

# The Modeler Schema Theory of Consciousness, with a Falsifiable Experiment

Frank Heile, Ph.D.

November 25, 2025

## Abstract

We propose that consciousness arises from a single control agent, the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ . It monitors the brain's Modeler as that system constructs and updates the internal World Model. As part of that monitoring, the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  generates experience by applying a qualia-based consistency check to the Modeler's output. The Human Agent comprises three cooperating agents: Modeler, Controller, and Targeter, each paired with an associated regulatory "schema" agent. We also describe fast-Modelers and fast-Controllers; evolutionary shortcuts whose rapid actions will precede awareness. Our core prediction is that the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  performs a qualia-based consistency check during saccades and issues a bottom-up target when a discrepancy is found. To test this prediction, we propose a saccadic change-detection experiment that distinguishes Modeler-generated from  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ -generated targets. Locating qualia in the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  ties experience to the regulation and refinement of internal representations, clarifies how awareness arises from model control, and suggests a path toward empirical falsification, thereby offering a concrete, testable proposal toward solving the Hard Problem of consciousness.

© 2025 Frank Heile. Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

## Introduction

In the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  Theory of Consciousness, an **agent** is defined as a system that takes input, pursues goals, and interacts with the world or other agents. In this framework, the brain, the **Human Agent**,<sup>1</sup> is a multi-agent system composed of three cooperating agents, each regulated by its own schema agent (for the definition of a schema agent, see "Introduction to Cybernetic Regulation"):

- **Modeler**: builds and updates the internal World Model of body and environment; supplies Focal Target Information to the Controller; and issues bottom-up target requests.
- **Controller**: uses Focal Target Information to propose, evaluate, and initiate actions; and issues top-down target requests.
- **Targeter**: selects and prioritizes the final focal targets that guide the Modeler and Controller.

Our central thesis is that conscious experience originates in the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ , which regulates the Modeler. The  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  monitors the Modeler's updates to the World Model and performs a

---

<sup>1</sup> Key terms appear in Title Case and **bold** at their formal definition; earlier partial descriptions and later uses retain Title Case only.

qualia-based consistency check; when a discrepancy is detected, it issues a bottom-up target that can bring the relevant content into focal awareness. Generic cybernetic regulation is not sufficient for consciousness. If it were, any feedback system would qualify, which would trend toward panpsychism. We avoid this implication by tying experience to the *Modeler<sub>schema</sub>*'s continuous checks for representational consistency in the Modeler's construction of the World Model, rather than to generic agent regulation. We also describe fast-Modelers and fast-Controllers as evolutionary shortcuts that enable rapid actions which precede awareness. The justification for these three principal agents and the World Model appears in "Possible Objections to this Theory." Their structures and functions are described in more detail in "The Three-Part Structure of the World Model" and "The Modeler, Controller, and Targeter Agents." In "Solving the Hard Problem of Consciousness," we use this framework to explain how locating qualia in the *Modeler<sub>schema</sub>*, and distinguishing it from the nonconscious Controller, addresses the Hard Problem and clarifies why consciousness appears so mysterious from the Controller's perspective—that is, from the perspective of the reporting Human.

### Introduction to Cybernetic Regulation

Norbert Wiener coined the term "cybernetics" in his 1948 book. Although the term does not appear in their publications, the Good Regulator Theorem (Conant & Ashby, 1970) and Friston's Free Energy Principle (Friston, 2010) are part of the cybernetic tradition. Ashby is recognized as a co-founder of the field, and both works formalize the idea that effective regulation requires modeling: a regulator must contain an internal model of the system it seeks to control. In Conant & Ashby, this typically refers to the regulator modeling its own system. For example, the Controller would regulate itself. Friston also frames the regulator as modeling its external environment (i.e., the world) to minimize prediction errors. In our theory, internal modeling is delegated to a dedicated control or **schema<sup>2</sup> agent** paired with, but distinct from, each agent. Thus, each "agent" is paired with a unique cybernetic control agent, its "*agent<sub>schema</sub>*," that monitors and optimizes<sup>3</sup> its functions. For the Human, Controller, Modeler, and Targeter agents, the corresponding cybernetic control agents are **Human<sub>schema</sub>**, **Controller<sub>schema</sub>**, **Modeler<sub>schema</sub>**, and **Targeter<sub>schema</sub>**. To better situate our theory within the broader context of cybernetic neuroscience, we now compare our architecture to Friston's predictive coding framework.

The World Model is dynamic: the Modeler uses it to predict changes in the environment and sensory input. This predictive role parallels Friston's generative model of bodily dynamics, which anticipates future states of the body. Because the body is part of the world, the generative model must encompass both external and internal states. In our architecture, Friston's framework maps onto the Modeler, the World Model, and the Controller (see the next section for details). Integrating the body model with the Controller and its control agent (the *Controller<sub>schema</sub>*) yields the *Controller<sub>whole</sub>*, which manages behavior, regulation, and bodily state. We formally define and clarify the role of the *Controller<sub>whole</sub>* and other "whole" agents later.

---

<sup>2</sup> "Schema" here simply means a model of another agent.

<sup>3</sup> "Optimize" means refining function via internal modeling, not achieving perfection.

The Modeler is closely tied to the World Model, updating it from sensory input while we are awake. Because the World Model functions as the Modeler's synaptic weight memory (i.e., the learned strengths of connections), the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> regulates the Modeler's processes and calibrates the short-term fidelity of the sensory part of the World Model. For example, if retinal cone density deviates from the Modeler's current assumptions, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> detects the inconsistency during pre- and post-saccadic integration. The Modeler then updates its cone-density assumptions accordingly. To support this role, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> maintains internal models of the relatively static Modeler and the rapidly changing sensory portion of the World Model (which is the Concrete World Model). The Quale World Model is an internal, abstracted model of the Concrete World Model combined with the focal target information, maintained within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. Thus, the Quale World Model is not identical to the Concrete World Model plus focal targets. Likewise, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> is an abstracted model of the Modeler rather than the Modeler itself.

The Quale World Model includes only dynamic elements: the current state of the Concrete World Model and the current focal targets. Static memories are excluded because they reside as synaptic weight patterns in the World Model and are reconstituted only when selected as focal targets. During a saccade, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> compares newly generated qualia with the pre-saccadic qualia stored in the Quale World Model. This allows it to detect unexpected changes and verify consistency, thereby supporting the perception of stability.

### Possible Objections to this Theory

A common objection is that the brain contains neither clearly delineated agents nor a recognizable World Model. We agree that the organization of cortical neurons is best understood as a gradient between two extremes. At one end, sensory neurons are predominantly sources: they provide inputs to other neurons, but do not receive significant input from other neurons. At the other end, motor neurons are predominantly sinks: they send commands to muscles and glands but do not significantly transmit to other neurons. Between these poles lies a population of interneurons, graded by proximity to either extreme. Some interneurons primarily receive input from earlier sensory stages, while others primarily project to later motor stages. Boundaries along this gradient are fuzzy, and multilevel feedback loops are pervasive, yet the organization reveals distinct functional tendencies.

Within this framework, two broad classes of neurons emerge, even though their boundaries are not sharp. Modeler neurons lie closer to the sensory side and compute inferences while updating synaptic weights to store memory traces. Controller neurons lie closer to the motor side and translate prior preferences (desired outcomes, or, in our terminology, goals) and evaluations into policy selection and action. Neurons in between may participate in both roles depending on context, which is why the boundary between Modeler and Controller is necessarily fuzzy. It is determined not by fixed cell identity but by the function a given neuron implements at a given moment.

The World Model is not a separate group of neurons but a representational structure in synaptic weights, maintained within the Modeler. These weights sustain structured representations of objects, relations, and regularities across many timescales. These weights are the substrate on which the

Modeler computes, and from which the Controller indirectly benefits. Only the Modeler directly reads from and writes to these weights. Accordingly, Figure 3 (presented later) depicts the World Model within the Modeler.

This distinction explains why the Modeler and Controller are agents while the World Model is not. Because the Human pursues goals and the brain's architecture is partitioned chiefly into a Modeler and a Controller, each is an agent running goal-directed computations and requires its own schema agent. By contrast, the World Model is not an agent; it is a dynamic, Modeler-maintained representational store. Its dynamics reflect learning-driven changes in synaptic weight representations rather than the active regulation of computations. For this reason, no separate schema agent for the World Model is warranted.

One objection is that predictive coding frameworks, such as Friston's Free Energy Principle, already portray the brain as a unified prediction-error minimizer, so why introduce additional agents? The answer is that, even if predictive coding is globally true, the sensorimotor gradient shows that only certain neuron classes perform inference (Modeler: understanding senses and updating the World Model) and action selection (Controller: deciding and initiating behavior). By contrast, the World Model is a parameterized substrate, encoded in synaptic weights, on which the Modeler operates; the Controller accesses it only via the Modeler's outputs.

Predictive coding often explains salience as precision weighting (postsynaptic gain) of prediction errors. We agree that this accounts for why some signals dominate attention. In this theory, the Modeler computes precision-weighted sensory prediction errors, yielding potential bottom-up target requests. The Controller sets expected precision according to goals and interoceptive state (e.g., hunger increases precision for food-related features), thereby issuing potential top-down target requests. The Targeter integrates these bottom-up and top-down requests by selecting the final focal targets, with precision estimates modulating the choice. It also manages the Focal Target Information stream that the Modeler delivers to the Controller. The Targeter may be realized in interface neurons that bridge the Modeler and the Controller, as they integrate input from both (see the upcoming Figure 3).

On the other hand, some predictive-coding models link high-precision prediction errors to conscious access, whereas this theory locates consciousness in the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>'s generation of qualia for such targets. For direct sensory targets, both accounts predict similar experiences. For recalled targets, however, our model explains the wide range of reported experiences—from hyperphantasia to aphantasia—by proposing that the mechanism generating qualia from memory varies far more across individuals than the mechanism generating qualia from direct sensory input. For example, two individuals may store similar memories; when those memories are selected as focal targets, their Controllers can act on them, yet the individuals may report quite different recall experiences. Predictive coding alone does not explain this divergence; our framework remains compatible with predictive coding while accounting for the variability in recalled qualia that it does not address.

Friston's Free Energy Principle explains how the brain minimizes prediction error and guides behavior, and our Modeler–World Model–Controller architecture aligns with this principle. However, the

principle by itself does not specify what subjective experience should feel like. If taken literally, lower peripheral vision precision would imply that the subjective peripheral experience is blurry relative to the sharp central vision. Nevertheless, ordinary experience is of a periphery that feels as crisp as the fovea. A saccade into that region yields continuity rather than surprise, only a seamless confirmation of what we already “saw” peripherally. Likewise, if recalled imagery simply inherited sensory precision, it should approximate perception, yet reports range from aphantasia to hyperphantasia. We therefore accept the Free Energy account for behavior, while holding that conscious experience requires an additional mechanism: the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ ’s generation and use of qualia for consistency checking and model refinement.

### Conscious Experience as Optimization

Although identifying the Quale World Model (and thus the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ ) as the source of consciousness may seem perception-focused, the same mechanism also explains variability in recalled and abstract content, both of which face weaker evolutionary pressure.

The architecture underlying this claim is summarized in Figure 1, which illustrates the cybernetic loop: the  $\text{Modeler}$  updates the World Model while the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  monitors its state and outputs to optimize performance.




Figure 1 — Interactions of the  $\text{Modeler}$  and the Cybernetic  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  Agents

The upward arrow, “Output,” bundles World Model updates (synaptic weight changes) with active Focal Target Information streams.<sup>4</sup> The downward arrow to the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  is wider because it conveys “Output” and “State Information”—the former for consistency checks, the latter for regulation. Thick arrows indicate high-bandwidth data streams; the thin arrow represents the two lower-bandwidth control signals.

Because the World Model’s long-term content is stored as synaptic weight patterns, it cannot emit a ready-made output stream when a memory target is selected. Instead, the  $\text{Modeler}$  reconstructs the selected memory target from those weights and supplies the Controller with an active Focal Target Information stream (see Figure 3). Hence, the circuitry that produces Focal Target Information belongs to the  $\text{Modeler}$ , not the Controller. Similarly, arrows B and D in the upcoming Figure 3 are Controller-to-

<sup>4</sup> The Focal Target Information stream enables the Controller to achieve its goals; see Figure 3.

Modeler signals that the Modeler encodes as synaptic updates in the World Model. In this architecture, only the Modeler reads from and writes to World Model synapses; the Controller interacts solely via the Modeler's mediation.

As the control agent, the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  interacts with the Modeler through two channels:

- *Accuracy channel*: the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  receives "Output" and issues "Optimize" directives to the Modeler to adjust parameters and maintain an accurate, consistent World Model.
- *State-control channel*: the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  receives "State Information" and issues "Control" directives to the Modeler to regulate overall behavior and to govern the Modeler's state transitions.

Conscious experience arises from the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ 's role in the World Model accuracy channel. This is where the Quale World Model is generated, making the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  the most plausible seat of conscious experience.

Furthermore, although the Controller performs actions and uses language, it remains separate from the experiences arising in the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ . The Controller accesses World Model data and receives limited but important indirect communication from the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ , as described in "The  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  as a Self-Contained Universe."

## The Three-Part Structure of the World Model

Any animal-like agent requires a World Model to navigate its environment. This **World Model** contains:

- A dynamic **Concrete World Model** that serves as short-term memory, continuously updated from current sensory inputs. Rather than storing raw data, it maintains a structured representation of recognized objects and their spatial relationships. The Modeler creates it to enable predictions of probable future states and to support the Controller's interactions with the environment. Objects in this model become focal experiences when selected as attention targets. Emotions generated by the Controller are treated as an internal (interoceptive) sense; their experienced contents are represented in the Concrete World Model. The entire Concrete World Model is continuously available to "diffuse awareness" (defined later).
- **Memories of the Concrete World Model** store medium-, long-, and permanent records of past objects and newly imagined ones. These are experienced only when they become focal targets. Once a concrete object or associated emotion is no longer actively sensed, it is reclassified as part of the Memories of the Concrete World Model and retained through long-term synaptic modifications. When a sensory memory is recalled, the synaptic weights are used to recreate a Focal Target Information stream approximating the one generated by the original concrete target.
- The **Abstract World Model** is rudimentary in most animals, but extensive in humans. It stores concepts and relations across levels of abstraction and time scales, from names to mathematics.

It is hierarchically organized: long-term structure is encoded in distributed synaptic weights, while current focal targets are maintained in transient activity patterns.

Although predictive coding frameworks encode memory in synaptic weights, this theory distinguishes three functional manifestations of this encoding. The Concrete World Model corresponds to the current, actively updated state that reflects short-term integration of sensory input. The Memories of the Concrete World Model represents the persistence of past states, stabilized in synaptic connections over longer time scales. The Abstract World Model extends this principle further, storing highly compressed and symbolic regularities acquired through learning. In all cases, what predictive coding would treat as different timescales of synaptic updating is here treated as distinct but interrelated components of a single representational system.

Therefore, we group the Concrete World Model, Memories of the Concrete World Model, and the Abstract World Model under “World Model.” Each embodies the same underlying principle: the storage of structured representations of the body and environment at different time horizons and levels of abstraction.

The World Model, in this sense, is not a separate anatomical entity but a functional designation for the ensemble of representations that the Modeler constructs and maintains, and that the Controller relies on to plan and act. It encodes an implicit understanding of physical principles (e.g., motion, object interactions) and basic psychological principles (e.g., body language, social expectations). This knowledge enables the Controller to predict the physical dynamics of objects and infer the behavior and intentions of agents, because the Concrete World Model’s synaptic weights support the structured representations required for those predictions. By integrating predictive models of physical and social dynamics, the Concrete World Model helps the Controller achieve its goals.

In this theory, the World Model represents the physical world through a continuum of increasingly abstract representations. At one end are concrete concepts that correspond to tangible objects and events in the current or past Concrete World Model. Further along the spectrum are abstract concepts, beginning with names and words tied to concrete objects, and culminating in fully abstract ideas, such as those in mathematics. In all three components, the continuity and stability of representations ultimately depend on patterns of synaptic weighting, with shorter timescales sustaining the Concrete World Model and longer timescales supporting memories and abstract concepts.

The Controller’s conscious working memory comprises current focal targets delivered from the World Model via the Focal Target Information stream (see Figure 3). Concrete World Model targets are read-only; the others are read-write. The Controller also maintains internal nonconscious working memory.

Figure 2 summarizes the Human World Model:




Figure 2 — The Human World Model

The Modeler constructs the World Model shown here, and the Controller uses Modeler-provided content from it to guide actions and pursue goals. Since the brain is built from neurons, these concepts are likely instantiated in ways analogous to artificial neural networks, not hand-coded software or symbolic logic.

Key terminology:

- **Focal attention** produces **focal experiences**.
- **Targets** are always focal attention targets: either current concrete objects or memories of abstract concepts or of past concrete objects.
- **Sensory stream**: A continuous flow of sensory data for one or a few concrete targets. This phrase also encompasses all sensory streams that comprise the Concrete World Model.
- **Abstract stream**: A discrete, finite, ordered sequence of abstract targets, such as the words in a sentence.
- **Diffuse attention** produces **diffuse awareness**. These concepts, and a brief exercise to experience them, will be presented in an upcoming section.

## The Modeler, Controller, and Targeter Agents

The following diagram illustrates the Human Agent, composed of the Modeler, Controller, and Targeter, and shows their inputs, outputs, and connections.






Figure 3 — The Three-Agent Model of the Human Agent

The Modeler receives inputs from arrows A, B, C, and D. Its primary output is the **Focal Target Information** stream, which provides the Controller with current focal targets, enabling it to act and achieve goals. The Controller accesses the world state only through Focal Target Information and uses arrows B, D, E, and F to act. The Targeter integrates bottom-up requests from the Modeler and top-down requests from the Controller to select the final focal targets. It supplies these focal targets to the Modeler and controls the Focal Target Information stream, transferring data to the Controller. Thus, when an object in the Concrete World Model is a focal target, the Focal Target Information stream represents the ongoing processing of those portions of the sensory inputs that carry information about that object. The Controller cannot update the World Model directly; signals on B and D are processed by the Modeler, which performs the updates.

### Input and Output Streams

Overall human sensory inputs (vision, hearing, smell, taste, touch, interoception) enter the Modeler at mid-left (arrow C – sensory inputs); motor outputs leave the Controller at mid-right (arrow F – body control).<sup>5</sup>

The Modeler’s abstract stream inputs appear at the upper left (arrow A – language input), arriving via the sensory stream (arrow C – sensory inputs), as shown by the curved black arrow on the left. The Controller’s abstract language outputs appear at the upper right (arrow E – language output) and are conveyed through motor outputs (arrow F – body control), as shown by the curved black arrow on the right.

<sup>5</sup> This introduces the parenthesized A–F arrow notation for Human Agent inputs, outputs, and Controller-to-Modeler data flows.

The Controller’s abstract output to the Modeler (arrow B – inner language) requests updates, which the Modeler encodes in the Abstract World Model. Meanwhile, the Controller’s other output to the Modeler (arrow D – emotions or imagined senses) updates the Concrete World Model (for emotions) or the Memories of the Concrete World Model (for imagined senses). As shown in the figure, abstract layers are at the top of each agent and concrete/sensory at the bottom, reinforcing the World Model’s hierarchy.

### Whole Agents and Consciousness Attribution

Having introduced the Controller<sub>whole</sub> informally, we now define a Whole Agent and formalize it with explicit body and symbolic representations. A **Whole Agent** is an integrated structure comprising a functional agent, its cybernetic control agent (“agent<sub>schema</sub>”), and any symbolic representations of that agent in the World Model. This definition applies to all agents and supports our account of experience.

The **Controller**<sub>whole</sub> comprises the Controller, its cybernetic agent (Controller<sub>schema</sub>), and two symbolic representations:

- The **Body**<sub>model</sub> encodes bodily state and dynamics in the Concrete World Model and its Memories.
- The **I/Me/My**<sub>model</sub> represents abstract identity, personal history, and conceptual self in the Abstract World Model.

These stand-ins enable the Controller<sub>whole</sub> to plan actions using the Body<sub>model</sub> and communicate via the I/Me/My<sub>model</sub>.

The **Human**<sub>whole</sub> contains the Controller<sub>whole</sub>, Modeler<sub>whole</sub>, and Targeter<sub>whole</sub>. Both the **Modeler**<sub>whole</sub> and **Targeter**<sub>whole</sub> consist only of the primary agent and the corresponding schema agent, with no symbolic representations. Thus, only the Human<sub>whole</sub> inherits the two Controller<sub>whole</sub> symbolic representations.

Figure 4 depicts the (a) Human, (b) Human<sub>whole</sub>, and (c) Human<sub>schema</sub> agents. The red-outlined rectangles mark the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> in panels (b) and (c). This nested architecture supports a key claim: conscious experience occurs only in the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>, and in the agents that include it.




Figure 4 — Composition of the Agents and Whole Agents

Besides the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ , only the  $\text{Human}_{\text{schema}}$ ,  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{whole}}$ , and  $\text{Human}_{\text{whole}}$  are conscious since they contain a red  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ , while the  $\text{Human}$ ,  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$ , and  $\text{Targeter}_{\text{whole}}$  are not.

Since the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  “owns” the body, performs actions, and uses language, we often identify with it. Many scholars likewise treat the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  as the full  $\text{Human}_{\text{whole}}$ , equating motor control and language with conscious experience. By contrast, some Eastern and philosophical traditions treat consciousness as disembodied, consistent with our claim that the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  lies outside the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  and is not tied to the  $\text{Body}_{\text{model}}$  or  $\text{I/Me/My}_{\text{model}}$ . Thus, this model explains and reconciles these seemingly contradictory views of human nature.

In this theory, diffuse awareness<sup>6</sup> plays a vital role: recognizing that the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  cannot access it is key to unlocking the Hard Problem of consciousness.

### Diffuse Attention and Diffuse Awareness

We distinguish “awareness” from “experience” by the type of attention.

- Awareness is the state produced by diffuse attention: broad, unfocused, all-encompassing.
- Experience results from focal attention: directed at one or a few objects or concepts.
  - In rare cases, when discussing focal and diffuse together, we use “experience” inclusively.

Over a century ago, William James wrote [*italics in original*]:

<sup>6</sup> Diffuse awareness is often mistaken for degraded focal attention or unconscious background processing. We treat it as a distinct conscious field maintained by the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ .

“Millions of items of the outward order are present to my senses which never properly enter into my experience. Why? Because they have no *interest* for me. *My experience is what I agree to attend to.*” (James, 1890, p. 490)

We interpret “millions of items... present to my senses” as diffuse awareness.<sup>7</sup>

Ninety years later, (Treisman & Gelade, 1980) began with:

“When we open our eyes on a familiar scene, we form an immediate impression of recognizable objects, organized coherently in a spatial framework.”

This account also describes diffuse awareness. The article coins the term “pre-attentive processing” for the mechanism that produces diffuse awareness and posits that it operates continuously during wakefulness, even when its contents go unnoticed. It focuses on how pre-attentive processing produces bottom-up attention targets and attributes occasional errors to faulty peripheral object construction. As we argue later, we interpret those findings differently from the original authors.

To experience diffuse visual awareness and to compare it with focal visual experience, try the following exercise:

- Direct your central vision to an object in front of you and maintain focus on it.
- Without moving your eyes, take in the entire forward visual hemisphere as a whole, out to its edges.
  - Spend a few moments attending to the whole field without fixating on any single item.
  - This is diffuse awareness.
- While still focused on the same object, try picking out a peripheral object (without moving your eyes) and note its color or shape internally.
  - Note how different this feels from the earlier, holistic diffuse awareness.

After this exercise, we hope you notice:

- To select or describe objects in the periphery, without moving your eyes, you must use peripheral visual focal attention.<sup>8</sup>
- This felt noticeably different from the initial, relatively effortless<sup>9</sup> diffuse awareness.

---

<sup>7</sup> Note that James includes all senses here, not just vision. Also see the footnote on page 12 for more connections between this quote to the terms used in this paper.

<sup>8</sup> Peripheral visual focal attention refers to focusing on peripheral objects without eye movement. It aligns with the standard notion of covert attention.

<sup>9</sup> The main challenge is to resist directing peripheral focal attention on specific items within diffuse awareness.

This exercise demonstrates that the Controller<sub>whole</sub> cannot access diffuse content: its access to the Concrete World Model is mediated entirely by focal attention. Since the Targeter<sub>whole</sub> operates only on focal targets, diffuse awareness must originate elsewhere, most plausibly in the Modeler<sub>whole</sub>.

We propose that diffuse awareness is generated and experienced by the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>, although this exercise cannot rule out the Modeler<sub>whole</sub> host diffuse awareness while the Controller<sub>whole</sub> hosts focal experience? Duplicating mechanisms in both agents would be biologically inefficient. We present stronger arguments later.

Therefore, the fact that “you” experienced diffuse awareness suggests that “you” are not the Controller<sub>whole</sub>.

For now, we posit that both diffuse awareness and focal experience originate in the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>; hence, only the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>, Human<sub>schema</sub>, Modeler<sub>whole</sub>, and Human<sub>whole</sub> are conscious, whereas the Controller<sub>whole</sub> and Targeter<sub>whole</sub> are not conscious (see Figure 4).

## Functions of the Modeler: *Understanding, Assessing, and Updating*

The Modeler performs three core functions: *understanding*, *assessing*, and *updating*.<sup>10</sup> Together, these functions process inputs and *update* the World Model.

*Understanding* involves recognizing patterns in both the sensory and abstract inputs and integrating them into the World Model. This includes interpreting speech and text<sup>11</sup> and building a unified, predictive model of physical and social environments.

*Assessment* evaluates how the current world state affects the Human Agent’s goals. If an *update* significantly advances or hinders a goal, the event may be deemed “*interesting*,” potentially triggering a bottom-up attention target.<sup>12</sup> However, *assessments* are limited: they detect single features or simple disjunctions (e.g., “red or vertical”) but struggle with conjunctions (e.g., “red and vertical”), as demonstrated by (Treisman & Gelade, 1980). In those studies, the Controller often had to sequentially

---

<sup>10</sup> Formatting note: Modeler functions and their inflected forms appear in italics (e.g., *understand*, *understanding*, *understood*). Emotion nouns also appear in italics (e.g., *anger*, *fear*).

<sup>11</sup> Speech and text input is shown by the curved black arrow from (arrow C – sensory inputs) to (arrow A – language input) in Figure 3.

<sup>12</sup> We reinterpret James’s quote (page 11), using this model’s terms as highlighted in **bold** below. His phrase “no *interest* for me” aligns with the bottom-up target *assessment* process. Translated into this framework, the quote reads:

“Millions of items of **my diffuse awareness** are present to my senses which never properly enter into my **focal** experience. Why? Because they **were assessed to be of** no *interest* for me. *My focal target experience is what I agree to direct focal attention to.*”

This illustrates how *assessment* produces results such as “*interested*” or “*not interested*.” The former become bottom-up focal targets; the latter remain in diffuse awareness. These results are described in the next section as adjectival emotions based on the root concept of “*interest*,” including variations like “*interesting*,” “*interested*,” or “*not interested*.”

examine red or vertical objects to find one that matched both criteria.<sup>13</sup> *Assessments* also detect “unexpected” changes, like motion, prediction errors, or anomalies.

The World Model is *updated* continuously; the Focal Target Information stream is *updated* as needed to ensure the Controller receives current information about its tracked targets. These *updates* are stored in short-, medium-, or long-term memory for both concrete and abstract representations.<sup>14</sup>

These three processes are continuous, often overlap, and may together produce a distinct class of appraisable emotions.

### Appraisable Emotions

We propose that this ongoing cycle, especially the Modeler’s *understanding* and *assessment*, gives rise to appraisable emotions.<sup>15</sup>

**Appraisable** emotions, **adjectival** or **adverbial**, reflect how a situation is internally processed. Unlike Controller-generated emotions such as *anger* or *fear* (typically expressed as nouns), appraisable emotions arise in the Modeler as it processes input and *updates* the World Model. They function as internal senses that track progress in *understanding*, *assessing*, or *updating*, and are naturally expressed adjectivally or adverbially. These states become conscious only when represented in the Quale World Model.

For the *understanding* function, appraisable emotion examples include:

- Adjectival: “*not understood*,” “*confused*,” “*surprised*.”<sup>16</sup>
- Adverbial: “*suddenly*,” “*gradually*,” “*intensely*.”

For the *assessing* function, adjectival examples include “*interested*” and “*not interested*.”

Most adjectival and adverbial emotions originate in the Modeler, but some also arise in the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. Regardless of source, they are experienced within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> and influence the Controller<sub>whole</sub> only when attached to a focal target; in that case, the “appraisal” functions as an emotion signal. When an *assessment* yields an “*interested*” appraisal, this may generate a bottom-up

---

<sup>13</sup> The (Treisman & Gelade, 1980) article attributed these errors to faulty peripheral object construction. We instead argue they result from limitations in the Modeler’s *assessment* function, which treats “red and vertical” as “red or vertical,” prompting sequential inspection.

<sup>14</sup> Sensory input *updates* the Concrete World Model; imagination *updates* the Memories of the Concrete World Model; and abstract data *updates* the Abstract World Model (Figure 2).

<sup>15</sup> The term appraisable emotions is grounded in Appraisal Theory of Emotion, first developed by Magda Arnold in the 1940s–50s and later extended by Richard Lazarus. In this tradition, emotions result from evaluative judgments about one’s environment. We adopt a similar view here: appraisable emotions arise from the Modeler’s *understanding* and *assessment* processes and are expressed adjectivally or adverbially.

<sup>16</sup> Formatting note: adjectival and adverbial emotions appear in italics with quotation marks (e.g., “*not understood*,” “*suddenly*”).

target request; if the  $\text{Targeter}_{\text{whole}}$  approves, the object becomes a focal target accessible to the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$ .

Like other emotional annotations, appraisable emotions are stored in the World Model alongside the object or event that triggered them. When retrieved, these appraisals function as emotion signals that can guide decisions by the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  and  $\text{Targeter}_{\text{whole}}$ , influencing the priority of the focal target.

In this theory, conscious experience arises only within the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ ; however, appraisable emotion signals, accessible to the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$ , can inform conscious narratives. When these emotion signals annotate focal targets, they guide the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  in constructing reports about experience. These reports rely solely on indirect signals—specifically, Focal Target Information and associated adjectival or adverbial emotion signals—rather than on direct access to qualia.

To illustrate and experience adjectival emotions such as “*understood*” and “*not understood*,” consider:

Sentence 1. The sum of the angles in any triangle is always one hundred eighty degrees.

Sentence 2. The hundred always one sum in the any is degrees eighty triangle angles of.

Sentence 1 is familiar and likely “*understood*.” Sentence 2 contains recognizable words but is either syntactically ill-formed or semantically incoherent: “*not understood*.” Sentence 2 is a scrambled version of Sentence 1.

Examples of concrete visual “*not understood*” images include impossible figures (e.g., M. C. Escher’s art), abstract paintings, and magic tricks, where familiar “*understood*” parts form “*not understood*” wholes.

The preceding examples are appraisable qualia, one of the four types proposed in this theory.

### The Four Types of Qualia

In this theory, **qualia** are internally represented experiences that the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  generates and “experiences” only within itself. These qualia fall into four types:

- **Sensory qualia** encompass perceptual experiences and emotions, with emotions treated as internal senses reflecting the Controller’s current state (e.g., *fear*, *sadness*, *joy*). These qualia arise from the Concrete World Model and include focal experiences (e.g., seeing red, feeling pain) and diffuse awareness of the entire sensory field (via arrow C – sensory inputs). Focal sensory qualia occur when attention targets a specific object, which can include emotional states. Emotional qualia arise when a general emotional state becomes a focal target (e.g., *anxiety*) or when emotions are linked to concrete or abstract objects (e.g., *fear* of snakes, *anger* at injustice).
- **Recalled sensory qualia** are remembered or imagined sensory objects (e.g., recalling a parent’s face or imagining a new object). They arise for focal targets in the Memories of the Concrete

World Model, which stores both remembered concrete objects and imagined ones generated by the Controller<sub>whole</sub> (via arrow D – imagined senses).<sup>17</sup>

- **Appraisable qualia** are internal experiences that originate in the Modeler (or the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>). They include adjectival and adverbial emotions reflecting how a situation or object is internally *understood*, *assessed*, or *updated*. Examples include adjectival (“*not understood*,” “*surprised*”) and adverbial (“*suddenly*,” “*gradually*”). These emotions are stored with the associated object and, when those objects become focal targets, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> can access the associated appraisable emotion signal, while only the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> generates and experiences the corresponding appraisable qualia.
- **Cognitive qualia** encompass abstract or symbolic content, such as inner speech, reasoning, recalled knowledge, or pattern recognition, typically drawn from the Abstract World Model. They may originate from either (arrow A – language input) or (arrow B – inner language) (see Figure 3), or from any focal target in the Abstract World Model.

These four qualia types are not part of the World Model. They are constructed by the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> and stored in the **Quale World Model**, which it maintains internally, to represent the qualia associated with four focal-target types: sensory (including emotional), recalled sensory, appraisable, and cognitive. In addition to these focal-target qualia, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> also experiences diffuse qualia spanning the entire Concrete World Model, including regions that are not current focal targets. Just as the Modeler contains the World Model, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> contains the Quale World Model; however, whereas selected World Model contents are accessible to the Controller<sub>whole</sub> via the Focal Target Information stream, the Quale World Model is accessible only to the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>.

In this theory, all qualia—and thus all conscious experiences—occur only within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. Although some define qualia narrowly as raw sensory properties, we use the term broadly. Because qualia remain private to the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>, only information about the focal target is exported to the rest of the system via the Focal Target Information stream. As described later, qualia help the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> monitor and refine the Modeler’s algorithm to improve the World Model.

Although academic models often treat metacognition and introspective awareness as distinct types of qualia, this theory does not assign a separate category. Statements like “I feel confused” or “I’m thinking about my thoughts” are linguistic summaries that the Controller<sub>whole</sub> generates in response to appraisable or cognitive qualia experienced by the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. The Controller<sub>whole</sub> does not directly experience these states; instead, it constructs symbolic narratives using abstract focal targets and inner language. Hence, metacognition is the Controller<sub>whole</sub>’s commentary on qualia it cannot experience directly.

---

<sup>17</sup> Imagined objects are assumed to be stored in the Memories of the Concrete World Model temporarily, since they automatically become focal targets and may be recalled later.



## Dynamics of the Concrete World Model

A stable, coherent model of the world is essential for the Controller<sub>whole</sub> to plan and execute goal-directed actions. The brain constructs the Concrete World Model by integrating multimodal sensory input; however, vision requires special handling due to frequent saccadic eye movements. These rapid shifts occur several times per second, yet the world appears stable.

According to (Burr & Morrone, 2012), vision relies on two complementary systems, which we describe as:

- **Stable spatial map:** A 3D multisensory, spatiotopic body/world-centered representation constructed more slowly in dorsal pathways ( $\approx 500$  ms).
- **Transient saccadic process:**<sup>18</sup> a fast visual mechanism in eye-centered (retinotopic) coordinates ( $\approx 200$  ms) that preserves continuity across saccades and supports rapid visual judgments.<sup>19</sup>

These systems cooperate to ensure seamless perception. The transient process holds the image constant during the saccade, preventing conscious awareness of the eye's movement. At the end of the saccade, it aligns pre- and post-saccadic input to seamlessly continue *updating* the Concrete World Model. When not saccading, visual input flows continuously into the stable map.

We treat Burr and Morrone's "stable spatial map" as functionally equivalent to our multisensory Concrete World Model, which supports the Controller<sub>whole</sub>'s interaction with the sensory world. It integrates spatial and object-level information, enabling the Controller<sub>whole</sub> to plan and execute actions to achieve its goals.

"This transient system cooperates with the spatiotopic mechanism to provide a useful map to guide interactions with our environment: one rapid and transitory... the other slow, long-lasting, and low-resolution..." (Burr & Morrone, 2012)

Ordinary interaction relies on the stable map despite its  $\approx 500$  ms delay. During this interval, the Modeler<sub>whole</sub> *updates* the Concrete World Model, and the Controller<sub>whole</sub> begins a response; muscle movement does not start until  $\approx 500$  ms. When faster action is needed, humans can respond in  $\approx 200$  ms via the transient process, bypassing slower *updates*. These fast responses, distinct from reflexes, are driven by simplified systems we call fast-Modelers and fast-Controllers. Thus, the  $\approx 200$  ms delay is the interval required for the fast-Modeler and the initial fast-Controller systems to process the input and initiate a motor action.

The transient fast-Modeler provides immediate high-resolution input to the fast-Controller for urgent actions, bypassing the stable Concrete World Model. Meanwhile, the stable model supports goal-directed reasoning by the Controller<sub>whole</sub>. Though slower, its spatiotopic multisensory integration makes it essential for deliberate interaction.

---

<sup>18</sup> "Transient saccadic process" is our term (the article says, "transient systems").

<sup>19</sup> Retinotopic maps (e.g., V1–V4) are retinal-based; spatiotopic maps are world-centered.

Together, these systems balance speed and deliberation: the transient fast-Modeler/fast-Controller enables rapid reactions, while conscious behavior depends on the Concrete World Model constructed by the Modeler<sub>whole</sub> and used by the Controller<sub>whole</sub>.

Although this discussion focuses on vision, analogous fast-Modeler and fast-Controller systems likely exist for other time-critical senses, such as hearing. We further propose that long-term training in skilled activities, such as sports or music, leads to additional fast systems. When skill execution becomes automatic, without conscious deliberation, it suggests that new fast-Modelers and fast-Controllers have developed and are in use.

The brain's ability to convert ordinary neural circuits into fast-response systems through practice exemplifies its evolutionary ingenuity.

### Distinct Qualia from Distinct World Model Components

In this theory, all conscious experiences arise from the Quale World Model, which is constructed and *updated* by the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> (see Figure 1). This model includes a quale version of the Concrete World Model (supporting diffuse awareness) and qualia for any selected focal target, regardless of its source within the World Model. To produce qualia, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> applies a quale-conversion process that transforms World Model data into abstracted, non-symbolic representations. We propose three distinct quale-conversion processes, corresponding to the three components of the World Model: Concrete, Memories of the Concrete, and Abstract. The Concrete World Model is continuously *updated* by sensory input and is always available as an active neural stream. By contrast, the Abstract component and the Memories of the Concrete are only available when selected as focal targets, which is why they require separate conversion processes. Accordingly, these Focal Target Information streams are among the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>'s inputs (see Figure 1).

Sensory experiences from the Concrete World Model are largely universal across individuals.<sup>20</sup> These experiences are vivid and stable, and they serve as evidence for real-time perception. While private qualia cannot be verified for identity, the evolutionary importance of accurate perception suggests that this Concrete quale-conversion process is tightly constrained by natural selection.<sup>21</sup> In our framework, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> optimizes and checks the sensory portion of the Quale World Model, ensuring the accuracy of the Concrete World Model.

In contrast, focal targets from the Memories of the Concrete World Model or the Abstract World Model generate quale experiences that vary dramatically across individuals. For example, as described in (Pearson, 2019), visual recall and imagery span a range from aphantasia (the absence of conscious imagery) to hyperphantasia (vivid, photorealistic imagery). Most people fall in between, reporting imagery that is “degraded, fuzzy, or weak.” This suggests that the recalled-imagery quale-conversion

---

<sup>20</sup> However, a rare but easily articulated exception is grapheme–color synesthesia.

<sup>21</sup> Nonetheless, laboratory isoluminance testing reveals subtle individual differences in early visual processing; for example, the carefully calibrated isoluminance point varies by observer. See “The Proposed Experiment” section for our near-isoluminance discussion.

process has faced minimal evolutionary pressure, allowing greater individual variability without compromising survival.

As discussed in (Alderson-Day & Pearson, 2023), inner experiences of abstract thought also vary considerably: many report inner speech as a verbal stream, while others describe visuospatial or imageless modes of thought. Deaf individuals often experience inner language as inner signing rather than as auditory phonemes. On this basis, we conclude that converting abstract content into qualia in this channel is powerfully shaped by early language learning and biological factors, yet not entirely determined by either.

We interpret this variability as robust evidence for the three distinct quale-conversion processes we proposed. The following case shows why this observed variability cannot be reduced to differences in working memory or abstraction skills.

This striking case comes from (Jacobs, Schwarzkopf, & Silvanto, 2017), who compared a single aphantasic participant with 11 controls across 16 working-memory tasks involving visual recall and imagery. The aphantasic subject performed comparably on all tasks except one, where her score was significantly lower than that of controls ( $p < .05$ ) yet still above chance. Notably, she reported no visual imagery at any point, instead stating that she “just knew the answer.” This supports our hypothesis: visual memory and imagery were available to her Controller<sub>whole</sub> as focal targets (enabling performance), but no qualia were generated, consistent with a disrupted or malfunctioning quale-conversion process.

These findings suggest that a single conversion mechanism cannot account for the full range of human experience. Instead, each part of the World Model has its own quale-conversion process:

Component	Qualia Produced by the Corresponding Quale-Conversion Process
Concrete World Model	Produces stable, vivid sensory qualia. The quale-conversion process is under intense evolutionary pressure because the Modeler <sub>schema</sub> relies on it for optimization and consistency checks, which are primary reasons for the schema agent’s existence.
Memories of the Concrete World Model	Produces qualia that may be strong, weak, variable, or absent, reflecting individual differences in the experiences of visual recall and imagery. This quale-conversion process component is under little or no evolutionary pressure.
Abstract World Model	Produces qualia for symbolic or conceptual content (e.g., inner speech, abstract reasoning). Variability is high and often reflects the language used during acquisition (including the sensory modality of auditory vs. signed), as well as cognitive style.

*Table 1 — The Quale-Conversion Processes for World Model Components*

This proposal explains the consistency of direct sensory experience and the diversity of recalled and abstract experiences. It also supports our claim that the Quale World Model does not reuse the Concrete World Model’s internal representations. If it did, experiences recalled from the Memories of the Concrete World Model would be as vivid as experiences in the Concrete World Model, which they often are not. By contrast, abstract content lacks a dedicated, evolved quale; when qualia are

nonetheless reported (e.g., inner speech), they often—though not always—recruit the modality-specific sensory representations used during language learning, so such abstract qualia vary widely.

## Experiential Unity: The Modeler<sub>schema</sub> as Subject, Process, and Content

Any coherent account of conscious experience must unify three roles: the experiencer (the subject), the experiencing process, and the experienced content. In the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> framework, all three roles are fulfilled by a single entity: the cybernetic Modeler<sub>schema</sub> agent. This unity aims to close the explanatory gap by locating experience within a single, self-contained mechanism (the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>).

In this theory, sensory input produces the Concrete World Model, a structured, multisensory map of the external environment. The Modeler<sub>schema</sub> applies the quale-conversion process to transform this input into qualia (e.g., the experience of “red”). The result is the Quale World Model, built entirely within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> and accessible only to it. Because the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> contains both the quale-conversion process and its qualia, it simultaneously plays all three roles:

- **Experiencer:** The Modeler<sub>schema</sub> is the only agent with direct access to qualia. Additionally, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> is represented within the Human<sub>schema</sub>, enabling the Human<sub>whole</sub> to attribute conscious experiences to itself (see Figure 4).
- **Experiencing process:** The quale-conversion processes are the sub-processes within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> that will transform World Model data into qualia and *update* the Quale World Model. Together with quale-conversions and *updates*, the ongoing consistency checks comprise the process of experiencing.
- **Experienced content:** The Quale World Model, contained within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>, is composed of qualia; “content” spans concrete sensory, recalled sensory/imagery, appraisable emotion annotations, and abstract/conceptual cases (e.g., inner speech).

This contrasts with models like Attention Schema Theory (Graziano, 2019), which distribute these roles across separate structures, such as a self-model, attention schema, and object representation. Graziano does not claim his model explains experience; he argues it explains “why and how the brain concludes that it contains an apparently non-physical property” (the attention schema). By contrast, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> Theory aims to explain the mechanism of experience. It treats consciousness as arising within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>, a single agent that simultaneously represents subject, process, and content.

In this framework, separating these roles across structures renders experience incoherent: the experiencer must also model the process and contain the result. Philosophers who deny this unity may implicitly assume a separation of subject, process, and content, generating the Hard Problem. The following section explains the solution.

## The Modeler<sub>schema</sub> as a Self-Contained Universe

Although physically part of the brain, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> functions as a distinct internal universe, separate not in substance but in informational access. Other agents in the Human<sub>whole</sub>, including the Controller<sub>whole</sub>, do not receive qualia; they receive only indirect outputs. The Modeler and the

Modeler<sub>schema</sub> supply adjectival and adverbial emotion signals (e.g., “*surprised*,” “*suddenly*”). When these emotion signals indicate sufficient salience, either source can issue a bottom-up target request to the Targeter<sub>whole</sub>. The Modeler also supplies the Focal Target Information stream to the Controller.

To other agents, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> is a black box. Its inputs are the current state of the Concrete World Model (for diffuse awareness) and the Focal Target Information stream from the Modeler (for current targets). Its only outputs to other agents are adjectival/adverbial emotion signals and, when salience is sufficient, bottom-up target requests. If an appraisable emotion annotation is attached to a current focal target, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> automatically receives that emotion signal with the target. If the object is not yet a target, the emitting agent (Modeler<sub>schema</sub> or Modeler) can issue a bottom-up target request to the Targeter<sub>whole</sub>. Once promoted to a target, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> receives the focal target’s content and the corresponding emotion signal (via the Focal Target Information stream). Thus, the associated emotion signal can inform the Controller<sub>whole</sub> why the item was promoted to a focal target.

The Controller<sub>whole</sub> then constructs narratives from the focal target information it receives, which includes the adjectival or adverbial emotion signals from the Modeler or Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. For every focal target, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> generates some particular adjectival or adverbial emotion regarding the quale it created (possibly “*none*” if no quale is generated). The Controller<sub>whole</sub>, lacking direct access to qualia, treats the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>’s emotion signal plus the focal model data as the target’s “experience.” Thus, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> uses the term “experience” for whatever appraisable emotion signals the Modeler or Modeler<sub>schema</sub> adds to those focal targets—the only parts of the World Model the Controller<sub>whole</sub> can access. When the Controller<sub>whole</sub> obtains a color code (here denoted “RGB 255,0,0” for concreteness), it labels the target “red.” The Controller<sub>whole</sub> does not “experience” red; rather, it associates that color value with the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>’s apparent “experience,” as indicated by the received emotion signal. In effect, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> uses the terms “experience” and “red” to describe whatever the Modeler/Modeler<sub>schema</sub> does with the RGB data the Controller<sub>whole</sub> receives.

This illusion is most evident in visual diffuse awareness. The Modeler and Modeler<sub>schema</sub> continuously *update* the unified visual field in the Concrete and Quale World Models via peripheral vision. However, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> cannot access or report the full contents of the Concrete World Model; it can only attend to and describe a small number of discrete focal targets. When asked to pay attention to the entire visual hemisphere, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> quickly realizes it cannot. However, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> processes the entire concrete visual field to produce the Quale World Model and may return an adjectival emotion, such as “*accomplished*,” which is not attached to any World Model object yet may become a focal target. The Controller<sub>whole</sub> accepts this singular focal-target emotion signal and narrates, “I am experiencing diffuse awareness.” Yet, the “I,” the “experience,” and the “*accomplished*” judgment originate within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>; the Controller<sub>whole</sub> lacks access to the entire visual Concrete World Model.

This mechanism generalizes beyond diffuse awareness to every focal target. The Controller<sub>whole</sub> has no direct access to qualia; it can access only focal data from the World Model via the Focal Target Information stream. While it can describe all information in the focal model for a target (detailed

properties and contextual associations), it also relies on adjectival and adverbial emotion signals from the Modeler or Modeler<sub>schema</sub> to construct first-person narratives about the associated “experience.”

When comparing the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> to the Modeler, the quale-conversion process corresponds to *understanding*, consistency checks correspond to *assessment*, and both include *updating*. Thus, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> can generate many appraisable emotions. The quale-conversion process may yield adjectival emotions such as “*vivid*,” “*unclear*,” “*faint*,” or “*none*,” reflecting the quality of the recalled visual-memory quale. The consistency check may also generate emotions such as “*surprised*” when discrepancies are detected—for example, when a stable object appears different across a saccade. For focal targets, the associated emotion signals are part of the experience and, via the Focal Target Information stream, are available to the Controller<sub>whole</sub>; for non-focal items, sufficiently salient signals can trigger a bottom-up target request.

When an aphantasic individual says, “I cannot visualize a red apple,” the Controller<sub>whole</sub> reports the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>’s judgment: no visual quale was generated, corresponding to an appraisable emotion signal of “*none*.” First-person reports of “experience” reflect the Controller<sub>whole</sub>’s interpretation of appraisable emotion signals, not direct access to qualia. The illusion of subjective “experience” arises from the Controller<sub>whole</sub>’s limited access to the Modeler/Modeler<sub>schema</sub>’s internal processes, specifically only the appraisable emotion signals previously or currently generated for the present focal targets. While this account explains the illusion that the Controller<sub>whole</sub> has direct access to qualia, it is not eliminativist about their existence. We do not deny qualia or conscious experience but locate them entirely within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> and explain how other agents infer them from indirect signals, including appraisable emotion signals. This creates the appearance of dual-aspect monism: the same event appears both experiential and behavioral because the Controller<sub>whole</sub> infers “experiences” from indirect cues. When commenting on a focal “experience,” the Controller<sub>whole</sub> combines focal model data from the World Model with adjectival or adverbial emotion signals from the Modeler/Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. For example, a stunning natural scene (such as sunlight glinting off waves) may lead the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>’s quale-conversion process to produce an adjectival emotion like “*vivid*” or “*striking*,” which the Controller<sub>whole</sub> incorporates into its narrative: “That’s beautiful” or “That’s dazzling.”

In this theory, conscious experience is constructed within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>, which unifies subject, process, and content. From inside the system, the constructed experience is simply the sense of being that agent.

Ontologically, our conscious self is the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>, whereas narratively, the “I” that speaks and controls the body is the Controller<sub>whole</sub>, supported by the Body<sub>model</sub> and the I/Me/My<sub>model</sub>—so we identify with the Controller.

Thus, the “I” is not the conscious self.

## Optimizing Perception and Visual Consistency Checks

To refine the Modeler’s outputs without duplicating its processes, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> monitors two outputs. The first is the Focal Target Information stream, and the second is the entire Concrete World

Model (see Figure 1). The Focal Target Information stream delivers focal target content and appraisable emotion signals for the Controller<sub>whole</sub>'s reporting about "experiences," controlling actions, and selecting future targets. When data arrives via arrows A (language inputs), B (inner language), and D (emotions or imagined senses) to *update* the World Model, they are automatically focal targets. Accordingly, the Focal Target Information stream carries (i) those streams in full, (ii) only the attended portions of arrow C (sensory inputs), and (iii) any additional focal targets drawn from the Memories of the Concrete World Model or the Abstract World Model (i.e., all focal target sources available to the Controller<sub>whole</sub>). To monitor unattended inputs, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> relies on the Concrete World Model, which integrates all sensory data from arrow C, thereby accounting for diffuse awareness.

This monitoring is critical because the Concrete World Model is the source of all bottom-up target requests, issued by the Modeler or Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. Missing a trigger can cause unresponsive behavior, and false triggers from internal changes (e.g., modeling errors) can be even more disruptive. By monitoring the entire Concrete World Model, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> distinguishes genuine environmental changes from inconsistencies in the Modeler's algorithm. This is especially important in vision. For example, if the system does not account for the retinal photoreceptor density gradient, the same object can excite different numbers of photoreceptors per degree of visual angle during saccades. This can be misinterpreted as an actual change in size or shape, producing false bottom-up targets.

To support this monitoring, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> maintains a qualia counterpart of the Concrete World Model. We propose that the Concrete World Model is continuously transformed into qualia by the Concrete quale-conversion process. Focal Target Information is converted by the appropriate quale-conversion process (Concrete, Memories of the Concrete, or Abstract). Together, these transformations generate the Quale World Model within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>.

By comparing visual qualia across time and locations, particularly before and after saccades, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> can detect inconsistencies and train the Modeler to correct them. Each saccade shifts the center of vision, allowing the system to verify that stable objects remain consistent across retinal positions, even though peripheral cone density is 5% of central vision (Wells-Gray, Choi, & Bries, 2016). To support this comparison, the Modeler's transient saccadic process retains the pre-saccadic image until the saccade completes. This transient hold may enable the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>'s cross-saccade consistency check. In principle, the system could suppress or ignore intra-saccadic changes at the Controller<sub>whole</sub> level. However, preserving a pre-saccadic snapshot permits direct comparison and enables the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> to refine the Modeler's algorithm.

When qualia for the same object differ across a saccade, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> may generate a "*surprised*" adjectival emotion. In infancy, these discrepancies likely reflect uncorrected differences in photoreceptor density or other early-vision algorithmic issues and serve as training signals, prompting the Modeler to adjust early visual processing. Later, the same "*surprised*" response can signal internal modeling errors, new vision problems, or genuine object changes, prompting bottom-up attention targets. The same consistency-checking process also supports adaptation to longer-term disruptions, such as acquired scotomas; even the natural blind spot in each eye may be perceptually filled in during early life using similar saccade-based comparisons. This consistency-checking mechanism helps explain

why visual qualia are not raw encodings (e.g., RGB values) but are abstracted and optimized for comparison across saccades. We propose that color qualia are shaped so that the easiest way to experience differences is also the easiest way to compute them.

### The Sensory Data Pipeline

Before describing the experiment, we summarize the steps in the sensory data pipeline for this model. (Note that Steps 1 and 2 are concurrent.):

Step 1: Visual data is *understood* and *assessed* to create a retinotopic map, which then *updates* the transient saccadic process input in Step 3.

Step 2: Non-visual sensory data is similarly *understood* and *assessed* for integration in Step 4.

Step 3: The transient saccadic process operates on visual input.

Step 3a: Before the saccade, input flows continuously through the transient process, *updating* the output.

Step 3b: During the saccade, output is held at the pre-saccadic visual values.

Step 3c: After the saccade, the transient process resumes *updating* only after aligning new input with pre-saccadic data to ensure continuity.

Step 4: Transient visual output is transformed into a stable, world-based representation, *integrated* with other sensory inputs, and further *assessed* to produce a cohesive multisensory model.

Step 5: The Concrete World Model is *updated* with this multisensory representation. Together with the current Focal Target Information stream, it provides input to Step 6.

Step 6: Within the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ , the appropriate quale-conversion process *updates* the Quale World Model, and the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  performs a cross-saccadic consistency check on the resulting qualia.

Thus, the Quale World Model contains diffuse-awareness qualia and focal target qualia. In Step 6, the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ 's cross-saccadic consistency check compares new qualia (from the full Concrete World Model and Focal Target Information stream) with those from just before the saccade. It flags discrepancies as possible errors in the Modeler's *understanding* or *updating* of World Model data, or in the quale-conversion process.

Performing this consistency check for Concrete visual Focal Target Information is essential. For targets, it provides a direct verification of the specific visual object that the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  will rely on. In effect, it ensures that the object does not change when it transitions from a peripheral focal target before the saccade to a central-vision focal target after the saccade. (In the experiment, changes will be restricted to objects that are neither the initial fixation target nor the final saccade target, since a change to a saccade target could be noticed directly by the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  and would confound the experiment.)



For Memories or Abstract focal targets, saccades do not alter the content, so this cross-saccade consistency check does not apply. This likely contributes to the substantial individual variability observed in recalled or imagined concrete and abstract qualia.

For reference, the visual fast-Modeler (Steps 1 and 3) together with the visual-to-motor fast-Controller can initiate motor action in  $\approx 200$  ms. By contrast, the full Modeler (Steps 1–6) together with the full Controller can initiate motor action in  $\approx 500$  ms (Burr & Morrone, 2012).

## The Proposed Experiment


The proposed visual experiment tests whether the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> performs pre- and post-saccadic consistency checks on qualia during Step 6. This consistency check should produce a bottom-up target if a peripheral, non-focal object changes during a saccade, likely accompanied by a “*surprised*” adjectival emotion. In principle, such a target could arise from Steps 1, 3c, 4, 5, or 6. Step 2 is excluded because it handles only non-visual data. We present arguments and supporting evidence to rule out Steps 4 and 5. If the predicted results are observed, they would rule out Steps 1 and 3c, leaving Step 6 as the sole source of targets generated during saccades.

Participants will report a bottom-up target, yet may often be unable to identify the specific feature that has changed. Feature identification requires the Controller<sub>whole</sub> to compare the pre-saccadic and post-saccadic focal targets of the same object. If the object becomes a target only post-saccade, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> lacks a pre-saccadic object representation and can report only that something has changed. Nevertheless, the instructions will ask participants to indicate what changed or to note a hunch if they are uncertain.

Intuitively, Step 1 detection is difficult because the image sweeps rapidly across the retina during a saccade. Accordingly, we ensure that object changes occur at a relatively slow rate compared with the instantaneous eye velocity. The eye’s velocity during a saccade follows a bell-shaped curve. We give the size, position, and color changes the same smooth temporal curve, scaling their rates to a small, fixed fraction of the eye’s instantaneous velocity, so they remain slow relative to ocular motion.

Independent of these measures to limit Step 1 detections, Step 3c is responsible for aligning the intended saccade target with the actual landing point. When there is a misalignment, a corrective microsaccade may follow, or the Modeler may shift the image data to compensate. We propose additional experimental methods to rule out Steps 1 and 3c as sources of bottom-up targets. Together with the arguments excluding Steps 4 and 5, successful results would thereby identify Step 6 as the source of such targets and support the theory.

The experiment could be performed in a university vision lab that has accurate eye trackers and a high-resolution, high-refresh-rate, high bit-depth monitor, perhaps configured like this:



*Figure 5 — Proposed Experimental Display Layout*

The subject is instructed to keep central vision on one of the red Xs and to saccade to the other X on cue. Thus, at any given time, there are two focal targets: the current fixation X, which is foveal focal before the saccade and becomes non-focal afterward, and the goal X, which is peripheral focal pre-saccade and foveal focal post-saccade. The changing object is never one of the two X-bearing objects. If the experiment succeeds, then on some trials a changed peripheral object will nevertheless be promoted to a focal target after the saccade.

Two background conditions will be used as a manipulation check: black, which produces high-contrast edges, and mid-gray. On the mid-gray background, colored elements will be chosen to be near-isoluminant (i.e., approximately luminance-matched) to one another and to the background. The same near-isoluminant color palette will also be used in the black-background condition, ensuring that the only differences between conditions are background luminance and edge contrast. On the mid-gray background, this should reduce early visual luminance-contrast transients<sup>22</sup> and, consequently, detections arising from early stages, namely Steps 1 or 3c and possibly Steps 4 and 5. Step 6 comparisons should be unaffected, because the qualia associated with permanent changes remain distinct even when luminance contrast is minimized. Thus, we expect fewer detections from the early steps on the mid-gray background than on the black background. If near-isoluminance yields the predicted pattern—namely, fewer temporary-change detections on the mid-gray background with preserved permanent-change detections—it would provide robust evidence for our model. In this case, we would consider a follow-up using full per-observer isoluminance calibration, which is challenging

<sup>22</sup> By luminance-contrast transients we mean brief changes in brightness or edge contrast that evoke fast responses in early vision; near-isoluminant, color-only changes produce much weaker transient energy.

but could provide even more compelling evidence.<sup>23</sup> Notably, the red target Xs will retain clear luminance contrast and will not be near-isoluminant.

During the saccade from one red X to the other, one or more objects on the display may subtly change in size, position, or color. The size change could be either horizontal or vertical, increasing or decreasing, while keeping the object's center fixed. Position changes can be vertical or horizontal, and they may or may not be coordinated with slight shifts in the destination target X. Size, position, or color changes occur continuously and smoothly during a saccade. The change can be permanent, a net change after the saccade, or temporary, changing during the saccade and returning to baseline by saccade end.

As a control, the experimental design also includes no-saccade trials with timing otherwise identical to that of the saccade trials. These provide a baseline for peripheral visual bottom-up target detection and can contribute to false alarm rate analysis. In these no-saccade trials, participants will more often be able to say what changed, even for temporary changes, because the changing object can become a focal target in the periphery while it is changing. Once targeted, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> can observe the unfolding change and identify the feature.

### Differentiating Step 1 Targets from Step 6 Targets

Here we concentrate on Steps 1 and 6. Other intermediate steps are considered later. This theory predicts that during saccades, relatively small, permanent changes in the size, position, or color of objects will be detected by Step 6 and generate a bottom-up target. Only Step 1 can detect temporary visual changes because Step 3 holds the pre-saccadic image constant until the end of the saccade. Therefore, only Step 1 can, in principle, detect both temporary and permanent visual changes. Moreover, for the same net magnitude, a temporary change has a higher rate of change, namely, edge velocity for size or position and color-change rate for color. Therefore, if Step 1 alone were responsible for a bottom-up target, temporary changes of the same magnitude would be more detectable than permanent ones. The strongest evidence for Step 6 would be the detection of permanent changes, while temporary changes of the same magnitude were not. This result implies that all detections arise from Step 6, with none from Step 1.

If any temporary changes are detected, include trials that pair a permanent change with a temporary change on different objects of the same magnitude. The theory is supported if the permanent-change object is more likely than the temporary-change object to become a bottom-up target, because Step 6 detects only permanent changes, whereas Step 1 should favor temporary changes given their higher rate of change. Size and position changes should produce fewer Step 1 detections on a mid-gray background than on black due to reduced luminance motion energy, while Step 6 is still expected to produce permanent-change detections.

---

<sup>23</sup> Because isoluminance varies between central and peripheral vision (e.g., due to differing cone distributions), peripheral isoluminance is the relevant factor for the proposed experiment and should be calibrated accordingly.

Under typical conditions, visual input is suppressed during a saccade. However, a 2-ms LED flash presented mid-saccade can be perceived, although it is typically mislocalized (Honda, 1989). This case exemplifies an abrupt, high-magnitude temporary change and suggests that Step 1 detected a sufficiently large transient and generated a bottom-up focal target that overcame saccadic suppression in Step 3, allowing the flash to reach awareness. Accordingly, a sufficiently large temporary change in a peripheral object during a saccade might also be consciously perceived. To prevent this, we will measure each participant's breakthrough threshold for conscious awareness of a large temporary change and run the main experiment with temporary changes set well below that threshold. The best-case outcome is that below this threshold, temporary changes never generate bottom-up targets. This is plausible because we ensure the temporary changes are always presented at a small fraction of the instantaneous saccade velocity.

### Differentiating Step 3c Targets from Step 6 Targets

From the literature, Step 3c appears to be saccade-target-centric. It verifies that the eye lands at the intended goal and aligns post-saccadic input with the pre-saccadic preview at that location. When the target is shifted slightly during a saccade, observers typically do not report the displacement, so no bottom-up target is generated, even though small corrective saccades may recenter the fovea on the goal (Bridgeman, Hendry, & Stark, 1975). By contrast, blanking the target for 50–300 ms immediately after the saccade restores sensitivity to small target steps (Deubel, Schneider, & Bridgeman, 1996), and the displacement at the landing site is reported (Deubel, Bridgeman, & Schneider, 1998). In addition, landmarks near the saccade target act as spatial references that bias perceived stability and displacement after the eye lands, further linking post-saccadic localization to objects found at the landing site (Deubel, Koch, & Bridgeman, 2010).

Additionally, according to (Melcher & Colby, 2008), predictive remapping in the parietal cortex and frontal eye fields<sup>24</sup> selectively updates salient, attended items. They describe “gist” as an abstract summary of the overall scene, dominated by peripheral, non-targeted information, and note that it is not remapped; thus, in our terms, gist corresponds to the diffuse awareness content of peripheral vision. On that basis, Step 3c should not align pre- and post-saccadic non-target peripheral content. We therefore assign any alignment of diffuse awareness to Step 6 within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. Accordingly, we predict that Step 3c will not generate bottom-up targets for our peripheral changes, whereas Step 6 can.

Hence, we propose that Step 6 receives both the visual Focal Target Information stream from Step 3c and the raw visual diffuse-awareness input from the Modeler. It then applies the saccade vector (direction and distance) estimated in Step 3c, based on pre- and post-saccadic focal alignment, to remap peripheral diffuse-awareness content, keeping the qualia for the entire visual field aligned in Step 6.

---

<sup>24</sup> These two loci align with the proposed Focal Target Information stream: signals proceed from occipital visual cortex through posterior parietal areas to the frontal eye fields and related frontal control regions, i.e., from the Modeler<sub>whole</sub> to the Controller<sub>whole</sub>.

To dissociate Steps 3c and 6, we focus on a distance-to-target gradient. If Step 3c contributes substantially, the probability of reporting a peripheral change should be highest near the saccade landing target X and decrease as the distance to that X increases. In contrast, Step 6, which aligns diffuse peripheral qualia, should yield detections that depend primarily on change magnitude and location in the display, with little or no additional dependence on distance to the landing X. If detection rates show no gradient around the landing X, we attribute detections to Step 6. If detections occur only near the landing X, our Step 6 hypothesis is not supported. Mixed patterns (for example, a near-target excess superimposed on a distance-invariant baseline) would suggest a combination of Step 3c spillover and Step 6 contributions.

### Why Steps 4 and 5 Cannot be the Source of the Bottom-Up Target

During Steps 4 and 5, the Modeler *understands* and *assesses* multisensory input, while continuously *updating* the Concrete World Model. The literature cited in this Proposed Experiment section suggests that the Concrete World Model has two functionally distinct components:

- *Focal Attention Information*: For each focal target, one or more sensory systems contribute data that are integrated into a unified object representation. For example, during manual manipulation, visual, tactile, and sometimes auditory information are combined to support precise control. Even when only a single sense contributes, that input is processed to yield the best available task-relevant model. This Focal Attention Information feeds the Focal Target Information stream available to the Controller (see Figure 3).
- *Diffuse Attention Information*: All incoming sensory data are *understood* and *assessed* at an initial level, including scene gist extraction and coarse object categorization, to determine whether any item merits promotion to a focal target. Regions that are not current targets and are not suggested to the Targeter as bottom-up targets receive only this preliminary analysis. However, these diffuse-awareness data must remain accessible to the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> so it can verify correctness and detect errors in the Modeler's assumptions. For example, if the Modeler's assumed peripheral cone-density gradient is inaccurate, the proposed experiment is designed to reveal that discrepancy.

Could Steps 4 and 5 be the source of the bottom-up target in our paradigm? By definition, any cross-saccadic comparison that detects discrepancies and tunes the Modeler is an optimization function of the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. If Steps 4 and 5 were to perform such a comparison, they would, in effect, be operating as the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. In that case, the sensory information format that they use would have to match the concrete-sensory portion of the Quale World Model. Under this assumption, the Concrete World Model would serve as the sensory portion of the Quale World Model, thereby effectively merging Step 6 with Steps 4 and 5. We now examine the consequences of this hypothesis, which treats the quale-conversion process as an identity mapping with no transformation.

Although Memories of the Concrete World Model are stored in synapses, they must be reconstituted in the Concrete World Model's sensory format for use by the Controller. Thus, focal targets in the Concrete World Model and in the reconstituted Memories must share a concrete format that the

Controller can use. If the quale-conversion processes for the Concrete World Model and its Memories were identical (i.e., an identity mapping), recalled focal targets would be as vivid as direct perception. However, they are not: recalled visual targets often lack the vivid qualities of direct perception and vary widely across individuals, from aphantasia to hyperphantasia. Therefore, the Quale World Model's concrete representation cannot be identical to the Concrete World Model,<sup>25</sup> and the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> component that generates a bottom-up target for an “*unexpected*” object change during a saccade cannot be implemented in Steps 4 or 5. To fit these observations, the Quale World Model must use a representation different from the Concrete World Model (i.e., an abstracted model), and there must be distinct quale-conversion processes for the three parts of the World Model.

Therefore, if the experiment rules out Step 1 and Step 3c, and the foregoing arguments and evidence rule out Steps 4 and 5, the remaining candidate is Step 6, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>'s qualia-consistency check. This process performs the pre-saccadic versus post-saccadic comparison and issues the bottom-up target for a permanently changed, non-focal object. A positive result on these tests would support the prediction that Step 6 is the sole source of such targets and would strengthen our proposed answer to the Hard Problem.

To our knowledge, no prior study has tested a peripheral-only, trans-saccadic consistency check that uses the bottom-up target itself as the dependent measure, rather than explicit Controller<sub>whole</sub>-mediated reports of change. We identified multiple studies in which the saccade target—whether initially foveal or finally foveal—changed size during the saccade, and participants reported the change. Thus, barring missed studies, prior paradigms effectively treat the Modeler<sub>whole</sub> and the Controller<sub>whole</sub> as a single reporting channel, relying on focal information conveyed by the Focal Target Information stream. By contrast, our paradigm isolates the Modeler and the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> by using bottom-up target signals arising from Diffuse Attention Information, which is experienced only as diffuse awareness within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>.

We now turn to the implications of our theory for the Hard Problem of consciousness.

## Solving the Hard Problem of Consciousness

Suppose science has precisely determined all the functions the brain performs to produce behavior. In this case, Chalmers defines the Hard Problem of consciousness as the question, “*Why is the performance of these functions accompanied by experience?*” [italics in the original] (Chalmers, 1995). This appears impossible to solve: if experience affects behavior, then some subset of those functions must produce consciousness; yet phenomenal consciousness does not seem reducible to the logical transformations and functions that neurons implement.

---

<sup>25</sup> As noted in “Introduction to Cybernetic Regulation,” the Quale World Model is an abstracted model of the Concrete World Model rather than the Concrete World Model itself; likewise, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> is an abstracted model of the Modeler rather than the Modeler itself.

On the other hand, if experiences do not affect behavior, then why do they exist at all? The Modeler<sub>schema</sub> Theory addresses this by granting that experiences do not directly affect behavior on short timescales but instead assigns them a long-term functional role.

Indeed, if a stroke selectively disabled the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> while leaving all other brain functions intact, the person would behave essentially normally yet lack experiences; about as close as one can get to a philosophical “zombie.” However, this “zombie” would be detectable: without the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>, some appraisable-emotion signals that depend on qualia would be missing. The Modeler would still supply its own appraisable-emotion signals; the absent signals are those tied specifically to qualia computed by the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. Consequently, the Controller<sub>whole</sub> would not furnish the same range of experiential reports—descriptions would lack some experiential adjectives and adverbs, yet it could still support fine discriminations. For example, such a person could judge a shade of red as intermediate between two others by its RGB values and could name colors by those values.

On the other hand, if the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> were disabled in infancy, the brain would not develop normally because the Modeler’s algorithms would not be monitored or improved by the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. The resulting adult would be severely impaired. We propose that avoiding this outcome is the evolutionary function of qualia within the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>.

In the short term, this theory holds that consciousness does not affect behavior and is therefore epiphenomenal. In the long term, consciousness calibrates and optimizes the Modeler, which yields evolutionary advantages.

### From Epiphenomenon to Function: Qualia as Calibration

However, questions remain: If experiences do not directly drive behavior, what are they, and where do they reside in the system? Our answers are developed in the sections “Experiential Unity: The Modeler<sub>schema</sub> as Subject, Process, and Content” (hereafter, **Experiential Unity**) and “The Modeler<sub>schema</sub> as a Self-Contained Universe” (hereafter, **Self-Contained Universe**). We address these “what” and “where” questions in two steps.

First, addressing the “what” question, Experiential Unity specifies a single mechanism in which the subject (the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>), the experiencing process, and the experienced content are co-constructed and unified in the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>. There is no separate viewer, so there is no homunculus regress. Thus, the unity and mineness of experience arise within a single locus: the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>.

Second, addressing the “where” question, Self-Contained Universe marks a clear informational boundary: the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> operates on World Model contents but is not itself a body-bound representation within the World Model. To other agents, the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> is a black box: its only inputs are the Concrete World Model state and the Focal Target Information stream. The Modeler<sub>schema</sub> outputs are nonconscious control signals to the Modeler, a limited set of appraisable-emotion signals, and bottom-up target requests. Since no other agent receives qualia, the phenomenology remains entirely inside the Modeler<sub>schema</sub>; therefore, it functions as a Self-Contained Universe.



These “what” and “where” answers help explain why experience can seem outside the physical world while remaining fully implemented in the brain. Although it can be implemented with low-level logic operations, an explanatorily adequate account is not tractable at that level alone and requires the higher-level architecture developed in this paper. Within this  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  closed loop (the Self-Contained Universe), the quale-conversion process produces the values used for cross-saccadic consistency checks, making qualia functionally necessary for calibrating the Modeler over developmental time. In this framework, phenomenality resides within the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ , and appraisable emotions generated within the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  enable the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  to discuss experiences despite lacking experience itself.

### Why We Misattribute Consciousness: The Control Hierarchy Illusion

Given this architecture, a natural puzzle arises: why does the  $\text{Human}_{\text{whole}}$  claim to be conscious, even though only the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  experiences qualia? The answer lies in the control hierarchy. The  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  is embedded within the  $\text{Human}_{\text{schema}}$ , which functions as the cybernetic regulator of the  $\text{Human}_{\text{whole}}$ . Because the conscious agent is nested inside the agent that governs the entire system, the  $\text{Human}_{\text{whole}}$ , as a system, reports consciousness. However, in everyday thinking, the  $\text{Human}_{\text{whole}}$  tends to identify with the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$ —the agent that selects actions, produces language, controls the  $\text{Body}_{\text{model}}$ , and identifies with the I/Me/My $_{\text{model}}$ . This misidentification is the root of the “problem” in the Hard Problem of consciousness. For the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$ , which is entirely nonconscious, consciousness is indeed an insoluble mystery. It can comment on experience only through appraisable emotion signals supplied by the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ . Although it uses words like “experience” and “consciousness,” it lacks phenomenality.

Beyond misidentification, the underlying architecture also helps explain why consciousness seems so alien to the physical world. The  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  directly owns the  $\text{Body}_{\text{model}}$  and the I/Me/My $_{\text{model}}$ , which together define the embodied, action-oriented self, as well as the human representation in the Abstract World Model. By contrast, the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{whole}}$  directly owns the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ —the sole source of phenomenality. These two wholes, though integrated in the  $\text{Human}_{\text{whole}}$ , are effectively distinct universes—one governs the agent that acts in the world, while the other governs the abstract internal system that generates conscious experience. The  $\text{Human}_{\text{whole}}$  inherits from both, but through structurally separate channels. This deep separation between the machinery that acts and the machinery that experiences creates the illusion that consciousness is not part of the physical world, even though it arises from a physical process within the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ .

This structure is graphically represented by the hierarchy of whole agents outlined in “Whole Agents and Consciousness Attribution” (see Figure 4). In our account, the only conscious agents are the  $\text{Human}_{\text{whole}}$ ,  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{whole}}$ ,  $\text{Human}_{\text{schema}}$ , and  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ —with the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  as the sole generative source of phenomenal content. Crucially, the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{whole}}$  and  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  are not body-bound representations within the World Model. They are abstract control agents: the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{whole}}$  constructs the World Model, and the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  receives that content as input. Neither is itself represented within the World Model, and this architectural separation helps explain why conscious experiences seem not to be part of the physical world, even though they are constructed from it.



To our knowledge, the consciousness literature does not yet provide a precise, body-independent description of an abstract control agent that could serve as the source of consciousness, the kind of agent we call the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ . Many proposed sources of consciousness explain only focal experiences,<sup>26</sup> attributing them to some part of the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$ , which is not an abstract control agent. This lack helps explain why the Hard Problem has seemed so intractable. We offer a precise, body-independent account of such an abstract control agent (the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ ) to address this omission. We argue that diffuse awareness is key to resolving this problem. The empirical observation that the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  lacks access to diffuse awareness motivates the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  explanation.

More concretely, on our account, the subjective feel of experience arises as the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  applies quale-conversion processes to World Model data (producing abstracted representations), generates and stores the resulting Quale World Model, and monitors internal coherence to improve subsequent modeling—all within the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ . As discussed in “Optimizing Perception and Visual Consistency Checks,” this agent-centered architecture renders qualia functionally necessary for optimizing the Concrete World Model through saccade-based comparisons.

## Empirical Support and Experimental Consequences

Converging support:

- *Absent qualia with intact task performance*: Aphantasia shows absent visual qualia with preserved task performance (Jacobs, Schwarzkopf, & Silvanto, 2017), (Pearson, 2019). This fits a  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ -only qualia mechanism: the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  can use accurate focal target information even without access to qualia.
- *Diffuse awareness vs. focal report*: The earlier exercise described in “Diffuse Attention and Diffuse Awareness” demonstrates diffuse awareness that the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  cannot directly access. Yet, for focal targets, it can narrate using appraisable emotion signals supplied by the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ . This supports the locus of experience being inside the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  and the reporting role of the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$ .
- *Inner experience variability*: Individual differences in inner speech and imagery (Alderson-Day & Pearson, 2023), (Pearson, 2019) align with our proposal of three distinct quale-conversion processes (Concrete, Memories of the Concrete, Abstract), with strong variability outside the evolutionarily constrained sensory Concrete World Model channel.
- *Saccadic stability as a training signal (why qualia are needed)*: Visual stability across saccades (Burr & Morrone, 2012), (Wells-Gray, Choi, & Bries, 2016) motivates a qualia-based comparison

---

<sup>26</sup> Examples of consciousness models that appear able to explain only focal experiences include Global Workspace Theory/Global Neuronal Workspace (GWT/GNW), Higher-Order Thought (HOT), and Attention Schema Theory (AST). By contrast, Integrated Information Theory (IIT) and Free Energy/Predictive Coding (FEP) may also capture diffuse awareness. Aphantasia highlights a gap: both frameworks can accommodate preserved task performance by adjusting parameters, yet neither explains why those parameter settings should yield no visual experience for recalled objects.

within the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  that detects mismatches and trains the Modeler, yielding optimized qualia<sup>27</sup> rather than the task-oriented object encodings used by the Concrete World Model. The proposed experiment, if confirmed, would provide evidence that these qualia are computed within the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ .

- *Peripheral visual data remapping (where remapping occurs):* As discussed in “Differentiating Step 3c Targets from Step 6 Targets” in “The Proposed Experiment,” the Modeler remaps focal target data so focal images appear stable to the  $\text{Controller}_{\text{whole}}$  during a saccade. However, evidence indicates that the Modeler does not remap peripheral, non-focal data (Melcher & Colby, 2008). Since diffuse visual awareness is stable both centrally and peripherally, the periphery must be remapped within the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ .

Further support for the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  framework comes from reported individual differences in inner experience for abstract or recalled concrete content. The section “Distinct Qualia from Distinct World Model Components” and Table 1 describe how separate quale-conversion processes for Concrete, Memories of the Concrete, and Abstract components can account for this variability. As a result, visual mental imagery need not feel like direct perception, and inner speech experiences can differ substantially across individuals.

Although we have mainly discussed vision, similar considerations apply to all sensory representations in the Concrete World Model. In each modality, a corresponding quale-conversion process would allow the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  to optimize that channel. Including all modalities is especially important for multisensory events in which a single external cause elicits qualia across multiple modalities. For example, in ventriloquism, synchronous lip movements visually capture the perceived location of the voice, biasing it toward the dummy’s mouth despite audition’s lower spatial precision and even when observers know the dummy cannot speak.

Thus, subjective experience is not a mysterious side effect, but a required mechanism for self-directed model refinement. In this framework, the Hard Problem becomes a design problem: identify the qualia-generating agent (the  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$ ), specify its quale-conversion processes and consistency checks, and test the behavioral consequences of these mechanisms, such as the proposed experiment.

## Conclusion

The  $\text{Modeler}_{\text{schema}}$  Theory of Consciousness identifies a specific, abstract control agent implemented in the brain as the sole generative source of conscious experience. By integrating subject, process, and content within a single cybernetic agent, it offers a path toward closing the explanatory gap. Qualia are not mysterious byproducts but functional internal constructs that calibrate and optimize the World

---

<sup>27</sup> “Optimized” means the qualia are simpler than the corresponding Concrete World Model representations, less computationally demanding to generate, and more readily comparable for pre-/post-saccadic evaluation. From an engineering perspective, these would constitute the design specifications for qualia.

Model. Unlike accounts that merely describe awareness, this theory specifies testable mechanisms and explicit falsification criteria.

If confirmed, the proposed saccadic-consistency experiment would support the hypothesis that qualia serve a crucial developmental function in maintaining perceptual stability and accuracy. Conversely, if temporary changes (of matched magnitude) are reliably more detectable than permanent ones in saccade trials with approximate isoluminance controls, or if permanent peripheral changes are not detected at all, this would falsify the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> Theory.

Taken together, the arguments and evidence presented here—along with the experiment’s predicted results—support considering the Modeler<sub>schema</sub> as a plausible source of human consciousness. We offer this theory as a starting point and welcome feedback.

## Acknowledgment

We are deeply grateful to our friend David McFadzean for his sustained and generous contributions to this work. Over several years, David reviewed multiple drafts of the paper, offering incisive critiques, thoughtful suggestions, and encouragement at key moments. Many of the clearest explanations, structural improvements, and refinements in terminology were the direct result of his feedback.

David played a vital role in strengthening the theoretical foundations of the model, particularly by encouraging greater emphasis on cybernetic principles and by ensuring that the proposed mechanisms fit together logically and are well-motivated. His philosophical insight and scientific rigor have had a lasting influence on this project.

## References

- Alderson-Day, B., & Pearson, A. (2023, Sep 5). What can neurodiversity tell us about inner speech, and vice versa? A theoretical perspective. *Cortex*. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2023.08.008
- Bridgeman, B., Hendry, D., & Stark, L. (1975, Jun). Failure to detect displacement of the visual world during saccadic eye movements. *Vision Res.*, 15(6), 719-22. doi:10.1016/0042-6989(75)90290-4
- Burr, D. C., & Morrone, M. C. (2012). Constructing stable spatial maps of the world. *Perception*, 41, 1355-1372. doi:10.1068/p7392
- Chalmers, D. (1995). Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3), 200-219.
- Conant, R., & Ashby, W. (1970). Every good regulator of a system must be a model of that system. *International Journal of Systems Science*, 1(2), 89-97.
- Deubel, H., Bridgeman, B., & Schneider, W. (1998). Immediate post-saccadic information mediates space constancy. *Vision Res.*, 38(20), 3147-59. doi:10.1016/S0042-6989(98)00048-0
- Deubel, H., Koch, C., & Bridgeman, B. (2010). Landmarks facilitate visual space constancy across saccades and during fixation. *Vision Res.*, 50(2), 249-59. doi:10.1016/j.visres.2009.09.020
- Deubel, H., Schneider, W. X., & Bridgeman, B. (1996, Apr). Postsaccadic target blanking prevents saccadic suppression of image displacement. *Vision Res.*, 36(7), 985-96. doi:10.1016/0042-6989(95)00203-0
- Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11, 127-138. doi:10.1038/nrn2787
- Graziano, M. (2019). Toward a standard model of consciousness: Reconciling the attention schema, global workspace, higher-order thought, and illusionist theories. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*. doi:10.1080/02643294.2019.1670630
- Honda, H. (1989). Perceptual localization of visual stimuli flashed during saccades. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 46, 162-174.
- Jacobs, C., Schwarzkopf, D. S., & Silvanto, J. (2017). Visual working memory performance in aphantasia. *Cortex*, 105, 61-73. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2017.10.014
- James, W. (1890). *The Principles of Psychology, Vol 1*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Melcher, D., & Colby, C. (2008, Dec). Trans-saccadic perception. *Trends Cogn Sci*, 12(12), 466-73. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2008.09.003.
- Pearson, J. (2019). The human imagination: the cognitive neuroscience of visual mental imagery. *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 20, 624-634. doi:10.1038/s41583-019-0202-9

- Treisman, A. M., & Gelade, G. (1980). A Feature-Integration Theory of Attention. *Cognitive Psychology*, 12, 97-136.
- Wells-Gray, E., Choi, S., & Bries, A. (2016). Variation in rod and cone density from the fovea to the mid-periphery in healthy human retinas using adaptive optics scanning laser ophthalmoscopy. *Eye*, 30, 1135-1143. doi:10.1038/eye.2016.107