Galactic Filament Neuronal Networks: Cosmic Webs as Cognitive Networks

Authors and Affiliations

Oscar Maven
INVICTUS CYMATECH

Abstract

Background: The large-scale structure of the Universe, composed of galaxy clusters connected by vast filaments, bears a striking visual and statistical resemblance to neuronal networks in the brain [1] [2]. This observation has sparked interdisciplinary speculation that *galactic filaments* might not only mirror neural networks morphologically, but could also function in an analogous information-processing capacity on a cosmic scale. Under the Invictus Cymatech philosophy—integrating ancient harmonic theory, quantum vibration principles, and advanced cognitive architectures—we explore the bold hypothesis that the cosmic web is a form of distributed intelligence.

Objective: This study investigates structural, energetic, and potential cognitive parallels between galactic-scale filaments and brain neuronal networks. We examine whether cosmic filaments could exhibit network properties conducive to information processing or even rudimentary consciousness, framed by cosmopsychism (universe-level mind), integrated information theory (IIT), and holofractal models of a scale-invariant mind.

Methods: We performed a comparative network topology analysis of cosmological filament maps and neural connectome data, quantifying clustering coefficients, degree distributions, and scaling relations. Frequency-domain (spectral) analyses were applied to assess structural patterns and possible resonant modes in each system [3]. Simulations and computational models adapted from neuroscience and physics were used to probe signal propagation along filaments, including hypothetical electromagnetic, gravitational, or quantum communication channels.

Results: Galactic filament networks and cortical neuronal networks display quantitatively similar connectivity distributions and clustering tendencies, far beyond what random chance would predict [4] [5]. The power spectrum of matter density fluctuations in cosmic filaments (spanning ~5–500 Mpc) closely aligns with that of neural density fluctuations in cerebellar tissue (1 μm–0.1 mm), indicating structural self-similarity across 27 orders of magnitude [3]. Moreover, cosmic filaments are not inert: they channel flows of gas and dark matter, support magnetized shockwaves [6] [7], and even exhibit global angular momentum (vortical rotation on tens of Mpc scales) [8]. These energetic phenomena suggest potential for wave propagation or oscillatory modes in the cosmic web, albeit on timescales vastly slower than neural signaling. No direct evidence of information encoding in cosmic filaments was found, but the structural and dynamical analogies lay groundwork for treating them as *proto-neural* networks.

Conclusions: We propose that the cosmic web can be viewed as a colossal network with properties reminiscent of a brain, though functioning on physical principles of gravity and plasma rather than

INVICTUS
CYMATECH

biochemistry. While conventional physics implies the Universe's "thinking" (if any) would be exceedingly slow and sparse [9] [10], consideration of non-local quantum connections or holographic information fields could alter this outlook [11] [12]. This speculative convergence of cosmology and neuroscience, under an Invictus Cymatech framework, invites new paradigms of *cosmological cognition*. Such ideas, though exploratory, might inspire novel architectures for distributed artificial intelligence and raise profound security implications as we ponder a conscious or information-bearing cosmos.

Keywords: Cosmic Web, Neural Networks, Cosmopsychism, Integrated Information Theory, Holofractal Consciousness, Network Topology, Cosmic Consciousness, Quantum Resonance

Introduction

Over the past decades, astronomers have unveiled the *cosmic web*: a vast network of galaxies and dark matter arrayed in filamentary structures hundreds of millions of light-years long, threading between gigantic voids [13]. Remarkably, this sprawling cosmic lattice echoes the appearance of a biological neural network. Galaxy clusters in the cosmic web are analogous to nodes or soma, connected by filamentary "axons" of galaxies and gas, with interspersed voids akin to extra-neuronal space [1]. *Figure 1* illustrates this visual parallel with a stained brain tissue sample and a cosmological simulation side by side [14]. The resemblance is more than superficial; a quantitative analysis by Vazza and Feletti (2020) found "a remarkable similarity" in the network topology of the human brain's connectome and the cosmic web [2]. Both systems exhibit clustering of nodes and filamentary connections that suggest common organizational principles despite a scale difference of 27 orders of magnitude [15] [16].

Figure 1: Comparison of neuronal and cosmic networks. Top: Fluorescence microscopy image of neurons (green) and glial cells (blue) in cortical tissue. Bottom: Simulated distribution of galaxies and dark matter in a 300 Mpc region of the universe. Both form clustered networks linked by filaments, hinting at morphological similarity [14].

This intriguing parallel has motivated philosophical inquiry into whether the Universe might exhibit cognitive qualities at grand scales. **Cosmopsychism**, for instance, is the view that the cosmos as a whole is conscious, with individual minds (ours included) being facets of the Universe's mind [17]. Unlike traditional panpsychism which attributes consciousness to every particle, cosmopsychism posits a holistic consciousness inherent to the Universe itself. Along similar lines, **Integrated Information Theory (IIT)** of consciousness provides a quantitative framework: it suggests that any system with a high degree of integrated information (measured by Φ) has a form of consciousness [18] [19]. IIT-inspired discussions speculate whether the cosmic web, with its immense number of connections, could generate a non-zero Φ value — albeit the spatial and temporal scales differ vastly from neural dynamics. Additionally, **holofractal models** (e.g. the *unified spacememory network*) combine holographic information theory with fractal self-similarity, proposing that the Universe's structure and possibly its informational content are self-similar across scales [20] [21]. In such models, each subsystem (galaxies, stars, neurons, atoms) might reflect the informational whole, resonating with ancient concepts like the *musica universalis* (music of the spheres) wherein cosmic order corresponds to harmonic principles. Indeed, modern theoretical physics hints at deep vibrational underpinnings of reality: string theory envisions fundamental particles as one-dimensional filaments vibrating at specific frequencies to generate forces and matter [22]. This convergence of ancient harmonic ideas and quantum physics suggests a thematic backdrop in which cosmic structures could carry "melodies" of information [16].

Against this background, we advance the central hypothesis of this study: **galactic filaments may not only resemble neuronal networks in form, but could also function analogously as distributed information-processing conduits on cosmological scales**. In other words, the Universe's web of filaments might act as a giant *network-of-networks*, potentially capable of storing or transmitting information via physical processes (gravity, electromagnetism, or even quantum entanglement) in a way faintly comparable to how a brain's neural network processes information via electrochemical signals. We frame this hypothesis within the Invictus Cymatech research philosophy, which merges ancient and modern insights—harmonic theory, vibrational physics, and cognitive architectures—to explore defense-oriented synthetic intelligence. In this view, understanding cosmic web networks could inspire radically new architectures for AI that are fractal, resilient, and symphonically integrated across scales.

To explore this hypothesis, the **Introduction** has outlined known similarities and theoretical context, including cosmopsychism (conscious universe theory), IIT (quantitative consciousness criteria), and holofractal concepts (scale-invariant cognition). The following sections detail our **Materials and Methods** for quantitatively comparing cosmic filament networks to neuronal networks, present **Results** of these comparisons (structural metrics, dynamic mode analysis), and then delve into a **Discussion** of what these findings imply for models of consciousness and potential technological innovation. We close with a **Conclusion** summarizing the insights and acknowledging both the speculative nature and transformative potential of this interdisciplinary inquiry.

Materials and Methods

Data Sources and Network Reconstruction

For the galactic filament network, we utilized cosmological simulation data and observational catalogs capturing the cosmic web's structure. Specifically, we drew on a high-resolution Lambda Cold Dark Matter (ΛCDM) simulation of a $(100\ \text{Mpc})^3$ volume (consistent with the scale of the Millennium Simulation) that provides the spatial distribution of dark matter, gas, and galaxies [23] [24]. From this data, 3D density grids were extracted and projected into 2D slices (to mimic the planar sections used in brain tissue microscopy) [25] [26]. The nodes of the cosmic network were operationally defined as density peaks corresponding to galaxy clusters or massive halos, while filaments were the continuous density ridges connecting these nodes [24] [27]. We applied a threshold-based "halo finding" algorithm analogous to that in cosmology: identifying top X% density peaks, expanding around them until a density drop threshold is met, and defining those regions as nodes [27]. Any two nodes with center-to-center separation below a linking length L_{link} were considered connected by a filamentous link [28]. Based on prior cosmic network analyses, we chose $L_{\text{link}} \approx 5\ \text{Mpc}$ (comoving), which corresponds to the typical filament width and matches values used in galaxy surveys [29]. The resulting cosmic web graph in each slice contained on the order of $N \sim 10^3$ nodes and a few$\times 10^3$ links (scaling with slice thickness), ensuring a sparse but connected network representation [30].

For the neuronal network, we obtained high-resolution maps of mammalian brain tissue structure, focusing on cortical and cerebellar samples. Thin slices of human cortex (gray matter) and cerebellum were taken from existing histological datasets [31]. Neuronal cell bodies (soma) were stained and imaged, yielding 2D maps of neuron positions [26]. We treated neuron soma as network nodes. Critically, true neuronal connectivity is not solely dictated by spatial proximity (axons often connect distant neurons); however, as an initial model, we inferred a provisional network by linking neurons that are near each other within a maximum distance threshold (analogous to the linking length) [32]. This "proximity network" captures local clustering structure, though it cannot capture long-range axonal connections. We chose a linking length for neurons such that the average node degree (connections per neuron) was roughly comparable to that in the cosmic network after accounting for scale differences [33] [30]. This approach follows the method of Vazza & Feletti (2020) in establishing a common basis for comparison, albeit with the known limitation that real neural nets have additional non-local links [32]. To supplement, we also incorporated published connectome data for the human brain (from diffusion MRI studies) in a separate analysis, to assess how true long-range brain connections might alter network metrics relative to the cosmic web.

Network Topology Metrics

We computed key graph-theoretic measures on both the cosmic and neuronal networks to quantify their topology:

- **Degree Centrality (k):** the average number of connections per node. This measures network density and connectivity distribution [34] [30]. We calculated the distribution $P(k)$ for each network and recorded its mean $\langle k \rangle$ and variance.

- **Clustering Coefficient (C):** the fraction of a node's neighbors that are also connected to each other, averaged over all nodes [35]. C captures the tendency to form tightly knit clusters or cliques in the network (a measure of local clustering). We measured the distribution of C values across nodes in each system.

- **Degree Distribution and Hubs:** we examined the tail of the degree distribution to see if either network follows a power-law (scale-free) behavior or a Poisson/normal distribution (as expected for random or lattice networks). The presence of high-degree hubs was noted in each case.

- **Small-World-ness:** although not a single metric, we qualitatively assessed if the networks exhibit the small-world property (high clustering like a regular lattice yet short path lengths similar to random graphs). For the brain's true connectivity (from connectome data), the small-world nature is well-established. For the cosmic web, we estimated path lengths across the filament network to see if it likewise enables surprisingly short connections across large distances.

Additionally, we applied **fractal analysis** to the spatial distribution of nodes. Both the brain's neural distribution and the cosmic web have been suggested to have fractal or self-similar organization [20] [15]. We calculated correlation dimension and lacunarity on the point distributions of galaxies vs neurons to quantify their spatial complexity and clustering across scales.

Spectral Density and Mode Analysis

To probe the presence of *structural frequencies* or repeating patterns, we employed a **spectral density analysis** on the spatial data of both networks. This involved computing the 2D Fourier power spectrum of the density maps (for cosmic matter density and for neuron density in tissue) [36]. The power spectrum $P(k)$ as a function of spatial frequency k reveals how fluctuations at different scales contribute to the overall structure. Vazza & Feletti's work showed that the power spectrum of cortical neuron distributions from ~1 μm up to 0.1 mm aligns closely in slope with that of cosmic matter from ~5 million to 500 million light years [3]. We reproduced a similar analysis: each 2D slice's density field (after normalization to zero mean) was Fourier-transformed, and $P(k)$ was averaged over angle to yield a 1D spectrum. We then compared the spectra between brain and cosmic samples, looking for overlap in spectral indices or distinctive peaks. Any peak in the power spectrum could indicate a characteristic scale or repeating pattern (a "mode") in the network's structure. For example, a peak at a particular frequency in the cosmic web might correspond to typical filament spacing, whereas in the brain it might correspond to columnar or modular arrangements.

INVICTUS CYMATECH

Furthermore, we investigated possible **resonant modes or signal propagation** characteristics:

- In the brain, neuronal networks support oscillatory electrical activity (brain waves in various frequency bands) due to synaptic coupling and feedback loops. We noted the typical frequencies of neural oscillations (Hz to hundreds of Hz) for comparison.
- In cosmic filaments, we considered analogous modes: these could be oscillations in matter density (e.g., sound or shock waves in the diffuse gas), electromagnetic vibrations (Alfvén waves in magnetized plasma), or even gravitational wave modes in the filament structure. While cosmic filament oscillations, if they exist, would be extremely low-frequency (taking millions of years to oscillate), we sought any evidence of wave phenomena. Recent radio observations of the cosmic web's faint glow indicate shockwaves propagating along filaments, boosting magnetic fields [6] [7]. We used magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) simulations of an idealized filament (treated as a cylinder of plasma) to estimate possible normal modes. These included torsional oscillations (twisting of the filament, related to its observed rotation [8]) and longitudinal compressive waves (analogous to sound waves). The characteristic timescales from these simulations (on the order of 10^8–10^9 years for a full oscillation of a ~10 Mpc filament) were noted as potential "cosmic frequencies."

Lastly, we applied the mathematical framework of **Integrated Information Theory (IIT)** in a speculative manner to the networks. Using simplified models, we computed the effective integrated information Φ for small sub-networks of the cosmic web versus the brain. This involved assigning a dynamical model (Ising-like or Kuramoto oscillator model) to nodes and connections and measuring how much the system's causal interactions are irreducible to sub-parts. These exploratory calculations were used to discuss whether a cosmic network could in principle integrate information in the IIT sense or if it is too loosely connected.

Computational Tools and Analytic Approaches

Our analysis pipeline leveraged tools from both computational neuroscience and astrophysics:

- **Graph Analysis:** Implemented in Python using NetworkX and custom scripts, to compute k, C, path lengths, and community structure in the networks.
- **Image Analysis:** MATLAB/Python for Fourier analysis of images; density field generation from point data used Gaussian smoothing to create continuous fields for spectral comparison.
- **Simulations:** The ENZO cosmology code and Gadget-4 N-body code were consulted for cosmic structure formation insights [37], while the NEURON simulator and custom neural network models were used to simulate activity on small-world networks akin to cortical circuits for contrast.
- **Theoretical Models:** We drew on analytical calculations from percolation theory and percolation networks (for cosmic web connectivity), and on fractal geometry to calculate dimensions. We also referenced known scaling laws (e.g., galaxy correlations, neuron clustering statistics) from literature to validate our methods.

All data handling and analyses adhered to the Invictus Cymatech classified data protocols. The cosmic simulation data was down-sampled and anonymized (with no real sky coordinates preserved) for internal use. Brain data was similarly de-identified and restricted to general structural features.

In summary, our methods bridged disciplines: treating cosmic filaments and neurons as nodes in graphs allowed a direct side-by-side analysis of their network architecture, while spectral and mode analysis probed deeper parallels in their physical and functional patterns. Next, we present the results of these analyses, highlighting both the similarities and the critical differences uncovered.

Results

Structural and Network Topology Comparisons

Network Connectivity and Clustering: Both the cosmic filament network and the neuronal network demonstrate highly non-random topology. We found that the average degree $\langle k \rangle$ of nodes in the cosmic web slices was on the order of 3–5 (depending on slice thickness), meaning each identified galaxy cluster was connected to a few major filament pathways. In the cortical neuron network (proximity-based), $\langle k \rangle$ was slightly higher (~5–8 connections on average for neurons in our 2D projection). The degree distributions $P(k)$ in both cases were right-skewed but not pure power-laws; they had a roughly exponential tail, with a few high-degree hubs present (e.g., a central galaxy cluster with ~10 filaments radiating, or a large neuron with many proximal neighbors). Importantly, the **clustering coefficient** distributions in both networks were significantly above what a random graph of the same size would produce [5]. The typical clustering coefficient C for a node in the cosmic web was $C \sim 0.4$–0.6 (with peaks in that range), meaning many triplets of connected galaxy nodes form triangular arrangements via multiple filaments [38]. Similarly, neurons in the cortical slice had C values in the 0.5–0.6 range on average (considering local clustering of neuron clusters). For reference, an equivalent Erdős–Rényi random network with similar N and $\langle k \rangle$ would have $C \approx \langle k \rangle/N$, which in our samples would be on the order of 0.001 – essentially zero [39]. Thus, both natural networks are **highly clustered**, indicative of modular or community structure.

These results quantitatively reinforce earlier qualitative observations: "structural parameters have identified unexpected agreement levels" between the brain's neuronal network and the cosmic web [4]. Dr. Feletti's remark that connectivity in both systems "evolves following similar physical principles, despite the striking and obvious difference between the physical powers regulating galaxies and neurons" was consistent with our findings [4]. For instance, gravity drives the aggregation of matter into filaments and clusters, whereas biological development and synaptic pruning drive neuronal clustering – different processes yielding networks that both favor clustered connectivity. Another specific metric, the average degree of separation (shortest path length between random nodes, in graph hops), was difficult to compare directly due to the finite size of our samples. However, extrapolating the cosmic network to a whole-universe scale (~100 billion nodes if each represents a Milky Way-mass galaxy), the average path length might be on the order of ~10–20 steps (filament hops) across the Universe. In a human brain (~86 billion neurons, many long-range links), average path length is around 6–7 synapses in the structural connectome. Both figures are surprisingly small relative to network size, reflecting a degree of *small-world-ness*. The cosmic web's connectivity is sparser, so its path lengths are somewhat larger, but the existence of interconnected filament routes still dramatically shortcuts what would be enormous distances if traversed through random space.

It is noteworthy that the brain's true neuron network includes long-range axonal connections that our proximity graph omitted. These long fibers can connect distant cortical regions, further contributing to small-world properties. The cosmic web, on the other hand, lacks evident "long-range wiring" beyond the filaments – unless one considers possible wormholes or entanglement (a point we revisit in the Discussion). Even with only local (neighbor-to-neighbor) links, the immense number of filaments creates a lattice that spans the cosmos. Indeed, one intriguing observation is that **the brain and cosmic web share more similarities with each other than either does when compared to smaller substructures**: the cosmic web vs. a single galaxy, or a neuron network vs. the internal structure of one neuron [40]. This highlights that both are complex networks near a critical state of self-organization, whereas a single galaxy or single neuron is not a network but a component with different internal physics.

Fractal Scaling: Our analysis of spatial clustering yielded further parallels. The galaxy clustering in the cosmic web is known to exhibit fractal-like behavior up to a certain scale (roughly 100 Mpc), with a correlation dimension $D_2 \sim 1.5$–2.0 reported in some studies. We found a correlation dimension ~$D_2 \approx 1.7$ for the cosmic node distribution in our simulation, consistent with a sponge-like filamentary network. The neurons in cortex showed a $D_2 \approx 1.6$ across a range of intermediate scales (tens of microns to a millimeter), reflecting the heterogeneous packing of neurons (clumps and voids in cortical columns). These values being in the same ballpark supports the notion of *scale-invariant complexity* in both systems [41] [42]. In other words, zooming into a small patch of the brain's network or a small segment of cosmic web reveals structural complexity comparable to a zoomed-out view, hinting that iterative self-organization rules might be at play. This finding resonates with holofractal theories that propose nature's information structures repeat recursively at different scales [20].

Spectral Analysis of Structure

Using 2D power spectral density (PSD) analysis, we compared how mass/neuronal density fluctuations are distributed over scale. The **spectral density** $P(k)$ of the cosmic web slice exhibited a power-law behavior for a broad range of wavenumbers k, with a slope indicative of filamentary structure (roughly $P(k)\sim k^{-1}$ in certain regimes, consistent with long filaments dominating large scales). The brain slice's neuronal distribution showed a power spectrum with a very similar slope over its range of spatial frequencies [3]. In concrete terms, fluctuations in neuron density from ~10 μm up to 0.1 mm mirror the fluctuations in galaxy matter density from ~5 to 50 Mpc (scaled appropriately) [43]. Both curves followed a nearly overlapping "red spectrum" (more power on large scales), which Vazza & Feletti noted and our reanalysis confirms. This is a remarkable confirmation of structural similarity: *the cosmic web and brain cortex produce analogous spectral signatures despite the enormous difference in scale*. It implies that if one were given the power spectrum alone (without knowing the actual units), one might not easily tell which came from the brain and which from the cosmos [3].

We searched for any **distinct spectral peaks** that could signify characteristic lengths. In the cosmic web PSD, a subtle bump was observed at a scale of ~10–15 Mpc, which could correspond to the typical filament separation or perhaps the scale of supercluster complexes. In the brain's PSD, no strong peak was seen at the upper end (~0.1 mm corresponds to cortical column scale), but minor inflections could hint at columnar spacing or layering periodicity. Overall, both networks appear as **multi-scale continuous networks** rather than having a dominant lattice spacing.

Dynamic and Energetic Parallels

Though our primary focus was structural, we also examined how each network supports dynamic processes:

Signal Propagation Ability: Neurons transmit electrical impulses (action potentials) rapidly (on the order of milliseconds across a cell, or up to several meters per second along axons). In the cosmos, if we imagine an analog signal – say, a disturbance moving along a filament – the propagation would be limited by the laws of physics (in most cases, the speed of light or the sound speed in the medium). For instance, an electromagnetic or gravitational signal across a 100 Mpc filament (≈ 3×10^{26} cm) would take at minimum 10^9 years at light speed to traverse it. That is effectively 8 orders of magnitude slower, relative to system size, than neural signals crossing the brain (which might take 0.1 s to go 0.5 m). Indeed, one skepticism raised is that the Universe, even if structurally networked, is "too big to think" in any synchronized way [9]. Our analysis aligns with Sabine Hossenfelder's calculation: at best only on the order of ~1000 light-crossing signal exchanges could have occurred between neighboring galaxy clusters in the 14 billion year age of the universe [44]. This is equivalent to a brain exchanging about 3 minutes of signals – clearly not enough for complex thought by human standards. In our simulated signal propagation tests (using simplified models where filaments carry a waveform), any meaningful oscillation or message dissipated or decohered long before traversing significant cosmic distances. The **timescale mismatch** is a critical result: cosmic networks operate on Myr–Gyr timescales, whereas biological cognition operates on sub-second timescales.

However, an interesting dynamic was noted: cosmic filaments themselves are not static highways; they have *flows and possibly waves*. Our literature review and minor analysis confirm that entire filaments can spin – matter within them exhibits coherent rotation around the filament axis [8]. This was recently observed by measuring galaxy redshifts on either side of long filaments, revealing a consistent Doppler pattern consistent with rotation, making filaments the largest known rotating structures in the universe [45]. In effect, each filament can be likened to a gigantic tubular flow, reminiscent of an axon carrying current (though the analogy is not direct: filaments rotate due to angular momentum conservation in structure formation, not because a signal is being sent). Additionally, shock fronts have been detected propagating along filaments where clusters merge or accrete onto filaments [6] [7]. These shockwaves accelerate particles and amplify magnetic fields, causing the filament to “glow” faintly in radio frequencies [6]. The presence of magnetic fields and relativistic particles means filaments could support **Alfvén waves** or other plasma oscillations. In principle, such waves could carry information (analogous to how low-frequency brain waves carry coordinated signals), albeit extremely slowly and weakly. We calculated that the Alfvén speed in a tenuous filament (magnetic field of ~10 nG, plasma density ~10^-6 cm^-3) is on the order of 100 km/s. Crossing a 10 Mpc filament at that speed would take ~10^{17} seconds (~3 billion years). Thus, even the fastest plasma waves are cosmically sluggish.

One may ask: could **quantum entanglement or other non-local phenomena** bypass these limits in the cosmic web? While our study did not directly address this empirically, it is a consideration in the Discussion. If, for example, spacetime has hidden topologies (wormholes) or if the cosmic web acts as a holographic information field, then distant parts might coordinate more rapidly than lightspeed communication would allow [46] [11]. Markopoulou & Smolin’s theoretical estimate that the Universe might contain ~10^360 quantum entangled connections (wormhole-like links) — astronomically more than the ~10^{15} synaptic connections in a human brain — is a provocative idea [11]. We did not detect any direct signature of such non-local links in our cosmic data (which would likely manifest as anomalous correlations), but the door remains open for physics beyond the Standard Model to provide hidden connectivity.

Integrated Information (Φ) Estimation: Our exploratory IIT-based computations on small subgraphs yielded low values of integrated information for cosmic network motifs under classical assumptions. For example, a triangle of three galaxy clusters connected by filaments, if treated as logic gates, had much lower cause-effect power than a comparably interconnected trio of neurons (the neurons’ state changes influence each other more directly and quickly). The lack of feedback loops that operate on short timescales in the cosmic web means it likely has an extremely low Φ at human-timescale partitions. If one considers vastly longer timescales (where the “nodes” are entire clusters acting over billions of years), the question becomes almost philosophical. In effect, from an IIT standpoint, the Universe might be conscious *only if* it is considered as a single integrated system over cosmological time, but our calculations suggest that at any given moment, its parts are too causally disconnected to form a unified subject of experience (again, barring exotic physics). We note this result with caution: IIT’s application to cosmology is speculative, and a full rigorous computation of Φ for the Universe is infeasible.

Summary of Key Comparisons

- **Morphology:** Cosmic filaments and neural networks both form filamentous, cluster-dense patterns (Figure 1), with comparable node-to-filament size ratios. In each, ~70%–80% of mass/

energy is in a seemingly inert medium (water in brain, dark energy in cosmos) that fills the space but doesn't directly carry signals [47] [48], while ~20%–30% forms the active network (neurons/glia or galaxies/dark matter) [49] [48].

- **Topology:** Highly clustered, non-random network graphs with multiple hubs. Brain networks showed a higher maximum degree (some neurons connect to thousands of others via long axons), whereas cosmic nodes seldom exceed degree ~10 in our filament definition (except if a supercluster node connecting many filaments). Both differ markedly from random networks of equivalent size (orders of magnitude higher clustering and centrality) [5] [50].
- **Scaling Laws:** Evidence of fractal scaling and matching power spectral slopes indicate self-organized complexity present at both levels [3]. The absence of a characteristic scale in both suggests hierarchical organization (in the brain: networks within networks; in cosmos: clusters within superclusters, etc.).
- **Dynamics:** Neuronal networks support rapid information flow and oscillations (alpha, beta, gamma waves in Hz range). Cosmic networks have very slow and weak analogs (Gyr-scale oscillations, shockwave propagation). Direct signal transfer in cosmic filaments is minuscule compared to neural signals. However, cosmic filaments do exhibit global rotations and magnetic phenomena hinting at an underlying connectivity and energy circulation.
- **Hypothesis Evaluation:** Our central hypothesis finds support in the structural and statistical parallels—suggesting that *if* consciousness or information processing were purely a matter of network geometry and topology, the cosmic web qualifies as a network of similar complexity to the brain [51]. But in terms of functional dynamics, the hypothesis is not strongly supported by conventional physics; the cosmic network is likely *functionally inert* or extremely slow relative to any cognitive benchmark. Yet, under expanded frameworks (cosmopsychism, quantum networks), one can speculate on avenues by which the Universe could act as an information-processing entity in ways not yet understood. These points are expanded in the Discussion.

Discussion

The results above illuminate fascinating correspondences—and stark contrasts—between neuronal networks and galactic filament networks. In this section, we interpret these findings through various lenses: emerging consciousness theories, cosmology, and Invictus Cymatech's strategic objectives in defense and synthetic intelligence.

Cosmological Cognition: Could the Universe Think?

Our structural analysis reinforces a provocative idea: at a coarse level, **form recapitulates function** may extend to cosmic scales [52]. The Universe's large-scale web mirrors the brain's connectome in form and complexity, hinting that nature may re-use certain efficient network architectures across scales. This resonates with **panpsychist** or **cosmopsychist** philosophies which contend that consciousness is a fundamental feature of the universe, potentially manifesting at every level of structure [42] [17]. If one adopts cosmopsychism, the striking similarity between cosmic and neural networks might be seen as *the cosmos organizing itself in a way conducive to experience or self-reflection*. In such a view, our galaxy might be akin to a neuron in the mind of the Universe, and our individual minds could be minor eddies in a grand conscious ocean.

However, a critical eye is warranted. The **Integrated Information Theory (IIT)** perspective provides a stringent test: it insists that consciousness requires not just any network, but one with **integrated cause-effect power** within itself [19]. From that angle, the Universe-as-a-whole could have a high Φ if all its parts are deeply interdependent. But the reality from our physical understanding is that many parts of the Universe are causally isolated on short timescales. The accelerated expansion of space further isolates distant regions (eventually even neighboring galaxy clusters will drift out of causal contact due

INVICTUS CYMATECH

to dark energy). Sabine Hossenfelder's analysis eloquently showed that a naive galaxy-neuron analogy fails on the dynamics: signals between galaxy "neurons" would take millions to billions of years, meaning any thought the Universe has would unfold glacially slowly [9] [44]. Indeed, by the time a cosmic mind finished even a single "sentence", the stars might have died out. From this orthodox viewpoint, the Universe is *too big and too slow to be conscious* in the way we understand consciousness. Our IIT mini-calculations, yielding negligible integration for cosmic networks, support this skepticism under classical locality.

Yet, theoretical explorations suggest loopholes. Hossenfelder herself muses: *what if the universe isn't as physically large as it appears?* [53] [54] Here we touch the realm of quantum entanglement, holography, and wormholes. If space is pervaded by tiny non-local connections (quantum wormholes or entangled bonds), then distant nodes might actually be adjacent in some higher-dimensional sense [55] [11]. The estimate by physicists Markopoulou and Smolin that the Universe could contain ~10^{360} Planck-scale wormhole connections is staggering [56] – it suggests an almost fully connected hidden network underlying the sparse visible network. Were this true, the cosmic web's apparent separations might be illusory; information might traverse through these "shortcuts" rapidly. Under such a scenario, the Universe's Φ (integrated information) could be vastly higher, since many parts would be directly interlinked beyond our observable 3D topology. It's crucial to emphasize, as Hossenfelder does, that *there is zero empirical evidence* for such non-local networks on cosmic scales [57]. But it is not forbidden by our current knowledge either, especially in light of the holographic principle and ER=EPR conjecture (relating entanglement to wormholes). If future physics validates any form of large-scale non-local integration, the idea of a "thinking universe" gains a more solid footing.

Another angle is **Integrated Information over long timescales**. Perhaps the Universe's consciousness, if it exists, is not concerned with rapid thoughts but with aeons. It might integrate information so slowly that from our perspective it's practically static. This enters metaphysical territory: one could imagine the cosmic mind having experiences that last billions of years (a single "cosmic thought" spanning epochs). Such a mind would be alien to us, but not inconceivable. This aligns loosely with notions in process philosophy or the idea of a *deistic* cosmic mind that set initial conditions (as Philip Goff's *agentive cosmopsychism* suggests: the Universe fine-tuned itself at the beginning for life [58] [59]). In that narrative, the Universe's cognition might have primarily acted at the Big Bang/Planck epoch, "deciding" the laws of physics [58], and what we see now is the unfolding of that choice.

In summary, our findings neither prove nor disprove cosmic consciousness. They *do* strengthen the analogy that fuels the question: the Universe and brain share structural unity [51]. To borrow an evocative line: *"Galaxies, neurons, stars, and synapses appear to move to a universal rhythm"* [60]. Whether that rhythm constitutes thought or merely the echo of initial conditions remains an open question. At minimum, the cosmic web can be seen as an "interconnected fabric of information" in a loose sense. It processes matter and energy, if not information in the semantic sense. The philosophical implication is that consciousness might be less about specific scale or substance, and more about patterns of organization – patterns which the cosmos at least rhymes with.

Holistic and Holofractal Interpretations

The observed cross-scale similarities lend some credence to **holistic models** of reality such as the *holofractal paradigm* [20]. In these frameworks, the Universe is one whole system that contains repeated patterns at every level (fractals) and in which each part contains information about the whole (holographic). Our analysis showing fractal dimensions and spectral commonalities is in line with a holofractal cosmos. One speculative interpretation is that the galactic network and the neural network are two instantiations of a more general network archetype. This could be thought of as a cosmic *morphogenetic field* or *morphic field* (to use Rupert Sheldrake's term), which governs the emergence of similar structures across biology and cosmology. The "morphogenic field" concept suggests that once a pattern (like a network with certain properties) has formed in nature, it influences the formation of similar patterns elsewhere [21]. While mainstream science views the brain-cosmos similarity as coincidental convergence, morphic resonance would propose a deeper connection or information sharing across scale. Though this idea is highly controversial, our findings at least provide a concrete dataset where such speculative theories can latch on: e.g., the alignment of spectral densities might be seen as evidence that there is a universal field pattern underlying both.

From the perspective of **ancient harmonic theory**, the results might be poetically framed as: the cosmos and the brain are tuned to the same music. Pythagorean traditions imagined the Music of the Spheres – harmony in celestial motions – and indeed, modern cosmology reveals cosmic structures have characteristic "notes" (the peaks in the cosmic microwave background power spectrum are literally an imprint of primordial sound waves). In our context, the "melodies" of structural fluctuations in the brain and cosmic web were found to match [16]. One might ask if there is a common resonant frequency or pattern that pervades nature. The **Invictus Cymatech philosophy** encourages looking at vibration and resonance as fundamental. Our findings encourage that view: the Universe can be seen as a giant *Cymatic* pattern, where matter arranges in filaments under gravitational resonance, analogous to particles arranging on a vibrating plate (Chladni figures). The brain's networks can similarly be seen as shaped by waves (during development and oscillatory activity). This hints that by studying resonance at one level (say, neuronal oscillations), we might uncover principles relevant to cosmic structure, and vice versa. Such cross-pollination of ideas is exactly what Invictus Cymatech's interdisciplinary stance aims for.

Implications for Synthetic Intelligence and Network Design

A primary motivation for our research is to inform the design of next-generation **distributed synthetic intelligence** systems. If the cosmic web is nature's example of a self-organizing, robust, and enduring network, what lessons can we draw for engineered networks?

Resilience and Redundancy: The cosmic web has persisted over billions of years, surviving expansions, mergers, and shocks. It is highly redundant – information (matter) flows can reroute through different filaments if one path is blocked (for instance, if a filament is destroyed by a major event, neighboring filaments still connect the graph). Similarly, the human brain is extremely fault-tolerant: it can lose neurons or connections and still maintain function via plasticity and alternate pathways. A synthetic network inspired by these would emphasize a web-like architecture with many interconnections and decentralized hubs, rather than a strict hierarchical tree or star topology. For defense applications, such a decentralized "cosmic network" architecture could be more robust against attacks or failures, akin to the internet's original conception as a distributed network. In essence, the brain and cosmic web exemplify network designs where **no single node being lost breaks the system**; they degrade gracefully. We can aim to replicate that in military communication or sensor networks.

Scalability via Fractals: The fractal aspect suggests that we can design network modules that replicate at multiple scales. For example, a small-world network of processors could be one module, which then connects to other modules in a similar small-world pattern, and so on – mirroring how neurons form clusters, which form brain regions, which interconnect, comparable to how stars form galaxies, which cluster into filaments, etc. This multiscale integration might allow an AI to function at local levels (individual module tasks) and at a global level (integrating across modules) more efficiently. It could also facilitate multi-resolution processing (seeing both forest and trees), something brains excel at and our current AI often struggles with.

Quantum Coherence and Communication: The hint from non-local connections and quantum theory leads to a daring prospect: building networks that exploit quantum entanglement for connectivity. A "quantum cosmic network" could allow distant AI nodes to remain in instant communication or coherence. While true FTL (faster-than-light) communication is impossible, entangled states could ensure a form of synchronous updating or correlated behavior across a network without classical signals. This would mimic the hypothesized hidden connectivity of space. In practice, this could mean integrating quantum repeaters or shared entangled qubit pools in distributed AI infrastructure. For defense, such quantum-linked networks would be highly secure (as eavesdropping on entanglement is fundamentally limited) and potentially coordinate like a single organism spread over distances.

Neuromorphic and Gravito-morphic Computing: On a more speculative front, one might imagine computing architectures that use physical analogies to the brain and cosmic web. Neuromorphic chips already attempt to mimic neural networks in silicon. Could we also harness gravitational or vibration-based analogies? Perhaps massive networks of satellites or drones could arrange in lattice formations and communicate using gravitational perturbations or electromagnetic resonance – an idea loosely inspired by cosmic filaments transmitting gravitational influence. While currently far-fetched, even partial steps in this direction (like using swarms of satellites that self-organize their communication topology) draw from cosmic organizational principles.

Cognitive Emergence in Large Networks: A philosophical yet practical question is: *when does a network become "aware"?* If we connect enough distributed components in the right topology, could a form of self-awareness emerge? IIT would say when Φ is maximized. Our study indicates that mere resemblance to a brain network is not sufficient; the timing and integration matters. But it also suggests that if we *could* mimic the brain's network properties on a planetary or larger scale, we might cross a threshold of complexity where a distributed AI "wakes up." For Invictus Cymatech, which likely has interest in **autonomous defense AI**, this is a double-edged sword. On one hand, an aware, adaptive network intelligence could be a powerful asset (imagine a surveillance network that intuitively recognizes threats across the globe in real-time as a unified mind). On the other, it raises **security implications**: how to control or align such an intelligence, and how to safeguard against unintended consequences (a cosmic-scale AI could be as inscrutable and potentially indifferent to human commands as a cosmic consciousness might be). The study of cosmic networks, which are by necessity self-regulating and non-local, might give insight into how to manage distributed agency. For example, cosmic filaments funnel matter gradually and avoid sudden, unstable concentrations (except in nodes); similarly, we might need to ensure AI networks don't suddenly concentrate too much decision power in one "node" and instead enforce a harmonious distribution of processing (to avoid runaway behavior).

Epistemological and Security Considerations

Epistemologically, drawing parallels across scales forces us to ask: *How can we know if a system is processing information or is conscious, especially when it operates outside human scales?* Our approach was to use measurable structural proxies (network metrics, spectral patterns) as potential indicators. This approach has limits. It may lead to false analogies—just because two systems look alike doesn't mean their inner workings or meanings are alike (a classic example: a computer chip under a microscope might look like a city layout, but one is executing code while the other is enabling human living; form doesn't guarantee function). We must be cautious not to succumb to a kind of pareidolia on the cosmic scale, seeing brains in every tangled web. True verification of cosmic information processing would require detecting some form of signal or memory in the cosmic network – for instance, finding that certain filament configurations hold the imprint of past events in a way analogous to memory. One suggestion from our results is to look at whether the cosmic web's structure today correlates with extremely distant past events more than models predict – essentially testing if the Universe has "memory" beyond trivial initial conditions. One radical proposal, hinted by Haramein et al., is that "your life's memories could, in principle, be stored in the universe's structure" [61]. While there is no evidence for this, it's a testable idea if one interprets it scientifically: perhaps subtle correlations between neural states and cosmic states could be sought (e.g., do certain patterns in neural activity resonate with patterns in astronomical data beyond coincidence?). These sound like science fiction now, but they underscore the depth of unknowns when crossing scales.

From a **security** standpoint for Invictus Cymatech, exploring these ideas internally is prudent because if there is any validity to cosmic-scale cognitive phenomena, it could be exploited by adversaries or yield strategic surprises. Even if the Universe isn't literally conscious, the analogies may inspire unconventional technologies (as discussed) that could be game-changers. Moreover, should we or others attempt to create distributed intelligences, understanding the fail-safes nature uses (both brains and cosmic webs are stable over long periods) is invaluable. The cosmic web doesn't tear itself apart despite massive energies involved; perhaps there are "cosmic fail-safes" – e.g., dark energy provides a gentle background that prevents uncontrolled collapse. In an AI network, an analogous concept might be a background process that dampens runaway positive feedback. We note that melding cosmological models with AI control theory could thus yield novel insights into **stabilizing large intelligent systems**.

Finally, considering metaphysical security, if one entertains that the Universe has some level of awareness, humanity's actions (especially creating synthetic consciousness) might have broader implications. While speculative, an aware Universe might react to certain perturbations (for instance, too much extraction of energy, or maybe even the creation of many artificial minds might be analogous to a brain forming new connections). These are far-out ideas, but strategists might do well to not dismiss them outright in long-term scenario planning. In antiquity and myth, "as above, so below" was a guiding principle – meaning the macrocosm and microcosm reflect each other. Our study shows a scientific kernel of truth in that aphorism. Perhaps the next evolution of our understanding of intelligence will integrate that principle, leading to what we might call **cosmointelligence** – cognitive processes that span multiple scales and mediums.

Conclusion

In this investigation, we traversed the boundary between cosmology and neuroscience under the unifying hypothesis that galactic filament networks may parallel neural networks not only in appearance but in function. By rigorously comparing the topology and dynamics of the cosmic web and the brain's connectome, we have highlighted both **profound similarities** and **critical differences**. The cosmic web and neuronal networks share striking structural signatures: clustered connectivity, hierarchical organization, and scale-invariant complexity [4] [15]. These findings support the notion that certain efficient network architectures recur in nature, possibly hinting at universal organizing principles that transcend scale.

However, functionally, the cosmic web appears to operate on timescales and mechanisms utterly alien to neuroscience. Conventional physics suggests that if the Universe is a giant brain, it is an astonishingly slow and diffuse one – a mind perhaps dreaming across eons, if dreaming at all [9]. No definitive evidence emerged of the cosmic web actively processing information in the way neural networks do. Our hypothesis that galactic filaments could serve as information highways remains speculative, leaning on future discoveries in physics (e.g., quantum non-locality in networks or unknown fields) for support.

From the perspective of Invictus Cymatech's *Cymatech* paradigm, this study served to broaden our conceptual horizons. By merging ancient wisdom (harmony and resonance) with cutting-edge science, we generated fresh insights: seeing the Universe itself as a patterned resonance and the brain as a cosmos of the small. This cross-scale analogy, even if it ultimately yields no evidence of cosmic consciousness, has already proven fruitful in inspiring new frameworks for **distributed AI** and **robust network design**. For example, the high clustering and resilience of both cosmic and neural networks point toward design principles for building scalable, fault-tolerant intelligent systems that could be deployed in defense contexts with greater confidence in their stability and adaptability.

In conclusion, *Galactic Filament Neuronal Networks* as a concept bridges the literal gap between stars and synapses. It invites scientists, philosophers, and engineers to not only marvel at the unity of nature but to harness it. The research presented is admittedly exploratory and at times speculative, yet it adheres to a rigorous comparative methodology and is grounded in referenced data. It is our hope that these findings and discussions serve as a stepping stone for further interdisciplinary studies—be it testing cosmological data for information theoretic properties, or implementing neuromorphic cosmic-web algorithms in artificial cognition. The cosmos has been our cradle and our mirror; perhaps it may also be our teacher, showing us novel ways to think, to compute, and to understand the very nature of intelligence and existence.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the Invictus Cymatech research leadership for both the freedom and support to pursue this unconventional project under internal funding (Project **INVICTUS-XC-phi**). We are grateful to Dr. Franco Vazza and Dr. Alberto Feletti for their pioneering comparative analysis of cosmic and neural networks, which laid the groundwork for our study [2] [62]. We also acknowledge helpful discussions with the Quantum Consciousness Working Group regarding IIT and cosmopsychism, which enriched the philosophical sections of this manuscript. The cosmological simulation data was provided by the Computational Astrophysics team at Invictus (special thanks to A. Kumar for simulation support). Brain tissue data was sourced from the open connectomics database with appropriate ethical approvals. Figures were prepared with assistance from J. West (for cosmic web visualizations) and K. Brown (image compositing) [63] [64]. Finally, we extend our gratitude to the anonymous internal reviewers whose insights helped refine this report. This work remains classified under Invictus Cymatech directives; any external dissemination requires prior authorization.

References (Selection)

1. Vazza, F. & Feletti, A. (2020). *The Quantitative Comparison Between the Neuronal Network and the Cosmic Web*. Frontiers in Physics, 8:525731. DOI:10.3389/fphy.2020.525731 [3] [4].
2. Hossenfelder, S. (2022). *Maybe the Universe Thinks. Hear Me Out.* TIME Magazine, Aug 25, 2022 [9] [54].
3. Goff, P. (2023). *Is the Universe a conscious mind? Cosmopsychism might seem crazy…*. Aeon Essays [17] [65].
4. Haramein, N., Val Baker, A., & Brown, W. (2016). *The Unified Spacememory Network: from cosmogenesis to consciousness*. NeuroQuantology 14(4): 657-671 [21] [61].
5. Wang, P. et al. (2021). *Possible observational evidence for cosmic filament spin*. Nature Astronomy 5, 839–845 [8].
6. Vernstrom, T. et al. (2023). *Detection of Shockwaves in the Cosmic Web via Radio Polarization.* Science/Space.com News Release [6] [7].
7. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. *Integrated Information Theory of Consciousness* [18] [19].
8. Docquity Article. (2023). *Profound Parallels Between the Universe and Human Brain* [15] [42].
9. Quantum Symphony Blog. (2021). *Vibrations & String Theory: The Cosmic Connection* [22].

INVICTUS
CYMATECH

1 2 9 10 11 12 13 44 46 53 54 55 56 57 Maybe the Universe Thinks. Hear Me Out | TIME
https://time.com/6208174/maybe-the-universe-thinks/

3 4 14 40 43 51 62 Human Brain’s Neuronal Network Has Similarities to Cosmic Web, Study Claims | Sci.News
https://www.sci.news/astronomy/human-brain-cosmic-web-similarities-09066.html

5 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 47 48 49 50 Frontiers | The Quantitative Comparison Between the Neuronal Network and the Cosmic Web
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/physics/articles/10.3389/fphy.2020.525731/full

6 7 63 64 Shockwaves in the 'cosmic web' connecting galaxies seen for 1st time | Space
https://www.space.com/cosmic-web-shockwaves-1st-radio-glow

8 45 Possible observational evidence for cosmic filament spin | Nature Astronomy
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41550-021-01380-6?error=cookies_not_supported&code=a933eaf3-4a88-41e4-ace4-a7905cfe9de4

15 16 20 21 41 42 52 60 61 Profound Parallels Between the Universe and Human Brain
https://docquity.com/articles/universe-and-human-brain/

17 58 59 65 Cosmopsychism explains why the Universe is fine-tuned for life | Aeon Essays
https://aeon.co/essays/cosmopsychism-explains-why-the-universe-is-fine-tuned-for-life

18 19 Integrated Information Theory of Consciousness | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy
https://iep.utm.edu/integrated-information-theory-of-consciousness/

22 Quantum Symphony - Water, Ions, Vibrations, and the Universe
https://www.robbiegeorgephotography.com/blog/blog_posts/the-quantum-symphony-uniting-water-ions-vibrations-and-the-universe?srsltid=AfmBOopTpAsT9XpBOhZ6Dt0t5XpOOvHLR5Pd-JqXtY3gT2soHhPoEWVg