Conscious Unity Theory (CUT): A Unified Ontology of Collapse and Experience

Brian Keith Brake, Esq.

June 30, 2025

Contents

Executive Summary

Conscious Unity Theory (CUT) offers a radical yet coherent new framework for understanding the intersection of quantum mechanics and conscious experience. Rather than treating the observer as an external entity causing wavefunction collapse or dismissing consciousness as irrelevant to quantum phenomena, CUT posits that **collapse and conscious experience are not merely linked—they are ontologically identical events**.

At the heart of CUT is a deeper, unified field of structured potentiality, denoted $\Phi(\Psi, \chi)$, from which both quantum states (Ψ) and awareness configurations (χ) co–emerge. This field does not reside within spacetime but instead constitutes the pre–physical basis of both reality and subjectivity. In a *unity event*, a quantum outcome and a conscious experience jointly actualize through a mutual compatibility constraint within this shared field.

The theory is structured into seven sections:

1. Introduction — Introduces the measurement problem and the limitations of existing interpretations.
2. Conceptual Foundation — Lays out the central principles of CUT, including its definition of observation, rejection of dualism, and the experiential nature of collapse.
3. Comparison with Existing Interpretations — Contrasts CUT with Copenhagen, Many–Worlds, Objective Collapse, QBism, and others, emphasizing its unique strengths.
4. Toward a Formal Model — Proposes a mathematical scaffold for Φ, including postulates, evolution rules, and analogies to path integrals.
5. Experimental Implications — Outlines five testable domains, such as altered–states experiments and Wigner's Friend setups, where CUT may yield novel insights or falsifiable predictions.
6. Philosophical Consequences — Explores implications for ontology, epistemology, time, free will, ethics, and the nature of scientific inquiry.
7. Conclusion and Future Work — Summarizes the theory's core insights and provides a roadmap for future development, testing, and collaboration.

CUT proposes that *every act of experience is the universe choosing to become*, offering a unified framework that dissolves the boundary between observer and observed. It is both a philosophical reimagining and a scientific hypothesis with the potential for formal development and empirical testing.

1 Introduction

1.1 The Observer Problem

The foundations of quantum mechanics remain unsettled. Despite nearly a century of experimental confirmation, physicists still disagree on a core conceptual question:

What role does the observer play in determining the outcome of a quantum event?

At the heart of this problem is the collapse of the wavefunction. According to standard quantum mechanics, a system exists in a superposition of states until a measurement is made, at which point the system "chooses" one definite outcome. This discontinuous, non–unitary "collapse" is not described by the Schrödinger equation, and it raises a critical question:

What exactly counts as a measurement—and what, if anything, causes collapse?

1.2 Current Interpretations and Their Limits

Over the years, many interpretations have tried to resolve this puzzle:

- **Copenhagen interpretation:** Collapse is real and occurs at measurement, but the role of the observer remains vague. Is consciousness involved? Is collapse physical? The interpretation is pragmatically useful but conceptually incomplete.
- **Many–Worlds interpretation:** There is no collapse; instead, all possible outcomes occur in branching parallel universes. This resolves the problem by denying its premise but at the cost of introducing an infinity of unobservable realities.
- **Objective collapse theories (e.g., GRW, Penrose):** Collapse is a physical process that happens randomly or at certain thresholds, without an observer. These models offer testable predictions but introduce new dynamics not yet observed.
- **Wigner's interpretation:** Collapse only occurs when a conscious observer becomes aware of the result. This places consciousness at the center of physics—but offers no mechanism and leaves open the boundary problem (what counts as consciousness?).
- **QBism and Relational Quantum Mechanics:** These frameworks reject the idea of objective quantum states altogether, viewing collapse as a personal or relational update in knowledge. While philosophically sophisticated, they leave many physicists unsatisfied due to their lack of ontological clarity.

Each interpretation addresses part of the observer problem, but none fully resolve the central mystery:

Why and how does potentiality become actuality—and what is the role of consciousness in this transition?

1.3 Toward a New Framework

This paper proposes a new approach: **Conscious Unity Theory (CUT)**. Rather than treating consciousness and quantum measurement as distinct—or merely interacting—domains, CUT posits that they are two aspects of a single underlying process.

According to CUT:

- The act of observation is not caused by consciousness, nor is collapse merely a physical event.
- Instead, conscious experience *is* the collapse—the moment when quantum possibility becomes lived reality.
- Both the wavefunction (quantum potential) and consciousness (subjective awareness) emerge from a deeper, unified informational–experiential field, denoted $\Phi(\Psi, \chi)$.

This theory aims to move beyond dualism, reductionism, and probabilistic epistemology to offer an ontologically unified account of reality — one that recognizes conscious experience and quantum actualization as indivisible.

In the sections that follow, we will:

- Define the conceptual and mathematical structure of CUT;
- Compare it systematically to existing interpretations;
- Explore potential experimental consequences; and

- Offer a path toward integrating consciousness into the foundations of physics.

2 Conceptual Foundation of CUT

2.1 Collapse and Consciousness as a Single Phenomenon

In most interpretations of quantum mechanics, collapse and consciousness are treated as separate entities. Some theories argue collapse is objective and physical (GRW, Penrose), others that it is merely epistemic (QBism), and still others that consciousness somehow causes collapse (Wigner). In CUT, we take a different stance:

Collapse and conscious experience are the same ontological event.

We call this a *unity event*—a moment where a potential quantum configuration and an experiential configuration actualize together. There is no causal arrow from one to the other. Instead, both are aspects of a single, indivisible process of actuality–selection.

In CUT, the question "What collapses the wavefunction?" is reframed:

Collapse is not something that happens to the quantum system—collapse is the conscious observation of an outcome.

2.2 The Unified Field $\Phi(\Psi, \chi)$

To formalize this unity, CUT proposes a shared ontological substrate: the Experiential Field, denoted $\Phi(\Psi, \chi)$.

- Ψ: the conventional wavefunction, encoding quantum potentiality.
- χ: the observer's pre–experiential configuration—the space of possible awareness states.
- Φ: the deeper field from which both Ψ and χ co–emerge and co–constrain one another.

We do not assume Φ exists in spacetime. Rather, it is a pre–physical, pre–subjective field of structured possibility, analogous to Hilbert space but inclusive of experiential configuration space.

In a unity event, Φ resolves a shared structure into:

- A single quantum outcome (e.g., spin up)
- A single conscious experience (e.g., "I observed spin up")

This process is not random, nor determined, but *constraint–resolved*: only configurations of Ψ and χ that are co–compatible will actualize.

2.3 The Nature of Observation

Observation is defined as: *The emergence of a first–person moment of experiential actuality from a background of co–potentiality.*

Thus:

- Observation occurs at the boundary where Φ resolves into a co–realized physical and experiential event.
- There is no wavefunction collapse without experience—and no experience without the collapse of quantum alternatives.
- The traditional observer–system boundary is a process boundary across Φ, not a spatial or informational divide.

2.4 Rejection of Observer–System Dualism

Traditional quantum mechanics is burdened by the Heisenberg cut—the boundary between the observer and the observed. In CUT, this boundary is an illusion. The observer and the observed are entangled manifestations of the same structure.

- There are no "outside observers."
- There are only nodes of awareness, each arising through co–selection events in Φ.
- These nodes are not separate "minds" or "particles," but dynamically emergent centers of actuality.

This implies that subjectivity and objectivity are both emergent and co-constitutive — not fundamental.

2.5 Information as Interface

CUT accepts that what we call "physical reality" is not ultimate but an interface through which awareness interacts with the underlying potential structure of Φ.

- Observables (spin, position, energy) are not fundamental properties.
- They are interface variables, shaped by the constraints of experiential embodiment and quantum structure.

• This mirrors ideas from Donald Hoffman's conscious realism, but integrates them with quantum dynamics.

2.6 Summary of Conceptual Claims

Principle	**Statement**
Unity of collapse and experience	Collapse and conscious observation are identical events.
Field of co–potentiality	Physical states and awareness states co–emerge from a deeper informational–experiential field Φ.
No external observers	All observers are emergent centers of co–actualization.
Reality is participatory	Outcomes do not exist independently of experience.
World as interface	Physical reality is a structured boundary zone within Φ.

3 Comparison with Existing Interpretations

3.1 Side–by–Side Snapshot

Feature	CUT	Copenhagen	Many–Worlds	Objective Collapse	Wigner	QBism / RQM
Ontological status of Ψ	Exterior face of Φ	Tool + partial ontology	Real, universal	Real w/ stochastic hits	Real until mind	Belief / relational
Role of consciousness	Intrinsic	Ambiguous	None	None	Trigger	Epistemic
Collapse	Experience	Postulated	Absent	Spontaneous	Mind–caused	Bayesian update
Observer boundary	Illusory	Heisenberg cut	None	Physical	At consciousness	Relational
Unobserved outcomes	None exist	Undefined	In other branches	Undefined till hit	Undefined till mind	Relational
Primary virtue	Unifies mind/matter	Pragmatic	Retains unitarity	Testable deviations	Mind role	Operational clarity
Chief challenge	Formalise Φ	Vague cut	Ontological load	No evidence	Consciousness undefined	No global view

3.2 Unique Advantages of CUT

1. **Ontological Unification** — abolishes mind–matter dichotomy without multiplying worlds.
2. **Natural Explanation for Singular Experience** — identifies the "one felt outcome" with collapse–as–experience.
3. **Intrinsic Role for Consciousness Without Dualism** — folds consciousness into physics via Φ.
4. **Potential Bridge to Neuroscience** — collapse = experience suggests empirical correlates in neural dynamics.

3.3 Key Points of Departure

Against
Copenhagen
Many–Worlds
Objective Collapse
Wigner
QBism / RQM
Against... CUT's Critique Copenhagen Leaves collapse primitive; cannot specify when/why it occurs o

3.4 Compatibility and Potential Synthesis

- **With Decoherence**: CUT accepts environmental decoherence as interface shaping branches of Ψ.
- **With Info Theoretic Approaches**: Φ could be cast in information geometry.
- **With Neuroscience**: Neural dynamics may set experiential boundary conditions on χ.

• With Decoherence: CUT accepts environmental decoherence as the interface that shapes the available branches of Ψ; $the unity event then select sone branch - and - experience pair. With I$
$Theoretic Approaches : CUT's \Phi can, in principle, be formalised using quantum information geometry$

$from-bitperspectives.WithNeuroscience: Ifspecificneuraldynamicsactas\backslash experientialattractor sideboundaryconditionson\chi.$

4 Toward a Formal Model of CUT

4.1 Minimal Postulates

Postulate 1 (Co–Potential Field). $\Phi : (\mathcal{H}_Q, \mathcal{H}_C) \to \mathbb{C}$ maps co–configurations (Ψ, χ) to amplitudes.

Postulate 2 (Actualization). A unity event occurs when $|\Phi(\Psi, \chi)|^2 > \epsilon$.

Postulate 3 (Basis Selection). Environmental decoherence sets the quantum basis; neural dynamics set the experiential basis. Collapse requires overlap.

4.2 Diagrammatic Representation

	χ_1	χ_2	χ_3
Ψ_1	✓	×	×
Ψ_2	×	✓	×
Ψ_3	×	×	✓

4.3 Evolution Between Collapses

Between unity events:

- Ψ evolves via Schrödinger equation.
- χ evolves via cognitive–neural dynamics.

4.4 Analogy to Path Integrals

Standard QM: $\Psi = \sum e^{iS/\hbar}$.
CUT: $\Phi = \sum_{\text{paths, exp}} e^{i(S_Q+S_C)/\hbar}$.

4.5 Empirical Outlook

Correlate neural states with collapse; modulate interference via awareness; design consciousness probes.

5 Experimental Implications

While CUT is a radical ontological proposal, it is not intended to be metaphysical speculation alone. A foundational theory must be empirically relevant. The central challenge is to identify where CUT makes distinct experimental predictions or explanatory advancements over other interpretations of quantum mechanics. CUT may not change the probabilities

predicted by standard QM in most scenarios — but it may affect when and how those probabilities actualize, depending on the structure of conscious experience. The key is this: If collapse = experience, then the structure, timing, and availability of conscious states should modulate the quantum-classical boundary. Below are five experimental domains where CUT could generate testable differences or at least provide new insight.

5.1 Delayed–Choice and Quantum Eraser

Unity event occurs only when outcome becomes conscious; paradoxes dissolve.

Standard View: • Retrocausal paradoxes arise when measurements made after a photon passes through a slit determine whether interference is seen. CUT View: • No paradox arises — the unity event (collapse = experience) does not occur until the final entangled outcome enters conscious awareness. • The outcome is not fixed in spacetime until it is co-actualized by an experiential configuration. Experimental Implication: • Modify delayed-choice setups to manipulate when and how conscious access to outcome information occurs. • Test whether interference patterns correlate more with conscious availability than with measurement-device logic alone.

5.2 Quantum–Cognition Interface

Test whether attention or altered states shift decoherence thresholds.

Hypothesis: • If consciousness is part of the collapse process, then certain cognitive states (e.g., attention, altered states, high coherence) might affect decoherence thresholds or the timing of collapse. Possible Tests: • Track neural correlates of participants viewing quantum outcomes (e.g., Geiger counter clicks, interference screens). • Measure whether subjective attentional focus or altered states (e.g., meditative or psychedelic states) change: o The rate of apparent decoherence o The fidelity of quantum measurements o The clarity of interference patterns

5.3 Entangled Observer Experiments (Wigner's Friend)

Partial collapses coexist; contradictions vanish upon shared awareness.

5.4 Consciousness Threshold

Predicts a minimum complexity of χ for participation in collapse.

5.5 Neuroscience–Quantum Correlations

Time–lock EEG/fMRI markers of awareness to collapse statistics.

6 Philosophical Consequences

6.1 Ontology: Participatory Monism

Matter and mind are complementary faces of one substrate Φ.

6.2 Epistemology: Knowledge as Co–Creation

Observation co–creates facts; objectivity requires overlapping experiential fields.

6.3 Time and Causality

Time = ordered unity events; retro–causal puzzles dissolve.

6.4 Free Will

Agency = capacity to reshape χ and bias compatible outcomes.

6.5 Ethical Ramifications

Quality of awareness shapes reality; empathy foundational.

6.6 Philosophy of Science

CUT is falsifiable and invites interdisciplinarity.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

Conscious Unity Theory identifies collapse and conscious experience as one phenomenon in $\Phi(\Psi, \chi)$, dissolving the observer–observed divide.

Future Work

1. Formalise Φ via information geometry.
2. Conduct awareness–modulated delayed–choice experiments.
3. Map neural correlates of unity events.
4. Publish focused studies and foster collaborations.

Final Remark

The observer problem is a clue to deeper unity: *each act of experience is the universe choosing to become.*