Fundamental Consciousness and Field-Conditioned Actualization: A Schwinger-Inspired Inquiry into the Manifestation of Matter and the Ontology of Consciousness

Raluca Bilasco-Rusu

University of Bucharest

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101100068

Received: 05 November 2026; Accepted: 10 November 2026; Published: 20 November 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper examines what the Schwinger effect can contribute to a philosophical account of consciousness as fundamental and to the question of how matter becomes physically manifest. The Schwinger effect is a non-perturbative prediction of quantum electrodynamics (QED): under a sufficiently strong external electric field, the QED vacuum becomes unstable against the production of real charged particle–antiparticle pairs. The paper argues that the effect is philosophically instructive because it provides a mathematically explicit case in which a field-theoretic state, under determinate conditions, transitions to a state containing real excitations. It thereby sharpens the distinction between an underlying physical field, the conditions governing its state, and the actualization of particular physical excitations. This is not creation from absolute nothing: the energy required for pair production is supplied by the external field. Nor does the effect establish that quantum fields or the vacuum are conscious. Its relevance is more limited but more precise. It offers a physical case through which to examine the meaning of manifestation, actualization, and differentiation in a field-based ontology.

At the metaphysical level, the paper advances a consciousness-first hypothesis: consciousness is fundamental to reality, while mind and matter may be understood as distinct aspects or modes through which reality is manifested. This position is not simply identified with classical neutral monism, because classical neutral monism ordinarily treats the fundamental basis as neither mental nor physical. It is also not assumed to be cosmopsychism. Instead, the paper develops a provisional multi-aspectual monist orientation and places it in critical dialogue with neutral monism, Russellian monism, panpsychism, cosmopsychism, and idealism. The paper then distinguishes physical field-conditioned actualization from phenomenal manifestation and proposes a provisional psychophysical manifestation hypothesis: the organization of physical systems may constrain the differentiation, unity, contents, temporal continuity, and boundaries of individual experience. Candidate organizational variables are identified, while their explanatory status remains open. The framework is compared with Integrated Information Theory, Global Neuronal Workspace approaches, quantum-field models of brain dynamics, Orch OR, and Keppler's TRAZE proposal. The conclusion is that the Schwinger effect cannot prove the metaphysical thesis or provide a mechanism of consciousness, but it can contribute a precise physical case for thinking about how differentiated forms of matter arise within field ontology. Whether this insight can illuminate phenomenal manifestation remains a substantive philosophical question requiring further argument.

Keywords: fundamental consciousness; Schwinger effect; quantum electrodynamics; quantum field theory; field-conditioned actualization; multi-aspectual monism; neutral monism; Russellian monism; phenomenal manifestation; mind–matter problem

1. INTRODUCTION

Consciousness remains a central difficulty for any comprehensive account of nature. Neuroscience has established extensive and systematic dependencies between conscious experience and brain activity. Changes in neural function are associated with changes in perception, attention, memory, wakefulness, and

the capacity to report experience. Yet the existence of phenomenal consciousness—the fact that there is something it is like to see a colour, feel pain, or undergo a thought—continues to raise a question about the relation between physical description and subjective character (Nagel, 1974; Levine, 1983; Chalmers, 1995). The identification of neural correlates is indispensable, but the metaphysical interpretation of those correlations remains contested.

This paper begins with a definite philosophical commitment: consciousness is fundamental to reality. The claim is not that every physical object is a conscious subject, that particles possess human-like experience, or that the quantum vacuum is conscious. It is the more general ontological thesis that phenomenal reality cannot ultimately be understood as an accidental product of entities whose nature is wholly non-phenomenal. The paper investigates a further possibility: that reality may manifest through multiple aspects, of which the mental and the material are the aspects most directly relevant to the present discussion. The nature and number of such aspects are not assumed to be exhausted by this distinction.

The metaphysical position developed here is consciousness-first and multi-aspectual. It is monist in seeking an underlying unity of reality, and multi-aspectual in allowing that this reality may be expressed or apprehended through different irreducible aspects. The position has affinities with neutral monism and Russellian monism, but it is not simply identical with either. Classical neutral monism typically regards the fundamental basis as neither mental nor physical (Stubenberg & Wishon, 2023). The present proposal gives consciousness ontological priority. Russellian monism, by contrast, is relevant because it asks whether the intrinsic nature underlying the structural and dynamical properties described by physics may also be relevant to consciousness (Alter & Pereboom, 2023; Russell, 1927). These theories provide important conceptual resources, while the paper leaves open whether the best final formulation will be a consciousness-first form of aspect monism, a variant of Russellian monism, or a related position.

The physical point of departure is the Schwinger effect. In QED, a sufficiently strong external electric field can render the vacuum unstable against the production of electron–positron pairs. The effect is a non-perturbative prediction: the pair-production rate is exponentially suppressed at field strengths well below the characteristic critical scale, and the process cannot be captured by a finite-order perturbative expansion in the external field (Schwinger, 1951; Dunne, 2004). The energy required to produce the pairs is supplied by the external field. The process is therefore not the appearance of matter from absolute nothingness. It is a transition within a physical field-theoretic description.

Why invoke this process in a paper on consciousness? The answer is not that pair production resembles subjective experience in any direct or mechanistic sense. Rather, the Schwinger effect provides a particularly explicit physical case for examining how a field state can give rise to differentiated, physically instantiated excitations under specified conditions. It allows the paper to ask a more precise question about matter: should particles be understood as self-subsisting material building blocks, or as excitations whose existence and properties are intelligible within a more fundamental field ontology? Quantum field theory does not settle every metaphysical question about the nature of fields, but the Schwinger effect makes the relation between field state, conditioning conditions, and actualized excitations unusually concrete.

The central philosophical question is therefore: can the Schwinger effect contribute to an account of the manifestation of matter from a more fundamental physical reality, and can this account provide conceptual resources for thinking about the relation between fundamental consciousness and differentiated phenomenal experience? The paper argues that it can contribute to the first question directly and to the second only indirectly. A physical process in QED cannot establish a psychophysical identity. It can, however, clarify what a carefully specified account of manifestation must distinguish.

The paper makes four contributions. First, it clarifies the metaphysical starting point and distinguishes it from classical neutral monism, cosmopsychism, and panpsychism. Second, it explains why the Schwinger effect is a particularly useful case for analysing field-conditioned physical actualization. Third, it separates physical actualization from phenomenal manifestation and proposes candidate organizational conditions that may constrain individual experience. Fourth, it compares the proposal with existing metaphysical and quantum-consciousness theories, especially Russellian monism and Keppler's TRAZE account. The paper

does not present a new physical law, a validated neural mechanism, or proof that consciousness is fundamental.

2. METHOD, SCOPE, AND TERMINOLOGY

2.1. Methodological approach

This is a conceptual and comparative study in metaphysics, philosophy of mind, and philosophy of physics. It reconstructs the relevant physical features of the Schwinger mechanism from foundational and specialist literature; distinguishes established QED claims from metaphysical interpretation; compares the proposed position with selected accounts of mind and matter; and formulates a provisional account of how physical organization might constrain phenomenal manifestation. The selection of comparator theories is guided by their relevance to four issues: ontological fundamentality, the relation between mental and physical aspects, the nature of physical fields, and the individuation of conscious subjects.

The argument proceeds by controlled comparison rather than by claiming a deduction from physics to metaphysics. The physical discussion establishes what the Schwinger effect describes. The metaphysical discussion asks what, if anything, that description makes conceptually available for a broader account of manifestation. Where the paper advances a philosophical interpretation, it is identified as such. No inference from the physical vacuum to consciousness is assumed.

2.2. Key terms

'Fundamental consciousness' refers to the thesis that consciousness belongs to the fundamental nature of reality, rather than being wholly generated from a basis that is entirely non-conscious. It does not imply that every entity is a subject or that all physical processes are accompanied by human-like awareness. 'Aspect' refers to a way in which a more fundamental reality is manifested, organized, or known. The term is deliberately less committal than 'substance' and does not assume that each aspect is a separate entity. In this paper, the mental and the material are treated as distinguishable aspects for purposes of analysis. The possibility of further aspects is left open, but no additional aspect is specified or asserted.

'Field-conditioned actualization' (FCA) refers to a physical transition in which a specified field state, under determinate dynamical conditions, gives rise to physically instantiated excitations or configurations. The term is a philosophical description of a physical structure exemplified by the Schwinger effect; it is not a new term in QED or a new physical law. 'Phenomenal manifestation' refers to the differentiation and structuring of particular experiences: their contents, unity, temporal continuity, perspective, and boundaries. It is not used to imply that consciousness is created from nothing. It marks the question of how particular forms of experience are associated with particular organized systems.

3. FUNDAMENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE METAPHYSICAL LANDSCAPE

3.1. The consciousness-first commitment

The paper’s starting point is that consciousness is fundamental. This commitment gives direction to the inquiry, but it does not by itself settle how consciousness relates to matter. Several metaphysical positions accept that consciousness or phenomenal properties have a fundamental role while offering different accounts of their distribution and relation to physical reality.

The position explored here is that one fundamental reality may manifest through more than one aspect, and that consciousness is not a derivative feature added to an otherwise wholly non-conscious world. This is a consciousness-first form of multi-aspectual monism. It is not yet a fully specified metaphysical system. In particular, it must explain whether the material aspect is constituted by consciousness, grounded in the same fundamental reality, or related to consciousness through a deeper intrinsic nature. The present paper treats this as an open but structured question.

3.2. Neutral monism

Neutral monism seeks to overcome the mind–matter divide by proposing that ultimate reality is neither exclusively mental nor exclusively physical. Mental and material phenomena are understood as derivative organizations, groupings, or aspects of a more basic neutral reality (Stubenberg & Wishon, 2023). In the historical tradition associated with William James and Bertrand Russell, what is experienced as mental in one context may function as physical in another; the distinction can depend on relations and organization rather than on two fundamentally different substances (James, 1912; Russell, 1921).

This position is highly relevant to the present inquiry because it challenges the assumption that mind and matter must be fundamentally separate kinds of being. However, a strict neutral monism does not state that consciousness itself is the fundamental basis. If the present paper insists that consciousness is ontologically fundamental, it departs from the standard neutral-monist claim that the basis is neutral between the mental and physical. The relationship is therefore one of affinity and critical dialogue, not identity..

3.3. Russellian monism

Russellian monism is particularly important because it addresses the gap between the structural descriptions supplied by physics and the intrinsic nature of the entities or properties that instantiate those structures. On one influential formulation, physics describes the spatiotemporal and causal structure of the world while remaining silent, or comparatively silent, about the intrinsic properties underlying that structure. Russellian monists propose that such intrinsic properties are relevant to consciousness or may partly constitute it (Alter & Pereboom, 2023; Russell, 1927).

This approach offers a powerful way to rethink the mind–matter relation without positing two independent substances. It also creates a natural point of contact with quantum field theory: field theory provides a sophisticated mathematical description of fields, states, interactions, and excitations, while questions about the ultimate intrinsic nature of the described reality remain philosophical. The present paper does not claim that quantum fields are phenomenal properties. It asks whether a consciousness-first account of intrinsic reality could be developed in conversation with Russellian monism.

A distinction is necessary. Some Russellian monist theories treat the intrinsic properties underlying physics as phenomenal; others treat them as protophenomenal or neutral. The present proposal is closer to a consciousness-first interpretation if consciousness itself is taken as fundamental. It is not thereby a standard Russellian monist theory.

3.4. Panpsychism and cosmopsychism

Panpsychism generally attributes phenomenal or proto-phenomenal properties to fundamental physical entities or constituents. Its central difficulty is the combination problem: how could many basic experiential properties or subjects constitute the unified experience of a complex organism? (Chalmers, 2013; Goff, 2017). Cosmopsychism reverses the direction of explanation by treating the cosmos or the universe as fundamental in the relevant conscious sense and asking how finite subjects are differentiated within it (Shani, 2015; Goff, 2017). This generates a related decombination or individuation problem.

The present paper does not adopt cosmopsychism as its starting point. It does, however, take seriously the possibility that individual subjects are differentiated within a more fundamental reality. This allows the paper to engage with the combination and decombination problems without assuming that its answer must be either atomistic composition or a single cosmic subject. A theory of manifestation may provide a different conceptual route, although it must still explain why particular experiences belong to particular subjects.

3.5. Idealism and consciousness-first monism

Idealist theories give mind or consciousness ontological priority and understand the physical world in relation to it. Some forms of idealism interpret the physical as constituted by, dependent upon, or represented within consciousness. The present proposal shares the commitment to the fundamentality of consciousness

but does not yet endorse a fully developed idealist account of matter. In particular, it does not claim that the QED vacuum is an appearance in a universal mind or that physical fields can be derived from phenomenal states.

For the purposes of this paper, 'consciousness-first multi-aspectual monism' is a working description of the intended direction: consciousness is fundamental, while reality may be expressed through distinguishable aspects, including mental and material aspects. The label is provisional and is not presented as an established school or as a claim of historical originality. It helps in clarifying my position while leaving open the precise grounding relation between consciousness and physical ontology.

3.6. Provisional metaphysical commitment

The paper therefore adopts three commitments. First, consciousness is treated as fundamental. Second, mind and matter are approached as distinguishable aspects or modes of manifestation within one underlying reality, rather than as two unrelated substances. Third, the precise relation between the fundamental conscious nature of reality and the physical field ontology described by QFT remains to be articulated. This position is closer to a consciousness-first aspect monism than to strict neutral monism, while remaining in sustained dialogue with Russellian monism and neutral-monist accounts.

4. QUANTUM FIELD ONTOLOGY AND THE SCHWINGER EFFECT

4.1. Particles as field excitations

Quantum field theory is the framework in which fields, rather than classical particles, occupy the central role in the description of fundamental interactions. In this framework, particle states are understood in relation to excitations of quantum fields. The vacuum is not classical empty space or metaphysical nothingness; it is a state of the relevant quantum fields. The details of particle interpretation depend on the theory and context, but the general field-theoretic picture challenges an ontology in which particles are simply tiny, self-subsisting objects that exist independently of the fields.

This point is philosophically significant but should not be overstated. QFT is a physical theory with mathematical structure and empirical successes. It does not by itself settle whether fields are substances, processes, structures, dispositions, or manifestations of a more fundamental ontology. Nor does it establish that fields are conscious. It does, however, make it reasonable to ask whether ordinary matter is best understood as a set of field excitations rather than as the ultimate level of physical explanation.

4.2. The Schwinger effect

The Schwinger effect is a non-perturbative prediction of QED. In a sufficiently strong external electric field, the vacuum becomes unstable against the production of charged particle–antiparticle pairs. For electron–positron production, the characteristic critical electric field is approximately:

$$E_s = \frac{m_e^2 c^3}{e\hbar} \approx 1.3 \times 10^{18} Vm^{-1}$$

This is a characteristic field scale, not a sharp threshold below which the production rate is identically zero. At field strengths much smaller than the critical scale, the pair-production rate is exponentially suppressed. Sauter (1931) and Heisenberg and Euler (1936) developed the effect, and Schwinger (1951) gave it its influential QED formulation. Dunne (2004) provides a detailed review of the effective-action framework and its extensions.

For a constant, spatially uniform electric field, the vacuum-persistence exponent per unit volume per unit time in spinor QED is commonly expressed, in natural units, as:

$$w = \frac{(eE)^2}{4\pi^3}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^2}exp\left(-\frac{n\pi m^2}{eE}\right)$$

The quantity *w* is associated with the vacuum-persistence probability and must not be casually identified with the rate of real pair production. Cohen and McGady (2008) explicitly distinguish the vacuum-persistence exponent from the pair-production rate, showing that the latter is given by the first term in the series for the idealized constant-field case. This technical distinction matters: a philosophical discussion should not treat every quantity associated with vacuum decay as if it measured the same physical event.

The physical process is often described using the language of virtual electron–positron pairs, but this image should not be taken as a literal account of observable particles temporarily borrowing energy. A more careful description concerns the dynamics of quantum fields in an external background and the transition from a vacuum state to a state containing real excitations. The energy needed for pair production is drawn from the external electric field. The process therefore concerns a field-mediated conversion of available energy into particle excitations, not creation from absolute nothing.

4.3. Experimental and biological status

The Schwinger mechanism is a robust theoretical prediction, but direct observation of spontaneous pair production in the canonical strong, quasi-static field regime remains experimentally challenging. Strong-field laser research investigates regimes relevant to non-perturbative QED, yet theoretical prediction, analogue modelling, and direct observation under idealized conditions must be distinguished (Dunne, 2004).

The critical field is approximately 1.3×10^{18} V m^{-1}. Ordinary neuronal and endogenous brain electric fields are far below this scale. This paper therefore makes no claim that Schwinger pair production occurs in neural tissue or that it is a mechanism of conscious experience. Any future biological proposal would require quantitative evidence about field strength, geometry, duration, energy transfer, and the relevant biological consequences.

5. WHY THE SCHWINGER EFFECT MATTERS TO A THEORY OF MANIFESTATION

5.1. Beyond the generic analogy

A central question for the proposal is why select the Schwinger effect rather than any other example

of physical emergence? The answer cannot be that it is the only process in which new physical forms arise. It is not. Nor is the claim that it is indispensable to the metaphysical thesis. Consciousness could be fundamental whether or not the Schwinger effect were considered. The more defensible claim is that the Schwinger effect is an unusually precise case for examining a particular transition: from a specified field-theoretic vacuum state, under a defined external condition, to a state containing real particle–antiparticle excitations.

Its philosophical relevance rests on the conjunction of several features. The initial state is specified; the conditioning factor is identifiable; the transition is non-perturbative; the resulting excitations are physically distinguishable; the process has a characteristic energy scale and rate structure; and the produced charges can in turn affect the field through backreaction. These features make the distinction between field state, conditioning conditions, transition dynamics, and actualized excitations unusually explicit. This is more informative than a loose statement that 'matter emerges from a field'.

The Schwinger effect is also particularly relevant to the question of matter manifestation because the outcome is not merely a change in how an already existing particle is described. The process concerns the production of real charged excitations from a field-theoretic vacuum state in an external background. It therefore provides a clear case in which the particle content of the physical state changes under determinate

conditions. This does not mean that particles are created from nothing: the energy comes from the external field, and the process is governed by QED.

5.2. What the effect can teach us and what it cannot

The effect can teach us that, within QFT, the physical vacuum is a structured state whose stability and particle content depend on the dynamical context. It can illustrate that what is described as matter at the particle level may be understood as excitations within a more basic field description. It can also discipline the use of the term 'manifestation' by requiring that a transition be specified in terms of an initial state, conditions, dynamics, and outcome.

It cannot teach us that the quantum vacuum is consciousness, that matter is literally made of consciousness, or that the Schwinger mechanism is a psychophysical process. No equation in the Schwinger calculation contains a phenomenal variable. No established result in QED identifies field excitations with experiences. Any such identification would require an independent metaphysical argument and, if a biological mechanism were proposed, a separate empirical research programme.

5.3. Field-conditioned actualization

I use 'field-conditioned actualization' (FCA) to name the physical structure exemplified by the Schwinger effect: a field-theoretic state, under specified conditions, transitions to a state with particular physical excitations or configurations. FCA is not a new physical law, and it does not claim priority over established concepts such as vacuum instability, pair production, or non-perturbative transitions. Its function is conceptual: it keeps distinct the underlying field state, the conditioning background, the transition dynamics, and the instantiated physical outcome.

5.4. A modest Field-Conditioned Actualization Criterion

The *Field-Conditioned Actualization Criterion* (FCAC) is retained only as a diagnostic checklist for claims that invoke field-conditioned physical actualization. It asks whether an account identifies:

- the initial field state and relevant boundary or background conditions;
- the conditioning parameter or interaction that alters the system’s dynamics;
- the transition law, probability, rate, or mathematical criterion;
- the physical outcome, including the distinction between real excitations and virtual or counterfactual descriptions;
- the relevant conservation laws, energy source, backreaction, and environmental constraints.

These are familiar requirements of physical explanation, not a newly discovered principle. The potential contribution of FCAC is therefore limited to analytical clarity. It helps prevent a philosophical argument from moving from 'a field exists' to 'matter manifests' without specifying the physical transition being discussed. If it does not improve conceptual precision in a given application, it should not be treated as an independent theoretical contribution.

5.5. The philosophical significance of field-to-excitation transitions

The central lesson is not that the Schwinger effect provides a model of consciousness. It is that the relation between a physical field and its differentiated excitations can be described without treating the excitations as ontologically independent of the field. The effect makes visible a distinction between a field-theoretic basis and particular physical forms actualized under specific conditions. This distinction offers a disciplined physical point of comparison for a metaphysical inquiry into manifestation.

The comparison must remain limited. A QED field and fundamental consciousness are not interchangeable concepts. The field is a mathematically defined physical entity or structure within a physical theory; fundamental consciousness is a metaphysical posit. The Schwinger effect therefore does not establish the

consciousness-first hypothesis. It gives the paper a concrete physical case with which to examine the meaning of conditioned manifestation and the ontological status of differentiated forms.

6. FROM PHYSICAL ACTUALIZATION TO PHENOMENAL MANIFESTATION

6.1. Why the transition requires an independent argument

The transition from physical actualization to phenomenal manifestation is the most difficult part of the framework. A physical theory can explain how a system changes state, produces excitations, or develops a new organization. Such an explanation does not by itself explain why a state is accompanied by subjective experience. The explanatory gap identified by Levine (1983) and the hard problem discussed by Chalmers (1995) remain relevant. The present proposal does not infer phenomenal manifestation from field-conditioned actualization. Instead, it separates two questions. The physical question is how particular material configurations become actualized within field ontology. The psychophysical question is whether, and under what conditions, such configurations are associated with differentiated forms of experience, given the hypothesis that consciousness is fundamental. The Schwinger effect informs the first question; it motivates a more disciplined formulation of the second but does not answer it.

6.2. A provisional Psychophysical Manifestation Hypothesis

The paper proposes the following provisional hypothesis:

Psychophysical Manifestation Hypothesis **(PMH)**

If consciousness is fundamental, the particular forms through which it is manifested as individual phenomenal experience may be systematically constrained by the organization and dynamics of physical systems. Physical organization may shape the unity, differentiation, temporal continuity, contents, and boundaries of experience, without being assumed to create consciousness from an entirely non-conscious basis. PMH is a metaphysical hypothesis, not a law derived from QED or an established neuroscientific result. It is stronger than the observation that brain states correlate with experience because it proposes an interpretation of that dependence: physical organization may condition the form of phenomenal manifestation. To become explanatory, it must identify the relevant organizational properties, explain their relation to phenomenal features, and clarify what would distinguish it from physicalist accounts.

6.3. Candidate organizational variables

Candidate physical feature	Phenomenal feature it may constrain	Status and open question
Causal integration	Unity and co-presence of experiential contents	Candidate correlate; a measure of integration is not itself an explanation of experience.
Differentiated state repertoire	Specificity and diversity of contents	May constrain what distinctions a system can sustain; requires operational definition.
Recurrent interaction and feedback	Stability and updating of contents	Relevant to perceptual processing; does not by itself explain phenomenal character.
Temporal coordination and persistence	Continuity and succession of experience	Candidate condition; relevant timescales and thresholds remain unspecified.
Operational boundary and causal autonomy	Individuation of a particular perspective	Central to the subject-boundary problem; physical boundaries may not map directly onto phenomenal boundaries.

These variables are drawn from themes already present in neuroscience and theories of consciousness. Their inclusion is not a claim of empirical originality. Their proposed role within a consciousness-first

metaphysics is the point requiring development. For example, causal integration may help explain why multiple contents are experienced together, while a differentiated repertoire may constrain the range of distinguishable contents. Recurrent interactions may stabilize and update contents, and temporal coordination may contribute to continuity. Operational boundaries may be relevant to the individuation of a perspective. None of these relations is yet sufficient to explain why there is something it is like to be the system.

6.4. A worked conceptual example: visual experience

Consider a person looking at a red object. The physical account includes reflected light, retinal transduction, neural signalling, recurrent processing, attention, memory, and report. A physicalist may interpret the relevant neural activity as realizing or constituting the conscious experience. Under the present hypothesis, the same neural organization is interpreted as constraining the manifestation of a particular experience within fundamental consciousness: it shapes the content (red rather than blue), its integration with other contents, its temporal persistence, and its availability to the subject.

The example does not decide between these interpretations. Its purpose is to specify the explanatory target. The framework must explain why the relevant organization corresponds to this particular phenomenal content and why the experience belongs to this subject. It must also clarify whether the physical system constitutes the phenomenal perspective, conditions it, or serves as its material aspect. Those are distinct claims and should not be treated as synonyms.

6.5. The individuation problem

If consciousness is fundamental and individual experiences are differentiated manifestations, the theory must explain why one stream of experience is distinct from another. Why does a particular experience belong to one subject rather than another? What establishes the boundary of a perspective? Can two physically integrated systems share a phenomenal perspective, or can one system support more than one? Does individuation admit degrees, or is it all-or-nothing? The present paper does not solve these problems. It identifies physical organization as a candidate constraint and makes subject individuation a central task for further theory development.

7. RELATED THEORIES AND CRITICAL COMPARISON

7.1. Neutral monism

Neutral monism is a close interlocutor because it seeks a single underlying reality from which mental and physical descriptions are derived. Its central neutrality claim, however, differs from the consciousness-first commitment adopted here: the ultimate basis is ordinarily understood as neither mental nor physical (Stubenberg & Wishon, 2023). The present proposal borrows the idea that mind and matter may be aspects or organizations of a more basic reality, but it does not leave the fundamental nature wholly neutral. It treats consciousness as fundamental. The resulting position may be described as aspectual in structure but consciousness-first in ontology.

7.2. Russellian monism

Russellian monism is perhaps the most productive comparator. It asks whether the intrinsic properties underlying the structural and dynamical properties described by physics may also be relevant to consciousness (Alter & Pereboom, 2023; Russell, 1927). This creates a possible bridge between physical ontology and phenomenal reality without requiring two independent substances. The present proposal shares the interest in an underlying reality that is not exhausted by structural physical description. Its stronger commitment is that consciousness is fundamental, rather than merely one possible role for intrinsic properties. The paper should therefore be understood as developing a consciousness-first question in the vicinity of Russellian monism, not as claiming to have established a new Russellian theory.

7.3. Panpsychism and cosmopsychism

Panpsychism offers a way to treat phenomenal properties as fundamental and widespread, but it faces the combination problem. Cosmopsychism reverses the explanatory direction and faces the challenge of explaining finite subject boundaries. The present proposal explores whether the language of differentiated manifestation can help reformulate these problems. It does not assume that elementary subjects must combine, nor does it posit a single cosmic subject from which all individual subjects must be separated. However, changing the explanatory vocabulary from combination to differentiation does not by itself solve either problem. A theory must still explain the structure and ownership of individual experience.

7.4. Idealism

Idealism is relevant because it grants consciousness or mind ontological priority. The present paper shares this priority but remains less committal about the exact status of matter. Some idealist theories understand the physical world as constituted within consciousness; the present framework does not yet defend that specific relation. It asks whether the physical and mental may be understood as distinct aspects of a fundamental conscious reality. This possibility needs further metaphysical specification.

7.5. Integrated Information Theory and Global Neuronal Workspace

Integrated Information Theory (IIT) attempts to characterize consciousness in terms of intrinsic causal structure and integrated information (Albantakis et al., 2023). It is relevant to the present proposal because both give importance to integration and differentiation. The difference lies in metaphysical starting point and explanatory ambition: IIT proposes a formal account connecting properties of experience to causal structure, whereas PMH interprets organizational properties as conditions under which fundamental consciousness may be manifested in particular systems. PMH must explain what it contributes beyond IIT's formal framework and should not claim integration as a novel discovery.

Global Neuronal Workspace approaches emphasize the global availability or broadcasting of information across distributed cognitive systems, often linking this availability to conscious access and report (Baars, 1988; Dehaene & Changeux, 2011). Recurrent Processing Theory emphasizes recurrent interactions in perceptual systems (Lamme, 2006). These theories provide candidate functional and organizational variables for the psychophysical discussion. The present framework differs primarily in its metaphysical interpretation; it must avoid treating the explanatory work of access, report, and perceptual stabilization as if it had already explained phenomenal subjectivity. Contemporary reviews emphasize that leading theories differ in their claims and empirical predictions and remain actively debated (Seth & Bayne, 2022).

7.6. Quantum field approaches to brain dynamics

Ricciardi and Umezawa (1967) applied many-body quantum field theory to brain states, particularly memory. Later dissipative quantum field approaches associated with Vitiello and collaborators explored collective modes, symmetry breaking, and open-system dynamics in models of brain activity (Vitiello, 2001; Freeman & Vitiello, 2008). These approaches are relevant because they use field-theoretic concepts to describe collective neural organization. They do not establish that consciousness is fundamental, and they should not be conflated with the Schwinger mechanism. The present paper makes no claim that Schwinger pair production occurs in the brain.

7.7. Orch OR and nuclear-spin proposals

Orchestrated Objective Reduction (Orch OR) proposes that quantum processes associated with neuronal microtubules are orchestrated and terminate through an objective-reduction process related to spacetime geometry, with conscious moments associated with these events (Hameroff & Penrose, 2014). Fisher (2015) has proposed that nuclear spins in particular molecular environments might support quantum processing relevant to cognition. These theories make specific biological and physical commitments. The present framework does not. Their relevance is methodological: any quantum-consciousness proposal must specify

its substrate, energy scales, timescales, environmental constraints, functional role, and testable consequences.

7.8. Keppler's TRAZE proposal

Keppler's work is a particularly important comparator because it explicitly connects consciousness with the electromagnetic zero-point field. His 2021 paper develops building blocks for an electromagnetic field theory of consciousness. His 2024 TRAZE proposal argues that resonant interaction between zero-point-field modes and glutamate-related brain dynamics may amplify selected modes associated with phenomenal qualities (Keppler, 2021, 2024). The proposal is more physically specific than the present framework: it advances a candidate coupling mechanism and a proposed relation between field modes and phenomenal qualities.

The present framework differs in three respects. First, it does not identify the electromagnetic zero-point field or the QED vacuum with consciousness. Second, it does not propose that individual zero-point modes correspond to particular qualia. Third, it does not propose a resonant brain–zero-point-field mechanism. It begins instead from a consciousness-first metaphysical hypothesis and uses the Schwinger effect to clarify a separate physical issue: how field-conditioned transitions can yield differentiated material excitations. The comparison with TRAZE also imposes a useful standard. If the present framework eventually proposes a physical coupling, it will need quantitative specification and empirical tests. Until then, its contribution is conceptual and metaphysical rather than mechanistic.

7.9. Comparative summary

Approach	Central commitment	Relation to this paper
Neutral monism	Ultimate reality is neither exclusively mental nor physical.	Shares the one-reality/aspectual intuition; differs because this paper gives consciousness ontological priority.
Russellian monism	Intrinsic properties underlying physical structure may be relevant to consciousness.	A close interlocutor; the present proposal makes a stronger consciousness-first commitment.
Panpsychism	Phenomenal or proto-phenomenal properties are fundamental and widespread.	Relevant to fundamentality; faces the combination problem.
Cosmopsychism	A comprehensive conscious reality is fundamental; finite subjects require differentiation.	Relevant to individuation, but not adopted as the paper's required ontology.
Idealism	Consciousness or mind is ontologically fundamental.	Shares the priority of consciousness; the status of matter remains open here.
IIT / GNWT	Formal or functional accounts of conscious integration and access.	Provide candidate organizational variables; differ in metaphysical starting point.
TRAZE	Proposed resonant coupling between brain dynamics and the electromagnetic zero-point field.	More mechanistic; requires evidence for the proposed coupling and mode–quality mapping.

8. OBJECTIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND REPLIES

8.1. The Schwinger effect is only an analogy

This objection is correct if the effect is used to claim that consciousness is produced by vacuum instability or that particle production is equivalent to phenomenal manifestation. The paper makes neither inference. The Schwinger effect is used as a precise physical case of field-conditioned actualization. Its value is that the field state, conditioning background, non-perturbative transition, and physical outcome can be specified. The

philosophical extension is a question about whether this structure can illuminate the concept of manifestation. The comparison is heuristic and analytical, not an identity claim.

8.2. Why this effect rather than another physical transition?

The Schwinger effect is not claimed to be the only relevant example or a necessary premise of the metaphysical theory. It is selected because it makes the relation between a field-theoretic vacuum and the production of real particle excitations especially explicit, while also displaying a characteristic non-perturbative dependence on an external field and a defined energy source. Other processes may illuminate related aspects of field ontology. The present paper's claim is comparative: the Schwinger effect is a particularly clear case for the specific question of field-conditioned particle actualization. Its philosophical usefulness depends on whether that clarity helps distinguish underlying physical reality from its differentiated excitations.

8.3. The QED vacuum is not consciousness

The paper agrees. The QED vacuum is a physical state defined within quantum field theory. The thesis that consciousness is fundamental is a metaphysical commitment. The physical description does not establish the metaphysical thesis, and the metaphysical thesis does not license the identification of consciousness with the QED vacuum. Their relation remains an open question.

8.4. The framework may be an idealist theory under another name

This is a genuine issue. If the paper claims that all physical reality is constituted by consciousness, it approaches idealism. If it claims that consciousness and matter are aspects of one neutral basis, it approaches neutral monism. If it claims that intrinsic properties underlying physical structure are phenomenal, it approaches a consciousness-first form of Russellian monism. The present proposal is deliberately positioned as a consciousness-first multi-aspectual monism, while acknowledging that its exact relation to these established categories requires further refinement. The terminology should not conceal the substantive metaphysical commitments.

8.5. The transition from physical to phenomenal manifestation remains underdeveloped

This is the central limitation. The paper identifies candidate organizational properties but does not derive a psychophysical law from QED. A complete theory must explain why particular physical organizations correspond to particular phenomenal contents, how experiences are unified, and how individual subjects are bounded. The Schwinger effect cannot supply this bridge. It can clarify the physical concept of actualization; a separate metaphysical and empirical account is required for phenomenal manifestation.

8.6. The framework may lack empirical distinctiveness

The same neural data may be interpreted by physicalist, functionalist, and consciousness-first theories. The present paper does not claim a decisive empirical refutation of physicalism or a unique prediction. Its current contribution is metaphysical and conceptual. To develop into a more explanatory research programme, it must identify cases in which its account of phenomenal manifestation makes different predictions or offers a clearer explanation than competing theories. Where predictions are shared, the framework should state that its contribution is interpretive rather than empirically distinctive.

8.7. Conceptual novelty

The *Field-Conditioned Actualization Criterion* is not presented as a new law or a novel set of physical requirements. It is a diagnostic schema. The potential originality of the paper lies in the specific philosophical use of the Schwinger case within a consciousness-first, multi-aspectual metaphysical inquiry, and in the explicit separation of physical actualization from phenomenal manifestation. Whether this synthesis constitutes a substantive advance remains open to critical evaluation. The paper therefore makes a qualified contribution claim rather than claiming a completed theory.

9. A RESEARCH PROGRAMME FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

9.1. Clarifying the metaphysical architecture

The first task is to specify the relation among fundamental consciousness, the material aspect, and the physical fields described by QFT. Three broad options should be distinguished: (i) matter is constituted by or dependent upon consciousness; (ii) mind and matter are distinct aspects of a single underlying reality whose intrinsic nature is conscious; or (iii) consciousness is fundamental, while physical ontology is related to it through a grounding relation that remains to be specified. These options are not interchangeable. The paper presently leans toward the second or third, but further argument is required.

9.2. Developing the psychophysical account

The candidate organizational variables should be developed into explicit conditional hypotheses. For example, if causal integration is disrupted while local sensory processing remains intact, does phenomenal unity change? If the repertoire of distinguishable neural states is restricted, does the specificity of phenomenal content change? If recurrent processing is selectively altered, are perceptual contents less stable or less integrated? If temporal coordination breaks down, does the continuity of experience change? These questions can be investigated through existing neuroscience, but their interpretation must distinguish access, report, and phenomenal character.

9.3. Subject individuation

The theory must explain why a given physical organization is associated with one phenomenal perspective. It must address nested systems, overlapping causal networks, split-brain findings, dissociation, altered states, and cases in which functional integration and reported unity diverge. It must also clarify whether subject boundaries are determined by causal organization, by a more basic phenomenal relation, or by a combination of both. Until this issue is developed, the framework discusses subject individuation as an open problem rather than a solved result.

9.4. What would count as progress?

- Metaphysical clarity: specify whether the proposal is consciousness-first aspect monism, a form of idealism, or a variant of Russellian monism.
- Physical accuracy: preserve the distinction between QED vacuum states, external-field energy, pair production, and metaphysical nothingness.
- Explanatory specificity: relate candidate organizational variables to defined phenomenal features without treating correlation as identity.
- Comparative value: state what the proposal adds to neutral monism, Russellian monism, IIT, GNWT, and TRAZE.
- Empirical discipline: identify measurable consequences and possible falsifiers for any future biological or psychophysical claims.

9.5. The role of quantum physics

The Schwinger effect should remain a physical case study unless a separate biological hypothesis can meet demanding feasibility requirements. Any proposed quantum mechanism in a living system must specify the relevant degrees of freedom, energy scales, coupling strengths, characteristic times, environmental noise, and causal contribution to neural function. It must distinguish genuinely quantum predictions from effects explainable by classical electromagnetic or conventional neural dynamics. No such mechanism is proposed in this paper.

10. DISCUSSION

This paper addresses three methodological demands. First, the Schwinger effect must contribute more than a decorative analogy. Its role is specific: it is a precise QED case in which a field-theoretic vacuum state, under a defined external electric field, can transition to a state containing real charged excitations. This makes it useful for analysing the manifestation of matter within field ontology. Second, the psychophysical bridge must be developed beyond a general assertion of correspondence. The paper therefore identifies candidate organizational variables and states the phenomenal features they may constrain. Third, the metaphysical position must be clearer. The paper adopts a consciousness-first multi-aspectual monist orientation, while retaining a critical discussion of neutral monism, Russellian monism, panpsychism, cosmopsychism, and idealism.

The central philosophical ambition is to investigate whether the manifestation of matter from quantum fields can provide conceptual resources for thinking about the manifestation of individual experience within a fundamental-consciousness ontology. The answer offered here is deliberately qualified. The Schwinger effect demonstrates a specific physical process of field-conditioned actualization. It does not demonstrate that matter is made of consciousness, that quantum fields are conscious, or that the same mechanism applies to phenomenal experience. Its contribution is to make the physical side of the manifestation question more precise.

The paper's metaphysical position is stronger than strict neutral monism because it assigns consciousness ontological priority. Yet it shares with neutral monism the effort to understand mind and matter within one reality rather than as two independent substances. It also shares with Russellian monism the intuition that the physical description may not exhaust the intrinsic nature of what exists. These affinities should be treated as theoretical resources rather than as proof that the proposed position is already contained in an established school.

The principal unresolved problem is the relation between physical organization and phenomenal manifestation. The proposed organizational variables may help explain unity, differentiation, continuity, and subject boundaries, but the paper has not yet derived a psychophysical law. This is not a minor gap; it is the central task ahead. The present article should therefore be read as a conceptual framework and research programme, not as a finite scientific theory.

11. CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the philosophical contribution that the Schwinger effect may make to a theory of consciousness in which consciousness is treated as fundamental. The effect is a non-perturbative prediction of QED describing the instability of the vacuum under a sufficiently strong external electric field and the production of real electron–positron excitations. It does not describe creation from absolute nothing, since the energy required for pair production is supplied by the external field. Nor does it establish that the quantum vacuum is conscious or that Schwinger pair production occurs in the brain.

Its philosophical value lies in the precision with which it displays a relation between a field-theoretic state, conditioning conditions, transition dynamics, and differentiated physical excitations. It therefore provides a concrete case for investigating how matter may be understood as field excitation rather than as a collection of entirely independent material primitives. This is the specific contribution of the Schwinger effect to the paper's discussion of manifestation.

At the metaphysical level, the paper advances a consciousness-first, multi-aspectual monist orientation: consciousness is fundamental, while mind and matter may be understood as distinguishable aspects of a more basic reality. This position is in dialogue with neutral monism and Russellian monism, while differing from strict neutral monism by assigning consciousness ontological priority. It does not require commitment to cosmopsychism, although it engages with the subject-individuation problem that also arises in cosmopsychist and panpsychist theories.

The paper's further hypothesis is that physical organization may constrain the particular forms through which fundamental consciousness is manifested as individual experience. Causal integration, differentiated state repertoires, recurrent interaction, temporal coordination, and operational boundaries are identified as candidate variables relevant to phenomenal unity, content, continuity, and subject individuation. These relations remain provisional and require further theoretical and empirical development. The Schwinger effect does not prove this psychophysical hypothesis. It helps clarify the physical meaning of field-conditioned actualization and thereby sharpens the question of how differentiated manifestations should be understood.

The result is a deliberately bounded philosophical research programme. It brings quantum-field ontology into dialogue with a consciousness-first metaphysics while maintaining the distinction between what QED establishes and what philosophy proposes. Its ambition is to reconsider the relation between fundamental consciousness and the manifestation of matter; its next task is to explain, with greater precision, how physical organization may be related to the differentiation of phenomenal experience.

REFERENCES

1. Alter, T., & Pereboom, D. (2023). Russellian monism. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2023 ed.).
2. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2023/entries/russellian-monism/
3. Albantakis, L., Barbosa, L., Findlay, G., Grasso, M., Haun, A. M., Marshall, W., Mayner, W. G. P., et al. (2023). Integrated information theory (IIT) 4.0: Formulating the properties of phenomenal existence in physical terms. PLOS Computational Biology, 19(10), e1011465.
4. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1011465
5. Baars, B. J. (1988). A cognitive theory of consciousness. Cambridge University Press.
6. Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. Journal of Consciousness Studies, 2(3), 200–219.
7. Chalmers, D. J. (2013). Panpsychism and panprotopsychism. In D. J. Chalmers, The character of consciousness (pp. 246–276). Oxford University Press.
8. Cohen, T. D., & McGady, D. A. (2008). The Schwinger mechanism revisited. Physical Review D, 78, 036008. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.78.036008
9. Dehaene, S., & Changeux, J.-P. (2011). Experimental and theoretical approaches to conscious processing. Neuron, 70(2), 200–227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.03.018
10. Dunne, G. V. (2004). Heisenberg–Euler effective Lagrangians: Basics and extensions. In M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein, & J. Wheater (Eds.), From fields to strings: Circumnavigating theoretical physics (Vol. 1, pp. 445–522). World Scientific. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812775344_0014
11. Fisher, M. P. A. (2015). Quantum cognition: The possibility of processing with nuclear spins in the brain. Annals of Physics, 362, 593–602. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2015.08.020
12. Freeman, W. J., & Vitiello, G. (2008). Dissipation and spontaneous symmetry breaking in brain dynamics. Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical, 41, 304042.
13. https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/41/30/304042
14. Goff, P. (2017). Consciousness and fundamental reality. Oxford University Press.
15. Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). Consciousness in the universe: A review of the 'Orch OR' theory. Physics of Life Reviews, 11(1), 39–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plrev.2013.08.002
16. Heisenberg, W., & Euler, H. (1936). Folgerungen aus der Diracschen Theorie des Positrons. Zeitschrift für Physik, 98, 714–732.
17. James, W. (1912). Essays in radical empiricism. Longmans, Green, and Co.
18. Keppler, J. (2021). Building blocks for the development of a self-consistent electromagnetic field theory of consciousness. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 15, 723415.
19. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2021.723415
20. Keppler, J. (2024). Laying the foundations for a theory of consciousness: The significance of critical brain dynamics for the formation of conscious states. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 18, 1379191. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1379191
21. Lamme, V. A. F. (2006). Towards a true neural stance on consciousness. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 10(11), 494–501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.09.001

22. Levine, J. (1983). Materialism and qualia: The explanatory gap. Pacific Philosophical Quarterly, 64(4), 354–361.
23. Nagel, T. (1974). What is it like to be a bat? The Philosophical Review, 83(4), 435–450. https://doi.org/10.2307/2183914
24. Ricciardi, L. M., & Umezawa, H. (1967). Brain and physics of many-body problems. Kybernetik, 4(2), 44–48. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00292170
25. Russell, B. (1921). The analysis of mind. George Allen & Unwin.
26. Russell, B. (1927). The analysis of matter. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
27. Sauter, F. (1931). Über das Verhalten eines Elektrons im homogenen elektrischen Feld nach der relativistischen Theorie Diracs. Zeitschrift für Physik, 69, 742–764.
28. Schwinger, J. (1951). On gauge invariance and vacuum polarization. Physical Review, 82(5), 664–679. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.82.664
29. Seth, A. K., & Bayne, T. (2022). Theories of consciousness. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 23, 439–452. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-022-00587-4
30. Shani, I. (2015). Cosmopsychism: A holistic approach to the metaphysics of experience. Philosophical Papers, 44(3), 389–437. https://doi.org/10.1080/05568641.2015.1106709
31. Stubenberg, L., & Wishon, D. (2023). Neutral monism. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2023 ed.).
32. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2023/entries/neutral-monism
33. Vitiello, G. (2001). My double unveiled: The dissipative quantum model of brain. John Benjamins.

Declaration of generative AI use

Generative artificial intelligence (ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI) was used as an auxiliary tool in the preparation of this manuscript, including assistance with structural development, conceptual organization, literature exploration, and language drafting and refinement. The author retains full responsibility for the manuscript's intellectual content, arguments, interpretations, scientific accuracy, references, and conclusions.

Scope and submission note

This manuscript is a conceptual contribution to metaphysics, philosophy of mind, and philosophy of physics. It does not report new experiments, numerical simulations, or a validated biological mechanism. The consciousness-first multi-aspectual position and Psychophysical Manifestation Hypothesis are philosophical proposals; FCA and FCAC are analytical concepts, not established physical laws.