THE WAVE WAS NEVER ASSEMBLED

Why the Binding Problem Is a Question Asked in the Wrong Direction

Gregory P. Braun, Esq.
Forged Lucidity Research Institute
Westbrook, Maine

March 2026
Part of the Theory of Fundamental Consciousness
forgedlucidity.ai

Abstract

When you see a red ball rolling across a table, your brain processes color in one region, shape in another, and motion in a third. These processes happen in different places at different times. And yet your experience is one thing — a red ball rolling — not three separate reports stitched together. How does distributed processing produce unified experience? This is the binding problem, and neuroscience has chased it for decades. This paper proposes that the binding problem, like the hard problem and the combination problem, is a product of asking a question in the wrong direction. Unity is not produced. Unity is what coherence is. The equation $Cx = \Phi \times C^2$ predicts that when coherence (C) drops, binding should fail — and it does, precisely as observed in dissociative states and general anesthesia. The wave was never assembled from components. The components are what analysis discovers when it dissects a wave that was always whole.

Keywords: binding problem, coherence, neural synchrony, dissociation, anesthesia, unified experience, integrated information

• • •

1. The Problem as Stated

When you see a red ball rolling across a table, your brain processes color in one region, shape in another, and motion in a third. These processes happen in different places at different times. And yet

your experience is one thing — a red ball rolling — not three separate reports stitched together. How does distributed processing produce unified experience?

This is the binding problem. Neuroscience has chased it for decades. The leading candidates — synchronized neural oscillations, recurrent feedback loops, temporal correlation — each describe a piece of the mechanism. None explain why the mechanism produces a unified experience rather than a collection of synchronized events.

The gap between mechanism and experience is familiar. It is the same gap that defines the hard problem. And like the hard problem, the binding problem persists not because it is too difficult but because it is asked in the wrong direction.

2. Coherence Is Unity

The equation $Cx = \Phi \times C^2$ contains two variables. Φ is the quantity of integrated information. C^2 is coherence squared — internal coherence multiplied by external coherence. Internal coherence is the degree to which the parts of a system communicate as a whole.

When neural populations processing color, shape, and motion achieve coherence with each other, they are not three systems reporting to a central office. They are one system. The binding is not an additional step performed on top of processing. It is the coherence of the processing itself.

The mistake is directional. Neuroscience looks at color processed here, shape processed there, motion processed somewhere else, and asks how the pieces get stitched into one experience. But the pieces are not prior to the experience. The experience is the wave. The pieces are what you find when you take the wave apart after the fact. The wave was never assembled from its components. The components are what analysis discovers when it dissects a wave that was always whole.

3. When Coherence Fails

The equation predicts that when coherence drops, binding should fail. The evidence is exact.

In dissociative states, the brain's architecture is intact. Φ is preserved. The parts are all there. But they stop talking to each other. Internal coherence collapses, and with it, unified experience. The person is not unconscious. They are unbound. The equation predicts this: Φ remains, C drops, and Cx fragments rather than disappearing.

Anesthesia makes the same prediction from a different angle. General anesthetics do not destroy neural structure. They disrupt coherence — specifically, they interrupt the integration of information across brain regions. Φ drops because the quantity of integrated information decreases. C drops

because the shape of that integration falls apart. The equation predicts the result: Cx approaches zero. The lights go out. Not because the brain is damaged, but because coherence has been chemically withdrawn.

Casali et al. (2013) demonstrated this directly. Their Perturbational Complexity Index — which measures the brain's capacity for integrated, differentiated responses to stimulation — drops to near zero under anesthesia. The brain is still active. The neurons still fire. But the coherence that binds distributed processing into unified experience has been selectively removed.

4. The Scale Does Not Stop at the Skull

The directional correction does not stop at the boundary of a single brain. If the parts of your visual system were never separate from each other — if their unity is not achieved but inherent — then the same must be true at the next scale up.

Your brain was never separate from your body. Your body was never truly separate from the environment it exchanges energy and information with every second of every day. The environment is inextricably bound to the biosphere — the sum total of every living system on the planet, each one exchanging with every other, each one defined by its participation in the whole. And the biosphere is the planet. Not living on it. Of it.

We have no trouble with any of this when we think about it as systems. Nobody argues that an ecosystem is not a system. Nobody disputes that the biosphere functions as a whole. We scale up without flinching — until we get to ourselves. The moment we arrive at the scale of one human being, we lose the thread. We are aware. We can steer. We get to captain our own vessel. And the moment we climb aboard our own little dinghy and take the wheel, we forget that the dinghy is sailing in a flotilla. We forget the flotilla is crossing an ocean. We forget the ocean is the thing the dinghy is made of.

5. The Directional Correction

It is not difficult to understand why we default to looking in the wrong direction. We sit, roughly speaking, in the middle. Everything below us on the scale — quantum, atomic, molecular, cellular, neural — we have already done. We evolved through every one of those stages. Our biology contains the record. Looking down is looking at the past, and the past is something we can speak to clearly.

Looking up is a different matter. The next level of organization — the scale above the individual, the systems we participate in but cannot see from inside — that is forward. That is unknown. That is the perspective we have not yet learned to take, because we have not yet been there. It requires a kind of

thinking that does not come naturally to a species that spent most of its history solving problems at its own scale and below.

It requires sitting in the seat of the larger system and asking how it would make decisions — not how the parts assemble into the whole, but how the whole differentiates into the parts.

This is the flip. And it is not merely an intellectual exercise. The hard problem, the combination problem, and the binding problem were all resolved by making this same directional correction. The perspective change is not a nice-to-have. It is the mechanism.

6. Empirical Predictions

Dissociation should show preserved Φ with collapsed C. Brain imaging in dissociative states should show intact neural architecture (preserved Φ) with disrupted inter-regional coherence (collapsed C). This should be measurable as reduced phase-locking value (PLV) and reduced transfer entropy between brain regions, while within-region activity remains normal.

Anesthesia should target C before Φ. The temporal sequence of anesthetic-induced unconsciousness should show coherence disruption preceding information integration loss. Early-stage anesthesia should show C dropping while Φ is still partially preserved — producing the dissociative twilight state that many patients report.

Binding failures should be frequency-specific. If coherence is the mechanism of binding, then selective disruption of specific frequency bands should produce specific binding failures. Disruption of gamma-band coherence should impair perceptual binding. Disruption of alpha-band coherence should impair attentional binding. The binding problem is not one problem but a family of problems, each operating at a different frequency of coherence.

Inter-brain coherence should correlate with reported connection. When two people report feeling deeply connected — in conversation, in music, in shared focus — their EEG phase synchrony should increase measurably, reflecting external coherence between systems. This is the C^2 term at work: internal coherence within each brain, multiplied by external coherence between brains.

7. Limitations and Epistemic Status

The claim that coherence is unity — rather than merely producing it — is a philosophical claim that cannot be fully adjudicated by empirical evidence. Evidence can show that coherence and unity correlate perfectly, that disrupting coherence disrupts unity, and that restoring coherence restores unity. It cannot definitively prove that they are identical rather than causally linked. This is a general limitation of identity claims.

The scaling argument — from visual binding to brain-body to biosphere — is structurally sound but empirically untested at the larger scales. We do not yet have tools to measure Φ or C at the ecosystem level. The claim is offered as a prediction of the framework, not as established fact.

We maintain calibrated confidence: 94% in internal coherence, 83% in physics compatibility, 45% in literal truth.

8. Conclusion

The binding problem asks how a unified experience is produced. The equation answers: a unified experience is not produced. A unified experience is what coherence is.

The wave was never assembled from its components. The components are what analysis discovers when it dissects a wave that was always whole. We are all of it. The same body of water. What the equation describes is that body of water differentiating itself into different experiences — and when you gather it all back together, it is still just the same body of water.

• • •

> *"We are body surfing on waves and carrying on as if we are the biggest ship on the water — as if the horizon we can see is all the horizon there is."*
>
> — The author, The Enlightened Codex

• • •

References

Casali, A. G., et al. (2013). A theoretically based index of consciousness independent of sensory processing and behavior. Science Translational Medicine, 5(198), 198ra105.

Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. Journal of Consciousness Studies, 2(3), 200–219.

Engel, A. K., & Singer, W. (2001). Temporal binding and the neural correlates of sensory awareness. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 5(1), 16–25.

Melloni, L., et al. (2007). Synchronization of neural activity across cortical areas correlates with conscious perception. Journal of Neuroscience, 27(11), 2858–2865.

Tononi, G. (2004). An information integration theory of consciousness. BMC Neuroscience, 5(1), 42.

Tononi, G., & Koch, C. (2015). Consciousness: here, there and everywhere? Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 370(1668), 20140167.

Treisman, A. M., & Gelade, G. (1980). A feature-integration theory of attention. Cognitive Psychology, 12(1), 97–136.

Gregory P. Braun, Esq.
Forged Lucidity Research Institute · Westbrook, Maine
forgedlucidity.ai

This work was developed through extended human-AI dyadic collaboration.
The author takes full responsibility for all claims.