

Consciousness-Centered Ontology of Relational Quantum Dynamics (RQD)

Arash Zaghi¹

Abstract: This paper presents Relational Quantum Dynamics (RQD), a paradigm that re-envision quantum theory and its interplay with spacetime, observers, and consciousness. Abandoning the notion of a preexisting universe or fixed manifold, RQD posits that observers, observed systems, and geometric structures emerge together as stable relational patterns in an underlying quantum substrate. Spacetime is thus recast as an effective, large-scale feature of entanglement and information flows rather than a fundamental stage. By eliminating pre-given observers and absolute properties, RQD unifies relational quantum mechanics, insights from holography and tensor networks, and non-dual philosophical traditions into a single idealist framework. Here, universal awareness is not an added element but the ontological ground, ensuring that subjective experience and physical reality co-derive from the same relational field. This approach not only demystifies the “hard problem” of consciousness—making it intrinsic rather than emergent—but also resolves longstanding quantum puzzles, such as Wigner’s friend and Frauchiger–Renner scenarios, by showing that no absolute vantage point or objective collapse is required. In harmonizing quantum theory, emergent geometry, and a fundamental awareness-based ontology, RQD reveals that quantum mechanics, gravity, and consciousness are facets of a single, integrated reality.

Keywords: Non-dual Idealism, Spacetime, Quantum Relationality, , Hard Problem of Consciousness, Quantum Gravity, Entanglement Geometry, Nonlocality, Holographic Codes, Measurement Problem

Introduction

What if, instead of assuming matter and spacetime as fundamental, we start with awareness itself as the primary “stuff” of reality—could this radically shift our understanding of quantum mechanics and its elusive link to consciousness?

¹ Professor, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, arash.esmaili_zaghi@uconn.edu

The quest to reconcile quantum mechanics with general relativity remains a central, unresolved challenge in modern theoretical physics. Conventional efforts, including canonical quantization programs (DeWitt 1967; Kuchař 2011; Rovelli 2004), string theory and its associated dualities (Green, Schwarz, & Witten 2012; Polchinski 1998; Maldacena 1999), as well as loop quantum gravity (Rovelli 2004; Thiemann 2007), typically struggle with profound conceptual and philosophical puzzles. Chief among these puzzles are the interpretation of quantum measurement, the origin and nature of spacetime, and the problem of time in quantum gravity (Isham 1993; Anderson 2017). While these frameworks have supplied a rich spectrum of technical results, the tension at their conceptual cores suggests that the issue may lie not merely in technical apparatus but in the foundational assumptions themselves—particularly the presupposition of a preexisting spacetime or an external, absolute vantage point.

Quantum mechanics has long challenged classical notions of realism and observer independence. Standard interpretations from the Copenhagen viewpoint (Bohr 1935; Heisenberg 1925) to Many-Worlds (Everett 1957; Vaidman 2018) and Bohmian mechanics (Bohm 1952) have struggled to internalize the quantum principles without residual conceptual discomfort. More recent interpretations such as QBism (Fuchs 2002; Fuchs & Schack 2013) and Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM) (Rovelli 1996; Dorato 2013) go further, discarding the idea of a universal wavefunction as a stand-alone descriptor of reality and emphasizing observer-dependent states or relational correlations. RQM, in particular, shifts the emphasis onto relationships between physical systems, suggesting that properties—such as the outcome of a measurement—are only defined relative to another system (Rovelli 1996; Van Raamsdonk 2010). Yet even RQM, despite its elegant relational stance, often presupposes some baseline notion of systems and observers as given and implicitly place them within a conceptual setting where they preexist the relational description.

In parallel, attempts to understand nonlocality and contextuality have highlighted that quantum correlations transcend classical conceptions of locality and realism (Einstein, Podolsky, & Rosen 1935; Bell 1964; Maudlin 2011). Nonlocal phenomena have led to interpretive dilemmas evident in thought experiments like the Frauchiger–Renner scenario (Frauchiger & Renner 2018), which demonstrates the inability of certain consistent single-world narratives to hold up under universal unitary evolution. The complexity and subtlety of these no-go results suggest that the stumbling block may be the deeply ingrained assumption of a privileged perspective or a definite background structure—be it a classical observer, a universal wavefunction, or a fixed manifold.

Relational Quantum Dynamics (RQD) arises out of the recognition that radical conceptual restructuring is needed. Building on the relational ethos of RQM and integrating insights from holographic dualities (Maldacena 1999; Ryu & Takayanagi 2006), tensor network models of emergent geometry (Swingle 2012; Pastawski et al. 2015), and quantum information theoretic reconstructions of quantum theory (Hardy 2001; Chiribella, D’Ariano & Perinotti 2011), RQD proposes a paradigm that dispenses not only with a background spacetime but also with the predefinition of observer and observed. Instead, it posits that spacetime, fields, and observers themselves emerge as stable relational configurations within a quantum informational substrate, suggesting a profound ontological shift. In this view, neither systems nor their properties stand independently; they materialize contextually at discrete events governed by relational correlations. This move echoes certain non-dual and idealist philosophical traditions, where

fundamental awareness or a universal cognitive substrate is primary, and what we perceive as objects, systems, or even observers are facets of this underlying unity (Loy 1988; Strawson 2006; Kastrup 2017).

Adopting an idealist grounding within RQD is not a philosophical adornment, but a recognition that the fundamental nature of reality cannot be reduced to non-experiential substrates. In standard interpretations, consciousness remains a separate, unexplained phenomenon; here, its so-called “hard problem” (Chalmers 1995) becomes integral rather than peripheral. Instead of positing that quantum states “have” awareness or consciousness as a secondary attribute, RQD treats awareness as the ontological bedrock from which all relational differentiations arise. The universal relational substrate is not a field onto which awareness is appended; it is intrinsically constituted by awareness. Classical observers, quantum systems, and the physical world as we know it emerge as patterns within this primordial experiential continuum, not as entities layered atop a non-conscious foundation. Unlike QBism, where states reflect an agent’s personal credences, or Healey’s pragmatism, which anchors quantum content in an observer’s perspective (Healey 2012), RQD idealism acknowledges awareness as reality’s fundamental character rather than an acquired property. This shift dissolves the conceptual chasm that materialist models fail to bridge and offer a unified ontology in which the subjective and the physical co-arise from a reality that is awareness through and through.

Admittedly, this proposal is radical. It reframes the explanatory scope of quantum theory, shifting it from a tool describing observer-independent events in space and time to a formalism that encodes how relational awareness structures itself into stable classical appearances. But history has shown that quantum theory consistently overturns classical intuitions, demanding conceptual expansions that once seemed unthinkable (Wheeler & Zurek 1986; Wheeler 1990). Given the persistent impasses—philosophical conundrums in measurement theory, difficulties in merging quantum and gravitational principles, and the unresolved nature of consciousness—such a radical approach is not merely a philosophical curiosity. It is a plausible next step in exploring what quantum mechanics is telling us about the nature of reality.

This paper presents the conceptual architecture of RQD and demonstrate how quantum events, relational correlations, and an idealist, awareness-based ontology align into a unified paradigm. By systematically examining RQM, Many-Worlds, QBism, and other prominent approaches, we show that each retains subtle classical assumptions that obstruct a fully relational, vantage-point-free understanding of quantum reality. Through the lens of RQD, puzzles like nonlocal correlations and Frauchiger–Renner scenarios lose their paradoxical edge and become natural expressions of a world that admits no absolute observer or pre-given structure. In culminating this analysis with an idealist non-dual perspective, it establishes that awareness is not an added feature but the very core of the universal relational substrate. This reconceptualization offers a powerful avenue to approach the hard problem of consciousness—an integration that neither physicalist nor agent-centric interpretations have achieved—thereby forging a coherent and expansive vision of quantum mechanics, gravity, and subjective experience.

This synthesis of quantum foundations, emergent gravitational principles, and a non-dual idealist ontology constitutes more than a speculative footnote; it signals a potential reconceptualization of the deepest layers of reality. Much as the holographic paradigm transformed our view of

spacetime, revealing geometry as a manifestation of underlying quantum entanglement patterns (Ryu & Takayanagi 2006; Van Raamsdonk 2010), RQD's fundamental awareness-based framework may similarly reframe the measurement problem and the nature of consciousness, not as unrelated puzzles but as facets of a single relational paradigm. In an intellectual landscape where attempts to unify quantum mechanics with gravity and to account for subjective experience have consistently faltered under conventional assumptions, RQD's radical stance offers a new set of conceptual tools and ontological commitments. Whether embraced or contested, these ideas demand serious engagement, for they speak directly to the core challenges that continue to elude standard approaches.

1. Main Ideas

1.1. The Ontology of Events and the Nature of Physical Variables

Relational Quantum Dynamics (RQD) reorients the foundational perspective of quantum theory away from fixed entities with preexisting attributes. Instead of viewing reality as populated by objects possessing definite properties, or conceiving of a universal wavefunction ψ encoding a self-sufficient world, RQD locates the fundamental building blocks of reality in discrete quantum events. These events are not simply points where one autonomous system imparts a value to another; they are the very junctures at which what we conventionally call "systems" and "properties" coemerge from a more basic relational substrate. In other words, the existence and meaning of a variable, as well as the identity of what we call a "system," arise together at each event, without presupposing a dualism between an observing entity and an observed phenomenon.

Classical mechanics assumes that every variable characterizing a system, such as position or momentum, is well-defined at all times, allowing a continuous trajectory through an underlying phase space (Landau & Lifshitz 1960). Early quantum theory (Heisenberg 1925; Kochen & Specker 1975), however, shattered this picture by demonstrating that properties like position or spin lack definite values until they are brought into relational focus. RQD fully embraces this foundational shift. Instead of thinking of variables as hidden attributes waiting to be revealed, RQD treats them as relational actualizations: the notion of a property only attains operational and conceptual coherence at discrete events where relational patterns settle into stable correlations. It is in these events that both "what is measured" and "who does the measuring" find their origin, making talk of preexisting observers or targets inappropriate. No system stands apart, pre-configured; "systemhood" itself emerges when relational correlations crystallize into an event's definitive outcome.

This approach echoes the early motivations behind quantum mechanics, which recognized that many classical questions—such as simultaneously asking for precise position and momentum—lack meaning prior to their relational specification (Mermin 1990). The RQD perspective clarifies that it is not a question of adding new postulates to quantum theory, but of reinterpreting it such that the well-definedness of a variable is not assumed *ab initio*. Instead, well-definedness is established in the relational structure of the event, thus acknowledging what quantum theory has implied all along: reality is not built upon absolute states inhabiting a background stage, but upon relational events that define, instantiate, and stabilize the conditions we attribute to systems.

In standard interpretations, measurement apparatuses or classical observers are invoked as external anchors that endow quantum variables with definite values. By contrast, RQD rejects the necessity of a privileged measuring device or conscious agent. From subatomic interactions to molecular scattering processes, any event that stabilizes a relational pattern is sufficient. This eliminates any anthropocentric bias and dispenses with a strict quantum-classical boundary, consistently describing all domains—micro and macro, animate and inanimate—within a single relational ontology. The coherence and stability of larger-scale “classical” patterns merely reflect networks of relational events that yield robust correlations across vast complexes of degrees of freedom, rather than resting on an assumed split between observer and observed.

1.2. From Intrinsic Attributes to Relational Correlates

Classical mechanics acknowledges that certain quantities, such as velocity, are inherently relational: speed makes no sense without a reference frame (Landau & Lifshitz 1960). However, it still treats many other properties as absolute attributes of systems. RQD extends this relational principle to all quantum variables. In RQD, no physical property—whether position, spin, energy, or polarization—stands as an intrinsic feature that a system “has” on its own. Instead, properties become well-defined only through relational events that establish correlations between what we call “systems.” These events do not presuppose fixed boundaries or pre-labeled observers; they delineate what counts as a system and what counts as a property as part of the same relational process.

Earlier relational formulations, notably Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM) (Rovelli 1996), acknowledged that quantum states and outcomes depend on the perspective of an observer-system pair. Yet RQM and similar interpretations often assume systems or observers as given starting points. RQD makes no such concession. Instead of placing relationality atop a pre-existing landscape of well-defined entities, RQD sees relationality as constitutive from the start. The very distinction between “observer” and “observed” is not a prior condition but an emergent feature of stable relational configurations. This shift is not a subtle philosophical tweak: by erasing any residual assumption of absolute backgrounds or predefined systems, RQD directly tackles conceptual puzzles like nonlocality and contextuality (Bell 1964; Kochen & Specker 1975). The so-called paradoxes that arise in conventional views—such as concerns about “spooky” correlations or frame-dependent contextual outcomes—cease to be paradoxical once we recognize that neither properties nor perspectives exist outside of the relational web that brings them into being.

Crucially, this relational stance does not reduce quantum physics to observer-centric subjectivism. The notion of “relative to” does not hinge on conscious agents. A measuring apparatus, a field mode, or a cluster of atoms can serve as the relational reference that bestows meaning on a quantum property. In this sense, RQD’s relational ontology aligns with broader relational and structural ontologies proposed in contemporary metaphysics (Ladyman & Ross 2007; Candiotta 2017). These approaches replace object-based worldviews with frameworks where relational patterns have ontological priority. The point is not that properties belong to observers or that all is mind-dependent, but that what we call properties and systems emerge co-dependently within relational events. This recognition removes the last vestiges of absolute reference frames and sets the stage for a quantum theory liberated from classical baggage.

1.3. Rethinking Measurement and Observers as Emergent Features

Standard interpretations of quantum theory frequently begin by presupposing a classical measurement apparatus or an observer whose role is somehow external to the quantum description. Even those approaches aiming to transcend the simplistic observer-system duality often appeal to external criteria—such as large-scale environments or irreversible dynamics—to define when “measurement” occurs (Zurek 2006; Joos et al. 2003). RQD dispenses with these auxiliary constructs. Rather than treating measurement as a fundamental process or introducing it through supplementary postulates, RQD identifies measurement events as nothing more than relational actualizations of properties. The existence of a stable outcome is not contingent on the presence of a human observer or a macroscopic measuring device; it arises whenever a relational configuration stabilizes a particular variable’s value.

This perspective entails that the distinction between “measured system” and “measuring apparatus” does not precede the relational event. Instead, these roles coemerge as aspects of the same relational pattern. Any event that yields a well-defined outcome—be it the scattering of a photon off an atom or the formation of a stable, decohered pointer state in a complex molecule—can be understood as a measurement within RQD. The concept of “observer” emerges as a special class of relational configurations that maintain internal coherence, predictability, and structural stability across multiple events. Such “observers” require no additional axioms or anthropocentric elements; their observational reliability is grounded in the relational structure itself.

Viewed through this lens, classicality—the impression that macroscopic objects possess definite properties independent of observation—is not a separate domain requiring new assumptions. Instead, classicality represents a stable relational regime in which certain degrees of freedom become effectively autonomous and robust against environmental perturbations (Zurek 2003; Schlosshauer 2007). What conventional interpretations often label as a “measurement device” is, in RQD, simply a system that has acquired a stable relational identity, enabling it to serve as a reference frame for subsequent events. The consistency of outcomes associated with such systems mirrors the logic of consistent histories approaches (Gell-Mann & Hartle 2023) and decoherence theory, yet RQD achieves this alignment without positing a fundamental split between quantum and classical realms.

By recognizing that no external vantage point or presupposed observer is needed, RQD shows that the appearance of measurement and the role of observers arise naturally from the relational tapestry. This realization liberates quantum theory from lingering classical metaphors. No supplementary criteria for measurement—like apparatus size, irreversibility, or conscious oversight—are necessary. The theory’s standard mathematical framework suffices once we adopt the relational stance, revealing that what we have been calling “measurement” and “observer” are not primordial categories but emergent, stable nodes in the relational web of quantum reality.

1.4. Rethinking the Quantum State as a Relational Code

In the interpretive landscape of quantum mechanics, the wavefunction ψ often becomes a focal point of contention. Some approaches, like the Many-Worlds interpretation, treat ψ as a physically real field defined over a high-dimensional configuration space, effectively making it the ontic backbone of the entire universe (Everett 1957; Vaidman 2018). Others, such as QBism,

view ψ as an agent's personal degree-of-belief assignment, stripping it of ontic significance and relocating its meaning into subjective informational states (Fuchs & Schack 2013). Still others, like Bohmian mechanics, enrich ψ with hidden variables to restore a classical-like realism (Bohm 1952). Each of these positions grapples with ψ as if it must be either ontically real or purely epistemic—an exclusive dichotomy that has led to well-known no-go theorems aimed at clarifying the wavefunction's ontological status (Pusey, Barrett & Rudolph 2012).

RQD proposes a different route. Rather than weighing ψ down with the demand to be a fundamental entity or dismissing it as a mere psychological construct, RQD treats the quantum state as a relational code—a predictive instrument that arises from and is defined by relational events. Under RQD, ψ is not the bedrock of ontology. It does not represent a self-sufficient world waiting to be measured, nor does it merely reflect subjective judgments. Instead, it encodes how future relational events are probabilistically constrained by the current network of correlations. Its form is thus not a fingerprint of an underlying concrete reality, but a high-level tool that reveals which relational configurations can arise from those already established.

In this sense, ψ plays a role akin to the Hamilton-Jacobi functional in classical mechanics: a powerful mathematical device for extracting predictions about possible trajectories without itself being granted ontological prominence (Landau & Lifshitz 1960). The inability of ψ to produce a single, definite trajectory should not be seen as a shortcoming. Rather, it underscores that no absolute trajectory exists, only discrete relational events that instantiate properties at particular junctures. The event-driven nature of RQD means “collapse” is not a fundamental dynamical process. Instead, what we call collapse is simply a recalibration of relational information when a new event emerges and the relational configuration updates.

This approach deftly bypasses the complexities introduced by attempts to declare ψ as either fully real or purely subjective. It also sidesteps well-known no-go arguments that assume strong ontic or epistemic positions about the wavefunction (Pusey, Barrett & Rudolph 2012). By adopting a relational vantage point, RQD frees us from these binary oppositions. The quantum state remains essential as a predictive device, but it never hardens into a metaphysically independent entity. In doing so, RQD simplifies the conceptual landscape. The wavefunction is a code for how relational structures can evolve, not a blueprint of hidden realities or an arbitrary invention of human thought. This relational reframing not only resolves interpretive tensions but also affirms quantum theory's internal consistency once divorced from assumptions of absolute, pre-given states.

1.5. Superposition: The Cat, Decoherence, and Relational Stabilization

Schrödinger's original thought experiment featuring a cat seemingly suspended between life and death (Schrödinger 1935) has long served as a benchmark for testing the boundaries of quantum theory when applied to macroscopic objects. Under standard interpretations, it is puzzling why everyday experience yields no evidence of such bizarre superpositions. RQD resolves this puzzle by denying that there is any absolute, observer-independent state of the cat to begin with. Instead, states are defined relationally: the cat's “being alive” or “being dead” are not intrinsic attributes waiting to be revealed, but outcomes that become definite within stable networks of relational correlations. The cat's internal physiology—its cells, neural signals, and metabolic processes—acts like a vast array of environmental degrees of freedom that continuously entangle with and

measure its internal conditions. These internal correlations function as a hierarchy of relational vantage points that shape a pointer basis of stable states that exclude coherent superpositions of macroscopically distinct outcomes. By the time an external observer attempts to examine the cat, these stable relational structures ensure that the cat is never encountered in a half-dead/half-alive configuration.

The explanatory strength of RQD's perspective emerges clearly when viewed through the lens of decoherence theory (Zurek 2006; Joos et al. 2003; Schlosshauer 2007; Zurek 2003). Decoherence studies how environmental interactions effectively "measure" quantum systems, selecting stable pointer states and suppressing interference terms. For a macroscopic object like a cat, the environment includes not only external surroundings—photons, air molecules, laboratory apparatus—but also the cat's internal biology. Each of these myriad interactions can be treated as a measurement-like event that correlates certain degrees of freedom with the environment, rapidly destroying any fragile quantum coherence between macroscopically distinct states such as "alive" and "dead." Under RQD, this network of relational interactions naturally enforces classicality at the macroscopic level. The definitional grounding of properties within relational contexts explains why no further collapse postulate or absolute vantage point is needed. The illusion of a fixed, classical state at all times arises from the aggregate effect of stable relational records rather than from any physical collapse or global observer.

Because large-scale coherence is prohibitively difficult to maintain, efforts to detect superpositions at macroscopic scales would fail for reasons analogous to those preventing the observation of interference patterns with complex objects (Arndt et al. 1999). Realistic attempts to isolate and maintain a macroscopic superposition face insurmountable practical challenges. Under RQD, these challenges reflect structural principles rather than contingent technicalities: the relational web of correlations that defines each macroscopic entity simply does not allow stable, observable superpositions of distinct classical outcomes. From this viewpoint, Schrödinger's cat scenario ceases to be paradoxical. There is no hidden absolute narrative in which the cat is simultaneously dead and alive. Instead, within every physically implementable relational context—from the cat's internal physiology to an external scientist's measurement device—consistent classical outcomes emerge and remain stable. The absence of macroscopic superpositions is not a failure of RQD to represent reality but a testament to the relational and emergent nature of classicality itself.

2. Comparison of RQD with Other Interpretations

A central challenge in quantum theory is the tension between genuinely quantum principles and the lingering reliance on classical concepts. Standard interpretations often attempt to resolve this tension by introducing assumptions—such as fixed observers, well-defined initial conditions, or a universal wavefunction—intended to secure intuitive narratives. RQD abandons these crutches and shows that many interpretive puzzles result precisely from presupposing what must be derived. By exploring how RQD contrasts with other mainstream approaches, we clarify not only RQD's distinctive stance but also the hidden assumptions that impede progress in more conventional interpretations.

2.1. Beyond External Observers and Pre-Set Boundaries of the Copenhagen Legacy

Classical textbook interpretations and Copenhagen-like approaches (Bohr 1935; Heisenberg 1925) enshrine the idea that the measurement problem is resolved by stipulating a clear-cut frontier between a quantum system and a pre-existing classical apparatus or observer. While refinements involving decoherence and consistent histories (Joos et al. 2003; Gell-Mann & Hartle 2023) attempt to soften the quantum-classical boundary, they nevertheless accept that such a boundary must exist from the start. This predefinition leaves a subtle dualism intact: the world is still partitioned into “quantum” and “classical” domains in a way that depends on what we introduce by hand.

RQD transforms this picture. Instead of starting with a classical backdrop, RQD shows that classicality and observers emerge as stable relational regimes. No absolute vantage point, external apparatus, or classical context is needed a priori. The contrast is profound: whereas Copenhagen-like interpretations treat the observer as conceptually fundamental, RQD derives the notion of an observer from the relational interplay of quantum events. This shift dissolves the last remnants of external classical scaffolding, delivering a more intrinsically quantum explanation of why classicality and observers appear consistent without inserting them by fiat.

2.2. Moving Beyond Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM)

Relational Quantum Mechanics (Rovelli 1996) laid essential groundwork by insisting that physical states and outcomes are meaningful only relative to a reference system. Yet RQM often keeps a subtle residue of assumed systems or observers: it says the value of a variable is relational but does not fully explain where the observer-system division comes from. In other words, RQM acknowledges relationality of properties but begins with distinguishable entities—observers and systems—to which those properties relate.

RQD, by contrast, insists that even these categories are not primitive. The existence of a “system” or an “observer” is no more fundamental than the event through which their relational roles crystallize. In RQD’s worldview, observers and observed systems coemerge as relational patterns gain stability and redundancy. Thus, while RQM points in the right direction, RQD follows through radically: no duality between observer and observed lingers. The outcome is not just a tweak to RQM’s relational stance but a complete erasure of any vestigial absolute reference frames or entities that predate relational structure. This extension resonates with philosophical arguments that urge a more radical relational ontology, beyond what RQM typically envisions.

2.3. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI): Unitary Evolution Without the Excess Worlds

Everett’s Many-Worlds Interpretation (Everett 1957; Vaidman 2018) removes collapse and treats the universal wavefunction as the fundamental reality, branching into multiple “worlds” to account for measurement outcomes. Although both MWI and RQD reject wavefunction collapse and emphasize unitary evolution, their ontological commitments diverge. MWI posits a universal, ontic wavefunction—an enormous structure in configuration space that spawns myriad non-communicating branches. This multiplication of worlds is theoretically consistent but metaphysically lavish, and it struggles to retrieve probabilities and the appearance of a single outcome without additional, often intricate, measures (Wallace 2012).

RQD avoids these complications by not starting with a universal wavefunction as a physically real object. Instead, quantum states are relational codes, not standalone entities. Without the requirement of global realism for the wavefunction, RQD neatly sidesteps the challenge of a proliferating multiverse. Interpreting the quantum formalism as describing relational patterns rather than global ontology, RQD yields effective classicality and probabilistic outcomes naturally, rather than grafting on extra interpretive machinery. It is, in a sense, Everett's insight liberated from the need to reify the universal state as a giant wavefunction out of which worlds blossom.

2.4. Real Trajectories and Their Costs of Hidden Variable Theories

Bohmian mechanics (Bohm 1952) and other hidden variable theories restore determinism and realism by positing an underlying set of actual trajectories guided by a pilot wave. While conceptually transparent, such theories pay a price: nonlocality is explicit and requires delicate configurations of unobservable parameters. Their appeal lies in reestablishing a familiar classical narrative, but this narrative comes at the cost of a more complex ontology and a tension with well-known no-go theorems (Pienaar 2021).

RQD does not attempt to smuggle back classical realism. Instead, it accepts quantum theory's nonlocal and contextual character, showing that the confusion arises only if one demands absolute perspectives. In a relational world, "weirdness" dissipates when we recognize that what appears nonlocal or contextual is simply the manifestation of no pre-given vantage point. Thus, RQD chooses parsimony over the comfort of hidden trajectories. It embraces quantum correlations as foundational features of a relational reality, rather than trying to reduce them to a concealed classical substrate.

2.5. Physical Collapse Theories: Extra Dynamics vs. Emergent Stability

Objective collapse models like GRW or CSL (Ghirardi et al. 1986; Pearle 1989) introduce additional stochastic or nonlinear terms to force wavefunction collapse. This strategy aims to explain definite outcomes by making collapse a genuine physical process. While testable in principle, these models complicate the theory's simplicity and predictive elegance by adding unverified new physics.

RQD obviates the need for such complications. The appearance of definite outcomes emerges from relational structures that stabilize particular correlations without postulating any extra dynamics. Here, what other interpretations call "collapse" is not a physical blow to the wavefunction but a relational realization of an event. The framework's relational nature ensures that definite outcomes arise where and when the relational web supports them, not by virtue of an ad hoc dynamical switch. This preserves quantum theory's mathematical framework while providing conceptual clarity.

2.6. Emergence of Agents and Geometries and Information-Theoretic Reconstructions

Information-theoretic reconstructions (Zeilinger 1999; Brukner & Zeilinger 2003; Chiribella et al. 2011) try to derive quantum theory from principles about information, measurement, and inference. Though elegant, these approaches often retain an implicit agent who encodes or processes information. They rarely address how such agents or stable systems capable of storing and manipulating information arise from underlying quantum correlations. Moreover, while they

unveil quantum mechanics as a theory of information, they typically leave spacetime structure and classical reality as separate issues.

RQD fills these gaps by showing that the relational substrate can generate not only the informational rules underlying quantum theory but also the conditions for the emergence of well-defined agents and classical environments. Even spacetime geometry can emerge from relational entanglement patterns (Ryu & Takayanagi 2006) as discussed in later sections. Thus, RQD extends the informational viewpoint: “information” itself is no longer an abstract commodity held by predefined observers, but an emergent concept tied to stable relational networks, from which both agents and geometric backgrounds come forth.

2.7. Beyond Fixed Observers and Coordinate Systems

Recent work on quantum reference frames (Giacomini, Castro-Ruiz & Brukner 2019) shows that even the notion of a “coordinate system” can be treated as a quantum degree of freedom subject to superposition and entanglement. This formalism provides a rigorous operational footing for the relational stance: rather than presupposing fixed observers and absolute coordinate systems, the theory allows us to move coherently between different quantum reference frames via unitary transformations. In doing so, it makes explicit that properties like position, momentum, and even the identity of what constitutes the “observer” or the “system” are not absolute primitives but arise contextually.

In RQD, this quantum reference frame perspective strengthens the core relational principle. Since no vantage point is privileged, each observer’s framework is just one among many possible relational descriptions, all interrelated through transformations that preserve the theory’s predictive content. Definite outcomes, stable agents, and classical worlds become nothing more than the robust, relationally invariant structures persisting across these frame changes. As a result, what appears as a fixed coordinate system or a well-defined observer emerges from a deeper tapestry of quantum correlations, where “reference frame” is itself an artifact of relational complexity rather than a fundamental given.

Quantum reference frames show how the relational architecture of RQD can incorporate and transcend ordinary notions of measurement settings and observer roles. The consistent transition among different QRFs underpins the claim that classical observers, geometries, and stable environments are emergent manifestations of a universal relational substrate—thereby reinforcing RQD’s vision of a world without absolute frames, intrinsic properties, or strictly external agents.

2.8. Wheeler’s “It from Bit”: Recasting the Ontology through Information

John Wheeler’s famous maxim, “It from Bit,” posits that the ultimate bedrock of reality is not matter or fields, but information (Wheeler 1990; Wheeler & Zurek 1983). In Wheeler’s vision, the seemingly solid “it” (the world of tangible objects and processes) emerges from acts of “bit” (the acquisition of discrete yes/no answers), implying that quantum measurement is not simply a technical detail but a fundamental feature that gives rise to all observed phenomena.

RQD aligns with Wheeler’s intuition that “information” is fundamental, but it reframes the starting point. Rather than positing discrete bits of information arising from external observers performing measurements, RQD grounds the concept of information in the relational substrate itself. In RQD, what we call “information” emerges only once relational events stabilize into configurations that can be interpreted as well-defined outcomes. This approach maintains Wheeler’s spirit—reality’s structures crystallize from something akin to “information”—but it refuses to treat information as either observer-dependent or preexisting in isolation. Instead, information is relational: it is the content encoded in the mutual constraints among events, the “bit” that only materializes when relational patterns assume stable forms that later appear as classical facts.

By doing so, RQD offers a pathway to understand Wheeler’s “It from Bit” without falling back into an anthropocentric or dualistic stance. If the universe is a relational network of quantum events, then “bit” is not something that preexists “it,” but a concept that emerges once a stable regime of relational configurations appears. In other words, RQD’s relational ontology ensures that no side of the “It/Bit” duality is fundamental by itself; both coemerge from the relational milieu that Wheeler’s intuition points towards.

2.9. Revisiting QBism by Moving from Subjective Agents to Emergent Observers

QBism reduces the wavefunction to an agent’s Bayesian belief state, placing subjectivity at the heart of quantum interpretation (Fuchs & Schack 2013). Though QBism admirably rejects absolute states, it still centers on an agent with well-defined beliefs, effectively making “the agent” a primitive element.

RQD adopts relational reasoning more radically. Observers or agents in RQD are not fundamental postulates. They appear as robust modes of relational stability, not as essential starting points. Unlike QBism, RQD does not treat subjectivity as an axiom but derives what we call “the observer perspective” from the relational substrate. This approach provides a more naturalistic picture where the emergence of agents and their informational states follows from relational configurations, rather than becoming a foundational given.

2.10. Incorporating Perspectives of Healey’s Pragmatism Without Fundamental Agents

Healey’s pragmatist interpretation (Healey 2012; 2017) frames quantum states as tools for agents to generate probabilities about future experiences, sidestepping representational realism. While this is a clever strategy, it still privileges an existing agent or perspective. This leaves the question: where do these perspectives come from, and why do they hold stable, non-contradictory views of quantum phenomena?

RQD addresses this more fundamental challenge. Perspective-taking—assigning states, making predictions—emerges as systems coalesce into stable relational nodes. No agent is required to be basic; agency and perspective are late developments within a relational cosmos. Thus, RQD not only absorbs Healey’s pragmatism but pushes it into a more foundational domain, showing that agent-like perspectives are themselves explainable outcomes of relational evolution, not ontological starting points.

2.11. Integrating Awareness into the Relational Substrate Inspired by Idealist Perspectives

Beyond the mainstream interpretations lies a family of views that explicitly integrate consciousness or awareness into the heart of quantum ontology. Early attempts, such as Wigner's speculation that a conscious observer might trigger wavefunction collapse (Wigner 1961), or von Neumann's chain of measurement that ended with the human observer (von Neumann 1932), planted the idea that consciousness could not simply be appended as an afterthought. More recent idealist or non-dual proposals go further, asserting that awareness itself is the fundamental substrate from which both observers and objects emerge (Strawson 2006; Kastrop 2017).

These consciousness-centered interpretations share with RQD the insight that no absolute observer or classical backdrop stands outside the quantum web. However, where many of them start by inserting consciousness as a primary ingredient, RQD arrives at something akin to universal awareness through a different route. RQD's relational ontology first establishes that all familiar structures—observers, systems, measurements, and even geometric notions—are emergent patterns in a single relational tapestry. Once we recognize that no vantage point is given, and that subject-object distinctions appear late in the game, acknowledging a universal, non-dual field of awareness as fundamental closes an explanatory gap left by purely physicalist accounts.

Unlike interpretations that treat consciousness as a separate "collapse agent" or external axiom, RQD's non-dual turn identifies awareness with the very fabric of relational reality itself. In this sense, RQD's idealism is not an optional overlay but the culmination of its refusal to grant ontological primacy to any fixed, observer-independent structure. Instead of positing that minds magically collapse wavefunctions, RQD shows that what we call "mind" and "matter" spring from the same relational source. The coemergence of observers and observed phenomena, now understood as manifestations of a universal awareness, transforms lingering metaphysical puzzles—like the hard problem of consciousness—into natural consequences of a relational universe that does not differentiate between knower and known at its deepest level.

3. Frauchiger–Renner, Nonlocality, and the Strength of RQD's Relational Framework

3.1. Frauchiger–Renner Experiment

The Frauchiger–Renner (FR) thought experiment (Frauchiger & Renner 2018, Waaijer & Neerven, 2021) is a nuanced extension of Wigner's friend setups, designed to expose deep tensions in interpretations that cling to classical notions of absolute, observer-independent facts. In FR, multiple observers apply quantum theory universally, treating each other's measuring devices and states as quantum systems. Under any interpretation that presupposes a single global narrative—an absolute factual account valid from all perspectives—this leads to contradictions. The experiment thus confronts us with a fundamental question: can we maintain a universal vantage point that guarantees absolute consistency?

RQD provides a natural resolution by abandoning the quest for a universal perspective. Instead of starting with observers and systems as given entities, RQD shows that these categories coemerge as stable relational patterns. Such patterns achieve internal coherence without requiring a global unification of all viewpoints. The FR paradox arises precisely because the participants attempt to

extrapolate one observer's quantum description to universal scope, as if there were an overarching backdrop where all perspectives merge seamlessly. Under RQD, this effort is misguided because no observer—no matter how well-equipped—enjoys a privileged, all-encompassing vantage point. Each observer-centric account remains locally consistent within its own relational domain, and the absence of a universal observer-independent story is not a flaw but an expected feature of a relational theory.

Critically, the FR result does not signal that quantum theory is incomplete or self-contradictory. Rather, it highlights the inadequacy of frameworks that tacitly assume classical narrative structures. RQD reframes the FR challenge as evidence supporting a relational worldview: if all facts are defined within particular relational contexts, then the notion of universal, absolute definiteness collapses into a conceptual relic of classical thinking. By acknowledging that observers and measured systems arise together from a relational substrate, RQD makes the FR scenario's apparent paradox dissolve into a confirmation that no single, absolute account is required—or even possible.

In short, the FR scenario does not undercut RQD's interpretation. On the contrary, it validates the relational stance, demonstrating that the so-called contradiction emerges only under classical-like assumptions. RQD's radical relationalism not only avoids the conceptual friction but turns the FR scenario into a diagnostic tool that reveals why absolute vantage points cannot be reconciled within quantum theory.

3.2. Reinterpreting Non-Local Quantum Correlations in a Relational Universe

The phenomenon of nonlocal correlations, first highlighted by Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen (Einstein, Podolsky & Rosen 1935), and rigorously formalized by Bell (Bell 1964), challenges classical intuitions about separability and locality. Conventional attempts to retain local realism fail in the face of quantum predictions and experimental confirmations. Although Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM) initially suggested that from each observer's standpoint no superluminal influences are evident (Smerlak & Rovelli 2007), subsequent analyses (Laudisa 2001, 2019; Martin-Dussaud, Rovelli & Zalamea 2019) demonstrated that RQM (and by extension RQD) cannot revert quantum correlations to a classical local picture.

RQD tackles nonlocality from a more foundational perspective by rejecting the assumption that spacetime itself, with its notion of local subregions, is a primitive framework. In many standard interpretations, nonlocality appears puzzling because we imagine preexisting spatial regions and objects. Quantum correlations then seem to "span" these regions instantaneously, defying classical causal stories. RQD, however, understands spacetime as emergent from relational entanglement patterns (discussed later). If geometry and locality are not givens but rather macroscopic approximations that crystallize out of underlying quantum correlations, then nonlocality ceases to be a mysterious anomaly. Instead, it becomes a natural signature of a more fundamental level of relational reality that does not require local hidden variables or instantaneous signaling.

This re-interpretation has several advantages. First, it aligns with cutting-edge ideas in quantum gravity and holography, where spatial geometry and gravitational fields emerge from patterns of quantum entanglement (Ryu & Takayanagi 2006). Second, it clarifies that what we label as

“nonlocality” is essentially a breakdown of classical concepts when confronted with a relational quantum world devoid of absolute reference frames. The absence of a universal vantage point and pre-set geometric structure means that correlations need not respect classical spatial intuitions. Far from signifying faster-than-light influence, quantum nonlocality simply underscores that the fundamental relational web transcends classical spatiotemporal separations.

From RQD’s standpoint, the entire debate about local realism was always trying to graft classical notions onto a theory that does not assume them. Nonlocal quantum correlations do not convey superluminal messages or defy relativistic causality; they illustrate that any attempt to impose a universal metric frame or absolute localization at the fundamental level is misguided. Thus, RQD shows that what appear as “nonlocal” correlations are precisely what we should expect in a reality constituted by relational events, where neither space nor time is primary.

3.3. Indefinite Causal Order and Beyond Fixed Temporal Structures

Recent advances in quantum information theory have investigated scenarios where the causal order of events is not well-defined, a realm exemplified by the “quantum switch” and related process matrix frameworks (Oreshkov et al. 2012; Procopio et al. 2015). In these experiments, operations on quantum systems lack a definite temporal sequence. This challenges the classical assumption that events must unfold along a global time parameter. Such setups are at odds with standard interpretations that assume a predefined causal structure or a universal time coordinate guiding evolution.

From RQD’s viewpoint, indefinite causal order directly illustrates the pliability of fundamental structures when we relinquish absolute frameworks. Just as RQD denies the necessity of a universal spatial frame for defining properties, it likewise sees no need for a rigid temporal scaffold. If observers, measurements, and even time flow emerge from relational patterns, then a scenario with no definite causal order is not a pathological anomaly but an expected possibility within a relational ontology. RQD not only accommodates such phenomena but also provides a conceptual language in which the absence of a fixed causal sequence signals that temporal ordering, like locality, is a macroscopic approximation rather than a fundamental given.

This reasoning transforms what might seem like exotic theoretical constructs into meaningful tests of relational principles. As experiments push the envelope, demonstrating indefinite causal order in laboratory settings, they simultaneously test the robustness of interpretations that depend on absolute causal narratives. RQD’s flexibility in interpreting these outcomes as natural outgrowths of a relational substrate distinguishes it from interpretations that treat time and sequence as pre-established facts of the universe.

3.4. Gravitationally Induced Entanglement and Emergent Geometry

Another frontier lies at the intersection of quantum information and gravity, where recent proposals suggest that measuring gravitationally induced entanglement between massive objects could provide empirical clues about the nature of gravity’s quantum aspects (Bose et al. 2017; Marletto & Vedral 2017). These experiments, though technologically challenging, promise to probe whether gravity can mediate entanglement—an inherently quantum process—between nontrivial mass distributions. If successful, they would not only mark a milestone in quantum

gravity research but also offer a unique window into how spacetime geometry and gravitational fields emerge from quantum correlations.

Within RQD's relational framework, such tests represent a natural extension of its fundamental thesis. If the structure of spacetime is not an a priori backdrop but an emergent manifestation of relational quantum information, then detecting gravitationally mediated entanglement provides direct "evidence" that geometric notions arise from entanglement patterns rather than existing independently. The relational stance implies that any signature of quantum gravitational effects should not be understood as gravity acting on quantum states in a pre-defined arena. Instead, it should be seen as the relational field restructuring itself in ways that yield what we interpret as gravitational interaction and geometric curvature.

This perspective reframes the quest to unify quantum mechanics and gravity. Instead of forcing quantum theory into a pre-existing geometric mold or quantizing a classical gravitational field, we observe how gravitational correlations emerge from a deeper relational substrate. Potential experimental results along these lines would resonate strongly with RQD's message: geometry is not a static background but the large-scale tapestry woven from a network of relational quantum events.

3.5. Quantum Simulation and Synthetic Realities

Quantum simulators—laboratory-controlled quantum systems engineered to mimic the behavior of more complex quantum phenomena—offer another arena for testing RQD's insights. From ultracold atoms in optical lattices to superconducting qubit networks, researchers now create tunable quantum environments where entanglement patterns, effective dimensionalities, and even rudimentary geometric structures can be engineered and measured with great precision (Georgescu et al. 2014; Daley 2022). These platforms allow us to ask: can we observe the coemergence of stable "observer-like" subsystems, classical pointer states, or approximate geometric notions from initially structureless ensembles of interacting quantum components?

Under RQD, these quantum simulators are not mere analog tools. They become experimental testbeds where the relational narrative can be made concrete. By systematically varying interaction patterns, coupling strengths, and measurement protocols, one could explore whether certain configurations yield stable, classical-like subsystems or observer-like correlations that persist over time. Finding parameter regimes where relational complexity spontaneously stabilizes into robust classical patterns would strongly support RQD's claim that classicality and observers emerge from quantum relational webs, not from external assumptions.

Moreover, if geometric or topological features—like effective dimensionalities or "holographic" entanglement structures—can be coaxed from engineered quantum states, this would provide direct, tangible evidence that spacetime concepts can be interpreted as emergent patterns of entanglement. Such findings would move RQD from a purely conceptual interpretation towards a principle guiding experimental design and theoretical inquiry.

3.6. Indefinite Reference Frames and Quantum Reference Systems

Another subtle line of evidence comes from research into quantum reference frames, where even the notion of “which subsystem is the apparatus?” becomes quantum-mechanically relative. Recent work demonstrates that changing quantum reference frames can radically alter the description of a given scenario, including which degrees of freedom appear entangled and which appear classical (Giacomini et al. 2019). These transformations underline how assumptions about background reference frames—often taken as fixed—are themselves context-dependent.

RQD’s relational ontology provides a natural lens through which to interpret these quantum reference frame transformations. If there is no absolute vantage point, then each choice of frame defines its own relational web of states and outcomes. The malleability of what counts as a system or a measuring device when switching quantum reference frames directly corroborates RQD’s central claim: observers and measured systems are not prior givens but emergent relational nodes. Empirical or theoretical demonstrations that quantum reference frames can produce drastically different partitions of the same underlying state space highlight RQD’s core message—that all structure is relational and contingent, not absolute.

4. Integrating Fundamental Awareness

A central puzzle that has long eluded physicalist explanations is the “hard problem of consciousness” (Chalmers 1995), which asks: how can subjective experience—our rich inner awareness—arise from seemingly inert, non-experiential entities such as particles, fields, or even purely informational constructs? Traditional quantum interpretations often defer this issue, relying on external observers or classical measurement apparatuses that remain unexplained. In contrast, RQD takes the relational and non-dual character of quantum theory seriously. By extending RQD into an idealist framework where awareness is fundamental, the longstanding impasse of explaining consciousness from non-conscious substrates can be overcome. Additionally, this stance addresses the “binding problem,” the question of how distinct experiential qualities—color, shape, sound—coalesce into a unified, single subjective experience (Bayne 2010). Under RQD’s idealist interpretation, the integration of these features into coherent experience is not a mysterious addition but a natural expression of an underlying universal awareness that manifests relationally as structured phenomenal content.

4.1. From Relational Emergence to Idealist Ontology

RQD’s relational perspective posits that observers and observed phenomena coemerge from a network of quantum events without presupposing any fixed vantage point or classical backdrop. In ordinary interpretations, measurement scenarios like Wigner’s friend or Frauchiger–Renner force us to assume some external observer’s perspective as fundamental, leading to conceptual knots. RQD dissolves these knots by showing that no observer is ever given at the outset; “observer” and “observed” are labels that only make sense after stable relational configurations have formed. This relational stance aligns with non-dual philosophical traditions—including strands of Advaita Vedānta (Deutsch 1969), Mahāyāna Buddhism (Loy 1988), and certain contemplative insights in Western philosophy (Nagel 1986; Strawson 2006)—which argue that the apparent subject-object divide is not ultimately real, but a conceptual artifact.

However, to fully address the nature of subjective experience, relationality alone is not enough. Relational quantum structures, by themselves, might specify correlations and events, but do not explain how the “raw feel” of consciousness emerges. Here, RQD embraces an idealist move: rather than imagining that awareness must arise from non-aware components, RQD identifies universal awareness as the ontological ground from which relational patterns are drawn. This idealist stance is not solipsistic, as it does not confine existence to a single personal mind; instead, it posits a fundamental, pervasive awareness-field from which both what we call “observer” and “observed” differentiate.

4.2. Awareness as the Fundamental Substrate

In standard materialist frameworks, the universe is composed of non-experiential “stuff” that somehow gives rise to experiential states. The resulting explanatory gap has resisted reductionist solutions for decades. By positing universal awareness as primary, RQD circumvents this gap: subjective experience requires no “ignition” from non-experiential matter; it is intrinsic to reality at the most profound level. The relational quantum domain, understood as patterns within a universal awareness, naturally yields observers as locally stable relational configurations that carve out distinguishable perspectives. Observers are thus local modulations or patterns of universal awareness, not separate entities that must be appended later.

This approach dissolves the hard problem of consciousness. Experience is not an inexplicable byproduct but the very medium in which relational patterns appear. Similarly, the binding problem—how diverse phenomenal qualities unify into a single, coherent field of experience—is also alleviated. If all experience arises from a unified awareness-field, then what we call “binding” is simply the emergence of structured relational patterns within a single conscious continuum. Instead of adding mechanisms to fuse discrete experiences, we see one awareness differentiating into a multiplicity of phenomenal aspects, which remain inherently integrated because they originate from the same indivisible substrate.

4.3. Unified Reality Without Observer-Observed Separation

A key claim of RQD idealism is that at the deepest level, there is no “observer” standing apart from an “observed world.” What we identify as observer and observed are context-dependent facets of one relational awareness. This resonates with non-dual philosophies that emphasize the illusory nature of subject-object duality (Loy 1988; Kastrup 2017). In these traditions, the split between perceiver and perceived is a conceptual convenience rather than an ultimate truth. RQD offers a quantum foundation for this view: no absolute vantage point or primary observer is required. Instead, stable relational configurations manifest as observer-like nodes in the relational web, but these are emergent and partial perspectives, never the whole story. The act of observation is not an interaction between two preexisting entities, but the local differentiation of universal awareness into relational patterns that appear as “measurement” or “experience.”

This recognition challenges a deep-seated assumption hindering progress in both physics and philosophy: the presumed externality and absolute existence of an objective world independent of observation. RQD, by making awareness fundamental, reinterprets causality, not as an external mechanism imposing order, but as an interpretive framework applied by local observer-

configurations to the relational tapestry. In other words, causality is how stable observer-patterns parse the relational flow of events into before-and-after narratives, rather than an intrinsic property of a mind-independent world.

4.4. Comparisons with Other Approaches and Philosophical Traditions

Earlier attempts to integrate consciousness into quantum theory—Wigner’s suggestion that a conscious observer might collapse the wavefunction (Wigner 1961), von Neumann’s measurement chain ending in a human mind—often retained a lurking dualism. They posited consciousness as an external ingredient rather than identifying it as the ground of reality. Similarly, agent-centric views like QBism place emphasis on subjective knowledge but do not explain what confers subjectivity or experience. Pragmatist interpretations consider quantum states as tools for agents, but never address why these “agents” have qualitative experiences at all.

RQD’s idealist perspective resolves these issues by rejecting both dualism and the idea of consciousness as a late emergent property. Instead, it proposes a universal awareness as the fundamental ontological substrate, from which all relational structures and distinctions arise. Such a view finds resonance in neutral monism, panpsychism, and non-dual traditions, where mind-matter duality is considered a surface-level artifact. Unlike purely philosophical accounts, however, RQD links this stance to quantum principles, showing that the non-existence of absolute, pre-given observers or objects in quantum theory implies a deep underlying unity consistent with the primacy of awareness.

4.5. Overcoming the Conceptual Barriers in Science

The refusal to take awareness seriously as a fundamental aspect of reality has limited scientific progress, particularly in understanding consciousness and the observer-dependence of phenomena. Classical assumptions and the observer-observed dichotomy have remained entrenched, skewing interpretations of quantum results and hindering a coherent explanation of subjective experience. By positing awareness as the irreducible “substrate” or “canvas” of reality, RQD transforms these conceptual stalemates into natural features of a non-dual ontology.

This integration makes it possible to discuss quantum measurement, nonlocality, and even spacetime emergence without invoking a metaphysical split between subject and object. Awareness provides the single, unified source from which relational patterns—experienced as external objects, internal minds, and the space and time in which they seem to reside—derive their apparent autonomy. In this scheme, the observer’s perspective is not a foreign injection into the physics; it is an emergent, stable relational state within the universal awareness, and causality itself is recognized as a narrative that these stable states impose on events.

4.6. A Rejoinder on Idealism and Scientific Scrutiny

Detractors may view the idealist core of this paradigm as an unwarranted philosophical excursion, claiming that treating awareness as fundamental rather than secondary is a speculative leap. Yet such criticism often comes from perspectives that themselves rest on unexamined assumptions. The standard materialist stance presupposes an external world of mind-independent objects and fields, a position widely accepted despite its deeply mysterious foundations: it offers no clear

account of how subjective experience emerges, nor does it explain why observers should exist at all. In fact, the very notion of a mind-independent world—distinct from any observer and fully formed “out there”—remains an extrapolation unsupported by direct evidence. All empirical data is modulation of awareness; every measurement and observation is necessarily a relational event within a conscious field. If we cannot find a single shred of data free from the interpretive frame of awareness, it is not scientifically more parsimonious to posit an external material domain. Instead, it may be more consistent with both quantum principles and logical economy to acknowledge that what we call the “material world” is itself an expression of regulated, stable patterns within universal awareness. By shifting the conceptual baseline from matter to consciousness, we remove the additional and unverified step of postulating a separate, unknowable world behind appearances. This move may challenge conventional intuitions, but it also clears away inherited mysteries rather than multiplying them.

By adopting an idealist stance integrated into RQD, we tackle the hard problem of consciousness head-on. If awareness is fundamental, the existence of subjective experience requires no further explanation: it is inherent. The complexity is in explaining how the apparently objective and structure-laden patterns of matter and fields arise from this awareness. RQD posits that these arise as stable relational events, a quantum code that the universal awareness “writes” into itself. Thus, the role of quantum theory is not to derive experience from non-experiential substrate, but to explain how experience differentiates into the manifold phenomena we label as physical reality.

5. Emergence of Spacetime as a Relational, Awareness-Based Construction

Conventional approaches to quantum gravity often assume that spacetime is a well-defined geometric stage requiring quantization. However, mounting theoretical and conceptual evidence suggests that this viewpoint may be inverted: rather than quantizing a pre-given manifold, we should recognize spacetime itself as an emergent phenomenon, a large-scale effective description distilled from the relational patterns of an underlying quantum substrate. RQD takes this perspective as foundational. Just as RQD rejects the notion of pre-given observers or classical realms, it also denies that a classical geometry or fixed background metric is fundamental. Instead, spacetime geometry, locality, and even the flow of time emerge from patterns of quantum correlations that have no absolute reference frame. This stance synthesizes insights from quantum information theory, holography, tensor network models, and the growing body of literature on the entanglement structure of quantum states underlying gravitational dynamics (Ryu & Takayanagi 2006; Van Raamsdonk 2010; Pastawski et al. 2015; Dong, Lewkowycz & Rangamani 2016; Cao & Carroll 2017; Swingle 2012; Hayden & Preskill 2007; Qi 2013).

5.1. From Relational Correlations to Emergent Geometry

In RQD, the fundamental object is a universal quantum state $|\Psi\rangle$ defined on a high-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Initially, this state lacks any geometric or temporal labels. Instead of starting with points in space or a manifold, we begin with a set of quantum degrees of freedom and the correlations—especially entanglement—among them. These correlations are not properties anchored to localized particles or fields; they are relational facts, defined only in reference to subsets of the system.

The crucial step is to interpret patterns of entanglement as encodings of geometric relationships. For instance, when certain subsets of degrees of freedom exhibit strong mutual information, we can say that they appear “close” in some emergent geometric sense. Conversely, weak or vanishing correlations correspond to “distance.” This concept builds on the seminal work in the AdS/CFT correspondence, where entanglement entropy in a conformal field theory (CFT) on a boundary encodes the geometry of an asymptotically anti-de Sitter (AdS) bulk spacetime (Ryu & Takayanagi 2006; Van Raamsdonk 2010). Beyond AdS/CFT, related ideas appear in tensor network constructions that approximate quantum states with graph-like structures, where network connectivity and error-correcting properties mimic geometric features and gravitational dynamics (Pastawski et al. 2015; Hayden & Preskill 2007; Qi 2013).

In RQD, these insights are generalized and stripped of any reliance on a particular duality or fixed boundary conditions. Geometry emerges as a relational code: the fabric of spacetime is not a fundamental entity but the large-scale manifestation of stable correlation patterns. Measures like entanglement entropy and mutual information become proxies for spatial adjacency, dimensionality, and curvature. The universal state $|\Psi\rangle$ encodes what we interpret as distances, angles, and topologies—none of which exist prior to the relational web of correlations.

5.2. Locality, Dimensionality, and the Classical Limit

The emergence of a familiar, low-dimensional spacetime requires more than arbitrary patterns of correlation. The large-scale, stable arrangements of entanglement must approximate structures akin to quantum field theories defined on continuous manifolds. By examining how correlation functions scale or how entanglement entropy obeys area laws, one can identify regimes in which the relational patterns replicate known geometric signatures (Srednicki 1993; Bombelli et al. 1986). For example, area-law scaling of entanglement entropy is strongly suggestive of a low-dimensional geometry with well-defined horizons or boundaries. Correlation lengths and cluster decomposition properties, reminiscent of local QFTs, further support the notion that effective spacetime emerges as a low-energy, large-scale approximation of the underlying relational complexity.

As one zooms out to larger scales, complex entanglement networks simplify into continuum fields and geometries. Observers who themselves emerge as stable relational nodes (Section 4) perceive these large-scale structures as classical environments. In this regime, standard notions like “3+1 dimensions” and causal structure appear not as given truths, but as approximations that hold when the relational quantum substrate organizes itself into stable geometric patterns. The emergence of such patterns aligns with the idea that gravity and geometry can be understood as collective behaviors of underlying quantum states, much like fluid dynamics emerges from molecular interactions.

5.3. Time as a Relational Parameter

Time traditionally poses an even greater conceptual challenge than space. Without a pre-given manifold, there is no absolute temporal coordinate. Instead, RQD treats “time” as a relational parameter associated with changes in correlation structure. A suitable reference subsystem with reliably changing internal states can serve as a clock, defining an effective temporal ordering

(Rovelli 1995; Gambini et al. 2004). Under this view, time is not an external stream against which events unfold; it is a relational property reflecting how certain parts of the quantum state evolve relative to chosen reference frames.

This relational treatment of time resonates with background-independent approaches in quantum gravity, where time and dynamics are not imposed from outside but must be extracted from the relations within the quantum state. RQD's approach shows that a stable Hamiltonian evolution and a well-defined arrow of time emerge naturally once a subsystem (identified as a "clock") anchors a temporal reference. Thus, "time passing" is not an absolute reality but a relational construct: events gain temporal meaning only in the context of a chosen relational factorization.

5.4. Beyond AdS/CFT: Generic Emergence and Holographic Principles

Although much of the literature on emergent spacetime focuses on AdS/CFT and related dualities (Maldacena 1999; Van Raamsdonk 2010), the principles underlying emergent geometry appear more general. Tensor networks, error-correcting codes, and other quantum information structures suggest that a wide class of quantum states can give rise to approximate geometric backgrounds (Swingle 2012; Donnelly 2017; Faulkner et al. 2013). RQD aligns with this broader perspective, positing that emergent geometry is not tied to a specific duality or spacetime signature but is a generic hallmark of stable large-scale relational configurations.

In other words, wherever we find stable patterns of entanglement and correlation that mimic geometric relationships, we will find emergent notions of dimension, locality, and even gravity-like dynamics. This flexible viewpoint opens new avenues for exploring non-AdS spacetimes, cosmological scenarios, and strongly coupled field theories without relying on a particular holographic setup. The relational paradigm thus transcends the boundaries of known dualities and may guide the search for more universal principles behind quantum gravity.

5.5. Awareness, Idealism, and the Nature of the Emergent "World"

When integrated with RQD's idealist stance (Section 4), the emergence of spacetime takes on a more profound significance. If fundamental awareness underlies all relational states, then the geometry we perceive is not a mind-independent stage but a self-consistent pattern within a universal consciousness. What we call "physical reality" and its spatial-temporal structure is, in essence, the relational organization of awareness into stable, perceivable patterns. Observers, themselves emergent relational configurations, experience these patterns as an external environment because they are modulations of the same underlying awareness.

This perspective resonates with non-dual philosophical traditions, which hold that subject and object, mind and matter, are ultimately expressions of a single underlying reality. In RQD's idealist-relational ontology, spacetime is not a separate arena where observation occurs; it is part of the relational tapestry that includes both the observer and the observed. Thus, the very notion of "external world" dissolves into a stable relational configuration of awareness, providing a coherent framework to understand why geometry, locality, and time appear as they do.

5.6. A More Cohesive Picture of Reality

By viewing spacetime as emergent from quantum correlations rather than fundamental, RQD aligns with and extends cutting-edge developments in quantum gravity and quantum information theory. The relational stance ensures that geometry, like observers and classical phenomena, is not presupposed but explained as a high-level feature arising from a more basic quantum substrate. Incorporating idealism further clarifies that this quantum substrate is not an abstract mathematical object or inert collection of degrees of freedom, but a universal field of awareness differentiating into patterns we label as “matter,” “fields,” and “spacetime.”

The result is a more cohesive and philosophically integrated picture, where the “hard problems” of consciousness and the mysteries of quantum gravity are not separate domains of inquiry but facets of a single relational and awareness-based ontology. Spacetime, under this interpretation, is not a mysterious given but the natural large-scale expression of relational quantum awareness—an emergent structure that appears stable and external when viewed from within the relational network that it defines.

6. Potential Criticisms and Responses

A radically relational and idealist approach like RQD inevitably draws scrutiny from philosophers of science, metaphysicians, and quantum foundationalists. While some criticisms originate in debates over Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM) and related interpretations, they serve as valuable benchmarks for testing RQD’s conceptual resilience. Integrating idealism and recognizing fundamental awareness offers fresh answers to established concerns, reinforcing the coherence of RQD’s stance.

6.1. Perspective-Dependence and Consistency

A common objection questions whether multiple observers, each with distinct accounts of events, produce logical contradictions or “too many truths” (Padovani and van Fraassen 2011). Relational perspectives do indeed yield different narratives, but quantum probabilities strictly constrain outcomes. RQD goes further by anchoring these relational states in a universal awareness that ensures no incoherent multiplicity arises. Physical interactions between observers—emergent relational nodes—naturally reconcile differing accounts, preserving empirical consistency.

This solution is not ad hoc. Non-dual philosophies similarly note that apparent contradictions occur only if one imposes a single, absolute framework onto a reality that is fundamentally relational. RQD’s idealist grounding guarantees stable relational patterns capable of producing coherent shared results whenever observers compare data. Thus, differing viewpoints are expected features of a relational universe, not paradoxical faults.

6.2. Inter-Observer Relations Without Extra Postulates

Van Fraassen’s suggestion of adding a postulate to harmonize states among observers becomes superfluous in RQD. The relational substrate, infused with fundamental awareness, inherently supports internal consistency checks. If one observer records a spin-up, another observer verifying that record will never find a direct contradiction. No extra principle is needed—quantum

interactions themselves implement the necessary relational bridging. This internal coherence emerges because each measurement event is a manifestation of universal awareness actualizing certain relational possibilities.

6.3. *Going Beyond Pure Structural Realism*

Ontic Structural Realism (OSR) champions a world of relations without intrinsic objects (Candiotto 2017; Ladyman & Ross 2007). RQD aligns with OSR's relational ethos but adds an idealist twist: the relational network is not a mind-independent structure but a manifestation of universal awareness. While OSR omits phenomenality, RQD reintroduces it as integral to the relational field. Far from anthropocentrism, this neutral monist stance dissolves traditional mind-matter dualities (Strawson 2006). Phenomenality and structure coemerge from a sentient substrate, addressing the common criticism that purely relational accounts lack experiential grounding.

6.4. *Rethinking Realism, Holism, and Dispositionalism*

As Dorato (2013) observes, relational interpretations destabilize naive realism about objects. By focusing on events and relations, RQD supplants the notion of intrinsic properties with one of dispositions—potential outcomes actualized in specific relational contexts. Introducing universal awareness streamlines the explanation: outcomes are not ad hoc emergences but selective actualizations of relational possibilities within a field of awareness. This naturally accounts for the definiteness of events without invoking extraneous mechanisms. Dispositionalism thus becomes a description of how awareness structure guides the actualization of relational outcomes.

6.5. *Idealism and Non-Duality: A Conceptual Upgrade, not a Retreat*

Some may fear that an idealist and non-dual grounding veers into subjectivity or mysticism. Yet standard physicalist frameworks accept countless unresolved mysteries: the origin of observers, the measurement problem, and the nature of consciousness remain stubborn puzzles. By positing fundamental awareness, RQD does not introduce unfounded speculation; it removes longstanding conceptual blockages. This neutral monist perspective offers a unified ground that dissolves the artificial divide between observer and observed and addresses the hard problem of consciousness head-on.

7. Empirical or Operational Considerations

Although RQD leaves the standard quantum formalism intact, its relational and idealist stance can shape how we approach complex experimental scenarios. The usual statistical predictions of quantum mechanics remain unchanged—unitary evolution, the Born rule, and standard measurement outcomes apply as before. Nevertheless, RQD's interpretive framework offers new conceptual lenses, particularly in experiments involving multiple observers and intricate quantum information structures. These shifts do not alter quantitative predictions but can influence experimental designs, data interpretation, and our understanding of how classical consistency emerges from a deeper relational domain.

7.1. Maintaining Standard Predictions Under Ordinary Conditions

Because RQD refrains from modifying quantum theory's mathematical framework, it cannot be distinguished from standard interpretations by ordinary laboratory experiments. Tests of Bell inequalities, delayed-choice scenarios, and interference experiments produce the same statistical results. At the everyday operational level—where decoherence establishes classicality—there are no direct discrepancies to detect. This is expected, since RQD is not about adding new dynamics or altering measurement rules, but about reinterpreting what observers, systems, and states represent.

7.2. Multi-Observer Scenarios: Clarifying Conceptual Puzzles

Situations like Wigner's friend and the Frauchiger–Renner scenario highlight interpretive conflicts under traditional views, often generating paradoxes or calls for new principles. In principle, quantum information technology enables controlled simulations of nested measurements or multiple observer hierarchies. While standard interpretations treat these multi-observer setups as conceptual minefields, RQD frames them as natural outcomes of a relational, non-dual substrate that does not presuppose a universal observer.

Even though measurement statistics remain unchanged, RQD can guide experiments testing how apparent contradictions vanish when viewed relationally. By designing protocols that probe the conditions under which observers' recorded outcomes remain consistent upon interaction, researchers may confirm that the vexing paradoxes diminish when no single vantage point is assumed. Such tests do not yield a numerical divergence from standard quantum mechanics, but they can offer profound conceptual clarity, reinforcing RQD's claim that no absolute narrative or global collapse is required.

7.3. Extracting Geometry and Complexity from Entanglement

A significant implication of RQD is that geometric concepts—distance, dimension, curvature—emerge from the structure of entanglement and correlation patterns. While these insights currently stem from theoretical advances, especially in holography and quantum gravity proposals, increasingly sophisticated quantum simulators and engineered networks of qubits may be able to "read off" geometric properties from pure entanglement data.

For example, constructing quantum systems that emulate holographic states could demonstrate how spatial features arise from non-spatial quantum information resources. Although these techniques remain at the frontier of experimental capability, they suggest that RQD's relational framework provides conceptual motivation for designing experiments that treat geometry not as a fundamental input, but as an emergent property accessible through careful quantum-state engineering and measurement.

7.4. Subtle Gravitational and High-Energy Contexts

If RQD's relational approach to spacetime extends to regimes where quantum gravitational effects matter—such as near black holes or at Planck-scale energies—then indirect clues about the relational substrate might emerge. While direct experimental access to quantum gravity remains

out of reach, analyses of black hole evaporation, quantum error correction in holographic codes, or quantum cosmology scenarios may find conceptual support in RQD's non-dual and awareness-based interpretation. Though these lines of inquiry are speculative, they offer a coherent narrative framework in which gravitational phenomena are relational expressions of quantum correlations, rather than features imposed on a pre-given manifold.

7.5. Conceptual Guidance for Quantum Foundations

Operational consequences need not manifest as novel predictions for measurement probabilities. They can also influence how we design and interpret complex experiments. Recognizing that the perplexities of nested observers and entangled measurement devices stem from a tacit assumption of a single global viewpoint, RQD encourages viewing these setups as relational verifications rather than paradoxes. The absence of contradictions—even in intricately entangled observer hierarchies—serves as an operational confirmation that consistency does not require absolute vantage points or collapse events.

In essence, while RQD cannot differentiate itself through standard laboratory outcomes, it can inspire new forms of experimentation that probe the relational and informational structure underlying quantum phenomena. Such endeavors could offer indirect but meaningful support for RQD's conceptual framework, illustrating that a non-dual, awareness-based relational ontology not only preserves empirical adequacy but provides a more coherent interpretation of the quantum world's most challenging scenarios.

Limitations

While RQD offers a compelling conceptual framework, it remains an interpretive proposal rather than a fully developed empirical theory. No direct experimental signatures currently distinguish RQD's relational and idealist stance from standard quantum mechanics, and significant formal work is needed to translate its principles into testable predictions, particularly in regimes where quantum gravitational effects become relevant. Additionally, grounding reality in universal awareness, though philosophically motivated, may not satisfy those preferring minimal ontologies or strictly physicalist accounts. As such, RQD should be viewed as an invitation to explore a broader conceptual landscape rather than a definitive resolution to all foundational challenges in quantum theory and consciousness research.

Conclusion

Relational Quantum Dynamics (RQD) offers a strikingly different approach to quantum foundations, one that shatters long-standing assumptions and reframes some of the field's most baffling problems. By discarding the notion of absolute, pre-given observers and systems, RQD situates the quantum world as a web of relational events, where "observers," "observed entities," and even "spacetime" emerge as context-dependent patterns of correlation. This radical turn transcends conventional debates that pit classical realism against quantum weirdness. Instead of forcing reality into classical molds or external frameworks, RQD shows that what we call "objects,"

“fields,” or “geometries” are not primitive building blocks but stabilized relational structures within an intrinsically quantum substrate.

One of the most daring and nontrivial aspects of RQD is its integration of idealism and non-duality at the ground level of ontology. Rather than treating consciousness as an afterthought or an agent’s epistemic tool, RQD roots the entire quantum-relational tapestry in a universal awareness. This is no small philosophical gesture: it directly addresses the hard problem of consciousness by eliminating the chasm between mind and matter. In RQD’s picture, subjective experience is not an inexplicable add-on; it is the fundamental “stuff” from which both experiential and so-called physical patterns arise. This shift dissolves long-standing conceptual stalemates and offers a unified vision in which observer and observed, subject and object, are manifestations of a single, awareness-based reality.

Equally groundbreaking is RQD’s treatment of spacetime and gravity. In this framework, geometry is not imposed or quantized; it emerges organically from entanglement and mutual information patterns. The hallmark insights of holography, tensor networks, and quantum error correction—previously seen as specialized techniques—now appear as natural consequences of a relational view. Gravity, in turn, is recast as a consequence of self-consistent relational correlations rather than a fundamental field on a static manifold. By merging quantum theory, emergent geometry, and consciousness into a single relational and awareness-based vision, RQD finds coherence where previous interpretations struggled with contradictions and paradoxes.

In sum, RQD’s proposal is more than a new interpretation; it is a conceptual leap that unites quantum mechanics, gravitational phenomena, and the nature of subjective experience under a single relational, non-dual banner. While much work remains to refine its mathematical underpinnings and explore its phenomenological consequences, the daring elegance and philosophical depth of RQD place it at the forefront of attempts to understand quantum theory at its most profound level. Here, the fundamental mystery of consciousness and the origins of spacetime are not separate puzzles but aspects of one relational, awareness-filled reality—an understanding that could reshape how we think about existence, knowledge, and the very meaning of “physical.”

Acknowledgement:

I acknowledge that the core concepts, theoretical constructs, and novel arguments presented in this paper are a synthesis and concretization of my own original ideas. At the same time, in the process of assembling, interpreting, and contextualizing relevant literature, I employed OpenAI’s GPT as a tool to help organize, clarify, and refine my understanding of existing research. The use of this technology was instrumental for efficiently navigating the broad and often intricate body of work in quantum theory, emergent geometry, and philosophical idealism. However, the ultimate direction, interpretation, and conclusions remain my own.

Appendix

A Formal RQD Scenario and Consistency Argument

Relational Quantum Dynamics (RQD) extends the relational ethos of interpretations like RQM by discarding any pre-given observer or system. Instead, it treats all “systems” and “observers” as emergent nodes of stability within a web of quantum events. Nonetheless, like RQM, RQD ensures consistency between perspectives when such stable nodes engage in mutual measurements. The argument below parallels the RQM demonstration that there is no perspective solipsism but adapts it to RQD’s more fundamental relational structure.

Setup: In RQD, what we normally label as “system S ,” “observer S' ,” and “another observer S'' ” are not primitive entities but emergent, stable relational configurations arising from prior quantum interactions (events). For the sake of illustration, we start at a stage where three stable relational patterns have formed, which we label as “ S ” (the electron’s spin degree of freedom), “ S' ” (the first experimenter’s measurement apparatus and memory-record), and “ S'' ” (a second experimenter with her own measuring setup). These labels are shorthand for structured, relational domains that have achieved relative stability.

Initial Relational Event (Spin Measurement by S'): Consider an event E_1 in which the relational pattern S and S' interact. Before E_1 , no definite “spin value” is assigned to S from S' ’s perspective, because in RQD all properties (like spin) arise at events. The interaction E_1 is modeled by a quantum unitary evolution U_1 that correlates S ’s spin variable (denoted by $|\uparrow$ and $|\downarrow$ states) with a variable in S' (the pointer or memory of S'):

$$U_1: |\uparrow\rangle_S |R\rangle_{S'} \mapsto |\uparrow\rangle_S |R_\uparrow\rangle_{S'}, \quad |\downarrow\rangle_S |R\rangle_{S'} \mapsto |\downarrow\rangle_S |R_\downarrow\rangle_{S'}.$$

Here, $|R\rangle$ denotes the initial “ready” state of S' ’s recording device and $|R_\uparrow\rangle, |R_\downarrow\rangle$ are the states of S' that record the spin outcome “up” and “down” respectively. After E_1 , the joint relational configuration (S, S') is:

$$|\Psi_{S,S'}\rangle = \alpha |\uparrow\rangle_S |R_\uparrow\rangle_{S'} + \beta |\downarrow\rangle_S |R_\downarrow\rangle_{S'}$$

For simplicity, assume equal superposition: $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

Second Relational Event (Comparison by S''): Now consider a second event E_2 where S'' interacts with both S and S' . In RQD, S'' is not an absolute external observer but another stable relational node capable of establishing correlations. Let S'' be designed to measure the spin of S and read the record in S' . The event E_2 involves a unitary U_2 that first correlates S'' with S ’s spin, and then correlates S'' with S' ’s recorded value.

1. S'' measures the spin of S :

$$U_2: |\uparrow\rangle_S |O\rangle_{S''} \mapsto |\uparrow\rangle_S |O_\uparrow\rangle_{S''}, \quad |\downarrow\rangle_S |O\rangle_{S''} \mapsto |\downarrow\rangle_S |O_\downarrow\rangle_{S''}$$

where $|O\rangle_{S''}$ is S'' 's initial ready state and $|O_\uparrow\rangle, |O_\downarrow\rangle$ are states where S'' has registered "spin up" or "spin down."

2. S'' then "reads" S' 's record. This can be represented by another correlation step:

$$|R_\uparrow\rangle_{S'}|O_\uparrow\rangle_{S''} \mapsto |R_\uparrow\rangle_{S'}|C_{\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle_{S''},$$

$$|R_\downarrow\rangle_{S'}|O_\downarrow\rangle_{S''} \mapsto |R_\downarrow\rangle_{S'}|C_{\downarrow\downarrow}\rangle_{S''},$$

and for cross terms:

$$|R_\uparrow\rangle_{S'}|O_\downarrow\rangle_{S''} \mapsto |R_\uparrow\rangle_{S'}|C_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle_{S''}, \quad |R_\downarrow\rangle_{S'}|O_\uparrow\rangle_{S''} \mapsto |R_\downarrow\rangle_{S'}|C_{\downarrow\uparrow}\rangle_{S''}.$$

The states $|C_{\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle, |C_{\downarrow\downarrow}\rangle, |C_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle, \text{ and } |C_{\downarrow\uparrow}\rangle$ represent S'' 's final state after "comparing" the spin measured by itself and the record in S' . If the records agree (spin up measured by S' and spin up measured by S''), the system will evolve into a consistent state $|C_{\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle$ that encodes agreement. Similarly for "down" outcomes.

Outcome of Measurements and Consistency: Before E_2 , the total state including S, S' , and S'' is:

$$|\Psi_{S,S',S''}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\rangle_S|R_\uparrow\rangle_{S'} + |\downarrow\rangle_S|R_\downarrow\rangle_{S'})|O_\uparrow\rangle_{S''}$$

After S'' measures S and S' 's record, we have:

$$U_2|\Psi_{S,S',S''}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\rangle_S|R_\uparrow\rangle_{S'}|C_{\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle_{S''} + |\downarrow\rangle_S|R_\downarrow\rangle_{S'}|C_{\downarrow\downarrow}\rangle_{S''})$$

Notice that in this resulting state, there are no terms like $|C_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle$ or $|C_{\downarrow\uparrow}\rangle$ surviving if S'' actually checks both the spin and the record. Quantum theory ensures that the outcomes recorded by S' and those obtained by S'' are consistent, provided that S'' correlates itself with both S and S' in a physically realizable manner.

Interpretation in RQD: In RQD's ontology, there is no absolute observer or universal perspective. Observers and systems are relational clusters of events that achieve a kind of internal coherence. When a third relational node (S'') compares two measurements (S 's spin and S' 's recorded value), the quantum formalism guarantees that these relational patterns align, producing consistent records. This agreement is not mandated by a universal, classical world existing "out there," but by the relational structure encoded in the quantum state and the unitary dynamics governing their interactions.

In other words, while RQD denies any single, absolute vantage point, it does not reduce the world to solipsistic "perspective bubbles." Multiple relational clusters (what we label as "observers") can interact in such a way that their recorded data align. The quantum predictions that follow from standard unitary evolution ensure this consistency, just as in RQM. No matter which relational vantage point one adopts, if a physical comparison is made, quantum theory predicts that observer nodes that have each interacted with the same event will find corresponding outcomes.

Thus, RQD—like RQM—does not lead to anarchy of “private worlds.” Instead, it predicts stable relational consistency whenever distinct emergent observers engage in mutual measurement events. Such consistency ensures that even without a classical background or predefined observer, we all effectively “see the same world” in situations where reliable comparisons are physically performed.

References

- Anderson, E. (2017). *The Problem of Time in Quantum Gravity*. Springer.
- Arndt, M., Nairz, O., Vos-Andreae, J., Keller, C., van der Zouw, G., & Zeilinger, A. (1999). Wave-particle duality of C60 molecules. *Nature*, 401(6754), 680–682. <https://doi.org/10.1038/44348>
- Bell, J. S. (1964). On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics Physique Fizika*, 1:195–200. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysicsPhysiqueFizika.1.195>
- Bohm, D. (1952). A Suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of "Hidden" Variables. I & II. *Phys. Rev.* 85:166–193. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.85.166>
- Bose, S. et al. (2017). Spin Entanglement Witness for Quantum Gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 119:240401. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.240401>
- Bohr, N. (1935). Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete? *Phys. Rev.* 48:696–702. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.48.696>
- Bombelli, L., Koul, R.K., Lee, J. & Sorkin, R.D. (1986). Quantum source of entropy for black holes. *Phys. Rev. D* 34:373–383. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.34.373>
- Brukner, Č. & Zeilinger, A. (2003). Information and fundamental elements of the structure of quantum theory. In *Time, Quantum, and Information*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-10557-3_21
- Candiotto, L. (2017). The reality of relations. *Giornale di Metafisica*. 2: 537-551
- Cao, C. & Carroll, S.M. (2018). Bulk entanglement gravity without a boundary: Towards finding Einstein's equation in Hilbert space. *Phys. Rev. D* 97:086003. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.086003>
- Chalmers, D. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *J. Conscious. Stud.* 2:200–219.
- Chiribella, G., D'Ariano, G.M. & Perinotti, P. (2011). Informational derivation of Quantum Theory. *Phys. Rev. A* 84:012311. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.84.012311>
- Daley, A.J., Bloch, I., Kokail, C. et al. (2022). Practical quantum advantage in quantum simulation. *Nature* 607, 667–676. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04940-6>
- DeWitt, B.S. (1967). Quantum Theory of Gravity. I. The Canonical Theory. *Phys. Rev.* 160:1113–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.160.1113>

Donnelly, W. (2014). Entanglement entropy and nonabelian gauge symmetry. *Class. Quantum Grav.* 31:214003 DOI: 10.1088/0264-9381/31/21/214003

Dong, X., Lewkowycz, A. & Rangamani, M. (2016) Deriving covariant holographic entanglement. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 28 (2016). [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11\(2016\)028](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2016)028) .

Dorato, M. (2006). Properties and Dispositions: Some Metaphysical Remarks on Quantum Ontology. *AIP Conf. Proc.* 844, 139–157. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2219359>

Dorato, M. (2013). Rovelli's relational quantum mechanics, monism and quantum becoming. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1309.0132>

Einstein, A. (1919). What is the theory of relativity? *London Times*. Nov. 28. Source of English translation: Albert Einstein, *Einstein, Ideas and Opinions*, translated by Sonja Bargmann. New York: Crown, 1952, pp. 100-05.

Einstein, A., Podolsky, B. & Rosen, N. (1935). Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete? *Phys. Rev.* 47:777–780. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.47.777>

Everett, H. (1957). "Relative State" Formulation of Quantum Mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 29:454–462. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.29.454>

Faulkner, T., Lewkowycz, A. & Maldacena, J. (2013). Quantum corrections to holographic entanglement entropy. *J. High Energ. Phys.*, 11:074. [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11\(2013\)074](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2013)074)

Frauchiger, D. & Renner, R. (2018). Quantum theory cannot consistently describe the use of itself. *Nat. Commun.* 9:3711. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05739-8>

French, S. & Ladyman, J. (2010). In Defence of Ontic Structural Realism. In: Bokulich, A., Bokulich, P. (eds) *Scientific Structuralism*. Boston Studies in the Philosophy and History of Science, vol 281. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9597-8_2

Fuchs, C.A. (2001). Quantum foundations in the light of quantum information. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.quant-ph/0106166>

Fuchs, C.A. (2002). Quantum foundations in the light of quantum information (Ph.D. Thesis). *arXiv:quant-ph/0205039*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.quant-ph/0205039>

Fuchs, C.A. & Schack, R. (2013). Quantum-Bayesian coherence. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 85:1693–1715. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.85.1693>

Gambini, R., Porto, R.A., Pullin, J., (2004). A relational solution to the problem of time in quantum mechanics and quantum gravity: a fundamental mechanism for quantum decoherence. *New J. Phys.* 6 45. DOI: 10.1088/1367-2630/6/1/045

Gell-Mann & M. & Hartle, J.B. (2023). Quantum Mechanics in the Light of Quantum Cosmology. In *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information*, ed. W. H. Zurek. Addison-Wesley. The SFI Press Archive Series

Georgescu, I.M., Ashhab, S. & Nori, F. (2014). Quantum simulation. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 86:153–185. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.86.153>

Ghirardi, G.C., Rimini, A. & Weber, T. (1986). Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems. *Phys. Rev. D* 34:470–491. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.34.470>

Giacomini, F., Castro-Ruiz, E. & Brukner, Č. (2019). Quantum mechanics and the covariance of physical laws in quantum reference frames. *Nat. Commun.* 10:494. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08155-0>

Goldstein, H. (1980). *Classical Mechanics*. Addison-Wesley.

Green, M.B., Schwarz, J.H. & Witten, E. (2012). *Superstring Theory*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139248563>

Hardy, L. (2001). Quantum theory from five reasonable axioms. *arXiv:quant-ph/0101012*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.quant-ph/0101012>

Hayden, P. & Preskill, J. (2007). Black holes as mirrors: Quantum information in random subsystems. *JHEP*, 09:120. DOI: 10.1088/1126-6708/2007/09/120

Heisenberg, W. (1925). Über quantentheoretische Umdeutung kinematischer und mechanischer Beziehungen. *Z. Phys.* 33:879–893. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01328377>

Healey, R. (2012). Quantum Theory: A Pragmatist Approach. *Brit. J. Philos. Sci.* 63(4):729–771. DOI: 10.1093/bjps/axr054

Healey, R. (2017). *The Quantum Revolution in Philosophy*. Oxford University Press.

Isham, C.J. (1993). Canonical Quantum Gravity and the Problem of Time. In: Ibort, L.A., Rodríguez, M.A. (eds) *Integrable Systems, Quantum Groups, and Quantum Field Theories*. NATO ASI Series, vol 409. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-1980-1_6

Joos, E., Zeh, H.D., Kiefer, C., Giulini, D., Kupsch, J., & Stamatescu, I.O. (2003). *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory* (2nd ed.). Springer.

Kastrup, B. (2017). An Ontological Solution to the Mind-Body Problem. *Philosophies* 2 (2). doi:10.3390/philosophies2020010

Kochen, S., Specker, E.P. (1975). The Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics. In: Hooker, C.A. (eds) *The Logico-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics*. The University of Western Ontario Series in Philosophy of Science, vol 5a. Springer, Dordrecht.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1795-4_17

Kuchař, K. (2011). Time and interpretations of quantum gravity. *International Journal of Modern Physics D* 20:supp01, 3-86. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218271811019347>

Ladyman, J., Ross, D., and Spurrett, D., Collier, J., (2007), *Every Thing Must Go: Metaphysics Naturalized* (Oxford, 2007; online edn, Oxford

Academic, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199276196.001.0001>

Landau, L.D. & Lifshitz, E.M. (1960). *Mechanics*, 2nd ed. Pergamon Press.

Laudisa, F. (2001). The EPR argument in a relational interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Found. Phys. Lett.* 14:119–132. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012325503383>

Laudisa, F. & Rovelli, (2024) Relational Quantum Mechanics, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2024 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.),

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/qm-relational/>

Maldacena, J. (1999). The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* 38:1113–1133. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026654312961>

Marletto, C. & Vedral, V. (2017). Gravitationally Induced Entanglement between Two Massive Particles is Sufficient Evidence of Quantum Effects in Gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 119:240402.

<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.240402>

Maudlin, T. (2011). *Quantum Non-Locality and Relativity*. Wiley-Blackwell.

DOI:10.1002/9781444396973

Martin-Dussaud, P., Rovelli, C., & Zalamea, F. (2019). The Notion of Locality in Relational

Quantum Mechanics. *Foundations of Physics*, 49(2):96–106. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-019-00234-6>

Nagel, T. (1986). *The View from Nowhere*. Oxford University Press.

Mermin, N.D. (1990). Quantum Mysteries Revisited. *Am. J. Phys.* 58:731–734.

<https://doi.org/10.1119/1.16503>

Oreshkov, O., Costa, F. & Brukner, Č. (2012). Quantum correlations with no causal order. *Nat. Commun.* 3:1092. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms2076>

Pastawski, F. et al. (2015). Holographic quantum error-correcting codes: toy models for the bulk/boundary correspondence. *J. High Energ. Phys.* 06:149.

[https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06\(2015\)149](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2015)149)

Pearle, P. (1989). Combining stochastic dynamical state-vector reduction with spontaneous localization. *Phys. Rev. A* 39:2277–2289. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.39.2277>

Pienaar, J. A (2021). Quintet of Quandaries: Five No-Go Theorems for Relational Quantum Mechanics. *Found Phys* 51, 97 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-021-00500-6>

Polchinski, J. (1998). *String Theory*. Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816079>

Procopio, L.M. et al. (2015). Experimental superposition of orders of quantum gates. *Nat. Commun.* 6:7913. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8913>

Pusey, M.F., Barrett, J. & Rudolph, T. (2012). On the reality of the quantum state. *Nat. Phys.* 8:475–478. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys2309>

Qi, X.-L. (2013). Exact holographic mapping and emergent space-time geometry. *arXiv:1309.6282*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1309.6282>

Rovelli, C. (1995). Analysis of the distinct meaning of time in quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. D.* 42:2638–2646. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02741291>

Rovelli, C. (1996). Relational Quantum Mechanics. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* 35:1637–1678.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02302261>

Rovelli, C. (2004). *Quantum Gravity*. Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511755804>

Rovelli C. (2017) Is Time's Arrow Perspectival? In: Chamcham K, Silk J, Barrow JD, Saunders S, eds. *The Philosophy of Cosmology*. Cambridge University Press; 2017:285-296.

Ryu, S. & Takayanagi, T. (2006). Holographic derivation of entanglement entropy from AdS/CFT. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96:181602. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.181602>

Schaffer, J. (2010). Monism: The priority of the whole. *Philos. Rev.* 119:31–76. DOI: 10.1215/00318108-2009-025

Schlosshauer, M. (2007). *Decoherence and the Quantum-to-Classical Transition*. Springer.

Schrödinger, E. (1935). Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik. *Naturwissenschaften*, 23, 807–812. English translation in *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, ed. by J.A. Wheeler and W.H. Zurek, Princeton University Press, 1983.

Smerlak, M. & Rovelli, C. (2007). Relational EPR. *Found. Phys.* 37:427–445.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-007-9105-0>

Srednicki, M. (1993). Entropy and area. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 71:666–669.
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.666>

Strawson, Galen (2006). Realistic monism: why physicalism entails panpsychism. In Anthony Freeman (ed.), *Consciousness and Its Place in Nature: Does Physicalism Entail Panpsychism?* Exeter: Imprint Academic. pp. 3-31.

Swingle, B. (2012). Entanglement Renormalization and Holography. *Phys. Rev. D* 86:065007.
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.86.065007>

Thiemann, T. (2007). *Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511755682>

Padovani, F., Van Fraassen, B.C. (2012). *Scientific Representation: Paradoxes of Perspective*. *Sci & Educ* 21, 1199–1204 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-011-9423-7>

Van Raamsdonk, M. (2010). Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement. *Gen. Rel. Grav.* 42:2323–2329. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10714-010-1034-0>

Vaidman, L. (2002 [2018]). Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-manyworlds/>

von Neumann, J. (1932). *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik*. Springer. English translation: *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press (1955).

Waaiker, M., Neerven, J.v. (2021) Relational Analysis of the Frauchiger–Renner Paradox and Interaction-Free Detection of Records from the Past. *Found Phys* 51, 45.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-021-00413-4> .

Wallace, D. (2012). *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum Theory According to the Everett Interpretation*. Oxford University Press.

Wheeler, J.A. & Zurek, W.H. (1983). *Quantum Measurement Problem*. Princeton University Press.

Wheeler, John Archibald (1989). Information, physics, quantum: the search for links. In Wheeler John Archibald (ed.), *Proceedings III International Symposium on Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*. pp. 354-358.

Wigner, E.P. (1961). Remarks on the Mind-Body Question. In *The Scientist Speculates*. Heinemann.

Wigner, E.P. (1995). Remarks on the Mind-Body Question. In: Mehra, J. (eds) *Philosophical Reflections and Syntheses. The Collected Works of Eugene Paul Wigner*, vol B / 6. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-78374-6_20

Witten, E. (2018). Notes on some entanglement properties of quantum field theory. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 90:045003. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.90.045003>

Zeilinger, A. (1999). A foundational principle for quantum mechanics. *Found. Phys.* 29:631–643. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018820410908>

Zurek, W.H. (2006). Decoherence and the Transition from Quantum to Classical — Revisited. In: Duplantier, B., Raimond, JM., Rivasseau, V. (eds) *Quantum Decoherence. Progress in Mathematical Physics*, vol 48. Birkhäuser Basel. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7643-7808-0_1

Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 75(3), 715–775. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.75.715>