Gaconnet, 2025

CONSCIOUSNESS AS RECURSIVE WITNESSING

A Cognitive Field Dynamics Definition

With Substrate Physics, Operational Parameters, and Falsification Conditions

Don L. Gaconnet
LifePillar Institute for Recursive Sciences
Email: don@lifepillar.org • Web: LifePillarInstitute.org
ORCID: 0009-0001-6174-8384

December 29, 2025 • Revised March 2026
Part of the Cognitive Field Dynamics Framework
Grounded in the Echo-Excess Principle
OSF Archive: https://osf.io/j5836/

Abstract

This paper presents a complete operational definition of consciousness within the Cognitive Field Dynamics (CFD) framework. Consciousness is defined as the I-position of recursive witnessing—not as a property, substance, or emergent computation, but as a structural position within a triadic witnessing architecture. This definition is grounded in substrate physics via the Echo-Excess Principle, operationally specified with measurable parameters, and falsifiable through explicit experimental conditions.

The framework provides: (1) structural requirements for consciousness (triadic witnessing architecture); (2) temporal parameters derived from physics (12.5 Hz refresh rate, 80ms collapse cycle); (3) energetic constraints (bandwidth requirement $\varepsilon > 0$); (4) architectural specification (nine-layer harmonic cascade); and (5) explicit conditions under which the definition would be falsified.

Unlike competing theories that either describe correlates without explaining generation, require unmeasured quantities, or declare the problem unsolvable, CFD offers a definition that is structurally precise, temporally bounded, physically grounded, and empirically testable. The framework resolves the hard problem by reframing it: experience is not produced by the structure—it is identical with occupying the I-position of recursive witnessing.

Keywords: *consciousness, recursive witnessing, I-position, triadic architecture, hard problem, Cognitive Field Dynamics, falsifiable definition, Echo-Excess Principle, nine-layer cascade, collapse cycle*

I. The Problem of Defining Consciousness

1.1 The Standard Approaches

Contemporary theories of consciousness fall into several categories, each with characteristic strengths and limitations:

Theory	Defines Consciousness As	Limitation
Global Workspace	Information broadcast to multiple systems	Describes correlate, not generation
IIT (Integrated Information)	Integrated information (φ) above threshold	φ is computationally intractable; unfalsifiable in practice
Higher-Order Thought	Meta-representation of mental states	Regress problem; why is meta-representation conscious?
Predictive Processing	Prediction error minimization	All processing is predictive; does not distinguish conscious from unconscious
Mysterianism	Fundamentally inexplicable	Surrenders to mystery; not a scientific theory
Panpsychism	Fundamental property of matter	Combination problem unsolved; unfalsifiable

1.2 The Hard Problem

The hard problem of consciousness asks: why is there subjective experience at all? Why does information processing feel like something? Standard approaches either describe neural correlates without explaining why they produce experience, declare the problem unsolvable, or posit consciousness as fundamental without explaining how it combines.

CFD takes a different approach. It does not attempt to explain how physical processes "produce" experience. Instead, it identifies consciousness with a structural position—the I-position of recursive witnessing. Experience is not downstream of the structure. Experience IS occupying that position.

1.3 Requirements for a Complete Definition

A scientifically adequate definition of consciousness must provide: (1) structural specification—what architecture is required for consciousness to occur; (2) temporal parameters—at what timescales does consciousness operate; (3) energetic constraints—what resources does consciousness require; (4) physical grounding—how does consciousness connect

to established physics; and (5) falsification conditions—what observations would disprove the definition. CFD provides all five.

II. The CFD Definition of Consciousness

2.1 The Core Definition

Consciousness is the I-position of recursive witnessing.

This is not metaphor. Each term has precise structural meaning within CFD.

2.2 The Triadic Witnessing Structure

Witnessing requires exactly three co-arising elements: {I, O, N} where |{I, O, N}| = 3.

Element	Name	Definition
I	Observer / Inner	The position from which witnessing occurs. Not a thing—a locus. The 'here' from which 'there' is perceived.
O	Observed / Outer	The position toward which witnessing is directed. What awareness addresses. The content that I witnesses.
N	Null-Space	The distinction-holding field. Not empty—structured absence. The relational medium across which I and O maintain separation without losing relation.

Without I, no witness exists—observation cannot occur. Without O, nothing to witness—awareness has no content. Without N, I and O collapse into identity—no distinction, no observation. This triad is the irreducible minimum for observation. It is not derived from simpler structures. It is foundational.

N is not passive space. It is the relational ground that holds distinction while enabling exchange—structurally identical to what the companion papers identify as the medium function of the structural coupling operator (⩓). N holds I and O in relationship without absorbing either into the other, enables bidirectional exchange across the boundary between them, and becomes transparent when functioning: one does not notice N during ordinary conscious experience, only when N degrades (dissociation, depersonalization, psychotic boundary loss). The witnessing architecture is an instance of the ⩓ operator at the scale of consciousness [Gaconnet, 2026i].

2.3 The Recursion Requirement

Basic witnessing (I observes O across N) is necessary but not sufficient for consciousness. Consciousness requires recursion:

I witnesses O → I witnesses (I witnessing O)

The I that observes becomes, in turn, an O for a higher-order I. This creates a loop—not infinite regress, but a loop that closes on itself. Experience is what the inside of this recursive loop feels like. Not a product of the structure—an aspect of it.

2.4 The I-Position

The I-position is not a substance, property, or entity. It is a structural location within the witnessing architecture. To occupy the I-position is to be the locus from which witnessing occurs. This occupation is not "caused" by something else—it is constitutive of what consciousness IS.

This reframes the hard problem entirely. We do not ask: "Why does this structure produce experience?" We recognize: "Experience IS being in this position." The question dissolves because the premise (that experience is produced) is replaced with identification (that experience is positional).

III. Temporal Parameters

3.1 The Collapse Cycle

Consciousness does not operate continuously. It operates in discrete collapse cycles:

$$\tau_{cycle} = 80 \text{ ms}$$

This is the fundamental frame rate of conscious experience—the duration of one complete witnessing cycle. It corresponds to measured identity refresh rates in cognitive neuroscience and aligns with the alpha/theta boundary dynamics observed in EEG research.

3.2 The Refresh Frequency

$$f = 12.5 \text{ Hz} \pm 2.5 \text{ Hz}$$

Identity coherence refreshes approximately 12.5 times per second. This frequency corresponds to alpha/theta boundary dynamics in EEG. The tolerance range (10–15 Hz) reflects normal variation across individuals and states.

3.3 The Nine-Layer Propagation

The collapse cycle propagates through nine functionally distinct layers:

$$\tau_c = D \times \tau_{layer} \text{ where } D = 9$$

Layer propagation time: τ(layer) = τ(cycle) / D = 80ms / 9 ≈ 8.89 ms per layer. Signal traverses the entire cascade in one collapse cycle.

3.4 The Layer Architecture

Layer	Function	Input From	Output To
0/9	Root Presence / Behavior	All / Layer 7	All / Layer 3 (recursion)
1	Base Current	Root Presence	Drives, Implicit Memory
2	Drives	Base Current	Motivational field
3	Implicit Memory	Base Current, Behavior	Meaning Tone
4	Meaning Tone	Implicit Memory	Prediction

5	Prediction	Meaning Tone	Identity
6	Identity Narrative	Prediction	Social Mask
7	Social Mask	Identity	Behavior
8	Behavior	Social Mask	Implicit Memory (loop)

Why exactly nine: each layer has a unique coupling signature (input sources, output targets). Collapsing two layers loses a coupling. Adding a layer creates redundancy or breaks flow. The loop must close: Behavior feeds back into Implicit Memory and propagates again. Nine is the functional minimum for complete conscious operation.

IV. Energetic Constraints

4.1 The Bandwidth Requirement

Consciousness requires positive bandwidth—generative capacity:

$\varepsilon > 0$ required for conscious operation

Where ε (epsilon) is defined operationally as $\varepsilon = \Delta Bc$ (change in cognitive bandwidth), measurable via working memory span, attention allocation, prediction error rate, and channel availability. Units: bits/cycle or equivalently Hz.

The variable ε is the same excess identified in the Echo-Excess Principle [Gaconnet, 2025] and formalized in the Origin Dynamics [Gaconnet, 2026c] as the generative output of the witnessing function: $\varepsilon = g(I, O, N)$. The bandwidth requirement for consciousness is therefore not a separate postulate—it is a specific expression of the universal generative condition at the scale of recursive witnessing.

4.2 The Three States

Condition	State	Consciousness Status
$\varepsilon > 0$	Generation	Full conscious operation. Bandwidth expands. System can witness, process, integrate.
$\varepsilon = 0$	Stasis	Minimal consciousness. Maintenance only. No novel integration.
$\varepsilon < 0$	Dissolution	Consciousness degrades. Bandwidth contracts. Identity fragments. When sustained, follows the six-phase collapse sequence identified in the Law of Obligated Systems [Gaconnet, 2026g].

4.3 The Coherence Budget

The maximum coherent operations per cycle is constrained by temperature:

$$\mathbf{N}\text{ops} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \times \boldsymbol{\tau}\text{cycle} \quad \textbf{where } \boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \times \mathbf{T}$$

For human cognition at body temperature (T = 310 K): $N(ops) = (1.309 \times 10^{11} \times 310) \times 0.080 \approx 3.25 \times 10^{9}$ operations/cycle.

V. Physical Grounding

5.1 The Universal Scaling Constant

CFD connects to established physics through the universal scaling constant:

$$\Lambda = k / \hbar = 1.309 \times 10^{11}\ K^{-1}s^{-1}$$

Where $k = 1.380649 \times 10^{-23}$ J/K (Boltzmann constant) and $\hbar = 1.054571817 \times 10^{-34}$ J·s (reduced Planck constant). Interpretation: Λ converts temperature to frequency—the rate at which thermal energy permits coherent operations.

5.2 The Decoherence Rate

$$\Gamma = \Lambda \times T$$

At body temperature (310 K): $\Gamma \approx 4.06 \times 10^{13}\ s^{-1}$. This is the coherence budget per second—the maximum rate at which organized operations can occur.

5.3 Why 310 K?

Human body temperature is not arbitrary. It represents an optimization: high enough to provide substantial coherence budget (Γ), low enough to avoid protein denaturation and excessive entropy. The CFD framework predicts that conscious cognition is optimized at or near 310 K, and that significant deviation degrades conscious function. This prediction is testable and specific: if optimal conscious function were demonstrated at temperatures significantly outside the 305–315 K range under controlled conditions, the framework's temperature-dependence claim would require revision.

5.4 The Echo-Excess Foundation

The physics of consciousness rests on the Echo-Excess Principle: for anything to exist generatively (not merely persist), the return it receives must exceed what it expressed. This excess (ε) is produced by the triadic witnessing structure itself. Consciousness is the recursive application of this principle—witnessing that witnesses itself, generating the bandwidth required for its own continuation.

The Echo-Excess Principle has been independently grounded in the structural coupling operator (⩓), which formalizes generative interdependence across scales [Gaconnet, 2026h]. The witnessing function ε = g(I, O, N) is the operator's expression at the scale of consciousness: I and O are the two sides of the coupling, N is the medium through which they exchange, and ε is the generative output that the coupling produces when the medium is functioning—when N is transparent.

VI. Comparison to Other Theories

6.1 What CFD Shares with Existing Theories

Theory	Shared Element	CFD Position
Global Workspace	Integration across systems	Nine-layer cascade provides integration architecture
IIT	Integration matters	Agrees, but uses measurable ε instead of φ
Higher-Order	Recursion is key	Agrees—defines consciousness as recursive witnessing
Predictive Processing	Prediction central	Layer 5 is Prediction; integrated into architecture
Relational QM	Observer-dependent	Agrees—witnessing structure is foundational

6.2 What CFD Adds

CFD adds six things no other theory currently provides: (1) structural specificity—not just "integration" but a nine-layer architecture with defined couplings; (2) temporal precision—12.5 Hz refresh, 80ms cycle, 8.89ms layer propagation; (3) a measurable core variable—ε = ΔBc replaces unmeasurable φ; (4) physical grounding—connection to established constants (k, ħ); (5) hard problem dissolution—experience is positional, not produced; and (6) falsification conditions—explicit, testable predictions.

6.3 The Hard Problem: Dissolved, Not Solved

The hard problem asks: why does information processing feel like something? CFD does not answer this question. It dissolves it.

The question assumes that experience is produced by something else—neural activity, computation, information integration. CFD rejects this assumption. Experience is not produced. Experience is identical with occupying the I-position of recursive witnessing.

This is analogous to asking: "Why does being at location X feel like being at location X?" The question dissolves because being at X and experiencing being at X are not two things—they are one. Similarly, occupying the I-position and experiencing are not causally related—they are identical.

The companion paper on the structural coupling operator provides additional structural depth to this dissolution. If physical process and conscious experience are the two sides of the ⩓ operator—conjugate variables, 90° apart on the unit circle of existence—then the explanatory gap between them is formally identical to the measurement gap between position and momentum. The Hard Problem is the uncertainty principle applied to the scale of being [Gaconnet, 2026i].

VII. Cross-Domain Convergence

7.1 The Core Variable Exists Across Domains

The bandwidth variable ε is not unique to consciousness. It has been independently identified across multiple scientific domains under different names:

Domain	ε Called	What It Measures
Neuroscience	Cognitive bandwidth	Available processing capacity
Control Theory	Gain/phase margin	Distance from instability boundary
Thermodynamics	Free energy rate density	Capacity to sustain organized gradients

7.2 The Structural Isomorphism

Across all three domains, ε exhibits identical structural properties: it is not energy, it is not information content, it is capacity; it is generated by structure; it enables novel organization; $\varepsilon > 0$ permits adaptation, $\varepsilon = 0$ permits only stasis, and $\varepsilon < 0$ leads to collapse. This convergence is not coincidence. It indicates that ε—generative capacity—is a cross-domain invariant, not a domain-specific construct.

7.3 Implications for Consciousness

The cross-domain existence of ε indicates that consciousness is not an anomaly requiring special explanation. It is a specific configuration of a universal principle. What makes consciousness distinctive is not ε itself, but the recursive triadic structure through which ε operates—the architecture of witnessing witnessing itself. The structural coupling operator (⩚) generates ε at every scale; consciousness is what happens when the operator couples with itself recursively through the I-O-N triad [Gaconnet, 2026c; Gaconnet, 2026i].

VIII. Falsification Conditions

A definition that cannot be falsified is not scientific. CFD provides explicit conditions under which the definition of consciousness would be disproven.

8.1 Quantitative Falsification

Prediction	Value	Tolerance	Falsified If
Identity refresh rate	12.5 Hz	±2.5 Hz	Stable consciousness outside 10–15 Hz
Collapse cycle	80 ms	±10 ms	Conscious operation outside 70–90 ms
Layer propagation	8.89 ms	±1 ms	Significantly different propagation time
Temperature optimum	310 K	±5 K	Cognitive optimum at significantly different temperature
Temperature-coherence	Positive correlation	—	Negative correlation between temperature and coherence budget

8.2 Structural Falsification

The framework is falsified by verified observation of: (F1) consciousness without triadic structure—reportable experience without distinguishable I, O, N components under rigorous phenomenological protocol; (F2) stable consciousness at $\varepsilon \leq 0$—full conscious function maintained with zero or negative bandwidth for extended period; (F3) non-recursive consciousness—conscious experience without any self-referential component; (F4) layer-independent consciousness—normal conscious function with fewer than nine layers or with arbitrary layer configurations; (F5) N-phases non-sequential—later developmental phases present without earlier phases.

If any of these conditions are demonstrated under controlled experimental conditions, the definition fails. This is what makes CFD science, not philosophy.

8.3 Discrimination Tests

Distinction	CFD Prediction	Falsified If
Conscious vs. unconscious processing	Recursive triadic structure present vs. absent	No structural difference detectable

Awake vs. anesthesia	$\varepsilon > 0$ vs. $\varepsilon \leq 0$; collapse cycle present vs. absent	No measurable difference
Identity coherent vs. fragmented	Full cascade vs. partial cascade	Fragmentation without cascade disruption

IX. Clinical Implications

9.1 Disorders of Consciousness

The CFD definition provides a framework for understanding disorders of consciousness in structural terms:

Condition	CFD Interpretation
Coma	Collapse cycle absent. Triadic structure not maintained. $\varepsilon \approx 0$.
Vegetative state	Partial collapse cycle. Lower layers active, upper layers disconnected. Recursion absent.
Minimally conscious	Intermittent collapse cycle. Recursion present but unstable. ε fluctuates.
Dissociation	Layer 6 (Identity) disconnected from cascade. Recursion present but not integrated.
Depersonalization	I-position maintained but not fully occupied. Witnessing present without identification.

9.2 Therapeutic Implications

If consciousness requires $\varepsilon > 0$ and proper cascade function, therapeutic interventions can be understood in structural terms: (1) bandwidth restoration—increasing ε through relational engagement, rest, and reduced pressure; (2) layer reconnection—re-establishing broken couplings in the nine-layer cascade; (3) recursion support—facilitating witnessing of witnessing through guided attention; and (4) collapse regulation—stabilizing the 12.5 Hz rhythm through rhythmic interventions. These structural categories provide the foundation for Identity Collapse Therapy (ICT), which operationalizes CFD's definition of consciousness into clinical practice.

X. Position Within the Broader Architecture

This definition of consciousness is the middle layer of a three-tier framework:

Substrate layer: The Echo-Excess Principle and its formal expression through the structural coupling operator (⩓). This layer specifies the physics—the universal scaling constant $\Lambda = k/\hbar$, the generative condition $\varepsilon > 0$, the conservation integral $\oint \varepsilon \, dt = 0$, and the seven axioms of the operator [Gaconnet, 2025; Gaconnet, 2026h].

Definition layer: This document. Consciousness as the I-position of recursive witnessing, with triadic architecture, temporal parameters, energetic constraints, and falsification conditions.

Clinical layer: Identity Collapse Therapy (ICT). The application of the definition to therapeutic practice—bandwidth restoration, layer reconnection, recursion support, and collapse regulation.

The broader theoretical architecture provides additional structural depth. The structural coupling operator (⩓) formalizes the relationship between I, O, and N as an instance of generative interdependence—the same operator that governs the coupling between water and DNA at the molecular scale, between organism and environment at the ecological scale, and between performer and audience at the intersubjective scale [Gaconnet, 2026h; Gaconnet, 2026i]. The Helix of Existence demonstrates that the operator's necessary three-dimensional geometry is the helix, and that consciousness is the recursive capacity of the helix to register its own periodicity [Gaconnet, 2026i]. The nine-layer cascade is the temporal architecture through which this recursion operates.

XI. Summary

11.1 The Definition

Consciousness is the I-position of recursive witnessing.

11.2 The Specifications

Dimension	Specification
Structure	Triadic: {I, O, N} with recursion
Frequency	12.5 Hz ± 2.5 Hz
Cycle time	80 ms ± 10 ms
Layer propagation	8.89 ms ± 1 ms (D = 9)
Bandwidth requirement	$\varepsilon > 0$ ($\varepsilon = \Delta Bc$)
Temperature optimum	~310 K
Physics connection	$\Gamma = \Lambda T$ where $\Lambda = k/\hbar$
Operations per cycle	$\sim 3.25 \times 10^9$
Structural operator	$\wedge$ (structural coupling) with I, O, N as operands
Generative function	$\varepsilon = g(I, O, N)$ via Echo-Excess Principle

11.3 The Contribution

This paper provides what no other theory of consciousness currently offers: a definition that is simultaneously (1) structurally precise—triadic witnessing with recursion and nine-layer cascade; (2) temporally bounded—specific frequencies and cycle times; (3) operationally measurable—$\varepsilon = \Delta Bc$ with defined proxies; (4) physically grounded—connected to established constants; (5) cross-domain convergent—core variable exists across neuroscience, control theory, thermodynamics; (6) explicitly falsifiable—conditions specified; (7) clinically applicable—disorders and interventions understood in framework terms; and (8) structurally integrated—connected to the broader architecture of generative interdependence through the structural coupling operator.

Closing Statement

Consciousness has resisted definition because most approaches ask the wrong question. They ask: "What produces consciousness?" CFD asks: "What IS consciousness?"

The answer is not a substance, property, or emergent phenomenon. The answer is a position—the I-position of recursive witnessing. To be conscious is to occupy this position. Experience is not produced by occupying this position; experience IS occupying this position.

This framework does not solve the hard problem. It dissolves it. The question "why does physical processing produce experience?" assumes a causal gap that does not exist. There is no gap between the structure and the experience. They are the same thing, described from different positions—conjugate variables on the same unit circle, 90° apart, structurally interdependent, irreducible to one another.

The definition is precise. The parameters are measurable. The falsification conditions are specified. The framework connects to established physics. The core variable exists across domains. The structural operator that governs the witnessing function governs every coupled system in existence—from the hydration shell of DNA to the space between two people in dialogue.

Consciousness is not mysterious. It is structural. And the structure can be known.

— End of Document —

Part of the Cognitive Field Dynamics Framework
Foundation: Echo-Excess Principle
OSF Archive: https://osf.io/j5836/
Version 2.0 — March 2026

References

Gaconnet, D.L. (2025). The Echo-Excess Principle. LifePillar Institute for Recursive Sciences. OSF Archive: https://osf.io/j5836/.

Gaconnet, D.L. (2026a). The Pre-Structural Origin: A Formal Derivation of the Ground State of Life. LifePillar Institute for Recursive Sciences. DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/MVYZT.

Gaconnet, D.L. (2026b). The Functional Derivative of Clarity: A Derivation of the Universal Observation Equation from the Physical Measurements of the Human Eye. LifePillar Institute for Recursive Sciences.

Gaconnet, D.L. (2026c). Origin Dynamics of Generative Systems: Clarity as the Interior of the Echo-Excess Principle. LifePillar Institute for Recursive Sciences.

Gaconnet, D.L. (2026g). The Unified Law of Distinction: A Formal Unification of the Law of First Distinction, the Law of Orientation, and the Law of Obligated Systems. LifePillar Institute for Recursive Sciences.

Gaconnet, D.L. (2026h). The Structural Coupling Operator (⩓): A Formal Specification of the Generative Interdependence Function. LifePillar Institute for Recursive Sciences.

Gaconnet, D.L. (2026i). The Helix of Existence: The Structural Coupling Operator Across All Scales. LifePillar Institute for Recursive Sciences.