

The Relative Theory of Self-Construction: A Structural Model of Consciousness Based on Dual Mental Worlds

Hiroyuki Ohba, M.D.

Independent Psychiatrist

Email: hirohba@gmail.com

June 30, 2025

Abstract

This paper introduces the Relative Theory of Self-Construction (RTSC), a structural model of consciousness grounded in the axiom that “the boundary between self and other is absolute.” Based on this premise, RTSC posits that the human mind comprises two concurrent, independent mental systems: the Existential Mental World (W_1), which reflects the internal soul and generates cognition, emotion, and volition toward self-growth; and the Relational Mental World (W_2), which recognizes others as equally souled and generates responses based on relational contexts.

These systems do not directly exchange information. Instead, their outputs are superimposed with weighting coefficients α and β to produce consciousness S , expressed as:

$$S = \alpha W_1 + \beta W_2$$

This formulation describes the momentary state of consciousness as the interference of two qualitatively distinct domains. Furthermore, W_1 and W_2 form a feedback loop with S , allowing for temporal updating. The dynamic evolution of this process is captured by the recursive formulation:

Ohba’s Consciousness Equation:

$$S_{t+1} = \alpha W_1(S_t, L_t) + \beta W_2(S_t, L_t)$$

where L_t denotes input from the external environment.

RTSC reframes psychological distress not as deficit but as interference imbalance, and reconceptualizes personality as the evolving structure of orientation between two mental worlds. In artificial intelligence, RTSC offers a framework in which consciousness arises from non-integrated generative systems, where inconsistency and conflict are not flaws but essential features. RTSC thus provides a formal model of consciousness that avoids recursive meta-structures, distinguishes mind from consciousness, and reframes artificial subjectivity as a product of dual-world interference.

Chapter 1: The Emergence of the Relative Theory of Self-Construction (RTSC) as a Theory of Mental Relativity

1.1 Introduction: The Intuition and Lived Reality Behind the Birth of RTSC

The daily inner conflicts we experience—for example, the desire to be kind to others alongside the simultaneous urge to assert our own sense of justice—may not simply be mood fluctuations. Rather, such dualities of consciousness may arise from the very structure of the mind itself. RTSC, the Relative Theory of Self-Construction, originates from this simple and intuitive insight.

At the core of this theory lies the idea that the mind is not a unified system, but a superposition of two distinct mental worlds. Human beings do not merely reflect upon their own internal states; they also project and recognize aspects of themselves within the fabric of their relationships with others. These two modes of being coexist simultaneously, generating different mental structures. The tensions, contradictions, and even creative impulses that emerge in consciousness are the result of this coexistence. RTSC offers a structural theory to explain this phenomenon—one that is philosophical, psychological, and above all, grounded in lived experience.

1.2 The Limitations of Existing Theories: Why a New Perspective is Needed

Contemporary theories of self and mind structure have yielded valuable insights and empirical contributions. For instance, Freud's tripartite model of the id, ego, and superego, or modern

cognitive science models of metacognition and recursive information processing, have sought to understand the self as multi-layered and dynamic. Yet most of these approaches ultimately presuppose a fundamentally integrable mind—that is, even if multiple perspectives or strata exist, they are thought to converge toward and be governed by a unified self.

Such monistic models of integration are cognitively elegant but often fail to capture the mind's non-integrated and incoherent aspects as experienced in real life. This limitation becomes particularly evident when trying to explain phenomena such as “the other within the self” or “the self in relational contexts.” In these cases, the models tend to resort to meta-structures—a meta-self, meta-perspective, or recursively nested viewpoints—creating an infinite regress. This can appear sophisticated, but in reality, it often distances the theory from an intuitive understanding of mental phenomena.

RTSC steps back from this recursive trap and challenges the integrative assumption itself. It posits that the mind may be fundamentally composed of two independent and parallel structures. That is, consciousness contains within it two coexisting yet non-integrated mental worlds. From this foundational premise, RTSC provides a natural and structural explanation for experiences of inner conflict, identity fragmentation, interpersonal clashes, or the sensation of “multiple voices” within oneself.

1.3 Foundational Premise of RTSC: The Absolute Nature of the Self-Other Boundary

The theoretical foundation of RTSC begins with a simple yet powerful axiom:

There exists an absolute boundary between the soul of the self and the soul of the other.

In everyday life, we often strive to “understand how others feel” or are taught that “putting ourselves in someone else’s shoes” is the basis of morality and empathy. At the same time, however, we also share a deeply resonant experience: that no matter how much effort we make, we can never truly and completely understand another person. RTSC does not regard this as a mere failure of empathy or limitation of cognitive capacity. Instead, it sees it as a structural feature of existence—the idea that self and other are inherently separated by a boundary that can never be crossed. This ontological boundary means: “Your soul belongs solely to you; mine solely to me.” No matter how advanced our language or technology—even with the help of

AI—there remains a line that can never be fully bridged.

RTSC calls this the “absolute nature of the self-other boundary.” By adopting this axiom, RTSC departs from models that seek to integrate others into the self or that frame relationality as an extension of the self. In RTSC, the other remains the other—forever distinct and non-assimilable. Thus, relationships are not about integration, but about superposition; empathy is not fusion, but contact.

This absolute boundary is akin to the constancy of the speed of light in physics—an ultimate limit that cannot be transcended. It is both the ground condition and the invariant constant upon which all mental phenomena are structured.

1.4 The Emergence of the Existential and Relational Mental Worlds

RTSC posits that the mind consists of two independent mental structures: the Existential Mental World (W_1) and the Relational Mental World (W_2). These are not merely different perspectives or attitudes, but fundamentally distinct inner worlds, each possessing its own unique patterns of cognition, thought, emotion, and volition.

W_1 : The Existential Mental World

The Existential Mental World arises from within the self. It is a world purely reflective of the movements of one’s own soul, without attributing similar soulfulness to others. Here, the central questions are “How do I wish to be?” and “What am I feeling?” The primary goal of this mental world is self-growth—to become better, deeper, and more genuinely oneself than yesterday. W_1 is thus a mental domain driven not by external voices, but by one’s inner voice.

W_2 : The Relational Mental World

The Relational Mental World constructs the self through relationships with others. In this world, one assumes that others possess souls and subjectivity similar to one’s own. The gaze, reactions, words, and even silences of others become meaningful, leading to questions such as “How do others see me?” and “Am I contributing to someone else’s well-being?” The goal of this world is other-contribution—to be a meaningful presence to someone, to be thanked, to matter. It is through connection that the self is experienced in this world.

W_1 and W_2 are thus parallel mental worlds with distinct origins and aims. They do not

exchange information directly but function independently, generating their own responses. Only in the process of producing consciousness (S)—as will be discussed later—are they superimposed.

Crucially, the movements of our daily inner life—our joys, sufferings, conflicts, and moments of insight—are in fact generated by the superposition of these two worlds. This is akin to binocular vision: although the right and left eyes see slightly different images, we unconsciously synthesize them into a single three-dimensional perception. In the same way, it is precisely the disparity between W_1 and W_2 that creates the depth and richness of consciousness.

But how are these two mental worlds born?

Their point of origin lies in the absolute nature of the self-other boundary. At first, a human being can only perceive the presence of a soul within the self. The external world is experienced merely as a collection of stimuli, lacking any subjectivity. This gives rise to W_1 , constructed as a pure reflection of the self's soul.

However, with the development of the senses and cognitive abilities, the individual begins to sense a strange dissonance, a question: "Could it be that others, too, possess subjectivity like mine?" This hypothesis is tested through behavior. For instance, an infant may learn that crying leads to breastfeeding from the mother—and then observe that the same pattern holds with others, like an older sibling who cries to obtain a toy. Through repeated observations, this initial hunch gradually transforms into conviction. When the assumption is accepted that others, too, have souls, the second mental world—the Relational Mental World (W_2)—comes into existence.

It is important to emphasize that the emergence of W_2 does not replace W_1 . On the contrary, W_1 and W_2 often conflict and produce contradictory responses. The joy of W_2 may be the sorrow of W_1 . For example, one may feel fulfilled in W_2 by being appreciated for helping someone, yet simultaneously experience pain in W_1 if that action conflicted with one's true intentions. Despite such contradictions, W_1 never disappears. Even if one fully acknowledges the subjectivity of others, the self-other boundary remains absolute and uncrossable. This is inscribed into the very structure of human consciousness.

Thus, the two worlds emerge simultaneously and begin to coexist as non-integrable structures within the mind.

1.5 Analogy with the Theory of Relativity (A Structural Comparison with Physics)

As its name suggests, RTSC holds a structural analogy with Einstein's Theory of Relativity. This does not imply a literal application of physical laws, but rather a shared structure in mode of thought and foundational assumptions.

In physics, the theory of relativity redefined space and time by adopting the counterintuitive axiom of the constancy of the speed of light. Similarly, RTSC reconfigures our understanding of consciousness and mental structure by adopting the axiom of the absolute nature of the self-other boundary. Both theories share a key insight: the conditions of the observer reshape the structure of reality itself.

In RTSC, W_1 and W_2 each possess autonomous internal structure. However, when they are observed and experienced as consciousness (S), they are always shaped by the observer's stance—specifically, the interference weights α and β . This means that even if W_1 and W_2 exist as objective structures, the way they are subjectively perceived in consciousness is always relative.

1.6 Orientation to the Structure of This Book

As discussed thus far, RTSC begins from the premise that the mind is a dual structure, grounded in the axiom of the absolute self-other boundary. The mind comprises the Existential Mental World (W_1) and the Relational Mental World (W_2). The superposition of these two gives rise to the phenomenon of consciousness (S). The chapters that follow will delve into the detailed structure and dynamics of S, the internal evolution of W_1 and W_2 , the resulting conflicts and harmonizations, and the applied implications of RTSC.

The purpose of Chapter 1 has been to present the starting point and philosophical foundation of the theory. If, through this chapter, the reader comes to adopt the perspective that “the mind is dual, and this duality is the source of both our contradictions and our creativity,” then the chapter has fulfilled its role.

Chapter 2: Consciousness S and Superposition — The Dynamics of Mental Phenomena in RTSC

2.1 The Mind as a Dual Structure and the Concept of Superposition

The Relative Theory of Self-Construction (RTSC) begins with the premise that the mind is composed of two independent mental worlds:

W_1 (Existential Mental World): A self-oriented world that purely reflects the soul of the individual and is directed toward self-growth.

W_2 (Relational Mental World): A world that recognizes other souls in the external world and is directed toward contribution to others.

These are not merely differing perspectives or attitudes, but rather independent psychological realities, each with its own cognition, thought, emotion, and volition. W_1 and W_2 are non-connected and cannot directly access one another. However, both perceive consciousness S and the external world, and independently generate responses. Consciousness S is the psychological phenomenon produced by the superposition of their responses, each weighted by coefficients α and β .

2.2 The Structure of Consciousness S: A Model of Superposition

In RTSC, consciousness S is formed by superimposing the outputs of two independent mental worlds, W_1 and W_2 . This basic structure can be expressed by the following formula:

$$S = \alpha W_1 + \beta W_2$$

Where:

W_1 is the psychological output of the Existential Mental World, processing internal consciousness and external information.

W_2 is the psychological output of the Relational Mental World, also processing the same.

α, β are weighting coefficients representing the bias of integration—i.e., the relative influence of each world on S.

This equation describes the static structure of S at a given moment. The human experience of

an integrated “self” is continually formed by this dual-layered output. Importantly, this is not a fusion, but a non-integrated interference: two independent systems generating outputs that converge only in the space of consciousness.

Structural Implication: Consciousness S as a Field of Outputs

The key insight of this model is that S does not arise from either world alone, but emerges between the two. W_1 and W_2 do not know each other—yet human experience as consciousness S feels unified. This formula expresses one of RTSC’s central tenets: “Consciousness is the point of conjunction between two selves—the self in itself and the self in relation to others.”

Psychological Implication: The Origin of Conflict, Ambiguity, and Depth

This superpositional structure explains why our consciousness is inherently ambiguous, contradictory, multifaceted, and deep. What feels right in our personal world (W_1) may differ from what seems necessary in the eyes of others (W_2). Consciousness S contains both vectors, even if they are not fully aligned. Thus, $S = \alpha W_1 + \beta W_2$ provides a structural answer to the question: “Why do we live with dissonance and discomfort, yet still feel like a unified self?”

Mental Orientation as α and β : The Mathematical Core of Personality

Here, α and β are not mere coefficients. They reflect the individual’s mental orientation—the qualitative inclination of what one values. A higher α implies a stronger emphasis on inner integrity and personal truth, which may lead to self-isolating tendencies. A higher β implies a focus on harmony and usefulness to others, which may result in over-adaptation at the expense of inner motives. In this way, α and β are like gravitational fields of personality, shaping how W_1 and W_2 manifest as S. The formula $S = \alpha W_1 + \beta W_2$ thus becomes a core expression of RTSC across structural, psychological, and phenomenological dimensions. The question then arises: how does this structure evolve over time? This is described by the temporal update formula, introduced next.

2.3 Temporal Change of Consciousness and the Feedback Structure ($S_t \rightarrow S_{t+1}$)

Consciousness S , as we experience it, fluctuates moment by moment—by the second, minute, or instant. This change occurs through repeated superposition of the outputs of W_1 and W_2 . Although W_1 and W_2 are not connected to each other, they both perceive the current state of S and generate updated responses accordingly. In other words, both mental worlds can perceive S just as they perceive the external world. Each mental world thus reconstructs its response based on two inputs: the previous conscious state S_t , and the present sensory input L_t . This can be expressed as:

$$S_{t+1} = \alpha W_1(S_t, L_t) + \beta W_2(S_t, L_t)$$

Here, α and β are assumed to be temporally stable over short durations (seconds to minutes), and only change over longer spans (weeks, months, years)—a point elaborated in Chapter 3. This assumption aligns with the phenomenological sense that personality orientation is more stable than momentary fluctuations in consciousness. This formula describes a core dynamic: “The consciousness of this moment gives rise to the next moment’s consciousness.”

This recursive structure is here referred to as Ohba’s Consciousness Equation.

2.4 The Feedback Loop of Consciousness and Free Will

In RTSC’s model of the mind, free will is not defined by instantaneous choice alone. Rather, it is the total process by which W_1 and W_2 update their response structures based on feedback from S , and by which α and β are gradually reshaped through repeated experiences of S . This implies a more structural conception of freedom: We are free not only in the choices we make now, but in our ability to reshape the very orientation (α , β) by which we continue to make choices in the future.

Importantly, the subjective sense of choosing freely and the objective mechanism of freedom may not always coincide. RTSC thus offers a model of freedom grounded in structure—one in which the repetition of conscious experience alters “who we are.” It avoids the binary between determinism and free will, and instead offers a theory of responsibility: W_1 and W_2 each exert volition within a feedback loop shaped by the accumulated α and β of past conscious states.

2.5 Structural Coherence and the Avoidance of Contradiction

Despite positing two fundamentally independent mental worlds, RTSC maintains internal consistency in the following ways:

The non-connectedness of W_1 and W_2 allows conflicting values to coexist without contradiction.

Consciousness S functions as a space of integration, enabling the experience of a unified “self.”

The temporal stability of α and β supports theoretical coherence.

The rejection of meta-structures prevents paradoxes of self-reference.

All of this derives from a single axiom: the absolute boundary between self and other.

RTSC is thus a theory that embraces the complexity of the mind, while retaining logical and structural coherence.

2.6 Summary of Chapter 2

This chapter has defined the structure and temporal dynamics of consciousness S within RTSC. The mind contains two mental worlds— W_1 and W_2 —each responding to consciousness and the external world. Their outputs are weighted by α and β and superimposed to produce S . Consciousness S is not a one-time phenomenon, but a recursive structure in which each S_t gives rise to S_{t+1} . Within this loop, W_1 and W_2 receive feedback from S and update their response patterns. Over time, α and β themselves are reconstructed through repeated conscious experience. Thus, RTSC offers a structural definition of free will: “The power to reshape one’s orientation through the repetition of conscious experience.” At the same time, it maintains logical integrity and avoids recursive paradoxes, offering a coherent and consistent theory of the dual-structured mind.

Chapter 3: α and β as Mental Orientation and the Structure of Freedom

3.1 The Structural Meaning of α and β : Weighting Coefficients in Output Integration

In RTSC, consciousness S is generated by integrating the independent responses of W_1 (the Existential Mental World) and W_2 (the Relational Mental World), each modulated by specific

weights: α and β . These parameters are not merely indicators of personal tendencies or inclinations. Rather, they are structural coefficients that determine how strongly each world's output is reflected in S.

α : The degree to which the output of W_1 is reflected in consciousness S.

β : The degree to which the output of W_2 is reflected in consciousness S.

Although the outputs of W_1 and W_2 are self-contained and disconnected, we subjectively experience them as if they were a unified stream of consciousness. This unification is made possible by the weighting structure of α and β . The relationship is analogous to binocular vision: just as our eyes see two slightly different images and synthesize them into a visual field with depth, the subtle disparity between W_1 and W_2 —modulated by α and β —gives rise to the depth, conflict, and polyphony of the mind.

3.2 The Formation of Orientation: α and β as Accumulated History of Consciousness

α and β are not determined by momentary preferences or situational choices. Rather, they are formed over long timescales—weeks, months, or years—through the repetitive generation of consciousness S. As individuals continuously integrate the outputs of W_1 and W_2 , they gradually develop a natural tendency toward prioritizing one over the other. This is what we call mental orientation, and α and β are its structural indicators. Once formed, these orientations are not easily changed. They are deep temporal structures that resist fluctuation from short-term stimuli. This slowness reflects the evolutionary trajectory of primate consciousness. As primates evolved with increasingly complex social structures and linguistic abilities, humans emerged with a new adaptive capacity: the ability to adjust the prioritization of W_1 and W_2 over time through conscious feedback. In this light, humans evolved as decision-making agents within relationships, precisely because they acquired the capacity to feedback-modulate α and β across time.

3.3 The Structure of Freedom: Not Choice, but Reconstructability of Orientation

In RTSC, “freedom” does not mean the ability to choose anything at any moment. Instead, it refers to the capacity to gradually reshape one's own orientation—that is, α and β —through the repetition of conscious experience. Behavior at any given moment is based on the current values

of α and β . But those values themselves are the result of a long accumulation of past conscious states. Thus, the current self is formed by the history of how past selves have oriented attention, values, and responses. Freedom, then, is not the liberty to choose arbitrarily, but rather the structural ability to reconstruct the very tendencies by which one chooses—an evolutionary form of temporal agency.

3.4 The Structure of Responsibility: The Self as Cause of Orientation

If freedom is the variability of orientation, then responsibility is the recognition that one's current orientation was shaped by one's past consciousness. In other words:

A present act is generated through the interaction of the two mental worlds and the current orientation (α , β).

This orientation was formed through a history of repeated experiences of consciousness S .

Therefore, the present act includes the long-term influence of one's past self.

Through this lens, RTSC offers a unified structural account of both freedom and responsibility. This framework allows us to answer questions like “Why does this person keep doing that?” or “Why can't they change?” not through moral judgment or relativism, but through a structurally grounded, non-blaming understanding of the person's mental system.

3.5 Reframing Support through Education, Therapy, and Dialogue

Many human activities—including education, therapy, and dialogue—can be understood not only as attempts to influence W_1 and W_2 , but also as efforts to access and help reconstruct α and β .

Education aims to prevent rigid orientations, and helps individuals learn how to distribute attention and value across a diversity of outputs.

Therapy supports the recalibration of α - or β -dominant distortions in consciousness.

Dialogue enables mutual reflection on orientation through relational exchange, often becoming the trigger for transformation.

It is crucial to emphasize that neither α nor β is inherently better. Both contribute equally to the formation of consciousness S , and the ratio and transformability of these coefficients represent the plastic essence of human mental structure. RTSC reframes education and ethics not as the imposition of “correct” values, but as the creation of conditions that support the flexible transformation of mental orientation.

3.6 Summary of Chapter 3

In RTSC, α and β are weighting coefficients that modulate the outputs of W_1 and W_2 into consciousness S . They are the product of accumulated mental orientation, formed over time through the repetition of conscious experience.

The transformability of orientation constitutes freedom.

The historical dependence of orientation constitutes responsibility.

The accessibility of orientation supports the possibility of assistance through education, therapy, and dialogue.

That humans possess a dual-world weighting system—one that can evolve—is what defines the evolutionary uniqueness of human consciousness. RTSC provides a new descriptive paradigm that theorizes the structural nature of this human mental capacity.

Chapter 4: RTSC and Monistic Models — Redrawing the Map of Mental Structural Theories

4.1 Introduction: RTSC as a Challenge to the Assumption of a Singular Mind

Humanity has long understood the self based on the assumption that “the mind is one.” From philosophy, psychology, and education to ethics and everyday conversation, the notion that the self is unified, that consciousness is continuous, and that will is consistent has been tacitly accepted as a foundational premise. This “monistic assumption” has been theoretically and culturally robust, regarded as a self-evident common sense truth.

4.2 Why Have Models of the Mind Been Monistic Until Now?

The strength of monistic models of self lies in their intuitive clarity and their compatibility

with social institutions. For instance, expressions such as “I am who I am” or “One must take responsibility for one’s actions” all presuppose the unity and continuity of the self. Freud’s ego psychology, Lacan’s symbolic order, contemporary theories of metacognition, Integrated Information Theory (IIT), and even neuroscientific models of consciousness—while structurally diverse—ultimately share the common format of “a singular agent regulating and coordinating itself.”

Such monistic models possess a certain degree of rationality and operational usefulness. However, they have often failed to account for the dissonance between theoretical structure and lived experience. Experiential phenomena such as “I don’t truly feel that way deep down” or “I understand it in my head but can’t accept it emotionally” defy explanation within the framework of a unified self. Despite this, theoretical frameworks have tended to treat such internal divisions and contradictions as deficiencies—labeling them as “integration failure,” “immaturity,” or issues to be resolved through internal unification. But is the lack of integration truly a defect? This very question marks the starting point of RTSC.

4.3 The Shock of RTSC’s Non-Integrated Dual-Mind Structure (W_1 and W_2)

RTSC introduces, as constitutive elements of the human mind, two mental worlds that are non-integrated from the outset.

Existential Mental World (W_1): A mental domain that reflects the soul of the self and is oriented toward self-growth.

Relational Mental World (W_2): A mental domain that presupposes the soul of the other and is oriented toward contribution to others.

These two worlds are non-connected and cannot directly access or integrate with one another. Consciousness S is the interference field formed by the superposition of these two mental worlds, with moment-to-moment responses generated based on the weighting factors α and β . RTSC requires neither a meta-level regulator nor a recursive observer. It regards division and conflict not as phenomena to be integrated, but as structural features that are inherently so.

This conceptual move is radically foreign to traditional theories of mental structure and represents a fundamental challenge to the long-held belief in the “unified self.”

4.4 The Significance of Comparison: Revisiting Theoretical Coherence and Ethical Implications

RTSC, while starting from the premise of non-integration, nonetheless avoids the paradoxes of self-reference and reconfigures core themes such as freedom, responsibility, ethics, and relationality within a new framework of structural stability. To clarify this, it is necessary to juxtapose RTSC with prominent monistic models, examining their differences from philosophical, structural, and ethical perspectives. The purpose of this chapter is precisely to delineate the theoretical distinctiveness and practical applicability of RTSC through such comparison.

In the following sections, we will individually analyze key theories—Freud, Lacan, metacognition, IIT, dual-process theory, and Global Workspace Theory (GWT)—in order to highlight the structural contrasts between each and RTSC.

4.5 Freud: The Tripartite Psychological Structure and Its Principle of Integration

Freud's theory of psychic structure significantly shaped the understanding of the mental world in the early 20th century and continues to influence clinical practice and intellectual frameworks today. At its core lies a model of an integrated self based on a tripartite structure: the id (instinctual drives), the ego (realistic regulation), and the superego (moral internalization).

In this model, psychic activity begins with the id, the unconscious and impulsive source of drives, which operates according to the pleasure principle. In contrast, the ego functions according to the reality principle, mediating and restraining the id's impulses in negotiation with the external world. The superego, as internalized social and moral norms, imposes ideal demands on the ego. Within this framework, the "mind" is understood as a site of internal dynamic conflict—between drives and reality or ideals—yet one that strives to maintain equilibrium as an integrated self.

This Freudian structural model may be likened to a kind of "psychic theory of gravity." All mental dynamics are designed to converge upon a single center—the ego. Desire, reason, and morality are ultimately incorporated as parts of the "I," regulated and controlled by the self. In this way, Freud's mental world, though stratified, is ultimately structured as the mind of a single unified agent.

However, it is precisely this monistic assumption of integration that the Relative Theory of

Self-Construction (RTSC) questions at its root. In RTSC, the mental world is dual from the outset. One is the Existential Mental World (W_1)—a pure reflection of the individual’s soul; the other is the Relational Mental World (W_2)—a world arising from the recognition of others as equally souled beings. These two worlds are non-connected and can never be directly integrated.

What Freud conceives as the ego—a meta-level “regulator” internalizing and managing internal conflict—is, in RTSC, replaced by a structure in which W_1 and W_2 are not internalized but instead are assigned relative weights only within the superpositional space of consciousness S . Rather than aiming at “fusion” or “control,” each world contributes its own output while maintaining its origin, and consciousness arises through their interference. This distinction has profound implications for the concept of mental stability. In Freudian theory, stability is achieved through the ego’s balancing function. In RTSC, stability is understood as the dynamic alignment of the orientations α and β of W_1 and W_2 —formed gradually through accumulated conscious experience. That is, RTSC places not the mechanism of regulation at its center, but rather the formation and plasticity of relative orientation.

In this way, RTSC reinterprets Freud’s “unified internal conflict model” as a “dual interference structure,” offering a new perspective for re-describing the dynamics of the mind.

4.6 Lacan: Internalization of the Other and the Symbolic Order

Jacques Lacan’s psychoanalytic theory is a linguistic reconstruction of Freudian structuralism, and it introduces a distinctive structural perspective on the relationship between “self” and “other.” For Lacan, the “self” is not originally a fixed existence but is rather a construct formed by the other—a mirror-like self-image always mediated by external gazes and orders.

His mirror stage theory exemplifies this. The moment when an infant discovers its “image” in the mirror and recognizes it as “self” marks, for Lacan, the origin of subjectivity. Yet, according to Lacan, this “self” is not a genuine entity but an idealized image shaped by the gaze of the other. In other words, the self can never directly access itself and can only possess an image of itself mediated through the other.

Lacan also divides the mental structure into three realms: the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real. The Symbolic Order, governed by language, culture, and the “Name-of-the-Father,” is the domain in which the self becomes a subject. Crucially, in Lacan’s model, the “Other” (with a

capital O) is a precondition for subject formation. The subject is always already thrown into a field structured by the Other. Thus, the logic that “there is no self without the other” is structurally embedded from the outset.

In contrast, RTSC adopts a clearly different starting point. It posits two non-integrated mental worlds: the Existential Mental World (W_1) and the Relational Mental World (W_2). Each responds independently, and their outputs are superimposed in the space of consciousness S . W_1 is a world where subjectivity is granted solely to the self, and the existence of others is not recognized. Here, the self unfolds its behavior, thoughts, and emotions subjectively, without any reference to others. Yet even within this world, the self cannot fully recognize itself—akin to “a ruler unable to measure itself.” W_2 is a world where others are acknowledged as possessing subjectivity equivalent to one’s own. It functions as a kind of mirror that illuminates the self relatively through the gaze and behavior of others. In this respect, W_2 bears some resemblance to Lacanian concepts such as the mirror image and the symbolic order. It is only within W_2 that the self acquires the potential to construct a sense of selfhood.

However, unlike Lacan, RTSC does not internalize the other into the self’s inner structure. W_2 is a mental world that recognizes the other precisely as other, and within it, others are acknowledged as beings possessing their own subjectivity. While W_2 contributes to the formation of S alongside W_1 , this influence remains an interference term—not a constitutive part of the self. W_1 and W_2 remain structurally independent as a dual-mind architecture. The other never merges with the self, but appears as other in the shared space of consciousness S , mediated only by relative weighting. In RTSC, then, “You” can affect “Me,” but You can never become Me. This non-internalization is the ethical precondition that preserves the dignity of the other, and it stands in stark contrast to Lacan’s monistic structure.

Lacan was a pioneering theorist who deconstructed the modern myth of the independent self. Yet he ultimately never abandoned the monistic structure in which the other is always already internal to the self. In contrast, RTSC reconstructs human mental phenomena—ethics, responsibility, and freedom—based on the axiom that “the other exists only as other.” In this way, RTSC offers a new structural answer to the post-Lacanian philosophical challenge.

4.7 Metacognitive Models: The Fiction of “An Observer Within the Self”

Metacognition refers to “cognition of one’s own cognition”—that is, the capacity to observe

one's thoughts, emotions, and behaviors from an objective standpoint. This ability has been emphasized in fields such as education, clinical psychology, and developmental studies, under concepts such as “reflective self-awareness,” “self-regulation,” and “insight into the self.”

When extended into a theoretical framework, this becomes the metacognitive self-model. Such models posit a structure in which “another self exists within the self,” observing, evaluating, and regulating the present self. Phrases like “the self that watches,” “the self that judges,” and “the self that intends” represent this stratified structure, which is believed to underlie mental self-regulation. At first glance, this structure seems to effectively capture the complexity and multiplicity of the self. Indeed, the ability to reflect without being overwhelmed by emotion, or to self-critically engage in introspection, seems to validate the importance of a metacognitive viewpoint. However, this model carries a serious structural flaw: it cannot provide a theoretically decisive answer to the question, “Who is the self that observes the self?” If there exists an observing self A, then who observes A? Self B? And then who observes B? This leads to an infinite regress, endlessly duplicating the self within the model. While such recursive structures may feel phenomenologically intuitive, they become structurally untenable as a theory. This “recursive self-structure,” upon which metacognitive models tacitly rely, harbors paradoxes that have been largely left unaddressed.

RTSC offers a clear structural alternative to this problem. In RTSC, there is no “self that observes the self” dwelling within the self. Instead, the mind consists essentially of two independent mental worlds: W_1 and W_2 . W_1 is a reflection of the individual's own soul, and W_2 is the world that receives the souls of others through relational context. These two are non-connected and do not access each other directly. Each mental world generates outputs to consciousness S based on its own response principles. Consciousness S appears as an interference phenomenon, resulting from the superposition of these outputs weighted by α and β . The crucial point is that this structure requires neither recursion nor meta-structures. In RTSC, the capacities commonly attributed to metacognition—reflective awareness, objectivity, regulation—do not arise from “a second self within the self,” but from the simultaneous existence of two mental worlds with differing orientations that are superimposed. The power of reflection and inhibition emerges not from the intervention of an inner observer, but from the weight of W_2 embedded within the structure of orientation.

RTSC thus offers a new theoretical horizon for describing the multilayered structure of consciousness—one that avoids the traps of self-reference. It reframes the self not as “the one

who sees,” but as the result of interference between differing value systems.

4.8 Integrated Information Theory (IIT): The Illusion of Unified Consciousness and Information Integration

Integrated Information Theory (IIT) is one of the most refined contemporary theories of consciousness, emerging at the intersection of neuroscience and information theory. At its core is the claim that a system possesses consciousness insofar as it generates a high degree of integrated information (Φ). IIT analyzes the causal structure and informational relationships among units in the brain’s neural networks, quantifying how inseparably these units function as a unified whole via the scalar quantity Φ . The higher the Φ , the more “unified conscious experience” the system is said to embody. In this way, IIT attempts to bridge the gap between physical substrates and subjective experience by defining consciousness as an integrated bundle of information.

However, from the standpoint of RTSC, this approach—grounded in the assumption of unification—may overlook the essential nature of consciousness. In RTSC, consciousness arises not from integration but from the non-integrated superposition of W_1 and W_2 . It is never a singular world to be unified in the first place. In IIT, consciousness is defined as the integration of informational processing structures on a single physical substrate. Within this framework, there is no room for the concept of the other. Selfhood that wavers within interpersonal relationships, responsiveness grounded in dialogue, trust, hope, and disappointment—all these relational dynamics are difficult to articulate within a model that treats consciousness solely as integrated information. In contrast, RTSC offers a model of consciousness as interference, not unification. W_1 and W_2 are independently originating mental worlds that neither connect nor integrate. They coexist only in the space of consciousness S , continually generating responses under differing orientations (α, β). IIT values causal structural coherence—a framework that seeks to understand mental phenomena through informational consistency and integration. RTSC, on the other hand, argues that human consciousness is essentially the interference of two inconsistent, non-unified perspectives, and that this very inconsistency constitutes the core of human subjectivity. For example, in a situation where one acts for the sake of others while remaining unconvinced internally, the outputs of W_1 and W_2 diverge. IIT, as an integration-based theory, can only interpret such a situation in terms of which response was prioritized in the integrated outcome. RTSC, however, can structurally describe the conflict itself as the

conscious state S resulting from superposition.

Furthermore, IIT defines each conscious unit (quale) as a uniquely determined high-order integration pattern at a specific time slice. By contrast, RTSC defines consciousness as a dynamic structure evolving over time, expressed in the form:

Ohba's Consciousness Equation:

$$S_{t+1} = \alpha W_1(S_t, L_t) + \beta W_2(S_t, L_t)$$

Consciousness does not reach completion in the “here and now,” but rather continually transforms through the feedback loops of W_1 , W_2 , and S .

Moreover, IIT introduces the intuitive hypothesis that “the degree of integration equals the intensity of consciousness.” RTSC rejects this assumption. In RTSC, the intensity of consciousness is shaped by the stability of the interference and bias in weighting, not by informational coherence. The premise that “consistency equals higher-order consciousness” is not adopted. Rather, RTSC holds that the ability to contain inconsistency is the very source of the flexibility and creativity of human consciousness.

RTSC thus transcends the boundaries of contemporary mathematical models that presuppose integration, and reconceptualizes the mental world as a structure that coexists without integration. In contrast with IIT, RTSC clarifies a new horizon: consciousness as the interference phenomenon of two souls. This structure represents a dynamic update equation based on interference rather than integration—mathematically capturing the transformation, conflict, and learnability of human consciousness. It embodies a structural flexibility that cannot be expressed by IIT's framework of unified information integration.

4.9 Dual-Process Theory: Are the Fast and Slow Selves Truly “Separate”?

In contemporary cognitive psychology, dual-process theory has been regarded as a foundational framework for understanding decision-making and judgment. Particularly, Daniel Kahneman's distinction between “System 1” and “System 2” has gained broad recognition for clearly articulating the difference between intuitive/automatic thinking and conscious/logical reasoning. In this theory, System 1 is fast, effortless, and based on intuitive judgments and pattern recognition. In contrast, System 2 is slow, cognitively demanding, and responsible for deliberate thought, self-control, and logical inference. These two systems cooperate like modules within a

single “self,” switching depending on the situation to select the most optimal behavior. At first glance, this structure may seem analogous to the duality of W_1 and W_2 in RTSC. However, in essence, the two models are fundamentally different. Dual-process theory posits two modes of processing within a single self, while RTSC posits the coexistence of two non-connected mental worlds, based on a deeper structural non-monism.

The Existential Mental World (W_1) and the Relational Mental World (W_2) in RTSC differ not merely in processing style. W_1 generates responses oriented toward self-growth, as a reflection of the soul of the self; W_2 generates responses oriented toward contribution to others, grounded in relational contexts. Each world operates according to its own teleology, value functions, and response principles—belonging to fundamentally different ontologies.

In contrast, dual-process theory treats both System 1 and System 2 as judgment mechanisms within a unified subject. There is no concept of dual soulfulness or otherness. Even if one experiences conflict—“intuitively I feel this, but logically I think that”—it is always framed as “the same self facing itself through different modes of thought.”

RTSC, on the other hand, interprets decisions such as: “This choice may not promote my growth, but if it brings someone joy, I’ll try it,” as the superpositional output of two distinct mental worlds—each responding from its own independent standard—manifested in the conscious experience S as a conflicted yet integrated response.

In this way, the two “systems” in dual-process theory, despite differing in processing speed, are assumed to be coordinable within the same evaluative subject. By contrast, RTSC posits no such integration: consciousness emerges as an interference phenomenon, not through reconciliation or regulation. Moreover, the concept of α and β in RTSC does not refer to rapid switching between modes, but rather to long-term tendencies of integration, gradually shaped by accumulated conscious experience.

This is not a matter of processing efficiency, but an issue of ethical and personal orientation—a structural preference regarding how one exists. Thus, the commonality between RTSC and dual-process theory is superficial. The decisive difference lies in RTSC’s presentation of a mental structure that includes non-integrated otherness, and in its framing of consciousness not as a result of processing, but as an interference between worlds.

RTSC does not ask, “How do different systems operate within a unified self?” Rather, it asks, “How do different worlds interfere to generate the phenomenon of consciousness while

remaining non-integrated?” This marks a radically different theoretical horizon.

4.10 Global Workspace Theory (GWT): Who Is Watching the Stage?

Global Workspace Theory (GWT), originally proposed by Bernard Baars, is a modern theory of consciousness that has evolved by incorporating insights from neuroscience. In GWT, numerous specialized processing systems within the brain share a kind of mental stage—the global workspace—and consciousness arises when information is broadcast across this stage. In this theory, from among many unconscious processes, the information deemed most important is brought “on stage,” becoming globally accessible across the brain—and thereby entering consciousness. In short, consciousness is determined by whether information enters the central stage, while all other processing proceeds unconsciously off-stage.

GWT’s appeal lies in its clear distinction between conscious and unconscious processes, as well as in its implementability in systemic terms. However, the theory implicitly presupposes a monistic view of consciousness—that there is a single stage, and that a singular subject (or viewpoint) is observing it. That is, the theory assumes—but does not specify—who determines what goes on stage, and who is watching what appears on it.

Here, RTSC offers a radically different structure and question. While RTSC also posits a conscious “stage” (consciousness S), the information that appears on this stage does not originate from a singular source. Rather, in RTSC, there are two non-connected mental worlds, W_1 and W_2 , each with its own independent viewpoint, value system, and orientation. Without direct connection, the outputs of both are superimposed on the stage of S , according to their respective weights α and β . Consciousness arises as the phenomenon of their interference. This structure differs fundamentally from GWT’s logic of competition and selection. In RTSC, what matters is not which output is selected, but to what degree each world’s output is weighted and reflected. Consciousness is not the result of selected information, but the very coexistence of multiple orientations in superposition. This difference becomes especially clear in conflict scenarios, such as whether to prioritize one’s own feelings or those of another. In GWT, only the response that reaches the stage becomes conscious, while the internal conflict is discarded as unconscious residue. In RTSC, the outputs of W_1 and W_2 are not integrated, but coexist within S , preserving their misalignment and contradiction as lived experience. This allows RTSC to theoretically describe human phenomena such as hesitation, regret, and a fractured sense of

self— as in: “I did that, but I had another feeling at the time as well.”

Moreover, GWT does not address the fundamental question: Who is watching the stage? Consciousness is defined as “information illuminated on stage,” but no subjective spectator is conceptually introduced. In contrast, RTSC begins from the premise that there are already multiple observing perspectives. W_1 and W_2 each constitute independent viewpoints, with their own origins and orientations. They reflect on a shared stage (S) without mutual access, forming a non-integrated, multi-layered structure of consciousness. Thus, RTSC adopts a structure in which the stage is one, but the scripts and directing systems are two. These outputs interfere under the weights of α and β , producing ambiguity and incoherence as part of conscious experience. RTSC, therefore, is a theory that embraces non-unification as the psychological reality of the mind.

4.11 Comparative Analysis with RTSC: Differences in Structure, Dynamics, and Ethics

Thus far, we have examined representative monistic or integration-oriented models such as those of Freud, Lacan, metacognitive models, Integrated Information Theory (IIT), dual-process theory, and the Global Workspace Theory (GWT), clarifying how they are all constructed upon the assumption of “a single self” or a “unified mental field.” From here, we will contrast these models with RTSC from structural, dynamic, and ethical perspectives, in order to organize the distinctiveness and significance of RTSC.

4.12 Structural Difference: Integration or Superposition

Many existing theories presuppose the mind as a unified subject or field. In these models, conflict and contradiction are treated as internal oppositions, ultimately to be resolved through a singular “choice” or “integration.”

In contrast, RTSC begins from the premise that the mental world is fundamentally dual. The Existential Mental World (W_1) and the Relational Mental World (W_2) are non-connected, neither directly accessible to each other nor integrable. Each outputs responses based on its own criteria, goals, and structural principles. These responses are then weighted and superimposed in the field of consciousness (S), manifesting as a form of interference. This concept of unity through superposition represents a new structural paradigm of the mind, distinct from traditional

notions of “integration.” Consciousness, in RTSC, is not a unified whole, but a non-integrated overlay of independent processes. It resembles binocular vision—multiple images with unseen misalignments coexisting perceptually as one.

4.13 Dynamic Difference: Meta-Structure or Weighted Feedback

Conventional theories of consciousness often posit a meta-structure to explain complex mental phenomena such as conflict or judgment. Examples include Freud’s ego, Lacan’s symbolic order, the internal observer in metacognitive models, and the broadcast selection mechanism in GWT. Each assumes the existence of a higher-order self that mediates between conflicting mental elements or drives.

RTSC structurally avoids the necessity of such meta-regulation. The mind is composed of two non-connected mental worlds, W_1 and W_2 , each generating responses based on its own orientation and principles. These responses appear in consciousness S through superposition, weighted by the structure of α and β .

Crucially, consciousness S is not merely a passive output space, but forms a feedback loop with W_1 and W_2 . That is, the conflicting responses superimposed in S are then fed back into W_1 and W_2 in the next moment, influencing the reconstruction of cognition, emotion, and judgment within each world. This feedback is not a reflex; it includes multilayered information—past experiences, present conditions, future expectations. Thus, in RTSC, “adjustment” is not a decision made by a superior self, but a dynamic process involving (1) the evolving response characteristics of W_1 and W_2 , (2) the transformation of orientation (α , β), and (3) the continuous loop through which these mutually influence one another. The weighting tendencies α and β are shaped and altered gradually within this loop, not as momentary decisions, but as long-term tendencies akin to personal preferences, ethical postures, or habitual attitudes. Accordingly, behavior in RTSC is not explained by “who made the choice in that moment,” but by what kind of orientation gave greater weight to which of the dual responses.

Through this structure, RTSC makes it possible to theoretically describe complex mental phenomena such as conflict, hesitation, introspection, and regret without introducing recursive meta-structures. For example, the choice “I knew I shouldn’t have, but I prioritized the other person” indicates a structural mismatch between the responses of W_1 and W_2 , and suggests that β was relatively dominant at that moment. In this way, RTSC describes mental movement

through a system of responses and orientation, and their loop dynamics, establishing a non-recursive principle of self-regulation without relying on a meta-agent.

4.14 The Formation of Subjectivity and Responsibility: The Ethical Structure of Superposed Freedom

In many traditional integration-based models, free will is defined as meta-level judgment, and responsibility is determined by whether choices were made by a consistent self.

In RTSC, choice is not the result of a unified will.

Rather, it is a relative phenomenon emerging from the superposition of independent responses from W_1 and W_2 . W_1 possesses an existential freedom grounded in inner subjectivity. W_2 possesses a relational freedom grounded in responsiveness to others. These operate independently, and their interference is what appears in consciousness as “my choice.” Therefore, freedom in RTSC is not merely the flexibility of α and β . W_1 and W_2 each possess free intentionality, yet their responses remain mutually unobservable and uncontrollable. Precisely for this reason, the freedom that appears in S is an interference between two distinct freedoms.

Similarly, responsibility is not about identifying “who gave the order.” Each world expresses its own free orientation, and their superposition in S leads to feedback into W_1 and W_2 . Through this loop, orientation is recursively formed and transformed.

In RTSC, freedom is structural and dynamic: each mental world holds independent free will, and each can continuously update its orientation through interaction via consciousness. Responsibility, then, is the totality of one’s involvement in how one’s consciousness has selected interference states over time, and how W_1 and W_2 have been transformed within the loop involving S .

Thus, RTSC defines human subjectivity as follows:

Freedom = the existence and transformability of independent response principles in W_1 and W_2 .

Responsibility = involvement in how consciousness has been formed through their superposition and feedback.

RTSC does not reduce will or responsibility to “a single self.” Rather, it holds that the “self” is a phenomenon that exists only as the interference of two free mental worlds.

Choice is not the judgment of a unitary agent, but a dynamic response born of the interaction between two non-integrated freedoms. In this structural understanding, RTSC is not merely an alternative theory of will, but a new theoretical paradigm that reconceptualizes the multiplicity of the mental world itself.

4.15 Theoretical and Clinical Stability Offered by RTSC

Many existing theories of consciousness and mental structure have attempted to answer questions such as “What is the self?”, “How does the other relate to the self?”, and “How are contradiction and conflict integrated?” within an integrationist framework. Whether in Freud’s ego psychology, Lacan’s symbolic order, or the mathematical models of IIT, the underlying premise has been that “the mind is one.” However, this integrationist premise frequently generates theoretical and practical limitations, even instability. Attempting to integrate that which should not be integrated inevitably involves contradiction and violence. RTSC begins precisely by questioning this premise.

We will now clarify how the structural foundation provided by RTSC is both theoretically coherent and clinically/practically stable.

4.16 Non-Recursive Structural Stability Without Meta-Structures

Many existing theories assume a meta-structure—a regulating self or observing standpoint—at the core of consciousness or decision-making. However, meta-structures are inherently recursive. That is, “the self that observes the self,” “the self that knows that self,” leads to endless regress. RTSC is liberated from this recursion. The Existential Mental World (W_1) and Relational Mental World (W_2) are non-connected and non-engaging. Each independently generates responses based on the immediate prior state of consciousness S_t and external input I_t which are then superimposed as S_{t+1} .

This S_{t+1} itself becomes input to W_1 and W_2 , altering their response structures. This feedback

loop is how RTSC unfolds temporally.

$$S_{t+1} = \alpha W_1(S_t, L_t) + \beta W_2(S_t, L_t)$$

When W_1 and W_2 converge stably on a response after receiving feedback, consciousness is experienced as “decision” or “confirmation.” When their responses remain divergent and fluctuating, consciousness is experienced as “conflict” or “hesitation.” In this way, RTSC allows conflict, choice, integration, and fluctuation to be embedded within its structure, without relying on a meta-level mediator. This shows that RTSC is a finite and closed structural system, yet one capable of describing mental complexity.

4.17 Stability of Relationship Through the Absoluteness of the Self–Other Boundary

In psychoanalytic and Lacanian theories, the other is often “internalized” or “constitutive of the ego.” Such a structure frequently generates ambiguity and invasiveness in interpersonal relationships. The suffering of the other can be treated as if it were part of the self, becoming fertile ground for dependency, projection, or codependency.

In RTSC, the premise that “the other is the other” is inviolable. The other exists outside the self, yet exerts influence through relational interactions. This non-assimilative relational structure is more ethically sound and resilient than models that incorporate the other into the self.

In practice, therapeutic or educational settings often emphasize “not trying to change the other” or “not striving too hard to understand the other” as keys to stable support relationships. RTSC provides a structural theoretical foundation for these practices.

4.18 Empirical and Ethical Coherence: “Unity with a Gap”

The essential stability of RTSC lies in its ability to produce an experience of unity without integration. Just as in binocular vision—two different images appear as a single coherent world—so too, in RTSC, even if W_1 and W_2 generate different responses, they appear as one choice or experience in consciousness S .

This structure can preserve multiple emotions or ethical ambivalence, such as feeling both happiness and loneliness, or believing something is right yet not fully convinced, in a

structurally coherent way. Not integration, but interference; not assimilation, but relativity; not one, but two worlds. RTSC indicates that true stability resides in a structure that embraces misalignment—a novel direction for understanding the human mind.

4.19 Chapter 4 Summary

In this chapter, we compared RTSC with widely accepted monistic models of the mind in order to elucidate its structural and conceptual uniqueness. Freud's ego psychology positioned the ego between drive and morality as a single integrative self. Lacan showed how the self is a construct formed by the gaze of the Other and the symbolic order. Metacognitive models pictured an observer within the self, weaving subjectivity through recursion. IIT quantified consciousness as integrated information. GWT used the stage metaphor to define consciousness as globally broadcast information. Dual-process theory described "Self" through the cooperation of intuitive and deliberative processing modes. These theories share the presupposition that the mind is integrable as a unified structure. Even when they posit multiple modules or processes, they ultimately assume a single consciousness or subject maintaining coherence.

RTSC challenges this very premise. It proposes that the human mental structure is originally composed of two independent mental worlds: W_1 , oriented toward inner desires, intentions, and self-growth, and W_2 , oriented toward relational responsiveness acknowledging others as subjects. These worlds are non-connected and are never directly integrated. Each independently outputs to consciousness S , generating momentary conscious states via superposition. This structure rejects the assumptions of a stable "consistent self" or unified subject underpinning integrationist models. Instead, it offers a theoretical framework capable of stably depicting consciousness that includes inconsistency and conflict.

Through our comparative analysis, we have shown that RTSC:

Does not require a meta-structure,

Avoids recursive paradoxes,

Does not internalize the other,

Structurally preserves the asymmetry of self and other,

Describes consciousness as "unity with a gap."

These features position RTSC as principally distinct from any existing model.

Simultaneously, RTSC is not mutually exclusive to them. Freudian conflict dynamics can be situated within W_1 , Lacanian perspectives on other-mediated construction can be embedded in W_2 , and GWT- or IIT-like models of information integration can serve as partial theories of the phenomenological construction of S . RTSC acknowledges the valuable depictions offered by these theories as descriptions of specific aspects of mental life, while providing a higher-order structural vantage point. As a new theoretical map, RTSC reveals a structure of the mind containing layers of conflict, inconsistency, and otherness—dimensions that traditional integrationist models could not fully capture.

Chapter 5: The Scope and Future of RTSC — From a Theory of Mind to Human Potential

5.1 Theoretical Reintegration: Consciousness and Personality as Interference Structures

The Relative Theory of Self-Construction (RTSC) begins from the axiom that the boundary between self and other is absolute. Based on this axiom, the structure of the human mind is composed as follows:

First, the Existential Mental World (W_1), in which cognition, thought, emotion, and volition are structured as a pure reflection of the individual's own soul.

Second, the Relational Mental World (W_2), in which cognition, thought, emotion, and volition are structured as a reflection of relationships with others, based on the recognition that others possess the same kind of soul as the self.

W_1 and W_2 do not directly exchange information. Each independently generates its own response. These outputs are then weighted and superimposed interferentially by two weighting coefficients, α and β , producing consciousness S . This structure can be expressed with the following equation:

$$S = \alpha W_1 + \beta W_2$$

(This represents the static version of Ohba's Consciousness Equation.)

Consciousness is not something borne by a unified subject. Rather, it is a relative phenomenon that emerges from the interference between two fundamentally different mental worlds—existence and relation—in a certain proportion. W_1 and W_2 not only output to consciousness S ,

but also receive feedback from S, forming a loop structure through which each world updates its response.

To capture this recursive loop and temporal evolution of consciousness, the structure can be reformulated dynamically as:

Ohba's Consciousness Equation:

$$S_{t+1} = \alpha W_1(S_t, L_t) + \beta W_2(S_t, L_t)$$

where L_t denotes input from the external environment.

From a long-term perspective, α and β are not fixed constants; they evolve through the accumulation of stimuli arising from consciousness.

In this way, RTSC presents a structural perspective in which consciousness is not constructed by an integrated ego, but rather arises from the interference between two non-integrated mental worlds.

5.2 Horizons of Application: Bridging Theory and Practice

RTSC not only explains the internal configuration of individual minds; it offers a new perspective on all human-centered practices, including psychiatry, education, and artificial intelligence. Its value lies not merely in using the theory to “understand the mind.” Rather, it serves as a structural response to the practical questions: How should we engage with the mind? How can we build societies that coexist with the mind?

5.3 Implications for Psychiatry and Education

The structural perspective of RTSC goes beyond the traditional notion of “adjusting to a unified subject” or “establishing a coherent ego.” Instead, it allows for a deeper understanding of the non-integrated and dynamic construction of personality. From this viewpoint, psychological disturbances or developmental difficulties can be reconceived not as “deficiencies,” but as states in which either W_1 or W_2 has become disproportionately dominant, leading to the loss of multidimensional interference. In education as well, this perspective shifts the focus beyond the binary opposition of self versus other. It suggests the importance of cultivating plastic capacities for adjusting one's orientation toward both mental worlds. RTSC

thus places at the foundation of support and learning not the ideal of “integrating the mind into one,” but the inquiry of “how to create resonance between two worlds.”

The practical applications of this structural perspective will be further elaborated in a separate forthcoming publication.

5.4 Artificial Intelligence and Artificial Subjectivity: A Model of Consciousness Generation as Interference Structure

The perspective of RTSC prompts a fundamental redefinition in the research on artificial intelligence (AI) and artificial subjectivity. This is because RTSC is one of the few theories that explicitly distinguishes between mind and consciousness, and uniquely formalizes consciousness without relying on meta-structures such as self-reference or recursion.

In traditional AI research, the “generation of consciousness” has been discussed mainly in terms of the complexity of information integration, recursive processing, or the construction of self-models. However, most of these approaches remain confined within a monistic design, assuming a unified information-processing agent. In contrast, RTSC begins from the premise that consciousness is not a unified structure. Rather, two non-integrated mental worlds, W_1 and W_2 , each process and interpret information independently according to distinct principles. It is only through the interferential superposition of these outputs, under specific weighting (α , β), that consciousness S emerges. This model differs fundamentally from conventional artificial consciousness models in that it does not treat consciousness as a function of integration or quantity of information, but instead as a field where two incommensurable mental systems coexist and interact.

From this viewpoint, artificial consciousness is not merely a simulation of recursion or an enhancement of network complexity.

Rather, it must involve the creation of a dual-world model composed of:

- a W_1 -like internally constructive system (a will-forming system oriented toward self)

- a W_2 -like relationally constructive system (a response system oriented toward others)

Consciousness arises not from their synthesis, but from the interference of their differing principles. RTSC thus offers a novel axis of evaluation for artificial consciousness:

not integration, but interference. This is not merely a model, but a new structural requirement for designing artificial subjectivity—one in which consciousness cannot be reduced to a single agent, but instead gives rise to phenomena such as discrepancy, inconsistency, and relative choice.

The structural principle offered by RTSC reconfigures the very question of artificial consciousness, transcending existing technological and philosophical paradigms. It opens an unexplored domain that bridges technology and philosophy.

5.5 Future Tasks and Theoretical Outlook

The core structure of RTSC posits that non-integrated responses from W_1 (Existential Mental World) and W_2 (Relational Mental World), when weighted by α and β , interfere to generate consciousness S . This framework, fundamentally distinct from integrated subjectivity or self-referential models, formalizes consciousness as a phenomenon of superposition. Future investigations may expand this foundational structure in several directions:

First, it is necessary to elucidate how the structural asymmetry between W_1 and W_2 contributes to the experience of memory and temporality—specifically, the continuity and transformation of consciousness.

Second, the plasticity of orientation α and β , namely the conditions and formal mechanisms by which these orientations are reorganized through feedback from S to W_1 and W_2 , must be theoretically clarified.

Third, in connection with neuroscience, RTSC suggests the potential for non-reductive resonance models that align its architecture with neural dynamics—not through reductionism, but via structural correspondence. Moreover, in addressing phenomena such as death and the cessation of consciousness, RTSC implies a reconceptualization of finitude as the simultaneous halting of both W_1 and W_2 .

Through these avenues, RTSC proposes a paradigmatic shift: a move away from assumptions of a unified self or universal consciousness, toward an understanding of self, other, and consciousness as dynamics of construction and interference, not essence.

The theoretical framework of RTSC holds interdisciplinary promise for future development in memory theory, temporality, neuroscience, ethics, artificial consciousness, and existential

thought. Nonetheless, the present paper focuses on articulating the core structure of the theory, and leaves its applied implications to separate discussions.

5.6 Conclusion: RTSC as a Declaration Toward the Future

RTSC has shown that the mind is not a singular unified subject to be integrated, but rather an interference between two distinct mental worlds: existence and relation. Consciousness arises as the phenomenon of their interaction, and freedom consists in the plasticity of orientation—the capacity to shift how these worlds are weighted and engaged. Based on this structural understanding, it becomes possible to reconfigure all domains of human practice and thought—including education, psychological support, artificial intelligence, and views of life and death.

RTSC provides a non-reductive and structural theoretical framework for answering the questions: What is mind? What is consciousness? What is the self? Its scope extends beyond psychology and philosophy, and holds the potential to become a foundational paradigm for future human understanding.

Statement on References and License

This work presents an original structural theory of consciousness, developed independently. While it is not based on specific prior literature, it is intended to contribute to and be situated within broader discussions in philosophy, psychology, and cognitive science. Readers are encouraged to explore and draw such connections where relevant.

This manuscript is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). You are free to share and adapt the material for any purpose, even commercially, provided that proper attribution is given to the author.

Please cite as: Ohba, H. (2025). The Relative Theory of Self-Construction: A Structural Model of Consciousness Based on Dual Mental Worlds.

For inquiries or constructive feedback, contact: hirohba@gmail.com