First-Principles Assessment

Physicalism and Idealism at First Principles

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: March 2026

Abstract

The epistemic gatekeepers of this project have established that physicalism's neutrality is illusory, that its dominance is historically contingent, that methodological restraint is applied asymmetrically, that the generativity standard is miscalibrated, and that the real disagreement concerns where explanation stops — not how mechanisms work. None of them renders a verdict. This essay does. Operating strictly at the level of first principles — not theory maturity, not evidential closure, not institutional success — it asks which contemporary framework currently commits fewer unjustified epistemic inversions. The answer: analytic idealism commits fewer inversions at the foundational level while remaining empirically adequate. The essay specifies the conditions under which the assessment would change and names idealism's genuine vulnerabilities alongside physicalism's structural costs.

Keywords: first-principles analysis · epistemic direction · hard problem of consciousness · parsimony · analytic idealism · physicalism · epistemic inversion · brute facts

Scope and Constraints

This essay operates under five constraints that must be stated before the assessment begins, because without them the exercise loses its disciplinary standing.

1. Foundations only. The comparison is limited to epistemic starting points, explanatory direction, and the placement of brute facts. It does not compare theory maturity, predictive track records, or institutional output — these reflect developmental history and resource allocation, not foundational coherence. *The Generativity Question* has shown why these cannot serve as proxies for ontological adequacy.

2. Explicit conditionality. The verdict is contingent. It represents the current balance of first-principles considerations as this project understands them. It is sensitive to future developments

— philosophical, empirical, and conceptual. Section VIII specifies what would change the assessment.

3. Symmetry of standards. Idealism is evaluated under the same discipline applied to physicalism. Where idealism commits epistemic errors, they are named. Where its explanatory gaps are real, they are acknowledged. An assessment that protects its preferred framework from scrutiny is not an assessment — it is marketing.

4. No appeal to anomalies or convergence. The empirical considerations documented elsewhere in this project — anomalous phenomena, cross-cultural convergence, contemplative reports — are not invoked here. This assessment must stand even if every anomalous finding fails to replicate and every convergence is explained by shared cognitive architecture. The verdict rests on first principles, not on contested evidence.

5. Judicial tone. This essay aims to read as adjudication. The tone is deliberately measured — not to hedge the finding, but to ensure the analysis is evaluated on its merits rather than dismissed as partisanship.

A final note on scope: this essay is a checkpoint in the project's epistemic sequence, not its conclusion. Nothing downstream — no applied essay, no structural extension, no boundary test — relies on accepting its verdict. Readers who reject the assessment but accept the diagnostic corrections that precede it lose nothing of the project's core contribution.

I. What "First Principles" Means Here

A first-principles assessment does not ask which framework has produced more papers, attracted more funding, or generated more technological applications. It asks something more fundamental: *given what we know about the structure of explanation, the nature of evidence, and the relationship between method and ontology, which framework's starting commitments are currently more defensible?*

"More defensible" does not mean "certainly true." It means: commits fewer unjustified inversions — fewer places where the framework assumes something costly without adequate justification, or where it treats an explanatory gap as a feature rather than a debt.

The gatekeepers have cleared the ground for this question by establishing several things:

- That physicalism's claim to neutrality is untenable — it is a substantive metaphysical position masquerading as methodological modesty (*Myth of Metaphysical Neutrality*)
- That its institutional dominance is historically contingent, not philosophically earned (*The Emergence of Physicalism*)
- That restraint against alternatives is asymmetric — consciousness-first frameworks face barriers that structurally equivalent physics-based speculation does not (*Asymmetric Methodological Restraint*)
- That the standard of "generative capacity" encodes production-level assumptions that predisqualify constraint-level work (*The Generativity Question*)
- That the real disagreement is about where explanation stops — where brute facts are placed — not about mechanisms, which both frameworks accept (*Where Explanation Stops*)

These are diagnostic achievements. They correct the terrain on which comparison occurs. They do not themselves perform the comparison. This essay does.

II. The Assessment Framework

To compare frameworks at first principles, we need criteria that do not presuppose either framework's conclusions. The following five are drawn from the project's own methodology (*Integration by Constraints*) and from epistemic principles both frameworks accept:

Epistemic direction. Does the framework begin with what is known more directly and proceed to what is known less directly? Or does it invert this order?

Explanatory honesty about brute facts. Every framework must stop somewhere. The question is not whether brute facts exist but whether the framework's placement of them is coherent — whether the primitive it accepts is genuinely primitive, or whether it smuggles in structure that requires further explanation.

Handling of the hard problem. The hard problem of consciousness — why there is something it is like to be a conscious being, given any amount of physical description — is the central unresolved question in philosophy of mind. How each framework handles this problem is diagnostic of its foundational coherence.

Parsimony of ontological categories. How many fundamental kinds of thing does the framework require? Not merely how many entities, but how many *types* of entity — and whether the relationships between those types are well-defined.

Self-referential coherence. Does the framework's account of knowledge undermine its own epistemic standing? Can the framework explain how it comes to know what it claims to know?

A committed physicalist could accept each of these criteria. They are standard in philosophy of mind and epistemology. Epistemic direction is a concern since Descartes; brute-fact analysis is standard metaphysical methodology; the hard problem is named by physicalist-sympathetic philosophers (Chalmers himself does not endorse idealism); parsimony is a shared desideratum; self-referential coherence is a basic logical requirement. The criteria do not encode idealist assumptions. If the assessment favors idealism, the disagreement lies in how the criteria evaluate — not in which criteria were selected.

A note on differential weight. These criteria are not weighted in advance by stipulation, but the assessment that follows reveals that they do not contribute equally. The hard problem and parsimony criteria carry the most force because they involve *category-crossing transitions* — cases where a framework must generate a new ontological kind from primitives that exclude it. A category-crossing transition introduces an explanatory kind without mechanism or structural continuity between the source and the product. Intra-category costs — explaining the specific structure or configuration of an already-accepted primitive — are genuine but structurally different: they ask why X has *this form* rather than asking how X arises from not-X. The first multiplies ontological kinds; the second multiplies structural articulation within a single kind. This difference is not aesthetic. It is epistemically weight-bearing because category-crossing gaps have no known direction of approach (no one can specify what a successful bridge would look like), while intra-category gaps admit of progressive elaboration. The assessment reflects this asymmetry, and the reader should evaluate whether it is justified.

III. Epistemic Direction

Every act of knowing begins in consciousness. Perception, measurement, mathematical reasoning, scientific inference, philosophical argument — all occur within experience. The existence

of experience is known directly, non-inferentially, and with a certainty that no external observation matches. That the physical world exists is known only *through* experience — through perception, instrument readings, and inferential chains that begin and end in conscious states.

This is not an idealist premise. It is an epistemological observation that physicalists and idealists both accept. The disagreement is about what to *do* with it.

Physicalism's move: Despite the epistemic primacy of consciousness, physicalism treats the physical as ontologically fundamental and consciousness as derivative — something that emerges from, or is identical to, physical processes. This is an inversion: the thing known most directly is treated as ontologically secondary to the thing known only through it.

The inversion is not incoherent — indirect knowledge can reveal truths about what underlies direct knowledge. But it carries an epistemic cost. It requires that consciousness, the medium through which all evidence arrives, be *explained by* entities that are themselves known only through that medium. The explanandum grounds the explanans epistemically while the explanans is supposed to ground the explanandum ontologically. This circularity does not refute physicalism, but it identifies a structural tension at its foundation.

Idealism's move: Analytic idealism aligns epistemic and ontological direction. What is known most directly — experience — is treated as ontologically fundamental. What is known inferentially — the mathematical structure that physics describes — is treated as the extrinsic appearance of mental processes. There is no inversion. Epistemic access and ontological priority run in the same direction.

This alignment does not prove idealism true. Epistemic access is not an infallible guide to ontological structure. But it eliminates a structural tension that physicalism must carry as a standing cost.

Assessment on this criterion: Idealism aligns epistemic and ontological direction. Physicalism inverts them. The inversion is not fatal but constitutes an unjustified cost — unjustified because no independent argument establishes that ontological priority must run *against* epistemic access, and the historical case for that inversion rests on the method-ontology conflation *Myth of Metaphysical Neutrality* has already diagnosed.

IV. Brute Facts and Their Placement

Where Explanation Stops established that both frameworks have brute facts — primitives accepted without further grounding. The question is not whether they have them but whether their placements are coherent.

Physicalism's brute fact: The existence of organization-enabling laws and structures — a reality whose fundamental character already has the capacity to generate complex, self-organizing systems, including conscious beings. This is the "organization-fertile ontology" that emergentism presupposes.

Idealism's brute fact: The existence of mind — experiential, intentional, self-organizing reality — and the fact that it partitions itself into dissociated segments whose specific configuration requires explanation (the granularity problem).

The question is which primitive is more *genuinely* primitive — which one smuggles in less unexplained structure.

Physicalism's placement. Physicalism begins with entities defined as non-experiential — matter, energy, fields, mathematical structures — and must then explain how experiential reality arises from them. This requires an emergence claim: that consciousness appears at some threshold of physical complexity, despite the fact that nothing in the physical description — however complete — entails or predicts experiential character. The emergence claim does not derive consciousness from physical description — it posits that consciousness appears when physical complexity reaches a threshold, without specifying why complexity of any degree should produce experience. The explanatory gap persists within the solution.

Moreover, the "organization-enabling" character of physicalism's primitive is itself unexplained. Why do the laws have this form? Why does reality permit the kind of complexity that generates consciousness (on physicalism's account)? These questions receive the answer: "That's just how things are." The primitive carries substantial hidden structure — lawfulness, mathematical regularity, organization-fertility — that is accepted without explanation.

Idealism's placement. Idealism begins with experiential reality and must explain the specific structure of dissociation — why *these* partitions, with *these* boundaries. This is a genuine explanatory burden — *Where Explanation Stops* is right that it is relocated, not eliminated. Note, however, that *regularity itself* — the existence of stable, lawlike structure — is equally brute under both frameworks. Physicalism cannot explain why its laws have the form they do any more than idealism can explain why mentation has the structure it does. Charging idealism with regularity while giving physicalism a pass is asymmetric skepticism at the level of explanatory demands (as *Return to Consciousness* argues in detail).

However, the primitive — mind — already has properties that the physical world exhibits: goal-directedness, self-organization, error-sensitivity, integration. These are native to mentality, not anomalous features requiring special explanation. The physical world's character is *less surprising* given a mental primitive than consciousness is given a non-mental primitive. This asymmetry does not prove idealism correct, but it identifies a differential in unexplained structure: physicalism's primitive must generate something categorically unlike itself (experience from non-experience), while idealism's primitive must generate something structurally continuous with itself (stable regularity from inherently organized mentality).

Assessment on this criterion: Idealism's brute fact carries less unexplained structure. Both frameworks stop somewhere, but physicalism's stopping point contains more that demands further explanation — specifically, the appearance of experiential character from non-experiential primitives, and the organization-fertility of a universe defined as non-mental. Idealism's stopping point — the specific character of mentation — is a genuine cost, but it is a cost of a different order: explaining why mind has *this* structure rather than some other, not explaining how mind appears at all from something categorically non-mental.

V. The Hard Problem

The hard problem of consciousness asks: why is there something it is like to be a conscious being? Why does physical processing — however complex, however functionally integrated — give rise to subjective experience?

This is not a gap in current knowledge that future neuroscience will close. It is a structural feature of the explanatory landscape. A distinction is needed here between two readings of "gap":

- **Conceptual isolation:** Two descriptions are cognitively independent — knowing one does not let you derive the other. Water and H_2O are conceptually isolated before their identity is discovered, but the isolation is resolved by structural analysis.
- **Ontological discontinuity:** There is no structural entailment between the explanans and the explanandum — not because we lack the right concepts, but because the descriptions characterize different *types* of property. One characterizes relational structure (functional roles, causal relations, mathematical form); the other characterizes qualitative character (what it is like).

The hard problem is a type-level gap, not merely a conceptual one. Physical descriptions characterize functional roles, causal relations, and mathematical structures. They do not — and cannot, by their own logic — characterize what it *is like* to be the system that instantiates those roles. No amount of additional physical description bridges this gap, because no elaboration of relational structure logically entails qualitative character. The gap is between types of property, not between levels of detail.

Physicalism's handling. Physicalism has four options:

1. *Strong emergence:* Consciousness arises from physical complexity through lawlike but not derivable principles. This is coherent but names the problem rather than solving it. It accepts that consciousness cannot be predicted from physical description and adds emergence as a brute law.

2. *Identity theory:* Consciousness just *is* certain physical processes. This closes the gap by asserting identity rather than deriving it — but asserting that a physical process *is* an experience does not explain why it has experiential character. The original question is restated in different terms, not answered.

3. *Illusionism:* There is no hard problem because consciousness is not what it seems. But this faces a dilemma: if the *seeming* itself is real (there is something it is like to be deceived about consciousness), the hard problem returns at one remove. If the seeming is not real, the theory is self-undermining — it cannot be entertained without the very phenomenon it denies.

4. *Deference:* The hard problem will eventually be solved by future science. This is a promissory note, not an assessment. It may be correct, but it cannot be presented as a current first-principles advantage.

Each option carries costs. None dissolves the hard problem; each either renames it, defers it, or denies its coherence.

Idealism's handling. Under analytic idealism, the hard problem does not arise. If consciousness is fundamental, the question "how does experience emerge from non-experience?" is malformed — non-experience is not posited as fundamental. There is no gap to bridge because the primitive already has experiential character.

This is not a trick. It is the consequence of placing the brute fact differently. Instead of asking "how does mind arise from matter?", idealism asks "how does the appearance of matter arise from mind?" — a different question, with different challenges, but one that avoids the categorical chasm that defines the hard problem.

Idealism pays its own costs: it must explain the specific structure of dissociation — why consciousness partitions into *these* configurations rather than others, and how those partitions map

onto the neural correlates neuroscience has cataloged. But this explanatory burden is *within* the same ontological category (mind explaining mind's structure) rather than *across* categories (non-mind explaining mind's existence). The existence of lawlike regularity itself is not an idealism-specific cost — it is equally brute under physicalism.

Assessment on this criterion: Idealism dissolves the hard problem by placing its brute fact where the problem cannot arise. Physicalism must either accept the problem as a standing cost or adopt strategies (emergence, identity, illusionism, deference) that rename or defer it. This is not a minor advantage. The hard problem is the central unresolved issue in philosophy of mind, and dissolving it — genuinely, not verbally — is a significant first-principles achievement.

VI. Parsimony

Parsimony in ontological assessment does not mean simply "fewer entities." It means fewer *unexplained transitions between ontological categories*.

Physicalism requires one ontological category (the physical) plus an unexplained transition: the emergence of experiential reality from non-experiential primitives. This transition is not an additional entity — it is an additional *kind of relationship* between the primitive and what it generates. The transition itself has no mechanism. It is the hard problem expressed as a structural feature of physicalism's ontology.

Idealism requires one ontological category (the mental) and no category-crossing transition. What physics describes is the extrinsic appearance of mental processes — the same ontological kind, viewed from a different perspective. But idealism's parsimony advantage is not free. Treating the physical as the extrinsic appearance of the mental generates substantial explanatory debts that must be priced honestly:

- **The granularity problem.** Under analytic idealism, individual minds are not metaphysically separate — they are dissociated segments of a single universal consciousness. Intersubjective agreement is therefore the *default condition*, not a puzzle requiring external synchronization: coordination is not "enforced across" independent minds but is the natural state of aspects of one reality that were never ontologically separated. The remaining task is articulating why dissociation produces *this* specific configuration of bounded perspectives — why *these* partitions, with *these* boundaries. The dissociation model (Kastrup, 2019) provides structural resources, but this articulation remains underdeveloped.
- **Regularity (shared cost, not idealism-specific).** The physical world exhibits precise, mathematically describable regularities. This is sometimes presented as an idealism-specific debt, but it is equally brute under physicalism — neither framework explains why reality exhibits lawlike structure rather than chaos. Physicalism cannot explain why its laws have their specific form any more than idealism can explain why mentation has its specific structure. The intuition that regularity is "natural for matter" presupposes the physicalist ontology under examination. What *is* idealism-specific is the need to articulate how mental processes present with *this particular* mathematical form — a question about the details of dissociative structure, not about regularity itself.
- **Mind-to-physics mapping.** Neuroscience has accumulated detailed correlations between brain states and experiential states. These correlations are ontologically neutral — both frameworks accept them and reinterpret them within their own frame (production vs. constraint). Physicalism's "predictions" here are largely empirical descriptions

organized within its interpretive vocabulary, not derivations from the axiom that matter is fundamental. Nevertheless, physicalism has a more developed interpretive framework for these mappings than idealism currently does. The constraint model must eventually articulate its interpretation with comparable specificity. It has not yet done so.

These are real costs — explanation within a single ontological category, but explanation that idealism owes and has not fully delivered. The assessment does not minimize them.

The comparison. Physicalism's central cost is a category-crossing transition: the emergence of experience from non-experience. Idealism's costs are intra-category: explaining the specific dissociative structure of experience — why *these* partitions, with *these* boundaries — and developing the mind-to-physics mapping with comparable specificity to physicalism's neuroscientific framework. Regularity itself is a shared cost, not chargeable to either side alone. Both sets of genuine costs are real. The question is which is more tractable.

This distinction requires argument, not assertion, because a serious objection holds that idealism's granularity burden is as foundational as physicalism's emergence burden — that "why bounded subjects within a lawlike order?" is constitutive of the explanandum, not a mid-level elaboration. The objection has force. But the two problems differ in logical type. Physicalism's hard problem asks how a *new ontological kind* — experience — appears from primitives that lack it entirely. There is no mechanism, no known bridge principle, and no structural continuity between the explanans and the explanandum. Idealism's granularity problem asks how an *accepted primitive* — experience — differentiates into the specific configuration we observe: bounded perspectives within a shared order. This is a question about the *structure* of something whose existence is already granted, not about the *appearance* of something from a category that excludes it. (Note that intersubjective agreement per se is not the problem — under a single mind-at-large, agreement is the default condition, since there is only one thing. What needs explaining is the *specific dissociative structure* that produces the appearance of separation while maintaining consistency.) The distinction is between "how does X arise from not-X?" (category-crossing) and "why does X have this particular form?" (structural elaboration). Both are hard. But the first has no known direction of approach — no one can specify what a successful answer would even look like — while the second is the kind of problem that admits of progressive articulation. Kastrup's dissociation model, whatever its current limitations, is an attempt at such articulation. Physicalism has no analogous attempt at bridging the category gap — only strategies for managing or renaming it.

Common objection. "Physicalism is more parsimonious because it doesn't posit mind as fundamental." This assumes that physical entities are simpler than mental ones. But this assumption is not self-evident. Physical entities, as described by fundamental physics, are abstract mathematical structures — wavefunctions, field operators, symmetry groups. Their "concreteness" is a phenomenological addition supplied by perception, which is itself a conscious process. The apparent simplicity of matter is an artifact of familiarity, not an independent measure of ontological cost.

Assessment on this criterion: Both frameworks posit a single ontological category. Physicalism requires an unexplained category-crossing transition (from non-experiential to experiential). Idealism avoids this transition but carries genuine intra-category debts — the granularity problem (why *these* dissociative partitions?) and mind-to-physics mapping — that remain underdeveloped. Regularity is a shared cost, equally brute under both frameworks, and does not count against either side alone. On balance, idealism is more parsimonious: its debts are within a cat-

egory, physicalism's central debt is across one. But the balance is closer than the raw structural advantage suggests, and idealism's debts could prove more costly than they currently appear.

VII. Self-Referential Coherence

This criterion contributes less to the verdict than the preceding three. It is included as secondary reinforcement, not as a co-equal pillar. The assessment's core weight rests on the hard problem, category-crossing parsimony, and epistemic direction.

A framework's account of reality must be able to explain how the framework itself comes to be known. If the account of knowledge undermines the reliability of the very cognition that produced it, the framework is self-undermining.

Physicalism's challenge. If consciousness is a byproduct of physical processes optimized for survival, the reliability of the cognitive processes that produced physicalism itself is in question. Evolutionary pressures select for fitness, not for metaphysical accuracy. Physicalists respond — correctly — that truth-tracking is instrumentally useful for survival and that evolutionary pressures therefore approximate it. This response has real force: it establishes a plausible connection between fitness and truth. But it establishes a *correlation*, not an identity. It leaves open the possibility that metaphysical beliefs — including physicalism itself — are fitness-serving rather than truth-tracking. The concern is not decisive, but it is structural.

Idealism's position. If consciousness is fundamental, cognition is a feature of reality's basic nature rather than a biological accident. The knower and the known share a common nature. This does not guarantee that any particular cognition is reliable — error and distortion remain possible. But it removes the structural worry that cognition is entirely untethered from truth: under physicalism, the connection is contingent; under idealism, it is constitutive.

Assessment on this criterion: Idealism holds a modest advantage. Physicalism faces a standing question about whether cognition tracks truth or merely fitness — a question it can address but not fully close at the first-principles level. This is a secondary consideration that reinforces the verdict without driving it.

VIII. The Strongest Physicalist Responses

The preceding sections find idealism advantaged on each criterion. A fair assessment must engage the strongest physicalist responses at the hinge points — not to survey the literature, but to test whether the assessment survives the best available objections.

The Phenomenal Concept Strategy

The most sophisticated response to the hard problem argument (Section V) does not deny the explanatory gap but reinterprets it. The phenomenal concept strategy (Loar, 1997; Papineau, 2002) argues that our concepts of experience are *cognitively isolated* from our physical concepts — not because experience is ontologically distinct from the physical, but because we access it through a different conceptual mode. The gap between "brain state X" and "the experience of red" is real at the conceptual level but does not indicate an ontological gap. We lack the cognitive architecture to see the identity directly, but the identity holds.

This is the strongest move available to physicalism on the hard problem. It concedes the explanatory gap while denying its ontological significance. The strategy should be evaluated for

what it is: a defeater of one specific inference (from explanatory gap to ontological dualism), not a positive explanation of consciousness. On those terms, it succeeds — it blocks the move from "we can't derive experience from physics" to "therefore experience is non-physical." But blocking an inference is not the same as providing an explanation. The original question — why any physical process is accompanied by experience at all — remains unanswered. PCS neutralizes a defeat for physicalism but does not deliver a win. It leaves physicalism where it was: without a positive account of why there is something it is like to be in brain state X. The assessment holds not because PCS fails at what it attempts, but because what it attempts is insufficient for first-principles comparison — a framework needs more than a successful defense against one argument; it needs a coherent account of its central phenomenon.

A Posteriori Identity

A related but distinct response (Papineau, 2002) argues that the lack of a priori entailment from physical to phenomenal description does not imply non-identity. Water is H_2O even though "water" and "H_2O" are conceptually independent. Similarly, consciousness might *be* a physical process even though physical descriptions don't logically entail experiential descriptions. The identity is discovered empirically, not derived a priori.

This is a serious argument. It is correct that a posteriori identities exist and that conceptual independence does not entail ontological distinctness. The essay's assessment holds against it because the consciousness case is disanalogous in a specific way: in the water/H_2O case, both descriptions — the phenomenological (clear, liquid, drinkable) and the chemical (H_2O) — are descriptions of *how the substance appears and behaves*. They are different levels of the same descriptive type. In the consciousness case, the physical description (neural firing patterns, functional organization) and the phenomenal description (what it is like to see red) are descriptions of *different kinds* — one characterizes structure and function, the other characterizes qualitative character. The water/H_2O case involves two descriptions of how a substance *appears and behaves* at different levels. The consciousness case involves a description of how a system is *organized* and a description of what it is *like* to be that system — a gap between the relational and the qualitative that does not appear in the water analogy. Functionalists will respond that qualitative character *just is* functional/representational organization under the right constraints, and that the felt disanalogy reflects our cognitive limitations rather than an ontological difference. This is a coherent position, but it requires that the identity be accepted as a primitive — it cannot be demonstrated, because no amount of functional description entails qualitative character. The analogy with water, where the identity *can* be demonstrated through structural analysis, therefore does not do the work the argument requires.

Russellian Monism

The most promising physicalist-adjacent response avoids the hard problem entirely by reconceiving what "physical" means. Russellian monism (Stoljar, 2001; Chalmers, 2015) observes that physics describes the world's *relational structure* — causal roles, mathematical relations — but says nothing about the *intrinsic nature* of what occupies those roles. The intrinsic nature might be experiential or proto-experiential. On this view, consciousness is not emergent from something non-experiential; it is the intrinsic character of what physics describes extrinsically.

This is the response that most directly threatens the assessment, because it dissolves the category-crossing problem that drives the parsimony argument (Section VI) and the hard problem argu-

ment (Section V). If the physical *is* experiential at its intrinsic level, there is no non-experiential-to-experiential transition to explain.

The assessment survives for two reasons. First, if Russellian monism is correct, then "physicalism" in its standard form — the view that reality is fundamentally non-experiential — is false. What succeeds is a view in which experience is fundamental, which is structurally closer to idealism than to the physicalism the essay compares. The label is preserved but the content shifts. Second, Russellian monism in its panpsychist variants faces the combination problem — how micro-experiential properties combine into unified macro-experience — which is structurally analogous to the hard problem it was designed to dissolve. The problem is not eliminated but redistributed.

If Russellian monism were developed into a fully articulated account that solved the combination problem, the terms of the comparison in this essay would change — not because physicalism as usually understood would be vindicated, but because a third framework, closer to idealism in its commitments, would have entered the field. This is acknowledged, not resisted.

IX. What Would Change the Assessment

A verdict that cannot be revised is a dogma. This one can be revised — but honesty requires stating what revision would actually require.

The assessment would change if physicalism's foundational costs — the hard problem, the brute emergence of consciousness, the inversion of epistemic direction — were dissolved rather than deferred. This could take the form of a successful reduction of experience to functional description, a demonstration that empirical predictions genuinely depend on physicalist ontology rather than on method alone, or a principled account of why what is known most directly is ontologically least fundamental. The assessment would also change if idealism's handling of intersubjectivity proved incoherent — if the dissociation model or its successors could not account for the stable, lawlike character of the physical world. This is where idealism's explanatory debt is most visible, and where the verdict is most exposed.

The gatekeeper essays give reason to doubt that the first set of conditions can be met within physicalism's current explanatory grammar. The essay's own argument is that the gap between functional description and experience is type-level, not detail-level, and that the portability of scientific method means empirical success does not depend on physicalist ontology. If those arguments are correct, reversal would require not further mechanistic articulation but a reconceptualization of where explanation stops — which would itself alter the terms of the comparison. The intersubjectivity condition, by contrast, remains genuinely open.

X. Scope and Standing

This assessment operates at the level of first principles — foundational coherence, not theory maturity or institutional track record. Its scope is deliberately narrow, and that narrowness is a feature, not a hedge.

First-principles advantage does not settle every question. A framework can be more coherent at foundations and fail at implementation. But foundational coherence is not trivial — it determines which explanatory directions are structurally open and which require unexplained transitions before they begin.

The assessment was conducted without appeal to contested empirical phenomena. If the anomalous findings documented in *Anomalous Phenomena and Consciousness* replicate, they provide independent support. If they fail, the verdict here is unaffected — it rests on structural analysis, not on empirical outliers.

Idealism's genuine gaps — underdeveloped neural mapping theory, incomplete mid-level explanatory bridges, limited predictive specificity — are acknowledged throughout and analyzed in *The Generativity Question*. These are real costs. But they are costs of *development*, not costs of *foundation*. Physicalism's central cost — the emergence of experience from non-experience — is foundational. The distinction matters: developmental gaps can in principle be closed by further work within a framework; foundational gaps require the framework to do something it has no known mechanism for.

The conditions under which this assessment would reverse are specified in Section IX. It is designed to be revised — but revision requires addressing the structural features the comparison identifies, not merely restating confidence in the alternative.

XI. The Verdict

Given the irreducibility of qualitative character under current explanatory grammar — given that no amount of structural or functional description logically entails experiential character — analytic idealism currently commits fewer unjustified epistemic inversions than physicalism at the level of first principles.

Criterion	Physicalism	Idealism	Differential
Epistemic direction	Inverts epistemic and ontological priority	Aligns them	Moderate
Brute facts	Organization-fertile ontology, unexplained	Mental primitive, unexplained	Moderate
Hard problem	Persistent type-level gap	Dissolved by placement of primitive	Major
Parsimony	Category-crossing transition required	Intra-category costs only	Major
Self-referential coherence	Contingent truth-tracking	Constitutive cognition	Minor

The verdict is conditional on the type-level reading of the hard problem. If the gap between physical description and qualitative character is merely conceptual — if a successful phenomenal concept strategy or a posteriori identity could close it — the central weight of this assessment would shift. Section IX specifies in full what would change the finding.

The scope is foundational coherence, not theory maturity, institutional output, or empirical track record. Idealism's starting commitments are currently more defensible — its foundation carries fewer unresolved structural tensions.

The project has argued throughout that intellectual integrity requires stating where the current balance of reasons points — not only what we do not know. To do the diagnostic work and then decline to state the finding would be evasion, not caution.

Conclusion

The question this essay addresses is the one the project has circled without landing: *at the level of foundations, which framework is currently more defensible?*

The gatekeepers established that the comparison cannot proceed under distorted standards. Physicalism's neutrality is illusory. Its restraint against alternatives is asymmetric. Its generativity standard encodes production-level assumptions. Its historical dominance is contingent. The real disagreement is about primitives, not mechanisms.

Once these distortions are corrected, the comparison can be conducted on appropriate terrain. On that terrain — epistemic direction, brute-fact coherence, the hard problem, parsimony of transitions, and self-referential coherence — analytic idealism carries fewer unresolved costs.

At the level where foundational choices are made, the balance favors a framework that begins with consciousness rather than one that must explain its appearance from something categorically unlike it. The refusal to engage idealism seriously — a refusal diagnosed by every gatekeeper essay in this project — is not justified at the level of foundations.

The reader who accepts this verdict and the reader who rejects it now share something they did not share before: clarity about what is actually at stake, and agreement about the terms on which the question can be productively disputed.

The verdict is the contribution the diagnostic sequence demanded. It is revisable — but issuing it is not optional. A project that corrects every distortion in the comparison and then declines to compare has not been cautious; it has been evasive. What is not revisable is the demand that the comparison be conducted under symmetric standards, on appropriate terrain. That demand is not a feature of idealism or physicalism. It is a feature of intellectual integrity.

References

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

Chalmers, D. J. (2015). Panpsychism and panprotopsychism. In T. Alter & Y. Nagasawa (Eds.), *Consciousness in the Physical World: Perspectives on Russellian Monism* (pp. 246–276). Oxford University Press.

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

Loar, B. (1997). Phenomenal states (second version). In N. Block, O. Flanagan, & G. Güzeldere (Eds.), *The Nature of Consciousness: Philosophical Debates* (pp. 597–616). MIT Press.

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

Papineau, D. (2002). *Thinking about Consciousness*. Oxford University Press.

Plantinga, A. (1993). *Warrant and Proper Function*. Oxford University Press.

Stoljar, D. (2001). Two conceptions of the physical. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 62(2), 253–281.

Related Essays in This Project

Available at: https://returntoconsciousness.org/

Integration by Constraints (ibc) — The epistemic methodology this essay presupposes

Myth of Metaphysical Neutrality (mmn) — Exposes the illusion of physicalism's neutrality

The Emergence of Physicalism (eop) — Genealogy of physicalism's contingent dominance

Asymmetric Methodological Restraint (amr) — Diagnoses the asymmetric application of restraint

Where Explanation Stops (wes) — Maps where each framework places its brute facts

The Generativity Question (tgq) — Corrects the miscalibrated standard of explanatory productivity

Return to Consciousness (rtc) — The foundational synthesis this essay precedes

License