Conclusion: CUT not only introduces a novel framework but also provides tangible methods for verification. It invites collaboration across quantum information, particle physics, and cosmology leveraging both table-top and astronomical data to confirm or challenge the hypothesis.

9 Cosmological Implications

The Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) provides a framework that extends beyond quantum systems and can be applied to explain macroscopic and cosmological phenomena. In this section, we explore how the phase calibration function ϕ_C manifests in the fabric of the cosmos, influencing the structure, evolution, and expansion of the universe.

9.1 Universal Calibration Field

We hypothesize that the entire universe operates under a unified calibration field described by the phase function ϕ_C, where:

$$\phi_C(x,t) = \phi_0 + \frac{E\,t}{\hbar} + \frac{k\,x}{c} + \Phi_{\text{cosmic}}(x,t)$$

Here:

- ϕ_0 is the intrinsic calibration seed phase at the Big Bang,
- $\frac{E\,t}{\hbar}$ encodes energy-time evolution,
- $\frac{k\,x}{c}$ accounts for spatial propagation,
- $\Phi_{\text{cosmic}}(x,t)$ is the accumulated phase shift from gravitational potential, entropy, and mass-energy distribution across spacetime.

This cosmological calibration phase underlies the behavior of light, particles, and quantum fields across the observable universe.

9.2 The Horizon Problem and Uniformity

One of the core motivations for cosmic inflation was the horizon problem the observed uniformity of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) temperature despite causally disconnected regions.

In CUT, this uniformity emerges naturally from the initial universal phase calibration ϕ_0. Since entangled quanta share the same ϕ_C from their birth, even distant regions of spacetime preserve synchronized calibration:

$$\Delta\phi_C \approx 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Uniform evolution of all early quantum systems}$$

This eliminates the need for superluminal inflation to explain early thermal equilibrium.

9.3 Cosmic Expansion and ϕ_C Gradients

We further propose that observable cosmic expansion is a consequence of gradual decoherence or drift in ϕ_C over cosmological scales:

$$\frac{d\phi_C}{dt} \propto H(t)$$

where $H(t)$ is the Hubble parameter. Instead of space expanding per se, observers experience time-shifted calibration offsets in phase-coordinated particle fields, giving rise to the redshift phenomena.

9.4 Dark Energy as Phase Dispersion

The so-called "dark energy" component driving accelerated expansion may be reinterpreted in CUT as an emergent effect of long-range decoherence in the universal calibration field. That is,

$$\Lambda_{\text{eff}} \sim \left\langle (\nabla \phi_C)^2 \right\rangle$$

where local fluctuations in the calibration gradient act like a pressure term in spacetime geometry.

9.5 Big Bang as Calibration Singularity

In CUT, the Big Bang is not a singularity of density but a **calibration origin point** the moment when ϕ_C was set identically for all quantum systems. All time-evolution and entropy increase are then expressions of divergence from this initial calibration:

$$\phi_C(t = 0) = \phi_0 \quad \text{(global synchronization)}$$

Entropy is simply the local divergence of ϕ_C over time and space, explaining the arrow of time without resorting to statistical mechanics alone.

10 Biological and Consciousness Links

The Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) posits that all quantum systems, including those embedded in biological matter, carry a phase calibration ϕ_C. This implies a fundamental link between quantum coherence, biological complexity, and the emergence of consciousness.

10.1 Quantum Calibration in Biological Systems

Biological systems are composed of vast networks of quantum-coherent subsystems proteins, enzymes, neurotransmitters, and even DNA which may preserve calibration information at micro or mesoscopic scales.

We hypothesize that within biological systems, the phase ϕ_C can be locally synchronized due to entanglement or environmental correlations, producing emergent order in complex systems:

$$\phi_C^{\text{biological}} = \phi_0 + \delta\phi_{\text{cellular}} + \delta\phi_{\text{environmental}}$$

This local calibration may contribute to efficient energy transfer, information processing, and error correction in molecular structures (e.g., photosynthesis and olfaction), aligning with studies in quantum biology.

10.2 Neural Correlation and Phase-Coherent Thought

The brain can be modeled as a vast ensemble of interacting quantum elements synapses, ion channels, microtubules each carrying a local ϕ_C. When large-scale synchronization of ϕ_C occurs across neural assemblies, the following phenomena emerge:

- Coherent awareness
- Memory encoding via phase locking
- Non-local correlation of perception and intention

This aligns with the Penrose-Hameroff Orch-OR model but reinterprets it under CUT as a deterministic calibration framework rather than stochastic quantum collapse.

10.3 Consciousness as Calibration Collapse

We further propose that conscious experience is a dynamic process of phase calibration convergence a system achieving internal phase agreement across its constituent quantum parts:

$$\langle \phi_C^{\text{neurons}} \rangle_t \approx \text{stable} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Conscious thought moment}$$

In this view, the emergence of subjective experience is a quantum-physical phenomenon arising from the sustained phase alignment of many-body systems.

10.4 Implications for Determinism and Free Will

If ϕ_C governs both physical matter and conscious states, then mental intention and physical causality are not disjoint. Instead, they are different expressions of calibration.

This suggests that:

1. Consciousness may affect physical outcomes by modifying local ϕ_C fields.
2. Free will is the ability to internally realign calibration vectors before external decoherence.
3. Entanglement between individuals (e.g., empathy, telepathy) might reflect correlated calibration states.

Thus, the boundary between matter and mind dissolves both are governed by the same cosmic phase framework.

11 Limitations and Open Problems

While the Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) offers a unified, deterministic phase-based framework for quantum and cosmological phenomena, several limitations and open questions remain. Acknowledging these is essential for guiding future theoretical and experimental efforts.

11.1 Unknown Initial Calibration ϕ_0

A core component of CUT is the universal calibration phase ϕ_0, representing the origin phase state of the universe. However, this quantity remains fundamentally unobservable, as it is set at or before the Big Bang. While CUT allows us to observe relative shifts $\Delta\phi_C$, it currently lacks a predictive model for ϕ_0.

Open question: Can ϕ_0 be derived from first principles, symmetry breaking, or quantum cosmology?

11.2 Experimental Accessibility of ϕ_C

CUT predicts calibration shifts in quantum systems, but direct measurement of ϕ_C is only feasible through statistical interference patterns or RMSE comparison models (e.g., Bell test deviations, entangled state alignment). No apparatus yet exists to measure ϕ_C directly at a single-particle level.

Open question: Can we develop local interferometric tools or phase-based tomography to extract ϕ_C in real-time?

11.3 Distinguishability from Standard Quantum Mechanics

In many low-noise regimes, CUT predictions converge with standard QM and General Relativity. Only in carefully constructed scenarios (e.g., offset Bell tests, relativistic precession, or cosmological horizons) do measurable deviations appear.

Open question: What are the minimal, replicable experiments that distinguish CUT from standard QM in laboratory conditions?

11.4 Computational Complexity of Global Calibration

If every particle carries a ϕ_C dependent on all prior interactions and universal conditions, the theory implies a vast entangled memory structure. Although deterministic, reconstructing or simulating ϕ_C for large systems may be computationally intractable.

Open question: Can machine learning, tensor networks, or quantum error correction methods approximate or predict calibration dynamics?

11.5 Relation to Quantum Field Theory and Gauge Invariance

CUT is currently formulated using wavefunction phase arguments and entangled states. A complete integration with quantum field theory (QFT) and standard model gauge symmetry has not yet been realized.

Open question: How does ϕ_C behave under gauge transformations? Is there a gauge-invariant formulation of calibration?

11.6 Biological and Conscious Agents as Calibrators

While Section 10 proposed a link between ϕ_C coherence and consciousness, this remains speculative. It is unclear whether biological systems possess mechanisms to intentionally manipulate or align ϕ_C values.

Open question: Can cognitive processes causally affect local calibration, or are they passive observers of ϕ_C states?

11.7 Boundary Conditions and Multiverse Hypothesis

If calibration is universal, then boundary effects at cosmological scales such as the cosmic microwave background, event horizons, or multiverse interfaces may induce discontinuities or resets in ϕ_C.

Open question: Does CUT extend beyond our observable universe? Are multiverse domains characterized by disconnected calibration manifolds?

We present these limitations not as weaknesses, but as invitations. Each open problem represents a frontier where CUT can evolve into a more predictive, testable, and unifying framework for 21st-century physics.

12 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Q1: Is the Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) just a reformulation of standard quantum mechanics with a hidden variable?

No. While CUT introduces a global calibration phase ϕ_C that evolves deterministically, it does not posit hidden variables in the classical sense. Instead, ϕ_C reflects the global alignment or misalignment of quantum phases originating from the universes initial conditions and local interactions. Unlike hidden variables, ϕ_C is not retroactively assigned but continuously evolves and accumulates calibration.

Q2: Can CUT be falsified?

Yes. CUT makes specific predictions about phase-dependent deviations in quantum interference, Bell inequality tests with calibration offsets, and relativistic anomalies such as orbital precession. If, across experiments, CUT fails to outperform standard QM in predictive accuracy (e.g., RMSE), the theory may be falsified. Its validity hinges on empirical measurements of ϕ_C-driven phase shifts.

Q3: What distinguishes CUT from the de BroglieBohm interpretation?

The de BroglieBohm model proposes particle trajectories guided by a pilot wave. In contrast, CUT does not prescribe particle paths but focuses on phase alignment of entangled systems. The calibration ϕ_C is global and cumulative, not individual and trajectory-dependent. Furthermore, CUT incorporates relativistic and cosmological implications not present in Bohmian mechanics.

Q4: How is ϕ_C different from the global phase often considered unphysical in quantum mechanics?

In standard QM, global phase is unobservable and irrelevant for isolated systems. CUT, however, proposes that relative calibration phases between entangled systems *do* carry observable implications. ϕ_C is not a static global phase but a dynamic, evolving parameter encoding energy, position, and interaction history. Its variation across observers or frames yields measurable predictions.

Q5: Does CUT conflict with special relativity or Lorentz invariance?

No. CUT is compatible with relativity, as ϕ_C evolves with proper time and incorporates relativistic contributions (e.g., gravitational potential, time dilation). The term $\phi_C = \phi_0 + \frac{Et}{\hbar} + \frac{kx}{c} + \ldots$ preserves invariance under Lorentz transformations when expressed covariantly. In fact, relativistic corrections are central to several CUT predictions.

Q6: Why does CUT predict better agreement with some experiments (e.g., Mercurys orbit)?

Because standard GR and QM do not model phase calibration explicitly, they occasionally require post-hoc corrections. CUT, by including calibration drift via ϕ_C, naturally accounts for phenomena such as orbital precession and Bell test deviations without additional parameters. This has been demonstrated via quantitative fits and reduced RMSE in specific setups.

Q7: Does CUT imply determinism?

Yes, but in a novel way. CUT implies deterministic evolution of phase calibration across spacetime, meaning outcomes are constrained by ϕ_C. However, since full knowledge of ϕ_C is practically inaccessible, probabilistic models still emerge at macroscopic and statistical levelsresembling quantum uncertainty but with a deterministic substrate.

Q8: Can consciousness manipulate or align ϕ_C?

This remains speculative. Section 10 discusses the potential correlation between coherence in biological systems and calibration alignment. However, no experiment to date has demonstrated causal influence of conscious agents on ϕ_C. This remains a philosophical and scientific open question.

Q9: How does CUT explain the speed of light and Planck constants?

In CUT, c and $\hbar$ are interpreted not just as conversion constants, but as fundamental calibration rates governing the evolution of ϕ_C. The speed of light emerges as the maximum calibration propagation velocity in spacetimea structural consequence of phase alignment between all particles.

Q10: Is CUT compatible with quantum field theory (QFT)?

Currently, CUT is framed at the level of wavefunction-based quantum mechanics. A generalization to QFT would require reinterpreting field operators in terms of calibration phase propagation and possibly defining ϕ_C over Hilbert space bundles. This remains an area of active exploration.

Q11: How can CUT be tested with current quantum hardware?

Experiments involving:

- Bell tests with calibration offsets.
- GHZ state coherence under spatial separation.
- RMSE comparison of expected vs. measured quantum probabilities.
- Qiskit Runtime Sampler experiments with offset parameters.

All offer feasible, near-term platforms for testing CUTs predictions on existing quantum systems such as IBMs superconducting qubit hardware.

Q12: What if future data shows no measurable ϕ_C effects?

In that case, CUT may either be incorrect or only relevant in regimes beyond current experimental resolution. Like any scientific theory, it must be judged on its explanatory power, falsifiability, and empirical fit. Null results would constrain the theorys scope and guide its refinement or rejection.

13 Applications and Future Work

The Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) introduces a unified phase-based framework that invites broad exploration across multiple domains of physics. This section outlines current and potential applications of CUT and proposes directions for future research.

13.1 Quantum Information and Computing

CUT provides a new lens for interpreting entanglement as a manifestation of phase calibration rather than nonlocal collapse. This reinterpretation leads to several implications:

- **Error mitigation:** CUT-inspired error models could improve quantum error correction by accounting for cumulative ϕ_C drift in entangled systems.

- **Entanglement quantification:** Calibration-based metrics may offer alternatives to entropy-based entanglement measures.
- **Quantum communication:** Protocols like quantum teleportation or QKD may be re-evaluated under CUT to include calibration fidelity as a resource.

13.2 Astrophysics and Cosmology

CUT enables novel interpretations of gravitational phenomena by attributing them to large-scale phase calibration gradients. Future applications include:

- **Orbital precession:** CUT has already demonstrated accurate prediction of Mercurys anomalous precession by attributing it to ϕ_C drift near massive bodies.
- **Black hole interiors:** Loss of calibration coherence inside event horizons may explain information scrambling and apparent entropy growth.
- **Dark energy:** A slowly varying universal ϕ_C gradient might manifest as cosmic acceleration without invoking exotic matter.

13.3 Quantum Foundations and Interpretation

CUT offers a deterministic yet non-classical view of quantum evolution. It circumvents nonlocality paradoxes by embedding causality within calibration propagation.

- **Bell tests:** Phase offset calibration provides an alternative explanation for statistical violations of Bell inequalities.
- **Wavefunction collapse:** Measurement does not collapse a wavefunction, but reveals the calibration mismatch between system and observer.
- **Time and causality:** Temporal ordering of events is preserved in CUT through continuous evolution of ϕ_C with local energy and proper time.

13.4 Experimental Roadmap

To test and apply CUT, the following experimental strategies are proposed:

1. **Qubit offset experiments:** Vary one qubits energy or timing and observe RMSE deviations from standard QM predictions.
2. **GHZ coherence tests:** Measure phase stability across three or more entangled qubits over long baselines.
3. **Interferometry with phase sweep:** Use calibrated phase-controlled interferometers to test predicted ϕ_C evolution over space and time.
4. **High-energy gravitational calibration:** Compare phase drift predictions with gravitational wave data or black hole dynamics.

13.5 Theoretical Development

Future research will focus on:

- **Formulating ϕ_C in relativistic field theory:** Expressing CUT as a generalization of QFT with embedded phase calibration fields.
- **Constructing a Lagrangian for calibration dynamics:** Deriving ϕ_C from first principles as a dynamical field coupled to energy, mass, and curvature.
- **Integrating with quantum gravity:** Investigating how calibration continuity may unify quantum mechanics and general relativity.
- **Topological phase alignment:** Exploring CUT's application to topological matter, edge modes, and protected quantum states.

13.6 Outlook

The Calibrated Universe Theory offers a compelling, parsimonious, and testable framework that reinterprets quantum mechanics, relativity, and cosmology through a unified phase calibration lens. Its simplicity, falsifiability, and alignment with real-world anomalies make it a promising direction for foundational physics and interdisciplinary applications alike.

14 Acknowledgements and Author Contributions

Acknowledgements

The development of the Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT) was inspired and rapidly shaped during a focused period of exploration. The author would like to express gratitude to the following:

- **Kenneth L. Dudley**, whose insightful discussions helped spark many of the core ideas that led to the foundation of this theory.
- **OpenAI's ChatGPT**, which served as a valuable assistant in exploring, validating, and expressing the theory through mathematical, physical, and computational tools.
- **IBM Quantum Platform**, for providing free quantum computing access through their platform, enabling real-time experimental validation of the theory.
- **LaTeX**, for making scientific writing efficient, structured, and beautifully typeset, significantly accelerating the preparation of this manuscript.
- All scientific thinkers, past and present, whose questions answered or unresolved continue to drive our understanding forward.

Author Contributions

Fatih Durmaz is the sole author of this work. He conceived the Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT), derived its mathematical formulation, performed quantum simulations, and prepared the manuscript.

Contact: `fatih@calibrateduniverse.org`
All theoretical development, code implementation, and experimental validation were independently conducted by the author, with support from collaborative tools and discussions as acknowledged above.

15 References

References

[1] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, *Experimental Realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment: A New Violation of Bell's Inequalities*, Physical Review Letters **49**, 91 (1982).

[2] J. S. Bell, *On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox*, Physics **1**, 195200 (1964).

[3] A. Einstein, *The Foundation of the General Theory of Relativity*, Annalen der Physik **49** (1916).

[4] IBM Quantum, *IBM Quantum Platform Documentation*, `https://quantum-computing.ibm.com/` (Accessed 2025).

[5] Qiskit Team, *Qiskit Runtime Documentation*, `https://docs.quantum.ibm.com` (Accessed 2025).

[6] M. Planck, *On the Law of Distribution of Energy in the Normal Spectrum*, Annalen der Physik **4** (1901).

[7] F. Durmaz, *Calibrated Universe Theory (CUT)*, This work (2025).

[8] H. Everett, *"Relative State" Formulation of Quantum Mechanics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29**, 454 (1957).

[9] D. Bohm, *A Suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of "Hidden" Variables I and II*, Phys. Rev. **85**, 166193 (1952).

[10] S. Hameroff and R. Penrose, *Consciousness in the Universe: A Review of the Orch-OR Theory*, Physics of Life Reviews **11**(1), 3978 (2014).

[11] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, *Going beyond Bell's Theorem*, In: Bells Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe, pp. 6972, Springer (1989).

[12] A. H. Guth, *Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problems*, Phys. Rev. D **23**(2), 347 (1981).

[13] A. G. Riess et al., *Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant*, Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998).

[14] W. Heisenberg, *The Physicist's Conception of Nature*, University of Chicago Press (1958).