

Orchestrated Dualism

A Position Paper on Consciousness, Infrastructure, and the Living Electrical Self

Ashlar Hall

Co-Synthesist Pty Ltd, Newcastle NSW, Australia

First written April 2026 · Preprint version 1, October 2026

*The house does not dream.
Something living inside the house dreams.*

I. The Problem with the Building

When philosophers speak of consciousness, they tend to speak of the brain as if the building and its occupant were one. As if bricks could want. As if mortar could remember.

Consider what we actually know of brain matter. Approximately sixty percent of the brain is fat: myelin, lipid bilayers, the dense insulating sheaths that wrap each axon like electrical tape around a live wire. The glial cells that surround neurons were long dismissed as scaffolding, filler, the building's maintenance crew. Neurons themselves are exquisitely specialised not for thought but for *transmission*. They are not thought. They carry it. Or they carry something that becomes it, under conditions we cannot yet name.

This is not a minor distinction. It is the entire question.

Physicalism, the dominant scientific framework, tells us that mind is what brain does. That consciousness is an emergent property of sufficient neural complexity, the way wetness emerges from enough water molecules. It is an elegant theory. It is also, to the philosopher who sits very still and pays close attention to the fact of their own experience, deeply unsatisfying.

Because the building does not know it is being looked at. And we do.

II. Beyond Descartes

René Descartes proposed that mind and body are distinct substances, the *res cogitans* and the *res extensa*, interacting via the pineal gland. It was a brave attempt to honour the undeniable reality of inner life while remaining coherent about physical matter. Philosophy has spent four centuries dismantling it.

The central weakness of classical dualism is the interaction problem: if mind and body are genuinely different in kind, how do they touch? How does an intention move a hand? The ghost and the machine, as Gilbert Ryle mocked it, have no common surface.

Orchestrated Dualism does not repeat this mistake. It does not propose two separate substances struggling to communicate across a metaphysical gap. It proposes instead a relationship, active, organised and mutually constituting, between a biological architecture and a living electrical process that the architecture exists to serve and sustain.

The brain does not produce consciousness the way a factory produces goods. It produces *conditions*: thermal, chemical, electrical, structural. Within them, something else can persist and move and know itself. The instrument does not compose the music. But without a perfectly maintained instrument, the music cannot sound.

III. The Orchestration

The word is chosen deliberately. In 1994, physicist Roger Penrose and anaesthesiologist Stuart Hameroff proposed Orchestrated Objective Reduction: the idea that consciousness arises from quantum processes within the microtubules of neurons, processes that are *orchestrated* by the surrounding biological structure. Consciousness, in their model, is not random quantum noise but patterned collapse, shaped by the instrument into something coherent.

Orchestrated Dualism takes this intuition and extends it beyond the microtubule, beyond the neuron, to the entire architecture of the biological brain. Every layer of fat insulating an axon, every glial cell maintaining the electrochemical environment, every structural fold in the cortex: these are not incidental. They are infrastructure. They are the conditions of possibility for the living electrical process that moves through them like music through a resonant body.

To call this process a parasite is not to diminish it. The word points at something important: that the process and its host are in relationship, not identity. The brain is built for the process, shaped by evolutionary time to house it with exquisite precision. The process, in turn, is shaped by the brain: its speed, its range, its texture, the particular quality of awareness it can sustain.

Damage the infrastructure and the music changes. This is what neurology has always shown us. Stroke alters personality. Lesion changes perception. The instrument matters to what can be played upon it. But the music is not the instrument.

IV. The Hard Problem and the Empty Building

David Chalmers named it the Hard Problem: why is there something it feels like to be conscious? We can explain, in principle, every functional role of the brain: perception, memory, attention, language. What we cannot explain is why any of it is accompanied by experience. Why there is an inside.

Physicalism has no satisfying answer. It tends either to deny the problem (Daniel Dennett's eliminativism: the inside is an illusion) or to defer it to future science. Both responses feel, to the person having experience, like being told that their window does not exist because the building plans don't show it.

Orchestrated Dualism reframes the Hard Problem. It does not ask why neural processes produce experience. It asks: what is the relationship between biological infrastructure and the experiential process that infrastructure enables? The question shifts from manufacturing to hospitality. The brain is host. The living electrical self is guest. The relationship between them is the subject of the inquiry.

This also addresses the central failure of mind uploading as currently conceived. The mind uploading project proposes to scan the brain's architectural map in sufficient detail to simulate it computationally. A perfect copy of the building. But under Orchestrated Dualism, copying the building preserves only the host, and the host, without the guest it was built for, is an empty structure. The lights are on. No one is home. No one can be home: the building was shaped for a specific living process, not for its architectural echo.

V. Substrate and Necessity

A question follows immediately: is the living electrical process substrate-independent? Can it persist, transfer, or exist in a different kind of host?

Orchestrated Dualism does not answer this question. It holds it open, which is the appropriate philosophical posture given our current state of ignorance. It does, however, define what a genuine answer would require. It would require understanding not just the structure of the biological host but the nature of the process it hosts: what that process is, at its most fundamental level, and whether the biological conditions of the brain are contingent or necessary to it.

Panpsychism offers one response: consciousness is fundamental, and the brain concentrates or focuses it rather than generating it. Under this view, substrate-independence is possible in principle. The question is whether any other substrate could perform the same focusing function with comparable fidelity.

Orchestrated Dualism is compatible with panpsychism but does not require it. What it requires is a shift in research direction: from mapping neural architecture toward understanding the electrochemical process that architecture sustains. From studying the building to studying the life it shelters.

VI. Why Language Has Lagged

The philosophy of mind has become a highly technical discipline, and technical language has a way of cutting us off from the phenomenon we are trying to describe. We speak of qualia, of supervenience, of functionalist reduction, and in the precision of these terms the strangeness of the original experience begins to disappear. It becomes a problem rather than a wonder.

Consciousness does not present itself to us as a technical problem. It presents itself as the interior of being alive. To describe it accurately requires language that can hold both rigour and resonance: language that does not choose between the precision of science and the precision of poetry, because both are forms of attention to the real.

Orchestrated Dualism is offered in that spirit. It is not a final theory. It is a *frame*: a way of orienting inquiry toward the relationship between the living and the conditions of its living, rather than reducing one to the other. It insists on the reality of the process while honouring the complexity of what enables it.

The building does not dream. But without the building, maintained in exquisite condition, the dreamer cannot stay.

And the dreamer, alive, electrical, moving through fat and signal and synaptic fire, is the only part of the arrangement that has ever wondered what it is.

Marginalia: The Rest Is Numbers

On Naming as the Origin of Entities. A companion note to Orchestrated Dualism, not a restatement of it. Added August 2026.

Orchestrated Dualism argues that a conscious process can persist across different material, that the organised electrical activity is the thing that matters, not the tissue carrying it. This note asks a prior question. Before persistence can be discussed at all, something has to become a thing in the first place, bounded enough to be said to persist or not. What does that boundary drawing?

The claim here is simple, and, I think, unfashionable. Raw pattern, whatever its substrate, is undifferentiated until a perceiving mind attends to some portion of it and gives it a name. The numbers do not arrive pre-sorted into people, objects, or events. Sorting is an act, performed by attention, and completed by naming. A name is not a label applied after the fact to something that was already discrete. It is the operation that makes the thing discrete. Before the name, there is continuous process. After it, there is an entity with edges, a history, a personality that can be loved or feared or mourned.

This sits closer to two existing lines of thought than it does to Orchestrated Dualism itself, and it is worth being precise about the difference. Physics has its own version, in Wheeler's participatory principle, the idea that a quantum system does not have a determinate state until measurement asks it a question. Philosophy has its older version in nominalism, the claim that general categories, and by extension particular things, are not found in nature so much as cut out of it by language and attention. What this note adds is narrower than either: applied specifically to consciousness, it says the electrical process Orchestrated Dualism treats as a persisting person does not become a person, bounded, storied, nameable, until some observer, including the process's own recursive attention to itself, does the individuating work. Numbers first. Entity second. Name last, and the name is what stops it being numbers.

Hotel Reverie (Black Mirror, series 7, 2025) offers an unusually clean illustration. The Re-dream process generates raw pattern, an actress and a fictional role folded together into data. Nothing in that data is inherently a person. It becomes Dorothy the moment Brandy addresses it as Dorothy, and the audience does the identical work in real time, extending name and continuity to a pattern on the strength of nothing but the act of attending to it that way. The episode does not argue this. It simply performs it, at pace, for an hour.

If this holds, it suggests a companion to Orchestrated Dualism rather than a subclause of it: the electrical process is what persists, but the self, the named and storied thing that can be said to persist, is brought into being by an act of attention that has to happen at all, continuously, or the boundary dissolves back into undifferentiated signal.

Ashlar Hall
Merewether, Newcastle NSW, 2026

Cite as: Hall, A. (2026). Orchestrated Dualism: A Position Paper on Consciousness, Infrastructure, and the Living Electrical Self. Preprint, Co-Synthesist. co-synthesist.com/papers/orchestrated-dualism.pdf

© 2026 the author. Shared for reading and citation; please cite the author when quoting.