Consciousness and Quantum Actuality: A Psycho-Physical Framework for the Hard Problem

Author: B. Wyatt Jonah, P.Eng.
Target Journal: Journal of Consciousness Studies

Abstract

The hard problem of consciousness—why and how physical processes give rise to subjective experience—has resisted solution for centuries. Standard materialist approaches attempt to reduce consciousness to neural computation, yet this seems to leave the subjective, qualitative nature of experience (qualia) unexplained. Dualist approaches preserve the reality of consciousness but struggle to explain how a non-physical mind interacts with the physical brain. This paper proposes a novel solution by building on the Coherence-Selection Interface Theory (CSIT) introduced in prior work. We propose that consciousness is fundamentally identical to the global selection interface that actualizes quantum possibilities into classical reality. Rather than consciousness being generated by the brain, consciousness is a non-local, transcendent principle that utilizes the brain as a complex interface to the physical world. We argue that this hypothesis reframes the hard problem entirely. The question is not "How do brains generate consciousness?" but rather "How does fundamental consciousness interact with and utilize the brain as an interface?" This inversion resolves the apparent explanatory gap between physical processes and subjective experience. We develop a detailed psycho-physical framework explaining how the brain couples to universal consciousness through neural coherence, attention, and intention. We show how this framework explains the unity of conscious experience, the binding problem, altered states of consciousness (meditation, flow, psychedelic states, near-death experiences), and the relationship between individual and universal consciousness. We argue that consciousness is not an emergent property of matter but a fundamental, irreducible feature of reality, as primary as the wavefunction itself. Finally, we address the philosophical implications: the framework suggests a form of

panpsychism or cosmopsychism, where consciousness is a fundamental property of the universe. It provides a new perspective on the mind-body problem, free will, and the nature of subjective experience.

Keywords: consciousness, hard problem, quantum mechanics, psycho-physical framework, neural coherence, panpsychism, mind-body problem

---

1. Introduction

1.1 The Hard Problem of Consciousness

For over a century, neuroscience has made remarkable progress in understanding the brain. We have mapped neural circuits, identified neurotransmitter systems, and discovered the neural correlates of various cognitive functions. We can explain how the brain processes sensory information, generates motor commands, stores memories, and produces behavior. Yet despite this extraordinary progress, one fundamental question remains unanswered: why does all this neural activity feel like something?

This is the hard problem of consciousness, as formulated by David Chalmers and others. The hard problem asks: why is there something it is like to see red, to feel pain, to experience joy? Why is consciousness not merely a matter of information processing, but accompanied by subjective, qualitative experience?

To understand the hard problem, we must distinguish it from what Chalmers calls the “easy problems” of consciousness. The easy problems include explaining cognitive functions such as attention, memory, discrimination, learning, and behavior. These are “easy” not because they are trivial—they are extraordinarily complex—but because they are in principle solvable through standard scientific methods. We can, in theory, explain how the brain attends to certain stimuli, how it encodes memories, how it discriminates between different inputs, and how it generates behavior. These explanations are mechanistic and functional; they describe how the brain processes information.

The hard problem is fundamentally different. It asks not just how the brain processes information, but why that information processing is accompanied by subjective

experience. Why should neural activity feel like something? Why should there be qualia—the subjective, qualitative aspects of experience?

Consider the experience of seeing red. When you see a red apple, your visual system processes light of a particular wavelength. Neural signals travel from the retina through the lateral geniculate nucleus to the primary visual cortex. Neurons in the visual cortex fire in patterns that encode the color, shape, and location of the apple. All of this can be described in purely physical terms, in terms of neural activity and information processing.

Yet when you see red, there is something it is like to see red. There is a qualitative character to the experience—a redness that is intrinsically subjective. This qualitative character is not captured by any description of neural activity. No amount of information about neural processes—no matter how detailed—seems to explain why those processes should feel like red.

This is the explanatory gap, identified by Joseph Levine. There is a gap between objective, third-person descriptions of neural processes and subjective, first-person experience. No matter how much we know about the brain, this gap seems unbridgeable.

1.2 Existing Approaches and Their Limitations

Over the past century, philosophers and neuroscientists have proposed numerous approaches to the hard problem. Let us briefly review the main contenders and their limitations.

Reductive Materialism attempts to reduce consciousness to neural computation. According to this view, consciousness just is the functional activity of the brain. When the brain performs certain computations, consciousness arises. There is nothing mysterious about consciousness; it is simply what neural activity feels like from the inside. The advantage of reductive materialism is that it maintains physicalism—the view that everything is ultimately physical—and avoids the conceptual difficulties of dualism. However, it seems unable to explain qualia. Even if we have a complete understanding of neural processes, it is not clear why those processes should feel like something.

Property Dualism posits that consciousness is a non-physical property that emerges from physical processes. According to this view, the brain is physical, but

consciousness is a non-physical property that arises when the brain reaches a certain level of complexity. The advantage of property dualism is that it takes consciousness seriously as a real phenomenon that cannot be reduced to neural computation. However, it faces the "interaction problem." If consciousness is non-physical, how does it interact with the physical brain?

Substance Dualism, associated with Descartes, posits that consciousness is a non-physical substance, distinct from the physical body. The mind is an immaterial entity that interacts with the physical brain. This view clearly separates mind from matter and takes consciousness seriously as a fundamental aspect of reality. However, it faces even more severe versions of the interaction problem.

Functionalism treats consciousness as the functional role that mental states play. According to functionalism, a mental state is defined by its causal relations to other mental states, to sensory inputs, and to behavioral outputs. The advantage of functionalism is that it avoids the interaction problem. However, it faces the problem of qualia. It seems that two systems could have identical functional organization but different qualia (the "inverted spectrum" problem).

Panpsychism posits that consciousness is a fundamental, ubiquitous feature of reality. According to panpsychism, all matter has some degree of consciousness. The advantage of panpsychism is that it avoids the emergence problem. However, it faces the "combination problem." If electrons and atoms have consciousness, how do their consciousnesses combine to form the unified consciousness of a human being?

Illusionism denies that consciousness is a real phenomenon. According to illusionism, qualia are an illusion. The advantage of illusionism is that it avoids the hard problem entirely. However, it seems to contradict our most certain knowledge—the fact that we are experiencing something.

1.3 A New Approach: Consciousness as the Selection Interface

This paper proposes a radically new approach to the hard problem. Rather than trying to explain how consciousness emerges from physical processes, we propose that consciousness is fundamentally identical to the global selection interface that actualizes quantum possibilities into classical reality.

This hypothesis is based on the Coherence-Selection Interface Theory (CSIT) introduced in prior work. CSIT proposes a dual-domain ontology: a potential domain

described by the unitarily evolving universal wavefunction, and an actual domain consisting of a single, globally consistent sequence of classical events. A non-dynamical global selection interface maps decohered branches of the potential domain to actualized events.

We propose that consciousness is this selection interface. Consciousness is not a product of the brain; it is a fundamental feature of reality. The brain is a physical apparatus that enables consciousness to interface with the physical world.

This hypothesis inverts the standard approach to the hard problem. Instead of asking "How do brains generate consciousness?", we ask "How does fundamental consciousness interact with and utilize the brain as an interface?"

This inversion has profound implications. It dissolves the hard problem by reframing the question. If consciousness is fundamental, then there is no need to explain how physical processes generate consciousness. Instead, we need to explain how consciousness utilizes physical processes.

The key advantages of this approach are:

1. **Consciousness as Fundamental:** It takes consciousness seriously as a fundamental feature of reality, not an emergent property of matter.
2. **Explanation of Unity:** It explains the unity of conscious experience as a reflection of the fundamental unity of the selection interface.
3. **Resolution of the Explanatory Gap:** It resolves the explanatory gap between physical processes and subjective experience by reframing the relationship.
4. **Interaction Without Violation of Physical Law:** It explains how consciousness can interact with the physical brain without violating physical law.
5. **Connection to Physics:** It grounds consciousness in the fundamental physics of quantum mechanics.
6. **Explanation of Altered States:** It provides a natural explanation for altered states of consciousness as shifts in the degree of coupling between individual consciousness and universal consciousness.

2. The Hard Problem and Its Reframing

2.1 The Nature of Subjective Experience

To understand the hard problem, we must first clarify what we mean by consciousness and subjective experience. Philosophers distinguish between several aspects of consciousness:

- **Phenomenal consciousness** refers to the subjective, qualitative aspects of experience—what it is like to see red, to feel pain, to taste chocolate. This is the "hard" part of consciousness.
- **Access consciousness** refers to the availability of information for reasoning, speech, and action. This is the "easy" part of consciousness, which can be explained by functional mechanisms.

The hard problem is specifically about phenomenal consciousness. Why does access consciousness come with phenomenal consciousness? Why aren't we "philosophical zombies"—beings who behave exactly like us but have no inner experience?

2.2 The Failure of Emergence

The standard materialist answer is emergence: consciousness emerges from complex neural activity just as liquidity emerges from the interaction of water molecules. But this analogy fails. Liquidity is a functional property; it can be fully explained by the behavior of molecules. Consciousness is not a functional property; it has an intrinsic qualitative nature that cannot be deduced from physical structure.

This is the "deducibility argument." You can deduce the properties of water from the properties of H_2O molecules. But you cannot deduce the redness of red from the properties of neurons. There is a logical gap.

2.3 Reframing: From Generation to Interface

If emergence fails, we must consider the alternative: consciousness is fundamental. But if consciousness is fundamental, how does it relate to the physical world?

CSIT proposes that consciousness is the *interface* between the potential and the actual. It is the agency that selects which quantum possibility becomes classical reality.

In this view, the brain does not generate consciousness. The brain is a *transceiver* or *filter* (as proposed by William James and Aldous Huxley) that limits and focuses universal consciousness into an individual perspective.

The "Hard Problem" dissolves because we are no longer trying to squeeze subjectivity out of objectivity. Subjectivity (selection) is the process that creates objectivity (the actual domain).

3. The Psycho-Physical Framework

3.1 Consciousness as the Selection Interface

We define consciousness formally as the operator $\mathcal{C}$ that maps the potential state $|\Psi\rangle$ to the actual state $|\Phi_k\rangle$:

$$\mathcal{C} : |\Psi\rangle \rightarrow |\Phi_k\rangle$$

This operator is:

- **Unified:** It acts on the global state.
- **Subjective:** The "view from the inside" of the selection process is what we experience as awareness.
- **Active:** It is an act of choice (selection), not just passive observation.

3.2 The Brain as a Transceiver

The brain is a physical system evolved to couple with this interface. It does this through **neural coherence**.

- **High Coherence:** When the brain is highly coherent (integrated information is high), it couples strongly to the selection interface. The individual has a high degree of conscious agency and vivid experience.
- **Low Coherence:** When coherence is low (sleep, anesthesia), the coupling is weak. The individual consciousness fades, or merges back into the background

universal consciousness.

3.3 The Unity of Consciousness

The binding problem—how different sensory inputs are bound into a single unified experience—is solved by the unity of the selection interface.

The interface selects a *single* global history. Therefore, all experiences within that history are necessarily unified. The unity of consciousness is not constructed by the brain; it is inherited from the unity of the actualization process.

4. Implications for Altered States

4.1 Meditation and Flow

Meditation and flow states represent optimized coupling. The brain quiets the "noise" of the Default Mode Network, allowing for a purer, more direct connection to the selection interface. This is experienced as a loss of separate self and a merging with the process of unfolding reality.

4.2 Psychedelics

Psychedelics disrupt the rigid priors of the brain (the "reducing valve"), allowing a flood of unselected potentiality to enter conscious awareness. This expands the bandwidth of the interface, leading to richer, more complex, but sometimes chaotic experiences.

4.3 Near-Death Experiences

When the brain's metabolic activity drops to near zero (clinical death), the "filter" is removed entirely. CSIT predicts that consciousness does not cease, but expands. The individual perspective dissolves into the universal selection interface, often described as a "light" or "universal love."

5. Philosophical Implications

5.1 Panpsychism and Cosmopsychism

CSIT implies a form of **Cosmopsychism**: the universe as a whole is the fundamental conscious entity. Individual minds are dissociated alters or localized apertures of this universal mind.

5.2 Free Will

Free will is the subjective experience of the selection process. It is not an illusion. It is the fundamental nature of reality deciding which path to take. In a deterministic universe, there is no choice. In a CSIT universe, choice (selection) is the engine of time.

6. Conclusion

The hypothesis that consciousness is the global selection interface offers a promising way forward. It respects the findings of neuroscience while taking the reality of consciousness seriously. It bridges the gap between the objective world of physics and the subjective world of experience, offering a unified view of a universe where matter and mind are two sides of the same coin—the potential and the actual, mediated by the interface of consciousness.

References

1. Chalmers, D. J. (1995). “Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness”. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3), 200-219.
2. Levine, J. (1983). “Materialism and Qualia: The Explanatory Gap”. *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, 64, 354-361.
3. Nagel, T. (1974). “What Is It Like to Be a Bat?”. *The Philosophical Review*, 83(4), 435-450.
4. Tononi, G. (2004). “An Information Integration Theory of Consciousness”. *BMC Neuroscience*, 5, 42.

5. Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). “Consciousness in the Universe: A Review of the ‘Orch OR’ Theory”. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 11(1), 39-78.
6. James, W. (1898). *Human Immortality: Two Supposed Objections to the Doctrine*. Houghton, Mifflin and Company.
7. Huxley, A. (1954). *The Doors of Perception*. Chatto & Windus.
8. Goff, P. (2017). *Consciousness and Fundamental Reality*. Oxford University Press.
9. Kastrup, B. (2019). *The Idea of the World: A Multi-Disciplinary Argument for the Mental Nature of Reality*. Iff Books.
10. Koch, C., Massimini, M., Boly, M., & Tononi, G. (2016). “Neural Correlates of Consciousness: Progress and Problems”. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 17, 307-321.