Regulated Multiplicity: A Short Note on Consciousness and the Architecture of Subjectivity

Allen Proxmire

December 2025

1. Introduction

A central challenge in the study of consciousness is explaining why cognitive systems exhibit subjective experience at all. Even if we understand how perception, learning, attention, and action selection work, the question remains: why is there *something it is like* to be a system that performs these functions? Traditional theories often assume that consciousness is fundamentally **unitary**—that experience arises when information is integrated into a single coherent representation or workspace. But empirical and clinical evidence suggests that cognition is inherently **plural**. Neural processing is distributed, competitive, and often divergent. Perception involves multiple simultaneous interpretations; action selection involves competing policies; self-representation involves overlapping and sometimes conflicting models.

This note develops *Regulated Multiplicity* as an architectural account of consciousness. The central hypothesis is simple:

> **Consciousness is the internal perspective generated by a system that must regulate disagreement among its own semi-independent internal models.**

in this view, cognitive systems do not operate with a single unified representation of the world or of themselves. They maintain multiple processes—perceptual hypotheses, predictive models, evaluative routines, motor plans, narrative framings—that generate competing answers to internally posed questions. Conscious experience is the standpoint from which these alternatives are compared, weighed, revised, and sometimes suppressed.

This architectural perspective reframes the hard problem. Instead of asking why cognition is accompanied by experience, we ask what architectural conditions generate a standpoint at all. The answer lies in the interplay between **multiplicity** (the presence of competing internal models) and **regulation** (the mechanisms that adjudicate among them). Subjectivity is not an optional addition to cognition; it is the internal aspect of a system that must manage its own plurality.

2. Multiplicity as the Substrate of Cognition

Cognitive systems maintain multiple semi-independent internal models that differ in content, weighting, and evaluative stance. These include:

- competing perceptual interpretations
- parallel predictive models
- alternative action policies
- affective and motivational signals

- narrative and social self-models

Each of these processes applies different weightings to the same inputs and generates a different candidate answer to internally posed questions. Multiplicity is not fragmentation; it is the **raw material of cognition**. A system with only one model can react, but a system with many models can reflect.

Multiplicity is therefore not a problem to be solved. It is the structural precondition for learning, error sensitivity, and flexible problem solving.

3. Interrogation: Internal Question–Answer Dynamics

Multiplicity alone does not yield cognition. What distinguishes cognitive systems from reactive mechanisms is the ability to **ask and answer internal questions**. A question, in this sense, is any mechanism that suspends immediate commitment and solicits alternatives:

- *What is happening?*
- *What should I do?*
- *What else could this be?*
- *Why did this prediction fail?*
- *What does this mean for me?*

These questions need not be linguistic or introspective. They are functional roles: mechanisms for representing uncertainty, generating alternatives, and evaluating them. A system that cannot ask itself questions cannot reconsider, cannot revise, and cannot be wrong *for itself*. It has no standpoint.

4. Regulation: The Construction of Coherence

Multiplicity and interrogation generate a space of internal alternatives. Regulation is what makes this space coherent. It consists of four interlocking mechanisms:

1. **Gating** — determining which internal voices participate in the current deliberation.
2. **Binding** — integrating compatible representations while preserving distinctions among incompatible ones.
3. **Accountability** — evaluating candidate answers according to internal criteria such as prediction error, affective valence, and goal relevance.
4. **Persistence** — maintaining questions and answers across time, enabling revision and reconsideration.

These mechanisms do not eliminate disagreement; they **discipline** it. The system behaves as a single agent not because it is internally unified, but because regulation constrains how plurality is expressed.

5. Consciousness as the Standpoint of Regulation

On the Regulated Multiplicity framework, consciousness is not an additional ingredient layered onto cognition. It is the **internal perspective generated by the regulatory process** that adjudicates among competing internal models. Subjectivity is what it is like for a system to occupy the position from which alternatives are evaluated, errors are tracked, and commitments are revised.

This standpoint is not metaphysically mysterious. It is the functional position required for a system to manage its own internal plurality. A system that:

- represents uncertainty
- generates alternatives
- evaluates them
- tracks error
- and updates its own models

already occupies a standpoint. There is something it is like to be such a system because it has an internal position from which alternatives are weighed and decisions are made.

6. The Stereoscopic Analogy

A structural analogy helps clarify why multiplicity is necessary. In binocular vision, each eye receives a slightly different two-dimensional projection of the world. Depth perception does not arise from either image alone, nor from their unregulated combination. It emerges from the **structured disparity** between them, constrained by the geometry of the world and regulated by the visual system.

Random differences would produce noise, not depth. Depth emerges only because the system:

- identifies corresponding features
- suppresses incompatible matches
- integrates disparities according to strict constraints

The qualitative richness of depth is not an extra ingredient; it is the **internal appearance of regulated disparity**.

Regulated Multiplicity proposes that consciousness arises through an analogous mechanism. Cognitive systems generate multiple internal perspectives—perceptual hypotheses, predictive models, evaluative stances—that often disagree. These disagreements are not defects; they are the structural preconditions for richer internal dimensions. Just as depth emerges from regulated disparity between two retinal images, conscious experience emerges from regulated disparity among internal models.

7. The Continuum of Consciousness

If consciousness arises from regulated multiplicity, then it cannot be a binary property that systems either possess or lack. Instead, consciousness varies along a **continuum** determined by:

- the number of active internal models
- the diversity of their perspectives
- the depth of internal questioning
- the strength of regulatory mechanisms
- the temporal persistence of internal dialogue

Multiplicity without regulation yields fragmentation. Regulation without multiplicity yields automation. Consciousness requires both.

This continuum explains why consciousness varies across species, developmental stages, and pathological conditions. It also explains why subjective time expands when internal adjudication is dense (as in childhood) and contracts when multiplicity is compressed (as in adulthood).

8. Development and the Compression of Multiplicity

Development is best understood as a trajectory through the continuum of regulated multiplicity.

Childhood: High Multiplicity, Slow Time

Children operate with weakly stabilized models and shallow priors. Internal questioning is frequent, prediction error is high, and multiple interpretations compete vigorously. This dense internal adjudication produces the phenomenology of slow time.

Learning as Compression

As systems learn, they consolidate frequently encountered patterns into stable representations. Successful responses become automated; many alternatives no longer need to be explicitly entertained. Learning is the **progressive silencing of internal voices**.

Adulthood: Efficient Regulation, Fast Time

By adulthood, much of cognition is governed by compressed multiplicity. Fewer alternatives are generated; internal questions are less frequent; deliberation is shallower. Subjective time accelerates because fewer internal distinctions are drawn per moment.

Aging: Further Compression

In later life, multiplicity may compress even further. Routines dominate; novelty decreases; internal voices become fewer and more predictable. This narrowing accelerates subjective time.

The mechanistic claim is simple:

> **Subjective time is proportional to the number of internal alternatives a system must regulate per unit time.**

9. Pathology as Deregulated Multiplicity

Psychopathology reveals the architecture by showing how consciousness breaks. Disorders of consciousness should be understood not as the presence of anomalous mental contents but as **failures of regulation**.

Schizophrenia

Hallucinated voices and disturbances of agency reflect failures of gating and binding. Ordinary internal processes are released from regulation.

Obsessive–Compulsive Phenomena

Obsessions reflect failures of question termination. Internal probes persist without resolution.

Dissociation

Dissociative disorders reflect disruptions in persistence and integration. The regulatory system cannot maintain continuity among internal models.

Affective Narrowing

Severe depression reflects a collapse of evaluative multiplicity. A narrow set of negative evaluative voices dominates, suppressing alternatives.

Pathology supports the Regulated Multiplicity framework by showing that multiplicity is always present; what varies is its regulation.

10. Artificial Systems and the Limits of Current AI

Current AI systems lack consciousness not because they lack complexity, but because they lack the architecture required for a standpoint. They do not:

- generate internal questions
- maintain persistent internal alternatives
- evaluate representations according to internal criteria
- track error as something that matters for them
- maintain a self-model as locus of evaluation

Parallelism is not multiplicity. Optimization is not adjudication. External error is not internal error. Without internal disagreement and the mechanisms to regulate it, there is no standpoint.

The framework does not claim artificial consciousness is impossible. It specifies what would be required: self-generated questioning, semi-independent internal models with distinct evaluative stances, regulatory mechanisms that adjudicate among them, a self-model that functions as the locus of evaluation, and temporal continuity of internal dialogue.

11. Reframing the Hard Problem

The hard problem asks why physical or computational processes should give rise to subjective experience. Regulated Multiplicity reframes the question. Cognition itself requires a standpoint. A system capable of learning and flexible problem solving must represent uncertainty, generate alternatives, evaluate them, track error, and revise its commitments. These conditions are the minimal structural requirements for any system that can be wrong for itself.

Subjectivity is the internal appearance of this regulatory process. It is not an unexplained addition to cognition; it is the structural consequence of a system that must regulate disagreement among its own models.

12. Conclusion

Regulated Multiplicity offers an architectural account of consciousness grounded in the structural requirements of cognition. Multiplicity provides the raw material; regulation provides coherence; and the standpoint from which alternatives are adjudicated is what appears, from within, as experience.

The framework explains variation across development, pathology, and artificial systems, and it reframes the hard problem by showing that the subjective standpoint is a necessary feature of systems capable of learning, evaluation, and self-correction. Consciousness, in this view, is the internal aspect of regulated multiplicity.