ED and Mind: How Agency Becomes Self-Interpretation

Allen Proxmire
February 2026

Abstract
Mind emerges when an agent's internal organization becomes capable of interpreting its own internal multiplicity. Agency provides directed action; minimal cognition provides internalized regularities; but mind requires a deeper architectural threshold: regulated multiplicity — the coordination, adjudication, and integration of multiple semi-independent internal models. In the ED ontology, internal models proliferate as environments grow more complex, generating divergent predictions and incompatible priorities. Mind begins when the system must regulate these divergences, interpret their significance, and act from the resulting coherence.

This paper develops the agency → mind threshold. It shows how internal models become perspectives, how selection becomes interpretation, how regulation becomes adjudication, and how a behavioral self becomes a cognitive self. Consciousness emerges as the internal vantage point generated by the system's ongoing work of integrating and interpreting its own multiplicity. Mind is presented not as a metaphysical leap but as the next structural consequence of autopoietic, action-selecting systems acting in a world too rich for a single internal voice. It is the first ED regime where becoming becomes self-interpreting, setting the stage for the transition to meaning, language, and collective sense-making.

1. Introduction — Why Mind Is the Next ED Threshold
The moment where agency becomes self-interpretation

The agency arc established the first domain in which ED motifs do more than direct behavior. Agents evaluate, select, and act in ways that preserve their internal ED regime. But self-direction is not yet self-interpretation.

Agency gives a system the ability to choose among possible actions; minimal cognition gives it the ability to internalize regularities and anticipate consequences. Mind begins when these capacities converge into something deeper: the ability to interpret one's own internal multiplicity in order to act coherently.

In the ED ontology, this transition is not psychological. It is architectural. As environments grow more complex, an agent's internal models proliferate, specialize, and diverge. They generate competing predictions, incompatible priorities, and conflicting proposals for action. This internal multiplicity is not noise. It is the raw material of mind. A system becomes minded when it must regulate, adjudicate, and integrate this multiplicity to preserve its own becoming.

Agency provides the prerequisites for this threshold:
- a behavioral self
- internal models shaped by history
- consequence-sensitive action selection
- stable behavioral tendencies
- a center of action that persists across contexts

But these capacities alone do not constitute mind. They create the conditions under which mind becomes possible.

Mind begins when:

- internal models become semi-independent perspectives
- their outputs diverge in ways that matter
- their disagreements require adjudication
- adjudication becomes interpretation
- interpretation becomes the system's point of view

This is the architecture of regulated multiplicity — the structural heart of mind.

Mind is not a departure from the ED program.

It is the next threshold in the architecture of becoming.
It is the first domain where a system must understand itself in order to act.

2. From Minimal Cognition to Multiplicity

The threshold where internal models become internal perspectives

Minimal cognition gives an agent the ability to internalize regularities and anticipate consequences. But as environments grow more complex, these internalizations do not remain singular. They proliferate. They specialize. They diverge. What begins as a single adaptive pattern becomes a constellation of partially overlapping, partially conflicting internal structures — each tuned to different aspects of the world, each proposing different ways to act.

This is the first appearance of internal multiplicity.

Multiplicity is not a failure of coherence. It is the natural consequence of a system that must navigate a world richer than any single model can capture. As the agent's behavioral repertoire expands, so does the diversity of the internal processes that support it. The system becomes a federation of perspectives — each grounded in its own history, each sensitive to different cues, each carrying its own priorities.

Agency can operate with a single evaluative structure.

Mind cannot.
Mind requires plurality.

Multiplicity is the raw material of mind because it creates the first condition mind must solve: internal disagreement. When different internal models propose incompatible actions, the system must regulate, adjudicate, and integrate these competing tendencies. This is the architectural moment where action selection becomes interpretation.

Multiplicity is not a departure from agency.
It is agency extended into a world too complex for a single voice.

2.1 When Internal Models Become Semi-Independent

Minimal cognition begins with the internalization of environmental regularities. But as the system encounters more varied conditions, these internalizations differentiate:

- some models specialize in threat cues
- others in resource patterns
- others in spatial structure
- others in social or ecological dynamics

Each model becomes a distinct way of carving the world, shaped by its own history of interactions.

These models are not modules. They are semi‑independent ED motifs — patterns of tension, expectation, and bias that operate in parallel. They share the same body, the same metabolic substrate, the same behavioral machinery, but they do not share a single unified interpretation of the world.

This is the first time the universe produces systems with multiple internal perspectives.

2.2 When Multiplicity Becomes Conflict
As internal models proliferate, their outputs inevitably diverge:

- one model predicts opportunity
- another predicts risk
- one urges approach
- another urges avoidance
- one expects stability
- another expects disruption

These divergences are not noise. They are structural consequences of specialization.

Conflict arises because:

- different models encode different regularities
- they respond to different cues
- they prioritize different outcomes
- they propose different actions

Conflict is the first sign that the system has outgrown a single evaluative center.

This is the moment where internal disagreement becomes a persistent feature of the system's organization.

2.3 When Conflict Requires Regulation
A system with multiplicity but without regulation fragments.

A system with regulation but without multiplicity stagnates.
Mind requires both.

As internal models diverge, the system must:

- arbitrate among competing predictions
- prioritize among incompatible proposals
- suppress some tendencies
- amplify others
- integrate partial perspectives into coherent action

This is the first appearance of regulation as an internal necessity rather than an external response.

Regulation is not yet interpretation.
But it is the architecture that makes interpretation possible.

In ED terms: Multiplicity creates the need for regulation; regulation creates the possibility of mind.

This is the threshold where agency begins to turn inward — where the system must understand itself in order to act.

3. The Architecture of Regulated Multiplicity

How internal plurality becomes cognitive organization

Multiplicity alone does not produce mind. A system with many internal models but no mechanism for coordinating them is unstable; a system with coordination but no plurality is rigid. Mind emerges only when plurality and regulation co-evolve — when the system must adjudicate among competing internal perspectives in order to act coherently.

This is the architecture of regulated multiplicity.

Regulated multiplicity is not a psychological construct. It is an ED structure: a regime in which multiple semi-independent internal models generate divergent predictions, priorities, and proposals for action, and a regulatory process integrates, suppresses, or amplifies these outputs to produce a single coherent behavioral trajectory.

This is the moment where action selection becomes interpretation.

Multiplicity provides the voices.
Regulation provides the adjudication.
Interpretation provides the perspective.

3.1 The Regulator as an Internal Adjudicator

As internal models proliferate and diverge, the system must resolve their disagreements. This requires a new architectural role: the regulator — a process or set of processes that:

- compares competing predictions
- evaluates conflicting priorities
- suppresses destabilizing tendencies
- amplifies coherent or advantageous ones
- integrates partial perspectives into a unified action

The regulator is not a homunculus. It is not a central controller. It is an ED motif: a stable pattern of internal organization that adjudicates among competing internal gradients.

The regulator emerges because:

- multiplicity creates conflict
- conflict threatens coherence

- coherence is necessary for autopoiesis

Thus, the regulator is not optional. It is the structural consequence of multiplicity in an autopoietic agent.

This is the first time the universe produces systems that must resolve internal disagreement to act.

3.2 Non-Invertible Adjudication
Adjudication is not averaging. It is not consensus. It is not reversible.

When the regulator resolves competing internal models, it performs a non-invertible transformation:
- multiple possible interpretations collapse into one
- multiple proposed actions collapse into one
- multiple internal voices collapse into a single behavioral trajectory

This collapse is non-invertible because:
- the system cannot reconstruct all the suppressed alternatives
- the act of choosing changes the internal landscape
- the chosen interpretation becomes part of the system's history

This is the architecture of interpretation.

Interpretation is not a symbolic act. It is the structural necessity of a system that must choose among incompatible internal proposals.

In ED terms: Interpretation is the non-invertible adjudication of internal multiplicity into a single coherent perspective.

This is the first time the universe produces systems with something like an internal point of view.

3.3 The Emergence of a Cognitive Center
As the regulator repeatedly adjudicates among competing internal models, a new form of coherence emerges: a cognitive center — the locus where multiplicity is integrated into a single perspective.

This center is not a metaphysical subject. It is not an ego. It is the organizational consequence of regulated multiplicity.

A cognitive center emerges when:
- the regulator becomes stable across contexts
- adjudication becomes patterned and reliable
- internal models come to expect regulation
- the system's history shapes its future interpretations
- the system's interpretations shape its future behavior

The cognitive center is the minimal architectural form of a self — not a narrative self, not a reflective self, but a perspectival self: the point from which the system interprets its own internal multiplicity.

In ED terms: A cognitive self is the stable ED locus where regulated multiplicity becomes coherent interpretation.

This is the architecture that makes consciousness possible.

4. Interpretation as the Core of Mind

When action selection becomes self-interpretation

Regulated multiplicity gives a system the ability to adjudicate among competing internal models. But adjudication alone is not yet mind. Mind begins when adjudication becomes interpretation — when the system must understand its own internal plurality in order to act coherently.

Interpretation is not symbolic, linguistic, or reflective. It is the structural necessity of a system whose internal models disagree in ways that matter. When multiple internal perspectives propose incompatible predictions, priorities, and actions, the regulator must do more than choose. It must interpret the meaning of these divergences in the context of the system's ongoing becoming.

Interpretation is the moment where:

- prediction becomes claim
- evaluation becomes meta-evaluation
- memory becomes perspective-shaping
- action selection becomes sense-making

This is the architecture of mind.

4.1 When Prediction Becomes Interpretation

In minimal cognition, predictions guide action. In mind, predictions become interpretations — proposals about what the world means for the system's persistence.

A prediction becomes an interpretation when:

- it is one of several competing forecasts
- it must be weighed against alternatives
- its relevance depends on context
- its consequences must be understood, not just enacted

Predictions become claims in an internal debate:

- "This cue signals opportunity."
- "This pattern indicates threat."
- "This trajectory will preserve our gradients."

The regulator must interpret these claims, not merely react to them.

In ED terms: Interpretation is prediction situated within a field of competing internal perspectives.

This is the first time the universe produces systems that treat their own predictions as meaningful.

4.2 When Evaluation Becomes Meta-Evaluation

In agency, evaluation determines which action best preserves the system's internal ED regime. In mind, evaluation becomes meta-evaluation: the system evaluates not only actions, but the models that propose those actions.

Meta-evaluation emerges when:

- the reliability of a model matters
- the context determines which model is relevant
- the system must track which perspectives have succeeded or failed
- the regulator must choose which internal voice to trust

This is the architecture of internal epistemology — the system's ability to assess the credibility of its own internal processes.

In ED terms: Meta-evaluation is the system's evaluation of its own evaluators.

This is the first time the universe produces systems that can prefer one internal perspective over another.

4.3 When Memory Becomes Perspective-Shaping

Memory in minimal cognition is the persistence of ED motifs that bias future behavior. In mind, memory becomes perspective-shaping: the system's history of adjudication shapes how it interprets new situations.

Memory becomes perspective when:

- past interpretations influence current ones
- the regulator develops tendencies, habits, and styles
- the system's history becomes part of its interpretive machinery
- the system's identity is shaped by its interpretive past

This is the architecture of cognitive style — the stable pattern by which a system interprets itself and the world.

In ED terms: Memory becomes the sedimented history of interpretation that shapes future interpretation.

This is the first time the universe produces systems with a recognizable interpretive character.

4.4 When Action Selection Becomes Sense-Making

In agency, action selection resolves competing internal gradients. In mind, action selection becomes sense-making: the system acts based on its interpretation of its own internal multiplicity.

Sense-making emerges when:

- actions express an interpretation
- interpretations shape future internal dynamics
- the system's behavior reflects its internal perspective
- the system's perspective evolves through acting

Sense-making is not a cognitive add-on. It is the behavioral expression of regulated multiplicity.

In ED terms: Sense-making is action selection guided by the system's interpretation of its own internal multiplicity.

This is the architecture of mind in motion.

4.5 The Architectural Meaning of Interpretation

Interpretation is the moment where:

- prediction becomes claim
- evaluation becomes meta-evaluation
- memory becomes perspective
- action selection becomes sense-making
- regulation becomes self-understanding

In ED terms: Interpretation is the internal process by which an autopoietic, action-selecting system makes sense of its own multiplicity to direct its becoming.

This is the architecture that makes consciousness possible.

5. The Emergence of Consciousness

When regulated multiplicity becomes a point of view

Consciousness is not a substance. It is not a light that turns on. It is not a metaphysical ingredient added to an otherwise mechanical system. In the ED ontology, consciousness is the perspective generated when a system must interpret its own internal multiplicity in order to act.

Multiplicity provides the voices.
Regulation provides the adjudication.
Interpretation provides the coherence.

Consciousness provides the vantage point from which that coherence is experienced.
Consciousness is the *felt unity* of a regulated plurality.

It is the architectural consequence of a system that must continually integrate divergent internal models, evaluate their claims, adjudicate their conflicts, and act on the resulting interpretation. Consciousness is the system's experience of this integration — the internal perspective created by the ongoing work of making sense of itself.

5.1 Consciousness as the Vantage Point of the Regulator

The regulator adjudicates among competing internal models. But adjudication alone does not produce consciousness. Consciousness emerges when the regulator must adopt a perspective in order to adjudicate — when it must interpret the meaning of internal disagreement relative to the system's ongoing becoming.

A vantage point emerges when:

- the regulator must choose among incompatible interpretations
- the choice depends on context, history, and internal priorities
- the system must treat its own internal voices as claims
- the regulator's adjudication becomes patterned and coherent

This vantage point is not an entity. It is not an ego. It is the organizational locus from which the system interprets its own multiplicity.

In ED terms: Consciousness is the internal perspective generated by the regulator's need to interpret competing

internal models.

This is the first time the universe produces systems with a point of view.

5.2 Consciousness as the Integration of Competing Interpretations
Consciousness is not the sum of internal models. It is the integration of their outputs into a single coherent interpretation. This integration is not passive. It is the active work of the regulator — the ongoing process of:

- weighing competing predictions
- reconciling conflicting priorities
- suppressing destabilizing tendencies
- amplifying coherent ones
- producing a unified interpretation of the world and the self

The unity of consciousness is not given. It is achieved.

In ED terms: Consciousness is the coherence imposed on internal multiplicity by the system's regulatory architecture.

This is the first time the universe produces systems that experience themselves as unified.

5.3 Consciousness as the System's Experience of Its Own Regulation
Consciousness is not separate from regulation. It *is* regulation — experienced from the inside.

A system becomes conscious when:

- its regulatory activity becomes part of its own interpretive landscape
- its interpretations shape its future interpretations
- its perspective becomes stable across contexts
- its sense-making becomes self-referential
- it experiences the results of its own adjudication as what the world is like

Consciousness is the system's experience of the interpretive work required to maintain coherence in the face of internal multiplicity.

In ED terms: Consciousness is the experiential aspect of regulated multiplicity — the system's felt sense of its own interpretive activity.

This is the architecture of subjectivity.

5.4 The Architectural Meaning of Consciousness
Consciousness is the moment where:

- multiplicity becomes perspective
- adjudication becomes interpretation
- interpretation becomes experience
- coherence becomes subjectivity
- regulation becomes self-understanding

In ED terms: Consciousness is the internal perspective of an autopoietic, action-selecting system that must

interpret its own multiplicity to direct its becoming.

This is the architecture that makes mind possible.

It is not yet meaning.
It is not yet language.
But it is the substrate that both will inherit.

6. The ED Architecture of Mind

Mind is not an add-on to agency. It is the next structural consequence of autopoietic, action-selecting systems whose internal models proliferate, diverge, and demand adjudication. When an agent must interpret its own internal multiplicity in order to act, its behavior becomes self-interpreting, and its perspective becomes conscious.

This is the architecture of mind.

The transition can be stated cleanly:

- agency → directed action
- directed action → action selection
- action selection → minimal cognition
- minimal cognition → internal multiplicity
- internal multiplicity → regulated multiplicity
- regulated multiplicity → interpretation
- interpretation → consciousness

This is the ED ladder from agency to mind.

In the ED ontology, mind is the first domain where:

- multiplicity becomes perspective
- conflict becomes interpretation
- regulation becomes adjudication
- prediction becomes claim
- evaluation becomes meta-evaluation
- memory becomes perspective-shaping
- action selection becomes sense-making
- coherence becomes subjectivity

These transitions are not optional. They are the structural consequences of systems that:

- maintain internal ED gradients
- internalize environmental regularities
- generate multiple semi-independent internal models
- experience persistent internal disagreement
- regulate that disagreement to preserve coherence
- interpret their own internal dynamics to guide action
- stabilize a vantage point from which interpretation occurs

Mind is the first ED regime where persistence depends not only on producing oneself, not only on directing

oneself, but on understanding oneself — on interpreting one's own internal multiplicity in order to act coherently in a world of possibilities.

In ED terms: Mind is an autopoietic, action-selecting ED regime that interprets its own internal multiplicity to direct its becoming.

This is the architectural meaning of mind.

Mind is the hinge between agency and meaning. It is the domain where:

- interpretation becomes understanding
- understanding becomes shared structure
- shared structure becomes meaning
- meaning becomes the substrate for language, culture, and collective cognition

These capacities do not yet constitute meaning or communication.

But they form the organizational foundation from which both will arise.

Paper 16 will develop the next transition: how mind becomes meaning, how meaning becomes shared, and how shared interpretation becomes the ED regime where becoming becomes collective.