The day the universe changed: *Toward a quantum paradigm in medicine*

Blair P. Grubb, MD, FACC, FAHA
Dr. Grubb (AΩA, College of Medicine and Life Sciences University of Toledo, 1998, Faculty) is Distinguished University Professor of Medicine, Pediatrics, and Neurology at University of Toledo Medical Center in Toledo, OH. His email address is: blair.grubb@utoledo.edu.

In 1985, science historian James Burke produced a television series titled, *The Day the Universe Changed.* His thesis was elegant and profound: when our fundamental understanding of reality shifts—through the telescope, the printing press, the discovery of perspective—the universe itself effectively changes for us. Not that objective reality alters, but that our relationship to it, our possibilities within it, transform completely.

Medicine stands at such a threshold now.

I have been a physician for nearly 50 years. I have performed more than 5,000 surgeries and procedures, published hundreds of papers, pioneered treatments for conditions other physicians avoided. And I can say with some certainty: modern medicine has its intellectual feet firmly planted in the nineteenth century, holding fast to a reductionist, mechanistic paradigm that every other scientific field has long since moved beyond.

But something is shifting. The argument of this essay is straightforward: the discoveries of modern physics—quantum biology, field theory, entanglement—have profound implications for how we understand the body, how we perceive patients, and how we heal. To follow that argument, it helps to begin with a story.

Knowing

A seasoned pediatrician was seeing patients one afternoon when a mother brought in her infant for a routine visit. The physician took one look at the child, touched her briefly, and told the mother to go directly to the emergency room. The baby had no obvious symptoms. The ER staff were puzzled. But the pediatrician insisted the child be admitted immediately.

Two hours later, the infant went into cardiac arrest. The child was septic.

When asked how she knew, she shrugged and said simply: "I felt it."

Every experienced clinician has had similar moments. You walk into a patient's room and instantly know—not think, not deduce, but know—that something is profoundly wrong, sometimes before any measurable parameter confirms your perception. We call this clinical judgment, or intuition, or the art of medicine. But our reductionist paradigm has no framework for what is actually occurring.

This capacity for perception beyond measurable parameters is not unique to physicians. Specially trained service dogs can detect an impending epileptic seizure in their owner minutes before it occurs, alerting them to sit or lie down before they lose consciousness. Other dogs reliably detect hypoglycemia—dangerously low blood sugar—in diabetic patients through subtle changes in breath and skin chemistry, often before the person is aware of any symptoms themselves.[1] These animals are registering a systemic disturbance—a field-level change—before it manifests in any single measurable parameter. The physician sensing the septic infant and the service dog sensing the hypoglycemic patient are examples of the same phenomenon: awareness operating at a level of biological reality that reductionist medicine has no language to describe.

What are we perceiving in these moments? The answer, I believe, requires a paradigm we have not yet integrated into medicine—one that physics discovered over a century ago. But first, we must understand why our current paradigm falls short.

The problem with reductionism

Reductionism, as applied to medicine, is the approach of understanding complex biological systems by breaking them into their component parts—genes, proteins, cells, organs—and studying each part in isolation. It has been enormously productive. Antibiotics, pacemakers, organ transplants, targeted cancer therapies: all emerged from reductionist science. But reductionism rests on a foundational assumption—that the behavior of the whole can be understood by analyzing the parts—and that assumption increasingly fails us.

In 2008, *JAMA* published a commentary by Henry H.Q. Heng titled, "The conflict between complex systems and reductionism."[2] He argued that the key obstacle to future medicine is the disconnect between the reality of biological complexity and our reductionist approach. The failures are not marginal. Intensive glucose control in diabetes—targeting a single measurable parameter—actually increases mortality risk.[3] Chemotherapy shrinks tumors but often fails to prolong survival and may hasten death.[4–6] As Heng observed, there is a fundamental disconnect "between the status of the parts (such

as tumor response) and the systems behavior (such as overall survival of the patient)."[2]

Every other scientific field has moved beyond this model. Ecology studies relationships and emergent properties, not just individual organisms. Meteorology treats weather as chaotic systems. Neuroscience has shifted from individual neurons to distributed networks. Even economics embraces complexity theory.

Only medicine remains committed to the Cartesian clockwork: find the broken part, fix or replace it, patient cured.

Heng identified the problem with precision. But he stopped short of asking the deeper question: Why do biological systems display such profound complexity, such emergent properties that defy reductionist analysis? The answer lies in recognizing that life operates on fundamentally different principles than we assumed—principles that modern physics has discovered but medicine has not yet integrated.

What physics has learned

Quantum theory, at its most basic, is the physics of the very small—the behavior of matter and energy at the scale of atoms and subatomic particles. At this scale, the classical rules of physics that govern billiard balls and planetary orbits break down entirely. Particles exist in superposition—multiple states simultaneously—until observed. They become entangled, sharing instantaneous connections across any distance. And, as we have discovered, life has been exploiting these quantum properties for billions of years.

Consider photosynthesis. For decades, scientists couldn't explain how plants achieve nearly 100 percent efficiency in transferring energy from light absorption to chemical storage. The answer requires quantum mechanics: the excited electron exists in superposition, simultaneously exploring all possible pathways before collapsing to the optimal route.[7] Life harnesses quantum coherence in wet, warm, chaotic conditions—something physicists long believed impossible. European robins navigate using quantum entanglement in their retinas, sensing the Earth's magnetic field.[8] Enzymes catalyze reactions through quantum tunneling at rates classical chemistry cannot explain.[9]

If the fundamental processes of life—energy transfer, catalysis, navigation, sensing—operate through quantum mechanisms, then treating the body as a classical mechanical system is not just incomplete. It is fundamentally wrong.

There is a deeper shift still. In quantum field theory, what we call "particles" are not particles at all. Electrons, photons, quarks—every fundamental entity—are localized excitations in fields that permeate all space.[10] A field, in this sense, is an invisible medium that fills all of space and carries energy and information. An electron is not a tiny ball orbiting a nucleus. It is a ripple in a field—a standing wave pattern that manifests as a particle only when observed.

Think of ocean waves. We point to a wave and say, "that wave," as if it were a separate object. But the wave is not separate from the ocean—it is a temporary pattern in water, arising from the ocean and returning to it. The field is primary. The particle is derivative. What we perceive as solid, separate matter is, at the most fundamental level, patterns of excitation in interconnected fields.

Perhaps most startling is quantum entanglement. When two particles interact, they form a single quantum system. Measure one particle's spin, and instantaneously—regardless of distance, whether millimeters or light-years—the other particle's state is determined. Not because information traveled between them, but because they were never truly separate to begin with.[11] Einstein called this "spooky action at a distance," and spent years trying to disprove it. He failed. Entanglement has been verified in thousands of experiments. It is not speculation—it is established physics.

What entanglement reveals is that separation, at the quantum level, is in a profound sense an illusion. The unified field is not a metaphor—it is the actual substrate of physical reality. If the fundamental constituents of matter are not truly separate, what does this mean for medicine's assumption that patients are collections of separate organs, separate cells, separate molecules that can be fixed in isolation?

Several credentialed scientists have begun exploring these implications seriously. Federico Faggin, inventor of the microprocessor, argues from quantum mechanics that consciousness is fundamental to reality, not emergent from it.[12] Bernardo Kastrup, philosopher and computer scientist, has developed a rigorously argued position that physical reality is what consciousness looks like from the outside.[13] Itzhak Bentov, biomedical engineer and inventor, built an experimental apparatus to detect standing wave patterns in what he proposed was a universal field of consciousness.[14] These are not fringe figures—they are credentialed scientists applying

rigorous thinking to phenomena that materialist reductionism cannot explain.

And none of this is entirely new. Three thousand years before quantum mechanics, the Upanishads declared Tat Tvam Asi—Thou art That—recognizing individual consciousness as identical to universal consciousness. Kabbalistic Judaism teaches that each soul is a nitzotz, a spark of the divine, emanated as a localized expression of Ein Sof, the infinite. Across traditions and millennia, contemplatives reported the same essential insight through direct experience: separation is illusion. We are the whole, experiencing itself as parts.

What has changed is not the truth. What has changed is that science, after centuries of productive reductionism, is finally developing tools sophisticated enough to verify what contemplatives always knew. The convergence of quantum physics and ancient wisdom is not coincidence. It is recognition.

What this means for medicine

Return now to the pediatrician and the septic infant—and to the service dog sensing hypoglycemia before any instrument can detect it. In the reductionist paradigm, we explain such perceptions as unconscious pattern recognition: skin color, muscle tone, breathing rate, dozens of micro-observations processed below conscious awareness, or in the dog's case, volatile organic compounds on the breath. Those explanations are partially true. But they miss something essential.

The pediatrician did not deduce the child was septic. She felt it. The dog did not calculate a biochemical profile. It knew. Both were perceiving a systemic disturbance—a disruption in the patient's overall field—before that disturbance had concentrated into any single measurable abnormality. If consciousness and awareness are expressions of a unified field, as both quantum physics and wisdom traditions suggest, then the boundary between the physician's awareness and the patient's physiological state is more permeable than our mechanistic model assumes. The field recognized disturbance in itself. This is not mysticism. It is the logical extension of recognizing field dynamics as fundamental to biological reality.

This is also distinct from what is usually meant by "holistic medicine." Holistic medicine, as commonly practiced, broadens the scope of clinical attention—treating mind, body, and spirit rather than isolated symptoms. That is valuable. But a field-based paradigm goes deeper: it proposes that the very substrate of biological reality is relational and interconnected at the quantum level, and that healing therefore involves engaging with patterns of field dysregulation, not merely expanding the checklist of factors we address. The difference is not one of degree but of kind.

I have experienced field perception myself. During complex cardiac electrophysiology procedures—where millimeters matter and a single error can be fatal—I have had moments of profound guidance. My hands moved with certainty I cannot consciously account for. Decisions emerged fully formed. Afterward, I could not fully reconstruct my reasoning. I simply knew what to do. Every surgeon I have discussed this with privately acknowledges similar experiences. We do not speak of it publicly because we have no framework for it. We now may.

My own clinical work offers a concrete example of field-based thinking in practice. I have spent decades treating Postural Orthostatic Tachycardia Syndrome (POTS)—a disorder in which the autonomic nervous system fails to maintain circulatory stability upon standing. Early in my career, other physicians treated only the most obvious symptom: rapid heart rate on standing. Prescribe a beta-blocker. Problem solved. Except patients remained profoundly disabled.

I succeeded where others struggled not because I was smarter, but because I recognized POTS as a systemic dysregulation—a disturbance in the autonomic nervous system's ability to maintain dynamic equilibrium. I looked for patterns: connections to hypermobile Ehlers-Danlos syndrome, to autoimmune processes, to neuroinflammation. Treating POTS requires addressing the whole system. You are not fixing a broken part. You are helping a dysregulated system find new equilibrium. This is precisely what Heng described as emergent systems behavior—and it is what field-based medicine looks like in practice.

The same logic applies to cancer. We can sequence tumor genomes and design targeted therapies. Yet overall survival for most metastatic cancers has not improved dramatically, and aggressive chemotherapy can introduce chaos into stable systems, potentially shortening lives. We are treating a twenty-first-century complex systems disease with nineteenth-century reductionist thinking.

Heng also noted something profound about disease heterogeneity: many "common" diseases are not caused by common genetic alterations but by rare, individually

unique genetic changes.[15,16] What we call the same disease in different patients may be fundamentally different field disturbances manifesting similar surface features. This explains why clinical trials show such variable responses—we are averaging across genuinely different phenomena. Field-based medicine would be inherently personalized: each patient understood as a unique expression of a field with its own pattern of dysregulation.

A personal reckoning

I write this at 72, after a lifetime in medicine that has taken me from rural Maryland poverty through rejection by American medical schools to learning Spanish and completing my training in the Dominican Republic, to performing 5,000 surgeries and working on conditions others dismissed as untreatable. I have trained fellows who now train others. I have felt guidance during surgery that I cannot explain mechanistically. I have watched someone I deeply loved die of brain cancer despite our most aggressive interventions.

For forty years I have observed Shabbat—the Jewish day of rest that begins at sundown on Friday and ends at nightfall on Saturday. I mention this not as a biographical footnote but because Shabbat encodes something directly relevant to the argument of this essay. Six days a week, we engage the world by separating, analyzing, fixing, improving—the reductionist mode. On the seventh day, we are commanded to stop. To perceive the world as whole. To rest in the awareness that beneath all our separating and fixing, reality is unified and sacred. I have found, over decades of practice, that this weekly return to wholeness is not merely spiritual discipline. It is epistemological training—a practice of perceiving at the level of the field rather than the parts. I have also served on the Chevra Kadisha, the sacred burial society, preparing bodies for return to the earth. In that act—tending to what remains of a human life with reverence—the unity of matter, consciousness, and meaning is not a theory. It is a felt reality.

I have lived long enough, and experienced deeply enough, to know that our mechanistic paradigm—for all its genuine successes—is incomplete. The universe is stranger and more unified than we were taught. Consciousness is more fundamental than we assumed. Healing involves more than fixing broken parts.

The mystics knew this. Indigenous healers knew this. The service dog sensing hypoglycemia knows this. Now physics confirms it.

What changes

A field-based medical paradigm would not abandon reductionist insights—they remain valuable and necessary at the scales for which they were developed. But it would contextualize them within a fuller understanding of biological reality. The goal is integration, not replacement.

In diagnosis, we would cultivate and systematize the direct perception that experienced clinicians already practice. That "felt sense" of a patient's state is real information, not mere intuition, and it can be trained, studied, and transmitted. In treatment, we would prioritize system stability alongside targeted intervention, recognizing that aggressive therapies destabilizing the patient's overall field can cause more harm than the disease itself. In research, we would design studies that respect heterogeneity as signal rather than noise and measure emergent system properties rather than only isolated biomarkers. In education, we would teach field dynamics alongside anatomy and physiology—and we would take seriously what wisdom traditions and experienced clinicians have always known.

If the fundamental nature of reality is field, if separation is illusion at the most basic level of physical reality, then there is no "other." The consciousness in me is the same consciousness as in the patients we serve, and in the policy-makers who create separations. When we harm others, we harm the field. Medicine, of all professions, should know this—because healing has always depended on perceiving the fundamental unity beneath apparent separation.

Conclusion

The main argument of this essay can be stated plainly: modern medicine is using an outdated map. The reductionist paradigm—break the body into parts, fix what is broken—was a profound achievement of Enlightenment science. But physics has since discovered that the territory is different from what that map assumes. Life operates through quantum mechanisms. Fundamental reality consists of fields, not separate particles. Consciousness may be fundamental rather than emergent. Complex biological systems display emergent properties that reductionism cannot predict or explain.

The cost of clinging to the old map is not merely theoretical. It is failed cancer treatments, paradoxical clinical trial results, disabled POTS patients told nothing is wrong with them, and the loss of the perceptual capacities that make the finest clinicians—and the most

sensitive service dogs—so extraordinarily effective. It is the reduction of the physician to a technician of parts, when the deepest tradition of medicine has always understood the healer as someone who perceives and engages the whole person.

Medicine's mission has always been humane in the deepest sense: to relieve suffering, to restore function, to accompany patients through illness with both skill and compassion. A field-based paradigm does not diminish that mission—it enlarges it. It restores what reductionism has squeezed out: the recognition that healer and patient meet not merely as technician and mechanism, but as two expressions of the same underlying reality. That recognition is not sentimental. It is, as physics now confirms, literally true.

Three thousand years ago, the sages declared: Tat Tvam Asi—Thou art That.

Modern physics confirms it. Ancient wisdom knew it.

It is time for medicine to practice it.

References

1. Rooney NJ, Guest CM, Swanson LC, Morant SV. How effective are trained dogs at alerting their owners to changes in blood glycaemic levels? Variations in performance of glycaemia alert dogs. *PLoS One.* 2019; 14(1): e0210092.
2. Heng HH. The conflict between complex systems and reductionism. *JAMA.* 2008; 300(13): 1580–1581.
3. Gerstein HC, Miller ME, Byington RP, et al. Effects of intensive glucose lowering in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med.* 2008; 358(24): 2545–2559.
4. Mittra I. The disconnection between tumor response and survival. *Nat Clin Pract Oncol.* 2007; 4(4): 203.
5. Leyvraz S, Pampallona S, Martinelli G, Ploner F, Perey L, Aversa S, Peters S, Brunsvig P, Montes A, Lange A, Yilmaz U, Rosti G. A threefold dose intensity treatment with ifosfamide, carboplatin, and etoposide for patients with small cell lung cancer: a randomized trial. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2008; 100(8): 533–541.
6. Bear HD. Earlier chemotherapy for breast cancer: perhaps too late but still useful. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2003; 10(4): 334–5.
7. Engel GS, Calhoun TR, Read EL, et al. Evidence for wavelike energy transfer through quantum coherence in photosynthetic systems. *Nature.* 2007; 446(7137): 782–86.
8. Ritz T, Adem S, Schulten K. A model for photoreceptor-based magnetoreception in birds. *Biophys J.* 2000; 78(2): 707–18.
9. Klinman JP, Kohen A. Hydrogen tunneling links protein dynamics to enzyme catalysis. *Annu Rev Biochem.* 2013; 82: 471–96.
10. Wilczek F. Quantum field theory. *Rev Mod Phys.* 1999; 71(2): S85–S95.
11. Aspect A, Grangier P, Roger G. Experimental realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm gedankenexperiment: a new violation of Bell's inequalities. *Phys Rev Lett.* 1982; 49(2): 91–4.
12. Faggin F. *Silicon: From the Invention of the Microprocessor to the New Science of Consciousness.* Berkeley, CA: Waterside Productions; 2021.
13. Kastrup B. *The Idea of the World: A Multi-Disciplinary Argument for the Mental Nature of Reality.* Winchester, UK: Iff Books; 2019.
14. Bentov I. *Stalking the Wild Pendulum: On the Mechanics of Consciousness.* Rochester, VT: Destiny Books; 1988.
15. Walsh T, McClellan JM, McCarthy SE, et al. Rare structural variants disrupt multiple genes in neurodevelopmental pathways in schizophrenia. *Science.* 2008; 320(5875): 539–43.
16. Szatmari P, Paterson AD, Zwaigenbaum L, et al. Mapping autism risk loci using genetic linkage and chromosomal rearrangements. *Nat Genet.* 2007; 39(3): 319–25.