

THE ZABECKI THEORY (REV 1) By Allan Zabecki, Independent Researcher Date: 2025-11-26 Email: allan@zabecki.com

THE ZABECKI THEORY: Consciousness-Dependent Actualization and the Structure of Shared Reality
By Allan Zabecki, Independent Researcher

Abstract This paper introduces The Zabecki Theory, a conceptual framework proposing that consciousness is the fundamental mechanism by which potential physical states become actual. Drawing on insights from quantum foundations, philosophy of mind, and cognitive science, the theory argues that physical reality does not exist in fully determinate form prior to conscious observation. Instead, it unfolds through a structured sequence: potential, conscious actualization, resultant reality, viewpoint filtering, and the emergence of a coherent shared world.

A key implication is the Shared Reality Constraint: if consciousness actualizes reality, and if multiple observers reliably experience the same world, then their consciousness cannot be ontologically separate. Instead, individual minds function as localized filters of a single underlying consciousness. This provides a unified explanation for quantum measurement, intersubjective coherence, and the stability of macroscopic experience without resorting to many-worlds branching, hidden variables, or dualistic metaphysics.

The Zabecki Theory reframes the relationship between consciousness and physical reality, offering a unified approach that clarifies why observation shapes outcomes and why multiple individuals experience a single, stable external world. The framework lays the groundwork for future mathematical formalization and empirical exploration, and contributes to evolving interdisciplinary dialogue on the nature of consciousness and physical existence.

1. Introduction The connection between consciousness and physical reality has long posed deep challenges to both physics and philosophy. Quantum mechanics suggests that physical systems remain in states of potential until measured, implying an essential role for observation. Yet everyday experience presents a stable, coherent world that appears to persist independently of any single observer. Reconciling these two perspectives remains one of the most profound unresolved problems in foundational science.

This paper introduces The Zabecki Theory, which proposes that consciousness is the ontological mechanism that transforms potential into actuality. The reason multiple observers inhabit the same world is not because they independently observe the same external structure, but because they are expressions of the same underlying consciousness. Individual minds are local filtering interfaces; consciousness is universal and primary.

To explain this, the theory presents a structured sequence: Potential (P) → Conscious Actualization (C) → Resultant Reality (R) → Viewpoint Filtering (V) → Emergent Shared World (E)

This sequence provides a coherent model for how the world becomes determinate and why intersubjective agreement is possible.

2. Background and Motivation Quantum mechanics challenges classical assumptions about physical reality. Prior to measurement, the wavefunction encodes multiple possible outcomes; measurement leads to a single realized result. Traditional interpretations struggle to explain the nature of this transition.

Copenhagen posits collapse but leaves the mechanism undefined. Many Worlds preserves determinism at the cost of unobservable branching. Bohmian mechanics introduces hidden variables but sidesteps consciousness. Relational QM frames measurement relationally but does not explain

global coherence. IIT and related models elevate consciousness but do not connect it to physical actualization.

The core unresolved question is: How does the world become definite, and why do multiple observers experience one reality rather than many?

The Zabecki Theory addresses this by treating consciousness not as a product of the world but as the mechanism that makes the world real.

3. Foundational Assumptions The Zabecki Theory is grounded in three fundamental premises.

Premise 1 — Physical states exist as potentials prior to observation. They represent structured possibilities, not yet determined outcomes.

Premise 2 — Consciousness is the mechanism that actualizes potential into reality. Observation is not passive; it is the active step where reality acquires definiteness.

Premise 3 — A coherent shared world requires a single underlying consciousness. If multiple consciousnesses were ontologically separate, their actualizations would diverge, producing incompatible worlds.

These premises jointly form a consistent ontological foundation for understanding physical actualization and shared experience.

4. The Zabecki Actualization Framework Reality becomes actual through a five-stage process.

4.1 Potential State (P) Before observation, systems exist as potentialities—multiple possible states encoded in physical structure but not yet realized.

4.2 Conscious Actualization (C) Consciousness interacts with potential and selects a single outcome into existence. This step gives determinate reality its form.

4.3 Resultant Reality (R) The selected outcome becomes stable, objective, and persistent. This constitutes the actualized world that consciousness brings into being.

4.4 Viewpoint Filtering (V) Organisms experience reality through sensory and cognitive filters shaped by their biological and neural architecture. Thus, individuals perceive the same underlying reality but through differently structured windows.

4.5 Emergent Shared World (E) The shared world is the combination of: one actualized reality filtered through many biological interfaces

The stability of the world across observers is explained by the unity of the actualizing consciousness.

5. The Shared Reality Constraint A central implication of the theory is the Shared Reality Constraint: If consciousness is what actualizes reality, and if multiple observers inhabit the same world, then those observers cannot be ontologically distinct consciousnesses.

If consciousness were multiple and independent: Each would actualize its own outcomes Reality would fragment across observers There would be no guarantee of intersubjective alignment

But we observe the opposite: A coherent, stable world with consistent physical laws and shared experiences.

The only explanation consistent with this is that consciousness is unified, and individuality arises from localized filtering.

6. Unified Consciousness and Individual Viewpoints The Zabecki Theory distinguishes: Universal Consciousness (U) The singular source of actualization.

Individual Viewpoints ($v_1, v_2, v_3 \dots$) Localized perceptual filters belonging to organisms.

The relationship is: U actualizes $R \rightarrow R$ is filtered through $v \rightarrow E$ emerges

This explains why: people have individual perspectives yet agree on shared physical facts and why consciousness seems both personal and universal

Individuality is perspectival, not fundamental.

7. Implications for Physics and Mind

7.1 Quantum Measurement The Zabecki Theory replaces collapse with actualization: consciousness gives reality its definite form.

7.2 Macroscopic Coherence Resultant Reality is objective and persists independently of any single viewpoint.

7.3 Observer Agreement Arises naturally from unified consciousness, not coincidence.

7.4 Consciousness Theories The theory avoids reductive materialism and dualism, offering a unified alternative.

7.5 Identity and Experience The subjective sense of “self” emerges from viewpoint filtering, not from separateness of consciousness.

8. Predictions and Testable Consequences Observer alignment: No experiment should yield contradictory macroscopic outcomes between independent observers.

Filtering convergence: Reducing sensory filtering should increase perceptual similarity across individuals.

Consciousness weighting: Systems with richer conscious structure may exert stronger actualization influence.

Wigner-type implications: Non-conscious measuring devices do not finalize outcomes until observed by consciousness.

These predictions outline pathways for future empirical and mathematical investigation.

9. Responses to Objections “Is this idealism?” No—physical reality exists but is actualized through consciousness.

“Is this solipsism?” No—the theory posits one universal consciousness expressed through many perspectives, not one mind generating a private world.

“Does this conflict with neuroscience?” No—neural processes mediate filtering, not the origin of consciousness itself.

“Is this compatible with physics?” Yes—it integrates observer-dependent effects without altering experimental predictions.

10. Conclusion The Zabecki Theory offers a unified framework in which consciousness is the mechanism that actualizes potential into reality, and a single underlying consciousness ensures the coherence of the world shared by multiple observers. Biological organisms provide local filtering, creating the appearance of separate perspectives from a single universal source.

This origin paper establishes the conceptual foundation. Future work will develop formal mathematical models, analyze empirical predictions, and explore connections to information theory, cognitive science, and quantum foundations.

Acknowledgments The author acknowledges the influence of prior work in consciousness studies and quantum foundations that helped frame the conceptual environment for this theory. In particular, the author recognizes the impact of Donald Hoffman’s writings on perception and conscious agents, as well as Sean Carroll’s lectures on quantum mechanics, which provided valuable perspective on foundational issues related to observation and physical reality. While these influences helped inspire aspects of the present framework, the theory and its formulation are solely the work of the author.

References Wheeler, J. A. “Law Without Law.” Wigner, E. P. “Remarks on the Mind–Body Question.” Rovelli, C. “Relational Quantum Mechanics.” Chalmers, D. “Consciousness and Its Place in Nature.” Tononi, G. “An Information Integration Theory of Consciousness.” Hoffman, D. “The Case Against Reality.” Carroll, S. “Quantum Mechanics Lectures.”