Biological Observers

Supplement to The Ignorant Observer Framework

Aernoud Dekker

2025
Version 1.0

Abstract

This supplement explores how the layered temporal structure of human perception—including the well-known ∼350 ms Libet lag—can arise from the principles of the Ignorant Observer Framework (IOF) when applied to biological systems. The analysis connects IOF to biological information processing, semantic filtering, and hierarchical observer architecture, showing how finite capacity, umwelt partitioning, and dynamical self-ignorance at multiple nested scales produce the characteristic timescales observed in neuroscience.

The goal is not to expand IOF beyond its physical foundations, but to show how the framework instantiates in biological observers. All conclusions here are interpretative and exploratory; the core IOF remains unchanged.

1 Quick Dictionary (used throughout)

IOF uses one bookkeeping inequality:

$$\kappa \; = \; h_{KS} \; - \; C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2.$$

- h_{KS}: effective information-production / instability burden (nats/s).
  In chaotic dynamics, h_{KS} is the Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy rate; informally: "how fast the situation generates new information you would need to track."
- C_{eff}: effective tracking capacity available for world-representation (bits/s), after semantic filtering and internal budgeting.
- κ: information-deficit rate (nats/s). $\kappa < 0$ = capacity-wins; $\kappa > 0$ = chaos-wins.
- σ_θ^2: basis uncertainty (rad^2) in the observer's internal measurement frame.

Units note: if C_{eff} is in bits/s, then $C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2$ is in nats/s.

2 Introduction: Why This Supplement Exists

The main manuscript treats the empirical observer as a physical dynamical system with finite capacity, and therefore partial ignorance of its own internal basis.

The analysis here was inspired by the essay *Consciousness Across Three Worldviews* by Sarvapriyananda, Agüera y Arcas, and Rovelli,[1] which explores convergences between Vedantic, computational, and physical perspectives on consciousness, particularly regarding semantic information and umwelt filtering in biological systems.

This supplement serves three purposes:

1. To connect IOF to biological cognition, without burdening the main text.
2. To explain why IOF naturally reproduces characteristic timescales reported in neuroscience, including the ∼23 ms fundamental limit, the ∼68 ms biological tracking limit, and the ∼350 ms Libet lag.
3. To show how semantic filtering and hierarchical cortical architecture can be viewed as biological instantiations of IOF principles.

All claims here are offered for exploration, not as definitive biological theory.

3 Semantic Information vs Raw Capacity

In IOF, C is the raw Shannon capacity: the maximal rate at which information can be processed or integrated.

Biological observers do not devote their full Shannon capacity to world-representation. Most biological processing concerns:

[1] `https://www.noemamag.com/consciousness-across-three-worldviews/`

- homeostasis,
- regulation,
- prediction of internal states,
- semantically relevant signals,
- avoidance of irrelevant data.

Therefore we introduce an **effective** capacity:

$$C_{\text{eff}} \leq C, \tag{1}$$

where C_{eff} is the **semantic / relevance-filtered capacity** actually available for tracking the world.

3.1 The Umwelt and Semantic Filtering

Gregory Bateson described a bit of information as *"a difference that makes a difference,"* emphasizing that salient information is not just statistical distinction, but one that matters functionally for the organism.

Following Jakob von Uexküll, we call this filtered information space the organism's **umwelt**—the perspective-dependent universe of behaviorally relevant information.

Every organism has both:

- **Internal umwelt**: hunger, pain, satiety, homeostatic signals
- **External umwelt**: predators, prey, mates, threats

Only semantically salient information consumes C_{eff}.

3.2 Why $C_{\text{eff}} < C$ in Biological Systems

The total Shannon capacity C must be partitioned:

$$C = C_{\text{homeostasis}} + C_{\text{internal}} + C_{\text{external}}, \tag{2}$$

where:

- $C_{\text{homeostasis}}$: metabolic regulation, immune response, etc.
- C_{internal}: tracking internal state (fatigue, arousal, interoception)
- C_{external}: bandwidth for world-modeling

The effective capacity for world representation is therefore:

$$C_{\text{eff}} = C_{\text{external}} < C. \tag{3}$$

4 The Layered Timescale Structure of Human Awareness

IOF predicts a limitation on self-knowledge due to finite C_{eff} and internal instability burden h_{KS}. When instantiated in biological observers with semantic filtering and hierarchical architecture, this produces a cascade of characteristic timescales.

4.1 Layer 0—Fundamental Physical Tracking Limit (raw capacity)

From raw C versus h_{KS}, the IOF tracking timescale has the form:

$$\tau_{\text{raw}} \;=\; \frac{h_{KS}\,T_{\text{kick}}}{C\ln 2 - h_{KS}} \;\approx\; 23.2 \text{ ms.} \tag{4}$$

This is the shortest possible timescale for a finite observer with the given physical parameters.

This layer is not directly measurable in biology because organisms do not operate at raw Shannon capacity.

4.2 Layer 1—Biological Semantic-Filtered Tracking Limit

Because $C_{\text{eff}} < C$ due to umwelt filtering, the biological tracking timescale becomes:

$$\tau_{\text{SK}} \;=\; \frac{h_{KS}\,T_{\text{kick}}}{C_{\text{eff}}\ln 2 - h_{KS}} \;\approx\; 60\text{–}80 \text{ ms.} \tag{5}$$

Biological observers cannot track their own basis faster than this due to:

- semantic filtering (umwelt constraints),
- metabolic constraints,
- internal signal competition.

This aligns with the $\tau_{\text{SK}} \approx 68$ ms scale used in the main IOF narrative.

Important alignment note (IOF vs OR): IOF's experimentally relevant *failure* time τ_{loss} is only meaningful in the chaos-wins regime ($\kappa > 0$), because it is a threshold-crossing time. Near the threshold ($\kappa \approx 0$), both "recovery" and "loss" times become long and are dominated by the same bottleneck scale. The observed $\sim$68 ms biological scale is therefore a near-threshold signature in the semantic-filtered layer, and this is the layer where comparisons to objective-reduction timescales are discussed.

4.3 Layer 2—Multi-Level Observer Integration (cognitive ignition)

The brain is not a single observer; it is a hierarchy:

- neurons,
- microcircuits,
- cortical columns,
- regional networks,
- fronto-parietal "global access" system.

Each level must resolve its own basis uncertainty before the next can integrate it.

With a per-level convergence time $\sim$ 60–80 ms and 3–4 necessary cortical stages:

$$\tau_{\text{hier}} \;\approx\; N_{\text{layers}} \times \tau_{\text{SK}} \;\approx\; 200\text{–}300 \text{ ms.} \tag{6}$$

This aligns with:

- N200 / P300 components in event-related potentials,
- recurrent cortical "ignition" (Dehaene's global neuronal workspace),
- minimal time for a percept to become reportable.

4.4 Layer 3—Full Libet Lag (motor integration)

Adding final motor-plan convergence and response preparation:

$$\tau_{\text{Libet}} \approx \tau_{\text{hier}} + \tau_{\text{motor}} \approx 300\text{–}380 \text{ ms}, \tag{7}$$

reproducing the empirical ∼350 ms Libet lag between unconscious readiness potential and conscious intention to act.

4.5 Summary Table

Layer	**IOF Prediction**	**Neuroscience**	**Mechanism**
Layer 0	$\tau_{\text{raw}} \approx 23$ ms	N/A	Raw Shannon limit
Layer 1	$\tau_{\text{SK}} \approx 68$ ms	60–80 ms	Semantic filtering ($C_{\text{eff}} < C$)
Layer 2	$\tau_{\text{hier}} \approx 200$–300 ms	N200/P300	Hierarchical convergence
Layer 3	$\tau_{\text{Libet}} \approx 350$ ms	∼350 ms	Motor integration

5 Biological Observers as Hierarchical Ignorant Observers

IOF defines an observer as a system that:

1. must track itself while
2. remaining partially ignorant of its own state
3. due to finite capacity
4. while embedded in a dynamical world.

The cortex satisfies this definition at multiple nested scales.

Hence its structure as a stacked observer-of-observers:

- Each level has its own σ_θ^2 (basis uncertainty)
- Each level has its own C_{eff} (umwelt-filtered capacity)
- Each level must converge before higher levels can integrate

5.1 Serial Umwelt Filtering

Each cortical level defines its own umwelt at a different abstraction scale:

- **V1**: oriented edges, spatial frequencies, local contrast
- **V4**: colors, shapes, texture boundaries
- **IT**: objects, faces, complex patterns
- **PFC**: abstract goals, plans, task representations

This serial filtering supports the scaling:

$$\tau_{\text{hier}} \approx N_{\text{layers}} \times \tau_{\text{SK}}. \tag{8}$$

5.2 Recurrent Processing and Predictive Coding

Modern neuroscience emphasizes recurrent processing: higher areas send predictions down while lower areas send prediction errors up.

This is compatible with IOF:

- **Top-down predictions**: higher levels use their current basis estimate to predict lower-level signals
- **Bottom-up errors**: lower levels report deviations from predictions
- **Convergence**: occurs when prediction error drops below a threshold (equivalently, when σ_θ^2 stabilizes)

Even with recurrent loops, convergence remains bottlenecked by finite C_{eff} at each stage.

6 The ∼68 ms Scale and Objective Reduction (interpretative)

The appearance of a ∼60–80 ms characteristic scale in biological observers arises here at Layer 1, where semantic filtering constrains capacity.

In IOF language, the scale is near the threshold $\kappa \approx 0$:

$$\kappa = h_{KS} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2 \approx 0,$$

so convergence and failure become dominated by the same capacity bottleneck. Comparisons to objective-reduction timescales (e.g., Penrose OR) are therefore made at this semantic-filtered layer, and remain suggestive rather than explanatory.

7 Comparative Biology and Scaling Laws

IOF predicts that tracking delay τ is not a universal biological constant, but depends on the ratio between instability burden h_{KS} and effective capacity C_{eff}.

7.1 The Paradox of Complexity

Evolution can increase both processing capacity and internal complexity. If effective complexity grows faster than effective throughput, higher organisms can experience a greater "epistemic lag" than simpler ones.

- **Low-h_{KS} observer (e.g., Diptera/flies):** high critical flicker fusion frequencies (>200 Hz) suggest very short integration windows. With minimal internal narrative, effective h_{KS} may be low.

- **High-h_{KS} observer (humans):** the Default Mode Network (DMN) sustains a high-load self-referential prediction stream. This raises effective tracking burden, increasing integration windows toward the ∼300–500 ms range.

Conclusion (interpretative): "Higher" cognition can be characterized by a deeper buffering of the "Now" required to stabilize higher internal instability burden.

7.2 Variable Latency in Humans (the "Quiet Mind" hypothesis)

If the delay is driven by internal burden h_{KS}, then transient reductions in that burden should reduce the lag. This aligns with reports of flow states and meditative absorption:

- **High burden (anxiety/analysis):** controller saturation; reaction times increase.
- **Low burden (flow/mushin):** reduced internal noise improves the ratio C_{eff}/h_{KS}; hesitation shrinks and immediacy increases.

In this framing, "presence" is not merely psychological; it is an efficiency of the observer's tracking loop.

8 Limitations and Scope

This supplement is interpretative.

IOF is a physical framework; biology and neuroscience are external domains to which it can be applied, but they do not constrain the core theory.

Accordingly:

- None of the empirical values here validate IOF
- They illustrate compatibility with known biology
- The supplement remains separate from the main derivations

Further testing is required to determine whether biological implementations of IOF principles actually operate via the mechanisms described here.

9 Conclusion

IOF predicts a limitation on self-knowledge due to finite capacity and internal instability burden. When applied to biological systems, these principles can reproduce the layered temporal structure of human awareness—from the $\sim$68 ms semantic-filtered tracking limit to the $\sim$350 ms Libet lag.

On this view, biological cognition is not an exception to IOF but a hierarchical instantiation of it. Characteristic timescales emerge from:

- semantic filtering reducing effective capacity ($C_{\text{eff}} < C$),
- hierarchical architecture requiring serial convergence,
- umwelt partitioning across nested observer levels.