

Philosophical Resonances with Consciousness Across Three Worldviews

Supplement to The Ignorant Observer Framework

Aernoud Dekker

May 2026

Version 1.1

Abstract

This supplement explores structural resonances between the Ignorant Observer Framework and the synthesis presented in *Consciousness Across Three Worldviews* by Sarvapriyananda, Agüera y Arcas, and Rovelli.¹ Both works developed independently, yet they converge on remarkably similar insights from different starting points: the IOF from physics and information theory, the essay from Vedānta, cognitive science, and relational quantum mechanics. This supplement is written as a conditional consequence map: if the BLQC finite-rate phase-reference experiment confirms the predicted bandwidth dependence, then the philosophical “blast radius” is large, and these resonances become live interpretive consequences. The convergence suggests we may be approaching the same underlying truth from different levels of description. This supplement honors that resonance by analyzing the philosophical alignments without claiming priority for either approach.

Conditional Reading Rule

This document is not independent evidence for BLQC or IOF. It is a philosophical map of what would become plausible *if* the BLQC prediction is experimentally confirmed:

$$t_{\text{break}} \propto \frac{1}{h_{\text{KS}} - C_{\text{eff}} \ln 2}.$$

In that event, finite-rate basis tracking would no longer be merely a metaphor; it would be an operational physical effect. The later claims about observer-shaped quantization, semantic worlds, and Vedāntic resonance should be read in that conditional-future sense: not established yet, but describing the consequences if the experiment proves the core claim.

“The World is broken because the Eye is blinking.”

¹<https://www.noemamag.com/consciousness-across-three-worldviews/>

1 Semantic Information and Meaning-Filtered Capacity

The essay distinguishes between:

- Shannon information (statistical differences), and
- semantic information (differences that matter to an organism’s survival, behavior, or identity).

The Biological Observers supplement introduces $C_{\text{eff}} < C$, a relevance-filtered capacity, capturing the same insight: real observers process only semantically salient information.

This appears in both frameworks through:

- **The essay:** Bateson’s “a difference that makes a difference”
- **IOF:** The partition $C = C_{\text{homeostasis}} + C_{\text{internal}} + C_{\text{external}}$, where only $C_{\text{eff}} = C_{\text{external}}$ serves world-modeling

Both recognize that meaning, not mere correlation, defines what enters awareness.

The essay illuminates why this matters philosophically; IOF provides the information-theoretic mechanism.

2 The Umwelt and Observer-Dependent Reality

The essay describes reality as filtered through the organism’s *umwelt*—the perspective-dependent universe of behaviorally relevant information.

IOF captures this through basis uncertainty σ_{θ}^2 :

- Different observers have different basis-drift signatures
- Because their C_{eff} partitions differ
- And their semantic worlds differ

Both frameworks recognize that:

- There is no observer-independent “view from nowhere”
- What appears to each observer depends on its information structure
- The observer’s limitations shape what can be known

The essay explores this through biological examples (tick, bee, human); IOF formalizes it through finite capacity and internal unpredictability.

3 Fluid Self–World Boundaries

The essay emphasizes that the boundary between “self” and “world” is:

- semipermeable,
- dynamic,
- and dependent on coarse-graining.

IOF treats the observer as having finite capacity C , but does not explicitly address boundary fluidity.

Both frameworks recognize that:

- The “self” is not a fixed entity but a perspectival structure
- Information flow defines identity more than substance does
- What counts as “internal” vs “external” depends on the observer’s scale and function

The essay develops this explicitly through nested examples (cell, organism, colony); IOF implies it through the impossibility of complete self-tracking.

This links to Vedānta’s *upādhi* (limiting adjunct)—the empirical boundary that defines the apparent individual while not being fundamental.

4 The Light Metaphor as Semantic Thread

The essay builds a bridge using “light” to mean:

- physical illumination (photons),
- semantic relevance (what matters),
- and self-luminosity of awareness (Vedānta).

IOF provides the information-theoretic grounding for this metaphor:

- “Light” = accessible information (capacity C , effective capacity C_{eff})
- “Darkness” = the deficit caused by finite capacity and basis uncertainty σ_{θ}^2

Both frameworks use illumination as more than analogy:

- **The essay:** Awareness as the universal field within which perspectival structures arise
- **IOF:** Information accessibility as the boundary of what can be known by a finite observer

The metaphor works because both capture the same structural truth: knowing has limits determined by the knower’s architecture.

5 Nested Observers and Compounded Ignorance

The essay highlights nested coarse-grainings:

- Immune cells observe threats
- Organisms observe environments
- Colonies observe ecological niches

Each level defines its own umwelt and identity.

The Biological Observers supplement employs the same hierarchical structure:

- Neurons \rightarrow microcircuits \rightarrow columns \rightarrow networks \rightarrow global workspace
- Each level has its own σ_θ^2 and C_{eff}
- Convergence must occur at each level before higher levels can integrate

Both frameworks recognize:

- Observers exist at multiple scales
- Self-ignorance compounds across hierarchical levels
- Consciousness emerges from multi-level convergence

The essay illustrates this biologically; IOF quantifies it through layered timescales (68 ms \rightarrow 200–300 ms \rightarrow 350 ms).

6 Homeostasis and Information Preservation

The essay notes:

A living subject is defined by the information it preserves over time.

IOF captures this through capacity partitioning:

- Most of C must maintain homeostasis ($C_{\text{homeostasis}}$)
- Limited bandwidth remains for world-modeling (C_{eff})
- This increases self-ignorance

Both frameworks recognize:

- Identity is informational, not substantial
- Survival requires preserving certain patterns
- This preservation consumes capacity, limiting what else can be known

The essay explores this philosophically; IOF quantifies the capacity trade-off.

7 Convergence with Advaita Vedānta

The deepest resonance is structural, not verbal.

Three perspectives on the same pattern:

IOF (physics):

The observer cannot trace the causal origin of its own measurement basis due to finite capacity and internal chaos.

Advaita (metaphysics):

The empirical self (*jīva*) cannot illuminate its own source; only the Self (*ātman*) is self-luminous.

Three-Worldviews essay (synthesis):

Awareness as the universal field of illumination; individual observers as perspectival structures within it, each with limited access.

Common recognition:

All three recognize:

- The knower cannot fully know itself
- Self-ignorance is structural, not accidental
- Something beyond the empirical observer must be the ground
- The empirical observer-boundary itself is *upādhi* (limiting adjunct)—not fundamental

IOF provides the physical mechanism; Vedānta provides the metaphysical insight; the essay bridges them through cognitive science and relational quantum mechanics.

None reduces to the others; each illuminates a different facet of the same truth.

8 Observer-Induced Quantization: Extending the Resonance

The following section is deliberately written from the conditional-future viewpoint. If BLQC is confirmed, then observer-side finite-rate tracking becomes a real physical contributor to how continuous dynamics are rendered as stable, reportable outcomes. From that standpoint, the observer-generated reading of quantization is not an independent premise but a proposed consequence of the experimental result.

A striking convergence between the Ignorant Observer Framework and the themes explored in *Consciousness Across Three Worldviews* lies in a deeper insight that neither the Vedāntic nor the relational-quantum nor the computational view fully articulates, yet all implicitly gesture toward:

the discreteness of experience arises from the structure of the observer, not from any fundamental granularity in the observed.

While quantum theory traditionally assumes that physical quantities possess inherently discrete spectra, and while Vedānta asserts that multiplicity emerges through epistemic limitation (*avidyā*), the IOF provides a missing mechanism linking these perspectives: a finite-capacity observer cannot track its own evolving measurement basis, and therefore collapses continuous physical variation into stable discrete attractors. These attractors appear as “quantized outcomes.”

This leads to a unified philosophical reading:

Quantization is epistemic, not ontic—arising from the observer’s structural ignorance, not from intrinsic discontinuity in reality.

Quantization as Coarse-Graining by a Finite Observer

In Vedānta, the apparent world (*nāmarūpa*) is shaped by the limitations of the embodied mind. In the essay, semantic filtering and umwelt selection define which distinctions “make a difference” for an organism. In IOF, finite capacity C and basis drift driven by internal chaos λ force the observer into discrete classifications.

Across these systems, the same structure emerges:

- **Vedānta**: the mind constructs discrete objects from the undivided field of awareness.
- **Cognitive science**: the organism selects behaviorally relevant distinctions from a continuous environment.
- **IOF**: the observer’s internal ignorance generates discrete outcome sets as the only stable representational strategy.

Thus, discrete measurement outcomes are not properties of the world but stable islands carved out of a continuum by a limited observer embedded in a dynamical flow.

The Absence of Absolute Properties

Both Vedānta and relational quantum mechanics emphasize that no property exists “in itself”:

- For Vedānta, attributes are superimposed by the mind (*adhyāsa*).
- In relational QM, values exist only in inter-system interactions.

The IOF strengthens this claim by showing that even if the underlying physical ontology is continuous, deterministic, and fully classical at its core, the observer’s inability to track its own basis forces an effective discretization.

This difference is not metaphysical but informational:

What cannot be stably tracked cannot be experienced.

What cannot be experienced collapses into discrete alternatives.

The Observer as the Source of “Quantum Events”

The three-worldviews essay highlights the centrality of semantic information: a difference that makes a difference. IOF makes this operational by quantifying the observer’s maximum tracking rate and demonstrating when this rate is exceeded.

When the basis drifts faster than the observer can follow, the state space fractures into discrete representational attractors. These attractors correspond precisely to what physicists call “measurement outcomes.”

This yields a philosophical synthesis:

- **Vedānta**: differentiation appears when awareness interfaces with limiting adjuncts.
- **Cognitive science**: discrete symbols and categories arise from informational bottlenecks.
- **Relational QM**: “events” occur in interactions, not in the system itself.
- **IOF**: a finite observer must discretize; therefore discrete events are inevitable.

In this picture, “quantum jumps” are epistemic necessities, not ontological mysteries.

A Shared Insight: The Observer Limits the World It Can See

The convergence becomes clearest in what all three traditions deny:

No observer has unmediated access to an observer-independent world.

And in what all three affirm:

The structure of experience is shaped—sometimes dictated—by the structure of the observer.

The Vedāntic metaphor of “light” as awareness, the cognitive notion of an *umwelt*, and the relational physics view of mutual information all point to the same insight: the observer filters, limits, and structures reality.

IOF adds a deeper quantitative claim:

The very discreteness of quantum events is one of those limits.

The observer does not merely observe quantization—it generates it.

Closing Reflection

What began as separate lines of thought—Vedāntic metaphysics, cognitive science, relational quantum mechanics, and observer-based physics—reveals a shared architecture:

- A continuous underlying substrate (call it Brahman, or the ontic state, or the dynamical world).
- A finite-capacity observer embedded within it.

- Self-ignorance resulting from internal chaos and limited bandwidth.
- Discrete, stable, reportable experiences emerging from that ignorance.

Within this unified perspective, discreteness is not a property of the universe but a consequence of being a finite observer in it.

This extension makes explicit the philosophical resonance that the IOF formalism brings to light: quantization is not a fact about the world, but a fact about the knower.

Thus the circle closes: the physical and the metaphysical point toward the same structural truth.

9 Conclusion: Convergent Paths to the Same Insight

The *Three-Worldviews* essay and the IOF converge on fundamental recognitions:

From the essay:

- Reality is observer-dependent
- Semantic information, not raw data, defines experience
- Self-world boundaries are fluid and perspectival
- Nested observers compound ignorance
- Identity is informational preservation
- Awareness cannot be reduced to its contents

From IOF:

- Finite capacity C and chaos λ produce structural self-ignorance
- Observers cannot trace their own basis evolution
- Semantic filtering ($C_{\text{eff}} < C$) explains biological implementation
- Hierarchical observers produce layered timescales
- The measurement basis is hidden, not the measurement outcome

Both frameworks point to the same underlying truth: the observer is fundamentally unable to escape its own perspectival limits, not due to practical difficulty but due to the structure of knowing itself.

This supplement honors that convergence—not claiming priority for either approach, but recognizing that independent paths, pursued honestly, arrive at the same destination.