JNphi

The Many Within the One: A Neurophilosophical Inquiry into Consciousness, Identity, and Dissociation

Hasan Belli*, Selin Lacin†

Abstract

This paper explores the ontological and epistemological implications of consciousness through an interdisciplinary synthesis of analytic idealism, quantum panprotopsychism, and the clinical model of Dissociative Identity Disorder. Drawing on Bernardo Kastrup's analytic idealism, it argues that reality is fundamentally mental, constituted by a universal field of consciousness whose apparent multiplicity emerges from self-differentiation rather than physical fragmentation. Quantum ontology, particularly the principles of wave–particle duality and entanglement, serves as a heuristic metaphor for this dynamic interplay between unity and plurality within consciousness. The study examines the parallels between quantum models of cognition and psychodynamic structures of the self, proposing that the coexistence of "wave-state" (holistic) and "particle-state" (localized) consciousness reflects the dual nature of human awareness. Clinically, Dissociative Identity Disorder provides an empirically grounded analogy for understanding how one conscious system can host multiple, semi-autonomous centers of experience while maintaining overarching functional unity. Neuroimaging and trauma-theory data are discussed as evidence of structural dissociation, which, when reinterpreted philosophically, mirrors the idealist view of differentiated consciousness within a unified ontological field. However, the paper emphasizes that such analogies remain metaphorical rather than mechanistic, preserving the scientific and ethical integrity of psychiatric phenomena. Ultimately, this synthesis proposes a conceptual bridge between metaphysics and clinical science, situating consciousness as both a neurobiological and cosmological principle. While speculative, the framework provides a philosophically coherent and phenomenologically informed model for re-examining the nature of mind, matter, and identity in a post-materialist paradigm.

Key Words: consciousness, quantum panprotopsychism, analytic idealism, dissociative identity disorder, ontology

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.XXXXX

Corresponding author: Selin Lacin
Address: *Istanbul Atlas University, School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, Bagcılar, Istanbul, Turkey. †University of Health Sciences, Bagcılar Training and Research Hospital, Department of Psychiatry, Bagcılar, Istanbul, Turkey.
e-mail ✉ selin_demirdogan@hotmail.com

ISSN 1307-6531, JNphi, Since 2007

Introduction

This search for an integrative framework has inspired renewed interest in panpsychism, the view that consciousness or its precursors is a basic property pervading all matter. For Chalmers, panpsychism offers a "graceful explanatory continuity" that closes the gap between mind and matter (Chalmers, 2015). If consciousness requires an additional property beyond the physical, it becomes arbitrary to confine this property to complex nervous systems. Extending it universally avoids the problem of emergence, positioning consciousness as a fundamental feature of nature, on par with mass or charge. Physics, as Chalmers notes, describes only the structure of matter its relations and Dynamics but not its intrinsic nature. Assuming that these intrinsic properties are phenomenal, or consciousness-like, provides a coherent metaphysical solution. Yet the combination problem remains: how do micro-level experiences, if they exist, combine into a unified macro-level consciousness such as the human mind? This unresolved issue necessitates broader models capable of integrating both empirical findings and phenomenological insights, which is one of the central aims of the present study.

Bernardo Kastrup's philosophical system of analytic idealism offers one such model. It posits that reality is fundamentally mental, constituted by a universal consciousness, and that the physical world is its extrinsic manifestation (Kastrup, 2019). Within this view, individual minds are dissociated alters of a single cosmic consciousness, much like distinct personality states within a case of Dissociative Identity Disorder (DID). This reverses materialist ontology: matter does not generate consciousness; consciousness expresses itself as matter. The term analytic reflects Kastrup's commitment to rigorous logical argumentation and engagement with empirical data, an approach that aligns with the interdisciplinary methodology of this paper, which synthesizes metaphysical analysis with clinical and neurobiological evidence.

Kastrup grounds his metaphysical framework in two central analogies: quantum mechanics and DID. In quantum theory, observation plays a decisive role systems "collapse" into definite states only when measured. Kastrup interprets this not literally but conceptually, suggesting that consciousness constitutes the condition of observation itself, and that physical reality cannot be meaningfully described apart from the conscious act of measurement (Kastrup, 2018). Likewise, DID provides a phenomenological metaphor for how a single consciousness can appear as multiple, seemingly autonomous centers of awareness. Just as a mind with DID manifests several alters within one psyche, universal consciousness can differentiate into multiple individual subjects. These individual selves represent

localized, self-reflective partitions of the same universal field of awareness.

From both philosophical and neuropsychological perspectives, this framework offers a potential bridge between metaphysical theory and empirical observation, addressing the combination problem left unresolved in panpsychism. DID thereby exemplifies how a unified consciousness might, under certain structural and functional constraints, manifest as a multiplicity of experiences a pattern consistent with the principles of analytic idealism. The present study therefore aims to articulate an interdisciplinary synthesis that uses DID as a clinically grounded yet philosophically illuminating model through which to understand how a single consciousness can manifest multiple, differentiated centers of subjective awareness. This integrative approach forms the methodological foundation of the analysis that follows.

1. Materials and Methods

This theoretical study employs a multilayered analytic methodology grounded in the philosophical, clinical, and quantum ontological sources discussed throughout the manuscript. Because the paper aims to develop an integrative conceptual framework rather than test empirical hypotheses, no experimental or observational procedures were conducted. Instead, the study follows a structured interpretive strategy designed to synthesize metaphysical models with clinical data in a methodologically transparent manner. The analytic process consists of three interconnected components:

1.1 Conceptual Analysis of Analytic Idealism, Panpsychism, and Quantum Ontology

Primary philosophical sources including analytic idealism (Kastrup, 2018), Russellian monism and panprotopsychism (Chalmers, 2015; Goff, 2019), and quantum-holistic frameworks (Bohm, 1980; Heisenberg, 1958) were examined through close textual reading and comparative argument analysis. This stage involved identifying the ontological assumptions, explanatory aims, and internal logical structures of each framework, followed by an evaluation of their compatibilities and tensions. Particular attention was given to how these theories conceptualize the relationship between unity and multiplicity in consciousness.

1.2 Interpretation and Integration of Clinical and Neurobiological Literature on DID

Peer-reviewed studies on DID including trauma theory, neuroimaging findings, affective neuroscience, and structural dissociation models

were synthesized to clarify how identity fragmentation is understood in contemporary psychiatry. Rather than treating this literature as direct evidence for any metaphysical claim, the analysis focused on the structural features of dissociation (e.g., restricted autobiographical access, state-dependent memory, differentiated neural activation). These features were then compared with metaphysical models to evaluate whether DID can serve as a phenomenological analogy for differentiated consciousness.

1.3 Construction of Structural Analogies as Heuristic rather than Mechanistic Models

The final stage involved mapping selected structural patterns from quantum ontology and DID onto the metaphysical claims of analytic idealism. Throughout this process, such mappings were treated strictly as conceptual heuristics, not causal explanations. The analogies were evaluated according to their coherence, explanatory value, and ethical appropriateness especially given the clinical sensitivity of DID. This ensures that metaphysical speculation does not misrepresent psychiatric phenomena or overstep empirical boundaries.

Taken together, these methodological steps generate an interdisciplinary framework that integrates philosophical reasoning with empirical clinical insights while maintaining clear epistemic limits. All subsequent sections of the manuscript present the results of this analytic and integrative method.

2. Results

2.1 Quantum Ontology and the Dual Nature of Consciousness

Quantum Mechanics and the Observer Effect

Quantum mechanics represents a paradigm shift in our understanding of reality, revealing that the observer plays an integral role in the manifestation of physical phenomena. At the subatomic level, particles demonstrate wave–particle duality, a concept indicating that physical entities do not possess definite properties independent of measurement (Heisenberg, 1958). Heisenberg's uncertainty principle further asserts that the precise determination of both position and momentum is impossible, implying that nature is inherently probabilistic rather than deterministic (Bohm, 1980).

While such principles have been interpreted by some theorists as suggesting a direct link between consciousness and observation, it is crucial to distinguish metaphorical interpretations from empirical physical mechanisms. The "collapse" of the wave function should be understood as a formal description of measurement outcomes within quantum systems, not as evidence that human consciousness

causally influences matter. Therefore, the observer's role may be better viewed as epistemic participation the process through which knowledge of the system is constituted rather than as an ontological co-creator of reality.

The Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen (EPR) paradox and the phenomenon of quantum entanglement have inspired holistic philosophical interpretations, suggesting deep nonlocal correlations within nature (Busemeyer and Bruza, 2012). Nevertheless, these interpretations remain conceptual analogies rather than empirical claims about mind–matter interaction. Thus, quantum mechanics serves as a fertile philosophical framework for rethinking the relationship between knowledge, observation, and the ontology of reality.

Theories of Consciousness and Quantum Analogies

The conceptual openness of quantum mechanics has influenced theories of consciousness by challenging strict physical reductionism. Panpsychism, for example, proposes that consciousness is a fundamental property of all matter rather than an emergent phenomenon of neural complexity (Goff, 2019). While this ontological view broadens the philosophical horizon, extending quantum principles such as superposition or entanglement to mental phenomena must remain analogical. Otherwise, one risks conflating scientific description with metaphysical speculation.

The combination problem how micro-level experiential units could coalesce into a unified subjective consciousness remains a major unresolved issue for panpsychism. In this regard, quantum panprotopsychism metaphorically employs entanglement as a model of unification (Bohm, 1980). Yet this remains a philosophical metaphor rather than a testable hypothesis. Similarly, Penrose and Hameroff's Orchestrated Objective Reduction (Orch-OR) theory proposes that quantum coherence in neuronal microtubules underlies conscious experience (Hameroff and Penrose, 1996). However, this hypothesis faces significant physical objections most notably that quantum coherence cannot be sustained in the warm, wet environment of the brain (Tegmark, 2000). Consequently, Orch-OR should be treated as a speculative model rather than an established mechanism.

By contrast, the Quantum Cognition framework provides a more scientifically grounded application of quantum theory. It does not claim that the brain functions as a quantum computer but uses the mathematical formalism of quantum probability to model cognitive processes such as decision-making, perception, and memory (Busemeyer and Bruza, 2012). This approach demonstrates that mental processes often violate classical probability theory and can be more coherently represented through quantum probability logic.

Therefore, Quantum Cognition preserves empirical rigor while maintaining philosophical depth.

Orch-OR theory proposes that the collapse of the quantum wave function corresponding to the moment of conscious experience occurs not due to random chance but through a universal mechanism of causality known as Objective Reduction. According to this framework, the reduction of quantum superposition is not a subjective or observer-dependent process but an objective physical event occurring when the gravitational self-energy between superposed states reaches a critical threshold (Penrose, 1994). In this interpretation, the collapse is driven not by biological or chemical processes within microtubules, but by the fundamental geometry of spacetime itself. Consciousness, therefore, is not merely a byproduct of neural computation or biochemical interaction but is rooted in the very structure of the universe's fabric (Hameroff and Penrose, 1996). This view implies that conscious moments arise when specific quantum states within neuronal microtubules reach gravitational instability, triggering an objective, non-random collapse governed by the laws of quantum gravity. Furthermore, Penrose and Hameroff propose the existence of proto-consciousness elementary precursors or components of consciousness embedded at the Planck scale within spacetime geometry (Hameroff and Penrose, 2014). These proto-conscious entities represent primitive experiential or informational qualities, suggesting that consciousness is a fundamental property of reality rather than an emergent feature of biological complexity. Although this interpretation differs significantly from Kastrup's notion of Universal Consciousness, it nevertheless attributes a mental aspect to the universe's underlying structure. Despite its cosmological implications, the Orch-OR model remains brain-centered in its practical formulation. It posits that the human brain, through the orchestrated quantum dynamics of neuronal microtubules, serves as the primary physical medium through which consciousness becomes manifest (Hameroff, 1998). In this respect, the brain functions as an interface where the fundamental processes of spacetime interact with biological organization, making consciousness both a universal and neurobiological phenomenon.

The Problem of the Physical Identity of Experience

One of the most enduring philosophical challenges concerns the place of conscious experience within the physical universe. Classical dualism posited that mind and matter are ontologically distinct, but this position results in logical contradictions implying that one entity could simultaneously possess both physical and nonphysical properties. Dual-aspect monism attempts to resolve this paradox by positing that mental and physical phenomena are two complementary aspects of a single, underlying reality (Heisenberg, 1958). Yet, despite

its elegance, this view does not clarify how subjective experience arises from physical processes the so-called hard problem of consciousness.

The distinction between causality and identity intensifies this puzzle: if neural processes cause consciousness, the two cannot be identical; if they are identical, causation becomes redundant (Goff, 2019). These conceptual limitations have prompted the exploration of more integrative frameworks that bridge the epistemic divide between the physical and the phenomenal.

Quantum-inspired analogies have been used to articulate such integration, viewing consciousness and matter as intertwined manifestations of reality rather than separate substances (Hameroff and Penrose, 1996). Nonetheless, these analogies should not be mistaken for direct empirical accounts. Instead, they offer philosophical metaphors illustrating how subjectivity and objectivity might be fundamentally co-extensive. Consciousness, from this perspective, may be understood not as an emergent product of matter but as an intrinsic dimension of being deeply entangled with the physical yet irreducible to it.

Within the scope of this study, the concepts drawn from quantum mechanics are employed strictly as heuristic analogies rather than mechanistic explanations of consciousness. Terms such as wave–particle duality, superposition, and entanglement serve as conceptual instruments that help illuminate how unified and differentiated modes of awareness might coexist at an abstract structural level. These quantum notions are not presented as literal physical processes occurring in the brain, nor as causal mechanisms underlying conscious experience. Maintaining this distinction is essential to avoid category errors that would incorrectly equate mathematical features of quantum systems with neurobiological or phenomenological dynamics. By emphasizing the metaphorical and illustrative character of quantum terminology, the analysis preserves both scientific rigor and philosophical clarity, ensuring that quantum mechanics functions in the argument only as a framework for conceptual modeling rather than as an empirical claim about the nature of consciousness.

2.2 Self, Consciousness, and States of Self

Structure of the Self and Stages of Consciousness

The concept of the self represents a multifaceted, dynamic, and integrative structure anchored at the center of human consciousness. It functions as a psychodynamic center where subjective experiences, identity perception, personal continuity, and inner coherence converge (Freud, 1923). The self encompasses both the dimension of inner awareness and the way the individual relates to the external world. It thus determines not only who the person is but also how they exist.

This multidimensional nature of the self regulates the interaction between conscious (ego-centered) and unconscious processes, thus constituting both the source of psychological wholeness and the driving force of personal development (Jung, 1968).

The concept of ego, in contrast, is narrower and derives from Freud's structural model of the psyche. According to Freud, the ego mediates between the instinctual impulses of the id and the moral demands of the superego, enabling the individual to adapt to reality (Freud, 1923). The ego operates according to the reality principle and grants the subject the ability to regulate their drives, adapt to the environment, and steer their behavior according to social norms. In this sense, the self represents the entirety of the psychic system, while the ego forms its conscious and regulatory surface. In Jung's analytical psychology, this distinction becomes even clearer: Jung describes the self as the central principle that encompasses all conscious and unconscious parts of the psyche, while the ego merely represents the core of consciousness (Jung, 1968). The self is therefore a principle of wholeness that transcends the individual ego and is connected to the collective unconscious.

Self-consciousness is considered a higher form of consciousness and describes the individual's ability to experience themselves not only as a perceiving being of their environment but also as the subject of their own perception. This ability enables humans not only to be, but also to know that they exist. The development of language, symbolic representation, and abstract thought played a crucial role in the evolution of self-awareness (Schwartz and Sweezy, 2019). With the increase in cognitive abstraction capacity, self-awareness underwent a qualitative transformation in which the mind learned to observe itself. Self-awareness thus represents not merely a quantitative increase in perception, but the acquisition of the mind's ability to reflect on itself. As a result, humans experience themselves not only as an existing organism but as a conscious subject who is aware of itself.

Recent quantum-based cognitive models suggest that human consciousness operates on both physical and probabilistic levels (Bohm, 1980; Busemeyer and Bruza, 2012). According to these approaches, consciousness operates on two levels: particle-state consciousness (PSC) and wave-state consciousness (WSC) (Kastrup, 2019). PSC refers to temporally, spatially, and causally bound forms of thought logical, analytical, and linear thinking. At this level, consciousness manifests in rational processes such as problem-solving, planning, and decision-making. In contrast, WSC is associated with non-local, intuitive, creative, and holistic processes. Dreams, deep meditative states, intuitive insights, and creative inspirations are expressions of this form of consciousness.

The assumption that WSC can interact with other consciousnesses through quantum entanglement suggests that consciousness has a

nature that transcends individual boundaries (Bohm, 1980). This model interprets human consciousness not only as an individual phenomenon but also as a collective and holistic field. Thus, the human mind can be understood as a dual system that operates at both physical (material) and probabilistic (quantum mechanical) levels. This dual nature implies that consciousness exists both at the level of personal experience and at the universal level of awareness; consequently, the self is not only a psychological construct but can also be viewed as a form of cosmic consciousness organized at the quantum level (Kastrup, 2019).

Ego or Self States

Psychodynamic theory and contemporary trauma therapy literature view the human personality not as a unified whole but as a dynamic system of multiple ego states or partial selves (Watkins and Watkins, 1997). According to this theory, the individual's mental structure consists of relatively autonomous centers of consciousness that have evolved from experiences at various developmental stages. These ego states function as independent forms of identity not only at the conscious level but also at the emotional, cognitive, and behavioral levels. Each state is characterized by a specific emotional tone, a cognitive schema, and a characteristic behavioral pattern. For example, a protective or adaptive ego state developed in childhood can be reactivated in adulthood in the face of similar stressors, causing repressed emotions to re-express in current behaviors. Transitions between these states usually occur through unconscious processes but can be observed and regulated through therapeutic mindfulness (Freud, 1923; Watkins and Watkins, 1997).

At a deeper level of this multiple system lies the self, which, in Jung's terminology, is understood as the central archetype representing both the totality of the psyche and the innate principle of order (Jung, 1968). According to Jung, the self is not merely the sum of individual consciousness but the unifying principle of the entire psychic system the "center of the center." Through its ability to integrate conscious and unconscious components, the self-ensures the balanced functioning of the personality. In this sense, the "reconciliation of the ego with the self" is considered the decisive indicator of mental health.

In modern psychotherapeutic approaches, particularly in the Internal Family Systems (IFS) model, the self is described as the conscious center that observes, accepts, and guides all inner subpersonalities. According to the IFS approach, the self-possesses eight fundamental qualities: compassion, courage, clarity, calmness, confidence, creativity, curiosity, and connectedness. These qualities play a crucial role in restoring psychological wholeness. When active, the individual can integrate fragmented ego states and establish inner psychological balance. The self thus functions not only as the guardian of inner

order but also as the guiding force of the integration process (Schwartz and Sweezy, 2019).

From this perspective, consciousness is not merely a sequence of cognitive processes but a dynamic field of self-perception that continuously reorganizes itself. Within this structure, the self- occupies the position of both observer and experiencer; the human sense of self is therefore not a fixed, static structure but a variable, multifaceted process. Through the interplay of different ego states, humans can experience inner diversity and wholeness simultaneously (Van der Hart *et al.*, 2006).

This multi-layered structure shows a remarkable parallel to the concept of wave–particle duality in quantum ontology: The ego or the individual self-states correspond to the separate, observable particle forms of consciousness, while the self resembles the wave form holistic, comprehensive, and potential (Bohm, 1980; Kastrup, 2019). This analogy offers a fruitful metaphor for explaining the simultaneously fragmented and integrative nature of consciousness. Thus, consciousness can be understood as a system in continuous interaction on both the psychological and physical levels. This view supports the assumption that the multiple inner self-structures of humans are connected to a universal field of consciousness, building an integrative bridge between psychodynamic and quantum-based explanatory models (Kastrup, 2019).

2.3 DID and Identity Fragmentation

The Traumatic Adaptation of DID

DID is one of the most complex manifestations of identity fragmentation in contemporary psychiatry. It is characterized by the inability of the personality to integrate into a unified sense of self, leading to the emergence of distinct self-states that alternate in governing consciousness, memory, and behavior (American Psychiatric Association, 2022). Empirical and clinical studies demonstrate that DID typically originates in childhood, often following chronic and inescapable traumatic experiences such as physical, sexual, or emotional abuse (Putnam, 1997; Van der Hart *et al.*, 2006). Under such conditions, the developing self fails to integrate traumatic memories cohesively, and distinct, dissociated identity configurations emerge as adaptive responses to preserve psychological survival.

Rather than representing a simple pathological failure, dissociation can be understood as a trauma-based adaptive mechanism a functional reorganization aimed at maintaining homeostasis under extreme stress (Kluft, 1991). The child's psyche, unable to bear overwhelming affective loads, partitions experience into isolated compartments. Over time, these defensive partitions evolve into semi-autonomous self-states that encompass discrete emotional tones,

cognitive schemas, and physiological signatures (Watkins and Watkins, 1997).

Clinically, these self-states are not independent consciousnesses but context-specific configurations within a single self-system. They serve to preserve continuity by managing incompatible emotional and autobiographical content (Reinders *et al.*, 2014). The phenomenon of state-dependent memory whereby certain memories are accessible only within specific self-states illustrates the defensive logic of this adaptation. From a neuropsychological perspective, the fragmentation of identity in DID represents an intricate interplay between memory, emotion, and neural regulation rather than an ontological division of consciousness.

In this light, DID is best conceptualized as a neuropsychophysiological adaptation, in which the mind reorganizes itself to sustain functioning and coherence under trauma. This process reveals that identity is not a fixed construct but a dynamic field that reorganizes continuously in response to extreme environmental stressors.

Neurobiological Correlates and Physiological Expressions

Advances in neuroimaging have revealed that distinct self-states in DID correspond to distinct neural activation patterns, reflecting the phenomenological differences reported by patients (Reinders *et al.*, 2014). Studies using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and positron emission tomography (PET) have identified differential activation across the hippocampus, amygdala, and anterior cingulate cortex regions associated with emotional regulation and autobiographical memory. These findings support the interpretation that dissociation represents a functional segregation of neural networks involved in self-referential processing. Physiological correlates further substantiate this dissociation: self-states exhibit unique autonomic profiles such as variations in heart rate, muscle tone, and galvanic skin response. Thus, DID cannot be reduced to a purely psychological phenomenon; it also reflects embodied consciousness, where alterations in self-perception manifest simultaneously in neural, physiological, and behavioral domains (Scaer, 2001; Purcell *et al.*, 2024).

Trauma-related disruptions in hippocampal neurogenesis and synaptic plasticity contribute to the long-term neurobiological instability underlying DID (Lanius *et al.*, 2010). The resulting fragmentation is therefore not only psychological but also biological, involving an erosion of integrative neural mechanisms. Accordingly, identity disintegration in DID represents a multilevel phenomenon, bridging neurobiology, psychology, and phenomenology.

DID as a Structural Analogy for Differentiated Consciousness

Within the philosophical context of analytic idealism, consciousness is posited as the foundational ontological substrate of reality (Kastrup, 2019). However, applying DID as a literal model of "fragmented universal consciousness" risks both romanticizing a serious psychiatric condition and overstating the empirical implications of the analogy. To maintain conceptual precision, DID should instead be employed as a structural metaphor, illuminating how a unified conscious system can generate multiple, partially segregated experiential perspectives.

In clinical terms, DID involves a single organism hosting multiple self-models that have restricted mutual access to content (Putnam, 1997). Philosophically, this structure mirrors without equating to the way analytic idealism envisions one universal consciousness differentiating into multiple experiential standpoints. The comparison thus concerns the architecture of experience, not the ontology of being.

This interpretation reframes DID not as evidence for cosmic consciousness but as a microcosmic illustration of experiential multiplicity within unity. Just as the mind in DID maintains an overarching functional system despite internal differentiation, analytic idealism proposes that universal consciousness can manifest localized centers of awareness without compromising its intrinsic unity (Ludwig, 1983). Such a parallel is heuristic, offering philosophical insight into the structural dynamics of self-awareness while respecting the clinical reality that DID remains a trauma-related psychiatric disorder.

In this study, DID is used strictly as a heuristic and structural metaphor**,** rather than as a mechanistic model of consciousness. The clinical features of DID such as differentiated self-states, state-dependent memory, and restricted mutual Access are invoked to illustrate how a unified conscious system might appear partitioned into multiple experiential loci under certain structural conditions. These characteristics are not presented as evidence that consciousness literally fragments in a metaphysical or cosmological sense, nor as causal mechanisms that generate multiplicity within a universal mind. Emphasizing this distinction is essential for maintaining both scientific and ethical integrity, as DID is a trauma-based psychiatric disorder with empirically established neurobiological correlates. By treating DID solely as a conceptual analogy that highlights structural patterns rather than ontological truths, the analysis preserves clinical accuracy while using the disorder's phenomenology to illuminate theoretical questions about unity and differentiation in consciousness. Hence, DID does not ontologically prove the fragmentation of a "Mind-at-Large," but provides a phenomenological model for understanding how

consciousness both individual and universal can sustain differentiated perspectives within a unified whole.

2.4 DID as a Model for Analytic Idealism

When treated with conceptual precision, DID provides an illuminating analogical model for analytic idealism's account of how a single universal consciousness can manifest differentiated experiential centers without losing ontological unity. The analogy does not depend on any mechanistic claim but on the structural similarities between DID's neuropsychological dissociation and the idealist conception of consciousness as self-differentiating.

Clinically, DID is a trauma-based disorder in which the mind develops multiple self-states that maintain partial autonomy and limited mutual access to memory, emotion, and perception (Putnam, 1997). Neuroimaging research confirms that these states correspond to distinct neural activation patterns, particularly within the hippocampus, amygdala, and anterior cingulate cortex regions implicated in emotional regulation and autobiographical coherence (Reinders *et al.*, 2014). Despite this differentiation, the patient remains a single organismic consciousness: the alters are not ontologically separate beings, but functionally discrete self-models within the same psyche.

Analytic idealism, as formulated by Kastrup (2019), posits that all of reality is constituted by one universal consciousness "Mind-at-Large." Individual subjects are not autonomous consciousnesses but localized dissociations within that total mind. The structural parallel with DID becomes evident here: just as dissociative alters represent compartmentalized centers of experience within one brain, individual selves may represent localized perspectives within one universal field of awareness. Both systems preserve functional multiplicity within ontological unity.

However, this correspondence must remain metaphorical rather than literal. DID is not empirical proof of cosmic dissociation, and the brain cannot be regarded as a miniature universe. Instead, the analogy functions as a conceptual bridge a way of intuitively illustrating how unity and plurality can coexist within a single conscious substrate.

This interpretation can be further clarified using Kastrup's wave–particle consciousness metaphor. In the wave-state, consciousness exists in its undivided, holistic form analogous to the shared, underlying unity of Mind-at-Large (Kastrup, 2019). In the particle-state, it localizes into finite centers of awareness, analogous to individual subjects or, within DID, discrete self-states. The transitions between these "states" may not imply physical collapse or quantum measurement; they may serve purely as heuristic illustrations of

phenomenological differentiation. Kastrup uses these terms in quite different senses than Hameroff.

In DID, the psyche "collapses" into a particular self-state not through quantum processes, but through defensive cognitive dynamics. Similarly, in analytic idealism, the universal mind "collapses" into localized perspectives as a way of generating finite experiences (Kastrup, 2018). Thus, DID offers a clinically grounded metaphor for analytic idealism's central thesis: consciousness is one, yet capable of self-differentiation into multiple, semi-independent experiential loci. This model enriches the philosophical framework by grounding it in an empirically studied phenomenon, while clinical data from DID provides a human-scale reflection of how differentiated subjectivities can coexist within a single conscious field.

By employing DID not as an ontological mechanism but as a conceptual mirror, analytic idealism gains explanatory depth it demonstrates that multiplicity within unity is not an abstract speculation, but a structure observable in consciousness itself. The PSC/WSC metaphor, when treated as an intuitive tool, further clarifies this dynamic duality: consciousness is both wave-like (unified, continuous) and particle-like (localized, individuated), depending on the level of analysis.

This integrative interpretation positions DID as a phenomenological analogy that bridges clinical psychology and metaphysical philosophy. It shows how empirical insights into dissociation can illuminate the idealist view that consciousness underlies reality, while preserving the ethical and scientific boundaries of psychiatric understanding.

3. Discussion

The synthesis proposed in this paper, linking analytic idealism, quantum panprotopsychism, and DID, represents an ambitious yet necessarily speculative attempt to explore the interface between metaphysics and clinical science. While the analogies drawn across these domains are intellectually generative, they operate explicitly at a philosophical and heuristic level rather than offering empirically testable claims. This methodological boundary is crucial: analytic idealism situates consciousness as the fundamental ontological substrate of reality, a position that inherently transcends experimental verification (Goff, 2019; Kastrup, 2019). DID, by contrast, is rooted in empirical psychiatry and supported by reproducible neurophysiological, affective, and behavioral evidence (Putnam, 1997; Reinders *et al.*, 2014). The conceptual distance between these domains requires epistemic humility and careful interpretative strategies to avoid conflating metaphysical models with clinical pathology.

Despite these limitations, the comparison between DID and analytic idealism provides a compelling structural illustration of how differentiated experiential centers might arise within a unified conscious field. DID demonstrates that a single organism can manifest multiple, internally coherent self-states with restricted mutual access, distinct autobiographical memory profiles, and measurable neural correlates (Nijenhuis and Hart, 2011). When interpreted metaphorically rather than mechanistically, this phenomenon suggests that multiplicity within consciousness may reflect an inherent potentiality for localized experiential partitions rather than an absolute ontological division (Ludwig, 1983; Van der Hart *et al.*, 2006). Thus, DID serves not as evidence for cosmological dissociation but as a phenomenological model that enriches the conceptual vocabulary available to metaphysical discussions of unity and multiplicity.

The integration of quantum panprotopsychism into this framework further extends the structural analogy, though again only at a heuristic level. Quantum concepts such as complementarity, superposition, and relationality provide formal structures that loosely parallel certain features of conscious experience particularly the coexistence of global unity and localized manifestation. However, importing these concepts into discussions of consciousness requires extreme conceptual caution. Directly mapping quantum mechanisms onto mental processes risks committing category errors that undermine both scientific validity and philosophical coherence. In this context, quantum metaphors serve to illuminate structural patterns rather than supply mechanistic explanations, functioning as conceptual scaffolding to help articulate the relational aspects of consciousness proposed within analytic idealism (Whitehead, 1978).

Another dimension of this discussion involves the methodological asymmetry between metaphysics and clinical science. Psychiatry and neuroscience rely on empirical, operationalizable constructs, whereas analytic idealism engages with pre-empirical ontological assumptions about the nature of reality (Chalmers, 1995). This asymmetry complicates attempts to construct integrative models. Nevertheless, interdisciplinary dialogue can be fruitful when structured around clearly defined epistemological limits: metaphysics can offer interpretive frameworks for understanding experiential structures observed in clinical contexts, while clinical science can provide constraints that prevent metaphysics from drifting into unfalsifiable or ethically problematic claims. DID's clinically grounded dissociative architecture thus acts as a conceptual bridge one that does not erase disciplinary boundaries but invites structured reflection on how fragmentation and unity may coexist within consciousness (Varela, 1996).

Finally, the broader significance of this synthesis lies in its potential to reformulate ongoing debates about the nature of consciousness.

Rather than offering reductive explanations, the model developed here proposes a relational and multidimensional understanding of conscious experience in which unity and multiplicity coexist dynamically (Chalmers, 2010). Such a framework neither collapses consciousness into neural processes nor elevates metaphysical speculation above empirical reality; instead, it emphasizes that understanding consciousness may require conceptual tools capable of spanning phenomenology, neurobiology, and ontology. In this respect, the discussion advanced here highlights not definitive answers but new conceptual terrain from which more refined and empirically informed theories may eventually emerge.

4. Conclusion

This study concludes that the conceptual parallels between analytic idealism, quantum panprotopsychism, and DID offer a productive but necessarily speculative framework for exploring how differentiation may arise within a unified conscious system. While DID provides a clinically grounded illustration of structural multiplicity, and quantum metaphors offer a formal vocabulary for describing complementarity and relationality, these comparisons must remain heuristic tools rather than mechanistic explanations. When interpreted within these limits, the synthesis advances a coherent conceptual model for examining how unity and multiplicity can coexist in consciousness without conflating metaphysical speculation with empirical pathology.

5. Outlook

Looking forward, several targeted avenues for interdisciplinary research may help refine and operationalize the conceptual model developed here. Neurophenomenology represents a promising framework for examining how fragmented yet unified experiential structures emerge, integrating first-person reports with neural dynamics to explore correlations between subjective self-states and large-scale brain networks. Such approaches could clarify whether dissociative patterns reflect broader organizational principles of consciousness beyond clinical pathology.

In parallel, computational modeling of self-states including predictive-coding and active-inference architectures may provide formal tools for simulating how partially autonomous experiential centers can coexist within a single overarching system. These models could help operationalize the structural concepts introduced in analytic idealism and dissociation theory, rendering them testable within computational or simulation-based environments.

Future work must also articulate explicit ethical and epistemological guidelines for using trauma-based psychiatric conditions such as DID

in metaphysical discourse. Developing responsible frameworks for interdisciplinary dialogue will ensure that conceptual models do not distort or exploit the clinical realities of dissociative disorders and that philosophical extrapolation remains grounded in respect for empirical evidence and patient experience.

Finally, sustained cross-disciplinary engagement among metaphysics, psychiatry, neuroscience, and quantum-inspired theoretical models may yield more nuanced accounts of how unity and multiplicity interact across experiential, neural, and ontological domains. While such research cannot resolve the "hard problem" of consciousness, it may help reformulate it by framing consciousness as a multidimensional process through which differentiation and unity unfold within a single, dynamically integrated field.

Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to Hasan Gökçay for his helpful feedback and discussions on the earlier drafts of this article. We would also like to thank the distinguished authors who have written Turkish and English books and articles on the subjects addressed in this paper.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Abbreviations List

Dissociative identity disorder: DID
Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen: EPR
Orchestrated Objective Reduction: Orch-OR
Particle state consciousness: PSC
Wave state consciousness: WSC
Internal family systems: IFS
Functional magnetic resonance imaging: fMRI
Positron emission tomography: PET

References

American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 5th ed. Text Revision (DSM-5-TR). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing; 2022.
Bohm D. Wholeness and the Implicate Order. New York, NY: Routledge; 1980.
Busemeyer JR, Bruza PD. Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2012.
Chalmers DJ. Facing up to the problem of consciousness. J Conscious Stud. 1995;2(3):200-219.
Chalmers DJ. The Character of Consciousness. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2010.
Chalmers DJ. Panpsychism and panprotopsychism. In: Alter T, Nagasawa Y, eds. Consciousness in the Physical World: Perspectives on Russellian Monism. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2015:246-276.
Freud S. The Ego and the Id. London, UK: Hogarth Press; 1923.
Goff P. Galileo's Error: Foundations for a New Science of Consciousness. New York, NY: Pantheon Books; 2019.
Hameroff S. Quantum computation in brain microtubules? The Penrose–Hameroff "Orch OR" model of consciousness. Philos Trans R Soc Lond A. 1998;356(1743):1869-1896.
Hameroff S, Penrose R. Orchestrated reduction of quantum coherence in brain microtubules: a model for consciousness. Math Comput Simul. 1996;40(3):453-480.
Hameroff S, Penrose R. Consciousness in the universe: a review of the "Orch OR" theory. Phys Life Rev. 2014;11(1):39-78.
Heisenberg W. Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers; 1958.
Jung CG. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1968.
Kastrup B. The Idea of the World: A Multi-Disciplinary Argument for the Mental Nature of Reality. London, UK: John Hunt Publishing; 2018.
Kastrup B. Analytic Idealism: A Consciousness-Only Ontology. PhD thesis. Radboud University Nijmegen; 2019.
Kluft RP. Multiple personality disorder. In: Tasman A, Goldfinger SM, eds. Childhood Antecedents of Multiple Personality. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association Publishing; 1991:35-55.
Lanius RA, Vermetten E, Pain C. The Impact of Early Life Trauma on Health and Disease. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2010.
Ludwig AM. The psychobiological functions of dissociation. Am J Clin Hypn. 1983;26(2):93-99.
Nijenhuis ERS, Van der Hart O. Dissociation in trauma: a new definition and comparison with previous formulations. J Trauma Dissociation. 2011;12(4):416-445.
Penrose R. Shadows of the Mind. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 1994.
Purcell JB, Brand B, Browne HA, et al. Treatment of dissociative identity disorder: leveraging neurobiology to optimize success. Expert Rev Neurother. 2024;24(3):273-289.
Putnam FW. Dissociation in Children and Adolescents: A Developmental Perspective. New York, NY: Guilford Press; 1997.
Reinders AATS, Willemsen ATM, den Boer JA, et al. Opposite brain emotion-regulation patterns in identity states of dissociative identity disorder: a PET study and neurobiological model. Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging. 2014;223(3):236-243.
Scaer RC. The neurophysiology of dissociation and chronic disease. Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback. 2001;26(1):73-91.
Schwartz RC, Sweezy M. Internal Family Systems Therapy. New York, NY: Guilford Press; 2019.
Tegmark M. Importance of quantum decoherence in brain processes. Phys Rev E. 2000;61(4):4194-4206.

Van der Hart O, Nijenhuis ERS, Steele K. The Haunted Self: Structural Dissociation and the Treatment of Chronic Traumatization. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company; 2006.

Varela F. Neurophenomenology: a methodological remedy for the hard problem. J Conscious Stud. 1996;3(4):330-349.

Watkins JG, Watkins HH. Ego States: Theory and Therapy. New York, NY: W. W. Norton; 1997.