

UNITED WISDOM

The Quantum Observer and the Person Who Looks

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-30-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Quantum Observer and the Person Who Looks

Epigraph

> *“What exactly qualifies some physical systems to play the role of ‘measurer’?”*

John Bell, “Against ‘measurement’,” 1990, p. 216 in Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics; checked against the short question in the chapter.

Bell's question concerns the precision of physical theory. It does not appoint human consciousness as the cause of every outcome.

What this article is about

You have probably heard that quantum physics proves observers create reality. The phrase joins a real difficulty in physics to a much broader human promise. “Observer,” however, can mean an experiment's participant, a measuring instrument, a way of describing a system, or someone interpreting what they see. A shared name does not make these meanings identical. This article examines what changes when information about a particle's path is obtained, why experimental arrangements enter the description of outcomes, and what task decoherence helps address. We then consider how human attention actually changes decisions and our relationship to events without becoming physical omnipotence. The central question is not how astonishing quantum theory is. It concerns what follows from a specific experiment and where additional interpretation begins, still requiring grounds of its own.

I. One word can conceal several tasks

Imagine opening a sales report. Before reading you did not know the result; afterward you do. Looking changed your knowledge. Now imagine choosing how to measure a tiny object's temperature, where interaction with the instrument matters substantially. Changed knowledge connects with physical interaction. Finally, someone may see an unsuccessful sale as the beginning of a new project. The event's meaning in their life changes. These are three different transitions.

Ordinary speech readily collects them into “everything depends on the observer.” Yet available information, interaction, question formulation, or personal assessment may be what depends. Without precision we cannot identify the dependency claimed. It is especially risky when a conclusion about influencing circumstances receives authority from a physics term.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A quantum observer need not be a person staring at a particle. Physical description concerns registration arrangements and their connection to the studied system. An instrument can operate while researchers are elsewhere. Someone later reads the record, but reading time and instrument-object interaction time cannot automatically become one event.

This distinction does not make observation a simple mechanical procedure. Choosing what to register itself requires theory, conditions, and a researcher's decision. Choosing an apparatus, however, differs from asserting consciousness specially causes an outcome. The second does not follow from the first without another step.

Replace the noun in a grand promise with questions. What interacts? What is registered? Who reads the record? What changes after reading? This small exercise restores a subject to discussion. Instead of arguing between consciousness creating everything and humans meaning nothing, we can separately examine physical events, knowledge, and subsequent human action.

II. Two slits reveal the limits of a familiar picture

Feynman's celebrated two-slit explanation compares bullets, waves, and electrons. This is a teaching model, rather than a transcript of one historical experiment. For electrons, individual registrations and the eventual distribution cannot be reconciled with a simple picture of little balls each previously passing through one definite slit. Under appropriate conditions interference appears, described through probability amplitudes.

A bounded but serious difficulty follows: a familiar account of paths is not always compatible with theoretical predictions. It does not follow that nothing existed before encountering a human. That further assertion needs more than a distribution diagram. Discovering one model's limit does not license replacing it with any appealing story.

Consider a subway map. It shows transfers well, but distances between drawn stations cannot establish walking times. Finding this limitation does not mean our gaze creates the city. We specify which relationship the map conveys. The analogy concerns cautious inference, rather than electrons' nature: the quantum problem is deeper than an inaccurate drawing.

In public discussion, astonishment often accelerates the transition. An electron's unfamiliarity tempts us to treat it as confirmation of unfamiliar metaphysics. Yet an unusual result alone does not choose between interpretations. It demands a more precise account explaining the distribution and surviving checks, rather than merely impressing us.

We can permit ourselves to lack an image fully replacing calculation. That is no intellectual defeat. Understanding sometimes means knowing what theory predicts and which questions remain open. Respecting experimental reality requires no picture of every particle as a tiny

object with a familiar biography. Nor need we fill the absence of that biography with our consciousness.

III. Obtaining path information changes conditions

Feynman's next explanatory step adds light to distinguish an electron's path. His thought experiment involves interaction: obtaining information is not a weightless distant glance. The registration distribution changes. What changes in the account is the physical arrangement, rather than the researcher's mood. Light source, particle, and registration enter the conditions.

This does not establish the universal rule “looking is enough to change anything.” That is too broad. The result belongs to a specific information-gathering arrangement and phenomenon. Removing the entire apparatus and leaving only a person turns observation from a physically described process into a psychological image.

Imagine an employee negotiating while aware of a recording. Expectations of evaluation may change behavior. A camera in an empty warehouse and one before negotiating participants affect things through different routes. One registers; in the other case, someone may react to its presence. The shared verb “observe” does not explain mechanisms.

Accounts of quantum experiments require the same care. Ask about interaction mechanisms, rather than an observer's presence in a sentence. Replacing a described physical process with “your attention” requires showing that conditions and conclusions survive. Otherwise the result's authority has been transferred while the result itself is lost.

Nor should caution become excessive certainty. Teaching through light's effects does not exhaust contemporary quantum-measurement questions. Here it distinguishes a person looking from an arrangement making paths distinguishable. That is more useful than promising to resolve every dispute about reality. It permits further inquiry without prematurely making consciousness the principal physical actor.

IV. Measurement need not remove a ready label

We usually expect measurement to discover an existing property: table length, parcel mass, page count. The word evokes a ready answer translated onto a display. Bell notes that this everyday meaning can mislead in quantum contexts. Experimental arrangements must enter alongside the system, rather than imagining an independent label waiting to be read.

This does not make outcomes arbitrary. Arrangements permit checkable predictions; choosing an apparatus cannot deliver every desired value. Dependence on conditions differs substantially from absence of limits. That distance is especially easy to miss when physics discussion shifts to personal success.

Suppose a manager defines “good work” through speed, quality, or helping colleagues. The criterion changes an action's assessment. It cannot rename an unsent letter into a sent one or an incorrectly performed operation into a correct one. Criteria matter while factual limits remain. This everyday analogy does not explain particle measurement; it exposes the logical leap from helping define a question to controlling every answer.

“Creates” needs similar caution. An arrangement creates experimental conditions. Researchers create models and questions. Interaction may change a system's state. People create subsequent accounts of results. Each meaning needs completion: what was created, under which limits, and how was it established?

Combining meanings produces false relief: a complicated result becomes briefly explainable at the cost of the distinctions motivating the experiment. Precision sometimes needs a longer sentence. It leaves humans real participation—formulating questions, building instruments, checking conclusions, deciding how to use knowledge. None requires adding the ability to produce material outcomes through expectation.

V. Decoherence broadens the description of interaction

Decoherence theory considers a system's relation to its environment. Maximilian Schlosshauer's review describes how these interactions suppress interference between certain states accessible to local observation. This helps discuss the emergence of stable, apparently classical properties. The process requires no separate act of human awareness: physical connections operate in the description.

Yet decoherence alone is not equivalent to a single resolution of the entire measurement problem. Connecting mathematical description with a definite observed outcome also depends on interpretation. Retain both points: the physical mechanism has content, while foundations preserve open questions. The second does not cancel the first.

A common faulty move declares an unknown explanation proved because a known explanation does not settle everything. “Scientists disagree” becomes “therefore consciousness creates matter.” An open problem does not distribute victory among all possible answers. Each still needs clear formulation, compatibility with results, and a way of distinguishing it from competitors.

Everyday life makes this boundary understandable. Not knowing why a delivery failed cannot justify blaming the first person whose name comes to mind. Uncertainty expands investigation; it does not replace evidence. Fundamental physics is more complex, but the logical requirement remains: lacking a complete explanation does not positively confirm a chosen guess.

Openness need not feel like knowledge collapsing. We may reliably understand one relationship while incompletely understanding a broader question. Good theories can have application limits and disputed foundations. Separating levels makes uncertainty precise. It becomes grounds for another question rather than permission for arbitrary metaphysical certainty. This especially matters when attractive answers promise more control than experiments show.

VI. Human participation is real without quantum omnipotence

These distinctions may disappoint: if looking does not create desired material outcomes, has something essential disappeared? Yet people participate in life in many specific ways. We choose what to learn, whom to ask, which risks to accept, and where to spend time. These actions change later events through accessible connections and decisions. Their value needs no special quantum power.

Imagine no longer reading a colleague's silence as contempt and asking whether they received a message. A missed notification emerges. A new interpretation prompted action, action brought information, information changed the relationship. The situation actually changed. We can describe the sequence without claiming previous attention physically produced contempt and new attention abolished it.

Another person notices promising deadlines before checking workload. They begin evaluating tasks first. Missed promises diminish. Attention participates because it enters decisions. It does not replace resources or cancel the need to perform the work.

Such participation seems modest only beside unlimited promises. In actual life it matters: influencing what is available, seeing limits, and reaching agreements. Believing everything depends on the right consciousness state risks making factual obstacles evidence of personal inadequacy. People become answerable for circumstances they never controlled.

Distinguish influence from guaranteed outcomes. We can offer conversation without compelling agreement, check information without ensuring an error-free future, and change decisions without changing past events. Autonomy remains within these limits. It consists of concrete actions whose consequences can be discussed and revised, rather than a duty to inwardly produce a desired universe.

VII. The inner witness answers a different question

Spiritual and philosophical texts also discuss observation. It may mean noticing thoughts, an image of someone remaining beside experience, or distinguishing action from witnessing. Rigveda 1.164, verse 20, introduces two birds on one tree: one eats fruit, the other watches. The image has its own poetic and religious context. It does not describe an electron detector.

James's chapter on the stream of thought examines experience's continuity and the difficulty of dividing it into stationary elements. This concerns consciousness and its description. It does not become a quantum-measurement formula because both subjects resist naive pictures of separate ready-made things.

Comparison remains possible. Physical experiments and attentive experience descriptions can challenge assumptions of obviousness. But similar work on premises does not establish identical mechanisms. To assess a witnessing image's usefulness, examine what it helps someone notice and what subsequent action becomes possible. Physical predictions require appropriate calculations and experiments.

Imagine noticing irritation during an argument and pausing before answering. A reader might call this a witness position. If the pause helps hear the question, that description is useful here. Claiming it changed the other person's wave function adds no benefit. Instead, it mixes an accessible observation with an unsupported mechanism.

Respect for tradition lets it remain substantive in its own language. A text is not weaker for lacking early physics. Its questions about life, knowledge, and liberation can matter without laboratory renaming. Physics retains precision when poetic images are not declared hidden explanations of results. Dialogue about premises and knowledge limits needs no secret identity asserted beforehand.

VIII. Ignorance does not privilege a favored hypothesis

“Consciousness affects the outcome” has different possible degrees of precision. A researcher's choice of apparatus is understandable. A special physical mechanism needs operating conditions and an observation distinguishing it from alternatives. Without these, one sentence changes meaning whenever challenged.

Suppose someone promises intention changes a random outcome. What counts as intention? Who reports it, and when? Which outcomes are selected beforehand? How are other interactions and selection of successful cases handled? Which results would limit the promise? These questions test a specific claim, rather than declaring every unusual idea meaningless.

A theory equally confirmed after every outcome faces a problem. Success proves intention's power; failure becomes hidden resistance; no effect means inadequate depth. We cannot tell how a world containing the mechanism differs from one without it. The claim may remain personal belief, but there are no grounds to present it as an established physical law.

Avoid mocking people attracted by the idea. They may seek hope of participation, a way of living with uncertainty, or language for unusual experience. Checking mechanisms does not

refute those needs. They can be met more honestly without scientific authority assigned to philosophical suppositions or images.

We may say an idea helps us decide more attentively without adding that experiments prove thoughts control matter. The first is discussable through specific experience and consequences; the second requires different work. Separating them retains personal meaning without demanding others accept a scientific conclusion not yet supplied. Uncertainty remains a shared thinking task rather than protection against questioning a favorite answer.

IX. A strong discovery does not establish every neighboring claim

The 2022 Nobel Prize in Physics honored Alain Aspect, John Clauser, and Anton Zeilinger for experiments with entangled photons, establishing violations of Bell inequalities, and developing quantum information science. This is the committee's official account. It does not say human looking creates any desired outcome. The award's prestige cannot be transferred to that phrase without separate proof.

Conversation often uses short associations: quantum entanglement exists, people experience connection, so a special feeling of connection must be quantum. Shared wording does not connect mechanisms. Family closeness, coordinated action, shared language, and physical entanglement need separate definition before a substantive bridge can emerge.

Imagine two people independently remembering one song. It can matter to their relationship. Investigating circumstances might consider shared recent experience, habits, and available cues. A quantum cause does not follow from both being moved. Personal meaning does not become a laboratory explanation; requiring explanation does not destroy personal meaning.

Negative conclusions also need restraint. Absence of evidence for special quantum connection does not deny connection between people. It limits a particular explanation. Missing this distinction makes scientific objections seem denial of experience itself. One side defends experience and the other checks a mechanism, while both speak as though their subject were identical.

Clear formulation preserves the subject. We can acknowledge an event's significance, uncertain causes, and no grounds for assigning a particular physical mechanism. These are three answers to three questions, rather than evasion. The stronger the initial discovery, the more important it becomes to avoid making it a general authenticity badge for everything unusual and inspiring nearby.

X. Precision leaves room for wonder

Distinctions may seem to lead into a dull world where caveats replace mystery. Yet wonder need not feed on inaccuracy. Precise questions can be more astonishing than broad promises. How do system, instrument, and environment connect? Why does a familiar picture fail? What can theory predict while its meaning remains debated? Rejecting magical interpretations of looking does not remove these questions.

Human participation becomes clearer too. We neither stand outside the world nor wield unconditional power over it. We learn, respond, act, err, and change our methods. We can influence through known connections and investigate unknown ones without declaring them confirmed. That position allows modesty and initiative.

Inner change can matter precisely because it guarantees no external change. Someone listens more carefully though others may remain dissatisfied, checks information though final clarity may not arrive, and chooses honest wording though a spectacular story would draw more attention. These decisions need no promise that reality rewards a chosen consciousness state.

Sometimes replace “does the observer create reality?” with “what am I calling reality, and what participation can I actually describe?” Physical outcomes require arrangements and theory; human meaning requires accounts of experience and life conditions; action requires available steps, limits, and consequences. The replacement preserves complexity while making it discussable.

We can leave a fundamental problem open and still decide responsibly today. Understanding the universe completely is unnecessary for avoiding impossible deadlines or checking a beautiful quotation. Precision does not close future knowledge. It keeps a present claim within supplied grounds, allowing the next discovery to change understanding rather than merely confirm a story chosen in advance.

What this means in practice

When encountering a quantum-observer claim, reconstruct its subject. Does it concern a particular experiment, theoretical interpretation, or human experience? Find the original and check what was measured. One physics reference cannot explain a whole subsequent discussion of love, success, or intention.

Identify the changed condition. Was an instrument activated, interaction added, or data grouped differently? Did someone reinterpret an event already past? These cases need not share one answer. Sometimes the main clarification is splitting the question.

If an idea concerns your life, translate its promise into a describable action. Instead of creating desired reality through attention, choose to check one important premise before deciding: a budget, participant consent, or deadline. Notice what the step changed and what remained outside your control. This is practical work in its own right, rather than a quantum-measurement experiment.

Do not treat absence of the desired result as evidence of wrong consciousness. Actions involve conditions and other participants. Pausing may clarify a request without ensuring agreement. This boundary supports responsibility: you answer for the request and subsequent decision, rather than another person's entire inner life.

When discussing unusual experience, ask first about its meaning and then its proposed mechanism. This helps distinguish checking an explanation from refusing to hear experience. If the mechanism is unestablished, leave it open explicitly. Experiential significance and knowledge of causes may differ. Precision requires no coldness; it requires neither speaking for evidence nor removing people's right to describe their lives.

Key quotation

> *“the word comes loaded with meaning from everyday life”*

John Bell, “Against ‘measurement’,” p. 216; a short original sentence fragment checked against the source.

Bell is discussing “measurement.” What matters here is caution when extending everyday meanings into technical descriptions.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	What it reveals	Boundary
Bell and Feynman's teaching experiment	Registration conditions matter; everyday language can hide a task's structure.	Bell's linguistic critique and Feynman's teaching model do not supply a single complete interpretation of quantum theory.
Quantum observer and Rigveda 1.164.20's two birds	“Looking” participates in very different descriptions.	A religious witnessing image does not describe measuring apparatus.
James's stream of thought and the measurement problem	Both discussions can reveal limits of naive pictures of ready-made separate elements.	Experience descriptions do not derive quantum calculations; similar questions do not establish shared mechanisms.
Decoherence and practical attention	Connections producing change must be specified in each case.	Physical environment interaction and deliberate decision changes are checked differently.

Primary sources and research

1. Bell, John S. “Against ‘measurement’.” Physics World 3(8), 1990; reprinted in Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics, chapter 23, pp. 213–231. Chapter text. Opening and measurement discussion, pp. 213–217, were used; quotations are from p. 216.

2. Feynman, Richard P.; Leighton, Robert B.; Sands, Matthew. The Feynman Lectures on Physics, vol. III, 1965, chapter 1, §§ 1–4 to 1–6. Official Caltech edition. A teaching account; its thought experiment is distinguished from a historical laboratory protocol.

3. Schlosshauer, Maximilian. “Decoherence, the measurement problem, and interpretations of quantum mechanics.” Reviews of Modern Physics 76, 2005, 1267–1305. DOI: 10.1103/RevModPhys.76.1267. Author's arXiv v4, §§ I–III; introduction, problem formulation, and beginning of the decoherence program were read.

4. The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. “The Nobel Prize in Physics 2022,” October 4, 2022. Official award account. The award's stated subject was used, rather than expanded interpretation.

5. Rigveda 1.164, verse 20. R. T. H. Griffith, 1896 translation. Hymn. Poetic two-bird image; paraphrased in this article, rather than quoted from a Russian academic edition.

6. James, William. Psychology: Briefer Course, 1892, chapter XI, “The Stream of Consciousness.” Text. Discussion of experiential continuity was used; historical psychology is not presented as quantum theory.

Tags

quantum physics, observer, measurement, Bell, Feynman, decoherence, interference, two slits, instrument, environment, probability amplitude, interpretation, entanglement, scientific precision, consciousness, attention, witness, Rigveda, James, experience, meaning, metaphor, evidence, limits of knowledge, intention, participation, responsibility, autonomy, uncertainty, practical decision.

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.