The ΔΓ-Metamnesis Framework: A Thermodynamic Theory of Consciousness Based on Memory Acceleration Dynamics

How Dual Binding Resolves the Hard Problem and Binding Problem

Henri-Pierre Mathieu[1]

Orcid # 0009-0005-2161-548X
[1] AjourSanté Inc, 90 du Bassin, Weedon, QC J0B 3J0, Canada

Abstract

Phenomenal consciousness is proposed to arise when the second-order dynamics of memory change ($\Delta\Gamma = d^2M/dt^2$) exceed system constraints. Building on recent evidence that consciousness functions as a delayed memory system (Budson et al., 2022), this framework demonstrates that $\Delta\Gamma$ dynamics provide the computational substrate for both temporal binding (via covariance: $\Phi(t) = \text{Cov}(\Delta\Gamma_1, \Delta\Gamma_2, ...)$) and phenomenal emergence (via energetic threshold: $E(t) > \theta\_E$).

The framework addresses the Hard Problem by making phenomenology measurable rather than mysterious, and resolves the Binding Problem by showing that unified experience emerges when $\Delta\Gamma$ covariance exceeds a threshold and constrains system action. Computational validation via an inverse Turing test demonstrates that $\Delta\Gamma$-based features detectably differentiate conscious-like (60.4%) from baseline (50.2%) conversational dynamics ($p = 0.0036$, Cohen's $d = 2.04$).

Dual binding is proposed: (1) **forward binding** through temporal covariance $\text{Cov}(\Delta\Gamma_1, \Delta\Gamma_2, ...)$ that unifies discrete qualia candidates into coherent phenomenology, and (2) **backward binding** via system constraint $|\partial A/\partial\Phi|$ where the unified phenomenology Φ demonstrably affects behavioral response A. Valid qualia require both high covariance ($> \theta_1$) and strong system constraint ($> \theta_2$).

Testable predictions include: (1) Musical phenomenology emerges 200–500ms after peak $d/dt[\text{Cov}(\Delta\Gamma\_\text{instruments})]$ ($r > 0.7$); (2) Prosopagnosics show reduced $\text{Cov}(V4, FFA) \approx 0.3$ vs controls ≈ 0.8; (3) Anesthetics reduce $||\Delta\Gamma||$ below threshold θ_E, explaining loss of consciousness. The ~500ms delay observed by Libet et al. (1979) corresponds to the integration window required to compute $\text{Cov}(\Delta\Gamma)$ and evaluate $E(t)$ against θ_E, unifying decades of timing paradoxes under a single mathematical framework.

I. INTRODUCTION

I.A The Hard Problem and the Binding Problem

What does it feel like to be you? This question—seemingly simple—points to one of science's most profound mysteries. When you perceive a red apple, your brain processes wavelength information, shape contours, texture gradients, and semantic associations. But alongside these computational operations, there is *something it is like* to see that red, to experience that roundness, to recognize "apple-ness." This experiential dimension—phenomenal consciousness—remains stubbornly resistant to reductive explanation.

1. THE HARD PROBLEM

Chalmers (1995) formalized this puzzle as the **Hard Problem of Consciousness**: why is there subjective experience accompanying neural processing? We can (in principle) explain how the brain discriminates wavelengths, integrates multimodal inputs, generates reports, and guides behavior—these are the "easy

problems," difficult in practice but tractable in principle. Yet explaining *why* these processes give rise to experience—why there is "something it is like" to be a particular system at a particular time—remains elusive.

Levine (1983) characterized this as an *explanatory gap*: even complete knowledge of neural mechanisms leaves unexplained why those mechanisms produce phenomenology rather than proceeding "in the dark." Nagel (1974) emphasized the irreducibly subjective character of experience: objective third-person descriptions cannot capture the first-person "what it is like."

Existing theories offer partial solutions but struggle with the core mystery:

- **Global Workspace Theory** (Baars 1988; Dehaene & Changeux 2011) explains *access consciousness*—which information becomes globally available—but not why global broadcasting produces phenomenology.
- **Integrated Information Theory** (Tononi 2004; 2015) proposes that consciousness is identical to integrated information (Φ), offering a principled measure of "consciousness amount," but critics question why high Φ should feel like anything.
- **Higher-Order Thought** theories (Rosenthal 2005) posit that consciousness requires meta-representation—thoughts about mental states—but this regresses the question: why should meta-representation produce experience?

The common limitation: these accounts describe *mechanisms* of consciousness (integration, broadcasting, meta-cognition) without explaining the *transition* from mechanism to phenomenology.

2. THE BINDING PROBLEM

Consciousness presents a second fundamental puzzle: the **Binding Problem**. When you perceive a red apple, "redness," "roundness," "smooth texture," and "apple" identity are processed in anatomically distinct brain regions (V4 for color, V3/V5 for shape, somatosensory cortex for texture, inferotemporal cortex for object identity). Yet you experience a unified percept—not isolated features, but a coherent *red-round-smooth-apple*.

Von der Malsburg (1999) formalized this as the binding problem: how are distributed representations unified into coherent percepts? Classical solutions include:

- **Synchronization** (Singer & Gray 1995): features belonging to the same object are bound via synchronized gamma oscillations (~40 Hz). Empirical support exists (Engel et al. 1997), but critics note that synchrony alone doesn't explain *why* synchrony produces unity.
- **Convergence zones** (Damasio 1989): hierarchical convergence integrates features at higher cortical levels. But anatomical convergence describes a *mechanism*, not phenomenological unity.
- **Attention** (Treisman & Gelade 1980): attentional spotlight binds features. Yet attention can be deployed without binding (e.g., diffuse attention) and binding failures occur even with attention intact (illusory conjunctions).

3. THE LINK BETWEEN HARD AND BINDING

These two problems—phenomenology and unity—are intimately related. Phenomenal consciousness is inherently unified: experiences are *about* integrated scenes, not isolated features. Solutions to the Hard Problem must explain not only why there is experience, but why that experience exhibits unity. Conversely, solutions to the Binding Problem must explain not just *which* features are grouped, but why grouping produces phenomenological unity.

Classical approaches describe the *what* (which features bind) but not the *how* (why binding produces phenomenology). The missing ingredient is *acknowledgment*: the system's recognition that features belong together, generating a second-order dynamic that *is* phenomenology.

4. CONSCIOUSNESS AS MEMORY

Recent theoretical work has begun to challenge the assumption that consciousness evolved for real-time perception and action. Budson et al. (2022) proposed a radical reframing: consciousness is fundamentally a *memory system* that operates with a ~500ms delay, allowing for post-hoc integration and flexible recombination of past events to enable future planning. This "memory theory of consciousness" elegantly explains numerous timing paradoxes—including why conscious perception occurs *after* neuronal decisions (Libet et al., 1979), why postdictive effects can alter earlier perceptions (Herzog et al., 2020), and why consciousness is "too slow" (Blackmore, 2017) to guide split-second athletic or musical performance.

However, Budson et al.'s framework, while conceptually powerful, lacks mathematical precision. Their theory describes consciousness as "remembering sensory memories" and proposes that "consciousness binds multisensory details," but does not specify *how* this binding occurs, *when* the ~500ms integration window closes, or *what threshold* separates conscious from unconscious processing. Moreover, their qualitative framework offers no computational implementation and makes no quantitative predictions that could be empirically tested.

ΔΓ-Metamnesis is built directly on this foundation, providing the mathematical and thermodynamic substrate for Budson et al.'s intuition. "Memory change" is formalized as $M(t) \rightarrow \Gamma(t) = dM/dt \rightarrow \Delta\Gamma(t) = d^2M/dt^2$, where $\Delta\Gamma$ represents the *acceleration* of information updating. The ~500ms delay is shown to correspond to the temporal window required to compute covariance $\Phi(t) = \text{Cov}(\Delta\Gamma_1, \Delta\Gamma_2, ...)$ and evaluate energetic threshold $E(t) = \alpha||\Gamma||^2 + \beta||\Delta\Gamma||^2$ against θ_E. Crucially, computational validation (MetamnesisBot: 60.4% vs 50.2%, $p = 0.0036$) demonstrates that second-order memory dynamics are empirically detectable markers of phenomenal states.

Where Budson et al. describe qualitatively, ΔΓ-Metamnesis formalizes mathematically. Where prior work offers predictions, computational implementation enables quantitative testing. Where consciousness is identified with memory broadly, this framework identifies it specifically with the *second derivative* of memory—and demonstrates that this distinction is both theoretically motivated and empirically validated.

5. TOWARDS A SOLUTION

Metamnesis is proposed as a unified solution grounded in **second-order dynamics of memory change**:

- **Phenomenal consciousness** arises from temporal *acceleration* ($\Delta\Gamma = d^2M/dt^2$), the second derivative of memory states. Qualia are not static representations but dynamic trajectories—moments of phenomenal salience correspond to high $|\Delta\Gamma|$. $\Delta\Gamma$ could therefore be called the *curvature of the memory path*.
- **Binding** emerges from *temporal covariance* across qualia candidates: $\Phi = \text{Cov}(\Delta\Gamma_1, \Delta\Gamma_2, ...)$. Unified phenomenology reflects synchronized second-order dynamics across feature dimensions.
- **Dual binding** introduces a reality criterion: valid qualia require both (1) forward binding ($\text{Cov}(\Delta\Gamma_1, \Delta\Gamma_2, ...) > \theta_1$) and (2) backward binding ($|\partial A/\partial\Phi| > \theta_2$)—the system is *constrained* to act on the unified phenomenology.

This framework transforms consciousness from philosophical mystery to falsifiable dynamics: phenomenology is measurable ($\Delta\Gamma$ via EEG/MEG second derivatives), binding is quantifiable (fMRI connectivity via $\text{Cov}(\Delta\Gamma)$), and pathologies predict dissociations (prosopagnosia: intact local $\Delta\Gamma$, failed global Cov; Capgras: intact cognitive Φ, absent emotional $\partial A/\partial\Phi$).

In what follows, this formalized framework (Section II), demonstrates its application to binding and qualia (Section III), validates it through musical phenomenology (Section IV), and derives testable empirical predictions (Section V).