Regulated Multiplicity, Dialogue, and Consciousness

Allen Proxmire

22DEC2025

Abstract

We propose that consciousness arises from the regulated multiplicity of internal representational processes within a cognitive system. Rather than conceiving the mind as a single unified voice, we argue that conscious experience emerges from the structured interaction of multiple semi-independent "voices" that pose questions, generate competing answers, and adjudicate among them over time. By analogy with stereoscopic vision –where constrained disparity between two inputs yields qualitative depth –consciousness arises when internal disagreement is both structured and regulated. The degree of consciousness, in this view, corresponds to a system's capacity for sustained internal self-interrogation: the richness of the questions it can pose, the diversity of candidate answers it can entertain, and the mechanisms by which those answers are selected, revised, or suppressed. This framework reframes consciousness as a graded, architecturally grounded phenomenon, offering explanatory insight into psychopathology, neuroscientific findings, and the design of artificial cognitive systems.

1 Introduction

Despite decades of progress in neuroscience, cognitive science, and philosophy, the nature of consciousness remains deeply contested. Prominent theories emphasize different explanatory primitives: global integration of information, higher-order representation, predictive modeling, or informational unity. While each of these approaches captures important aspects of cognition, none fully explains why conscious experience exhibits its characteristic richness, flexibility, and perspectival depth.

A persistent assumption underlying many accounts is that consciousness is fundamentally unitary: that experience arises when information is bound into a single coherent representation. Yet empirical and clinical evidence increasingly suggests that cognition is inherently plural. Neural processing is distributed, modular, and often competitive. Pathological conditions such as schizophrenia, dissociative disorders, and split-brain phenomena further indicate that the unity of consciousness is fragile, constructed, and regulative rather than primitive.

This paper advances a complementary hypothesis: consciousness arises from regulated multiplicity. The mind consists of multiple semi-independent representational processes –"voices" –that generate candidate interpretations, predictions, and action policies. Conscious experience emerges

not from eliminating this multiplicity, but from regulating it into a coherent, self-referential dialogue. In this view, consciousness is neither binary nor mysterious; it is a graded property of systems capable of sustained internal self-interrogation.

2 The Stereoscopic Analogy Revisited: Multiplicity as Constraint

Analogies are often invoked to make consciousness intelligible, but few carry explanatory force beyond metaphor. Binocular vision, however, provides a structurally precise model for how qualitative enrichment can arise from multiplicity.

Stereoscopic depth perception does not result merely from having two visual inputs. The reason is that the disparity between the two retinal images is structured and constrained. Random differences between inputs would produce noise, not depth. Depth emerges only because the visual system regulates disparity by binding corresponding features, suppressing incompatible matches, and integrating differences according to strict geometrical constraints.

We propose that consciousness operates according to an analogous principle. Cognitive systems generate multiple internal perspectives –perceptual hypotheses, predictive models, evaluative stances, action plans, etc. These perspectives often disagree. Conscious richness does not arise from suppressing this disagreement or from unregulated plurality, but from the structured internal disparity governed by regulatory mechanisms.

Multiplicity, in this sense, is not a defect to be eliminated but a resource to be exploited, provided it is constrained. Just as stereopsis depends on regulated disparity, conscious awareness depends on regulated internal disagreement.

3 The Regulated Multiplicity Hypothesis

3.1 Core Claim

Hypothesis. The degree of consciousness in a system is proportional to its capacity to generate internal questions, entertain multiple candidate answers from semi-independent representational processes, and regulate those answers into coherent experience over time.

This hypothesis has three essential components: multiplicity, interrogation, and regulation.

3.2 Voices: Semi-Independent Representational Processes

By voices, we mean semi-autonomous representational processes that generate candidate interpretations, predictions, or action policies. These need not be linguistically articulated and need not correspond to homunculi. Examples include perceptual modules, predictive generative models, affective evaluators, motor planners, and narrative self-models.

Crucially, voices are capable of producing divergent outputs given the same internal or external state. This divergence is not noise but the raw material of conscious deliberation.

3.3 Questions: Internal Self-Interrogation

Conscious systems do not merely process information; they interrogate themselves. We define a question operationally as an internally generated probe that solicits alternative representations or policies.

Questions may take several forms:

- Counterfactual questions: What else could this be?
- Action queries: What should I do now?
- Meaning queries: What does this signify for me?
- Error probes: Why did this prediction fail?

The capacity to generate such questions distinguishes mere parallel processing from conscious cognition. A system that cannot ask itself questions, even if complex, lacks the dialogical structure characteristic of conscious awareness.

3.4 Answers: Candidate Hypotheses and Policies

An answer set consists of the competing outputs generated by voices in response to a question. These may be perceptual interpretations, action plans, emotional evaluations, or narrative framings.

Conscious richness correlates not with the number of answers alone, but with their diversity and incompatibility. A system that always produces a single dominant answer exhibits minimal consciousness, even if that answer is accurate.

3.5 Regulation: Making Multiplicity Coherent

Multiplicity alone is insufficient for consciousness. What distinguishes conscious systems from chaotic or pathological ones is regulation. We propose that regulation consists of four interrelated mechanisms:

1. **Gating**
   Determines which voices gain access to the internal dialogue at a given moment. Gating prevents uncontrolled proliferation of representations.
2. **Binding**
   Integrates compatible outputs into coherent percepts, thoughts, or action plans while maintaining distinctions between competing answers.
3. **Accountability**
   Subjects answers to evaluative criteria—prediction error, affective valence, goal relevance—allowing some to be endorsed, revised, or rejected.

4. **Persistence**
   Enables dialogue to unfold over time. Questions and answers are sustained, revisited, and updated rather than appearing as transient, unconnected events.

Failures of regulation explain why multiplicity can become pathological. Unregulated voices produce hallucinations, intrusive thoughts, or fragmented agency. Regulation is thus not an add-on to consciousness; it is its organizing principle.

4 Consciousness as a Graded Dialogical Space

In this framework, consciousness is neither binary nor unitary. It is a graded property that varies along several dimensions:

- Number of active voices
- Diversity of representational perspectives
- Depth and frequency of internal questioning
- Strength and stability of regulatory mechanisms

Different organisms, developmental stages, and artificial systems occupy different regions of this multidimensional space. Human adult consciousness represents one extreme –not because it is unified, but because it supports sustained, richly regulated internal dialogue.

This view naturally explains both continuity and breakdown. Consciousness can diminish through reduced questioning, collapse through loss of regulation, or fragment through failures of binding and accountability.

5 Pathology as Deregulated Multiplicity

If consciousness arises from regulated multiplicity, then disorders of consciousness should often manifest not as the absence of multiplicity, but as its deregulation. Psychopathological phenomena—particularly schizophrenia—provide a revealing test case.

5.1 Schizophrenia and the Failure of Regulation

Schizophrenia is frequently characterized by hallucinated voices, thought insertion, delusions of control, and fragmentation of agency. On traditional accounts, these symptoms are sometimes described as additional mental contents intruding into consciousness. On the regulated multiplicity framework, a more precise diagnosis is available: schizophrenia reflects a breakdown in the mechanisms that normally regulate internal voices.

In healthy cognition, internal voices are subject to gating, bound into coherent representations, evaluated for reliability, and sustained or revised through persistent dialogue. In schizophrenia, these regulatory mechanisms appear compromised:

- Gating failures allow internally generated representations to enter awareness without appropriate contextual filtering.
- Binding failures prevent internally generated speech or imagery from being integrated with the self-model, leading to experiences of alien agency.
- Accountability failures undermine the evaluation of candidate answers, allowing implausible interpretations to persist.
- Persistence failures disrupt the temporal coherence of dialogue, producing fragmented and intrusive experiences.

In this view, hallucinated voices are not anomalous entities, but ordinary representational processes rendered conscious without regulation. The pathology lies not in multiplicity itself—since multiplicity is ubiquitous—but in the loss of structured control.

5.2 Implications for Other Disorders

This framework generalizes beyond schizophrenia. Dissociative disorders, obsessive–compulsive phenomena, and certain affective disorders may likewise be understood as disruptions in the regulation of internal dialogue rather than as isolated deficits or excesses of representation. Conscious experience becomes unstable when internal questions and answers cannot be coherently adjudicated.

Pathology thus supports, rather than undermines, the regulated multiplicity hypothesis. It reveals what consciousness looks like when regulation fails.

6 Neuroscientific Correlates of Regulated Multiplicity

The regulated multiplicity hypothesis is not a neuroanatomical theory, but it makes principled contact with neuroscientific findings. In particular, it suggests that consciousness depends not on a single "seat" but on interactions among systems supporting gating, binding, evaluation, and temporal persistence.

6.1 Gating

Gating mechanisms plausibly involve frontoparietal and thalamocortical networks associated with attentional selection and access control. These systems determine which representations gain prominence and which remain latent. Damage or dysregulation in these circuits is associated with distractibility, intrusion, and loss of cognitive control.

6.2 Binding

Binding –the integration of compatible representations into unified percepts or thoughts –has been linked to synchronized activity across distributed cortical areas. Binding must preserve structured

disagreement while preventing incoherent fragmentation. Failures of binding are consistent with experiences of disunity and alienation.

6.3 Accountability and Evaluation

Evaluation of candidate answers likely recruits prefrontal and limbic systems involved in prediction error, reward assessment, and affective weighting. These systems allow internal answers to be endorsed, revised, or suppressed based on goals, context, and consequences.

6.4 Persistence and Temporal Integration

Sustained dialogue requires memory and temporal coherence. Working memory systems, hippocampal–prefrontal loops, and default-mode activity may support the persistence of questions and answers across time, enabling revision rather than momentary reaction.

In this picture, consciousness emerges not from any single neural signature, but from the coordinated operation of multiple regulatory systems acting on a plural representational substrate.

7 Implications for Artificial Cognitive Systems

The regulated multiplicity hypothesis also bears on the design and interpretation of artificial intelligence systems. Contemporary AI architectures often employ parallel processing, ensembles, or competing models. However, multiplicity alone does not suffice for consciousness.

7.1 Why Ensembles Are Not Enough

Many AI systems generate multiple candidate outputs in parallel and select among them. Yet such systems typically lack:

- self-directed questioning,
- persistent internal dialogue,
- accountability grounded in self-referential evaluation,
- integrated self-models.

As a result, ensembles and debate models simulate competition without instantiating regulated dialogue.

7.2 Toward Regulated Artificial Multiplicity

A system approximating conscious organization would require more than parallelism. It would need mechanisms for generating internal questions independent of external input, semi-independent

models capable of sustained disagreement, regulatory processes that adjudicate, revise, and suppress candidate answers, and temporal continuity of internal dialogue.

Whether such systems would merit attribution of consciousness remains an open ethical and philosophical question. The regulated multiplicity hypothesis does not assert that current AI systems are conscious, but it clarifies what is missing.

8 Discussion and Limits

The regulated multiplicity hypothesis does not claim to solve the "hard problem" of consciousness in the sense of explaining why subjective experience exists at all. Instead, it addresses a different but tractable question: what kind of organization gives rise to the richness, coherence, and flexibility characteristic of conscious minds?

Several limits should be acknowledged:

- The framework is structural and functional, not reductive of phenomenal qualities.
- It does not deny the importance of integration, prediction, or information; it reinterprets them as regulatory processes acting on multiplicity.
- It does not require linguistic thought or explicit self-awareness; internal dialogue may be implicit and nonverbal.
- It does not imply that all regulated multiplicity is conscious, only that consciousness depends on such regulation.

By reframing consciousness as regulated internal dialogue rather than unitary representation, the hypothesis integrates insights from neuroscience, psychopathology, and artificial intelligence without committing to speculative metaphysics.

In this view, consciousness and subjective experience are not binary properties but graded ones. Systems range from purely reactive architectures, in which behavior is governed by fixed stimulus–response couplings, to increasingly cognitive architectures capable of generating and adjudicating among internal alternatives. Minimal systems exhibit little or no subjectivity; richer conscious experience emerges as internal questioning, evaluation, and regulation deepen. Consciousness thus occupies a spectrum between instinctive reaction and fully developed subjective cognition.

9 Conclusion

Consciousness, in the regulated multiplicity hypothesis, arises not from the suppression of internal plurality but from its disciplined organization. A conscious system is one that can ask itself questions, generate multiple competing answers, and regulate those answers into a coherent, temporally extended dialogue. Like stereoscopic depth perception, conscious awareness emerges when structured disparity is constrained rather than eliminated.

This framework explains the graded nature of consciousness, illuminates pathological breakdowns, and clarifies why current artificial systems fall short of conscious organization. Most importantly, it offers a way to think about consciousness as an emergent property of architectural control rather than a mysterious byproduct of integration alone.

References

[1] O'Brien, G., & Opie, J. (2003). The multiplicity of consciousness and the emergence of the self. In A. Cleeremans (Ed.), *The Unity of Consciousness: Binding, Integration, and Dissociation* (pp. 23–42). Oxford University Press.

[2] Carls-Diamante, S. (2024). On the multiplicity of consciousness. *Philosophical Studies*, 181, 2855–2876.

[3] Baars, B. J. (1997). *In the Theater of Consciousness*. Oxford University Press.

[4] Hohwy, J. (2013). *The Predictive Mind*. Oxford University Press.

[5] Morin, A. (2009). Inner speech and consciousness. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 18(4), 1106–1114.

[6] Rosenthal, D. (2005). *Consciousness and Mind*. Oxford University Press.