Asymmetric Methodological Restraint

Reassessing Consciousness-First Ontology

Project: Return to Consciousness
Author: Bruno Tonetto
Authorship Note: Co-authored with AI as a disciplined thinking instrument—not a replacement for judgment. Prioritizes epistemic integrity and truth-seeking as a moral responsibility.
Finalized: February 2026

Abstract

When evidence underdetermines theory—when multiple frameworks can accommodate the same data—how should we decide what to believe? A common answer is methodological restraint: suspend judgment, avoid ontological commitment, wait for more evidence. This essay argues that such restraint, as actually practiced in contemporary intellectual culture, is applied asymmetrically. Speculative commitments grounded in physics, mathematics, or abstract structure are routinely tolerated under underdetermination, while commitments grounded in consciousness or phenomenology face disproportionate resistance. This asymmetry is not philosophically neutral; it encodes a background physicalism that disadvantages consciousness-first approaches before inquiry begins. Given shared epistemic principles—that brute facts are costly, that explanatory unification is valuable, and that all evidence is mediated through consciousness—the rational response to sustained explanatory failure is not indefinite restraint but ontological revision. Consciousness-first frameworks deserve serious consideration not because they are certain, but because they dissolve problems that restraint-oriented approaches have failed to solve for decades.

Keywords: methodological restraint · underdetermination · epistemic asymmetry · consciousness-first frameworks · many-worlds interpretation · philosophy of science · evidential standards

The Core Claim

Before developing the argument through examples and analysis, let me state the thesis in abstract form:

Asymmetry is not inherently problematic; unjustified asymmetry is. Reasonable people may apply different levels of scrutiny to different claims when there are principled reasons to do so. The problem arises when one class of explanation is allowed speculative extensions while

another is prohibited from even provisional consideration—without adequate justification for the difference.

Methodological restraint is legitimate only when applied symmetrically. If we invoke underdetermination to block consciousness-first hypotheses, the same principle should block equally speculative hypotheses grounded in physics or mathematics. When it doesn't—when many-worlds quantum mechanics, modal realism, and information-theoretic ontologies receive serious engagement while consciousness-first proposals are dismissed a priori—the restraint reveals itself as selective rather than principled.

When the asymmetry lacks justification, the restraint is epistemic, not methodological. It encodes substantive assumptions about which kinds of explanations are admissible—assumptions that deserve examination rather than default acceptance.

What This Essay Does Not Claim

To prevent misreading, let me be explicit about the scope of this argument:

- **This essay does not argue that all hypotheses deserve equal credence.** Some claims are better supported than others; prior probabilities matter; evidence constrains belief.
- **This essay does not deny the role of prior probabilities.** If a claim has systematically failed in the past, skepticism may be warranted. The question is whether such failure applies symmetrically to the domains under discussion.
- **This essay does not reject methodological rigor.** The argument is not that we should lower our epistemic standards, but that we should *apply them consistently*.
- **This essay does not license belief without evidence.** It defends the permissibility of investigation, not the endorsement of conclusions.

The distinction between *investigative permissibility* (what may be explored without stigma) and *epistemic endorsement* (what is warranted to believe) runs throughout this essay. The argument is that consciousness-first frameworks deserve the former—serious consideration on their merits—not that readers should accept them without further examination.

Introduction: A Curious Double Standard

Imagine two physicists presenting speculative theories to their colleagues.

The first proposes that reality consists of countless unobservable parallel universes, branching at every quantum measurement, with no possibility of ever detecting these other worlds. The theory is mathematically elegant, preserves certain intuitions about determinism, and has gained significant traction in physics departments worldwide.

The second proposes that consciousness might play a constitutive role in how quantum systems transition from indefinite to definite states—that observation isn't merely passive registration but participates in determining outcomes. This interpretation has historical precedent (von Neumann, Wigner, and others explored it seriously) and addresses puzzles the first theory simply relocates rather than solves.

Here's what's curious: the first proposal, despite positing infinitely many unobservable universes, is considered respectable physics. The second, despite invoking no unobservable entities

— only a role for the one thing we know most directly — is often treated as not-quite-scientific— a philosophical indulgence that serious researchers should avoid.

Why the difference?

The standard answer is methodological caution. We should be conservative about ontological commitments, especially when evidence doesn't force our hand. But this answer doesn't explain the asymmetry. Both proposals go beyond what evidence strictly requires. Both involve metaphysical commitments that cannot be directly tested. Yet one is welcomed into mainstream discourse while the other triggers suspicion.

This essay argues that what presents itself as neutral methodological restraint is actually a hidden philosophical stance—one that tends to exclude consciousness from fundamental status. Understanding this asymmetry matters because it shapes which questions we ask, which solutions we can imagine, and which problems we condemn ourselves to endlessly defer.

By "asymmetric methodological restraint" (AMR), I mean the practice of treating underdetermination as a decisive barrier to ontological revision when consciousness is proposed as fundamental, while permitting equally speculative ontological commitments grounded in third-person structure under comparable evidential conditions. AMR should be distinguished from general skepticism or quietism; it permits robust metaphysical commitment in many domains, but restricts it selectively with respect to consciousness. The asymmetry is the key: if restraint were applied consistently, it would block many-worlds interpretations, mathematical Platonism, and information-theoretic ontologies just as firmly as consciousness-first frameworks. It isn't. That selective application reveals that something other than methodological caution is at work.

I. What Underdetermination Means and Why It Matters

Before examining the asymmetry, we need to understand the problem it claims to address.

The Gap Between Evidence and Theory

Scientific theories aim to explain observable phenomena. But the relationship between evidence and theory is looser than we might hope. For any set of observations, multiple theories can account for the data. This is the problem of *underdetermination*: evidence alone cannot uniquely determine which theory is true.

Consider a simple example. You observe that a light in your neighbor's window turns on every evening at 7 PM. Multiple explanations fit this evidence: your neighbor comes home from work at that time; an automatic timer controls the light; a house-sitter follows the same routine. The observation underdetermines the explanation.

In fundamental physics, underdetermination becomes more acute. Quantum mechanics makes extraordinarily precise predictions, but the theory is compatible with radically different pictures of reality:

- **Copenhagen interpretation**: Quantum systems don't have definite properties until measured; the question of what's "really happening" between measurements is meaningless.
- **Many-worlds interpretation**: Every quantum measurement causes the universe to branch into parallel copies, each containing a different outcome. All possibilities are real; we simply find ourselves in one branch.

- **Pilot-wave theory**: Particles have definite positions at all times, guided by a "pilot wave" that evolves deterministically. Quantum randomness reflects our ignorance, not fundamental indeterminacy.
- **Consciousness-collapse interpretations**: Conscious observation plays a role in transitioning quantum systems from superposition to definite states.

These interpretations make identical predictions for all practical purposes. Evidence cannot distinguish between them. Yet they describe utterly different realities: one where measurement is fundamental, one with infinitely many parallel worlds, one with hidden determinism, one where consciousness participates in physics.

The Restraint Response

Faced with underdetermination, one natural response is restraint: suspend ontological judgment. If evidence can't determine which picture is correct, perhaps we shouldn't commit to any. We can use the mathematical formalism to make predictions while remaining agnostic about what's "really" going on.

This sounds like intellectual humility. But there's a problem: restraint, as actually practiced, isn't applied evenly.

II. The Asymmetry in Practice

What Gets a Pass

Consider some ontological commitments that flourish in contemporary intellectual culture despite underdetermination:

Modal realism. Some philosophers argue that possible worlds are as real as the actual world—that there exists a concrete universe where Napoleon won at Waterloo, another where dinosaurs never went extinct, infinitely many others for every way things could have been different. This is speculative, unfalsifiable, and motivated primarily by theoretical elegance in modal logic. Yet it's a respected position in academic philosophy.

Mathematical Platonism. Many mathematicians and philosophers believe that mathematical objects exist independently of human minds—that numbers, sets, and functions are discovered rather than invented, inhabiting an abstract realm we access through reason. This commitment goes far beyond what mathematical practice requires, yet it's widespread and respectable.

The multiverse. Cosmological theories increasingly posit vast ensembles of universes with different physical constants, most of which are unobservable in principle. These proposals are motivated by fine-tuning considerations and inflationary cosmology, but they commit us to extraordinarily rich ontologies on the basis of indirect theoretical considerations.

Many-worlds quantum mechanics. As noted above, this interpretation posits infinitely many branching universes, each as real as ours, none detectable from the others. Everettians claim parsimony — one equation, no collapse postulate — but this framing obscures the trade: removing collapse while applying the Schrödinger equation universally generates an infinity of unobservable branches and leaves the probability problem unsolved (why do we observe Born-rule frequencies if all outcomes are equally real?). Dynamical simplicity is purchased at the price of ontological extravagance. Many-worlds remains controversial even among physicists; critics like 't Hooft and Penrose object to these costs. Yet it is treated as a legitimate option

in ways that consciousness-involving interpretations are not—discussed in mainstream physics journals, taught in graduate courses, defended by prominent physicists without professional stigma.

Information-theoretic ontologies. While Wheeler himself emphasized a participatory universe in which observation is constitutive, many later information-theoretic ontologies retain the language of 'it from bit' while quietly dropping the observer. In these frameworks, information is treated as ontologically basic without clarifying for whom it is information—rendering 'information without subject' more mysterious than consciousness itself.

What these positions share: they involve substantial metaphysical commitments that go beyond what evidence strictly requires. They're grounded in considerations of theoretical elegance, explanatory coherence, or mathematical fruitfulness. And they're considered legitimate moves in intellectual discourse.

What Gets Blocked

Now consider proposals that face systematic resistance:

Consciousness as fundamental. The suggestion that consciousness might be a basic feature of reality—not reducible to or derived from physical processes—has historically triggered immediate suspicion. This is changing: panpsychism and analytic idealism have gained noticeable academic traction in the last decade, with serious work by philosophers like Goff, Chalmers (who takes panpsychism seriously), and Kastrup, and with Nagel's *Mind and Cosmos* prompting renewed debate. Yet the default institutional posture remains skeptical in ways that comparably speculative physicalist commitments do not face. Despite the persistent failure of physicalist theories to explain why there is subjective experience at all, despite the acknowledged "hard problem" that has resisted solution for decades, consciousness-first proposals are still more likely to be treated as giving up rather than making progress—despite being motivated by the same explanatory criteria (coherence, unification, parsimony) that justify speculative commitments elsewhere.

Mind in physics. Interpretations of quantum mechanics that give consciousness a constitutive role—not merely as an observer but as participating in how quantum states become definite—are marginalized despite their historical pedigree and despite the fact that they address puzzles that other interpretations merely relocate.

Phenomenology as evidence. First-person experience, investigated with discipline and precision, is often downgraded as a source of knowledge. While third-person methods (measurement, experiment, publicly observable data) are treated as paradigmatic of knowledge, first-person methods (introspection, contemplative investigation, phenomenological analysis) tend to be treated as merely subjective—interesting perhaps, but not genuinely evidential.

Anomalous phenomena. Research on near-death experiences, terminal lucidity, or other phenomena that sit uneasily with physicalist assumptions faces extraordinary barriers: funding difficulties, publication resistance, professional stigma. The bar for evidence is raised selectively; the demand for rigor is applied asymmetrically. The argument here does not depend on accepting any particular interpretation of these phenomena, only on the asymmetry with which they are excluded a priori.

The Pattern

The pattern is clear: ontological commitments grounded in third-person structural considerations (physics, mathematics, logic) are more readily permitted under underdetermination. Ontological commitments grounded in first-person phenomenological considerations (consciousness, experience, mind) face greater resistance.

To be clear: the point is not that sociological bias determines truth. Institutional resistance to an idea doesn't make it correct, and mainstream acceptance doesn't make something wrong. But persistent institutional asymmetry reveals an underlying epistemic rule about what kinds of explanations are permitted—and that rule is what requires examination. The question is whether the rule is justified or whether it encodes a hidden metaphysics.

The background physicalism at work here is rarely explicit or defended; it functions instead as a default constraint on admissible explanation. This is not an accusation of bad faith. Most researchers operating within this constraint are simply following the conventions of their fields. But conventions can embody philosophical commitments, and those commitments can be examined.

This is not neutral methodology. It's a substantive philosophical stance masquerading as caution.

III. Can Asymmetric Skepticism Be Justified?

Before concluding that the asymmetry is unjustified, we should consider the strongest case for it. A fair critique requires engaging the best version of the opposing view.

The Case for Differential Treatment

One might argue that asymmetric skepticism toward consciousness-based claims is earned, not arbitrary. Consider several possible justifications:

Track record. Perhaps consciousness-based explanations have historically failed more often than physics-based ones. If a domain has a poor track record of generating successful theories, heightened skepticism may be warranted.

Fraud and wishful thinking. Consciousness research has been plagued by fraud (e.g., some parapsychology scandals) and is particularly susceptible to wishful thinking. Perhaps the asymmetry reflects reasonable caution about a domain where motivated reasoning is especially likely.

Base rates. Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. If consciousness-first proposals are inherently more extraordinary than physics-based ones, the asymmetry in evidential demands may be justified.

Methodological tractability. Perhaps consciousness-based hypotheses are systematically harder to test, making restraint appropriate until better methods emerge.

Why These Justifications Fail

Each of these arguments has some merit but fails to justify the asymmetry as actually practiced:

On track record: The comparison is not straightforward. Physics has a strong track record for *certain kinds* of questions—those amenable to third-person measurement and mathematical

modeling. But it has a notably poor track record on consciousness itself. The hard problem has resisted solution despite decades of sophisticated work. If track record justifies skepticism, it should also justify skepticism toward the claim that physicalist methods will eventually explain consciousness. The track record argument cuts both ways.

On fraud and wishful thinking: These concerns apply asymmetrically within consciousness research but do not distinguish consciousness-based from physics-based ontologies in general. Fraud and wishful thinking occur in physics too (cold fusion, various replication crises). More importantly, the asymmetry exists at the level of serious academic philosophy and interpretive physics—domains where fraud is not the primary concern. Dismissing Goff or Kastrup or Chalmers by association with parapsychology scandals would be guilt by non-association.

On base rates: This argument assumes what it needs to prove—that consciousness-first proposals are inherently more extraordinary. From within a physicalist framework, they are. From a neutral starting point, it's not obvious why "reality is fundamentally conscious" is more extraordinary than "reality contains infinitely many unobservable parallel universes." The sense of extraordinariness reflects background assumptions, not neutral evaluation.

On methodological tractability: This is the strongest consideration but still fails to justify current practice. Methodological difficulty warrants caution about *conclusions*, not exclusion from *investigation*. If a hypothesis is hard to test, we should be cautious about believing it—but also cautious about dismissing it. The asymmetry goes beyond appropriate caution; it treats difficulty as disqualification.

The Real Test

The question is not whether *some* asymmetry is ever justified, but whether the *specific* asymmetry practiced in contemporary intellectual culture is justified by these considerations. When we compare:

- The treatment of many-worlds quantum mechanics (unfalsifiable, ontologically extravagant, but respectable)
- The treatment of consciousness-collapse interpretations (also unfalsifiable, adding no unobservable entities, but suspect)

…the disparity cannot be explained by track record, fraud concerns, or methodological difficulty. Both proposals face the same evidential constraints. The difference lies in what kind of thing is proposed as fundamental—and that difference reveals the hidden metaphysics.

IV. Five Shared Principles

To see why the unjustified asymmetry matters, we need to articulate some principles that both sides of the debate claim to accept. These aren't controversial premises smuggled in to support a predetermined conclusion; they're standard commitments in analytic philosophy and philosophy of science.

P1. Realism

There is a mind-independent reality that inquiry aims to describe. We're not merely constructing useful fictions or projecting our categories onto chaos. The world has a structure, and our theories can succeed or fail at capturing it.

P2. Fallibilism

Our access to reality is imperfect, revisable, and non-absolute. We can be wrong about our most confident beliefs. But fallibility isn't arbitrary—some theories really are better supported than others, and inquiry genuinely progresses.

P3. No View from Nowhere

All evidence—empirical, mathematical, theoretical—is mediated by cognitive perspective. We never step outside consciousness to compare our representations with unconceptualized reality. This doesn't make knowledge impossible, but it does mean that consciousness is always already involved in any evidence we possess.

P4. Explanatory Coherence

Other things being equal, theories that unify domains and reduce fragmentation are epistemically preferable. A theory that explains multiple phenomena with a single framework is better than one that requires separate, unconnected explanations for each.

P5. Bruteness Is Costly

A "brute fact" is something that must be accepted without explanation—a stopping point where we simply say "that's just how it is." Brute facts may be unavoidable, but multiplying them is a theoretical cost. A theory that explains more and posits fewer brute facts is, other things equal, preferable.

These principles are deliberately minimal. Rejecting any of them carries substantial philosophical cost.

V. The Argument

With these principles in hand, we can now see why asymmetric restraint is not neutral.

The Core Move

The position we might call *Asymmetric Methodological Restraint* (AMR) says: when ontological frameworks are underdetermined by evidence, we should suspend commitment—but especially when revision involves consciousness or phenomenology.

The key word is "especially." If restraint were applied generally, it would forbid the many-worlds interpretation, modal realism, mathematical Platonism, and information-theoretic ontologies just as much as consciousness-first frameworks. But it isn't. These proposals are evaluated on their theoretical merits—their elegance, their explanatory power, their coherence with other commitments.

Consciousness-first proposals are treated differently. They're not rejected because they've been examined and found wanting. They're dismissed because they violate an implicit boundary: whatever else we revise, we must not elevate consciousness to fundamental status.

What the Asymmetry Reveals

This selective application reveals that AMR isn't methodologically neutral. It encodes a background picture in which:

- Consciousness is epistemically secondary—a phenomenon to be explained by more fundamental things, not itself a candidate for fundamentality.
- Phenomenological evidence is inferior—first-person data doesn't carry the ontological weight that third-person data does.
- Explanatory unification across first-person and third-person domains is not a legitimate theoretical goal.
- Brute facts about consciousness are acceptable in a way that brute facts about physics would not be.

These are substantive metaphysical commitments. They constitute a philosophical stance, not the absence of one.

The Tension with Shared Principles

Notice how this stance sits uneasily with the principles we articulated:

Against P1 (Realism): Realism's core epistemic commitment is that convergent independent observation is evidence of something real. This is what grounds the entire scientific enterprise: when independent observers converge on the same finding, we take that as tracking reality rather than coincidence. But physicalism applies this criterion selectively. When independent observers across unrelated cultural traditions converge on the same phenomenological structure in non-ordinary states—encounters with non-human intelligence, the recognition of consciousness as fundamental, the dissolution of ego-boundaries into a unitive ground—the convergence is dismissed as "shared hallucination from common neurobiology."

The neurobiology response deserves careful engagement. It does not require physicalism: even within a consciousness-first framework, human minds share near-identical biological architecture, so some convergence in altered-state phenomenology is expected from shared hardware alone. This is a legitimate point. Shared architecture predicts convergent *forms* of experience — similar categories of altered state, similar emotional registers, perhaps similar visual geometry.

But the reported features of these experiences go beyond what shared architecture straightforwardly predicts: heightened rather than degraded cognition under severe neurological compromise; content that is novel, specific, and sometimes independently verifiable; convergence not merely on the *type* of experience but on its specific *content* across independent observers within the same event; and reports that contradict the experiencer's prior beliefs rather than confirming them. Whether these reported features withstand rigorous scrutiny is precisely the question that warrants investigation — and that investigation is what faces asymmetric barriers. The point for this essay is not that these reports establish a conclusion, but that the realist criterion of convergent independent observation is suspended precisely when the content is inconvenient. (For detailed engagement with the empirical evidence, see Anomalous Phenomena and Consciousness (apc).)

There is also a deeper structural issue about the nature of phenomenological evidence itself. Instrument-based observation — the paradigm of third-person science — accesses the extrinsic appearance of phenomena: what processes look like from outside, measured, mathematized,

reproduced in laboratories. Phenomenological report accesses the intrinsic character of experience: what it is *like*, from the inside, for the subject undergoing it. These are different evidential modalities, suited to different aspects of reality. Demanding that phenomenological evidence meet instrument-based standards — reproducible on command, readable by equipment, formalizable in equations — is not methodological rigor. It is the application of one evidential paradigm's criteria to a domain where they do not apply, while treating the mismatch as evidence of the domain's unreliability rather than the criteria's inapplicability. That move is itself an instance of asymmetric methodological restraint.

The demarcation between "real convergence" (ordinary perception) and "hallucinatory convergence" (non-ordinary phenomenology) cannot be drawn by the convergence itself — it is drawn by the prior commitment to what kinds of content are admissible. This is not realism applied; it is realism selectively abandoned.

Against P3 (No View from Nowhere): If all evidence is mediated by consciousness, then systematically downgrading consciousness-based evidence is self-undermining. We're using consciousness to establish that consciousness isn't evidentially significant.

Against P4 (Explanatory Coherence): The persistent failure to integrate consciousness into the physicalist picture—the hard problem, the explanatory gap—represents massive fragmentation. A framework that unified first-person and third-person domains would score better on explanatory coherence.

Against P5 (Bruteness Is Costly): Under physicalism, the existence of consciousness is a brute fact. Why is there subjective experience at all? No answer is forthcoming; it's just an inexplicable feature of certain physical arrangements. Consciousness-first frameworks dissolve this particular bruteness — if consciousness is fundamental, its existence requires no further explanation. New questions arise (what governs dissociation? how does universal consciousness give rise to individual perspectives?) but the deepest physicalist brute fact — that there is experience at all — is no longer brute.

VI. The Alternative: Ontological Revision Under Pressure

If AMR is not neutral, what's the alternative?

The Case for Consciousness-First Ontology

When a metaphysical framework systematically fails to solve its central problems—when it generates persistent anomalies across multiple domains—ontological revision becomes warranted, even under underdetermination.

This is not a call for certainty or dogmatism. It's the recognition that restraint has costs too. Indefinite restraint in the face of persistent explanatory failure is not wisdom; it's paralysis that privileges one metaphysical picture (the current default) over alternatives that might perform better.

Consider what consciousness-first frameworks offer:

On consciousness itself. Rather than treating subjective experience as an inexplicable add-on to a fundamentally non-experiential world, these frameworks take experience as basic. The hard problem dissolves because there's no gap to bridge—consciousness doesn't need to emerge from non-consciousness because non-consciousness was never fundamental.

On quantum mechanics. The measurement problem asks why observation seems to play a special role in quantum theory. Under analytic idealism for example, this role becomes intelligible: what we call "physical reality" is itself a representation within consciousness, and measurement is a particular kind of interaction between dissociated conscious perspectives. We're not explaining how consciousness affects physics from outside; we're recognizing that physics describes patterns within consciousness.

On the unity of knowledge. First-person and third-person methods become complementary rather than competing. Phenomenology and physics investigate the same reality from different angles—the intrinsic nature of experience and its extrinsic appearance. The integration crisis—the gap between how we experience the world and how science describes it—finds resolution.

On anomalous phenomena. Terminal lucidity (cognitive clarity in dying patients with severely damaged brains), near-death experiences, and other phenomena that strain physicalist assumptions become intelligible rather than embarrassing. If the brain is not a generator of consciousness but more like a receiver, reduced brain function might correlate with expanded rather than diminished awareness under certain conditions.

These examples serve as *applications* of the framework, illustrating its explanatory potential. They are not premises of the argument. The core case for investigative permissibility stands independently: when restraint is applied asymmetrically, it functions as a philosophical commitment rather than neutral methodology, and that commitment deserves examination rather than default acceptance.

Explanatory Economy

The comparison isn't between certainty and uncertainty. Both AMR and consciousness-first ontology operate under underdetermination; neither can be proven definitively. The comparison is between explanatory economies:

AMR preserves the current framework at the cost of: - Persistent unsolved problems (hard problem, measurement problem) - Systematic fragmentation (first-person vs. third-person) - Multiplying brute facts (why is there consciousness? why does it correlate with these brain states?) - Blocking the only ontological move that addresses these failures

Consciousness-first ontology carries its own open questions — what governs dissociation? how do individual perspectives arise from universal consciousness? But it: - Dissolves the hard problem rather than deferring it indefinitely - Unifies domains that restraint keeps separate - Opens new theoretical possibilities

Neither side is cost-free. The question is not which framework is obviously cheaper — that depends on contested judgments about how to weigh different kinds of costs. The question is whether the comparison should be made on its merits, or foreclosed by the assumption that only one side's costs count.

VII. The Landscape of Consciousness-First Frameworks

"Consciousness-first" is not a single position but a family of frameworks, each with distinct commitments, strengths, and challenges. A reader persuaded that these options deserve serious consideration should know what's on offer.

Analytic Idealism

Core claim: Consciousness is the sole fundamental reality. What we call "matter" is the extrinsic appearance of mental processes—how experience looks from the outside rather than what it is in itself. Individual minds are dissociated centers within a universal field of consciousness, analogous to how dissociative identity disorder produces apparently separate personalities within one mind.

Key proponents: Bernardo Kastrup has developed the most systematic contemporary version, drawing on Schopenhauer and integrating findings from neuroscience, physics, and depth psychology.

Strengths: Compatible with physics and empirical science in the relevant sense—it reinterprets what physical descriptions refer to (the extrinsic appearance of mental processes) without contesting their mathematical structure, predictive success, or empirical adequacy. Dissolves the hard problem entirely: consciousness does not emerge from non-consciousness because non-consciousness is not fundamental on this view. Provides a coherent interpretive framework for phenomena that strain physicalist assumptions, including terminal lucidity and near-death experiences, without treating such phenomena as evidential premises.

Challenges: Must explain why the world appears so consistently law-governed if it's fundamentally mental. Must clarify the relationship between individual minds and universal consciousness.

Panpsychism

Core claim: Consciousness is a fundamental and ubiquitous feature of reality. Rather than emerging at some level of complexity, experiential properties are present at all levels—perhaps even in fundamental physics.

Key proponents: Philip Goff, Galen Strawson, David Chalmers (who takes panpsychism seriously though doesn't fully endorse it). Historical precedents include Leibniz, Whitehead, and aspects of William James.

Variants:

- *Micropsychism*: Fundamental physical entities have micro-experiences; macro-consciousness somehow emerges from combinations of these.
- *Cosmopsychism*: The universe as a whole is conscious; individual minds are aspects or fragments of cosmic consciousness. (In stronger forms, this converges with analytic idealism.)
- *Panprotopsychism*: Fundamental entities have proto-conscious properties that aren't fully experiential but ground consciousness when organized appropriately. (This shares conceptual territory with neutral monism.)

Strengths: Takes consciousness as fundamental without eliminating the physical world. Potentially compatible with physics as currently understood. Avoids the radical revisionism of pure idealism.

Challenges: The "combination problem"—how do micro-experiences combine to form unified macro-experience? This is sometimes called "the hard problem turned upside down."

Neutral Monism

Core claim: Reality is fundamentally neither mental nor physical but some neutral "stuff" that can appear as either depending on how it's organized or viewed. Mind and matter are two aspects of the same underlying reality.

Key proponents: Historical versions from Spinoza, William James, Bertrand Russell (in some phases). Contemporary versions connect to structural realism and information-theoretic approaches.

Strengths: Avoids privileging either mind or matter. Potentially dissolves the mind-body problem by denying the initial dualism. Compatible with scientific practice while leaving room for consciousness.

Challenges: The "neutral" substrate can seem obscure—what is it, if neither mental nor physical? Risks collapsing into either physicalism or idealism depending on how the neutral base is characterized.

Dual-Aspect Monism

Core claim: Mind and matter are two aspects of a single underlying reality, neither reducible to the other. Every physical event has a mental aspect; every mental event has a physical aspect. They're not causally related because they're not separate things.

Key proponents: Connects to Spinoza's metaphysics. Contemporary versions in some interpretations of quantum mechanics (Pauli-Jung conjecture) and in integrated information theory.

Strengths: Preserves the reality of both physical science and mental life. Explains mind-brain correlation without reduction. Avoids interaction problems that plague substance dualism.

Challenges: Must clarify what "aspects" means. Can seem to merely redescribe the problem rather than solve it.

What They Share

Despite differences, these frameworks share key features that distinguish them from standard physicalism:

1. **Consciousness is not derived.** It's either fundamental or co-fundamental with matter, not an emergent product of non-conscious processes.
2. **First-person evidence matters.** Phenomenology is taken seriously as a source of knowledge about reality, not merely as data to be explained away.
3. **The hard problem is addressed, not deferred.** Each framework offers a positive account of why there is experience, rather than treating it as a puzzle for future science.
4. **Integration is possible.** These frameworks aim to unify first-person and third-person perspectives rather than treating them as irreconcilable.

The choice among them involves further philosophical work. But the first step—recognizing that serious options exist and deserve evaluation on their merits—is what asymmetric restraint prevents.

VIII. Objections and Responses

"But consciousness-first is unfalsifiable!"

This objection proves too much. Many-worlds quantum mechanics is unfalsifiable—we can never observe other branches. Modal realism is unfalsifiable—we can't visit other possible worlds. Mathematical Platonism is unfalsifiable—we can't detect the abstract realm. "It from bit" is unfalsifiable—we can't observe information as ontologically prior to physics. If unfalsifiability were grounds for dismissal, the asymmetry would apply to these positions equally. The fact that it doesn't reveals that something other than falsifiability is driving the resistance.

"But physicalism has proven empirically fruitful."

This objection rests on a category error that deserves careful unpacking.

What has proven empirically fruitful is *objective empiricism*—the methodology of studying nature through quantitative analysis of reproducible, intersubjectively verifiable patterns. Mathematical description, experimental method, prediction, technological application—these constitute the engine of scientific success. The question is whether this engine requires *metaphysical materialism* (the ontological claim that reality is fundamentally unconscious matter) to run.

It doesn't. Objective empiricism requires only: - That observable phenomena contain stable, quantifiable patterns - That mathematical relationships can describe these patterns - That reproducible experiments can test hypotheses - That intersubjective verification of measurements is possible

None of these requirements entail that consciousness is derivative, that mental phenomena reduce to physical processes, or that mind-independent matter exists beyond all possible experience. These are *additions* that metaphysical materialism makes to the methodology—additions that generate the hard problem, the measurement problem, and other persistent failures.

Consciousness-first frameworks preserve the methodology entirely. Under analytic idealism, mathematical relationships still hold (as patterns in how experience unfolds), measurement still works (instruments operate as stable patterns within the same conscious field), prediction remains possible (regular patterns enable forecasting regardless of their ultimate nature), and technology functions (by exploiting reliable experiential regularities). The empirical content transfers completely; what doesn't transfer are the metaphysical assumptions that create more problems than they solve.

This matters for the asymmetry argument: if empirical fruitfulness belongs to the *method* rather than the *metaphysics*, it cannot justify treating physicalism as the default ontology. Consciousness-first frameworks inherit the same methodological fertility while dissolving problems physicalism leaves as brute.

One further point: the appeal to empirical fruitfulness sits uneasily with the *a priori* dismissal of anomalous phenomena (see Anomalous Phenomena and Consciousness (apc) for detailed analysis). Research into terminal lucidity, near-death experiences, and other consciousness-related anomalies faces barriers—not because such research has been conducted and found wanting, but because the phenomena are ruled incompatible with physicalist assumptions in advance. One cannot claim empirical fruitfulness as a virtue while blocking empirical investigation of inconvenient data.

"We just need more neuroscience."

This response assumes what it needs to prove: that the hard problem is merely hard rather than pointing to a categorical limitation. Decades of sophisticated neuroscience have mapped neural correlates of consciousness in impressive detail without making progress on why any of it is accompanied by experience. More of the same approach is unlikely to bridge a gap that may be conceptual rather than empirical.

"You're giving up on explanation."

On the contrary. Consciousness-first frameworks don't abandon explanation; they relocate the explanatory task. Instead of explaining how consciousness emerges from non-consciousness (which has proven intractable), they explain how apparent matter emerges from consciousness (which may prove more tractable). The structure of physics, the regularities of nature, the appearance of an external world—all these require explanation, but the explanation runs in the opposite direction.

"This is just mysticism dressed up as philosophy."

Some consciousness-first positions may deserve this critique. But the serious versions—analytic idealism, neutral monism, panpsychism in its rigorous forms—are as technically demanding and carefully argued as any materialist philosophy of mind. Dismissing them as mysticism is a way of avoiding engagement, not a substantive response.

IX. Why This Matters

The asymmetry in methodological restraint isn't merely an academic curiosity. It shapes which research programs receive funding, which questions young scholars dare to ask, which phenomena get taken seriously, and which solutions remain invisible.

In artificial intelligence research, background physicalism does more than shape our expectations—it defines which questions are even considered coherent. The very notion of "machine consciousness" presupposes that arranging matter or computation in the right way could generate experience, even though consciousness remains ill-defined within physicalism itself. Under consciousness-first frameworks, this framing is a category error: machines are appearances within consciousness, not candidates for becoming centers of it. The issue, then, is not whether machines will become conscious, but whether physicalism's way of posing the question is intelligible at all. If these background assumptions are mistaken, we are not merely at risk of technological surprise—we are reasoning, planning, and allocating moral concern within a conceptual framework that mischaracterizes the nature of mind from the outset.

In medicine and psychiatry, the downgrading of first-person experience shapes how we understand and treat mental illness. Frameworks that take phenomenology more seriously might open therapeutic possibilities that current approaches foreclose.

In how we understand ourselves, the metaphysics we absorb—often unconsciously—shapes what we take to be possible for human flourishing. If consciousness is accidental and meaning is constructed, life is one thing. If consciousness is fundamental and meaning is discovered, life is another.

These are not small stakes.

Conclusion: Risk in the Right Direction

The argument of this essay is not that consciousness-first ontology is certainly true. Certainty isn't available in foundational inquiry. The argument is that *asymmetric methodological restraint* is not the neutral, cautious position it presents itself as. It embodies substantive philosophical commitments that disproportionately exclude certain possibilities before inquiry begins.

Given shared epistemic principles—that coherence matters, that brute facts are costly, that all evidence comes through consciousness—the rational response to decades of explanatory failure is not indefinite restraint. It's willingness to take ontological risk in pursuit of explanatory progress.

The question is not whether consciousness-first ontology involves risk—it does. The question is whether that risk is greater than the cost of indefinitely preserving a framework that cannot resolve its central explanatory failures. Risk attaches to both options; the asymmetry lies in pretending that only one side bears it.

This means treating consciousness-first frameworks as genuine competitors, not as lapses in intellectual seriousness. It means applying the same standards of evaluation—elegance, coherence, explanatory power—that we apply to speculative physics. It means acknowledging that the "neutral" position isn't neutral at all.

The choice before us is not between certainty and uncertainty. It's between different ways of distributing epistemic risk. We can continue paying the costs of a framework that cannot solve its central problems, or we can invest in alternatives that might.

Genuine intellectual honesty requires that this choice be made explicitly, not foreclosed by rules that pretend to be neutral while encoding a particular answer in advance. Once asymmetric methodological restraint is made explicit, the exclusion of consciousness-first ontology can no longer be defended as mere caution.

References

Chalmers, D. J. (1996). *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. Oxford University Press.

Goff, P. (2019). *Galileo's Error: Foundations for a New Science of Consciousness*. Pantheon.

Kastrup, B. (2019). *The Idea of the World: A Multi-Disciplinary Argument for the Mental Nature of Reality*. iff Books.

Lewis, D. (1986). *On the Plurality of Worlds*. Blackwell.

Nagel, T. (2012). *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False*. Oxford University Press.

Tonetto, B. (2025). *Return to Consciousness: A Philosophical Journey from Materialism to Meaning*.

Wallace, D. (2012). *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum Theory According to the Everett Interpretation*. Oxford University Press.

Related Essays in This Project

Available at: https://returntoconsciousness.org/

What Physics Actually Closes (wpc) — Technical grounding for this essay's claims about quantum interpretations and causal closure

Myth of Metaphysical Neutrality (mmn) — Conceptual foundation for this essay's argument

Return to Consciousness (rtc) — The core framework this essay supports

Epistemic Authority (eaa) — Extends this essay's analysis to epistemic constraints

License