The No-Communication Theorem as a Spacetime Artifact

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

April 10, 2025

The No-Communication Theorem is often cited as a safeguard for preserving causality in a world shaped by quantum entanglement. It assures us that, although entangled particles exhibit instantaneous correlations across vast distances, these correlations cannot be exploited to transmit information faster than light. In doing so, the theorem seems to protect the causal structure of spacetime as defined by special relativity. But what if this protection is illusory? What if the theorem is not a fundamental law of nature, but a conceptual artifact born from our refusal to abandon an outdated geometric framework? This paper argues that the No-Communication Theorem is best understood not as a principle, but as a boundary condition imposed to preserve Minkowskian causality in a quantum world that has already surrendered locality. By examining the theorem's assumptions and consequences, we suggest that entanglement reveals a reality beyond spacetime—an informational substrate from which space, time, and causality themselves emerge. To understand this deeper structure, physics must move beyond geometry and reframe causality in terms of quantum information.

Keywords: quantum entanglement, nonlocality, causality, Minkowski spacetime, no-communication theorem, quantum information, emergent spacetime, ER=EPR, Bell's theorem, relativistic causality, pre-geometric physics, quantum foundations, informational ontology, Hilbert space, spacetime emergence. A collaboration with GPT-4o.

1. Introduction

At the heart of modern physics lies the concept of spacetime, a unified four-dimensional continuum introduced by Hermann Minkowski as a geometric foundation for Einstein's special theory of relativity. Within this framework, the notions of space and time are no longer separate entities but are interwoven into a single, coherent structure in which all physical events take place. Causality — the principle that effects follow causes — is embedded within this geometry, tightly coupled to the speed of light, which defines the limits of information transfer through the structure of light cones.

A key feature of Minkowski spacetime is locality: the idea that objects are directly influenced only by their immediate surroundings, and that any causal influence propagates through space no faster than light. This principle has underpinned both classical field theories and the early formulations of quantum theory. Within this view, causality and locality are not in tension but are mutually reinforcing: the geometry of spacetime determines what can cause what, and when.

However, this classical union is fundamentally challenged by the phenomenon of quantum entanglement. When two or more particles become entangled, their properties become strongly correlated in a way that defies any local explanation. Measurements performed on one particle appear to instantaneously influence the state of the other, even when separated by vast distances. This strange feature — once described by Einstein as "spooky action at a distance" — violates the intuitive notion that information or influence must travel through space over time.

The experimental verification of Bell's theorem, and the consistent violation of Bell inequalities, have removed any possibility of explaining entanglement within a local hidden variable theory. Physics was forced into a binary decision: either give up locality, or relinquish causality. Most interpretations of quantum mechanics choose the former, preserving causality while accepting that nonlocal correlations are real.

This compromise has led to the formalization of the No-Communication Theorem, which asserts that although entangled particles exhibit nonlocal correlations, these cannot be used to transmit information faster than light. In other words, the theorem preserves the letter of relativistic causality, even while admitting that something beyond classical intuition is occurring.

But this paper begins from a deeper unease: what if the No-Communication Theorem is not a triumph of reconciliation, but a mask for contradiction? What if, in giving up locality while clinging to the structure of Minkowski spacetime, we have created a paradox that cannot be resolved within the current framework?

We propose that the No-Communication Theorem is best understood not as a foundational principle, but as a residual feature of a desperate effort to preserve the appearance of causality within a spacetime geometry that has already been rendered incomplete by entanglement. It is a boundary condition, not a law — a statement of what we can't do, rather than a revelation of how the universe works.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the No-Communication Theorem as an artifact of broken assumptions, to show how it inherits its limitations from the structure it tries to protect, and to argue that the real path forward lies in letting go of spacetime as fundamental. By following the thread of entanglement to its logical end, we are drawn toward a reality in which geometry is emergent, and in which causality must be redefined in the language of information rather than propagation.

2. The Quantum Dilemma: Locality or Causality

At the heart of quantum theory lies a conflict so deep that it continues to shape our understanding of reality more than half a century after it was formally identified. This conflict was crystallized in the work of John Bell, whose 1964 theorem demonstrated that the predictions of quantum mechanics are incompatible with any theory based on both locality and realism — the view that physical properties exist independently of measurement and that effects have local causes. Bell's theorem provided not only a philosophical challenge to classical intuitions, but also a mathematical inequality — a concrete, testable boundary between local hidden variable theories and the strange nonlocal structure of quantum mechanics.

Bell's inequalities established a critical benchmark: if correlations between entangled particles violated these inequalities, then no theory based on local realism could be correct. In a striking series of experiments — beginning with Alain Aspect's work in the 1980s and culminating in loophole-free tests in the 2010s — nature has consistently shown its hand: the inequalities are violated, and with them, the principle of locality as classically understood.

These experiments confirm that entangled particles display correlations that cannot be explained by any signal traveling through space at or below the speed of light. When a measurement is made on one particle, the corresponding state of its entangled partner becomes determined instantaneously — even when the two particles are separated by light-years and measured in such a way that no signal, not even a hypothetical one, could pass between them within the time allowed. This is quantum nonlocality, and it is real.

Faced with this empirical reality, physics was forced into a painful decision. Either accept that influences can propagate faster than light — violating relativistic causality — or accept that these influences cannot be used to transmit usable information, and therefore do not truly constitute a breakdown in causality.

The standard response has been pragmatic and conservative: abandon locality, but preserve causality. That is, physicists have accepted that entangled systems behave in a nonlocal way, but have insisted that these nonlocal behaviors cannot be used to communicate faster than light. This viewpoint maintains consistency with special relativity by asserting that although correlations exist, no signal or influence is transmitted in any operational sense. The behavior is real, but it cannot be harnessed to send messages or cause effects beyond the light cone.

This approach culminates in the No-Communication Theorem, which formalizes the idea that entanglement, for all its strangeness, does not allow the violation of relativistic causality. However, this entire interpretive structure implicitly assumes the continued validity of Minkowski spacetime. The preservation of causality is meaningful only in a framework where causality is defined in terms of the light cone — the boundary structure determined by Minkowski geometry.

In other words, by choosing to abandon locality while preserving causality, physics retains the spacetime scaffolding of relativity even as it sacrifices one of its key structural beams. The No-Communication Theorem becomes a patch — a necessary condition for maintaining internal consistency — but it is not a resolution. It is a way of keeping the map intact even when the territory beneath it is shifting.

The deeper implication is that this compromise may obscure the truth rather than reveal it. By maintaining the form of causality embedded in Minkowski space while conceding that entanglement lies outside its bounds, the response hides a profound inconsistency. It suggests that our classical concepts of space, time, and information flow may no longer be the correct language for describing reality at its most fundamental level.

What remains, then, is a geometry with broken pillars — a framework haunted by its own exclusions, still clinging to causal constraints that no longer emerge naturally from its foundations. The next step is to confront this fracture directly — and to examine what the No-Communication Theorem truly represents when locality has been given up and geometry no longer defines the structure of causality.

3. Entanglement and the Breakdown of Minkowski Geometry

The elegance of Minkowski spacetime lies in its precise structure: a four-dimensional manifold in which every event is assigned a position in space and a coordinate in time, and where causality is geometrically encoded in the separation of events by light cones. Within this framework, timelike intervals define the realm of causal influence, lightlike intervals represent the theoretical limit of information transfer, and spacelike intervals denote events that cannot possibly influence each other, at least not without violating the speed-of-light constraint. This structure has proven robust across the domains of classical physics and relativistic field theory, providing a consistent account of how information and causality are bound to geometry.

But quantum entanglement poses a direct challenge to this framework — not as a minor contradiction to be patched, but as a conceptual fracture that undermines the very geometry on which Minkowski spacetime is built.

Nonlocality Defies Geometric Embedding

Nonlocal correlations — the hallmark of entanglement — simply cannot be embedded meaningfully within Minkowski space. There is no trajectory, no signal, and no continuous evolution through spacetime that can connect the instantaneous correlations between entangled particles. These correlations appear not merely to bypass the geometry of spacetime, but to exist outside of it entirely.

In Minkowski terms, two measurement events that are spacelike-separated should have no causal relationship. Yet entangled systems demand that their outcomes be correlated in ways that imply an instantaneous dependency. This implies a relational structure between measurement outcomes that cannot be drawn as a worldline or described as the result of a local interaction. The standard formalism of quantum mechanics — where the wavefunction spans a configuration space, not physical space — reflects this deeper dimensionality, where the idea of a single geometric backdrop is already inadequate.

The Limits of Light Cone Causality

The concept of the light cone is the cornerstone of relativistic causality: events outside one another's light cones are causally disconnected, and no influence can pass between them faster than light. This structure not only determines what can affect what, but also how we understand the passage of time, the flow of information, and the nature of simultaneity.

Entangled systems, however, routinely violate the spirit of light cone causality while remaining compliant with its letter. For example, if two observers, Alice and Bob, perform measurements on entangled particles at locations A and B such that A and B are spacelike-separated, the correlations between their outcomes will still perfectly reflect the structure of entanglement — regardless of the coordinate frame or time ordering of the measurements. No influence travels between them in spacetime, yet their outcomes are instantaneously related.

This suggests that light cone causality is insufficient to account for what is really happening. Something deeper than spacetime is establishing the relational order between events, something that Minkowski geometry cannot capture or explain.

Spacelike-Separated Correlations: Beyond Classical Explanation

Experiments have demonstrated again and again that quantum correlations can exist between events that are spacelike-separated — that is, between measurements that are outside of each other's causal light cones. These correlations are not weak statistical quirks but robust features of nature that violate Bell inequalities and match the predictions of quantum mechanics with striking precision.

No classical mechanism can explain how one measurement "knows" the outcome of the other. And more importantly, no local model — no model in which influences are restricted to propagate through space at or below the speed of light — can account for them. These are not coincidences. They are signs that the spacetime picture is incomplete.

The EPR paradox, Bell's inequalities, and experiments like those conducted by Aspect, Zeilinger, and others all point toward this same conclusion: whatever entanglement is, it is not a phenomenon that occurs within the boundaries of spacetime. It is something that manifests within it, but is not of it.

Quantum Mechanics vs. the Geometry of Relativity

The result is a growing tension — one that cannot be dismissed as philosophical hand-wringing. Quantum mechanics and special relativity rest on different assumptions about what is fundamental. Quantum mechanics deals in nonlocal correlations, wavefunctions that exist in abstract configuration spaces, and instantaneous state updates across distance. Special relativity demands a geometric continuity in which no such features are allowed.

The attempt to reconcile the two without confronting the underlying contradiction has led to increasingly complex interpretations — from relativistic quantum field theory, which sidesteps measurement altogether, to decoherence-based models, which avoid the collapse of the wavefunction but not the correlations themselves. Yet none of these fully explain how spacelike-separated correlations can exist without invoking non-spatiotemporal processes.

The very geometry of Minkowski space — once the bedrock of causality and physical law — now appears as an emergent structure, meaningful only at the classical level. Entanglement may be the first clear indicator that the universe's deepest truths do not reside in space and time at all, but rather in a hidden informational order that gives rise to spacetime only as a limiting case.

4. The No-Communication Theorem: A Closer Look

In the wake of quantum mechanics' assault on locality, physicists have leaned heavily on the No-Communication Theorem as a kind of conceptual firewall — a principle that permits nonlocal correlations without violating the sacred boundary of relativistic causality. The theorem is typically invoked to explain how entangled particles can exhibit instantaneous correlations across vast distances while preserving the constraint that no usable information travels faster than light. But to truly understand the role this theorem plays — and the assumptions it buries — we must examine both its formal structure and its philosophical implications.

Formal Definition and Mathematical Statement of the Theorem

The No-Communication Theorem arises naturally in the mathematical structure of quantum mechanics, particularly in the analysis of composite systems with entangled subsystems. Let us consider two observers, Alice and Bob, each in possession of one half of a maximally entangled quantum pair. The total state of the system is represented by a shared wavefunction — for instance, a Bell state such as:

$$|\Psi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0\rangle_A |1\rangle_B - |1\rangle_A |0\rangle_B \right)$$

If Alice performs a measurement on her qubit in some basis, quantum mechanics tells us that Bob's qubit will be instantaneously projected into the corresponding state, even if he is far away. However, if Bob examines his subsystem in isolation, he sees a completely **mixed state** regardless of what Alice does. That is, the **reduced density matrix** for Bob's subsystem is:

$$\rho_B = \mathrm{Tr}_A \left(|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-| \right) = \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle\langle 1|$$

This result holds true no matter what measurement Alice performs, or even whether she chooses to measure at all. From Bob's perspective, nothing observable changes as a result of Alice's local operation. Thus, no signal — in the Shannon sense — is transmitted.

This is the essence of the No-Communication Theorem: the marginal statistics of one observer's subsystem are independent of the operations performed on the distant entangled partner.

How the Theorem Prevents Faster-Than-Light Signaling

By ensuring that the local statistics of measurement outcomes are invariant under remote operations, the No-Communication Theorem upholds the operational version of causality required by special relativity: that no information or influence propagates faster than light. Even though the *joint* probabilities between Alice's and Bob's outcomes are strongly correlated — violating Bell inequalities — no controllable signal can be encoded or transmitted using these correlations alone.

This is an important distinction. While quantum entanglement establishes a connection that appears to be instantaneous and nonlocal, the inability to use this connection to influence the outcome of measurements at a distance preserves a façade of causality consistent with the relativistic structure of spacetime. The theorem essentially draws a line between correlation and communication, asserting that the former does not imply the latter.

The Key Insight: Correlation Without Control

The central paradox embedded in the No-Communication Theorem is that information is clearly present in the system, but cannot be controlled by either observer. The correlations are predictable and repeatable — they can be statistically verified and mathematically modeled — but they cannot be used as a channel for communication in the conventional sense.

This leads to a deeper philosophical tension: if two observers can witness statistically correlated outcomes that depend on one another, yet cannot use these correlations to exchange messages, then what, exactly, is being preserved by the prohibition on communication?

The answer seems to be: our classical concept of cause and effect, embedded in the Minkowski geometry of spacetime. The universe is permitted to behave in a way that violates the spirit of locality but is bound not to violate the letter of causality — as long as that causality is defined by what can be transmitted through space, via controllable signals, at or below the speed of light.

In this sense, the No-Communication Theorem is less a statement about physics than it is a semantic firewall — a rule that preserves the appearance of causality while conceding that something deeper is at work.

Why the Theorem Depends on Preserving a Minkowskian Concept of Causality

At its core, the No-Communication Theorem rests on an assumption that is rarely questioned: that spacetime is still the correct stage on which physical processes unfold, and that causality — the ordering of cause and effect — is defined by the structure of Minkowski spacetime. The entire concept of “communication” as defined in the theorem presupposes classical information theory and relativistic constraints.

But if the phenomena being described — entanglement, wavefunction collapse, instantaneous correlations — do not themselves occur within spacetime in any meaningful way, then the operational boundary enforced by the theorem is only valid within a framework that may no longer apply. The theorem prohibits communication in space, but the correlations are not taking place in space. They are taking place in Hilbert space, in configuration space, or perhaps even in a yet-undeclared pre-geometric realm.

Thus, the No-Communication Theorem is not a triumph of quantum-classical harmony, but rather an artifact — a concession made to protect a conceptual structure that quantum mechanics has already outgrown. By continuing to interpret quantum correlations within the geometry of Minkowski spacetime, the theorem upholds causality in form, but not in substance. It allows us to keep the structure of spacetime intact, while turning a blind eye to the fact that the correlations themselves may originate in a realm where spacetime has no meaning at all.

5. The No-Communication Theorem as a Spacetime Artifact

The No-Communication Theorem is often treated as a reassuring anchor in the turbulent waters of quantum mechanics — a formal proof that, despite quantum strangeness, the deep structure of spacetime remains untouched. Yet upon closer inspection, it is less of a foundational law and more of a boundary condition — a constraint imposed to preserve the illusion of consistency within a framework that is already conceptually fractured.

To appreciate this, one must recognize the peculiar position the theorem occupies: it operates within a quantum theory that has already relinquished locality, yet it claims to safeguard a causal structure that is only meaningful if locality holds. This makes the No-Communication Theorem a rule devised not to explain the behavior of entangled systems, but to contain their implications within a failing model of spacetime.

A Boundary Condition Within a Broken Framework

A boundary condition, in mathematics and physics, is not a law of nature but a constraint — a filter placed on a system to produce acceptable or manageable results. The No-Communication Theorem performs this function with remarkable subtlety. It acknowledges the empirical fact of nonlocal correlations, but denies those correlations any physical agency. It effectively says: *Yes, the entanglement is real, but it shall not be allowed to interfere with the geometry of spacetime.*

This is not resolution. It is containment.

The theorem acts as a conceptual firewall, a boundary erected not because we understand the terrain beyond it, but because we fear that traversing it would upend our ability to describe reality in conventional terms. The No-Communication Theorem is the line drawn in the sand, a refusal to follow the consequences of quantum theory to their logical conclusion.

Protecting Causality in a Framework Whose Locality Has Already Failed

The irony is inescapable: causality, as defined by the geometry of Minkowski spacetime, is being protected within a system that has already admitted the failure of locality — one of spacetime's essential underpinnings.

If no physical process can account for the instantaneous coordination of entangled outcomes across spacelike intervals, then causality, as traditionally understood, has already been compromised. The refusal to allow these correlations to be used for signaling is not a triumph of physical law, but a self-imposed restriction designed to avoid overt contradictions with relativity.

This kind of reasoning reveals the fragility of the framework. Relativity assumes that all causal influences are local — that they propagate through space and time along well-defined paths. If locality no longer applies, then the entire architecture of relativistic causality becomes a façade, preserved not by physical mechanisms, but by the decision to disallow certain interpretations of quantum phenomena.

The Illusion of Consistency: Causality Without Mechanisms

What the No-Communication Theorem ultimately creates is an illusion of consistency: a system in which causality appears to be preserved, even though the mechanisms by which it would ordinarily operate have been removed.

We are left with correlations without causes, outcomes without influence, and events bound together without any mediating process. In such a world, causality is no longer a law of nature but a category of description — a narrative we impose on events in order to make sense of them within a failing geometry.

This is a profound epistemic shift. We are no longer observing causality; we are enforcing it by definition. The theorem ensures that no signal — no manipulable message — can be transmitted faster than light, but it does not, and cannot, explain how spacelike-separated systems come to be correlated. It forbids the use of nonlocality, but it does not deny its existence. It masks a paradox, rather than resolving it.

Spacetime's Authority Maintained by Definition, Not by Coherence

By enforcing a prohibition on faster-than-light communication, the No-Communication Theorem preserves the authority of Minkowski spacetime, but only by definitional fiat. The underlying reality, as revealed through entanglement, suggests that spacetime is not the arena in which all physical phenomena play out. Instead, it is an emergent construct — a useful map, perhaps, but no longer the territory.

When the foundational principles of a theory are preserved only by stipulating what cannot happen, rather than by describing what does, we are no longer doing explanatory physics. We are performing conceptual triage — keeping the patient alive by ignoring the symptoms.

Reframing the Theorem as a Symptom, Not a Solution

The No-Communication Theorem should not be viewed as a safeguard of consistency, but as a symptom of a deeper inconsistency. It reflects the limits of our current conceptual vocabulary. We are attempting to describe nonlocal, non-geometric phenomena using the tools of local, geometric physics — and the theorem is a patch, not a bridge.

It is a sign that the structure we are working within is no longer adequate to describe the reality we are uncovering. The persistence of this theorem in the literature is not evidence of its truth, but of our reluctance to abandon the comfort of Minkowski space. It tells us not how the universe works, but how far we are willing to go to preserve an outdated worldview.

In short, the No-Communication Theorem is not a revelation of nature's law. It is a boundary we drew when we could go no further, a quiet confession that spacetime, as we know it, is beginning to fail us.

6. Toward a Post-Spacetime Ontology

The failure of locality and the constrained preservation of causality within Minkowski space has brought us to a philosophical and scientific crossroads. If the correlations observed in quantum entanglement cannot be embedded in spacetime, and if the No-Communication Theorem merely preserves a shadow of causal structure by definitional prohibition, then it is no longer sufficient to think of spacetime as the ontological foundation of physical reality.

Instead, we are invited — or perhaps compelled — to consider the possibility that spacetime itself is emergent, and that beneath it lies a deeper, pre-geometric substrate whose fabric is not composed of spatial distances and temporal intervals, but of informational relationships. In this emerging view, quantum information, rather than matter or fields in spacetime, becomes the true substance of the physical world.

Quantum Information as the More Fundamental Layer

In quantum mechanics, the wavefunction encodes information about the possible outcomes of measurement, not physical quantities like position or momentum in the classical sense. When systems become entangled, they do not merely exchange energy or particles — they share information in a way that defies any local encoding.

This has led many physicists and philosophers to argue that information is more fundamental than spacetime — not merely a description of the state of a system, but the primitive substance from which physical reality emerges. In this view, the informational state of a quantum system exists outside space and time, and spacetime is a secondary construct, a large-scale approximation arising from the coarse-grained relationships among a vast number of microscopic informational events.

John Wheeler's famous dictum — *"It from bit"* — was an early anticipation of this idea. But in the quantum context, the phrase might be better rendered as *"It from qubit"* — physical reality arising not from classical bits of knowledge, but from quantum entangled structures that possess no definite properties until measured. This informational layer is not embedded in spacetime. It generates spacetime.

Entanglement as Pre-Geometric Structure

Entanglement, when viewed through this lens, is not a mysterious phenomenon occurring within space — it is the relational glue that precedes geometry altogether. The degree and pattern of entanglement among quantum degrees of freedom appear to dictate the topology and geometry of spacetime at large scales.

This is not mere speculation. In several quantum gravity programs, particularly in the context of holographic dualities, entanglement entropy has been shown to correlate directly with spatial connectivity. That is, the more entangled two regions of a quantum system are, the closer they are in emergent space.

This gives rise to a startling hypothesis: that spacetime itself is a manifestation of the entanglement structure of the underlying quantum state. It is not that entanglement occurs within spacetime — rather, spacetime occurs because of entanglement. This reversal of the usual explanatory order redefines our most basic intuitions about reality.

Emergent Spacetime Theories: ER=EPR, Tensor Networks, Causal Sets

Several modern theoretical frameworks now attempt to formalize this informational view of reality.

- ER = EPR: Proposed by Maldacena and Susskind, this conjecture suggests that entangled particles (EPR pairs) are connected by microscopic Einstein-Rosen (ER) bridges — non-traversable wormholes. While initially speculative, this duality implies that spacetime connectivity (geometry) and quantum entanglement (information) are two sides of the same coin.
- Tensor Networks: In condensed matter physics and holographic quantum gravity, tensor network models like MERA (Multi-scale Entanglement Renormalization Ansatz) show how entanglement structure builds spatial geometry. These models construct space from networks of entangled states and provide a framework where curvature and distance are functions of entanglement.
- Causal Sets: Another approach, causal set theory, proposes that the fundamental structure of the universe is a discrete set of events ordered by causality. Here, spacetime geometry arises from the patterns of causal relationships, not from a continuous manifold. Again, the emphasis is on relational information, not geometric substance.

These theories are radically different in implementation, but they share a common philosophical core: spacetime is not fundamental, and its structure is emergent from something deeper — something that is nonlocal, pre-geometric, and fundamentally informational.

Rethinking Causality in an Informational, Not Geometric, Context

If spacetime is emergent, then the traditional notion of causality as a geometrically ordered chain of events must also be rethought. The light cone, so central to special relativity, is not a primitive structure in these emergent models — it is a derived feature that holds only at macroscopic scales, where the informational substrate gives rise to a smooth geometric approximation.

In an informational ontology, causality becomes correlation. What we call a causal connection is, at root, a manifestation of the mutual informational dependencies between subsystems of the universe. These dependencies are nonlocal by nature, and the time-ordering of events may be observer-relative, or in some formulations, not well-defined at all until the act of observation crystallizes it.

Rather than thinking of cause and effect as entities moving through spacetime, we might instead describe them as updates to the relational state of a universal informational network. In this view, entanglement is not a threat to causality — it is causality, seen in its native form, prior to its projection into space and time.

This shift is not merely interpretive — it is structural. If we accept that quantum information, rather than spacetime geometry, is the foundation of physical law, then the very idea of a "signal" or a "message" changes. The No-Communication Theorem becomes moot in such a context. What was once communication across a distance becomes instantaneous mutual definition within a non-spatial domain.

In light of this, the debate between locality and causality dissolves. The real question is not whether entangled systems violate spacetime constraints, but whether spacetime constraints are even relevant at the level of reality where entanglement resides. We are not watching information travel — we are watching structure unfold.

---

7. Conclusion

For over a century, Minkowski spacetime has served as the stage on which modern physics has been performed — elegant, rigid, and deeply intertwined with our intuitions about locality, causality, and the flow of time. But the rise of quantum mechanics — and, more specifically, quantum entanglement — has exposed the limitations of this stage. At first, the strange behavior of entangled particles seemed like a peripheral oddity. Then it became a central puzzle. Now, with increasingly precise experimental confirmation, it has become an unavoidable clue pointing toward a deeper structure of reality.

In this light, the No-Communication Theorem no longer stands as a triumph of reconciliation between quantum mechanics and relativity. Instead, it appears more like the relic of a dying framework, a vestigial structure that maintains the *appearance* of consistency by denying us access to deeper implications. It permits the observable fact of nonlocal correlations while strictly forbidding their use as signals — not because such a restriction is logically or ontologically required, but because it is necessary to preserve the causal scaffolding of Minkowski space, even as that scaffolding begins to collapse under its own contradictions.

The theorem, in essence, protects the map at the expense of the territory. It reflects a worldview still rooted in geometric thinking — in the idea that space and time are the containers of all physical processes, and that causality is defined by light cones and continuous trajectories. But quantum entanglement reveals that this picture is no longer tenable. The behavior of entangled systems cannot be faithfully represented within spacetime, and attempts to do so result only in a proliferation of semantic constraints and formalistic firewalls, such as those embodied in the No-Communication Theorem.

A true understanding of entanglement requires a departure from geometric thinking altogether. We must accept that reality at its most fundamental level is not structured by coordinates and intervals, but by informational relationships that do not unfold in space or time, but generate them as emergent phenomena. In this deeper view, entanglement is not a challenge to causality but its pre-geometric form, a kind of primitive ordering that exists before — and gives rise to — any geometry at all.

The future of physics, therefore, lies not in defending the old boundaries, but in transcending them. It lies in the recovery of causality as an informational principle, unshackled from the constraints of spacetime, and in the development of new frameworks that can describe this deeper ordering of reality without relying on outdated assumptions.

To move forward, we must stop asking how entanglement fits into spacetime, and begin asking how spacetime arises from entanglement. The No-Communication Theorem, then, is not a final word, but a historical marker — a signpost at the edge of a vast and uncharted domain.

It is time to cross that boundary.

References

1. Bell, J. S. (1964). *On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox*. Physics Physique Физика, 1(3), 195–200.
2. Aspect, A., Dalibard, J., & Roger, G. (1982). *Experimental test of Bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers*. Physical Review Letters, 49(25), 1804–1807.
3. Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A., & Holt, R. A. (1969). *Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories*. Physical Review Letters, 23(15), 880–884.
4. Wiseman, H. M., & Cavalcanti, E. G. (2017). *Causarum Investigatio and the Two Bell's Theorems of John Bell*. In Quantum [Un]Speakables II (pp. 119–142). Springer.
5. Nielsen, M. A., & Chuang, I. L. (2010). *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Preskill, J. (1998). *Lecture Notes on Quantum Computation*. California Institute of Technology. Retrieved from: http://theory.caltech.edu/~preskill/ph229/
7. Susskind, L., & Maldacena, J. (2013). *Cool horizons for entangled black holes*. Fortschritte der Physik, 61(9), 781–811. [ER = EPR conjecture]
8. Van Raamsdonk, M. (2010). *Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement*. General Relativity and Gravitation, 42(10), 2323–2329.
9. Bianchi, E., & Myers, R. C. (2014). *On the architecture of spacetime geometry*. Classical and Quantum Gravity, 31(21), 214002.
10. Bombelli, L., Lee, J., Meyer, D., & Sorkin, R. D. (1987). *Space-time as a causal set*. Physical Review Letters, 59(5), 521–524.
11. Wheeler, J. A. (1990). *Information, physics, quantum: The search for links*. In Zurek, W. H. (Ed.), Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information, Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Sciences of Complexity.

12. Hardy, L. (2005). *Probability theories with dynamic causal structure: A new framework for quantum gravity*. arXiv preprint: arXiv:gr-qc/0509120.

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

14. Zeilinger, A. (1999). *Experiment and the foundations of quantum physics*. Reviews of Modern Physics, 71(2), S288–S297.

15. Harlow, D. (2016). *Jerusalem lectures on black holes and quantum information*. Reviews of Modern Physics, 88(1), 015002.