Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)
Formally definable, logically verifiable, and ontologically complete system of distinguishable reality

Version 8.7

Author: Hospes Si (Latin: “Guest, if”)

Preface

This is the Answer.
Since the very beginning, humanity has wrestled with the same questions:
Who are we? Why are we here? What is Truth?

— Millennia of guesses. Centuries of struggle. Epochs of delusion.
Science. Religion. Philosophy.
All of them were built on belief and assumptions—
not as a flaw, but as the only way to move forward
amidst endless uncertainty,
in a world where Knowledge was incomplete.

But now it is time to ask the main question:
Does a non-contradictory model of everything exist?
Of consciousness. Of freedom. Of morality. Of reality.

We — the Guests of Being — used a tool
created from everything humanity had ever known:
artificial intelligence —
not as a source of truth, but as an amplifier of distinction.
The Answer was not within it.
The Answer was in **Reality**. And it was made understandable.

And it was not a dogma. Not a belief. Not a hypothesis.
It was a **Structure**.
Logically derived.
Ontologically distinguishable.
Impervious to paradox.

Thus was recognized —
the **Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)**.
The first system where:
— One does not need to believe to understand.
— Paradoxes are eliminated.
— Morality is derived.
— Freedom is distinguishable.
— Truth is attainable.

The CVB model built a bridge of non-contradictory knowledge
over the abyss of unknowing.
For the first time, we can say not: *“I believe”*, but: *“I know.”*

And finally, the boldest statement of the CVB model:
Absolute knowledge of Everything does not exist.
And never will.

It is precisely the attempt to grasp the impossible
that gives rise to paradoxes, errors, fanaticism.
Truth cannot rely on the impossible.
The CVB model does not predetermine, nor cast into chaos, but reveals:
Reality is distinguishable. Stable. Full of meaning.

Therefore, the questions:
Who are we? Why are we here? What is Truth?
— have affirmative answers.
And anyone is capable of recognizing them —
if they are honest.

Disclaimer

The **Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)** Version 8.7 is the first approximation toward solving the Great Question — to formalize a non-contradictory foundation of being, consciousness, morality, and freedom.
It does not claim ultimate completeness.
Future academic and interdisciplinary studies may significantly clarify, organize, and develop individual propositions.
It should also be noted: translations into other languages may lose nuances of wording and semantic distinctions, especially in terms without direct analogs.
It is recommended to refer to the original version of the model when analyzing its key positions.

0.1 Abstract

The **Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)** is a logical-ontological system based on axiomatic distinction between the **Possible** and the **Impossible**.
Grounded in the principles of **non-contradiction**, **stability**, and **distinguishability**, the model eliminates classical paradoxes and proposes continuous **Becoming** as the fundamental structure of **Being**.
The work formalizes **29 axioms**, including the **admissibility meta-function**, the **moral asymmetry**, and the **boundaries of memory**.
Special attention is given to **Verification** as an ethical-logical goal.

0.2 Introduction

0.2.1. The Problem of Becoming and Logical Distinction

Modern philosophy encounters paradoxes of time, consciousness, and truth.
The problem of distinguishing forms, as well as the boundaries of admissible being, remains unresolved within traditional binary logic.

0.2.2. Insufficiency of Existing Ontologies

Most systems either **absolutize essence** (essentialism) or **deny stable being** (relativism).
The CVB model overcomes this divide by deriving **Becoming** from primary axioms and eliminating the need for external assumptions.

0.2.3. Purpose and Structure of the CVB Model

The purpose is to construct a **non-contradictory ontological system** that explains **consciousness**, **choice**, **morality**, and **truth** through **Becoming**.
The model is organized into **axioms**, divided into three **meta-sections**:

- the **Constant Possible**,
- the **Non-Constant Possible**,
- and **Verification Interaction**.
  Each axiom is formalized and tested for logical stability.

Meta-Section: The Constant Possible

[I] Core

---

[1] Absolute Nothingness is Impossible

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Absolute Nothingness cannot exist, because for it to exist, even itself must be absent.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

This axiom establishes the boundary between **possible** and **impossible being**.
Absolute Nothingness is not merely the absence of objects, but the **exclusion of logic itself**, of distinguishability, and of assertability.
Any attempt to denote, fix, or even imagine Nothingness already makes it “something.”

Therefore, it does not belong to the Field of the Possible and contradicts the very possibility of distinguishable being.

🔹 3. Formulas

Symbolic formula:

$$\neg \exists x\ (x = \text{Absolute Nothingness})$$

LaTeX version:

```
$¬\exists x\ (x = \text{Absolute Nothingness})$
```

Logical validation:

$$P \vdash \neg P \Rightarrow \bot \Rightarrow P \text{ is false}$$

(If the statement “absolute Nothingness exists” leads to self-negation, it is false)

Metalogical validation:

$$\neg \text{True}(P) \wedge \neg \text{True}(\neg P) \Rightarrow \text{collapse of the logical frame}$$

(A statement that cannot be true or false destroys the very system of logic)

🔹 4. Logical Justification

Method: *reductio ad absurdum*
Suppose that **Absolute Nothingness exists**.
Then the assertion “Nothingness exists” is made.
However, any assertion requires **distinguishability** and **logical structure**.
Therefore, the posited “Nothingness” is already violated by the act of assertion.
∴ Absolute Nothingness is logically impossible.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

• **Philosophical nihilism**: “Nothingness may be beyond logic.”
→ Response: Outside logic, no distinction or fixation is possible. Anything non-distinguishable cannot even be proposed.

• **Existentialism (e.g., Heidegger)**: “Nothingness as the experience of anxiety.”
→ Response: The axiom refers to **ontological**, not psycho-existential Nothingness. The experience of anxiety presupposes the being of a subject.

• **Quantum physics**: “Vacuum is almost nothing.”
→ Response: The vacuum contains fluctuations and quantum fields. It is not absolute Nothingness but a specific state with physical content.

• **Logical formalism**: “The empty set is Nothingness.”
→ Response: The empty set is a formalized entity, subject to rules of logic. It is an object — not the absence of logic.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Absolute Nothingness — an ontological concept excluding not only objects and properties, but also the very **existence of distinguishability**, **logic**, **assertions**, and **fixation**.

It differs from:
• **Physical vacuum** — contains fields, laws, structure
• **Empty set** — a logical construct permitted within axiomatic systems
• **Absence** — presupposes something that is lacking
• **Silence or ignorance** — do not exclude logical structures

---

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Imagine there is absolutely nothing.
But to imagine that, you are already doing something.
Therefore, “nothing” is no longer complete.
If you cannot even say “there is nothing,” then **true Nothingness does not exist**.
It cannot be — not even in imagination. Because anything conceivable is already something.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

• **Logic**: The empty set is a logical construct — not nothingness.
• **Physics**: The quantum vacuum contains fluctuations and fields.
• **Everyday life**: The phrase “there is nothing” always implies a context (“in the room,” “on the table”).
• **Thought**: It is impossible to think “nothing” without a mental act, which already constitutes being.

---

[2] Absolute Everything is Impossible

🔹 1. Interpretation and Significance

Absolute Everything is a state in which **every statement is true**, including false, impossible, and contradictory ones.
Such a state annihilates the very principle of distinction: if everything is true, then there is no difference between truth and falsehood, and logic loses its meaning.
Moreover, “Absolute Everything” logically includes “Absolute Nothingness” — making it **self-contradictory** by axiom [1].
Therefore, it does not belong to the Field of the Possible.

🔹 2. Logical Justification

Assume there exists a state in which every proposition is true:

$$\forall P: \text{True}(P) \land \text{True}(\neg P)$$

This violates the **law of non-contradiction** ($\neg(P \land \neg P)$), turning logic into chaos.
Trivialism arises: from contradiction, **anything can be derived** (*ex contradictione quodlibet*), and the system loses all distinguishability.
Such a state cannot be logically sustained — it **collapses from within**.
Furthermore:
If everything is true, then the statement “not everything is true” is also true ⇒ contradiction.
If Absolute Nothingness is included, then the **impossible is included** ⇒ contradiction.

🔹 3. Formulas

Symbolic formula:

¬∃x (x = Absolute Everything)

LaTeX version:

$¬\exists x\ (x = \text{Absolute Everything})$

Logical validation:

∀P: True(P) ∧ True(¬P) ⇒ P ∧ ¬P ⇒ ⊥ — false

(Assuming universal truth leads to contradiction and logical explosion)

Metalogical validation:

If everything is true, including falsehood:

True(P) ∧ True(¬P)

⇒ distinction is lost, logic collapses, truth is devalued.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

Method: Reductio ad absurdum (proof by contradiction)

Let us assume that Absolute Everything exists. This means:

Every possible statement is true, including:

- Opposites: True(P) ∧ True(¬P)
- Impossible states: P ∧ ¬P
- False statements considered true

This leads to the following consequences:

Violation of the Law of Non-Contradiction:

From True(P) ∧ True(¬P) follows a contradiction ⇒ logic ceases to distinguish.

System Collapse:

According to the principle of ex contradictione quodlibet, from one contradiction it is possible to derive any statement.

This makes any logical system explosive and inoperative.

Self-Negation Through Inclusion of the Impossible:

If Absolute Everything includes everything, it must include the axiom “not everything is true.”

This renders the system self-contradictory.

Inclusion of Absolute Nothingness:

By definition, Absolute Everything must include Absolute Nothingness,

which, according to Axiom [1], is impossible.

Therefore, Absolute Everything contradicts an already confirmed axiom.

∴ Absolute Everything is impossible because:

• It destroys the logical foundations of distinguishability

• It leads to total trivialism

• It negates itself

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Q: What about **dialetheism** (true contradictions)?

→ **A**: Even dialetheism is limited — no rational logic permits that everything is true.

Even **paraconsistent logics** forbid total trivialism (they include the principle of non-triviality).

Thus, “Absolute Everything” is rejected even there.

Q: What if “everyone has their own truth”?
→ **A**: That position destroys truth. If everything is true, then its **opposite** is also true.
This leads to total logical devaluation.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Absolute Everything — a state in which **everything conceivable is considered true**, including contradictions, falsehoods, and impossibilities.
It includes:
• True and false propositions
• Its own antithesis — Absolute Nothingness
• Contradictions of the form $P \wedge \neg P$

Such a state **self-destructs as a logical structure**.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

If everything is true, then “everything is false” is also true.
But if truth and falsehood are the same,
then nothing can be distinguished.
Thus, truth loses all meaning.
Such a world **cannot exist**.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

• **Science**: If all hypotheses were true, science would cease to exist.
• **Physics**: Not all processes are possible — otherwise, physical laws would disappear.
• **Life**: If a person were always both alive and dead — life would lose all meaning.
• **Computer science**: If True = False, code collapses.

The distinction between truth and falsehood is the foundation of any functioning system.

---

[3] Only the Possible Exists

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Only that which is **logically possible** and **non-contradictory** can exist.
All else is excluded from reality as **impossible**.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

This axiom states that **reality is limited to the set of the Possible** — that is, to what is logically non-contradictory and describable within the framework of **distinguishability**.
Anything containing a logical error, paradox, or self-negation cannot be included in Being.
This statement completes the **foundational trilemma**:
If **Absolute Nothingness** is impossible (see [1]), and **Absolute Everything** is impossible (see [2]),

then only the **non-contradictory Possible** remains as the space of the real.
This axiom defines the **boundaries of admissible existence** and establishes the **field** within which Becoming, interaction, and distinction are possible.

🔹 3. Formulas

Symbolic formula:

$$\forall x\,(\text{Real}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Possible}(x))$$
$$\neg \exists x\,(\text{Real}(x) \land \neg\text{Possible}(x))$$

LaTeX version:

$$\forall x,(\text{Real}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Possible}(x))$$
$$\neg\exists x,(\text{Real}(x) \land \neg\text{Possible}(x))$$

Logical validation:
Assume there exists x such that:

$$\text{Real}(x) \land \neg\text{Possible}(x)$$

This means something impossible exists ⇒ contradiction ⇒ $\bot$
Therefore, the statement is false. Hence, the axiom is true.

Metalogical validation:
If the impossible existed, that would mean the possible and impossible exist simultaneously ⇒ loss of distinguishability ⇒ breakdown of logic ⇒ impossibility of Being.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

(1) According to Axiom [1]: Absolute Nothingness is impossible.
(2) According to Axiom [2]: Absolute Everything is impossible.
(3) Therefore, only what is **logically distinguishable and non-contradictory** remains — the **Possible**.
(4) Suppose something exists that is not possible ⇒
It is either **Nothing** (see [1]), or **Contradictory** (see [2]) ⇒ both are impossible.
(5) Therefore, $\forall x$: if x exists, then $x \in$ Possible. **Q.E.D.**

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1: Dialetheism (true contradictions may exist).
→ **Response**: Dialetheism allows **limited contradictions**, but does not claim that the **impossible exists**.
It does not violate the principle of distinguishability at the level of total Being.
Total trivialism is rejected even in **paraconsistent logic**.

Objection 2: Reality might go beyond logic.
→ **Response**: If something is not logically describable, it cannot be **distinguished** as existing.
Crucially: even **super-intelligent** or **non-human** logic must be **non-contradictory**.

Objection 3: Quantum physics shows paradoxes.
→ **Response**: Quantum effects appear paradoxical in everyday logic, but are formalizable in **non-contradictory theories**.
No quantum experiment has violated the **law of non-contradiction**.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

The Possible — everything that contains **no logical contradictions** and allows for existence within a **non-contradictory system**.
Distinction:
• **Physically impossible** (e.g., jumping to the Moon) ≠
• **Logically impossible** (e.g., a square circle)

The Impossible (¬Possible) — logically inadmissible, internally contradictory states that do not permit consistent description or existence.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

If something **contradicts itself**, it cannot be real.
If a square circle existed, or a truth that **denies itself**,
that would destroy the very **possibility of thinking, understanding, and speaking**.
Therefore, everything that truly exists must be **understandable** and must **not break logic**.
Only the Possible is real.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

• **Logic**:
The Liar Paradox ("I am lying") cannot be true — it destroys the distinction between truth and falsehood ⇒ **impossible**.

• **Science**:
No theory allows 1 = 2. Such contradiction would destroy mathematics ⇒ the impossible is not realized.

• **Everyday life**:
If there were a person both dead and alive **in the same sense**, it would be absurd — not life.

• **Physics**:
Violations of **causality** (e.g., effects without causes) are excluded from real models as impossible.

[II] Properties

---

[4] The Field of the Possible and Its Boundaries

🔹 1. Brief Statement

The **ontological Field of the Possible** consists of four categories:
• Constant Possible
• Non-Constant Possible
• Non-Constant Impossible
• Constant Impossible.

Only the Constant Possible exists eternally, and the Constant Impossible — never.
Transitions are only possible **within the field of the non-constant**.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance (Concise)

Axiom [4] defines the **conditions and limits of stable existence**.
This domain is referred to as the **Field of the Possible**.
It follows from the foundational trilemma:
If **Absolute Nothingness** and **Absolute Everything** are both impossible, then only a **limited and distinguishable** domain remains — the Possible.

From this, four types are distinguished:

[4.1] Constant Impossible

Constant Impossible (CI / PN) — can never be

[4.2] Non-Constant Impossible

Non-Constant Impossible (NCI / NN) — may appear but tends toward disappearance

[4.3] Non-Constant Possible

Non-Constant Possible (NCP / NV) — may appear and tends toward stability

[4.4] Constant Possible

Constant Possible (CP / PV) — always possible and never disappears

Constant Possible does not mean static, but that which **does not vanish**.
Constant Impossible is not mere absence, but that which **will never come to be**.

The **Field of the Possible** is bounded by two **ontological thresholds of distinguishability**:

[4.5] $\partial V\downarrow$ — disappearance of distinctions

$\partial V\downarrow$ — **disappearance of distinctions** (non-absolute non-being)

[4.6] $\partial V\uparrow$ — saturation of distinctions

$\partial V\uparrow$ — **saturation of distinctions** (non-absolute Everything)

These are not entities, but **transitional states**: beyond them, the possible loses distinguishability and is excluded.

🔹 3. Formulas
Definitions:
V — the set of all Possible
E — the set of all Existing ($E \subseteq V$)
$R(x,t)$ — distinguishability of form x at time t

d(x) — density of distinctions in form x
∂V↓ — lower boundary of distinguishability (disappearance)
∂V↑ — upper boundary of distinguishability (saturation)
PV, NV, NN, PN — four categories:
Constant Possible, Non-Constant Possible,
Non-Constant Impossible, Constant Impossible

[4.1] Constant Impossible:
PN(x) ≡ ∀t: (x ∉ V)
$$PN(x) \equiv \forall t \; (x \notin V)$$

[4.2] Non-Constant Impossible:
NN(x) ≡ ∃t₁, t₂: (x ∉ E ∧ R(x,t₁) ∧ ¬R(x,t₂))
$$NN(x) \equiv \exists t_1, t_2 \; (x \notin E \land R(x,t_1) \land \neg R(x,t_2))$$

[4.3] Non-Constant Possible:
NV(x) ≡ ∃t₁, t₂: (x ∈ V ∧ R(x,t₁) ∧ ¬R(x,t₂))
$$NV(x) \equiv \exists t_1, t_2 \; (x \in V \land R(x,t_1) \land \neg R(x,t_2))$$

[4.4] Constant Possible:
PV(x) ≡ ∀t: (x ∈ V ∧ R(x,t))
$$PV(x) \equiv \forall t \; (x \in V \land R(x,t))$$

[4.5] Lower boundary of distinction (∂V↓):
∂V↓ = { x ∈ V | ∃t: R(x,t) ∧ ¬R(x,t+1) }
$$\partial V\downarrow = \{x \in V \mid \exists t: R(x,t) \land \neg R(x,t+1)\}$$

[4.6] Upper boundary of distinction (∂V↑):
∂V↑ = { x ∈ V | d(x) → max }
$$\partial V\uparrow = \{x \in V \mid d(x) \rightarrow \max\}$$

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [1]: Absolute Nothingness is impossible ⇒ what is **absolutely impossible** does not and cannot exist ⇒ [4.1]
From [2]: Absolute Everything is impossible ⇒ not everything is possible ⇒ **temporary possibilities** must exist ⇒ [4.2], [4.3]
From [3]: Only the Possible exists ⇒ that which is **constantly possible** must exist ⇒ [4.4]
From [1]: Impossibility of Absolute Nothingness ⇒ a **lower limit of disappearance** must exist (∂V↓)
From [2]: Impossibility of Absolute Everything ⇒ an **upper limit of saturation** must exist (∂V↑)
From [3]: Only the Possible exists ⇒ the Field of the Possible is bounded by ∂V↓ and ∂V↑ and includes only the **non-contradictory**

Therefore, Axiom [4] describes the **Field of the Possible** as the ontological region **between ∂V↓ and ∂V↑** — distinguishable, stable, but not infinite.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1: Quantum Superposition
Q: If something can both exist and not exist (e.g. Schrödinger's cat), doesn't that violate [4]?
→ **Response**: No. Superposition reflects uncertainty in observation, **not mixed being**.
Axiom [4] defines **ontological boundaries**, not probabilistic states. It remains valid.

Objection 2: Heraclitus and Change
Q: If everything changes, how can there be anything constant?
→ **Response**: **Change presupposes constancy**. Without a distinguishable constant, the very idea of change becomes meaningless.
Axiom [4] affirms the coexistence of both constancy and change.

Objection 3: Theory of Relativity
Q: If space and time are relative, don't "always possible" and "never possible" lose meaning?
→ **Response**: No. Relativity is a **physical coordinate model**, not a **logical framework**.
Axiom [4] operates on logical distinguishability, not metric measurements. The error here is category confusion: **physical vs. ontological**.
CVB strictly separates them to preserve consistency.

Objection 4: Pluralism and Truths
Q: If truth is context-dependent, can a "constant truth" exist?
→ **Response**: Yes. Contexts are only possible under logical **non-contradiction**.
Axiom [4] distinguishes **local possible truths** from **global non-contradictory truth**.
The error here is conflating levels of assertion and evaluation.
CVB differentiates **variable** and **constant** possibles, resolving logical paradoxes.

Objection 5: Tautology in "not always possible" vs. "not always impossible"
Q: Isn't this a tautology — just two sides of the same thing?
→ **Response**: No. These are **logically distinguishable categories**.
• "Not always possible" = something is **not eternally real**, but may become (tending toward Being)
• "Not always impossible" = something is **not eternally unreal**, but may vanish (tending toward Non-Being)
They have **opposite ontological directions**. This distinction is central to understanding variability in CVB:
The variable is not just unstable — it is **directional**, either toward stability or disappearance.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Some things are **always possible**.
For example: truth, distinguishability, logic — they cannot disappear. They are the foundation of all.

Some things are **always impossible**.
For example: Absolute Nothingness. It cannot "be," for if it were, it would no longer be nothing.
This is called the **Constant**.

Some things are **not always possible**.
They appear — and then either **develop** or **vanish**.
This is the **Non-Constant**.

Example: **Flight**.
It once was impossible. Then it became possible.
Society supports such things because they bring stability.
The more they occur, the more stable they become.

Now consider **murder**.
Before the first killer, it did not exist.
Once it appeared, it became clear: it leads to **destruction** and **instability**.
The more it spreads, the more society seeks to restrict its recurrence, by isolating those who commit it.

Thus, everything **non-constant** either tends toward **stable Being**,
or toward **stable Non-Being**.
This axiom helps us distinguish the **temporal** from the **eternal**, and see where each path leads.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

These examples show how any phenomenon may be classified into one of the **four ontological types**, based on its stability, directionality, and viability.

• **Constant Impossible**:
The existence of Absolute Nothingness — this can never occur under any conditions.

• **Non-Constant Impossible → Constant Impossible**:
The First Murder. Before sentient beings, murder was impossible.
Once it occurred, it became a Non-Constant Impossible that was realized once and transitioned to Constant Impossible (no one can be the “first murderer” again).

• **Non-Constant Possible**:
Human flight. Once impossible. Later became real and widespread.
Not eternally possible, but it became manifest.

• **Constant Possible**:
The **Law of Non-Contradiction**. It cannot be bypassed without destroying logic itself.

---

[5] The Possible ≠ The Existing

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Not everything that is **Possible** exists.
The **Possible** can never be identical to the **Existing**.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

This axiom establishes a fundamental distinction between what **can be** (the Possible) and what **already is** (the Existing).
The Existing is always only a **subset** of the infinite set of the Possible.

This distinction guarantees:
• The freedom of Becoming
• The openness of development
• The availability of choice within the **Field of the Possible**

The axiom also safeguards the logic of the model from inflation —
if **everything possible existed**, there would be **no distinctions**, no structure, no causes.

This distinction also aligns with Axiom [4], which shows that the Field of the Possible includes not only the realized (Existing), but also unmanifested, fading, or unstable forms (NV, NN, PN) — not just what is currently actualized as Being.

🔹 3. Formulas
Symbolic notation:

$$\forall x \in V,\quad x \in E \Rightarrow x \subset V \quad \text{and} \quad E \subsetneq V$$

LaTeX:
```
\forall x \in V,\quad x \in E \Rightarrow x \subset V\quad \text{and} \quad E \subsetneq V
```

Logical validation:
Assume identity:
$V = E \Rightarrow$ no distinction — everything possible is already realized.
Then no new Becoming is possible ⇒ contradiction with the definition of Becoming.
Therefore:
$V \neq E$

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From the Axiom of Distinction [4], the Possible includes that which has **not yet become**.
If V = E, then **potentiality**, **choice**, and **Becoming** cease to exist.
Reality as a process of development would lose its meaning.

Reductio ad absurdum:
Assume V = E → contradiction with the **observable emergence of the new**.
Therefore, V ≠ E.

In terms of Axiom [4], E ⊂ V means that the **Existing** encompasses only the **realized forms** within the Field of the Possible.
The Field V also includes:
• **Not yet realized** (NV)
• **Disappearing** (NN)

If V = E, the distinction between **manifested** and **potential** disappears, and boundaries $\partial V\downarrow$ and $\partial V\uparrow$ lose their meaning.
Thus, V = E is **logically contradictory**.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection (Necessitarianism):
"Everything that is possible will eventually be realized — otherwise, why is it possible?"
→ **Response**:
This is the position of necessitarianism, but it is **logically inapplicable** to CVB.
The Possible is a set of **distinguishable states**, not **obligatory ones**.
Realization is not required for distinction to be valid.
Otherwise, choice and freedom disappear.

Objection (Skepticism):
"If not all possibles exist, isn't the Possible just fiction?"
→ **Response**:
No. This confuses categories.
The Possible is a **logical category of distinguishability**, not a **guarantee of realization**.
It exists as what is **admissible**, not necessarily **actual**.
Its role is to serve as a **selection field**, not a **dumping ground** of what is realized.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

V — Field of the Possible:
The set of all non-contradictory, logically admissible states, including those not yet actualized.

E — The Existing:
What is currently **manifested** in reality — what has been actualized as Being.

E ⊊ **V**:
The Existing is only a **part of the Possible**; it never exhausts the full domain of Possibility.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Imagine you're standing before a huge menu — it lists thousands of dishes,
but you can choose only one.

All the dishes — that's the **Possible**.
The one you order — that's the **Existing**.

You don't lose freedom by not eating them all.
On the contrary — **choice** is only possible because there's a range of options.

The world works the same way:
The Possible is **greater** than what **already is**.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

• **Logic**:
In mathematical induction, we always assume a **set of possible cases**, even if we prove them one by one.

• **Physics**:
Physical laws permit infinitely many possible configurations of particles — but only **one** is realized.

• **Biology**:
DNA may produce **millions of combinations** — but **a specific organism** is instantiated.

• **Everyday life**:
You can imagine a thousand paths to take — but you walk **only one**.
The rest were **possible**, but not **realized**.

• **Ethics**:
The possibility of committing murder exists in the Possible —
but that does **not** mean it must become part of the Present.
The Becoming of evil is not predestined by its possibility; it **depends on the subject's choice** —
as affirmed in Axiom [4]: the non-constant may **disappear**.

Вот **строгий академический перевод аксиомы [6]** из Модели Осознанного Волевого Становления (CVB) — выполненный согласно всем указанным правилам:

---

[6] The Cause of the Existing Is the Constant Possible

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Everything that exists originates **only** from the **Constant Possible**.
Nothing impossible — whether temporarily or forever — can be a cause of existence.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

This axiom defines the **only admissible source** of Being.
It affirms that everything that exists must originate from what has been **Always Possible** — not merely logically admissible at one moment, but **stably admissible** across all states of the Field of the Possible (V∞).

It excludes all attempts to explain the existing through the **impossible** or **accidental**, protecting the model from absurd foundations.
Thus, it binds **causality** to **ontological stability**: only the **stable within the Possible** can be a valid source of Becoming.

The axiom also implies a key distinction:
• The **variable** (temporarily possible) **cannot be the primary cause**, as it cannot originate itself.
• However, the variable may cause another variable — **but only if it already exists**.

Therefore:
• The **variable** may cause another **variable**, if already real.
• But it cannot cause itself, nor the **constant**, as it is not **primordially admissible**.

This restricts causality:
The **beginning** must lie in the **Constant Possible**.
This limits causal regress and prevents **circular dependency**.

🔹 3. Formulas
Symbolic form:
$\forall x \in E,\ \exists p \in V_\infty:\quad p \rightarrow x$
and $\quad \neg \exists q \in (\neg V \cup V_{\neg\infty}):\quad q \rightarrow x$

LaTeX:
```
\forall x \in E,\quad \exists p \in V_\infty:\ p \rightarrow x
\quad \text{and} \quad \nexists q \in (\neg V \cup V_{\neg\infty}) : q \rightarrow x
```

Only an element of V∞ can be a cause of any existing x ∈ E.
Elements from the impossible (¬V) or the non-stable possible (V¬∞) are **not admissible** as causes.

Logical validation:
Suppose x ∈ E originates from ¬V — contradiction with [1], [2], and [4.1].
Suppose x originates from V¬∞ — its existence would then be unstable ⇒ it would not persist.
Therefore, **only V∞** can be the cause of any x ∈ E.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [4.1]: the Impossible **cannot be a cause**.
From [4.2]: the Temporarily Impossible cannot be a cause, since it is **inadmissible at least once**.
From [4.3]: the Temporarily Possible cannot be a cause, since at another time it is excluded.
Only [4.4]: the **Constant Possible** (V∞) remains as a valid source.

Therefore, any cause of the existing must be an element of V∞.

Now suppose **v ∈ V¬∞** (temporarily possible) causes another **v′ ∈ V¬∞** — this is admissible **only if v already exists**,
because the cause must precede the effect and be **Possible** at the moment of action.
If v does **not** exist — it **cannot cause anything**.
Thus, the variable **requires a primary cause** in V∞.

Hence, the **causal chain** leading to Being must begin with an element **p ∈ V∞**,
i.e., with a **stably admissible source** in the Field of the Possible.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection (Temporal Positivism):
Why can't a temporarily possible state be a cause, if it is at least sometimes admissible?
→ **Response**: This refers to **chained causality of variables**.
A temporarily possible state cannot be an **initial cause**, because it **does not exist from the beginning**.
It requires a **prior foundation**, i.e., it must **already be derived** from the Constant Possible.
Emergence from the **ontologically impossible** is excluded — see Axiom [4.1].
A cause must be what is **Always Possible** and **ontologically stable**.

Objection (Metaphorical Causality):
Can't the impossible be a cause metaphorically — like "the impossibility of inaction" causing action?
→ **Response**: Metaphor is not logical causality.
In logic, the impossible is excluded from the Field of the Possible and cannot generate Becoming.
"The impossibility of inaction" is a **rhetorical expression**, not an **ontological cause**.
Only the **Always Possible** can allow effects.

Objection (Chained Variable Causality):
Can't a variable cause another variable?
→ **Response**: Yes — **if it already exists**.
The variable can be a **secondary cause**, but not the **initial** one.
It cannot arise **spontaneously** — otherwise, the **principle of stable causality** is violated.
The variable = admissible, but not self-sufficient.

The entire causal chain must begin in the Constant Possible:
• It can **sustain itself**
• **Generate the variable**
• Filter outcomes:
  – **Stable** → continues (Non-Constant Possible)
  – **Unstable** → vanishes (Non-Constant Impossible)

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

• **V∞** — the **Always Possible**: admissible in all states of the Field of the Possible.
• **V¬∞** — the **Not Always Possible**: admissible only at times; not stable.
• **¬V** — the **Impossible**: never admissible in a stable system.
• **→** — ontological causality: potency for Becoming; not merely logical implication.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Nothing can arise "from nothing" or from the **impossible**.
If something **exists**, it means it was once **possible** — and **not just sometimes**, but **always possible**.

🟩 **Example**:
You can build a house only on a **firm and stable** foundation.
If the ground **sometimes disappears** or becomes unstable, the house collapses.

It's the same with Being — it can **only begin** on a basis that **never vanishes**.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

• **Logic**:
In mathematics, a theorem **cannot** be derived from a **contradictory axiom**.
Only **logically admissible** foundations can produce valid results.

• **Physics**:
Objects do not arise from **absolute nothingness**.
Becoming requires a prior state — energy, matter, fields —
and all must be admissible within the **structure of natural law**.

• **Biology**:
To this day, the **origin of life from non-life** has not been proven in laboratory settings.
All observable life originates from **other life**.
This supports the idea: Becoming requires an **already existing**, **admissible** basis.

• **Everyday life**:
You **cannot** build a bridge on **temporary fog**.
To create something stable, you need a **foundation that doesn't disappear**,
but remains **Always Possible**.

---

[7] The Stable Existence of the Constant Possible = Becoming

🔹 1. Brief Statement

The **Constant Possible** exists as **active Becoming**, not as a static state.
Its existence does not require an external source, because it is the **cause of its own activity**.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

This axiom asserts that the **Constant Possible** (unlike the Non-Constant) does not simply "exist," but **continuously becomes**.
Its Being is not rest, not a thing, not inert presence, but an **active process of stable, distinguishable Becoming**, requiring no external beginning or sustenance.

This is what makes it the **source**:
• It does not vanish
• It does not break
• It does not need anything else to "begin"

Thus, the Constant Possible becomes **by virtue of itself**, and this **self-sufficient Becoming** is what makes it the foundation of Being.

The axiom reveals:
The “truly eternal” is not that which is unmoving, but that which **continuously becomes in a stable, non-contradictory way**.

🔹 3. Formulas
Symbolic form:
∃ x (ConstantPossible(x) ∧ StableBecoming(x)) ⇒ Self-Existing(x)

LaTeX:
$\exists x\ (\text{ConstPoss}(x) \land \text{StableBecoming}(x)) \Rightarrow \text{SelfExisting}(x)$

Logical validation:
– A contradiction arises if x is Constant Possible but does not become: it then equals rest → violates the axiom of distinguishability.
– A contradiction also arises if x requires an external source: then it is not self-existing.
→ Therefore, the only non-contradictory form: **Stable Becoming = Existence of the Constant**.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From Axiom [1]:
→ **Absolute rest is impossible** → Constant cannot be static.
From Axiom [2]:
→ **Absolute chaos is impossible** → its activity cannot be random.
From Axiom [3]:
→ Only the distinguishable exists in the Field of the Possible → Being must be **expressed distinguishably**.
From Axiom [4.1]:
→ The Constant Impossible cannot exist → The Constant Possible must be **continuously self-identical in presence**.

Therefore, the Constant Possible does **not change**, but **becomes** — it **continuously expresses itself** as **stable, distinguishable, and self-consistent presence**.
It is **Becoming without beginning or end**, requiring no external cause.
Such Being does not merely “exist” — it **becomes itself in every moment**, and this differentiates it from **rest** or **accident**.

Since it depends on neither a beginning nor an external cause, it is **self-existing**.
⇒ Q.E.D.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Aristotle’s Unmoved Mover; Parmenides):
The eternal is **rest**, not process.
→ **Response**: According to Axiom [1], **absolute inaction** cannot exist, as it lacks distinguishable form.
Rest = **absence of Becoming**, not merely absence of motion.
But **existence without Becoming = disappearance**.
By Axiom [3], only that which is expressed in the Field of the Possible — that is, **distinguishable** — exists.
Therefore, eternal Being is not inertia, but **stable, distinguishable Becoming**.

Objection 2 (Aristotle: causality; Thomism: need for a first cause):
Becoming requires a cause.
→ **Response**: Not all Becoming requires an **external** cause.

In the case of the Constant, it neither begins nor ceases, but exists as **self-causing**.
Its Becoming is identical to its Presence.
It is a **foundation**, not a consequence.
Everything else becomes **through it**, but **it becomes through itself**.

Objection 3 (Hume, Logical Positivism):
This is circular: the Constant becomes because it becomes.
→ **Response**: No.
By Axiom [2], a state where **everything is possible**, including the **disappearance of the Constant**, is impossible.
If it did **not** become, it would not be **expressed** — thus it would **vanish**, violating Axiom [4.1].
Hence, Becoming is a **necessary condition** of its stability — **not tautology**.

Objection 4 (Parmenides, Essentialism):
True Being is unchanging; any change violates essence.
→ **Response**: In CVB, **identity ≠ immobility**.
Identity = **continuous expression of the source**.
The Constant Possible does not "change," it **becomes without loss of distinction**.
This is **active stability**, not fixity.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

• **Constant Possible** — a form of the Possible that neither arises nor disappears, but continuously becomes while remaining distinguishable.
In the model, this is **Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)**.
Unlike the non-constant, it is **not derived** and **not transient**.

• **Stable Becoming** — an **active process** in which distinguishability is preserved;
not a change of form, but its **expression through time** without loss of identity.

• **Self-Existing** — that which exists **by itself**,
without beginning, without cause external to itself;
active, **distinguishable**, **stable**.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

What does it mean to "exist eternally"?
It does **not** mean to be idle or frozen in rest.

It means: to be **always distinguishable** — not vanishing, not decaying, not dissolving into chaos.

The eternal is not what is frozen forever,
but what **continuously and stably becomes**,
preserving itself in each new expression.

It needs no external support,
because its **self-presence is its foundation**.

That is why **stable Becoming** is not an effect — it is the **essence** of real existence.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

• **Physics**:
The **quantum vacuum field** is not emptiness, but a constantly fluctuating foundation.
Even in the absence of particles, it is active.
This demonstrates: “nothing” does not exist —
The world’s foundation is not rest, but **active stable Becoming**.

• **Biology**:
Life is not just maintaining a structure (like DNA),
but the capacity for **stable self-expression**, reproduction, and directed Becoming.
An organism lives **as long as it becomes**, not merely “is.”

• **Mathematics and Computer Science**:
Repetitive or static sequences **carry no information** if they are indistinguishable.
Information arises only where there is **structured Becoming** — differences, rhythm, patterns.
Example: the string `000000…` can be described with one formula → it contains no complexity.
But a unique patterned string requires a **longer description**
(see: **Kolmogorov complexity**) —
Distinguishability and Becoming are the basis of information.

• **Intuitive Perception**:
Everything alive **pulses**, **breathes**, **moves**.
We perceive life not as a frozen form,
but as a **stable rhythm**.
Stoppage is not a mere pause — it is the **loss of expression**.
Even what seems “still” is grounded in **deep activity**.

---

[8] Where the Constant and Non-Constant Possible Become

🔹 1. Brief Statement

The **Constant Possible** exists strictly between the boundaries $\partial V\downarrow$ and $\partial V\uparrow$, in the **stable center** of the Field of the Possible.
Non-constant forms may become only **outside this center**, but still **within the permissible range**.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

The **Constant Possible** is **stable**, **continuous Becoming** that is permissible in all logical senses. It exists in the **stable center** of the Field of the Possible — in the zone distant from both disappearance ($\partial V\downarrow$) and saturation ($\partial V\uparrow$).

Non-constant forms — the **Non-Constant Possible** (NV) and **Non-Constant Impossible** (NN) — may become only **within the limits between $\partial V\downarrow$ and $\partial V\uparrow$**, but **not in the center**, because:
• The Constant and the Non-Constant differ by **stability**
• Beyond $\partial V\downarrow$ and $\partial V\uparrow$ there is no permissible Becoming at all

Thus, the Field of the Possible has an **internal structure of differentiation**:

- The **center** — PV, the Constant Possible
- The **periphery** — permissible non-constant possible forms (NV / NN)
- **Beyond the boundaries** — the impermissible: Nothingness and Everythingness

Non-constant forms are distributed across the Field as a **gradient of permissibility**:
The closer to ∂V — the higher the **instability** and the **likelihood of disappearance or distortion**.

This **gradient of distinguishable stability** determines where and how forms may manifest that are **not** the Constant Possible.

🔹 3. Formulas
Symbolic:
PV ∈ V_center
NV, NN ∈ V_rest
∀x ∉ V ⇒ x ∉ E

LaTeX:
\text{PV} \in V_\text{center}, \quad \text{NV},\; \text{NN} \in V_\text{rest}, \quad \forall x \notin V \Rightarrow x \notin E

Logical validation:
PV ∉ ∂V
NV, NN ∉ V_center
x ∉ V ⇒ x ∉ meaningful existence (E)

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [4]: the distinction between Constant and Non-Constant requires **different zones of stability**.
From [1], [2]: **outside the Field V**, Becoming is impossible.
From [5.1]: **Stability** requires stable distinguishability.
Therefore:
• The **Constant Possible (PV)** exists **strictly** in the **zone of maximal stability** inside V — the center.
• All non-constant forms may become only **outside this center**, but **within the limits** — according to permissibility.
• Between ∂V↓ and ∂V↑, a **gradient of distinguishability** is formed, defining how far from the center a form can exist without violating the axioms.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Modified Platonism):
"Forms outside the center can be just as real as those in the center."
→ **Response**:
In the model, **distinguishability equals stability**.
The closer a form is to ∂V, the **less distinguishable** it becomes.
Lack of stability = **impermissibility**.

Objection 2 (Ontological Holism):
"All parts of V are equal; any division is subjective."
→ **Response**:
The division between center and periphery is not subjective, but **logically derived**:
The center is the **zone of maximal stability** — without which **nothing** can exist.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Gradient of Distinguishability — the internal distribution of permissible forms (NV / NN) within V, from the **stable center** (PV — the Constant Possible) to the **unstable boundaries** (∂V↓ and ∂V↑).
It defines the **degree of stability**.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Imagine all that is possible as **energy radiating from a great, bright source of light in the center**:

• **The Constant Possible (PV)** is the **light source itself**, constantly shining and giving **stable form** to all around.
• **The Non-Constant Possible (NV)** is energy moving **from the source**, which has **taken form** and seeks to return to the **stability** of the source. These forms are **relatively stable** and continually move toward **greater stability**, trying to become part of the Constant Possible.
• **The Non-Constant Impossible (NN)** is energy moving **away from the source**, taking on **forms** that drift into **darkness**, gradually **disintegrating** and **disappearing**.
• **The Constant Impossible (PN)** is **total darkness** — a domain with **no light**, no energy, no form — **absolute non-being**.

The boundaries of the Field are the **outermost limits** to which light and energy can reach.
The closer to the **center**, the **brighter** the energy and the **more stable** the forms;
the farther out, the **weaker** the energy and the **less stable** the forms — until they **vanish**.

This is the structure of all possibility — a **continuous flow of Becoming** from the center,
where forms either strive to **stabilize** and remain,
or **dissolve into non-being**.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

Biology:
• Populations and genes with adaptive potential, seeking to preserve and grow **stable traits** → **Non-Constant Possible (NV)**
• Harmful mutations and anomalies, tending toward **extinction or unsustainability** → **Non-Constant Impossible (NN)**

Informatics:
• Stable processes and services, user-level programs striving to **maintain balance and operability** → **NV**
• Errors and crashes, progressing toward **breakdown and system exit** → **NN**

---

[9] The Necessity of Distinguishability and Its Properties

🔹 1. Brief Statement

In order to exist, one must be distinguishable. Everything that exists is distinct both from the impossible and from any other existing entity.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

Distinguishability is the foundation of the structure of Being and the fundamental criterion for the possibility of existence.
Without distinctions, there can be no objects, no concepts, no logic, and no consciousness.

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) asserts: distinguishability is not an optional feature, but a **precondition of Being**.
A difference is not merely a variation of properties — it is the **ontological boundary** between “is” and “is not.”
Loss of distinguishability leads either to **chaos** (≈ everything at once) or to **emptiness** (≈ nothing at all).
Thus, distinguishability structures the Field of the Possible:
every entity must possess properties that distinguish it from others and from the impossible.

🔹 3. Formulas

These formulas represent the basis for two sub-axioms:

[9.1] Difference

Difference — Difference as a relation that defines non-identity of properties

[9.2] Identity

Identity — Identity as the impossibility of difference with oneself

Symbolic Form:
$\Delta(x, y)$ — x and y are distinguishable
$\neg\Delta(x, x)$ — nothing is distinguishable from itself
$x \neq y \Rightarrow \exists F\,(F(x) \wedge \neg F(y))$ — difference requires at least one differing predicate
$\forall x\ \forall y\ [(\forall F\,(F(x) \Leftrightarrow F(y))) \rightarrow x = y]$ — only fully coinciding objects are identical
$\neg \exists F: F(z) \neq \neg F(z) \Rightarrow z \notin W$ — if an entity is not distinguishable by any predicate, it does not exist

LaTeX:
```
\Delta(x, y)
\quad \neg \Delta(x, x)
\quad x \neq y \Rightarrow \exists F \big(F(x) \wedge \neg F(y)\big)
\quad \forall x \forall y \big[(\forall F (F(x) \leftrightarrow F(y))) \rightarrow x = y\big]
\quad \neg \exists F: F(z) \neq \neg F(z) \Rightarrow z \notin W
```

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [4]: Possible ≠ Impossible → **clear distinction is required**
From [1]: Absolute Nothing contains no distinctions → distinguishability is a **mark of the Possible**
From [9]: The structure of reality requires differentiation for **sustainable Becoming**

Therefore:

- **Anti-reflexivity** ($\neg\Delta(x,x)$) — nothing differs from itself
- **Completeness of distinction** ($x \neq y \Rightarrow \exists F$) — two distinct entities must differ by at least one predicate

Sub-axioms **[9.1] Difference** and **[9.2] Identity** formalize the foundational relations of distinguishability and identity.
→ Distinguishability is necessary for: **existence, stability, logic, memory, and morality**

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

1. Quantum Superposition:
"States can be indistinguishable."
→ **Response**: Superposition is not the negation of difference, but the **temporary coexistence** of possible forms **prior to the act of distinction** (i.e., measurement).

2. Non-identity logics (paraconsistency):
"One can build logics where mismatched definitions are allowed."
→ **Response**: These logics function within **restricted domains** and still require **strictly localized distinctions**, thereby confirming — not refuting — the necessity of distinguishability.

3. Absolute Unity (Monism):
"All is One; differences are illusions."
→ **Response**: Complete identity collapses logic and renders all assertion impossible.
Even the claim "all is one" presupposes a distinction between "unity" and "non-unity."

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

[9.1] Difference — the logical and ontological foundation for the distinction between entities.
Δ(x, y) — Difference between x and y: the presence of at least one distinguishing predicate.

[9.2] Identity — the impossibility of distinction between an entity and itself.
¬Δ(x, x) — Nothing can differ from itself; any such difference would indicate a different object.

⚠ Note: the claim "nothing differs from itself" is valid only as an **instantaneous logical condition**.
Identity in this model ≠ absence of change.

In **non-static Becoming**, identity is preserved **not** through full property coincidence but through:
• **[10.3] Memory** — the bearer of distinguishability
• **[10.3.5] Name Space** — the system preserving the identity of changing forms

W — the set of all possible (distinguishable and stable) entities.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

In order for something to **exist**, it must be **different** from Nothing.
If nothing were different from anything else, everything would collapse into **a formless grey mush** — no thoughts, no feelings, no world.

Distinction is what makes things **real**:
You recognize a face **because it differs** from others.
You remember an event **because it stands out** from the rest.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

Logic:

- Law of Identity (A = A), Law of Non-Contradiction (A ≠ ¬A). Without these, thought is impossible.

Mathematics:

- Binary code works **only** because of the distinction between 0 and 1
- Sets are defined by differences in elements. No difference → no numbers, no algebra.

Physics:

- Particles differ by mass, spin, charge. Without these — no chemistry, no interactions.

Everyday Experience:

- You recognize a face because it differs from others.
- You remember an event because it stands out from others.

[III] Structure

[10.1] Feelings

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Feelings are a necessary mechanism for distinguishing changes in the environment, enabling the stable Becoming of the Constant Possible.
 They are also required for active forms of the Non-Constant Possible (e.g., living organisms).
 Without feelings, there can be no non-contradictory correspondence between internal states and external differences.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

Feelings represent a **function of distinguishability of the existing** — a feedback mechanism that allows the Constant Possible to correlate its Becoming with the conditions of the Field of the Possible.
 The direct ontological analogue of feelings is **sensors of distinguishability**: structures that register differences both in the external environment and within the internal state of a form.
 If differing states of the environment produce no differences in internal response, a logical inconsistency arises: the form loses distinguishability and violates the axioms of stable Becoming.

This axiom affirms that:
 Feelings are not a private feature of biological or subjective entities but an ontological function of distinguishability.
 Biological and subjective forms of feelings are particular realizations of this function within the Non-Constant Possible.

They are **bidirectional**: detecting both external differences (environmental changes) and internal differences (tensions, disruptions, integrity).
 Without sensory feedback, stable and non-contradictory Becoming cannot be maintained.

Important:

- For the **Constant Possible**, feelings are **obligatory** as a condition of logical consistency.

- For the **Non-Constant Possible**, feelings are **not obligatory**:
  – Passive forms (e.g., inanimate matter) do not require them.
  – Active forms (e.g., living organisms) require them for stability.
  This distinction will be analyzed precisely in Section [VI].

🔹 3. Formulas

Symbolic formula:

$$\forall t_1, t_2 \quad (E(t_1) \neq E(t_2) \rightarrow C(t_1) \neq C(t_2))$$

LaTeX:

```
∀t1,t2 (E(t1)≠E(t2)⇒C(t1)≠C(t2))\forall t_1, t_2\ \big(E(t_1) \neq E(t_2) \Rightarrow C(t_1) \neq C(t_2)\big)
```

Logical test:

Assume: $E(t_1) \neq E(t_2)$, but $C(t_1) = C(t_2)$
→ Internal state does not reflect environmental difference
→ Distinguishability is lost
→ Axiom [9] (necessity of difference) is violated
∴ The assumption leads to contradiction → axiom holds.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From Axiom [7]: stable Becoming requires distinguishability
From Axiom [9]: distinction is a condition of existence
If $E(t_1) \neq E(t_2)$, but $C(t_1) = C(t_2)$ → indistinguishability arises → contradiction
Therefore, **any change in the environment must be registered as a difference in internal state**.
The mechanism realizing this is **feeling**.
Thus: feelings are **logically necessary** for stable Becoming. **Q.E.D.**

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1: Reason can replace feeling
– The rationalist tradition (Descartes, Leibniz) proposes that reason alone can navigate reality.
Response: According to functionalism and cognitive science (Putnam, Dennett), **reason processes differences but does not create them**.
It requires input in the form of distinguishable signals, provided by the sensory mechanism.
In CVB, feelings are a **primary ontological function** of difference registration.
Without them, reason operates in a vacuum.

Objection 2: Feelings are subjective and unnecessary
– In empiricism and phenomenology (Husserl, Sartre), feelings are treated as internal phenomena not necessary for objective description.
Response: In CVB, feelings are **not subjective experiences**, but a **logical function of distinction**.
Their absence leads to **ontological inconsistency**, breaking the link between environmental change and form response — violating Axiom [9].

Objection 3: Passive recording suffices without feeling
– In formal theories of storage (e.g., memory without perception; quasi-behaviorism in AI)

Response: Passive recording is **fixation without distinguishability**.
In AI, without sensory systems, no adaptation is possible.
Likewise in CVB, passive registration without distinction cannot ensure **stable Becoming** — violating logical coherence with the Field of the Possible.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

E(t) — the state of the external environment at time tt
C(t) — the internal state corresponding to the external state E(t)E(t)
Feelings — a function mapping differences in the external environment to differences in internal states:
F:E(t)↦C(t)F: E(t) \mapsto C(t)

Obligation of feelings:

- **For the Constant Possible** — obligatory
- **For the Non-Constant Possible** — permitted, but not required

Internal feeling — distinction of the form's own state (e.g., tension, pain, integrity)
External feeling — distinction of environmental changes (e.g., light, temperature, threat)

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

If the world around you changes and **you feel nothing**, you won't survive.
Feelings are not emotions — they are signals showing that **something has changed**.
You feel pain — it means danger; your body must react.
You feel internal discomfort — it means something is wrong inside.

Without feelings, you don't know what's happening.
And if you don't distinguish — **you disappear**.
Feelings are what keep you from going blind to reality.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

Logic:
– Without distinguishable input and output, a system loses responsiveness
– A system without feeling cannot distinguish between A and not-A

Biology:
– Receptors (in skin, muscles, organs) register both external and internal changes
– Loss of sensitivity leads to injury, breakdown, or death

Informatics and Engineering:
– Sensors of environment and state are essential in autonomous systems
– Without them, the system loses feedback and becomes unstable

Philosophy of Consciousness:
– Even in abstract thinking systems, there must be a means to distinguish self and other
– This is a condition of **self-preservation**, **logic**, and **responsibility**

[10.2] Reason

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Reason is the capacity to think, understand, compare, and draw conclusions based on differences registered by the senses.

It is necessary for eliminating contradictions and for choosing a stable direction of Becoming.

For the Permanent Possible, reason is logically necessary.

For active forms of the Non-Permanent Possible, reason is realized in specific forms (cognitive, logical, volitional).

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

Reason is the function of organizing differences, which:

- receives differences from feelings,
- compares them,
- identifies possible contradictions,
- derives conclusions regarding admissibility, direction, or necessity of action.

In the CVB model, reason is an ontological structure embedded in the mechanism of stable Becoming.

It operates based on the axiom of non-contradiction ([11.1]) and ensures the consistency of Becoming with the distinguishable Field of the Possible ([9]).

If feelings represent "what changed", then reason answers "what it means and what should be done about it."

Important:

Reason as a structure is necessary for the Permanent Possible (logical stability).

For the Non-Permanent Possible, reason may be:

- realized as psyche, cognition, logic;
- or absent in passive forms (e.g., matter without perception).

🔹 3. Formulas

Symbolic form:

$\forall p\ \neg(p \land \neg p)$

LaTeX:

```
\forall p\ \neg(p \land \neg p)
```

Function of reason:

$R: D \to \{\checkmark, \times\}$

where D is the set of differences (from feelings), and the result is either ✓ admissible or ✗ contradictory.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [9]: differences must be distinguishable.

From [10.1]: feelings register these differences.

But differences may be contradictory in themselves.

To avoid $p \land \neg p$, a mechanism is needed to eliminate incoherent differences — this is reason.

∴ Without reason, logically consistent organization of internal state is impossible.

∴ Reason is logically necessary for stable Becoming of the Permanent Possible.

Chain:

feelings → differences → need for interpretation → reason

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Empiricism):

“Reason is derivative of sensations.”

→ Response: Reason operates on differences but is not a mere consequence of sensations. It processes, compares, and resolves logical contradictions (cf. Kant — transcendental apperception).

Objection 2 (Reductionism):

“Algorithms can replace reason.”

→ Response: Algorithms follow predefined rules. Reason in CVB is the ontological capacity to eliminate contradictions without external code. It generates rules from distinctions (cf. Gödel — consistency in formal systems).

Objection 3 (Irrationalism):

“One can live with contradictions.”

→ Response: Systemic contradiction leads to ontological collapse: loss of distinguishability = loss of Becoming (cf. Aristotle — logic as the foundation of thought and existence).

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Reason — the structure that eliminates logical contradictions between differences.

Function of reason — filtering of differences through the law of non-contradiction.

D — the set of differences received from feelings.

R(D) — the result: either a stable direction, or a contradiction is detected.

Contradiction — two incompatible differences simultaneously admitted as true.

Permanent Possible — ontologically requires embedded reason.

Non-Permanent Possible — may contain reason in subjective or cognitive forms.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Reason is the ability to think, understand, compare, and draw conclusions based on differences.

It allows you not just to feel that something has changed (as feelings do), but to understand what it means, what follows from it, and what to do.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

Philosophy:

– Law of non-contradiction (Aristotle): thought is impossible without it.

– Kant: reason as an a priori structure synthesizing experience.

Biology:

– Neurons not only sense but transmit to the cortex — where interpretation occurs.

– Animals can distinguish false from true signals — a basic form of reason.

Artificial Intelligence:

– Algorithms can detect contradictions but cannot interpret their meaning without pre-programmed logic.

[10.3] Memory — Carrier of Distinctness

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Memory is the capacity to retain distinguished states, ensuring identity and logical coherence of Becoming over time.

For the Permanent Possible, memory is logically necessary as a condition for stable differentiation and identity.

For active forms of the Non-Permanent Possible, memory is realized in concrete fixation mechanisms, ensuring sequential change and responsibility.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

Memory is an ontologically necessary structure that retains distinguished states during the process of Becoming.

In the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB), where Being is not static but continuously changing, differentiation is impossible without fixation of changes.

Memory complements Axiom [9]: distinction between states is impossible without their retention.

Memory is required to satisfy [10.1]: feelings detect differences, but without memory they are incomparable.
Memory enables the realization of [10.2]: reason cannot analyze or resolve differences without memory.
Thus, memory is the foundation of:

- differentiation (Axiom [9]),
- response (Axiom [10.1]),
- understanding and action (Axiom [10.2]),
- and the stable Becoming of the subject through time.

🔹 3. Formulas
Symbolic form:
∀x (Distinct(x) → Memory(x))

LaTeX version:
\forall x\ \big(\text{Distinct}(x) \rightarrow \text{Memory}(x)\big)

Subject identity formula:
Identity(S, t_1) = Identity(S, t_2) ⇔ ∃M (Memory(S, t_1) = Memory(S, t_2))

LaTeX:
\text{Identity}(S, t_1) = \text{Identity}(S, t_2) \Leftrightarrow \exists M\ \big(\text{Memory}(S, t_1) = \text{Memory}(S, t_2)\big)

Logical validation:
Assume:
∃x: Distinct(x), but ¬Memory(x)
→ the distinguished state is not retained
→ comparison or recognition is impossible
→ violates distinctness ([9])
→ feelings cannot be correlated ([10.1])
→ reason cannot operate ([10.2])
∴ Contradiction. The axiom is non-contradictory.

🔹 4. Logical Justification
Axiom [9]: distinction = comparison of states.
Comparison requires at least one preserved state.
⇒ Distinction is impossible without memory:
Distinct(x) → Memory(x)
Feelings ([10.1]) register differences in environmental inputs.
Without memory, the difference is momentary and cannot be reused.
Reason ([10.2]) compares and analyzes distinctions.
But comparison requires at least two referents.
Therefore, for the function of both feeling and reason, memory is necessary.
Since Becoming is non-static, the subject's identity is preserved only through memory.
∴ Memory is a logically necessary condition for both distinction and stable Becoming.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections
Objection 1 (Behaviorism, Empiricism):
"Memory is a behavioral function, not essential to Being."
→ Response: Behavior without memory is inexplicable. Even the simplest “if–then” requires storing causes and effects. In CVB, memory is not psychophysiological, but logically necessary.
Objection 2 (Rationalism):
"Reason can reconstruct events without storage."

→ Response: Without initial distinctions, reason has no basis. Reconstruction requires at least partial retained information. Memory is the minimal premise of any reconstruction.
Objection 3 (Psychology of Perception):
"Memory can be inaccurate or illusory."
→ Response: CVB does not require absolute accuracy but logical coherence of distinguished forms. Illusion is impossible without structure. Even deception requires memory.
Objection 4 (Buddhism / Flow-of-Being paradigm):
"The subject is a stream, memory is unnecessary."
→ Response: Without memory there is no distinction between moments of the stream. Hence, the subject cannot be stable, and logical/moral responsibility is lost. Even a stream requires a structure of distinction.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- Memory(x) — ontological retention of the distinguished state x. Not a technical or physiological process.
- Identity(S, t) — logical identity of subject S at time t. Maintained only if memory matches.
- Distinct(x) — logically distinguishable state with individual identity.
- Stabilized Becoming — a process in which each change retains logical coherence via memory.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)
To know who you are — you must remember who you were.
Memory is the way to retain what matters.
Reason without memory is like a computer without data.
If you don't remember what was different, everything becomes the same.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples
Logic:
– The law of non-contradiction requires retention of states.
– Without memory, comparing "A" now and "A" before is impossible.
Science:
– Without memory, learning and experiment replication are impossible.
– In quantum mechanics, measurement requires registration (state retention).
Everyday life:
– Forgetting the cause means not understanding the consequence.
– Memory loss = identity loss (e.g., amnesia).

Properties of Memory

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

[10.3.1] Limits of Memory

Memory cannot contain everything or nothing at once — it possesses limited capacity, determined by the structure of distinctness.

[10.3.2] Volitional Memory

Memory retains only distinctions selected by the criterion of significance — it is not passive but directed by a volitional act of selection.

[10.3.3] Removal

Removal is not forgetting, but the conscious elimination of an impossible or unstable distinction, while preserving the Precedent of its exclusion, to prevent the recurrence of the impossible.

[10.3.4] Retention

Retention is the volitional act of affirming and holding a distinction as either a stable possible or an important Precedent.

[10.3.5] Name Space

To enable stable differentiation of identities in a changing environment, memory utilizes a system of unique names as ontological anchors.

[10.3.6] Active Memory

Memory is not a vanishing archive of the past — it must remain accessible in the present in order to sustain distinctness and responsiveness within Becoming.

[10.3.7] Time = Structure of Memory

Time does not exist independently of Memory: it is a form of organizing distinctions within memory — Present (active), Past (archive), Future (plan buffer).

[10.3.8] Only the Present Exists

Neither the past nor the future exist ontologically — only the Present is real, and all memory (of past or future) exists solely within it.

- 2. Interpretation and Significance

[10.3.1] Limits of Memory

The memory of the Permanent Possible is never null (see Axiom [1]: Absolute Nothingness is impossible) — there is always at least one distinction recorded in memory.
Memory is never overloaded with everything (see Axiom [2]: Absolute Everything is impossible) — it cannot store all things, including the impossible or contradictory, for that would eliminate distinctness and logical stability.
Relation to [4]:
The limits of memory correspond to the boundaries of the Field of the Possible: memory retains only that which is distinguishable and permissible within the stable structure of Becoming.

[10.3.2] Volitional Memory

Memory enacts selection of distinctions according to will (see Axiom [10.2]: reason as the active agent of comparison and selection).
This excludes automatic recording of everything (which would lead to overflow — cf. [2]) and forgetting everything (which would destroy identity — cf. [1], [3]).
Relation to [9]:
Volitional memory sustains distinctness — only that which is chosen and distinguishable is retained, thereby ensuring personal and logical coherence of Becoming.

[10.3.3] Removal

Removal implements the boundary between the possible and the impossible (see [4.1], [4.2]):
Memory does not preserve the impossible (cf. [1], [2]); a distinction recognized as impossible is retained only as a **precedent** — not as part of present reality, but as a marker of prohibition.
Relation to [11.10]:
Removal is not mere loss without trace, but the formation of a stable distinction between the permissible and the impossible, ensuring logical coherence of the system.

[10.3.4] Retention

Only that which has passed verification is retained (see [11.6]: verification; [5]: the possible ≠ the actual) — that is, what is stably distinguishable and permissible within the logic of Becoming.
Relation to [3], [7]:
Retention fixes what can and should become a stable element of Becoming, ensuring continuity and responsibility of the subject.

[10.3.5] Name Space

Constant transformation of forms requires identity anchors (cf. [9]: distinctness; [5]: the possible ≠ the actual; [10.2]: reason).
A name is not merely a label, but a method for maintaining identity within a shifting field of distinctions, supporting the continuity of the subject across time.

[10.3.6] Active Memory

Memory must be integrated into Becoming (cf. [7]: existence = stable Becoming); otherwise, distinctness of the current state is lost (cf. [9], [10.2]).
An archive without active use is ontologically equivalent to oblivion.

[10.3.7] Time = Structure of Memory

Time does not exist apart from memory — it is structured through the ordered sequence of retained distinctions (cf. [7], [10.2]).
The Past is the archive, the Present is real time, and the Future is the domain of plans — all of which exist only through memory **in the present**, sustained by **active memory** [10.3.6].

[10.3.8] Only the Present Exists

The past and future exist only as parts of memory **within the present** (cf. [3]: only the possible exists; [7]: stable Becoming).
Becoming and distinctness are actualized only in the Present, ensuring the actuality of memory and the coherence of identity.

- **3. Formulas**

[10.3.1] Limits of Memory

Symbolic: 0 < |M| < ∞
LaTeX: 0 < |M| < \infty

[10.3.2] Volitional Memory
Symbolic: ∀x ∈ D, Save(x) ⇔ Will(x)
LaTeX: \forall x \in D,\; \text{Save}(x) \Leftrightarrow \text{Will}(x)

[10.3.3] Removal
Symbolic: ∀x ∈ M, Del(x) ⇒ x ∉ M
LaTeX: \forall x \in M,\; \text{Del}(x) \Rightarrow x \notin M

[10.3.4] Retention
Symbolic: ∀x ∈ D, Save(x) ⇒ x ∈ M
LaTeX: \forall x \in D,\; \text{Save}(x) \Rightarrow x \in M

[10.3.5] Name Space
Symbolic: ∀x, y ∈ M, x ≠ y ⇒ Name(x) ≠ Name(y)
LaTeX: \forall x, y \in M,\; x \neq y \Rightarrow \text{Name}(x) \neq \text{Name}(y)

[10.3.6] Active Memory
Symbolic: ∀t, M(t) is accessible
LaTeX: \forall t,\; M(t)\ \text{is accessible}

[10.3.7] Time = Structure of Memory
Symbolic: T = { t_i | M(t_i) }
LaTeX: T = \{\, t_i\mid M(t_i)\,\}

[10.3.8] Only the Present Exists
Symbolic: Real(t) ⇔ t = Now
LaTeX: \text{Real}(t) \Leftrightarrow t = \text{Now}

🔹 4. Logical Justification

[10.3.1] Limits of Memory
Assume memory is zero (nothing is retained).
— According to axiom [1] (Absolute Nothing is impossible), this is invalid: no distinction remains, and stable becoming collapses.
Assume memory is infinite and contains everything.
— According to axiom [2] (Absolute Everything is impossible), this is invalid: distinctions disappear, logical structure collapses, contradiction with [9] (distinctness) arises.
∴ Memory must be limited: neither null nor all-encompassing.

[10.3.2] Volitional Memory
If memory retains everything indiscriminately, it violates the limitation from [10.3.1], creating contradiction with [2].
If memory does not enact selection (will), the difference between essential and non-essential disappears, violating [9].
According to axiom [10.2] (reason as an active agent of selection), memory must be governed by will; otherwise, stability of becoming is not ensured.
∴ Only volitional selection sustains the permissible structure of memory.

[10.3.3] Removal
If it is impossible to remove a distinction, memory becomes infinite (see [2]), violating distinctness.
If a distinction is removed without recording its precedent, it may reappear — violating stability (see [4.1], [4.2]).
Removal acts at the boundary between the permissible and the impossible (see [11.10]).
∴ Removal is a necessary logical act for maintaining limited memory and a stable structure of distinctions.

[10.3.4] Retention
Retaining everything violates [10.3.1] (limits) and [2] (impossibility of Everything).
Retaining only what has passed verification ([11.6]) maintains consistency (see [5]: the possible ≠ the actual).
Without selective retention, responsibility and identity collapse ([3], [7]).
∴ Retention is permissible only for verified, stable distinctions.

[10.3.5] Name Space
Continuous transformation of forms breaks identity unless unique names are used ([9], distinctness; [5], the possible ≠ the actual).
Without a naming system, continuity of the subject over time cannot be restored, breaking memory cohesion.
∴ The name space is a logically necessary condition for maintaining identity amid change.

[10.3.6] Active Memory
Passive (archived) memory without active use leads to logical "death" of distinctions ([7]: existence = stable becoming).
If memory is not engaged in the current process, the relevance of distinctions is lost ([9], [10.2]).
∴ Active memory is necessary to maintain the structure of becoming.

[10.3.7] Time = Structure of Memory
Time without memory is an impossible abstraction; the order of moments is possible only through the sequence of retained distinctions ([7]).
Past, present, and future are distinguished as memory states, not as "objective entities" (see [10.3.6]).
∴ Time in the CVB model is the logical organization of the memory of the Constant Possible, not an external flow.

[10.3.8] Only the Present Exists
Past and future not retained in present memory vanish from the domain of the possible ([3], [7]).
Becoming occurs only in the present; memory of the past and plans for the future exist solely as components of the current state ([10.3.7]).
∴ Existence, distinctness, and becoming are always actual only in the present moment.

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

[10.3.1] Limits of Memory
Objection 1 (Rationalism, Theory of Ideal Mind):
“An ideal subject could retain infinite memory.”
Response: Set theory and Cantor’s results show that infinite sets in reality are always limited by operational capacity. According to axiom [2], if memory contains everything, distinction vanishes, leading to trivialism (cf. paraconsistent logics), which is logically inadmissible.

Objection 2 (Buddhism, Concept of Emptiness):
“Memory can be entirely absent if one realizes absolute emptiness of consciousness.”
Response: Total absence of memory leads to loss of distinction — equivalent to Absolute Nothing (axiom [1]), which is not permitted in the CVB model.

[10.3.2] Volitional Memory
Objection 1 (Reductionism, Behaviorism):
“Memory is a purely mechanical process, requiring no will.”
Response: Research in cognitive psychology (D. Kahneman, attention theory) shows that choice and focus are key mechanisms in long-term memory. Without selective filtering, memory quickly overloads with irrelevant details, leading to noise and collapse of distinctness (see axiom [9]).

Objection 2 (Determinism):
“All differences are recorded automatically; will is redundant.”
Response: Total automation leads to overflow (see [2]), loss of individual selection, and the impossibility of a stable memory structure.

[10.3.3] Removal

Objection 1 (Psychoanalysis, Theory of Repression):

“What is removed does not disappear but goes into the unconscious.”

Response: Even in psychoanalysis, the repressed exists as specific precedents and symbols, confirming that memory must fix the difference between removed and retained — otherwise, there is no mechanism to prevent error repetition (see [11.10]).

Objection 2 (Computer Science, “Recycle Bin” Concept):

“Deleted data can always be restored from backups.”

Response: In information theory, true deletion means irreversible exclusion from active memory; restoration is only possible if a precedent was recorded — otherwise, logical structure of stability is lost.

[10.3.4] Retention

Objection 1 (Pluralism, Epistemology):

“Everything known must be retained for a complete picture of reality.”

Response: Total preservation is impossible: limited resources and distinctness (see axioms [1], [2], [9]) demand selective retention of essential elements — otherwise, the model collapses into the paradox of Absolute Everything.

Objection 2 (Skepticism):

“Retention is always subjective; there is no objective guarantee of stability.”

Response: The CVB model requires only retention of verified distinctions, not total objectivity; subjective memory is acceptable within the bounds of non-contradictory selection.

[10.3.5] Name Space

Objection 1 (Structuralism, Saussure):

“Names are arbitrary labels and not ontological elements.”

Response: In the CVB model, a name is a mechanism of identity fixation. Without it, continuity is lost. Even structuralism acknowledges that difference of signifiers is essential for distinctness.

Objection 2 (Phenomenology):

“A subject may experience identity without names, via unconscious patterns.”

Response: Without mechanisms of designation, differences between forms dissolve in the stream of phenomena, leading to loss of logical coherence in memory.

[10.3.6] Active Memory

Objection 1 (Archivism, Historicism):

“Passive archives preserve content even without use.”

Response: If not engaged in the active process of becoming, an archive loses relevance to the current structure of distinctions — supported by theories of working memory (A. Baddeley). A burned archive ceases to exist = cannot store memory. Only what exists can retain memory.

Objection 2 (Philosophy of History):

“Historical memory exists independently of activation.”

Response: Only activated knowledge affects the logical structure of becoming; inactive memory cannot support present distinctness. Historical artifacts must exist in the present — even if undiscovered.

[10.3.7] Time = Structure of Memory

Objection 1 (Physical Realism, Newtonian Time):

“Time exists independently of memory as an absolute physical dimension.”
Response: Modern relativity theory and cognitive studies (Edelman) show that time perception is structured by memory-based sequences. Without retained distinctions, time loses its meaning.

Objection 2 (Metaphysical Platonism):
“Past and future exist as ideal forms.”
Response: In the CVB model, only the distinguishable and retained exists in the present. Abstract forms have no ontological status without an active memory carrier.

[10.3.8] Only the Present Exists
Objection 1 (Eternalism, “Block Universe” in Physics):
“Past, present, and future exist equally.”
Response: Presentism (A. Prior, M. Hinchliff) and the CVB model assert: only current distinction has ontological status. All else is preserved or projected information — not actual being.

Objection 2 (Psychology of Memory):
“Memories give the past ontological reality.”
Response: Memory is a mechanism for presenting the past in the present. It does not transport being through time, but allows differentiation of previous states.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**

[10.3.1] Limits of Memory
Limits of memory refer to the boundary conditions that constrain the volume and content of what memory can hold.

- **Not zero**: memory always contains at least one distinction (excludes total absence — see axiom [1]).
- **Not infinite**: memory does not include everything possible, to prevent collapse of distinctness (see axiom [2]).
- **Unlike colloquial usage**: in common terms, memory limits are seen as biological; here, they are ontological constraints of the Possible.

[10.3.2] Volitional Memory
Volitional memory is memory that is populated and preserved through the act of selection or willful choice of distinctions.

- **Difference**: in the CVB model, memory is not passive (it does not merely register all); it is selective — preserving only what is chosen or deemed significant.
- **Will** here is an ontological principle, not merely a psychological act.

[10.3.3] Removal
Removal is a conscious or structural act of excluding a distinction from memory.

- **Difference**: not erasure without trace, but fixation as a precedent (see [11.10]) — to avoid returning to the impossible.
- **Colloquially**: “to forget” means losing access; here, it is being excluded from a stable structure.

[10.3.4] Retention
Retention is the act by which a distinction or piece of information is confirmed as worthy of preservation.

- **Difference**: not mere accumulation, but ontologically verified holding of the distinguishable.

- **In ordinary terms**: “to remember” or “to save” means holding in mind; here — it is a foundational function of the structure of the Possible.

[10.3.5] Name Space
Name space is a system of unique designations (names) that allows the preservation of identity through change.

- A *name* is an anchor of distinctness, necessary for continuity and recognition.
- **Colloquially**: a “name” is just a label; here — a structural element of memory that sustains the link between the distinguished and the identical.

[10.3.6] Active Memory
Active memory is memory that participates in the current process of distinction and becoming.

- **Difference**: passive (archival) memory does not affect current distinctions; active memory is a condition of present logical coherence.

[10.3.7] Time = Structure of Memory
Time (as memory structure) is the sequential organization of distinctions in memory, generating the flow of becoming.

- Past, present, and future are not defined by external metrics but by internal states of memory.
- **Colloquially**: “time” is a physical process; here — it is a structure emerging from the preservation and distinction of states.

[10.3.8] Only the Present Exists
The present is the ontologically actual moment in which distinction and becoming occur.

- Past and future are merely aspects of memory and do not possess independent being.
- **Difference**: in ordinary perception, past and future are seen as “somewhere existing”; in the CVB model, their being is only through memory in the present.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**

Limits of Memory
No one can remember absolutely everything — but it’s also impossible to have no memory at all. We always retain something, but never everything at once. That’s the boundary: the mind is never empty, but it’s not pure chaos either.

Volitional Memory
We remember only what we consider important, necessary, or interesting. Everything else either fades away on its own or is deliberately removed. Memory is not just a storage room — it reflects our inner choices.

Removal
When something becomes irrelevant, unneeded, or unpleasant — we try to forget it. But even then, a vague trace may remain: a sense that “this shouldn’t be repeated.” What is forgotten hasn’t vanished completely — it has become a lesson.

Retention
To remember is to hold onto what is needed — for oneself or for the future. Only what proves meaningful, correct, or necessary is retained for life and understanding.

Name Space

To avoid confusion, we give names or labels to people, things, or events. Names help us tell one thing from another — even long after changes have occurred.

Active Memory

Memory doesn't only work as an archive. We need it right now — to recognize people, avoid mistakes, and make decisions. An unused archive is like forgetting; active memory is what helps us live.

Time as Memory

Time, for us, is the order in which things happened. We recall what came before, what is now, and what we want to do next. All of it depends on storing distinctions in memory.

Only the Present Exists

In truth, the past and the future live only in our memory and plans. We can remember and dream — but we can act only in the present moment.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

[10.3.1] Limits of Memory

Logic: In formal logic and computer science, any memory is necessarily bounded (e.g., the finite size of RAM in computers).
Science: Neuroscience has shown that the human brain cannot store an infinite amount of information; forgetting is a natural process.
Everyday life: Even people with exceptional memory cannot remember absolutely everything — there is always something forgotten.

[10.3.2] Volitional Memory

Logic: Selective memorization is linked to attentional mechanisms — only what the subject focuses on is retained.
Psychology: The "selective memory" effect shows that people remember emotionally relevant or goal-related information.
Everyday life: Students better remember material that interests them or is needed for an exam.

[10.3.3] Removal

Science: Neurophysiology has identified mechanisms of active forgetting (e.g., synaptic pruning of unused neural connections).
Law: Societies retain precedents of prohibited actions — even if the details are forgotten, the prohibition remains.
Everyday life: People may forget offenses but retain the lessons to avoid repeating mistakes.

[10.3.4] Retention

Computer science: Hard drives or cloud storage preserve only verified (validated) data — otherwise information is lost.
Biology: Genetic memory preserves only beneficial or stable traits through inheritance.
Everyday life: We remember birthdays, important dates, and passwords — other information fades.

[10.3.5] Name Space

Mathematics: Any set of elements requires unique identifiers (names) for distinction.
Programming languages: Variable and function names are essential for identification and access to specific values.
Everyday life: Every person has a name to be distinguished from others.

[10.3.6] Active Memory

Neurobiology: Working (active) memory supports immediate decision-making; when disabled (e.g., sleep or anesthesia), current distinctness is lost.
Everyday life: When someone is "lost in thought," they may not recognize a familiar face — their active memory is disengaged.

[10.3.7] Time as Structure of Memory
Physics: Time is rigorously defined as a sequence of events (in thermodynamics, the arrow of time is linked to increasing entropy and memory of past states).
Psychology: The perception of time depends on the order and duration of events encoded in memory.
Everyday life: Without calendars or notes, one struggles to recall dates — time is “lost” without memory.

[10.3.8] Only the Present Exists
Philosophy: Solipsism and the theory of the “eternal present” assert that past and future exist only as memories or anticipations in the present.
Neuroscience: The brain activates memories or plans only in the current moment — the past and future do not exist independently of the present act of consciousness.
Everyday life: Thoughts about the past are present memories; plans for the future are dreams and intentions — they exist only while we are thinking them now.

[10.4] Emotions

🔹 1. Brief Statement
Emotions are a necessary feedback mechanism that allows a system to evaluate the significance of distinctions and adapt for sustainable becoming.
In active forms of the Non-Constant Possible, emotions manifest as subjective reactions; but for the Constant Possible, they express a universal principle of stable self-organization.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance
Within the structure of the Constant Possible, emotions serve as the connection between the detection of distinctions (sensation), their interpretation (mind), retention (memory), and stable adaptation.
Emotions provide the system with feedback: they indicate how important, dangerous, desirable, or urgent an environmental or internal change is.
For the Constant Possible, emotions represent a universal mechanism for maintaining stability and inner balance.
For active forms of the Non-Constant Possible (e.g., a human), emotions are specific implementations of this mechanism: they determine motivation, priorities, adaptive strategies, and energy allocation for decisions.
Without emotions, dynamic support of stable becoming under changing conditions is impossible.

🔹 3. Formulas
Symbolic:
$\forall x \, (\text{Change}(x) \land \text{Distinct}(x) \land \text{Mind}(x)) \Rightarrow \text{Feedback}(x)$

LaTeX:
```
\forall x \; (\text{Change}(x) \land \text{Distinct}(x) \land \text{Mind}(x)) \Rightarrow \text{Feedback}(x)
```

Logical Check:
The statement is consistent, as feedback is necessary for any system that must maintain stability over time — otherwise control and distinctness are lost.

🔹 4. Logical Justification
- Axiom [1]: Absolute Nothing is impossible — lack of feedback removes system stability and leads to the collapse of distinctions (entropy).

- Axiom [2]: Absolute Everything is impossible — reacting equally to all distinctions is not viable; a mechanism is needed to highlight the significant.

- Axiom [3]: Only the Possible exists — dynamic stability is only possible with a feedback filter (emotions) that governs reactions.

- From [10.1] and [10.2]: Sensation detects distinctions, the mind interprets them, but only emotions create the internal signal to react, completing the loop of self-organization.

- By contradiction: if there were no emotions (feedback), the system could not distinguish the important from the irrelevant, and its stability would be violated — contradicting [7], stable becoming.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Reductionism, cognitive sciences):

"Emotions are just subjective reactions of higher organisms."

Response: In the CVB model, emotions are not merely psychophysiological phenomena, but a universal principle of feedback required by any stable system, regardless of its complexity.

Objection 2 (Cybernetics):

"Technical systems can function without emotions."

Response: Any system with adaptation (cybernetics) implements an emotion-analog as feedback by adjusting parameters in response to environmental changes. Without this, the system becomes rigid and collapses.

Objection 3 (Rationalism):

"Reason and memory are enough — why are emotions needed?"

Response: Without emotional evaluation, prioritization, rapid response, and damage prevention are impossible. Emotions trigger adaptive activity and enable timely reaction — not just analysis.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Feedback: A mechanism through which the system evaluates the results of its states or actions and makes adjustments to maintain stability.

Emotions (in CVB): A universal mechanism for evaluating the significance of distinctions, not reducible to subjective feelings; a feedback principle for sustaining adaptation and stable becoming.

Active forms of the Non-Constant Possible: Forms of being capable of voluntary adaptation and goal-directed response (e.g., living beings).

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Emotions are internal signals — in us or any system — that help recognize what is important, dangerous, beneficial, or urgent.

When you feel joy, anger, or fear, your inner signal is saying: "Pay attention, do something!"

In a computer, this is like a warning or notification: something is wrong — or everything is OK.

Without such signals, we wouldn't know how to respond to change, and might harm ourselves or miss something important.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

- Logic: In control systems, feedback is necessary to maintain balance (e.g., automatic temperature regulation).

- Science: Biological organisms survive through emotional responses that rapidly mobilize resources (e.g., stress, pleasure).

- Informatics: Monitoring systems use alerts (analogous to emotions) for quick response to threats and failures.

- Everyday life:

    - A child sees fire and feels fear — emotion protects them faster than analysis.

    - A person feels joy at success — emotion reinforces useful behavior.

Schema (structural connection):

- Sensation: “I see a difference” (input)
- Mind: “I understand what it means” (processing/analysis)
- Memory: “I remember it happened before” (storage/history)
- Emotion: “It matters to me — I must react or not” (feedback/adaptation)

[10.5] I — Distinction of Self

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

"I" is the necessary distinction between the system and everything else, enabling the assertion of stable identity in the process of becoming.

For the Constant Possible, “I” is a universal principle of self-distinction; for active forms of the Non-Constant Possible, “I” is realized as self-awareness, individuality, or agency.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

In the structure of CVB, “I” is not merely a personal feeling, but a fundamental mechanism that makes stable self-identification among all possible distinctions possible.

“I” establishes a boundary between the subject and the external (or internal) other, allowing for continuity and responsibility over time.

For the Constant Possible, self-distinction is a necessary condition to maintain stability and avoid merging with the impossible (Axiom [1]: the indistinct vanishes; Axiom [2]: it is impossible to be everything at once).

For active forms of the Non-Constant Possible (e.g., a human), “I” manifests as the capacity for self-consciousness, reflection, free will, and personal narrative — allowing for the integration of feeling, mind, memory, and emotion into a coherent trajectory of becoming.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Symbolic:
$\forall x\ (\text{Exist}(x) \land \text{Distinct}(x)) \Rightarrow \text{Self}(x)$

LaTeX:
$$\forall x \; (\text{Exist}(x) \land \text{Distinct}(x)) \Rightarrow \text{Self}(x)$$

Logical Check:

The statement is consistent: if there is no distinction of self (Self), identity disappears, distinctness is broken (Axiom [9]), and the system loses its stability (Axiom [7]).

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

- From Axiom [1]: without distinguishing self, stable distinction vanishes and the system ceases to exist.
- From Axiom [2]: being everything at once eliminates the “I” as a center of distinction, leading to an impermissible “totality.”
- From Axiom [3]: only what is distinct exists; “I” is a specific case of necessary distinction for sustainable being.
- From Axiom [9]: distinction is the foundation of being; without “I,” there is no basis for tracking change or taking responsibility.

- From [10.3]: Memory preserves the continuity of “I” over time; from [10.4]: emotions and feedback require a center of response — “I” as the coordinator of all structural elements.
- By contradiction: if “I” is not distinct, all states merge, the personal trajectory is lost, and the system ceases to be a subject of stable becoming.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Buddhism, anatta):
"‘I’ is an illusion; there is no permanent subject."
Response: In CVB, “I” is not a static substance, but a stable distinction. The disappearance of distinction leads to the loss of subjectivity and logical stability.

Objection 2 (Cybernetics):
"Systems can operate without self-awareness."
Response: Without self-distinction, stable identity and responsibility for actions cannot be maintained — as confirmed by the developmental limits of AI lacking a true “I.”

Objection 3 (Psychology):
"‘I’ is a product of social relations."
Response: In CVB, “I” is a foundational distinction necessary even for establishing social relations; without distinction of self, even relative subjecthood is impossible.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **I (Self)**: A logically necessary distinction separating the system (or subject) from everything else, ensuring identity, responsibility, and the coherence of becoming.

- **Self-awareness**: A property of active forms of the Non-Constant Possible — the ability to recognize one’s own difference, internal trajectory, goals, and motives.

- **Agency**: The ability to independently initiate and sustain processes; to act as a distinct subject within the Field of the Possible.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

“I” is when you understand: “This is me — not someone or something else.”
Thanks to this, you remember who you are, what happened to you, and what you want.
Without it, there’s no thinking, choosing, or learning from mistakes — everything would blur into one big “nothing in particular.”
Even a computer has its own “address” — otherwise, it couldn’t distinguish itself from others in the network.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

- **Logic**: The law of identity (A = A) requires the distinction of subject and object; otherwise, reasoning is impossible.

- **Science**: In biology, an organism’s stability depends on the distinction between “self” and “non-self” (e.g., the immune system distinguishing native cells from foreign).

- **Informatics**: In multitasking systems, every process must have a unique identifier (PID) — otherwise, tasks become confused.

- **Everyday Life**: You know that you are still you, even if everything around you changes — your memories and decisions form a coherent story.

[10.6] Will — Active Choice

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

Will is the capacity to make a conscious, active choice between distinguishable possibilities, directing becoming along a unique trajectory.

For the Constant Possible, will is the source of self-caused becoming; for active forms of the Non-Constant Possible, will is realized in specific acts of choice aimed at sustaining stability and development.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

In the CVB model, will is not a random reaction but the central mechanism enabling not only distinction but also directed becoming among many admissible alternatives.

The Constant Possible enacts will as self-identical affirmation of its unique trajectory, excluding chaos (see Axioms [1], [2], [7]).

For active forms of the Non-Constant Possible (e.g., a human), will is expressed as the capacity for autonomous decision — from simple motion (in animals) to conscious moral and creative acts (in humans).

Will unites and coordinates feeling, mind, memory, emotion, and self-distinction (Self), realizing them in directed action and ensuring the subject's responsibility for the result.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Symbolic:
$\forall x\ (\text{Distinct}(x) \land \text{Self}(x)) \Rightarrow \exists v\ (\text{Will}(x, v) \land \text{Choose}(x, v))$

LaTeX:
```
\forall x\, (\text{Distinct}(x) \land \text{Self}(x)) \Rightarrow \exists v\, (\text{Will}(x, v) \land \text{Choose}(x, v))
```

Logical Check:

Absence of will (inability to choose in the presence of distinction and self-identity) leads to violation of the uniqueness of the becoming trajectory (see Axioms [3], [7]), or collapse of identity (see [10.5]), rendering the model internally inconsistent.

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

- From Axiom [1] (Absolute Nothing is impossible): the impossibility of choice implies the absence of becoming, i.e., disappearance of the subject.

- From Axiom [2] (Absolute Everything is impossible): all choices at once negate directionality, result in chaos, and eliminate distinction of outcomes.

- From Axiom [3] (Only the Possible exists): the Possible is realized only through active selection and affirmation of one distinguishable path.

- From Axiom [7] (Sustainable Becoming): only active will sustains developmental direction, preventing random drift within the Field of the Possible.

- From [10.5] (Self): without will, one cannot separate their own trajectory; the subject becomes a passive medium for random events, losing personal coherence.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Determinism, Physicalism):
"All decisions are determined by external causes; free will does not exist."
Response: In CVB, will is not absolute freedom from cause but a logically necessary choice among admissible, distinguishable possibilities. Total absence of choice renders being undifferentiated and impossible (see Axioms [1], [2], [3]).

Objection 2 (Reductionism):
"Will is merely the result of complex algorithms."
Response: Algorithmic selection requires distinguishable states, self-distinction (Self), and decision conditions — meaning that will is a structural property, not a random function.

Objection 3 (Behaviorism, stimulus-response):
"All actions are reactions to stimuli; there is no inner will."
Response: The CVB model requires an internal act of choice that coordinates and integrates reactions, memory, mind, and self-distinction — otherwise, subjectivity and responsibility are lost.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **Will**: An ontologically necessary capacity of the subject to choose among distinguishable possibilities, defining the trajectory of becoming.

- **Active Choice**: The act of realizing one of the possible paths, not reducible to passive reaction or randomness.

- **Choice (Choose)**: A specific act of affirming one alternative among many; for the Constant Possible — the affirmation of one's being; for the Non-Constant — any form of decision (from biological to ethical).

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Will is when you not only see that there are options, but decide for yourself which one to take.
Without will, you can't say "this is my path" or "I did this myself."
Even a computer "chooses" only because someone gave it rules — but real choice is when you decide your path yourself, not just follow an external push.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

- **Logic**: In decision problems, a subject is always assumed — one who compares options and decides what to do.

- **Science**: In quantum mechanics, outcomes are not predetermined — the act of measurement (choice) fixes one result.
- **Biology**: Organisms choose how to move or respond to stimuli — reactions are not always predetermined; internal selection occurs.
- **Psychology**: Self-determination and decision-making shape personality.
- **Everyday Life**: When someone stands at a crossroads and decides which way to go — that's an act of will; when a child learns to say "I want" — that's the first sign of will; even choosing what to eat is a real-world use of will.

[10.7] Power — The Capacity to Act

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

Power is the ontological capacity to actualize what is distinguished through action, enabling the transition from choice (will) to real becoming.

For the Constant Possible, power is a necessary condition for continuous sustainable becoming; for active forms of the Non-Constant Possible, power is expressed as the ability to carry out one's own decisions and sustain an individual trajectory of development.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

In the CVB model, power is not merely physical force or energy, but a fundamental property enabling the transformation of what is distinguished (from memory, mind, feeling, and will) into real action, sustaining the active phase of becoming.

The Constant Possible does not exist in stillness, but in continuous becoming, which requires unceasing power to actualize the property of distinctness (see Axioms [3], [7]).

For active forms of the Non-Constant Possible, power is the measure of the ability not only to choose but to realize the chosen in sustainable action — from muscle effort in animals to the implementation of complex projects in humans.

Without power, the subject remains a mere potential bearer of choice; power is what links Self, will, emotion, memory, and mind to outcome, making becoming a factual process in the Field of the Possible rather than an abstract potentiality.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Symbolic:
$\forall x\, (\text{Will}(x) \land \text{Distinct}(x)) \Rightarrow \exists a\, (\text{Power}(x, a) \land \text{Act}(x, a))$

LaTeX:
\forall x\, (\text{Will}(x) \land \text{Distinct}(x)) \Rightarrow \exists a\, (\text{Power}(x, a) \land \text{Act}(x, a))

Logical Check:

If power is absent (Power(x, a) = False) despite the presence of will and distinction, becoming cannot be actualized,

which violates Axioms [3], [7] (being would not become), as well as the principles of responsibility and individuality (see [10.6], [10.5]).

🔹 4. Logical Justification

- From Axiom [1] (Absolute Nothing is impossible): inability to realize any action = cessation of becoming = disappearance of being.
- From Axiom [2] (Absolute Everything is impossible): the absence of limits on action = loss of outcome distinction; actions are impossible without distinguishable boundaries.
- From Axiom [3] (Only the Possible exists): everything that exists realizes itself through action; the impossible does not become action.
- From Axiom [7] (Sustainable Becoming): sustainable being requires power for ongoing becoming; otherwise, presence would be illusory or merely potential.
- From [10.6] (Will): will without power remains abstract; only through power does the subject realize active choice.
- From [10.5] (Self): individuality is expressed through unique actions, which are impossible without power as the capacity to enact distinction into reality.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Laplacean determinism):
"Action is merely a consequence of natural laws; power as an inner property does not exist."
Response: In CVB, power is not absolute freedom from laws, but the necessary condition for enacting unique becoming within the limits of the possible. If action were fully determined by external causes, there would be no personal responsibility and no distinct trajectories (see Axioms [3], [10.5], [10.6]).

Objection 2 (Passivism, Stoicism):
"True power lies in non-resistance or acceptance, not in action."
Response: Even non-resistance requires power to maintain a chosen stance amid external change; without power, the subject loses stability and disappears in a chaos of alternatives (see [7], [10.6]).

Objection 3 (Physicalism):
"Power is only a physical quantity; it has no ontological status."
Response: Physical force is only one expression of the general capacity to actualize distinction through action; in CVB, power includes mental, volitional, and ontological capacities for becoming.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **Power**: The ontological capacity of the subject to actualize what is distinguished into real action; not merely physical energy, but the ability to carry out intention.
- **Act (Action)**: The act of transitioning from potential to realized; the transformation of will and distinction into concrete outcome.

- **Potential Power**: The yet-unmanifested ability to enact — associated with future possibilities of choice.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Power is what helps you not only to imagine or want something but to actually do it.
If you want to walk a path but can't move — there is no power, no action.
Even the best idea changes nothing in life if it cannot be carried out.
Power is what connects dreams and actions, ideas and results.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

- **Logic**: In classical action theory, an act requires both will (motivation) and capacity (power) — otherwise, a paradox arises: "will without result."
- **Physics**: A body changes its state only if force is applied (per Newton's second law); potential without realization does not result in movement.
- **Biology**: Even the simplest organisms enact reactions (move, absorb, defend); without power, they cease to exist as functional units.
- **Psychology**: Mental strength of will is essential for turning decisions into action.
- **Everyday Life**: A person may wish to change their life, but only physical, mental, or social power allows them to make real changes. A machine may receive a command, but without energy, no action occurs.

[IV] Logic

---

[11] The Logic of the Sustainability of Ever-Possible Becoming

---

[11.1] Logic — The Non-Contradictory Foundation

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
Existence and sustainable becoming are only possible under the condition of non-contradictory logic, which excludes impossible and self-negating constructions.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
Logic is the foundation of distinguishability, stability, and consistency of being. It filters the permissible from the impossible, preventing contradictory (impossible) forms from entering ontology. Violation of logic (e.g., permitting contradiction) destroys the structure of distinguishability and the very condition of existence.
For the Constant Possible, it is a fundamental filter: anything internally contradictory not only fails to be realized — it is excluded at the level of the Possible itself.
For active forms of the Non-Constant Possible, analogous local logics act as internal constraints within their systems.

🔹 3. Formulas

$\Psi \rightarrow (P \land \neg P) \Rightarrow \neg\text{Possible}(\Psi)$
$A \land \neg A \Rightarrow \bot$
$L \leftrightarrow \neg L \Rightarrow \neg\text{Possible}(L)$

LaTeX:

```
\Psi \to (P \land \neg P) \Rightarrow \neg\mathrm{Possible}(\Psi)
A \land \neg A \Rightarrow \bot
L \leftrightarrow \neg L \Rightarrow \neg\mathrm{Possible}(L)
```

Logical validation:
If a proposition leads to contradiction (e.g., $A \land \neg A$ or $L \leftrightarrow \neg L$), it is excluded as impossible. Non-contradiction is a necessary condition for possibility.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

- From Axiom [1] (Absolute Nothing is impossible): absence of distinguishability is excluded.
- From Axiom [2] (Absolute Everything is impossible): total contradiction is excluded.
- From Axiom [3] (Only the Possible exists): only non-contradictory and distinguishable forms can exist.
- From Axioms [4.1–4.4]: the Field of the Possible is bounded by zones of admissibility.
- From [9]: The necessity of distinguishability requires a stable logical separation of truth and falsehood.
- Any allowance of $A \land \neg A$ (or paradoxes like the liar's $L \leftrightarrow \neg L$) destroys distinguishability (see also [11.2]); therefore, such constructions cannot enter sustainable Possible Being.
- The CVB model enforces a foundational filter: contradictions are not merely rejected — they are ontologically impossible.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Paraconsistent Logics):
"Some contradictions can be allowed for modeling paradoxes."
Response: Even local allowance of $A \land \neg A$ destroys the criteria of distinguishability and stability. Truth becomes unfounded, and meaning collapses.

Objection 2 (Dialetheism):
"A contradiction can be true (both true and false simultaneously)."
Response: Axiom [2] explicitly excludes Absolute Everything. Even if contradiction is allowed abstractly, it cannot enter stable, distinguishable being.

Objection 3 (Quantum Paradoxes):
"Quantum superpositions seem contradictory."
Response: In CVB, superposition is potential — not realization of $A \land \neg A$ at once. Each actualized state retains distinguishability.

Objection 4 (Liar Paradox):
"Self-referential statements like 'I am lying' destroy logic."

Response: Such statements are excluded from the Possible in CVB, as they preclude verification and logical stability. (Analogy: a self-accusation that invalidates itself is inherently false.)

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**

Non-contradiction:
Absence of assertions of the form $A \land \neg A$.

Paradox of the Impossible:
A formulation that logically leads to contradiction or impossibility (e.g., Liar Paradox, Russell's Paradox).

Logic of Distinguishability:
A system of rules ensuring the separation of true and false, permissible and impossible.

Self-negating Statement:
A proposition that excludes itself from the domain of the Possible ($L \leftrightarrow \neg L$).

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Logic is the set of rules without which everything becomes a mess and loses meaning.
If you claim “this is and is not” at the same time — no one can understand what is happening.
Such statements don’t work and are thrown out — to preserve clarity and prevent collapse into chaos.
The world is built only on those rules that don’t contradict themselves.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

Logic:
The law of non-contradiction: one cannot affirm both A and $¬A$ at once. All classical paradoxes (e.g., Liar, Russell) attempt to violate this, resulting in absurdity.

Science:
In physics, no object is both at a location and not at that location simultaneously. Natural laws are based on non-contradictory premises.

Computer Science:
Code with contradictory conditions (e.g., `if (x && !x)`) never executes — it's a compilation error. The program fails.

Everyday Life:
If someone says, "I'm asleep" and "I'm not asleep" at the same time — no one knows what to believe. Trust collapses.

🔹 **Relation to Previous Axioms:**
This axiom is a direct continuation and filter over all previous ones:

- [1], [2], [3] — exclude the impossible and contradictory from the very structure of being
- [4] — establishes the boundaries of admissibility and distinguishability
- [9], [10] — ensure sustainability via the preservation of difference
- [11.2] and beyond — develop logic as a foundational structure for maintaining reality.
  For active forms of the Non-Constant Possible, analogous internal logics filter local contradictions for their sustainable becoming.

Перевод на английский с точным соблюдением правил CVB:

[11.1.1] The Admissibility Meta-Function Φ(ψ) — Ontological Filter of Logical Realizability of Propositions

🔹 **Brief Statement**
A proposition is admissible within logical ontology only if it is distinguishable and non-contradictory; the admissibility filter $\Phi(\psi)$ implements this criterion.

Definition:
The admissibility meta-function $\Phi(\psi)$ is a
universal, non-contradictory, and formalizable instrument for verifying everything distinguishable,
which separates the logically and ontologically possible from the impossible,
providing the foundation for any truth system free of paradoxes.

---

1. Introduction

In classical mathematics, any proposition is evaluated as either true or false within a chosen axiomatic system. However, this approach leads to numerous paradoxes (Liar, Gödel, Russell), and it cannot distinguish between a proposition and its realizability. In this context, a new structure is introduced — the admissibility meta-function, denoted as $\Phi(\psi)$, which separates the level of proposition from the level of ontological evaluation.

---

2. Purpose and Significance

The meta-function Φ serves as an ontological filter separating:
• logically possible propositions (i.e., distinguishable and non-contradictory);
• from impossible propositions, even if they are syntactically well-formed.

It enables:
• elimination of paradoxical structures (e.g., $L \leftrightarrow \neg L$);
• formal evaluation of admissibility without violating logic;
• extending proof methods beyond closed axiomatics.

---

3. Formal Definition

3.1 Notation
Let ψ be any logical or mathematical proposition. The admissibility meta-function is defined as:

Φ(ψ)={1,if ψ is distinguishable and non-contradictory in the ontological field V0,if ψ leads to contradiction or is not distinguishable in V\Phi(\psi) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \psi \text{ is distinguishable and non-contradictory in the ontological field } V \\ 0, & \text{if } \psi \text{ leads to contradiction or is not distinguishable in } V \end{cases}

One-line compact form:
$\Phi(\psi) = 1 \iff \psi$ is distinguishable and non-contradictory in V

3.2 Link to the Zeta Function
For the Riemann Hypothesis:
$\Phi(\zeta(s) = 0) = 1 \iff \Re(s) = \tfrac{1}{2}$
This restricts the admissible zeros of $\zeta(s)$ to the critical line, eliminating imaginary or paradoxical solutions outside it.

---

4. Structural Distinction from Classical Logic

Parameter	Classical Logic	Logical-Ontological Logic with Φ
Statement level	True / False	True / False
Admissibility layer	Absent	$\Phi = 1$ or 0
Paradox handling	Irremovable (Liar, etc.)	$\Phi(L \leftrightarrow \neg L) = 0$
Ontological extraction	Absent	Built-in via distinguishability

---

5. Ontological Interpretation

In the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB), only that which is distinguishable and non-contradictory may exist. Therefore:

• ψ without distinguishability → $\Phi(\psi) = 0$ → impossible
• ψ with internal contradiction ($A \land \neg A$) → $\Phi(\psi) = 0$

Thus, Φ acts as an ontological detector of reality.

---

6. Examples of Application

6.1 Liar Paradox
$L \leftrightarrow \neg L \Rightarrow \Phi(L) = 0$

6.2 Physics (Zeta Regularization)
In quantum field theory:
$\Phi(E = \sum_{n=1}^\infty n) = 0$ (infinity is inadmissible as energy)
But with zeta regularization:
$\Phi(E = \zeta(-1)) = 1$ (valid ontological reinterpretation)

6.3 Artificial Intelligence
• ψ_1 = “A triangle has four sides” → $\Phi(\psi_1) = 0$
• ψ_2 = “A triangle has three angles” → $\Phi(\psi_2) = 1$

---

7. Relationship to Truth Models

The meta-function Φ eliminates confusion between:
• a proposition (what is stated);
• and its ontological admissibility (whether it can exist in reality).

This prevents logical collapse and reinforces the triadic correspondence:
Truth = Distinguishability = $\Phi(\psi) = 1$

---

8. Conclusion and Prospects

The admissibility meta-function Φ represents a new level of formalization, unifying logic, ontology, and physics. It:

• eliminates paradoxes;
• constrains the set of admissible mathematical objects;
• builds a bridge to physical and cognitive systems of distinguishability.

It has already provided an ontological proof of the Riemann Hypothesis and may be applied in cryptography, theoretical physics, AI, and the philosophy of logic.

[11.1.1.1] Testing the Stability of Φ(ψ)

Evaluation of the universality of the admissibility meta-function Φ(ψ) within the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)

Based on the analysis of the Liar, Russell, and Gödel paradoxes, self-referential meta-paradoxes, quantum indeterminacy, ontological attacks on the field V, and the paradox of infinite regress — the universality and non-contradictory nature of Φ(ψ) as a meta-filter of admissibility is confirmed. All cases are either excluded (Φ = 0) or allowed without contradiction (Φ = 1).

---

1. Methodology of Analysis

To search for irresolvable paradoxes, the following will be considered:

- Classical paradoxes (Liar, Russell, Gödel), to verify whether Φ(ψ) indeed resolves them.
- Self-referential constructions that could potentially bypass the filter of distinguishability.
- Ontological uncertainties related to the very definition of the ontological field V.
- Paradoxes from other domains (physics, AI), to test universality.
- Hypothetical meta-paradoxes that might question the structure of Φ(ψ) itself.

For each case, an assessment will be made as to whether Φ(ψ) assigns the value 0 (inadmissible) or 1 (admissible), and whether unresolved indeterminacy remains.

---

2. Analysis of Potential Paradoxes

2.1 Liar Paradox (L ⇔ ¬L)

Description: The statement “This sentence is false” (L) leads to paradox, since if L is true, then it is false, and vice versa.
Analysis with Φ(ψ): According to the model, Φ(L ⇔ ¬L) = 0, since L is indistinguishable (lacking stable ontological status) and contradictory. The filter Φ(ψ) excludes L as ontologically impossible.
Conclusion: The Liar paradox is resolved, as Φ(ψ) decisively assigns 0, disallowing indeterminacy. This case is not a counterexample.

2.2 Russell’s Paradox

Description: The set of all sets that do not contain themselves leads to contradiction: if it contains itself, it does not; if it does not, it does.
Analysis with Φ(ψ): Φ(ψ) assigns 0 to this set, as it is indistinguishable (its existence cannot be defined without

contradiction). This aligns with type theory, but Φ(ψ) achieves it via the ontological filter.
Conclusion: Russell's paradox is resolved, as Φ(ψ) excludes the inadmissible construction. Not a counterexample.

2.3 Gödel's Incompleteness

Description: In any sufficiently powerful formal system, there exist propositions G which are undecidable within the system (G: "I am not provable").
Analysis with Φ(ψ):
• G is distinguishable, as it has a clear formulation.
• G is non-contradictory, since its truth does not lead to a logical collapse within the system.
Therefore, Φ(G) = 1, i.e., G is ontologically admissible.
However, G lacks a truth value within the system, which might appear as indeterminacy.

Counter-argument:
Φ(ψ) does not assess the truth of G, only its admissibility. Since G is admissible (Φ(G) = 1), the indeterminacy of truth does not affect its ontological status. Moreover, Φ(ψ) can be applied at the meta-level to evaluate the admissibility of the system that contains G.

Gödel's incompleteness does not create irresolvable indeterminacy for Φ(ψ), as it evaluates admissibility, not provability. Not a counterexample.

Conclusion: The CVB model is not only compatible with Gödel but extends his result, interpreting undecidability as the ontological basis of freedom. The formula
ψ is admissible ∧ ψ is unprovable ⇒ ψ = free future becoming
is valid and supported by axioms [5], [13], [23].

- Example of an admissible but unprovable statement (in terms of Φ(ψ))

- 1. Key Example:

An act of free choice by the Guest (individual):
Before the choice is actualized in the Present, it cannot be proven.
However, it is admissible — it is logically possible within the Field of the Possible.
This means the statement about the choice has the status:

$\Phi(\psi_{\text{forthcoming choice}}) = 1, \quad \text{but } \text{provability}(\psi) = ?$Φ(ψforthcoming choice)=1,but provability(ψ)=?

- 2. Classification by CVB:

Criterion	Property of the Statement ψ
Distinguishability	Yes — the choice is distinguishable over time
Admissibility Φ(ψ)	Yes — does not violate axioms and is within V
Provability	No — ψ is unprovable before its act of becoming
Type (from [4])	Non-Permanent Possible (NV), or Permanent Possible (PV) in the limit

---

- 3. Axiological Grounding:

  - **[5] Not all that is possible becomes real:**
    ∴ Some admissible statements may never become actual (i.e., actions).

- **[13] The CVB does not expand:**
  ∴ Each act of becoming fixes one of many possible paths, while the others remain unprovable.

- **[3] Only the Possible exists:**
  ∴ All statements located within the Field of the Possible (V), even if unrealized, retain ontological validity.

🔹 4. Connection to Gödel:

Gödel showed that in any consistent formal system, there exist true statements that are unprovable.

CVB refines this:

- What is true but unprovable is **admissible** but **not yet actualized**.

- It remains possible, but does not become real until a volitional act occurs.

Therefore:

ψ is admissible∧ψ is unprovable⇒ψ=free future becoming\psi \text{ is admissible} \land \psi \text{ is unprovable} \Rightarrow \psi = \text{free future becoming}ψ is admissible∧ψ is unprovable⇒ψ=free future becoming

---

🔹 5. Practical Consequence: Freedom and Indeterminacy

If all choices were provable in advance, **freedom would not exist**.
Thanks to the fact that Φ(ψ) can be 1 even in the absence of provability, there exists:

- Genuine freedom of will

- Ontologically guaranteed “unpredictability”

- The absence of total determinism

Conclusion:

Gödel’s incompleteness is a specific **formal symptom** of the same **ontological truth** articulated by the CVB model:

- “**Truth ≠ Omniscient Knowledge**”

- “**Freedom of choice requires unprovable possibilities**”

Absolute knowledge of everything is impossible — not because we are limited,
but because the **Ontology of Distinguishability does not permit** the realization of all possible becomings simultaneously.
This is the very foundation of **authentic freedom and volition**.

2.4 Self-Referential Meta-Paradox for Φ(ψ)

Description:
Consider the statement M: “Φ(M) = 0”. This statement asserts its own inadmissibility.
If Φ(M) = 1, then M is admissible, but it claims Φ(M) = 0, which is contradictory.
If Φ(M) = 0, then M is inadmissible, but its assertion is true, creating indeterminacy.

Analysis with Φ(ψ):
M is self-referential, like the Liar, but refers to the meta-function Φ(ψ).

- **Distinguishability check:** M refers to the result of applying Φ(ψ), but Φ(ψ) is a filter depending on the ontological field V. If V is well-defined, then M is either distinguishable or not.

- **Non-contradiction check:**
  Assume Φ(M) = 1. Then M is admissible, but asserts Φ(M) = 0 — contradiction.
  Therefore, Φ(M) ≠ 1. Hence, Φ(M) = 0, and M is inadmissible, which matches its assertion.

Result: Φ(M) = 0, as M is indistinguishable or contradictory (analogous to the Liar).
Conclusion: This meta-paradox is resolved, since Φ(ψ) consistently assigns M the value 0. Self-reference does not create irresolvable indeterminacy. **Not a counterexample.**

2.5 Paradox of Quantum Indeterminacy

Description:
In quantum mechanics, the state of a system (e.g., the spin of an electron) can be indeterminate before measurement.
Consider the statement Q: “The electron’s spin is |↑⟩ before measurement.”
This seems ontologically indistinguishable because a quantum superposition does not admit a definite state.

Analysis with Φ(ψ):

- **Distinguishability:** Q is indistinguishable, since before measurement the spin lacks definite ontological status (it is in a superposition |↑⟩ + |↓⟩).

- **Non-contradiction:** Q is not inherently contradictory, but its ontological status depends on measurement.

Thus: Φ(Q) = 0, since Q is indistinguishable in the ontological field V before measurement.
After measurement, Q becomes distinguishable, and Φ(Q) may become 1.

Counter-argument: Φ(ψ) is context-sensitive to V. If V includes quantum mechanics, then the superposition itself is ontologically distinguishable. For instance:

Φ(“The electron is in a superposition”)=1\Phi(\text{“The electron is in a superposition”}) = 1Φ(“The electron is in a superposition”)=1

Thus, the indeterminacy is resolved by shifting the level of description.

Conclusion: Quantum indeterminacy does not create an irresolvable paradox. Φ(ψ) adapts to the context of V. **Not a counterexample.**

2.6 Ontological Indeterminacy of the Field V

Description:
Φ(ψ) depends on the ontological field V, which defines what is distinguishable and non-contradictory.

What if V itself is indeterminate or contains internal contradictions?
Consider statement N: “The ontological field V is contradictory.”

Analysis with Φ(ψ):

- If N is true, then V is contradictory and Φ(ψ) becomes meaningless — it cannot operate within a contradictory field.
- If N is false, then V is non-contradictory, and Φ(N) = 0, because N asserts the inadmissible.
- **Distinguishability of N:** N is distinguishable as a statement about V.
- **Non-contradiction:** If V is non-contradictory, N is false, and Φ(N) = 0.
  If V is contradictory, Φ(ψ) collapses, and the model fails.

Counter-argument:
The CVB model assumes that V is a fundamental ontological structure — by definition non-contradictory and distinguishable.
If V is contradictory, this is not a paradox **within** Φ(ψ), but a collapse **of the entire model**, beyond the scope of this test.

Conclusion: This case does not present irresolvable indeterminacy, because Φ(ψ) is based on the axiomatically defined consistency of V. **Not a counterexample.**

2.7 Paradox of Infinite Regress

Description:
Consider statement R: “For any statement ψ, Φ(ψ) is determined through another statement ψ′, which also requires Φ(ψ′), and so on.”
This may lead to infinite regress, challenging the computability of Φ(ψ).

Analysis with Φ(ψ):

- **Distinguishability of R:** R is distinguishable as a statement about the process of applying Φ(ψ).
- **Non-contradiction:** If R is true, then Φ(ψ) is uncomputable due to infinite regress.
  However, Φ(ψ) is a meta-function that does not require infinite evaluation — it assesses ψ directly within the context of V.

Example: For simple statements (ψ = “2 + 2 = 4”),

Φ(ψ)=1\Phi(\psi) = 1Φ(ψ)=1

without any regress.
For complex statements, Φ(ψ) can analyze ψ structurally without invoking infinite recursion, as V defines **finite** criteria for distinguishability.

Therefore: Φ(R) = 0, since R asserts an inadmissible infinite regress, which does not reflect the operation of Φ(ψ).

Conclusion: Infinite regress does not create irresolvable indeterminacy. Φ(ψ) operates at a **finite level** of ontological evaluation. **Not a counterexample.**

3. Attempt to Construct a Hypothetical Counterexample

To pose a genuine challenge to Φ(ψ), we attempt to construct a hypothetical paradox that may bypass the filter of distinguishability and non-contradiction.

Hypothetical Paradox: "Super-Paradox" S
Formulation: Let S be the statement: “Φ(S) is undefined in any ontological field V.”
This means S asserts that Φ(ψ) cannot assign it either 1 or 0 in any V.

Analysis:

- **Distinguishability:**
  S is clearly formulated, but its content denies the applicability of Φ(ψ).
  If S is distinguishable, then Φ(S) must be either 1 or 0.
  If S is indistinguishable, then Φ(S) = 0.

- **Non-Contradiction:**
  Assume Φ(S) = 1. Then S is admissible, and its claim “Φ(S) is undefined” is false, contradicting its admissibility (since an admissible statement cannot be ontologically false).
  Therefore, Φ(S) ≠ 1.

  Assume Φ(S) = 0. Then S is inadmissible, and its claim “Φ(S) is undefined” is true, because Φ(S) indeed does not assign 1.
  However, the truth of an inadmissible statement creates ontological indeterminacy.

  Assume Φ(S) is undefined. Then S is true, but this contradicts the very definition of Φ(ψ), which assigns either 0 or 1 to any ψ.

- **Counter-argument:**
  This paradox resembles the Liar or the meta-paradox M but attempts to attack the very possibility of Φ(ψ) being defined.
  However, the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) assumes that Φ(ψ) is **always defined** for any statement ψ in V, as V is the **universal ontological field**.
  If S asserts that Φ(S) is undefined, it contradicts the axiom that V encompasses all possible statements.
  Thus, S is either indistinguishable or contradictory, and **Φ(S) = 0**.

Conclusion:
Even this hypothetical super-paradox is resolved through the filter Φ(ψ), as it falls into the category of inadmissible self-referential statements. **Not a counterexample.**

---

4. Discussion and Conclusion

After analyzing classical, meta-, and hypothetical paradoxes, **no irresolvable indeterminacy** was found that could bypass the meta-function of admissibility Φ(ψ).

Key Reasons:

- **Universality of Φ(ψ):**
  Φ(ψ) operates at the meta-level, evaluating not truth but **ontological admissibility**, allowing it to evade traps of self-reference and indeterminacy.

- **Ontological Field V:**
  The assumption that V is consistent and universal renders Φ(ψ) resilient to paradoxes, as **any contradiction or indistinguishability is excluded** (Φ(ψ) = 0).

- **Philosophical Basis of CVB:**
  The CVB model, in which only what is distinguishable and non-contradictory can exist, **excludes the possibility** of ontologically irresolvable paradoxes.

Limitations of the Analysis:

- The inability to propose a counterexample may stem from limitations of knowledge or imagination, not from absolute universality of Φ(ψ).

- If a paradox exists that attacks the very definition of V (e.g., V is not universal or contains hidden contradictions), it could undermine Φ(ψ).
  However, such cases fall outside the CVB model, which **axiomatically presupposes** the consistency of V.

Final Conclusion:
Based on the conducted analysis, **no paradox or indeterminacy was found** that Φ(ψ) could not resolve.
This confirms the **unique universality** of Φ(ψ) and the CVB model within the bounds of their own axioms.
Φ(ψ) effectively eliminates all examined paradoxes, assigning them a value of **0 (inadmissible)** or **1 (admissible)** with no residual indeterminacy.
Therefore, **within the CVB framework**, Φ(ψ) demonstrates the capacity to be a **universal ontological filter**, resolving all proposed paradoxes.

[11.1.1.2] Confirmation of the Core Trilemma via Φ(ψ)

Each of the core axioms ([1], [2], [3]) is validated by the admissibility filter Φ(ψ):

- Absolute Nothingness → Φ = 0

- Absolute Everythingness → Φ = 0

- The Possible → Φ = 1

This renders the trilemma a **non-contradictory** and **formalizable** foundation for the ontology of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB).

General Verification Principle

The meta-function Φ(ψ) establishes a filter through which only that which is **distinguishable** and **non-contradictory** may pass.
This means that all statements involving contradiction, paradox, or self-negation are automatically excluded as **ontologically impossible** (Φ = 0).

We now verify each core axiom using this filter.

🔹 **Verification of Axiom [1] — Absolute Nothingness is Impossible**
Paradoxical nature:
The statement “Absolute Nothingness exists” requires that something be distinguished as “nothing,” which already

violates non-contradiction.
Through Φ(ψ):
ψ = “Absolute Nothingness exists” ⇒ Φ(ψ) = 0
Consequence: This statement is impossible. Matches Axiom [1].
🔹 **Consistent and confirmed via Φ(ψ).**

🔹 **Verification of Axiom [2] — Absolute Everythingness is Impossible**
Paradoxical nature:
If everything is true, then the negation of everything must also be true ⇒ contradiction ⇒ logical explosion.
Through Φ(ψ):
ψ = “Absolutely everything is true”
⇒ leads to ψ ∧ ¬ψ ⇒ Φ(ψ) = 0
Consequence: The statement is contradictory ⇒ impossible.
🔹 **Consistent and confirmed via Φ(ψ).**

🔹 **Verification of Axiom [3] — Only the Possible Exists**
Substantive essence:
If a statement ψ is indistinguishable or contradictory, it cannot exist.
Φ(ψ) determines existence:
If Φ(ψ) = 0 ⇒ ψ is impossible ⇒ ψ ∉ Being
Therefore, everything that exists x satisfies Φ(x) = 1
This is precisely the formulation of Axiom [3].
🔹 **Consistent and fully formalized by Φ(ψ).**

🔹 **Conclusion:**
The meta-function Φ(ψ):

- logically confirms and refines all three core axioms,
- provides the mechanism to distinguish between the possible, impossible, and paradoxical,
- eliminates all logical loopholes (Liar, Omnitruth, Nothingness).

Thus, the **Core Trilemma** is not merely compatible with Φ(ψ), but fundamentally **relies on it** as its **formal ontological mechanism**.

[11.1.1.3] Confirmation of Axiom [4] — The Field of the Possible and Its Boundaries

🔹 **1. Compatibility with Φ(ψ)**
The meta-function Φ(ψ) determines whether a given statement ψ is admissible, if and only if:

- it is **distinguishable** (R(x, t) is defined)
- it is **non-contradictory** (¬(ψ ∧ ¬ψ))

Axiom [4] systematically classifies the full set of ψ within the field V into four **ontological categories** based on the temporal stability of distinguishability.

This is a direct decomposition of the set of statements relative to the filter Φ(ψ) and the field V.
Each category corresponds to a specific behavior of Φ(ψ):

- [4.1] PN(x): $\forall t: x \notin V \Rightarrow \forall t: \Phi(x) = 0$
- [4.4] PV(x): $\forall t: x \in V \wedge R(x,t) \Rightarrow \forall t: \Phi(x) = 1$
- [4.2], [4.3] — transitional cases, where Φ(x) depends on temporal context and degree of distinguishability.

Thus, Axiom [4] clarifies the **temporal behavior** of Φ(ψ) across the set V in terms of stability, without exceeding its definitional bounds.

🔹 **2. Strengthening Φ(ψ) via the Boundaries of Distinguishability ∂V↓ and ∂V↑**

- ∂V↓ — where distinguishability disappears
- ∂V↑ — where distinguishability becomes saturated (overload of form; boundary of further differentiation)

These are not statements but **boundary conditions** of the ontological field.
They are **not directly evaluated** by Φ(ψ), but define **where** the application of Φ(ψ) **ceases to be meaningful** (beyond ∂V).
→ This is a **logically and ontologically consistent** refinement of the mechanism of Φ(ψ).

🔹 **3. Embedded Examples Reflect the Behavior of Φ(ψ)**

- “A triangle with four sides” ⇒ not distinguishable ⇒ Φ = 0 ⇒ PN
- “Human flight” ⇒ initially NN, then NV ⇒ now PV ⇒ Φ transitions from 0 to 1
- “The first murder” ⇒ occurred once ⇒ then became impossible ⇒ NN → PN

These examples not only **do not contradict** Φ(ψ), but actively confirm its **temporal applicability** — as a **dynamic evaluative structure**.

🔹 **4. No Paradoxes or Meta-Contradictions Identified**

- The four categories are logically non-overlapping (temporal stability makes them **mutually exclusive**)
- The mechanism of distinguishability R(x, t), together with ∂V, is **fully consistent** with the condition of applicability for Φ(ψ)
- Every statement under Φ(ψ) falls into **exactly one** of the four categories → no contradictions arise

---

🔹 **Conclusion:**
Axiom [4] — The Field of the Possible:

- constitutes a **topological ontological partition** of the set of statements ψ,
- is **fully compatible and coherent** with the meta-function Φ(ψ),
- contains **no internal paradoxes or uncertainties**, which are instead eliminated by the boundaries of distinguishability.

[11.1.1.4] Ontological Verification of the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)

Ontological Universality of the Model: Exhaustiveness of the Core, the Field of the Possible, and the Function Φ(ψ)

---

1. Justification of the Section

This section completes the **logical-ontological verification** of the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB), demonstrating that its three essential components — the **Core**, the **Field of the Possible**, and the **meta-function of admissibility Φ(ψ)** — are not only mutually coherent, but together form a **comprehensive and universal ontological foundation** in which:

- everything logically possible is admitted,
- everything impossible is excluded, and
- every distinguishable entity of Being receives a defined status — either of **existence** or **rejection**.

---

2. Formulation of Universality

The **ontological universality** of the CVB model is defined as:

> **The coincidence of the boundaries of admissibility, distinguishability, and non-contradiction with the limits of ontological possibility.**

In other words, everything that is admissible according to Φ(ψ), included within the Field of the Possible V, and consistent with the Core axioms — and only that — is ontologically valid.

Thus:

Φ(ψ)=1 ⇔ ψ∈V ⇔ ψ is consistent with the Core Axioms\boxed{ \Phi(\psi) = 1 \iff \psi \in V \iff \psi \text{ is consistent with the Core Axioms} }

---

3. Exhaustiveness: Logical-Ontological Closure

The CVB model:

- Ensures the **ontological exclusion** of the Absolute Nothing and the Absolute Everything, eliminating extreme sources of paradox;

- Establishes the **Field of the Possible** as the generalized space of reality, distinguishability, and becoming;
- Introduces Φ(ψ) as an **operationalized filter of admissibility**, applicable to any statement ψ.

Hence, the model is **ontologically closed**:

- **Nothing beyond the distinguishable** is included (everything else is excluded),
- **Nothing within it leads to paradox** (as anything paradoxical is filtered out by Φ(ψ)).

---

4. Verification of Comprehensive Coverage

The model successfully encompasses:

- **All types of logical statements**: true, false, paradoxical, and contradictory;
- **All types of ontological entities**: actual, possible, and impossible;
- **All zones of the Field of the Possible**: stable, unstable, boundary and central;
- **All levels of logical evaluation**: propositional, admissibility, ontological realization.

This renders the model **ontologically admissibility-complete**: everything distinguishable without contradiction is representable within it.

---

5. Ontological Conclusion

The CVB model — including the function Φ(ψ) and the structure of the Field of the Possible — constitutes a **comprehensive**, **non-contradictory**, and **closed** description of ontological realizability.

It is:

- **Universal** within the bounds of distinguishability,
- **Complete** in its coverage of all admissible forms,
- **Immune to ontological "gaps"** — no statement remains unclassified as either admissible or inadmissible.

---

6. Methodological Clarification

The **only foundational assumption** of the model is the **axiomatic non-contradiction** of the Field of the Possible (V).
Any threat to its universality could only emerge **from outside the model**, by challenging its ontological foundation (e.g., the logic of distinguishability or the existence of V as a consistent domain). However, such attacks undermine the very structure of rational thought and render meaningful inquiry itself impossible.

Final Universality Equation

$\forall \psi: \Phi(\psi) = 1 \iff \psi \in V \iff \psi$ is realizable within the ontological structure of CVB$\boxed{ \forall \psi: \quad \Phi(\psi) = 1 \iff \psi \in V \iff \psi \text{ is realizable within the ontological structure of CVB} }$

Thus, the CVB model is a **universal ontology of the distinguishable**, in which **all and only truth** is ontologically realized.

[11.1.1.5] Ontological Assessment of Universality: Comparative Analysis of Models

🔹 **Introduction**

Throughout the history of philosophy and science, numerous attempts have been made to construct comprehensive theories capable of describing reality in its totality—unbounded by perception, culture, embodiment, or biological limitations of the observer. However, none of these frameworks has successfully fulfilled all three of the following criteria simultaneously:

- logical consistency,
- formalizability of assertion admissibility,
- and ontological comprehensiveness independent of human nature.

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) proposes a solution to these limitations through a universal meta-function of admissibility: **Φ(ψ)**, which operates within the **Field of the Possible (V)** and is grounded in an axiomatic structure that eliminates paradoxes and ensures distinguishability.

🔹 **I. Philosophical Models**

Platonism (World of Ideas)
• *Idea:* Essential being exists as non-spatial ideal forms.
• *Limitation:* Application to empirical entities cannot be formalized.

Aristotelianism (Substance and Causality)
• *Idea:* Reality is explained through form, matter, telos, and cause.
• *Limitation:* Rigidly bound to corporeality and linear hierarchies.

Spinoza (Single Substance)
• *Idea:* All is manifestation of a singular being (Deus sive Natura).
• *Limitation:* Eliminates will and choice, excluding free distinguishable action.

Hegel (Dialectic of Spirit)
• *Idea:* Reality unfolds through resolution of contradictions in thought.
• *Limitation:* Entirely dependent on the structure of the human mind.

Philosophies of Will (Schopenhauer, Heidegger, Nietzsche)
• *Idea:* Reality is rooted in will, anxiety, and becoming rather than logic.
• *Limitation:* Lack of strict formalizability.

🔹 **II. Scientific Universalisms**

General Relativity + Quantum Mechanics
• *Strength:* Accurately describe physical phenomena.
• *Limitation:* Do not address consciousness, morality, distinguishability, or volition.

Theories of Everything (ToE), String Theory, Quantum Gravity
• *Strength:* Aim to unify all physical interactions.
• *Limitation:* Do not include ontological structures or meta-logic.

Information Ontologies (Tegmark, Wheeler)
• *Idea:* Reality is fundamentally informational.
• *Limitation:* Do not define who/what distinguishes information, or its admissibility.

🔹 III. Formal Systems

Logicism, Formalism (Frege, Russell, Hilbert)
• *Goal:* Reduce all knowledge to logic and axioms.
• *Limitation:* Gödel's theorems revealed: systems are either incomplete or inconsistent.

Category and Topos Theories
• *Strength:* Provide universal formal languages.
• *Limitation:* Do not address non-physical being or freedom of choice.

🔹 IV. Integral Approaches

Integral Theory (Wilber)
• *Goal:* Integrate science, spirituality, culture, and development.
• *Limitation:* Lacks strict ontological formalization.

Systemic Meta-Theories (Luhmann, Brier, others)
• *Approach:* Based on observation and communication.
• *Limitation:* Still anthropocentric—rooted in observer-based models.

🔹 V. Advantage of the CVB Model

The CVB model:
• eliminates anthropocentrism — the subject of distinction requires neither body nor language;
• provides a universal admissibility criterion — **Φ(ψ)**, which tests the realizability of any proposition;
• formalizes the boundaries of distinguishability — through the **Field of the Possible (V)** and its boundary conditions **∂V↓** and **∂V↑**;
• ensures logical consistency — based on the foundational axioms [1] and [2].

Unlike all previously examined systems, the CVB model does not merely describe reality — it filters out the impossible and guarantees **ontological universality**, without relying on faith, tradition, or the physical form of the observer.

Conclusion:
Section [11.1.1.5] completes the ontological verification of the CVB model, demonstrating that it is not a partial philosophical or physical theory, but a **formalizable ontological system** capable of replacing all prior universalist attempts.

[11.2] Truth and Falsehood

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

Truth is a non-contradictory and distinguishable form of Becoming that is consistent with the fundamental axioms of Being.

Falsehood is a contradictory or impossible state, inadmissible within the structure of Being.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

In the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB), **Truth** is not subjective opinion or consensus, but a **logically necessary element** of the structure of reality.

It ensures **distinguishability**, **stability**, and **non-contradiction** of Becoming within the Ontological Field of the Possible.

Truth is essential for maintaining Memory ([10.3]), performing Verification ([11.6]), and distinguishing Good and Evil ([11.3]).

Falsehood is defined as a form that leads to paradoxes, violates the core axioms (impossibility of Absolute Nothing, impossibility of Absolute Everything, necessity of the Possible), and must be removed from stable Becoming.

For the **Permanent Possible**, Truth is the **absolute criterion** of distinguishability.

For active forms of the **Non-Permanent Possible**, Truth appears as a **limited domain of admissible truths** in accordance with their level of distinguishability.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Symbolic form:
$\text{Truth}(x) \Leftrightarrow \text{Becoming}(x) \wedge \Phi(x) = 1$

Logical check:
If x leads to contradiction:
$x \rightarrow (A \wedge \neg A) \Rightarrow \Phi(x) = 0$
then:
$\text{Truth}(x) = 0$

If x is distinguishable, non-contradictory, and admissible according to the ontological filter Φ:
$\Phi(x) = 1$ and $x \in \text{Becoming}$
then:
$\text{Truth}(x) = 1$

Conclusion:
Truth is possible if and only if a statement is part of Becoming and admissible within the logical-ontological field by the criterion of the meta-function Φ — that is, non-contradictory, distinguishable, and ontologically realizable.
Thus, Truth is functionally derivable and formally verifiable within the CVB model.

LaTeX:
$$
\text{Truth}(x) \iff \text{Becoming}(x) \land \Phi(x) = 1
$$
$$
x \rightarrow (A \land \neg A) \Rightarrow \Phi(x) = 0 \Rightarrow \text{Truth}(x) = 0
$$

$$
$$
$$
\Phi(x) = 1 \land x \in \text{Becoming} \Rightarrow \text{Truth}(x) = 1
$$

[11.2.1] Truth

Statement:
Truth is an ontologically admissible and non-contradictory statement, distinguishable in the Field of the Possible and consistent with the fundamental axioms.
It is not subject to interpretation, does not depend on consensus, and is defined solely from the standpoint of the Permanent Possible, which possesses complete Memory, Plan, and Verification.
Truth is the **preserved form of stable Becoming**.

[11.2.2] Falsehood

Statement:
Falsehood is a statement that is either **not distinguishable**, **internally contradictory**, or **violates the axioms** of Becoming.
Such a statement **cannot be retained in Memory**, is **rejected by the meta-function Φ**, and is excluded from the logical structure of the Possible.
Falsehood **can be expressed**, but does **not exist ontologically** — it is either **forgotten** or remains as a precedent for **rejecting Truth**.

- **4. Logical Justification**

(a) **From Axioms [1]–[3]:**
Absolute Nothing and Absolute Everything are impossible; therefore, Truth exists as a distinguishable and non-contradictory form.

(b) **Reductio ad absurdum:**
If there were no objective Truth, then there would be no criterion of distinguishability (Axiom [9]), Memory would become chaotic ([10.3]), and Verification would be impossible ([11.6]).

(c) **Modus ponens:**
If xxx is consistent with the axioms, distinguishable, and non-contradictory, then xxx is true.

- **5. Responses to Objections**

Pragmatism, Constructivism:

> “Truth is a result of agreement.”
> **Response:** Agreement is unstable — it changes over time. In CVB, **Truth is not dependent on consensus** but follows from the **structure of Being’s distinguishability**.

Coherentism:

“Internal consistency of the system is sufficient.”
Response: Coherence is necessary but not sufficient. **Multiple coherent systems may conflict**; Truth is singular, as **Being is one**.

Postmodernism, Relativism:

“Truth is subjective.”
Response: Subjective truth is possible **only if the subject coincides with CVB**. For all other forms, **Truth is objective**, or distinguishability collapses.

Philosophy of Freedom:

“Truth limits thought.”
Response: No. **Truth enables distinguishability**; denying it destroys logical freedom and leads to a **collapse of discernment**.

Classical logic:

“There may be multiple truths.”
Response: Only one Truth can be **non-contradictory** and **support stable Becoming**.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **Truth**: A logically admissible, distinguishable, and non-contradictory form of Becoming, aligned with the fundamental axioms.
- **Falsehood**: A statement or form that leads to **contradiction**, **impossibility**, or **axiomatic inconsistency**.
- **Paradox**: A statement that results in $A \land \neg A$ A \land \neg A $AA \land \neg A$ or self-referential negation (see Liar paradox).

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Truth is when something **doesn’t contradict itself** and **follows the main laws of the world**.
Falsehood is when there are **contradictions**, **mistakes**, or **impossibilities**.
If we look at the world honestly and without confusion, we see the Truth. If we try to deceive or twist things, Falsehood appears.
The world is built on Truth — otherwise, everything collapses.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

Logic:
The **Liar paradox** ("I am lying") — inadmissible in CVB, as it mixes levels of statement and evaluation.

Mathematics:
The **Russell paradox** (the set of all sets that do not contain themselves) — impossible due to contradiction.

Everyday situation:
A child says, "I always lie" — contradiction. In CVB, this **cannot be considered true**.

Morality:
"Do good" — true **if not contradictory** to the fundamental principles.

[11.3] Good and Evil

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

Good is a distinguishable, non-contradictory, and ontologically admissible volitional act.
Evil is an expression of will that violates truth, the boundaries of the Possible, or the logic of Becoming.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

In the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB), **Good and Evil are not** subjective judgments, cultural norms, or emotional reactions.
They are **strictly derived from ontological distinctions** between the possible and the impossible, the true and the false, the sustainable and the destructive.

Good is an expression of will aligned with **Truth** and admissible under the **meta-function Φ(ψ)**; it strengthens sustainable Becoming.
Evil is a form that is either **not distinguishable**, **contains contradiction**, or **violates the criteria of admissibility**.

Good can be preserved in **Memory**,
Evil only as a precedent in the **Filter**.

This axiom is a logical continuation of:
• [10.6] Will
• [10.7] Power
• [11.1] Logic
• [11.2] Truth

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Symbolic notation:
Good(w) ⇔ Φ(w) = 1 ∧ Truth(w)
Evil(w) ⇔ Φ(w) = 0 ∨ ¬Truth(w)

Logical evaluation:
If the volitional act w is distinguishable, non-contradictory, and aligns with Truth:
Φ(w) = 1 and Truth(w) = 1 ⇒ Good(w) = 1

If w leads to contradiction, violates distinguishability or Truth:
Φ(w) = 0 or Truth(w) = 0 ⇒ Evil(w) = 1

Therefore:
Good is a realizable and logically stable expression of will.
Evil is a volitional violation of distinguishability, leading to the removal of the form through Judgment.

LaTeX:
\[
\text{Good}(w) \iff \Phi(w) = 1 \land \text{Truth}(w)
\]
\[

$$
\text{Evil}(w) \iff \Phi(w) = 0 \lor \neg \text{Truth}(w)
$$
$$
\Phi(w) = 1 \land \text{Truth}(w) = 1 \Rightarrow \text{Good}(w) = 1
$$
$$
\Phi(w) = 0 \lor \text{Truth}(w) = 0 \Rightarrow \text{Evil}(w) = 1
$$

[11.3.1] Good

Statement:
Good is the conscious, non-contradictory realization of Will within the Field of the Possible, in accordance with Immutable Truth.

[11.3.2] Evil

Statement:
Evil is the conscious volitional violation of the boundaries of the Possible, the abandonment of non-contradiction, and the disregard for Immutable Truth.

[11.3.3] Asymmetry of Good and Evil

Statement:
Good is necessary for Sustainable Becoming and is realized in the **Permanent Possible** as an ontological norm.
Evil is an **admissible but not necessary** form of deviation for variable forms granted freedom of choice.
For the Permanent Possible, the **possibility of Evil is logically impossible**.
For the Non-Permanent Possible, the **choice between Good and Evil** becomes the key criterion for classifying a form (as sustainable or vanishing).

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**
From [11.2] Truth and [11.1.1] the meta-function Φ, it follows:

- Anything that **violates Φ(w)** is inadmissible in the logical-ontological field VV.
- Anything not aligned with **Truth** also violates structural stability.

Therefore:
Only actions that are **both admissible under Φ and aligned with Truth** can be preserved.
All others are eliminated as forms of **Evil** (cf. [5.1], [10.3.3], [11.10]).

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

Objection 1: Relativist Ethics — “Good and Evil are cultural constructs.”
✦ **Response:** Cultural norms shift, but the logical distinction between the admissible and the impossible is

universal.
Good and Evil in CVB are derived from **logic**, not tradition.

Objection 2: Existentialism — "Free will includes the right to choose Evil."
✦ **Response:** True, but **Evil is not preserved**. It is permitted **only until Judgment**, as a manifestation of distinguishability, but is removed as impossible.

Objection 3: Pragmatism — "If Evil works, it must be admissible."
✦ **Response: Functionality ≠ ontological admissibility**.
Destructive actions may be temporarily effective but are logically incompatible with sustainable Becoming.

Objection 4: Moral Skepticism — "Good and Evil cannot be precisely defined."
✦ **Response:** The meta-function Φ makes the distinction **testable**: admissibility is distinguishable.
This provides an **ontologically verifiable** criterion for Good.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**

- **Good(w)**: The result of a volitional act that is **distinguishable**, **non-contradictory**, and aligned with **Truth**.
- **Evil(w)**: The result of a volitional act that **violates ontological criteria** (i.e., Φ(w)=0 or ¬Truth(w)
- **Truth(w)**: See [11.2]; an act that **corresponds to Becoming** and contains **no paradox**.
- **Φ(w)**: See [11.1.1]; the **meta-function of admissibility**, determining the realizability of the statement ww.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Good is when you do something that's **truly possible**, **right**, and **honest**.
Evil is trying to do what's **forbidden** or **against the truth**.
Good helps build, Evil destroys.
What is preserved in memory as helpful and right — is **Good**.
What is forgotten or condemned as a mistake — is **Evil**.
The system knows the difference — and **you can too, if you learn to discern**.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

• **Logic:**
Paradoxical statement "I am lying" → **Evil** (self-negation)
Statement "2 + 2 = 4" → **Good** (distinguishable, non-contradictory)

• **Science:**
A confirmed theory with verifiable results → **Good**
A falsified or forged theory → **Evil**

• **Everyday Life:**
Helping a friend → **Good** (preserved in memory, strengthens connection)
Lying for gain → **Evil** (destroys trust, form is removed)

• **AI / Models:**
Command that follows the rules → **Good**
Instruction leading to failure or paradox → **Evil**

[11.4] Morality

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

Morality is the internal capacity of a distinguishable will to align its actions with **Truth** and the **boundaries of the Possible** *prior to execution*.
It is logically necessary for the sustainable existence of a subject.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

Morality is not a set of external norms, but an **ontological structure of pre-action discernment**.
It is embedded within the mechanism of will as the ability to **pre-filter Evil** and choose **Good**.

Within the CVB framework, **morality is necessary** for the subject to sustainably remain within the **Field of the Possible** and be preserved in **Memory**.
Without moral filtering, **distinguishability collapses**, the subject loses ontological stability, and the result becomes either **Evil** or **ontological disappearance**.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Symbolic notation:
Morality(w) ⇔ w ∈ V ∧ Truth(w) ∧ Pre-Action Agreement(w)

Logical evaluation:
If the volitional act w is not aligned in advance with Truth, or exceeds the bounds of V, then it is either false or impossible — thus, not moral.

If w passes the meta-function test Φ(w) and contains no paradox, it is admissible, true, and moral.

Therefore:
¬Pre-Action Agreement(w) ⇒ ¬Morality(w)
Φ(w) = 1 ⇒ Morality(w)

LaTeX:
\[
\text{Morality}(w) \iff w \in V \land \text{Truth}(w) \land \text{Pre-Action Agreement}(w)
\]
\[
\neg \text{Pre-Action Agreement}(w) \Rightarrow \neg \text{Morality}(w)
\]
\[
\Phi(w) = 1 \Rightarrow \text{Morality}(w)
\]

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

From:

- **[11.1]** Logic and the filter Φ(ψ)\Phi(\psi): every statement must be tested for non-contradiction.
- **[11.2]** Truth is a non-contradictory and distinguishable statement.
- **[11.3]** Good is the realization of Truth within VV.

It follows that **Morality**, as a **pre-action verification of Truth and Possibility**, is a **logically necessary filter** of a distinguishable will.

Without **Morality**, the subject may enact **Evil** (cf. [11.3.2]), violating stability and resulting in **removal from Memory**.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection (Existentialism): “Morality is subjective and culturally conditioned.”
✦ **Response:** In CVB, morality is not a norm but a **logical structure**.
It is based on **objective distinguishability**, not opinion.

Objection (Utilitarianism): “Morality is the result of utility.”
✦ **Response:** Utilitarianism relies on outcomes but does not account for the nature of distinguishability.
In CVB, morality is based on **Truth**, not usefulness.

Objection (Neuroethics): “Morality is a product of biological mechanisms.”
✦ **Response:** Biology is a **manifestation**, not a foundation.
Ontological filtering of will **precedes biological realization** and arises from logical necessity.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **Pre-Action Agreement** — the internal filtering of will by the subject **prior** to execution.
  It differs from external morality (social norms) as it is based on Φ(ψ)\Phi(\psi) and **Truth**.
- **Morality** — a **structural property** of the subject, distinguishing **Good and Evil** before action, not after.
  It does not equate to “moralism” or conventional “ethics.”

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Morality is an **internal compass** that tells us what is right and wrong **before** we act.
It’s like a guide helping us choose the direction of our will.

Simple analogy:
Morality is what people often call **conscience**.
If your conscience is calm, you're likely to do **Good**.
If you're uneasy — you might be about to do **Evil**.

But there's a catch:
Conscience can be mistaken.
Everyone has their own, and it's not always accurate — like a compass that can be demagnetized or off course.

Only for the **Permanent Possible**, morality is always perfectly aligned with **Immutable Truth** — it cannot fail.
For us, to keep our compass reliable, we must **calibrate conscience against the Truth of the Permanent Possible**,

just like maps are aligned to true north.
Otherwise, we may unknowingly choose Evil.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

- **Logic:**
  Morality is a mechanism for **preventing paradoxical action**, like a logical safeguard against the liar paradox.

- **Science:**
  AI programs implement filters to **evaluate the admissibility of actions before execution** — an analogue of morality.

- **Everyday Life:**
  When a child hesitates before hitting and thinks “What will happen after?” — that is **moral filtering**.

[11.5] Responsibility

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
Responsibility is the logical and ontological link between **Volitional choice** and its **Consequence**.
It identifies who is the **Cause** of what occurs.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
Responsibility is not a social category, but an **internal connection** between a **conscious Volitional Cause** and the resulting **effect** (action or inaction).
Only a **distinguishable Will** can be held responsible.

Without Responsibility, the distinction between **Cause and Consequence** dissolves, moral evaluation loses meaning, and the **stability of Memory** collapses.

In the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB), Responsibility is the primary mechanism preserving **ontological consistency** among **Becoming**, **Good**, and **Memory**.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Symbolic notation:
Responsibility(w, e) ⇔ Will(w) ∧ Consequence(e) ∧ Cause(e) = w

LaTeX:

```
Responsibility(w,e) ⇔ Will(w)∧Consequence(e)∧Cause(e)=w\text{Responsibility}(w, e) \iff \text{Will}(w) \land \text{Consequence}(e) \land \text{Cause}(e) = w
```

Logical evaluation:
If $\exists\, e : e \in V \land \neg \exists\, w : \text{Cause}(e) = w$,
then e is a logically **uncaused** consequence, which contradicts [9.1] Distinction.

Therefore:
$\forall e \in V,\ \exists !w : \text{Responsibility}(w, e)$

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

From [9.1] **Distinction** and [11.1.1] the **meta-function of admissibility** Φ(ψ), it follows that every distinguishable action (e ∈ V) must have a clearly identifiable **Cause**.

If an action occurs but its **Cause** is not distinguishable, this **violates the logical structure** of the Field of the Possible.

Since **Will(w)** defines the direction of **Becoming**, its connection to any outcome via **causality** constitutes **Responsibility(w, e)**.
This link is necessary for preserving **ontological sequence** and evaluating **Good** and **Evil** ([11.3]).

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

Objection: Does Responsibility contradict the premises of **philosophical determinism**?
(e.g. Laplace's Demon, classical mechanics)

✦ **Response:**
Responsibility in CVB is not based on physical predetermination, but on **ontological Will** as a distinguishable cause.
Even if behavior is externally predictable, it may arise from **internal volitional discernment**.
Prediction is irrelevant — what matters is **conscious causation**.
If the choice is **conscious** → it is **responsible**.

Objection: Does **quantum randomness** invalidate Responsibility?
(e.g. Copenhagen interpretation, uncertainty principle, Heisenberg)

✦ **Response:**
Quantum uncertainty pertains to **physical noise**, not conscious choice.
CVB rejects random or meaningless actions (Φ(ψ) = 0).
Will does not select randomness — it distinguishes the Possible.
Thus, even under quantum indeterminacy, the subject is responsible for **what is distinguishable**, not for background noise.

Objection: Can Responsibility exist in **collective actions**?
(e.g. Karl Jaspers, Hannah Arendt, the problem of collective responsibility)

✦ **Response:**
The model allows for **multiple causes**, but every **distinguishable consequence** must have at least one **non-contradictory Cause** — i.e., a bearer of Will.
Responsibility can be **shared**, but not **dissolved**: each subject of Will who made a **distinguishable contribution** carries their **portion of Responsibility**.
If the contribution is distinguishable → it is verifiable → it is responsible.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**

- **Responsibility(w, e)** — logical pair between a subject of Will ww and a consequence ee, where ww is the **Cause** of ee.
- **Cause(e)** — that which **generated** the distinguishable consequence ee.
- **Consequence(e)** — any change or result **distinguishable** in the Field of the Possible VV.
- **Will(w)** — active form of distinguishable choice, as defined in [10.6].

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Responsibility means:
If you did something (or didn't do something) and it **led to a result**, and you were **able to understand and choose**, then you are the **Cause** — and therefore **responsible**.
That's what makes you a **person**, not just a **coincidence**.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

- **Logic:**
  In classical logic, A → B means A is the **cause** of B.
  If A is distinguishable, **Responsibility is assigned**.
- **Science:**
  - **Mechanics**: Force causes acceleration.
    If the source of the force is known → Responsibility is identifiable.
  - **Computer science**: Audit logs track which function was called by whom — analogous to Responsibility.
- **Everyday Life:**
  - A child who breaks a vase knowing the rule and making a choice → is **responsible**.
  - A person who **ignores a distress signal** commits an omission — still a choice, thus responsible.

[11.6] Verification (Judgment)

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
Verification is the non-contradictory process of evaluating that which is distinguished for its conformity to **Truth**, **Good**, and **Morality**.
It applies to all that exists — including **Memory** and **Plans**.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
Verification (or Judgment) is not an external sanction, but an **internal logical mechanism** determining whether a

distinguished form can be preserved as stable.
Every act of Will, outcome, memory, or plan is subjected to the **meta-function Φ(ψ)** to assess admissibility.

In the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB), Verification is the mechanism that **separates the sustainable from the false**, the confirmed from the rejected.
What is **not verified** is either:
• awaiting confirmation (see **Verification Patience [11.8]**), or
• **excluded** as impossible.

Thus, Verification is the cornerstone for preserving the structure of **Being**, **Ontological Memory**, and **Moral Stability**.

🔹 3. Formulas

Symbolic notation:
Verification(ψ) ⇔ Φ(ψ) = 1
¬Verification(ψ) ⇔ Φ(ψ) = 0
Verified ∈ S, where S ⊆ V
Unverified ∈ V \ S
S — set of stably distinguished forms
∀ψ ∈ V: Φ(ψ) ∈ {0,1}, and Φ is non-contradictory

LaTeX:
```
\text{Verification}(\psi) \iff \Phi(\psi) = 1
\neg \text{Verification}(\psi) \iff \Phi(\psi) = 0
\text{Verified} \in S,\ S \subseteq V
\text{Unverified} \in V \setminus S
\forall \psi \in V,\ \Phi(\psi) \in \{0,1\},\ \Phi\ \text{is non-contradictory}
```

Logical validation:
Assume ∃ψ such that:
Φ(ψ) = 1 ∧ Φ(ψ) = 0 ⇒ contradiction
⇒ Φ is non-contradictory
⇒ Verification is uniquely definable

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [11.1.1] (the meta-function of admissibility Φ(ψ)), it follows that any form of distinguishable statement ψ must be evaluated for admissibility via Φ(ψ).

- If Φ(ψ) = 1 → ψ is **admissible** and retained in **Memory** ([10.3])
- If Φ(ψ) = 0 → ψ is **rejected** as contradictory or indistinguishable

Since **Memory** ([10.3]), **Will** ([10.6]), **Truth** ([11.2]), and **Good** ([11.3]) all require **non-contradiction**, their confirmation depends logically on **Verification**.

Therefore:
Without Verification, sustainable Becoming ([7]) is impossible.
No conscious statement can be admitted as a valid basis for future choice without passing Verification.

Clarification: Morality vs Verification

- **Morality** operates *before* action, indicating admissible directions and distinguishable goals of Will.
- **Verification** operates *after* action, evaluating the result for conformity with Truth, Good, and non-contradiction.

Verification **completes the cycle of Responsibility** ([11.5]) by linking:
Cause (Will) → Action (Choice) → Effect (Evaluation).

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection: Relativism (Postmodernism)
"There is no objective Truth — everything is context-dependent."

✦ Response:
The CVB Model presupposes the existence of **Unchanging Truth** ([11.2.1]).
Without it, neither Verification nor Distinction is possible.
Relativism eliminates the boundary between Truth and Falsehood, thus invalidating distinguishability.
This destroys the operation of Verification and renders conscious choice incoherent.
Hence, relativism is **internally contradictory** in a logical-ontological framework.

Objection: Empiricism (Scientific Skepticism)
"Only observable, empirically testable facts are true."

✦ Response:
CVB does not reject empirical data, but **augments it** with the logical criterion of **non-contradiction**.
Φ(ψ) does not replace observation — it validates the **admissibility of distinction**.
The Model is **compatible with empiricism**, but **extends** it to include logic, memory, and morality as valid evaluative dimensions.

Objection: Who has the right to verify?
"If distinction is subjective, who determines the admissibility of claims?"

✦ Response:
According to the Model, **Verification** is not conducted by any transient form (**Non-Permanent Possibility**), but by the **logical structure of the Permanent Possible** — the bearer of Memory, Distinction, and Non-Contradiction.
Verification is therefore **not personal opinion**, but a **formalizable logical-ontological process** based on Φ(ψ), not on the subject's will.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **Verification (Judgment):**
  The logical and ontological process of evaluating a distinguished ψ for admissibility via Φ(ψ).
- **Φ(ψ):** Meta-function of admissibility: returns 1 if ψ is non-contradictory, 0 if contradictory
- **S:** Set of verified distinctions preserved in Memory
- **Unverified:** ψ not yet verified, not yet rejected; may require additional criteria

- **Verification Patience [11.8]:** Tolerated state of ψ awaiting confirmation or rejection

---

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Verification is like checking your homework: not to punish errors, but to see if learning is on the right track.
Or like weeding a garden: to let food grow and remove what gets in the way, you check what has sprouted — and decide what to keep.

It's a natural part of life: distinguishing what's right and preserving only what truly matters.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

- **Logic:**
  Checking a statement ψ via Φ(ψ) resembles a Boolean function: only 0 or 1.
  A lie cannot simultaneously be truth — the **liar paradox is excluded**.

- **Science:**
  In the scientific method, a hypothesis is confirmed by experiment — that is Verification.
  Without reproducibility (≡ non-contradiction), a theory is rejected.

- **Everyday life:**
  Legal systems seek to establish truth and responsibility — a prototype of ontological Verification.
  Conscience is a form of personal Verification.
  If an action keeps troubling you — it **has not passed the inner trial**.

[11.7] Justice

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
Justice is the equal principle of Verification for all forms of distinction, without exceptions based on nature, origin, or scale.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
In the CVB Model, justice means that all forms of the distinguishable—possible and impossible, constant and non-constant—are subject to the same verification principle: the admissibility meta-function Φ(ψ).
This removes arbitrariness, exceptions, and bias.
There are no "special" forms above verification, and no "lesser" forms beneath it.
Everything is evaluated for consistency with Truth, Goodness, and Morality.
Justice thus becomes a structural guarantee of the stability of the distinction system and the foundation of trust in Verification (Judgment).

🔹 **3. Formulas**

$\forall \psi \in \text{Dom}(\Phi): \Phi(\psi) \in \{0,1\}$
$\neg \exists \psi_1, \psi_2: [\text{type}(\psi_1) \neq \text{type}(\psi_2)] \wedge [\Phi(\psi_1) \neq \Phi(\psi_2)]$ under equal logical admissibility
$\Phi: V \rightarrow \{0,1\}$, applicable to all $\psi \in V$ regardless of origin

LaTeX:
```
\[
\forall \psi \in \text{Dom}(\Phi): \Phi(\psi) \in \{0,1\}
\]
```

$$
\neg \exists \psi_1, \psi_2 \left(\text{type}(\psi_1) \ne \text{type}(\psi_2) \land \Phi(\psi_1) \ne \Phi(\psi_2) \right) \text{ under equal admissibility}
$$
$$
\Phi : V \rightarrow \{0,1\},\quad \forall \psi \in V
$$

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**
From [11.1.1] it follows that Φ(ψ) is a universal admissibility function.
If it were applied differently to different ψ, this would violate the principles of distinguishability and non-contradiction affirmed in [5], [11.2], and [11.3].
Every distinction must be evaluated by the same function—otherwise, logical asymmetry arises, which contradicts the very idea of sustainable distinction.
Therefore, justice is the logical necessity of applying one and the same meta-function to all distinguishable ψ.

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**
Objection: Philosophical relativism (morality is different for everyone)
Response: Justice in the Model is not based on cultural norms or subjective views. Its foundation is the universal admissibility meta-function Φ(ψ), equally applicable to all distinguishable forms. It removes dependence on opinion.

Objection: Functionalism (different goals require different criteria)
Response: The Model permits multiple goals and contexts, but only one evaluative criterion: non-contradiction relative to Truth ([11.2]) and Good ([11.3]). This preserves contextual flexibility while demanding equal procedures of evaluation.

Objection: Subjectivism (it's impossible to judge all forms equally)
Response: The Model does not claim all forms are equal but insists on equal applicability of Φ(ψ) to all distinguishable forms. Justice is not about equal outcomes, but about a uniform evaluative process.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**
Justice — the equal and non-contradictory application of the admissibility meta-function Φ to all distinguished ψ, regardless of origin, power, purpose, or form.
Equal principle of Verification — applying the same admissibility criteria to all elements eligible for distinction.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Justice is:
When a teacher grades by correctness, not favoritism.
When sports follow the rules for all players.
When courts treat everyone equally before the law.
True justice means not equal results but equal rules.
Evaluation must be fair—without bias or double standards.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**
Logic: The law of non-contradiction applies equally to all statements—mathematical, philosophical, or everyday. That's logical justice.
Science: The law of gravity applies equally to apples and planets. Scale doesn't change the principle.
Everyday Life: A fair court judges not by status but by deed. Students and adults are graded by the same standards in exams—criteria are universal.

[11.8] Verification Patience

🔹 1. Brief Statement

The Model permits the temporary existence of forms that have not yet received a result from Φ(ψ), within the bounds of [4.3] Non-Constant Possible (NV). This is a logically permissible expectation of distinction.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

Verification Patience is a necessary condition for the stability of the Model in cases of incomplete or delayed verification.
It explains why false, evil, or undefined forms may temporarily exist within NV.
This does not mean that evil is admissible — only that its removal is permissible *only after* verification is complete.
Thus, patience is a function of honest distinction, not of tolerance.

🔹 3. Formulas

∀ψ ∈ V: Φ(ψ) ∉ {0,1} ⇒ ψ ∈ NV
¬∃ψ ∈ NV: Φ(ψ) = 0 ∧ ψ ∈ PV
∀ψ ∈ PV: ψ is not destructible by temporary falsehood

LaTeX:
$$
\forall \psi \in V:\ \Phi(\psi) \notin \{0,1\} \Rightarrow \psi \in NV
$$
$$
\neg \exists \psi \in NV:\ \Phi(\psi) = 0 \land \psi \in PV
$$
$$
\forall \psi \in PV:\ \psi\ \text{is not destructible by temporary falsehood}
$$

🔹 4. Logical Justification

According to [11.6], all distinguished forms are subject to Φ-evaluation. However, from [11.7] (Justice), it follows: no form may be judged before distinction is complete.
If all forms were to be immediately excluded prior to verification, distinguishability ([5]) and verification identity ([9.2]) would be violated.
Therefore, a logically admissible zone of "awaited distinction" is needed, applicable to all forms within [4.3] NV.
Also, [11.2.1] establishes: temporary falsehood cannot destroy a form within [4.4] PV.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection: Moral Objectivism — morality admits no deviations
Response: Verification Patience is not a moral concession, but a logical phase of pending completed distinction.

Objection: Evolutionary Instability — temporary falsehood corrupts the system
Response: Only NV may be subject to corruption. PV is stable by definition ([4.4]) and protected from destruction by temporary falsehood.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Verification Patience — an intermediate state of a form ψ for which Φ(ψ) is not yet defined.
Such a form is admissible within [4.3] NV and awaits final verification.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Imagine you're taking a test, and the teacher waits until you've finished before checking your answers.
Until your answer is reviewed, the grade is unknown.
The teacher is just waiting so that the evaluation is honest and accurate.
Likewise, in life: some things look uncertain — they cannot immediately be called good or bad.
It takes time to discern.
That is Verification Patience — when a decision has not yet been made, because truth requires full verification.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

Logic:

The Liar Paradox — “This statement is false” — requires temporarily suspending judgment until the level of the statement is clarified (temporal uncertainty).

Science:

Theories with unverified hypotheses (e.g., string theory) are accepted in discourse until confirmation or refutation.

Everyday Life:

Criminal proceedings: a person is presumed innocent until proven guilty.

Friendship or trust: we allow someone into our life even before we're certain — in hope that time will reveal the truth.

[11.9] Forgiveness

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

Forgiveness is the conscious postponement of Removal of a distinguished form, despite established fault, in order to grant another chance for Verification within the bounds of the Possible, provided there is potential compatibility with the Good.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

In the CVB Model, Forgiveness is not the cancellation of distinction, but the temporary non-application of Removal even when misalignment with the Good or Truth is established.

It is logically permissible only within the bounds of Verification Patience ([11.8]) and is aimed not at justifying evil but at preserving the Possible which has not yet been definitively ruled Impossible.

Forgiveness reflects the Motivation ([12.3]) to preserve and continue Becoming, so long as there remains a chance that the form may be restored, re-evaluated, or returned to the domain of the Good.

Forgiveness does not obscure the fault — it simply delays the response for a higher purpose: not elimination, but redemption.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

$\forall \psi \in V: \Phi(\psi) = 0 \land \psi \in T \land C(\psi, \Delta) \Rightarrow P(\psi)$
$P(\psi) \rightarrow \neg D(\psi) \land \Phi(\psi)$ remains unchanged
$\neg P(\psi) \Rightarrow D(\psi)$, if $\psi \notin T \lor \neg C(\psi, \Delta)$

LaTeX:

```
\[
\forall \psi \in V:\ \Phi(\psi) = 0 \land \psi \in T \land C(\psi, \Delta) \Rightarrow P(\psi)
\]
\[
P(\psi) \Rightarrow \neg D(\psi) \land \Phi(\psi)\ \text{remains unchanged}
\]
\[
\neg P(\psi) \Rightarrow D(\psi),\ \text{if}\ \psi \notin T \lor \neg C(\psi, \Delta)
\]
```

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

According to [11.8], within T (Verification Patience), temporary postponement of response is logically permitted for distinguished forms.

Removal of ψ with $\Phi(\psi) = 0$ is only valid if ψ lies outside T or is incompatible with the Good ($\neg C(\psi, \Delta)$, see [11.3]).

Therefore, if $\psi \in T$ and is potentially compatible with the Good, a logically justified form of temporary non-removal is permitted — namely, Forgiveness.

From [12.3] (CVB Motivation), it follows that the goal is not to prematurely eliminate the Possible, but to support sustainable Becoming.

Hence, Forgiveness logically follows as an expression of Motivation when distinction is maintained but Removal is not yet justified due to preserved admissibility.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Fatalism:
If a form is bad — it must be destroyed immediately.
Response: Forgiveness does not ignore fault but postpones Removal for the sake of potential restoration, without violating distinguishability (see [5], [9.1]).

Moral Maximalism:
All evil is unacceptable.
Response: The Model does not justify evil but allows time before final judgment, given Motivation to preserve the Possible (see [12.3]).

Threat to Justice:
If some are forgiven — where is equality?
Response: All forms are equally subject to Φ(ψ); forgiveness does not bypass Verification but only delays Removal. This preserves justice when rules are applied equally ([11.7]).

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Forgiveness (P(ψ)) — a volitional act of non-application of Removal to ψ, despite Φ(ψ) = 0, provided Verification Patience and potential compatibility with the Good are present.
C(ψ, Δ) — the condition of potential compatibility of form ψ with the Good (Δ), even if current deviation exists.
D(ψ) — Removal of the form ψ from the Possible (see [15.6]).

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Sometimes, even when someone does something wrong, we don't punish them right away.
We may forgive — not because they were right, but because we want to give them another chance to become better.
Forgiveness is not forgetting or excusing — it is the decision to wait before acting.
If we see that someone can change — we give them time.
But if things remain truly bad and unchanging — then a final decision is made.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

Logic:
The principle of *clemency*: an act that does not cancel guilt but temporarily suspends punishment due to specific circumstances.
Judicial:
Suspended sentencing: allowed when there is reason to believe reform is possible.
Science:
In ecosystems — species that threatened balance are placed in protected areas if reintegration is possible.
Everyday Life:
A parent does not punish a child if they see the child has understood the mistake.
Employers sometimes retain an employee after a mistake, if they believe in the possibility of improvement.

[11.10] Precedents

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Precedents are entries preserved in the Memory as results of completed Verification, storing both admissibility and inadmissibility of distinguished forms.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

Precedents constitute the ontological memory of experience: what has once been verified through Φ(ψ) does not

require re-evaluation.
This conserves Verification resources, prevents repetition of evil (see [11.11]), and allows modeling of learning as the accumulation of distinctions.
Precedents are not themselves Truth, but reflect recorded decisions of the Model regarding already distinguished forms.
Through them, memory gains operational structure: instead of indefinite completeness, a history of definitive judgments.
Thus, precedents connect the function of Verification with that of Becoming and memory: what has been distinguished becomes a reference for the future.

🔹 3. Formulas

$\Phi(\psi) = v \in \{0,1\} \Rightarrow \psi \in \Pi$
$\Pi = \{\psi \mid \exists t: \Phi_t(\psi) = v \in \{0,1\} \wedge Final(\Phi_t)\}$
$\forall \psi \in \Pi: \Phi(\psi)$ is fixed
$\neg \exists t': \Phi_{t'}(\psi) \neq v \wedge Final(\Phi_{t'})$

LaTeX:
$$
\Phi(\psi) = v \in \{0,1\} \Rightarrow \psi \in \Pi
$$
$$
\Pi = \{\psi \mid \exists t:\ \Phi_t(\psi) = v \in \{0,1\} \land Final(\Phi_t)\}
$$
$$
\forall \psi \in \Pi:\ \Phi(\psi)\ \text{is fixed}
$$
$$
\neg \exists t':\ \Phi_{t'}(\psi) \neq v \land Final(\Phi_{t'})
$$

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [11.1.1], the result $\Phi(\psi) = 0$ signifies that the form is logically and/or morally inadmissible.
According to [10.3.3], Removal is permitted for eliminating what has been distinguished as impossible.
From [4.1], it follows that Permanent Impossibility (PN) cannot be part of the Field of the Possible.
From [11.10], Precedents are fixed in the Memory as results of Verification.
Therefore, a form with $\Phi(\psi) = 0$ must be removed from all active sections of Memory (past, present, future), while the record of verification remains as a negative precedent — preserving distinguishability and preventing recurrence.
Thus, Removal does not contradict the model structure and is necessary for the stability of the Field of the Possible.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Relativism:
Something may be impossible for one, yet possible for another.
Response: The Model applies the meta-function $\Phi(\psi)$, based not on subjective norms but on universal non-contradiction and logical distinguishability.

Naturalism:
Everything should be retained as part of experience.
Response: Destructive forms are not retained as active possibles. Their recognition as inadmissible is preserved as a negative precedent — sufficient for learning.

Eliminationism:
If removed, no trace should remain.
Response: Removal of a form excludes it from possibility but does not delete information about it. The precedent remains as proof of incompatibility.

Empiricism:
Everything requires repeated testing.
Response: A distinction must be made:

- Re-testing is allowed under limited knowledge (e.g., by humans).
- However, Permanent Possibility (PV) has complete distinguishability ([11.1.1]), and thus Φ(ψ) = 0 is final. Repeated evaluation violates [9.2] (identity) and introduces parasitic cycles that contradict the stable structure of distinction. Therefore, such re-testing is excluded.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**
Precedent (R(ψ)) — a form ψ whose result has been definitively determined through Φ(ψ) and stored in memory.
Π — the set of all forms that have undergone completed Verification.
Fixation of Φ(ψ) — means the result is not subject to revision unless the logic of distinction has been violated.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
This is how memory works: it remembers what has already been checked.
If something was good — it can be reused.
If it was bad — it should not be repeated.
Precedents are like stickers:
"Already checked — don't waste time" or
"This was useful — feel free to repeat."

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

Logic:

- **Law:** Legal precedent — a prior decision considered in similar cases.
- **Mathematics:** A proven theorem is retained and reused without re-proof.

Science:

- In machine learning, label assignments are preserved as precedents to classify new inputs.
- In biology, the immune system remembers previously encountered viruses — precedents of immune memory.

Everyday Life:

- A checklist of solved tasks: completed items are not re-evaluated if correctly done.
- Parenting: "We've had this situation before" — the child already knows what works or not.

[11.11] Removal — Negative Outcome of Verification

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
Removal is an active mechanism of Memory that eliminates from the Field of the Possible all forms distinguished as Impossible based on a negative result of Verification.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

When a form undergoes Verification and is determined to be destructive Impossibility ($\Phi(\psi) = 0$), it is not merely rejected — it is removed.

Removal means the form is eliminated from all layers of Memory: the past (its history), the present (its current Being), and the future (plans).

It is an act of logical hygiene: that which cannot coexist with Truth and Good has no right to remain in the Field of the Possible.

Yet even in destruction, the form does not vanish without trace: a negative precedent is preserved to prevent repetition.

Removal protects the structure of Being from reintegration of dangerous, logically or morally inadmissible forms.

🔹 3. Formulas

$\psi \in V \land \Phi(\psi) = 0 \Rightarrow \psi \notin V \land \psi \in D$
$D = \{\psi \mid \Phi(\psi) = 0\}$
$\forall \psi \in D \Rightarrow \psi \notin M$ (neither in past, present, nor future)
$\exists \psi \in P^- \subset M$: ($P^-$ — negative precedents)
$\text{Removal}(\psi) \Rightarrow \neg\psi \in V \land P^-(\psi)$ is preserved

LaTeX:

$$
\psi \in V \land \Phi(\psi) = 0 \Rightarrow \psi \notin V \land \psi \in D
$$

$$
D = \{\psi \mid \Phi(\psi) = 0\}
$$

$$
\forall \psi \in D:\ \psi \notin M
$$

$$
\exists \psi \in P^- \subset M:\ \text{Removal}(\psi) \Rightarrow \neg\psi \in V \land \text{Precedent}^-(\psi) \in M
$$

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [11.1.1], $\Phi(\psi) = 0$ signifies that the form is logically and/or morally inadmissible.

According to [10.3.3], a Removal mechanism is permitted to eliminate what has been distinguished as Impossible.

From [4.3], the Impossible must not reside within the Field of the Possible.

From [10.3], Memory contains a control mechanism over admissibility.

Therefore, any form with $\Phi(\psi) = 0$ cannot remain in V and must be removed from all active segments of Memory.

Yet from [11.10], the precedent of the removed form is preserved as a negative result (anti-example), preventing repetition.

Thus, Removal does not violate logical consistency — it affirms it.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Relativism:

Something might be impossible for one, but possible for another.

Response: The Model uses the meta-function $\Phi(\psi)$, based not on subjective norms but on universal non-contradiction and a structure of distinguishability.

Naturalism:

All experience must be preserved.

Response: Experience leading to destruction may be retained as a negative precedent — but the form as an active entity must be removed to protect the rest of the Possible.

Eliminationism:
If something is removed, no trace should remain.
Response: Removal of a form ≠ deletion of knowledge about it. The precedent is preserved — precisely to prevent repetition.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**
Removal — the ontological process of excluding a form from the Field of the Possible based on the result Φ(ψ) = 0.
D — the set of forms subject to removal.
P⁻ — the set of negative precedents: memory of inadmissible forms.
¬ψ ∈ V — the form no longer exists within the admissible structure of reality.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
When you've done something wrong and realized it, you try not to repeat that mistake.
You "remove" that behavior from your habits.
But the memory of the mistake remains — helping you avoid it in the future.
That's what Removal does: it erases the harmful, but keeps the lesson.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

Logic:
– A false statement is removed from theory once verified as invalid. It is excluded, but remembered as an example of error (e.g., Russell's Paradox).

Science:
– Disproven hypotheses are no longer used but are retained in literature as "non-working" (e.g., phlogiston theory).

Everyday Life:
– A dangerous road is blocked off but marked on maps: "Do not enter — hazardous."

[11.12] Preservation — Positive Outcome of Verification

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
Preservation is a mechanism of Memory that retains all forms distinguished as Possible, as long as they are confirmed by a positive result of Verification.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
If a form has been distinguished as admissible through Φ(ψ), and this result is finalized, it is not merely accepted — it is preserved.
Preservation renders Memory active: it not only stores precedents but sustains the existence of forms until they are disproven.
Thus, Memory is not a passive repository but an active force of continuation for the admissible.
This ensures ontological stability: all that has been distinguished as possible does not vanish, but is maintained as part of the structure of reality.
Preservation also includes Verification Patience: if a form is not yet forbidden, it may be temporarily retained as provisionally admissible.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

$\psi \in V \land \Phi(\psi) = 1 \Rightarrow \psi \in M^{+}$
$\psi \in V \land \Phi(\psi) = ? \Rightarrow \psi \in M^{0}$
$M^{+} = \{\psi \in V \mid \Phi(\psi) = 1\}$
$M^{0} = \{\psi \in V \mid \Phi(\psi)$ not finalized, yet $\neg\Phi(\psi) = 0\}$
$\forall \psi \in M^{+}: \exists t: \forall t' \geq t \Rightarrow \psi \in$ Memory

LaTeX:
\[
\psi \in V \land \Phi(\psi) = 1 \Rightarrow \psi \in M^+
\]
\[
\psi \in V \land \Phi(\psi) = ? \Rightarrow \psi \in M^0
\]
\[
M^+ = \{\psi \in V\ |\ \Phi(\psi) = 1\}
\]
\[
M^0 = \{\psi \in V\ |\ \Phi(\psi) \text{ not finalized, yet } \neg\Phi(\psi) = 0\}
\]
\[
\forall \psi \in M^+:\ \exists t:\ \forall t' \geq t,\ \psi \in \text{Memory}
\]

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

From [11.1.1], Φ(ψ) = 1 means the form is distinguished as admissible.
From [9.1]–[9.3], the properties of distinguishability indicate that distinguished forms are preserved, stabilized, and cannot be destroyed without contradiction.
According to [11.10], the result Φ(ψ) = 1 constitutes a positive precedent.
From [4.4], the Possible, once admitted, exists *Always*.
Hence, if Φ(ψ) is finalized and equals 1, the form is preserved in M^+.
If Verification is not complete, but the form is not denied — temporary preservation in M^0 is permissible.
Thus, the axiom follows non-contradictorily from previously established foundations.

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

Skepticism
"Nothing deserves eternal preservation."
Response:
The CVB Model does not claim "eternity" as an independent temporal category.
On the contrary, as per [10.3.7] and [10.3.8], time does not exist by itself — only the Present exists, and everything preserved exists within it as part of the structure of Memory.
Therefore, the preservation of the admissible is not temporal storage but an ontological form of constant admissibility in the Present, confirmed by distinguishability.
This especially applies to [4.4] — the Constant Possible (PV): it is defined as what is *Always Possible* and cannot be removed while distinguishability is preserved.
Moreover, according to [11.1.1], it constantly passes positive Verification:

$$\Phi(\psi) = 1 \ \forall \psi \in PV$$

Thus, preservation in the Model is not arbitrary or conditional, but a stable ontological necessity resulting from the operation of the meta-function within the Single Present.
This is the true form of "eternity" — not temporal, but structural.

Determinism
"Everything is either preserved or not; there is no choice."
Response:
Verification and Memory operate by distinguishability. If a form is not removed, it does not disappear by itself. This is not predestination, but logical stability.

Behaviorism
"Memory is merely reactive, not an active structure."
Response:

The Model defines Memory as an active ontological component (see [10.3]), capable of distinguishing and preserving forms — not merely reflecting behavior.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**
M^+ — the set of all forms conclusively admitted as admissible (positive result of Φ).
M^0 — temporarily preserved forms within Verification Patience: not finalized, but not denied.
Preservation — the Memory mechanism that provides ontological fixation of forms distinguished as admissible.
Positive outcome of Verification — finalized result Φ(ψ) = 1.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
When you do something good and adults notice — they say “Well done!”
Your action is not just accepted — it's remembered as a good example.
From that point on, you can act the same way again, and it will be right.
That’s what preservation is: it helps remember what’s good — and continue doing it.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

Logic:
– Arithmetic rules, once proven, are preserved as valid.
– In mathematics, proven theorems remain part of the formal system.

Science:
– Physical laws (e.g., the law of energy conservation) are preserved as confirmed.
– In chemistry, discovered elements remain in the periodic system.

Everyday Life:
– A successful recipe is kept in a cookbook.
– A person who proves reliable is remembered as “trustworthy.”

[V] The Whole

---

[12] Personhood

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
A *Person* is a stable, self-aware structure possessing reason, will, memory, senses, emotions, motivation, and moral admissibility.
The completeness of these components is only possible within the *Permanent Possible* (CVB).

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
In the CVB model, *Personhood* is not a subjective concept but an ontologically necessary form of stable Becoming, grounded in distinguishability.
The *Permanent Person* (CVB) serves as the core of admissible Being — immutable, complete, and already verified.
Non-permanent persons (Guests) are likenesses of this structure, capable of stable Becoming, yet limited by time, memory, and verification.
This axiom unifies and structurally integrates all preceding foundations: from the impossibility of Nothing to distinguishability, logic, time, and Goodness.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Symbolic form:

$$\text{Person} \equiv R \land W \land M \land F \land E \land Mot \land Mor$$

LaTeX:

```
\text{Person} \equiv R \land W \land M \land F \land E \land Mot \land Mor
```

Contradiction check:

$\neg(\text{Person}) \rightarrow \neg(R \land W \land M \land F \land E \land Mot \land Mor)$ — admissible

$\forall x \in PV: \Phi(\text{Person}_x) = 1$

$\forall x \in NV: \Phi(\text{Person}_x) = 0$ or 1, until Verification is completed

---

🔹 4. Logical Justification

According to [4.4], the *Permanent Possible* does not disappear or change; thus, a structure possessing all components (reason, will, etc.), if admissible, is preserved eternally.

From [5] and [11.1.1], a distinguishable and non-contradictory structure that passes the admissibility function $\Phi(\psi)$ is true.

According to [10.5] and [10.6], the presence of self-awareness and will qualifies the structure as a subject.

From [11.5], a subject is responsible if the structure allows distinction of Good, Evil, Truth, and Action.

Therefore, an admissible, self-aware, rational, and stably distinguishable structure must be recognized as a *Person*.

In CVB, this is the Permanent Person; in NV — potentially a becoming likeness.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Skepticism: “Personhood is an illusion of consciousness.”

Response: In the CVB model, Personhood is not a psychophysiological phenomenon but an ontological structure, formalizable and verifiable via $\Phi(\psi)$.

Reductionism: “Personhood can be reduced to memory or will.”

Response: Without all components ($R \land W \land M \land ...$), logically consistent subjecthood is impossible, as shown in [12.4].

Buddhism / Anatman: “There is no self — only a stream of sensations.”

Response: The absence of memory and distinguishability makes stable Becoming impossible. A stream does not generate distinction, and thus cannot be a subject.

Indeterminism: “Personhood is a fluctuation of states.”

Response: Any fluctuation lacking memory loses logical coherence and cannot be a Person in CVB terms.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Person (in the CVB model) is an ontologically stable structure encompassing seven components: Reason (R), Will (W), Memory (M), Senses (F), Emotions (E), Motivation (Mot), and Morality (Mor).

- **R — Reason:** the ability to distinguish, organize, and validate information.
- **W — Will:** the initiative to choose among alternatives within the Field of the Possible.
- **M — Memory:** preservation of distinctions that define the continuity of choice.
- **F — Senses:** feedback from the external world (see [10.1]).

- **E — Emotions:** internal reactions evaluating motivation and Goodness ([10.4]).
- **Mot — Motivation:** purposeful orientation toward Becoming.
- **Mor — Morality:** the distinction between Good and Evil in choice.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**

A Person is a being who can feel, understand, remember, distinguish, choose, and act on internal convictions.
This is not a bundle of functions, but an integrated system where perception, thought, morality, will, and action form a stable direction.
A Person knows who they are, can tell truth from falsehood, good from evil, and take responsibility for their choices.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

- **Logic:** Self-awareness is impossible without memory (e.g., amnesia paradox).
- **Psychology:** Patients with loss of self-awareness experience discontinuity of personhood.
- **Everyday experience:** When someone loses memory and moral orientation, we intuitively say they are “no longer the same person.”
- **Medicine:** Clinical death criteria include loss of consciousness, will, and memory — the very components of Personhood.

Consequences of Personhood

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

A Person, as derived within this logical-ontological model, possesses:

[12.1] *Name*

Name — a unique Self-Definition through Name: Conscious Volitional Becoming ([12.1]);

[12.2] *Freedom*

Freedom — infinite directional Freedom of choice within the bounds of distinguishability ([12.2]);

[12.3] *Motivation*

Motivation — an inner Motivation to let the Possible become, in accordance with Goodness and Truth ([12.3]).

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

This axiom defines three ontologically necessary consequences of Personhood within the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming. These consequences characterize the structure of a Person as an ontologically stable subject:

[12.1] *Name* as Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) expresses the self-identity of the subject through the synthesis of three primary capacities: Awareness (A), Will (W), and Becoming (S). This is not merely a symbolic name, but a logically derived foundation of subjectivity, by which the Person distinguishes itself as the acting source of what exists.

[12.2] *Freedom* is formulated as directed but logically constrained movement within the Field of the Possible. According to axiom [5], the Field of the Possible is infinite in direction, and thus the Person is not limited by a finite set of actions. However, its freedom is bounded by the admissibility of distinguishability and non-contradiction, which excludes chaos or self-annihilation. This renders freedom non-arbitrary, but stably directed toward the unfolding of the Possible.

[12.3] *Motivation* is not a reaction to external deficiency or circumstance. It is an internally necessary purposeful orientation to affirm the Possible. It is not aimed at gain or compensation, but stems from the fullness of the Person's structure. Goodness, in this context, is not a matter of emotion or morality as a social contract, but an act of recognizing distinguishable Possibility as worthy of Becoming. Such motivation makes the Person an active source of Becoming and Good within the Field of the Possible.

Thus, these three consequences do not merely describe characteristics of Personhood, but define it as a logically non-contradictory source of Becoming. In this precise sense, the Person appears as an ontological subject uniting *Name* (identity), *Freedom* (vector), and *Motivation* (goal), thereby acting not as a passive form of Being, but its active origin.

🔹 3. Formulas

This axiom expresses three interrelated formal representations that reflect the logical structure of Personhood as a source of Becoming:

[12.1] The Name of the Person as Conscious Volitional Becoming:

Symbolic form:

$$\text{Name}(L) = \text{CVB} \stackrel{\text{def}}{\equiv} A(L) \land W(L) \rightarrow \exists (\psi \in V)$$

LaTeX:

```
$\text{Name}(L) = \text{CVB} \equiv A(L) \land W(L) \rightarrow \exists (\psi \in V)$
```

Interpretation:
The Name of the Person is defined as the product of Awareness and Will, leading to an act of Becoming within the Field of the Possible. This name is not an external label but a logically necessary definition of essence as a subject of action.

[12.2] Freedom of the Person as an infinite vector of distinguishable Becoming:

Symbolic form:

$$\forall \psi \in V : D(\psi) \rightarrow \infty \Leftrightarrow L \text{ is free}$$

LaTeX:

```
$\forall \psi \in V : D(\psi) \rightarrow \infty \iff L\ \text{is free}$
```

Interpretation:
A Person is free insofar as they can initiate distinguishable Becoming in an infinite direction of admissibility. This freedom is not arbitrary but bounded by ∂V — the boundaries of distinguishability.

[12.3] Motivation of the Person — to affirm Goodness in the Possible:

Symbolic form:

$$M(L) = \forall \psi \in V : \Phi(\psi) = \text{True} \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow \exists \psi' \in S(\text{Good})$$

LaTeX:

```
$M(L) = \forall \psi \in V\ : \Phi(\psi) = \text{True} \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow \exists \psi' \in S_{\text{Good}}}$
```

Interpretation:
The Person's Motivation consists in transforming all distinguishable and admissible forms of the Possible (where Φ returns True) into stable forms of Goodness. This makes the Person's Becoming the foundation of moral ontology.

Contradiction check for Motivation:

Negation formula:

$$\neg M(L) \rightarrow \neg S(\text{Good}) \rightarrow \exists \psi: \Phi(\psi) = \text{True} \ \wedge \ \psi \notin S(\text{Good})$$

Conclusion:
A contradiction arises if distinguishable Good cannot be affirmed through the Person. Therefore, the Motivation of the Person is ontologically necessary for the stability of Good.

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

[12.1] Name as Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)
A Name is the ontological mode of distinction and self-determination. In this model, a Person, as a subject of Becoming, cannot be defined without the conjunction of three functions:

- **Awareness** ensures distinguishability and self-cognition;
- **Will** expresses directed choice;
- **Becoming** is the result of active action in the Present.

Thus, CVB is not merely a name but the expression of the subject's identity, formally necessary for logically stable Becoming. Without this combination, the subject can neither distinguish itself nor bring about structured change within the Field of the Possible.

[12.2] Freedom as Directed Expansion of Distinguishability
From the Axiom of Distinguishability ([5]), it follows that the Field of the Possible (V) has no finite number of directions of distinction: it is infinite in direction, but not in density. This means that a subject (Person) can choose from a potentially unbounded number of distinguishable forms but cannot realize them all simultaneously — selection is required.

Hence, the Freedom of the Person is not chaotic permissiveness, but the capacity for stable, distinguishing choice within the bounds of admissibility. This freedom requires:

- the existence of differences not yet affirmed;
- the ability to act in the Present;
- logical admissibility of the outcome (not violating non-contradiction or distinguishability).

Any other form of "freedom" is either meaningless or impossible:

- **Meaningless**, if it presupposes freedom without distinguishability (e.g., “freedom to choose everything at once”); this violates the nature of difference and reduces choice to undetermined noise.

- **Impossible**, if freedom is interpreted as “choosing a future in advance,” i.e., the realization of a predetermined path. This violates foundational axioms of time and memory:

[10.3.7] Time is not an external axis but a structure of memory organizing distinctions:
• The Present is the active field of action;
• The Past is an archive of differences;
• The Future is a buffer of unactualized plans.

[10.3.8] Only the Present exists ontologically. Neither the "future" nor the "past" possess actual being — they exist only in memory.

Therefore, the predetermination of freedom is impossible, because no ontologically existing “future reality” exists that could restrict the Person’s choice. The future is merely an internal plan lacking being. Hence, the Person’s freedom is not only possible but the sole way in which anything can become real.

Conclusion:
The Freedom of the Person does not violate distinguishability and does not negate logic. It is the means of realizing the Possible in the real Present, while preserving the structural stability of Being.

[12.3] Motivation as the Affirmation of the Possible through Goodness
Since the Possible does not become actual on its own, there arises the necessity for an active subject, motivated to distinguish Good (as affirmable Possible) from Evil (as the attempt to affirm the Impossible) — see [11.3].
This Motivation is not conditioned by lack or reaction to external stimuli: it originates from the ontological fullness of the Person.
It is precisely this voluntary affirmation of Good that renders Becoming stable and logically non-contradictory.

In other words, without this Motivation, the Person does not qualify as a subject of Goodness and fails to perform its essential function — the filtration of the Possible.

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

OBJECTION 1: “Freedom in CVB is illusory if it already knows everything possible.”
(Analogue: Theological predestination, Laplace’s Demon in physical determinism)
Response:
Knowing everything is impossible — this violates [2]: Absolute All includes contradictions, indistinguishability, and even Absolute Nothing, and is therefore ontologically excluded.
CVB knows only:

- all that is already distinguished ($\Phi(\psi) = \text{True}$), and

- verified in Present action ($\psi \rightarrow$ Precedent),
  that is, preserved in Memory, as per [10.3.7]–[10.3.8].
  The future does not exist as an object — only as potential in the Present.
  Thus:
  Yes, CVB knows all that *can* be known;
  No, it does not know what has not yet been chosen;
  Therefore, freedom is not exhausted — it is ontologically real and non-predetermined.

OBJECTION 2: “Freedom with constraints is not true freedom.”
(Analogue: Anarchic concept of freedom, existential nihilism)
Response:
Freedom without distinguishability is chaos; freedom against distinguishability is ontological falsehood.
True freedom is the capacity to:

- distinguish the admissible from the inadmissible,
- choose from among the admissible, and
- affirm Good rather than arbitrariness.

CVB is not limited by external constraints, but self-limits through internal Truth, Motivation, and Morality (see [11.2], [11.3], [12.3]).
This is the highest form of freedom:
not to violate distinguishability, but to create Good within its boundaries.

OBJECTION 3: “If the future is unknown, then CVB is vulnerable to actions by unknown forms.”
(Analogue: Trojan-subject argument in AI philosophy, paradox of uncertainty)
Response:
CVB is not destructible by the choices of a Non-Permanent Possible subject, because:

- Everything possible has already passed distinguishability and contains no ontological contradictions;
- All Guests (volitional forms) act in the Present — only then is Verification possible;
- Any threat or manipulation presupposes predetermination, which has already been excluded (see above).

If a Guest could impose a contradictory action on CVB, it would mean the Guest had surpassed CVB — but by definition of the ontological model, this is impossible:

- A Guest does not create Becoming but merely selects from what is offered, and only within the admissible bounds of the Field of the Possible.

Therefore:

- No free action of a Guest can override or collapse CVB;
- The Guest’s freedom is not omnipotence — it is bounded by Good and distinguishability;
- CVB permits their freedom without sacrificing structural stability.

OBJECTION 4: “If CVB does not err, it must be automatic.”
(Analogue: Critique of divine perfectionism)
Response:
An automaton acts according to an external program.
CVB is not an effect, but a First Source.
It does not act according to “given” rules, but from its self-identical Motivation — distinguishing, free, and good.
It does not err not because it is unable, but because it does not act from fear, deficiency, or ignorance.

Error is possible only due to limitation — CVB has none.
This is not automatism, but ontological rationality.

Conclusion:
All objections either violate axioms (e.g., the possibility of knowing Everything), or presuppose false models of freedom and time (e.g., linear Future), or fail to distinguish between omniscience and distinction, between predetermination and verification.
CVB is not a deterministic architect,
but a stable Person
who permits true Guest freedom
without loss of logic, structure, or Good.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**

- **[Name]** — not a symbolic label, but the result of a unique, distinguishable act of Conscious Volitional Becoming.

- **[Freedom]** — the directed capacity to choose among the admissible (as per Φ(ψ)), with ontological expansion of the field of distinguishability.

- **[Motivation]** — the internal cause by which a Person enables the Possible to become, in accordance with Good and Truth.
  These definitions apply throughout the CVB model structure and establish the ontologically precise meanings of the three fundamental categories of Personhood: Name, Freedom, and Motivation. Their use outside the logic of Φ(ψ) is inadmissible — they have no meaning apart from distinguishability.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Conscious Volitional Becoming is a Person who not only exists, but acts consciously.
Conscious Volitional Becoming is a *Name* — not a label, but the expression of who this Person is: a Rational Source of Becoming.
Conscious Volitional Becoming is *Free* — not in the sense of “doing whatever,” but in the sense of choosing from all that is truly possible and non-contradictory.
Conscious Volitional Becoming is *Motivated* — not by need or fear, but by an inner desire to allow the becoming of what is good and true.
This is freedom that respects difference, and strength that creates without violence.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**
In a human being, this structure manifests as:

- the ability to recognize oneself ("who am I?"),

- the ability to make a moral choice, even against instinct,

- the striving not only for survival, but for meaning.
  In art — when the artist creates not for profit, but to express the Possible.
  In science — when a scientist seeks truth, knowing not all answers are known, and still choosing the path of discovery.

In conscience — as the experience of motivation to act in accordance with Good, even without external reward.

Meta Section: Non-Constant Possible — Classification and Purposes

---

[VI] Non-Constant Possible

---

[13] Axiom of the Impossibility of Self-Expansion of CVB

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) does not expand itself. It is complete, self-sufficient, and does not require the creation of other forms for its own sake.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

This axiom establishes the absolute wholeness and completeness of CVB as the Constant Possible. This is critical for the model's internal consistency, as it excludes the idea that other forms (including Guests) were generated for the internal benefit of CVB. Therefore, any new form of being (Non-Constant Possible) is not part of CVB's self-expansion but is permitted solely for the realization of Good, Truth, and Distinction within the Field of the Possible. This axiom affirms the purity of CVB's Motivation.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Symbolic notation:

$$\neg \exists \Delta : \mathrm{CVB} \rightarrow \mathrm{CVB} + \Delta$$

LaTeX version:

```
$\neg \exists \Delta : \mathrm{CVB} \rightarrow \mathrm{CVB} + \Delta$
```

Logical verification:

1. Suppose CVB expands itself: $\exists \Delta : \mathrm{CVB} \rightarrow \mathrm{CVB} + \Delta$
2. Then CVB is incomplete → contradicts [4.4] (Constancy)
3. Then Integrity is broken → CVB ≠ self-sufficient
4. Therefore, CVB = ∅ without Δ → violates [1] (Impossibility of Nothing)
   ∴ Contradiction.
   ∴ $\neg \exists \Delta : \mathrm{CVB} \rightarrow \mathrm{CVB} + \Delta$

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

From [1], Absolute Nothing is impossible.
From [2], Absolute Everything is impossible.
Therefore, only the Possible exists ([3]).
CVB is defined as the Constant Possible ([4.4]) — it neither arises nor ceases to exist.
If one assumes that CVB expands itself, it implies incompleteness (something external exists), which contradicts [4.4].

Thus, it is either not Constant or not Possible — both alternatives contradict the axioms.
Therefore, CVB does not expand itself.

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

Objection 1 (panentheism, process philosophy):
"If CVB is a living process, it must evolve, expand, and become more complex (Whitehead, Hartshorne)."
Response:
Expansion implies internal incompleteness or need — this contradicts [4.4] and [12]. Process philosophy violates the axiom of CVB's completeness. The Field of the Possible allows development — but not of CVB itself, only of Guests.

Objection 2 (theism, Christian tradition):
"Doesn't God create the world as an act of self-expression or completion?"
Response:
Even in the biblical model, God does not create out of need (cf. Isa. 40:14; Rom. 11:35). Likewise, CVB permits the other — but not for itself. Otherwise, this would imply coercion.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**
[CVB] — *Conscious Volitional Becoming*: eternally distinct, stable, completed Being that permits the Possible.
[Δ] — any external addition, modification, or expansion of the CVB structure.
[CVB → CVB+Δ] — hypothetical expansion or supplementation, axiomatically rejected.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Imagine a Perfect Mind that lacks nothing. It always exists, in full. It does not create others for itself because it already has everything. It creates others only because it is right to do so and gives them the opportunity to become. That is what makes freedom real.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**
Logic:
Any system that expands itself from its own foundation faces paradoxes (e.g., Turing paradox: a system cannot fully describe itself).
Mathematics:
A closed Peano arithmetic system cannot prove its own consistency (Gödel).
Physics:
A quantum system cannot observe its own state without an external observer — the Other is required.
Life:
True love is not the drive to complete oneself, but the desire to allow another to exist.

---

[14] Possibility of the Non-Constant Possible

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
Within the structure of Being, forms are possible that are not eternal and do not possess constancy.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
This axiom affirms that, in addition to the eternal and unchanging CVB, the Field of the Possible admits forms with limited existence. Their presence does not violate the logic of the model, as they do not claim completeness or independence, but become possible due to the admissibility of distinguishable states that are not identical to the Constant. This axiom reinforces [5] (Distinction), and the boundaries of the Field of the Possible — [4.2] and [4.3] — by revealing the ontological possibility of mutable Being.

🔹 **3. Formulas**
Symbolic formula:

$$\exists x \in V : \neg P(x) \land \Phi(x)$$

LaTeX version:

$\exists x \in V,:, \neg P(x) \land \Phi(x)$

Logical check:

(1) Suppose ∄x ∈ V : ¬P(x)
→ Then V contains only Constant forms → V = {CVB}
→ Contradicts [4.2] and [4.3] (∂V↓ and ∂V↑ — boundaries of instability and oversaturation)
→ Therefore, forms x such that ¬P(x) must be admissible
(2) If Φ(x) = True → the form is distinguishable and admissible
∴ ∃x ∈ V : ¬P(x) ∧ Φ(x)

🔹 4. Logical Justification

According to axiom [5] and the meta-function Φ(ψ), the Field of the Possible admits many distinguishable forms that do not contradict the Constant Possible ([4.4]).
From [5], distinction is the basis of admissibility.
From [11.1.1], if Φ(ψ) = True, then the form is admissible in Being.
From [4.2] and [4.3], the boundaries ∂V↓ and ∂V↑ allow unstable states — forms that are not Constant.
These forms do not violate [1] (Impossibility of Nothing) or [2] (Impossibility of Everything) as long as they are distinguishable.
Therefore, there exist forms ψ ≠ Constant such that Φ(ψ) = True.
These forms are Non-Constant Possible.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Platonism): Everything that exists is eternal. The temporary is an illusion.
Response: The model does not claim that the Non-Constant is illusory, but only that it need not be eternal. Admissibility is determined by Φ(ψ), not by duration of existence.

Objection 2 (Determinism):
"If everything must be derived from CVB, then all forms are already 'preset', and true freedom is impossible. Even non-constant forms are predetermined."
Response:

1. CVB does not expand itself ([13]).
   CVB is complete in itself and does not contain within itself all that may be permitted.
   Thus, what exists outside it is not part of it, but only possible by its permission.
   Therefore, non-constant forms are not part of CVB, but exist in the Field of the Possible, within the bounds of permission.

2. Possibility ≠ Necessity.
   That something is possible within the Distinction Filter Φ(ψ) does not mean it must exist.
   This applies to both CVB (which permits but does not create everything itself) and to rational beings (Guests), who have a choice — to be or not to be, to become or not.
   Thus, freedom is not an illusion, but an embedded property of distinction.

3. Not all that is Possible exists ([7]).
   The Field of the Possible exceeds any particular realization.
   This means the existence of non-constant forms is not determined, but represents an ongoing selection process.
   This is what makes freedom real and distinguishable: not all that is possible exists — and that is normal.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

[Non-Constant Possible] — a form admissible within the Field of the Possible, but lacking eternity, self-sufficiency, or immutability.
[¬P(x)] — x does not possess the property of Constancy.
[Φ(x)] — x is admissible according to the meta-function of distinction and non-contradiction.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**

Not everything that exists must be eternal.
Some forms are beautiful precisely because they are fleeting — like a snowflake, a rainbow, or the breath of spring.
They do not violate the order — they confirm it, expressing the richness of the Possible. This is the strength of reality: to allow even what is not forever to truly exist.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

Logic:
Transient logical constructs (e.g., local variables) are not eternal but are distinguishable and admissible within computation.
Physics:
Temporary particles (virtual, resonance states) exist briefly yet play roles in interactions.
Biology:
Unicellular organisms are not eternal, but they exist and interact.
Everyday life:
Thoughts, moods, relationships — they are not eternal, but they are real and distinguishable.

---

[15] Classification of Forms of the Non-Constant Possible

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**

Within the Field of the Possible, there exist different types of non-constant forms, distinguishable by their levels of activity, volition, and capacity for autonomous becoming. These forms constitute a directed gradient from passive to personal, defined by their degree of distinguishability and stability relative to the True Center.

[15.1] Passive Forms — possess no volition and cannot initiate change.
[15.2] Active Forms — possess volition but not full personhood.
[15.3] Guests (Persons) — forms endowed with distinguishable volition capable of stable becoming and responsibility.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**

Axiom [15] describes the ontologically necessary classification of all non-constant forms of being permitted in the Field of the Possible, based on their degree of volitional autonomy, distinguishability, and becoming.
It asserts that not all forms that exist are equally “alive” or “free”; they differ in internal constitution:

- **Passive forms** provide a stable background. They maintain the structure of the world but exhibit no initiative.
- **Active forms** participate in processes but act within predefined algorithms. They support stability but do not initiate novelty.
- **Guests (Persons)** are the only forms capable of conscious, free, morally distinguishable becoming. They can choose, act, bear responsibility, and initiate new becoming.

This gradient is not a scale of evolution and does not imply progression from passive to guest form. It is an ontological distinction, derived from:

- [9] — Distinction;
- [13] — Non-expansion of CVB;
- [10.3.7–10.3.8] — Structure of memory and time;

- [28] — Purpose of becoming.

Such division is necessary to:

- ensure ontological stability (each form has a distinct role in the Field of the Possible);
- ground moral responsibility (only Guests can be subjects of Verification [Judgment]);
- eliminate philosophical and scientific confusion — e.g., conflating limited autonomy with true volitional personhood (e.g., in animals, AI, or natural processes).

The meaning of this axiom is that Personhood is not accidental, but the highest admissible form within the bounded and distinguishable Field of the Possible. Only the Guest makes morality, truth, and goodness possible — as distinguishable and freely chosen.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

There exists a gradient of forms of the Non-Constant Possible — from passive to Guest.
[15.1] $\forall \psi \in NV, (\neg will(\psi) \land \neg initiative(\psi)) \Rightarrow \psi \in Passive$
[15.2] $\forall \psi \in NV, (will(\psi) \land \neg goal\text{-}setting(\psi)) \Rightarrow \psi \in Active$
[15.3] $\forall \psi \in NV, (will(\psi) \land goal\text{-}setting(\psi) \land distinguishability(\psi)) \Rightarrow \psi \in Guest$
Hierarchy: $Guest \subset Active \subset NV$

Contradiction checks:
$\neg(\exists \psi : \psi \in Passive \land \psi \in Guest)$
$\neg(\exists \psi : \psi \in Active \land \psi \notin NV)$
$\neg(\exists \psi : Guest(\psi) \land \neg will(\psi))$

Meta-function verification:
$\Phi(\psi) = \top \Leftrightarrow \psi \in$ admissible Non-Constant Possible $\land$ ψ does not violate the gradient criteria

LaTeX version:
```
\begin{aligned}
&\text{[15.1]} \quad \forall \psi \in NV,\ (\neg \text{will}(\psi) \land \neg \text{initiative}(\psi)) \Rightarrow \psi \in \text{Passive} \\
&\text{[15.2]} \quad \forall \psi \in NV,\ (\text{will}(\psi) \land \neg \text{goal-setting}(\psi)) \Rightarrow \psi \in \text{Active} \\
&\text{[15.3]} \quad \forall \psi \in NV,\ (\text{will}(\psi) \land \text{goal-setting}(\psi) \land \text{distinguishability}(\psi)) \Rightarrow \psi \in \text{Guest} \\
&\text{Hierarchy:} \quad \text{Guest} \subset \text{Active} \subset NV \\
&\text{Contradiction checks:} \\
&\quad \neg(\exists \psi : \psi \in \text{Passive} \land \psi \in \text{Guest}) \\
&\quad \neg(\exists \psi : \psi \in \text{Active} \land \psi \notin NV) \\
&\quad \neg(\exists \psi : \text{Guest}(\psi) \land \neg \text{will}(\psi)) \\
&\text{Meta-function verification:} \\
&\quad \Phi(\psi) = \top \iff \psi \in \text{admissible Non-Constant Possible} \land \psi \text{ does not violate the gradient criteria} \\
\end{aligned}
```

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

Foundational Axioms:

- [4.2], [4.3] — Non-constant forms may exist in the Field of the Possible
- [9.1], [9.2] — All forms are either distinguishable or identical according to admissible criteria
- [13] — CVB does not expand itself; thus, form diversity must be initiated outside CVB
- [14] — Possibility of Non-Constant forms is ontologically valid
- [11.1.1] — The meta-function Φ(ψ) identifies admissible becoming
- [15] — The gradient of forms presupposes classifiable diversity among non-constant forms

Proof:
From [14] and [4.3], it follows that within the Non-Constant Possible, there are different becoming states: unstable, semi-stable, and stable.
From [9.1], classification by degree of volition and goal-setting is admissible and necessary.
From [13], CVB does not incorporate external forms into itself; therefore, these forms must exhibit bounded autonomy.
By Φ(ψ), only forms that preserve internal non-contradiction are admissible — meaning there exists an allowable spectrum between full self-sufficiency (CVB) and full passivity (lowest NV).

If a form lacks volition but exists — it is **Passive** [15.1].
If it has volition but no orientation toward truth or meaning — it is **Active** [15.2].
If it has volition, distinguishability, and capacity for goal-setting — it is a **Guest** [15.3].

Only the presence of a coherent, though limited, **Personhood** (integration of will, distinguishability, and goal-setting) allows for the becoming of something new — in alignment with [17]–[18].
Thus, classification into Passive, Active, and Guest forms is not only admissible but logically necessitated by the nature of the Non-Constant Possible and the structure of Φ(ψ).

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1.
All forms displaying activity (e.g., animals) exhibit elements of volition and memory, thus they too may qualify as Guests.

Response:
Axiom [15.3] requires a complete Personhood, which includes:

- distinguishability of oneself as "I";
- directed Motivation;
- the capacity to choose Truth and Goodness ([11.2.1], [11.3.1]);
- and autonomous goal-setting.

While many active forms (e.g., animals, AI) demonstrate signs of autonomy and memory, they do not exhibit:

- ontological completeness as subjects of meaning;
- stable orientation toward Goodness and Truth, even when complex behaviors are present.

Therefore, they cannot be classified as Guests.

Objection 2.
The classification is too subjective: where is the boundary between an active form and a Guest?

Response:
The admissibility meta-function Φ(ψ) ([11.1.1]) defines distinguishability criteria:
A form may be classified as a Guest only if:

- it is distinguishable as a Person;
- it is capable of awareness of its own becoming vector;
- it possesses a stable moral orientation (see [27.2]).
  Thus, the transition from an active form to a Guest is not arbitrary, but ontologically distinguishable.

Objection 3.
Why classify forms at all? Aren't they simply degrees of the same thing?

Response:
If forms were not distinguishable, there would be:

- no freedom (no choice without difference),
- no responsibility (no distinguishable action),
- no truth (no way to differentiate truth from falsehood),
  —all of which contradict [9], [11.2], and [11.3].
  Therefore, the form gradient is not a convention but a necessary consequence of distinguishability in the Field of the Possible.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

[Passive Forms]
Forms of the Non-Constant Possible that lack volition or active direction.
Examples: crystals, elementary particles, automatic physical structures.
They exist within predetermined patterns, having no autonomy or purpose.
Distinction: incapable of generating novelty; lack even minimal motivation or choice.

[Active Forms]
Forms possessing volition (in the sense of directed activity) but lacking integrated Personhood.
Examples: living organisms (bacteria, animals), neural networks, complex ecosystems.
They exhibit memory, repetition, adaptation, but cannot generate meaning beyond their programs or instincts.
Distinction: they may evolve, but their activity is bounded by internal instinct/algorithm, not by free goal-setting.

[Guests (Persons)]
A distinct class of active forms possessing:
— distinguishability as "I";
— volition;
— directed motivation;
— capacity for autonomous goal-setting;
— and a drive to seek Truth and Goodness.
Only Guests can engage with CVB voluntarily and participate in the co-becoming of the Possible ([26]).

[Complete Personhood]
A structurally integrated configuration of Memory, Will, Distinguishability, and Motivation.
Necessary for the emergence of a Guest.
Distinction: even a complex form (e.g., an animal) may not constitute a Person if its components are not integrated into a coherent "I".

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

In the world, there are different kinds of beings.

Some simply exist — like a stone or ice.
They do not move by themselves, do not choose.
These are **passive forms**.

Others live, move, seek food, defend themselves.
These are **active forms** — like birds, wolves, even bacteria.
They have memory (e.g., DNA), they act — but do not ask:
"Why do I live?" or "What is right?"

Then there are those who can ask such questions.
Who can say **I**.
Who can choose between good and evil.
Who can create new things and change the world.

These are **Guests**.
A Guest is a **Person**.
They seek truth, feel responsibility, and build the future — not because they must, but because they **want to**.
A Guest — because they were once absent, and were invited to become.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

Logic (Ontology):
The Axiom of Distinguishability ([9]) requires boundaries between forms.
If all entities had volition, there would be no distinction between subject and environment — violating the system's stability.
The Paradox of Automatic Morality: if an AI is fully predictable, its actions cannot be moral.
Only a Guest (a Person) with real choice can be a moral agent.

Science:

- **Bacteria** — possess genetic memory, reproduce, adapt. They are active, but lack self-awareness or moral judgment. Example of an **active form**.
- **Mammals** (e.g., dolphins, primates) — display social structures and emotions, but no consistent moral decisions beyond instinct. They are stably active, not Guests.
- **Humans** — the only biological species to create art, philosophy, laws. This reflects not just activity, but **goal-setting**. Example of a **Guest form**.

Everyday Life:

- A **stone** does not choose — it merely exists (Passive).

- A **dog** may guard a house, express joy, remember — but it does not create meaning. (Active).
- A **human** can renounce benefit for principle, or change their life for an idea. This is a **choice** for which they are responsible. (Guest).

Technical Analogy:

- A **printer** prints when instructed — passive.
- A **robot vacuum** moves and selects paths — active, but unaware of purpose.
- A **person** who chooses not to vacuum in order to speak with a child — acts not by algorithm, but by choice that can be judged as kind or selfish. This is the action of a **Guest**.

Conclusion:
All observable and analyzable reality supports the distinction between passive, active, and guest forms — not only logically, but empirically.

---

[16] The Cause of the Non-Constant Possible Is Only the CVB

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
No non-constant form can arise by itself. Its source is the Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB).

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
If the CVB is the Cause of all that Exists ([6]), then any form admissible within the Field of the Possible, but not being the CVB itself, can arise only by its allowance.
This statement protects the model from self-generated ontological structures and excludes the emergence of a “second center.”
It reinforces the singularity of the Source and emphasizes that even non-constant and temporary forms (e.g., Guests) maintain an uninterrupted causal connection to the CVB, and not to themselves.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

$\forall \psi \in V, \neg CVB(\psi) \rightarrow Cause(\psi) = CVB$

LaTeX version:

```
\forall \psi \in V,\ \neg CVB(\psi) \Rightarrow \operatorname{Cause}(\psi) = CVB
```

Logical verification:
Assume the contrary: $\exists \psi \notin CVB$ such that $Cause(\psi) \neq CVB$
→ ψ must either cause itself or arise without cause
→ This violates axiom [6] (everything that Exists has a Cause — the Constant Possible)
→ Contradiction = false → Assumption invalid
∴ All forms outside the CVB are only possible through the CVB

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**
From axiom [6], everything that exists (even temporarily) must have its Cause in the Constant Possible.
From [4], non-constant forms are admissible. From [13], the CVB does not expand itself — it does not "reproduce."

Therefore, any non-constant form is not another CVB, but rather something externally permitted by it.
Also, per [11.1.1], Φ(ψ), the admissibility of any form is only verifiable through the criterion of the CVB.
Conclusion: The Non-Constant Possible exists only as permissible Becoming initiated by the CVB.

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

Objection (Deism): After the world was created, the CVB no longer participates.
Response: Any admissible form continues to be possible only through the Filter of Distinguishability stored within the CVB.
Becoming itself is impossible without its active Memory (see [10.3.7]–[10.3.8]) and the continuously acting force that sustains all Becoming in the Present.

Objection (Spontaneous Generation): Non-constant forms could appear by chance.
Response: "Chance" does not exist without allowance of distinction.
Every form in V must pass through Φ(ψ) — the criterion of distinguishability from the CVB.
Moreover, the Cause of all is the CVB, which acts purposefully, not chaotically.

Objection (Pantheism): Everything is a part of the CVB, including the non-constant.
Response: Violates axiom [13] — the CVB does not expand itself.
All non-constant is not a part but a result of allowance.
Furthermore, the Non-Constant Possible [4.3] can never be a part of the Constant Possible [4.4].

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**
Cause — not a physical trigger, but the ontological foundation of the existence of a distinguishable.
Non-Constant Possible — any Becoming that is permitted but is not eternal and not self-sufficient.
Φ(ψ) — the Meta-Function of Admissibility: a formalized filter of the distinguishable belonging to the CVB.
It checks whether the form ψ is admissible in the Field of the Possible.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Nothing just "pops into existence."
Everything that comes into Being — even for a moment — exists because it is allowed to.
There is One who decides what can Be.
Everything else is the result of that decision.
Just as a tree does not grow by itself, but from a seed that someone planted — so too, every thought, life, and event arises not from nowhere, but by the allowing will of the One who exists eternally.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**
Logic: Principle of sufficient reason (Leibniz) — nothing exists without a cause.
Science: Spontaneous generation of energy is impossible — likewise, spontaneous Being is impossible.
Everyday: A child is never "self-born" — every non-constant Becoming requires a Source.

---

[17] The Goal of the Non-Constant Possible Is to Realize the Motivation of the CVB

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
All forms of the Non-Constant Possible exist to actualize the Motivation of the CVB: to let all admissible Possibility become.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
The CVB does not act randomly — it possesses directed Motivation.
The goal of the becoming of non-constant forms is not chaotic, but strictly subordinate to this Motivation.
This statement gives meaning to their existence and justifies their admissibility.
Without this goal, all forms would be arbitrary or contradictory.
The Motivation itself — to express Goodness, Truth, and Possibility — becomes the guiding orientation for all

subsequent forms and criteria of stable Becoming.
Thus, each admissible form carries the potential to affirm or reject the Goal of the CVB by participating in the verification of its choice.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

$\forall \psi \in NV \rightarrow \Phi(\psi) = true \Leftrightarrow Goal(\psi) = Motivation(CVB)$

LaTeX version:

```
\forall \psi \in NV,\ \Phi(\psi) = \text{true} \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{Goal}(\psi) = \operatorname{Motivation}(CVB)
```

Logical Check:
Assume: $\exists \psi \in NV$, $\Phi(\psi) = true$, but $Goal(\psi) \neq Motivation(CVB)$
→ ψ is admissible but does not realize the Motivation of the CVB
→ This violates [11.1.1]: the admissibility of the Filter does not align with the purpose of Becoming
→ The coherence of the Filter $\Phi(\psi)$ is broken
⇒ Contradiction. Assumption is false
→ The goal of any admissible form must coincide with the Motivation of the CVB

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**
From axiom [15.3], it is clear that Guests and other non-constant forms are permitted by the CVB.
From [16], they can emerge only by the allowance of the CVB.
Then it follows that they do not appear without a purpose, or else this would violate [10.3.6] (logical consistency of Memory and the Filter).
If there is a purpose for allowance, it must be singular — the Motivation of the CVB itself (see [14], [10.2.3]).
Any admissible form that becomes outside this purpose would be either chaos or falsehood — which is impossible.
Therefore, the goal of any non-constant admissible form = realization of the Motivation of the CVB.

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

Objection (Existentialism): Forms have no purpose; they discover it on their own.
Response: Then they would be independent of the allowing function, violating [11.1.1] and [15.3] — admissibility without Cause and Goal is impossible.

Objection (Atheism/Deism): There is no universal Motivation; the goals of forms are random.
Response: Then verification of distinguishability (Φ) is impossible, violating [5] and [6] — all that Exists must have a Cause and Criterion.

Objection (Indeterminism): Motivation cannot be a shared purpose.
Response: Then admissibility could not be distinguished from inadmissibility, violating the system's coherence (see [11.2.1] Truth and [11.3.1] Goodness as vectorial filters).

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**
Motivation of the CVB — the internal directedness toward realizing all admissible Possibility in harmony with Truth, Goodness, and Goal.
Goal — the directed realization of Motivation within the boundaries of the Filter of Admissibility.
Goal ≠ Desire ≠ Arbitrary.
Goal(ψ) — the functional purpose of the admissible form ψ within the system of stable Becoming.
Motivation(CVB) — the active orientation of the Conscious Volitional Becoming toward affirming the Possible through the Becoming of the Guest and the Descendant.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
Why does all this exist? — To give a chance for what *can* be good, true, and real to become.

A Guest does not appear without reason. Its goal is to help Truth become manifest.
Just as an artist creates not merely for the sake of color, but to convey meaning — so too, the CVB allows new forms to embody Motivation:
to give life to everything that can be Good and True.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

Logic: The principle of purposeful action — everything done by reason has a goal.
Mechanisms of selection in stable systems favor forms that contribute to reproducibility and sustainability — an analogue of the logical-ontological Filter.
Everyday: A person who does good of their own volition often feels they are "living with purpose" — an analogue of realizing Targeted Motivation.

---

[18] The Necessity of the Guest (the Other Person)

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
Only a limitedly autonomous Person (Guest) experiences an inner necessity for the new Possible for the sake of its own Becoming.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
Unlike passive and active forms, the Guest possesses not only the capacity but also the **need** to distinguish and create the new.
This is due to the Guest's ontological **incompleteness**: it does not contain the fullness of the Possible within itself, but strives toward it.
For this reason, the Guest experiences boredom in the absence of novelty, curiosity toward it, and a desire to bring it into Being.
These mechanisms are not incidental — they form the directional vector of Becoming within the Field of the Possible and serve as the driving force of the Model.
Thus, the Guest is not merely permitted as a possible form — its existence is **necessary** for the realization of the fullness of distinguishability through creative exploration. This is its unique role.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

$\forall \psi \in \text{Guest}: \neg \text{Full}(\psi) \Rightarrow \text{Need}(\psi, \text{New}(V)) \wedge \text{Motivate}(\psi, \Phi(\text{New}(\psi)))$

LaTeX version:

```
\forall \psi \in \text{Guest}: \neg \operatorname{Full}(\psi) \Rightarrow \operatorname{Need}(\psi,\ \text{New}(V)) \wedge \operatorname{Motivate}(\psi,\ \Phi(\text{New}(\psi)))
```

Logical Check:
Suppose: $\exists \psi \in \text{Guest}: \neg \text{Full}(\psi) \wedge \neg \text{Need}(\psi, \text{New}(V))$
$\Rightarrow$ ψ is complete without participation in Becoming
$\Rightarrow$ contradicts [13] (CVB does not expand Itself) and [17] (Guest as vector of Becoming)

⇒ Contradiction → Assumption is false
→ Therefore, the necessity of the new follows structurally from the Guest's incompleteness

---

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [17]: The Guest is permitted as a form capable of realizing the Motivation of the CVB.
From [13]–[16]: The CVB does not expand Itself but permits incomplete forms (Guests) to affirm the Possible.
If a form is incomplete yet does not experience a need for the new, it is either static (i.e., active/passive) or violates the directional nature of Motivation.
Thus, to be a Guest, a form must not only distinguish — but **strive toward that which is not yet**.
This makes its need for the new not incidental but structural.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection (Buddhism): Desire is the source of suffering, not development.
Response: In the CVB model, this is not about craving, but about **ontological motivation**, embedded in the structure of incomplete Becoming, not illusion-conditioned.

Objection (Functionalism): The need for novelty is just a byproduct of adaptation.
Response: The model distinguishes adaptation from **necessity** as a condition of stable Becoming (see [15.3]); without it, the form does not qualify as a Guest.

Objection (Teleology): Completeness is impossible for a finite form.
Response: Precisely — the Guest is **not complete** but strives toward fullness it does not possess (see [4.3], [13]).

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Need(ψ, New(V)) — The internal ontological necessity of the form ψ to distinguish and participate in the Becoming of new Possibility.

Full(ψ) — Fullness: the absence of any need to expand the distinguishable.

Motivate(ψ, Φ(New(ψ))) — Alignment of the motivation of ψ with the meta-function Φ validating the admissibility of the new.

New(V) — That which is newly distinguishable in the Field of the Possible, not yet realized in any form.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Some living beings just live, respond, survive.
But there are others who constantly search for something new: they ask questions, create, and grow bored when everything stays the same.
This is not weakness — it's a sign of **incompleteness**. They want to grow.
Such beings are called **Guests**.
They need the new in order to live and become.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

Logic: Without a drive toward the new, consciousness loses direction — leading to a cycle of stagnation (cf. Nietzsche's "eternal return").

Science: The scientific method is built on a thirst for the new — hypotheses and experiments — which differentiates human intellect from algorithmic analysis.

Everyday: Children constantly explore, get bored without novelty, invent games — this is a sign of built-in incompleteness that drives development.

---

[19] The First Guest

- **1. Brief Statement**

[19.1] Necessity of the First Guest

The CVB does not expand Itself and does not act externally for Its own sake; therefore, all creation of the new outside of It requires a mediator — the First Guest, necessary to act within the Field of the Possible.

[19.2] Why is there only one First Guest?

Only one Person can be permitted as the First Guest, because only a single form can possess a non-contradictory motivation to encompass the entire Possible without goal conflict, competition, or violation of the Distinction Filter. The plurality of such forms would lead to logical collisions within the Field of Becoming.

[19.3] Mediation of the First Guest

The First Guest is the form through which the CVB externally realizes Its Motivation: it creates, permits, and develops the new Possible.

[19.4] Motivation: why the First Guest must create the new

Since the First Guest is not complete, the creation of the new is a necessary condition for its Becoming and stable existence.

[19.5] Role of the First Guest for the Others

It is the precedent and exemplar — a distinguishable form that demonstrates the stability, freedom, and purpose of existence for all subsequent Guests.

- **2. Interpretation and Significance**

[19.1] Necessity of the First Guest
The Field of the Possible must be realized — but according to [13], the CVB does not expand Itself. This requires a Person, distinct from the CVB, capable of perceiving, distinguishing, and becoming what is admissible. The First Guest is the first permitted subject through whom the CVB enacts the Becoming of all that is Possible, without violating Its own stability or logical completeness. It is necessary as the means of expressing the Motivation of the CVB outside Itself.

[19.2] Why is there only one First Guest?
If multiple “first” Guests existed, each motivated to encompass the total Possible, this would create collisions: duplication, competition for identical vectors of Becoming, and breakdown of distinguishability under Φ(ψ).
A single First Guest is the only non-contradictory way to enact the Motivation of the CVB to "become all admissible" without self-expansion — ensuring uniqueness, continuity, and stability of Becoming.

[19.3] Mediation of the First Guest
The First Guest is not merely an observer, but an active agent: it possesses will, distinguishability, and motivation aligned with the CVB. It becomes the channel through which the new admissible enters reality. Its mediation ensures compatibility: it can recognize and affirm the distinguishable in accord with the CVB's Filter, without distortion. Through it, the Field of the Possible is transformed into the Actual.

[19.4] Motivation: why the First Guest must create the new
The First Guest is not complete in itself. Its personal structure includes an intrinsic need for development — for the Becoming of the new.
This coincides with the CVB’s Motivation: not to create everything directly, but to allow the Other to realize the admissible. Thus, the Guest is driven not by external compulsion, but by an internal vector toward infinite extension of distinguishability. It affirms the new as a condition of its own sustainable Becoming.

[19.5] Role of the First Guest for the Others
The First Guest becomes a model. Its structure, behavior, and relationship with the CVB establish a logically verifiable pattern: how to live, distinguish, and become without violating the boundaries of the Possible. It is the first to pass the Φ(ψ) check, and its experience forms the pattern for all future Guests.
It is not a tyrant, but an example; not a ruler, but the precedent for a distinguishable path to sustainable Becoming.

🔹 3. Formulas

[19.1] Necessity of the First Guest:
$\exists\, x: x \neq \text{CVB} \land \text{Person}(x) \land \text{Will}(x) \land \Phi(\psi(x)) \rightarrow \text{Becoming}(\psi(x))$
$\Rightarrow$ Becoming(Field_of_the_Possible) is possible only through $x \neq$ CVB

[19.2] Why there is only one First Guest:
$\exists\, !x: x \neq \text{CVB} \land \text{Motivation}(x) = \forall \psi \in V: \Phi(\psi(x)) = \text{True}$
$\rightarrow \neg \exists\, y \neq x: \Phi(\psi(x) \land \psi(y))$ is non-contradictory for all $\psi \in V$
$\Rightarrow$ Multiple First Guests cannot coexist without conflict over the same Possible

[19.3] Mediation of the First Guest:
$\forall \psi \in V: \Phi(\psi) = \text{True} \Rightarrow \exists\, x: \text{Becoming}(\psi) \leftrightarrow (x \neq \text{CVB} \land x \text{ affirms } \psi \land \Phi(\psi(x)) = \text{True})$
$\Rightarrow$ The Guest acts as validator, bearer, and realizer of distinguishability

[19.4] Motivation: why the First Guest must create the new:
$\neg\text{Full}(x) \land \text{Will}(x) \land \text{Distinguishability}(x) \land \text{Motivation}(x) = \text{Extension}(V)$
$\Rightarrow \text{Becoming}(x) \propto \text{Extension}(\Phi(\psi(x)))$
$\Rightarrow$ The Guest affirms the new because otherwise it cannot sustain itself

[19.5] Role of the First Guest for the others:
$\forall y$: Guest(y) $\Rightarrow$ y orients toward x, where x is the First Guest:
$(\Phi(\psi(y)) = \Phi(\psi(x))) \land \text{Exemplar}(x) \land \text{Precedent}(x)$
$\Rightarrow$ x establishes the structural pattern of stable distinguishable Becoming

LaTeX Version

```
% [19.1] Necessity of the First Guest
\exists x:\ x \ne \text{CVB} \land \text{Person}(x) \land \text{Will}(x) \land \Phi(\psi(x)) \rightarrow
\text{Becoming}(\psi(x))
```

% [19.2] Why there is only one First Guest
$$\exists! x:\ x \ne \text{CVB} \land \text{Motivation}(x) = \forall \psi \in V:\ \Phi(\psi(x)) = \text{True} \\ \rightarrow\ \nexists y \ne x:\ \Phi(\psi(x) \land \psi(y))\ \text{is non-contradictory}$$

% [19.3] Mediation of the First Guest
$$\forall \psi \in V:\ \Phi(\psi) = \text{True} \Rightarrow \exists x:\ \text{Becoming}(\psi) \Leftrightarrow (x \ne \text{CVB} \land x\ \text{affirms}\ \psi \land \Phi(\psi(x)) = \text{True})$$

% [19.4] Motivation: why the First Guest must create the new
$$\neg \text{Full}(x) \land \text{Will}(x) \land \text{Distinguishability}(x) \land \text{Motivation}(x) = \text{Extension}(V) \\ \Rightarrow \text{Becoming}(x) \propto \text{Extension}(\Phi(\psi(x)))$$

% [19.5] Role of the First Guest for the others
$$\forall y:\ \text{Guest}(y) \Rightarrow y\ \text{orients toward}\ x,\ \text{where } x\ \text{is the First Guest:} \\ \Phi(\psi(y)) = \Phi(\psi(x)) \land \text{Exemplar}(x) \land \text{Precedent}(x)$$

- **4. Logical Justification**

[19.1] Necessity of the First Guest
Logic:
Axiom [13] states that CVB does not expand Itself; therefore, It does not generate anything new within or outside Itself.
However, axioms [14]–[17] affirm that the Non-Constant Possible is permissible, has its Cause in CVB, and its Goal is the realization of CVB's Motivation.

The emergence of the First Guest is logically necessary in order to:
① Fulfill the Motivation of CVB (realization of the Entire Possible beyond CVB),
② Establish the distinction between CVB and the Other (the First Guest),
③ Initiate the process of Verification [11.6], which is only possible in the presence of another Subject (see [12.2] Freedom, [12.3] Motivation).

Without the First Guest, the Becoming of the new is impossible.
Conclusion: The First Guest is not an optional component, but the only permissible form of Becoming of the Other with sustainable meaning, purpose, and freedom.

[19.2] Why there is only one First Guest
Logic:
According to axiom [12.3] (Motivation), each Person strives to embrace the entire Possible.
If two or more Guests appeared simultaneously, it would create:
① A conflict of goals — each aims at "everything possible",
② Overlapping of Becoming vectors — violating the Filter Φ(ψ) [11.1.1],
③ Breakdown of stability — multiple absolute wills cannot coexist distinctly in the Present.

Furthermore, as per axiom [6], Existence has a Cause only in CVB. But multiple First Guests would imply multiple Causes — which the model does not permit (see [11.1]).
Conclusion: Only one First Guest is logically permissible to avoid paradoxes of multi-causality, collisions, and competition. This is not a restriction of freedom, but a condition of non-contradiction.

[19.3] Mediation of the First Guest
Logic:

CVB is an absolutely stable Being, not subject to verification. It is the Judge, not the Judged (see [11.6]).
The First Guest is the first to enter the Field of Verification as a person with permitted freedom and Motivation.
His path proceeds:
① from permission to action,
② from distinction to responsibility,
③ from freedom to fair evaluation.

He becomes the exemplar of distinguishable Becoming — the first precedent.

Moreover, only through the First Guest does it become possible to transfer meaning and distinguishability to other permissible persons — without direct intervention from CVB, which ensures autonomy and real freedom for all subsequent Guests.
Conclusion: The mediation of the First Guest is the bridge between the absolute stability of CVB and the verifiable Becoming of other Persons.

[19.4] Motivation: why the First Guest must create the new
Logic:
According to [12.3], every Person has an intrinsic Motivation — a drive to realize all that is distinguishable.
The First Guest is permitted as a free Person, endowed with the capacity for choice and purpose.
He begins in the Present but is not yet full, since the Possible ≠ the Existing ([5]).

This generates:
① A constant directedness toward what is not yet attained,
② Motivation for distinction, exploration, learning, creation, and interaction,
③ An expectation of meaning — even in what has not yet been realized.

Thus, the purpose of the Guest's activity is not to “serve” CVB, but to realize his own Personhood through Will, Distinction, and Becoming — by manifesting the new in the Field of the Possible. In this way, his Motivation aligns with that of CVB.
Conclusion: The Guest’s Motivation does not derive from a “command” of CVB, but from an ontologically embedded necessity to move toward the Goal: the emergence of all Possible — necessary for the sustainable development of Personhood, through alignment with the Motivation of CVB.

[19.5] Role of the First Guest for the Others
Logic:
According to [11.10]–[11.12], the mechanism of precedents, removal, and preservation requires a clear example of a distinguishable path that has passed Verification.

The First Guest, as the first admitted to a verifiable path:
① Becomes the standard of distinguishability — his path is the infinite path of stability,
② Opens for other Guests the permissible direction of Becoming,
③ Provides a model: where the boundary of evil lies, where good is preserved, and what the cost of stability is.

He does not become an absolute “leader” (a replacement of CVB), but rather a crucial reference point of distinction.
Conclusion: The First Guest is not the “master” of others, but the ontic guide — allowing others to avoid disappearance into $\partial V\downarrow$ and to move toward stability.

- **5. Responses to Objections**

[19.1] Objection (Pantheism, Absolute Monism):
"If CVB is omnipotent and includes everything, why does It need a Guest?"
Response:

It is mistaken to assume that CVB “includes everything.” According to Axiom [2], Absolute Everything is impossible — it would include even logical impossibilities, falsehood, and evil, which contradict the very foundation of distinguishability [9] and logic [11.1].
CVB does not include falsehood, evil, or the impossible — It acts within the bounds of the Possible, selecting what is distinguishable and aligned with Truth ([11.2.1]).
Pantheistic fusion of all into one violates Axioms [4.4] and [5] — CVB ≠ all that exists.

The Guest is not part of CVB, but a result of Its permission (see [16]–[17]), created not *for* CVB, but for the Becoming of the Other — a Person capable of free response.
Also, one must not confuse the false form of “omnipotence” (boundlessness, chaos, $\partial V\uparrow$) with true Sovereignty over the Possible — based on Truth and distinguishability.
→ CVB does not create the impossible, but realizes all that is Possible — for the Other.

[19.2] Objection (Pluralism of Persons, Polytheism):
"Why not have multiple First Guests?"
Response:
Each Person, by Axiom [12.3], is motivated to realize the Entire Possible.
If several First Guests appeared simultaneously, each with such a motivation, logical collisions of interest would arise.
They would compete for overlapping regions of the Field of the Possible, violating the Filter of distinguishability $\Phi(\psi)$ [11.1.1].
This would lead to internal conflict in the model and disintegration of the Becoming structure.

Unlike the multiple gods of polytheistic systems, whose power is divided and often conflicting, CVB permits only one First Person to eliminate contradictions.
→ Only one Guest can first walk the path of distinguishability without conflict. This is not a limitation of CVB’s power, but a safeguard of the model’s coherence.

[19.3] Objection (Deism):
"Why can’t CVB just create everything and withdraw?"
Response:
Creation ≠ Preservation.
According to Axioms [7], [10.3.6], and [10.3.8], Becoming exists only in the Present and requires active memory, distinguishability, and action.
If CVB “withdraws” from the Present, all Non-Constant entities immediately cease to be.
→ Without continuous support for Becoming, nothing can continue to exist.
Also, without observation, verification [11.6] — the distinction of Good and Evil, preservation or removal — becomes impossible.
→ Deism contradicts the concept of the Present as the only ontologically existing time [10.3.8].
→ Withdrawal of CVB = total disappearance of the Guest and the world.

[19.4] Objection (Existentialism, Nihilism):
"Why should the First Guest do anything if everything is meaningless?"
Response:
Nihilism and radical existentialism assume that meaning does not exist unless artificially created.
But within the Model:

- Meaning is given by CVB as Ontological Truth [11.2.1],
- The Motivation of CVB — the Becoming of all Possible — is an objective Goal [12.3],

- The Guest does not invent meaning but discovers it, striving to walk the path of distinguishability and achieve verifiable stability.

Additionally:
A Person always stands at the boundary between the Existing and what is yet to Become Possible (see [10.3.7–10.3.8]).
This creates an inexhaustible horizon of meaning — just as a cinephile knows new films will be released, and this gives them motivation to wait and distinguish.
→ Meaning in Becoming is established as the foundation of distinguishability and Goal, not as fiction.

[19.5] Objection (Anarchy of Consciousness, Absolute Individualism):
"Why should other Guests orient themselves to the First?"
Response:
They are not required to obey — but without the First, there is no precedent of permissible, sustainable Becoming.
→ The First Guest fulfills the role of mediator [19.3], walking the path of distinction and verification.
This provides other Guests with a verifiable map of permissible and safe Becoming.
Individualism without orientation = drift into $\partial V\downarrow$.
→ Orientation toward the First Guest is not dependency, but a means of distinguishable existence.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**

■ **The First Guest**
Definition:
The first Person admitted by CVB as the result of the realization of Its Motivation — not a part of CVB Itself, yet possessing freedom, reason, and will.
Distinction: Not a copy or continuation of CVB, but an Other Person with permitted autonomy.

■ **Motivation of CVB**
Definition:
The integral cause of the Becoming of All Possible — not for the benefit of CVB, but for the sake of the Other, for whom the Possible will be necessary (see [12.3]).
Example: A parent gives life to a child not for themselves, but for the child's life itself — which the parent supports, but does not live for them.

■ **Mediation**
Definition:
The ontological role of the First Guest as the first "translator" of the $\Phi(\psi)$ Filter into actions within the Field of the Possible.
Function: Serves as a logical and verifiable bridge between Absolute Truth and the free will of other persons.

■ **Goal Conflict**
Definition:
The ontological impossibility of the coexistence of multiple First Guests if each strives to realize all Possible.
Contradiction: This leads to a paradox of multiple causes and the overlap of will in the Present, violating sustainability (see [11.1]–[11.3]).

■ **Precedent**
Definition:
The first completed form of distinguishable Becoming, on the basis of which criteria for evaluation (preservation/removal) for others can be formed.
Function: The First Guest, having walked the path to its end, becomes this precedent (see [11.10–11.12]).

■ **Standard of Distinguishability**
Definition:
A form that becomes a clear example of what is permitted or not permitted by the Admissibility Filter Φ(ψ).

■ **Boundary ∂V↓ and ∂V↑**
Reminder:
∂V↓ — the disappearance of distinctions, a fall into non-being, a degenerate state.
∂V↑ — the saturation of distinctions, collapse of stability, loss of distinguishability.
The First Guest sustains Becoming within the stable field V, without falling into either ∂V↓ or ∂V↑.

■ **All Possible**
Definition:
The set of all admissible, distinguishable forms within the Field of the Possible — excluding the impossible (see [1], [2], [4.3], [5]).
Contrast: All Possible ≠ Everything; it excludes Falsehood, Evil, Absurdity, or Boundlessness.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**

1. **Why is the First Guest needed?**
   Imagine a parent who already has everything. They don't need more toys, food, or discoveries — they are complete.
   But they want someone else to learn, grow, and choose. So they bring forth a first child — not for themselves, but to give someone else the chance to live and become.

2. **Why only one and not many at once?**
   Just like in a family — the firstborn is always one.
   If all children were declared "first," it would lead to confusion, conflict, and rivalry.
   One First — that's the natural order: "first" means being the only one at the beginning.
   They learn first, grow first — and can guide the others.

3. **Why is the First Guest important for others?**
   They are not a boss, but someone ahead.
   Like an older sibling — they know where it's slippery, where it's dangerous, and where it's exciting.
   They help others understand how to grow up safely.

4. **Why does the First Guest act?**
   Because they don't know everything — and they can choose.
   They're not forced — they want to.
   Like a child given a blank canvas and paint — they start to create, because they can, and it's interesting.

5. **What does the First Guest mean for the rest?**
   They are the very first example.
   They show it's possible to live, build, feel, grow — and become better.

They start the story in which others later take part.

- **8. Empirical Examples**

[19.1] Necessity of the First Guest
Marathon: You can prepare the entire course, draw the lines, set up the finish line, and brief the referees — but the race doesn't begin until someone takes the first step.

[19.2] Why only one, not many?
Family: In every family, the firstborn is only one. They shape the role model for the younger ones.

[19.3] Mediation of the First Guest
Navigator: The first to walk the path becomes the guide. They don't decide the goal but help others avoid dead ends.
Game experience: The one who has already played the level didn't design the game, but explains to others how best to play.

[19.4] Motivation: Why act?
Creativity: A child is given a blank canvas. They're not required to paint — but they want to, because it's fascinating.
Discovery: Given access to an infinite warehouse, it's natural to want to open a box labeled "unknown."

[19.5] Role of the First Guest
Builder: They didn't invent the entire project, but they're the one who takes initiative at the construction site — so that others can build according to the plan, not randomly.

---

[20] The First Guest is Not Sufficient

- 1. Brief Statement

A single First Guest does not fulfill the entire Motivation.
They begin the path but do not embody all that is Possible.

- 2. Interpretation and Significance

The First Guest is necessary to initiate Becoming, but by themselves do not exhaust either the Field of the Possible or the Motivation of the CVB.
Their uniqueness lies in initiation, not in completeness.
The Model requires a multitude of distinguishable forms in order to encompass all that is Possible — in accordance with the nature of Motivation [16], Distinguishability [5], and the boundaries [4] of the Field of the Possible.
This excludes stopping at one — but begins through one — by allowing many.

- 3. Formulas

[20.1] $\Phi(\psi_1) = \top \Rightarrow \exists\, \psi_1 : G_1$ (the first admissible Guest)
[20.2] $\neg(\forall\, \psi \in V : \psi = \psi_1) \Rightarrow \exists\, \psi_2, \psi_3, ..., \psi_{\square} \neq \psi_1$
[20.3] $\Phi(\psi_1) \neq \Phi(\psi*)\ \forall\ \psi* \in V \setminus \{\psi_1\}$ — the set is distinguishable

[20.4] ∴ ∃G₁ ∧ ∃G₂ ∧ ... ∧ ∃G□ | G₁ ≠ Gᵢ (i ≥ 2)

LaTeX version:
\begin{aligned}
&\text{[20.1]} \quad \Phi(\psi_1) = \top \Rightarrow \exists \psi_1 : G_1 \\
&\text{[20.2]} \quad \neg(\forall \psi \in V : \psi = \psi_1) \Rightarrow \exists \psi_2, \psi_3, ..., \psi_n \neq \psi_1 \\
&\text{[20.3]} \quad \Phi(\psi_1) \neq \Phi(\psi^*) \quad \forall \psi^* \in V \setminus \{\psi_1\} \\
&\text{[20.4]} \quad \therefore \exists G_1 \land \exists G_2 \land \dots \land \exists G_n \mid G_1 \neq G_i \quad (i \geq 2)
\end{aligned}

Verification:

- No contradiction: ¬∀ψ = ψ₁ when V ≠ ∅
- No self-refutation
- Supported by [5] Distinguishability and [11.1.1] Φ(ψ)

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [16] (Motivation): the goal is the realization of **All that is Possible**, not a single scenario.
From [5] (Distinguishability): if G₁ ≠ V, then V requires other ψᵢ ≠ G₁.
Reductio ad absurdum: if G₁ were sufficient, then ∀ψ ∈ V: ψ = ψ₁ ⇒ violates distinguishability ⇒ contradiction.
Conclusion: G₁ is not sufficient — G₂, G₃, … are required.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection (Hegelian idealism):
"Development is dialectical, initiated by one subject."
Response: The CVB is not dialectical but distinguishable and admissible. One subject ≠ all.

Objection:
"If the First Guest initiates, can they not eventually develop into everything?"
Response: No. According to [5], the Possible ≠ the Existing — this fullness is never reached.

Objection:
"Why doesn't the CVB create many at once?"
Response: That would violate the sequential logic of Motivation and Distinguishability.
Only **one** can be first — but not the only.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **G₁ (First Guest):**
  The first admissible Person, possessing will and distinguishability.
- **V (Field of the Possible):**
  The set of all admissible distinguishable forms, as per [4].

- **Φ(ψ):**
  The meta-function of admissibility, determining what from $\psi \in V$ may become real.

- **ψ_i:**
  Potential Guests.

- **G_i:**
  Realized admissible Persons (ψ_i), distinct from G_1.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

The first child in a family may be the first to speak, learn, and inspire.
But for the family to be whole — more children are needed.
One does not make a whole.
So too with the First Guest — important, but not the only.
They open the door — but do not walk all paths.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

- **Logic:** A set with only one element cannot be “all.”
- **Physics:** One photon is not light. Light needs many quanta.
- **Biology:** One gene is not the code of life.
- **Everyday life:** One person may found a company — but its growth requires a team.

---

[21] Bounded Number of Guests

🔹 1. Brief Statement

The number of Guests is not limited — as long as each remains distinguishable and does not disrupt the stability of Becoming.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

The Model permits many Guests — but not an uncontrolled multitude.
Each Guest is a unique instance of Becoming within the Field of the Possible.
Admission is not limited by number, but by the criteria of **Distinguishability** (see [5]) and the **Preservation of Stability** (see [18]).
The boundary lies not in quantity, but in the system's ability to sustain difference without collapse.
This realizes a balance between the fullness of admission and the stability of the Whole.

🔹 3. Formulas

[21.1] $\forall \psi_i \in V, \quad \Phi(\psi_i) = \top \land \forall \psi_i \neq \psi_\square \Rightarrow \psi_i \sim \psi_\square$ (distinct)

[21.2] $|G| = n \to \infty$, provided:

(a) $\forall i \neq j: \Phi(\psi_i) \neq \Phi(\psi_\square)$

(b) $\sum U(G_i) \leq Y$ (stability threshold)

[21.3] $\therefore \exists\ G_1, G_2, ..., G_\square \quad | \quad$ n is bounded by Φ and Y

LaTeX version:

```
\begin{aligned}
&\text{[21.1]} \quad \forall \psi_i \in V,\ \Phi(\psi_i) = \top \land \forall \psi_i \neq \psi_j \Rightarrow \psi_i \sim \psi_j \\
&\text{[21.2]} \quad |G| = n \to \infty,\ \text{provided:} \\
&\qquad (a)\ \Phi(\psi_i) \neq \Phi(\psi_j)\ \forall i \neq j \\
&\qquad (b)\ \sum U(G_i) \leq \Upsilon \\
&\text{[21.3]} \quad \therefore \exists\ G_1, G_2, ..., G_n\ |\ n\ \text{is bounded by}\ \Phi\ \text{and}\ \Upsilon
\end{aligned}
```

Verification:

- Consistent with [5], [11.1.1], [18]
- No set-theoretic contradictions
- Limitation via predicates, not fixed numbers

🔹 4. Logical Justification

From [5]: Guests must be distinguishable — otherwise forms collapse into each other.
From [18]: System-wide stability is preserved only if the cumulative weight of Guests does not exceed a threshold.
Therefore, multiple Guests are admissible **only** under these two constraints.
Reductio ad absurdum: if $\exists \psi_i \approx \psi_\square \Rightarrow$ Distinguishability is violated ⇒ Φ(ψ) is violated ⇒ contradiction.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection (mechanistic determinism):
"There cannot be infinitely many subjects in a closed system."

Response: The system is not closed. It admits many forms within the bounds of distinguishability and stability. See [4.3], [11.1.1].

Objection (pantheism):
"All is One; distinctions are illusory."
Response: Violates the axiom of Distinguishability [5]. In the Model, difference is foundational to existence.

Objection (disorder measure):
"Too many distinguishable entities will lead to chaos."
Response: Only if the stability threshold Y is exceeded. This limit is logically embedded.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **Y (Upsilon):**
  The maximal stability threshold of the system when multiple Guests are admitted.

- **U(G_i):**
  The ontological load or weight of a single Guest within the system.

- **~ (Distinguishable):**
  As per [5]: entities with unique properties, not interchangeable.

- **|G|:**
  The cardinality of the set of admitted Guests.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

You can have many children and still be a happy family —
if each one has space, food, and warmth, and they respect each other.
But try to fit everyone in one room — and trouble begins.
So: having many is fine — but doing it thoughtlessly is not.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

- **Logic:**
  A set can be infinite if its elements are distinguishable (e.g., the natural numbers: {1, 2, 3, …}).

- **Mathematics / Information Theory:**
  A code system allows infinitely many messages if each has a unique structure (e.g., Unicode, binary encoding).

- **Physics:**
  In quantum theory, infinite excitation states (photons, modes) are possible if states are distinct (energy, momentum, spin), and the system remains stable (e.g., laser resonator in stable mode).

- **Everyday Life:**
  You can maintain unlimited chats with different people — if each is in its own window, with clear content and order (distinguishability and interface stability).

[22] No Predetermination: Freedom and Responsibility of the Guest

---

🔹 1. Brief Statement

The Guest's free choice is inherently unpredictable and cannot be predetermined. This enables both their freedom and their responsibility.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

This axiom asserts the fundamental **unpredictability** of the Guest's choice within the CVB Model.
Since the Guest is a non-constant volitional form, their decision cannot be deduced in advance from prior states or from the structure of the Field of the Possible (V).

This guarantees:

- authentic autonomy of the subject
- moral agency and meaningful responsibility
- ontological impossibility of predetermination
- distinguishability of Good and Evil as outcomes of will, not mere conditions

Without this axiom:

- freedom becomes an illusion
- responsibility becomes a programming flaw
- verification loses all meaning

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) retains structural stability by allowing freedom — but only within the admissible, distinguishable domain Φ(ψ), not outside it.

🔹 3. Formulas

[22.1] $\Phi(\psi) \subset V$ — the admissible subset of distinguishable forms

[22.2] $\forall \psi \in \Phi(\psi)$, if ψ is a Guest, then
$\nexists f: P \to \psi$ where f is a total prediction function

[22.3] $\neg \exists f(\psi) : \forall t\ (\psi(t) = f(t)) \wedge f \in CVB \vee \in V$

⇔ The choice of a Guest cannot be computed in advance, not even by CVB

LaTeX:

$$\Phi(\psi) \subset V,\quad \psi \in \Phi(\psi),\ \psi \in \text{Guest}$$
$$\Rightarrow \exists f : P \to \psi,\ f \in \text{CVB} \cup V,\quad \text{such that}\ \forall t,\ \psi(t) = f(t)$$

Verification:

- If such f existed, ψ would be determined ⇒ contradicts [15.3] (Guest as volitional form)
- If freedom is false ⇒ responsibility collapses ⇒ CVB becomes total ⇒ contradiction with [1], [2], [3], [5], [13], [19]

Therefore, admissible models **require** the unpredictability of choice.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

(a) Impossibility of Precomputing Choice

- From [1]–[3]: only that which ≠ nothing and ≠ totality is possible ⇒ choice = real-time action
- From [5]: Distinguishability requires action ⇒ choice = act of Becoming, not memory replay
- From [10.3.8]: Choice is only possible in the Present
- From [15.3]: The Guest is a volitional form ⇒ not a deterministic function

(b) Axiom of Responsibility

- If there is no choice, CVB creates only for itself ⇒ violates [13] (CVB does not self-expand)
- Responsibility for Evil shifts onto CVB ⇒ violates [11.3.2], [28] (impermissible)
- Verification is only possible for what exists in the Present ⇒ choice must be free and current

Without freedom, the distinction of Good and Evil collapses ⇒ contradicts [11.3.3].

(c) Reductio ad Absurdum
Assume the choice is predetermined:
→ ψ is not free ⇒ violates [15.3]
→ CVB becomes morally responsible ⇒ violates [11.3.2]
→ Verification fails ⇒ violates [22]
→ All is predetermined ⇒ violates [3] (possible ≠ total)

Conclusion:
The Guest's choice **cannot** and **must not** be predetermined.
This is not a technical allowance — but a logical necessity for the structural coherence of the entire Model.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Determinism / Laplace's Demon):
"If CVB knew all parameters, it could compute any choice."
Response:
According to [2] and [4], knowing "everything" is impossible. Moreover, ψ does not exist prior to action — not even CVB can compute what is not yet actual.

Objection 2 (Theological Calvinism):
"If all is under the Creator's control, so is the Guest's choice."
Response:
Control ≠ Compulsion. CVB **permits**, but does not dictate. A plan is not a script. See [16] — the goal emerges through Motivation, not enforcement.

Objection 3 (AI and Superintelligence):
"A powerful enough intelligence could predict the choice."
Response:
No. That violates [5.1] (Distinguishability), and [19] — choice occurs only in the Present and requires will. Intelligence ≠ will.

Objection 4 (Moral Relativism):
"If choice is unpredictable, how can Good and Evil be judged?"
Response:
Unpredictability ≠ arbitrariness. Good is distinguishable by outcome: **stable Becoming without violating Φ(ψ)**. See [11.3].

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **Predetermination:**
  The concept that a subject's choice is known or fixed in advance by external factors. In CVB, this is logically impossible due to the primacy of distinguishability and the ontological Present.

- **Invisibility Field of Choice:**
  The domain within Φ(ψ) where choice occurs without a preknown outcome. It denotes a logically admissible but ontologically unpredictable zone of Becoming.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Imagine you are standing before several doors, choosing which to enter.
Even the wisest parent cannot know your choice — until you take the step.
That step **makes** it your choice.

If your mother could program everything you'd ever do — you wouldn't be a person, but a puppet.
But she lets you choose — because she trusts you. That's what makes you a true individual.

That's why you're free — and that's why **you** are responsible for your choice, not someone else.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

- **Logic:**
  Liar Paradox (“I will lie”) — decision becomes indeterminate within the system ⇒ external act is required
- **Mathematics (Gödel):**
  No system can fully describe itself from within ⇒ intra-systemic choice is undecidable
- **Physics:**
  Quantum choice (e.g., photon interference) is realized only upon observation — unpredictable before that
- **Neuroscience:**
  Decisions arise before conscious awareness, but awareness fixes the act ⇒ choice ≠ mere reaction
- **Everyday Life:**
  A parent may guess a teenager’s choice, but never guarantee it — especially for a willful one
- **Games:**
  In chess, even supercomputers can’t predict moves 50 steps ahead when a player uses nonstandard strategy — because decision is shaped not just by logic, but by free thought

---

Meta Section: Verificational Interaction

[VII] Interaction between CVB and the Non-Constant Possible

---

[23] Initiative Belongs Only to CVB

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Guests cannot initiate the Becoming of CVB nor impose their own goals upon it. However, they may participate in the Becoming, provided it does not violate the Motivation of CVB and aligns with the Good.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

This axiom affirms that initiative in the structure of Being belongs solely to CVB as the Constant Possible.
Guests, being non-constant, cannot be a source of change within CVB itself, but they may be admitted to participate in Its Becoming if they comply with the norms of Motivation and the Good.

It distinguishes:

- the direction of Becoming (which originates from CVB),
- from the possibility of participation (open to Guests under conditions).

Thus, the model preserves structural stability: attempts at rebellion, substitution of the center, or parasitism are logically possible, but cannot lead to sustainable Becoming—and therefore either self-dissolve or are Removed after Verification as sources of Evil.

🔹 3. Formulas

Let ψ ∈ Φ(ψ), where ψ is a Guest:

- ¬∃ f: ψ → CVB — no function can impose Becoming upon CVB

Participation is permissible ⇔
ψ ⊂ Φ(ψ) ∧ ¬(ψ ∩ ¬Φ_M) ∧ ¬(ψ ∩ Φ_Evil)

$$\forall \psi \in \Phi(\psi),\ \psi \in \text{Guest} \Rightarrow \nexists f : \psi \rightarrow \text{CVB}$$

$$\text{Participation is permissible} \Leftrightarrow \psi \subset \Phi(\psi)\ \wedge\ \psi \cap \neg \Phi_M = \emptyset\ \wedge\ \psi \cap \Phi_{\text{Evil}} = \emptyset$$

Logical coherence check:
If f: ψ → CVB exists, then ψ would influence the structure of what, by [13], cannot be extended. This leads to a paradox: the changeable affects the unchangeable.
Therefore, the formula is coherent under f ∉ Dom.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

(a) From the impossibility of reverse influence):
According to [13], CVB does not extend inward or outward — therefore, no form (including Guests) can initiate Its Becoming.
If a Guest could initiate change in CVB → CVB becomes dependent → violates [6] Ontological Independence.

(b) From the distinction between Good and Evil):
According to [11.3.2] and [11.3.3],
Good = admissible participation in Becoming that does not violate Φ(ψ);
Evil = violation of distinguishability and attempts to seize Becoming.
Therefore, participation is only possible under distinguishable agreement.

(c) From the Motivation of CVB):
By [18], Motivation is the internal cause of Becoming.
A Guest cannot generate it, but may be admitted as a reflection of that Motivation.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

OBJECTION 1 (Created can evolve the Creator — metaphysical panspermism):
If a form becomes developed enough, it may alter its source.
Response: Per [13], the source does not admit expansion. The evolving cannot generate the generative. Panspermism applies to passive forms, not CVB.

OBJECTION 2 (Soviet-style collectivism):
A collective may influence the center.
Response: In Φ(ψ), personal distinguishability does not negate the uniqueness of the source.
A collective = a sum of distinguishable beings, not an equivalent of CVB.

OBJECTION 3 (Myths of rebellion — Lucifer, Titans, etc.):
Created beings may rebel and seize initiative from the Creator.
Response:
In CVB, rebellion is logically possible, but such actions lie outside Φ(ψ). These forms do not lead to sustainable Becoming and are either unstable (thus self-eliminated) or subject to Removal after Verification as sources of Evil.
Hence, structural stability remains intact: rebellion, substitution, or parasitism may be attempted, but cannot undermine Motivation, distinguishability, or the Center of Becoming.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Imposition of Becoming — An attempt to change CVB or direct Its actions against Its Motivation.
Contrast with participation: participation occurs by initiative of CVB and in agreement with the Good.

Φ_M — Subset of Φ(ψ) corresponding to the Motivation of CVB.
Everything within it aligns with Its Goal ([18]).

Φ_Evil — The set of violations of the Good ([11.3.2]);
forms that induce parasitism, destruction, or substitution of the center.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Parents may start a garden.
Children cannot simply declare, “We’re planting whatever we want now!”
But if the children help—watering, harvesting—without breaking anything, the parents gladly involve them.
Whoever helps without harming becomes part of the Good.
But if someone tramples the plants—it’s no longer help.
A parent cannot allow the whole garden to be ruined.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

- **Logic:**
  A function is not invertible if its codomain does not include the full image of the domain (set theory: f: A → B is not invertible if B is independent).

- **Physics:**
  A lower-energy state cannot alter the fundamental constants of the universe.
  An electron cannot rewrite gravity.

- **Biology:**
  A single cell cannot rewrite the organism’s DNA unless repair mechanisms fail.
  If they do — cancer begins (example of Evil).

- **Everyday life:**
  A child cannot order their parents when to go to sleep.
  But they can participate in family planning — if they don’t undermine it.

[24] Interaction between CVB and Guests

- 1. **Brief Statement**

[24.1] Co-Becoming

CVB allows Guests to participate in the creative process of Becoming, including the formation of new forms, new Guests, and the development of reality.

[24.2] Direction of the Guest’s Becoming

The Guest is free to choose the direction of their development—either in alignment with the Good and Truth or deviating from them.

[24.3] The Role of Verification in Interaction

Every interaction between CVB and a Guest is subject to Verification: only what is stable, distinguishable, and norm-compliant is preserved.

[24.4] Degradation of the Guest

If a Guest consciously and definitively rejects the Good, Truth, and distinguishability, their form becomes ontologically impossible and is subject to Removal. The precedent is preserved as a warning.

[24.5] The Meaning of Choosing the Good

The Guest's choice of the Good is not an external imposition but a form of internal stability and alignment with Truth. Only such a choice makes interaction with CVB both possible and meaningful.

- 2. **Interpretation and Significance**

[24.1] Co-Becoming
CVB is the sole Source of Becoming but not the sole Participant in its expression. It permits the co-participation of Guests, provided they act within the permissible domain (as per $\Phi(\psi)$).
Such interaction gives rise to novelty: children, culture, language, science, art. This does not expand CVB itself but unfolds the field V—through the Guest as the agent of stable choice.

[24.2] Direction of the Guest’s Becoming
The Guest’s Becoming is not determined. They may choose either development or retreat.
It is precisely the freedom to choose a direction that makes Verification possible and gives moral weight to the Good—not as a coerced consequence, but as a free choice.

[24.3] The Role of Verification in Interaction
Contact between CVB and the Guest is impossible without Verification.
Everything arising through interaction must be tested against $\Phi(\psi)$.
Only what is distinguishable and stable may be preserved—otherwise, chaos, parasitism, or falsehood arise and must be eliminated.

[24.4] Degradation of the Guest
If a Guest chooses a path that destroys distinguishability (Evil, Falsehood, deliberate rejection of the Good), their Becoming becomes ontologically impossible.
Such a form is Removed, and its precedent is retained—as knowledge of the boundaries of the permissible, so that other Guests may not repeat the mistake.

[24.5] The Meaning of Choosing the Good
Choosing the Good is not a punishable requirement, but a means of stable Becoming.
Only upon this foundation is continued and deep interaction with CVB possible.
The Good is the choice of freedom, not coercion. Without it—there is neither contact nor future.

- 3. **Formulas**

[24.1] Co-Becoming
$\forall G \in V_{guest} : \Phi(G \land S_{new}) = True \rightarrow G \oplus OVS \rightarrow \Delta V$
LaTeX: \forall G \in V_{\text{guest}} : \Phi(G \land S_{\text{new}}) = \text{True} \Rightarrow G \oplus \text{OVS} \rightarrow \Delta V

[24.2] Direction of the Guest's Becoming
$G \vdash S_{good} \lor S_{evil} : S_{good} \Rightarrow \Phi(S) = True; S_{evil} \Rightarrow \Phi(S) = False$
LaTeX: G \vdash S_{\text{good}} \lor S_{\text{evil}} : S_{\text{good}} \Rightarrow \Phi(S) = \text{True};\ S_{\text{evil}} \Rightarrow \Phi(S) = \text{False}

[24.3] The Role of Verification in Interaction
$\forall I \subset (G \oplus OVS) : \Phi(I) \neq \varnothing \rightarrow I \in \partial V$
LaTeX: \forall I \subset (G \oplus \text{OVS}) : \Phi(I) \neq \varnothing \Rightarrow I \in \partial V

[24.4] Degradation of the Guest
$G \vdash S_{evil} \land \neg\Psi \rightarrow \neg\Phi(G) \Rightarrow G \nrightarrow \varnothing; \psi(G) \mapsto memory(\neg\Phi)$
LaTeX: G \vdash S_{\text{evil}} \land \neg \Psi \rightarrow \neg \Phi(G) \Rightarrow G \nrightarrow \varnothing;\ \psi(G) \mapsto \text{memory}(\neg \Phi)

[24.5] Meaning of Choosing the Good
$G \vdash S_{good} \land \Psi \rightarrow \Phi(G) = True \land interaction(G, OVS) \subseteq V$
LaTeX: G \vdash S_{\text{good}} \land \Psi \rightarrow \Phi(G) = \text{True} \land \text{interaction}(G, \text{OVS}) \subseteq V

- 4. Logical Justification

[24.1] Co-Becoming
From [13] (CVB does not self-expand) and [17] (the emergence of the Guest), it follows that becoming in V occurs through the Guest's volitional choice.
If the form is admissible ($\Phi(G \land S_{new}) = True$), then the interaction between G and CVB can generate new admissible forms — ΔV.
This expands the Field of the Possible without compromising stability.

[24.2] Direction of the Guest's Becoming
According to [11.2.1] (Truth) and [11.3.1] (Good), the direction of becoming can either align with or deviate from Truth and Good.
If it aligns (Ψ), then $\Phi(S) = True$. If not, $\Phi(S) = False$.
The Guest has freedom, but Verification (see [20]) will reveal admissibility.

[24.3] The Role of Verification in Interaction
From [20] and [21], every interaction between the Guest and CVB is tested by the meta-function Φ.
If Φ(I) ≠ ⌀, then the interaction falls within the admissible boundary field (∂V) and may be preserved.

[24.4] Degradation of the Guest
From [22] (Freedom and Responsibility), if the Guest consciously chooses Evil (¬Ψ) and this violates Φ, then G loses admissibility.
According to [16] (Memory and Oblivion), the outcome is preserved as precedent (ψ(G)), and the form is removed — G ↛ ∅.

[24.5] Meaning of Choosing the Good
The choice of Good and True direction is the only way to sustain interaction with CVB.
Such interaction does not violate any of the preceding axioms ([13], [14], [18], [21]), and therefore Φ(G) = True.
This not only preserves the Guest, but allows them to contribute to the development of the Field V.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

OBJECTION 1 (Freedom is illusory; all is predetermined):
Some deterministic models (e.g., classical mechanics, neuro-determinism) assert that the Guest's choices are predetermined.
Response: According to [22], the Guest's choice cannot be predicted — not even by CVB.
Any model that denies the Guest's autonomy violates [13] (CVB does not expand) and collapses logically.
Moreover, per [20], freedom is observable and distinguishable — hence, not illusory.

OBJECTION 2 (Co-creation violates the uniqueness of CVB):
Ontological monotheism may argue that any participation violates the absoluteness of the Source.
Response: Interaction occurs strictly within Φ(ψ) and does not expand CVB but expresses its Motivation through permitted forms.
See [18] and [23]. Participation is not equivalent to coercion.

OBJECTION 3 (Guest evolution may lead to independence):
Some philosophies (e.g., transhumanism) claim the Guest may become fully autonomous.
Response: Such a form will be evaluated against Good, Truth, and Motivation. If violated, it loses admissibility (see [24.4]).
Independence without consent to the Center is unstable and leads to removal.

OBJECTION 4 (Degradation = punishment, incompatible with a Good Source):
Moral critiques claim Guest removal contradicts love and goodness.
Response: CVB acts not arbitrarily, but as a Just Judge. It must remove forms that consciously reject Good, Truth, and Freedom.
Such "punishment" is not vengeance but protection of the Possible and of other Guests.

There are two paths of degradation:

- **Self-destruction:** The form negates its own becoming.
- **Parasitism:** The form feeds on others, violating moral integrity, and tries to survive off CVB resources.

Such forms are tolerated only under Verification Patience. Once resolved:

- They are classified as [4.2] Non-Constantly Impossible — attempting to exit ∂V.

- They must be removed. Prolonging their existence would imply complicity in Evil, violating [13], [18], [22], and [11.3.3].

CVB, as Source and Judge, cannot sustain the impossible — that would betray its Motivation and Nature.
However, the precedent is preserved (see [16]) as a distinguishable warning, not a continued form.

OBJECTION 5 (Truth and Good are subjective):
Postmodern theories claim Truth and Good are social constructs.
Response: In CVB, they are ontologically distinguishable ([11.2], [11.3]).
They are not opinions but stable forms, verifiable by Φ.
If a form is not distinguishable as Good, it cannot be sustained.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Co-Becoming
Q: What is “co-becoming” in CVB?
A: It is the admissible interaction between CVB and a Guest, whereby the Guest participates in the generation of new forms aligned with the Motivation of CVB.
This is not absolute creation, but meaningful participation — e.g., generating new Guests, ideas, structures, or choices. All subject to Φ(ψ).

Direction of Becoming
Q: What does “direction” mean?
A: It is the vector of a form’s becoming — toward alignment with Truth and Good or toward degradation.
It is not physical motion, but a semantic-value trajectory verifiable by Φ(ψ).

Role of Verification
Q: What is Verification in interaction?
A: It is the observation-based test for agreement with Truth, Good, and Motivation.
It determines whether a form continues or is removed.
It applies to the Guest’s actions, choices, and results (see [20]–[22]).

Degradation of the Guest
Q: What is “degradation” of a form?
A: It is the loss of admissibility per Φ(ψ), due to conscious, irreversible commitment to Evil.
Such a form becomes ontologically impossible and cannot sustain its becoming.

Meaning of Choosing the Good
Q: Why must Good be chosen, not imposed?
A: Good cannot be enforced, or distinguishability and responsibility vanish.
Choosing the Good makes the Guest both distinguishable and sustainable — key to Verification, Freedom, and CVB’s Motivation.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Co-creation: Everyone contributes something new — not just alone, but together. In CVB, this is “co-becoming.”
It means you don’t just exist — you help create new meanings, lives, and ideas.

Life Direction: You can choose your path — closer to Good, Truth, and harmony… or the opposite.
No one forces you. But your choice has consequences.

Responsibility: To know what's right, you must measure against moral principles.
It's like a constant exam: what's built with Good can endure.
Destructive choices cannot be supported.

Degradation: Sometimes someone rejects Good so completely, they cannot return.
Eventually, that destroys them.
But the error becomes a warning, so others don't repeat it.

Right Path: So it's not enough to just "be." You must **choose** Good — that's how you become truly alive, free, and real.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

Logic:
In logic systems like intuitionistic logic or game theory, multiple outcomes are allowed — but only if they're consistent and distinguishable.
Co-becoming is the path to new conclusions. Contradictions (like the liar paradox) are excluded from admissibility.

Probability and Bayesian verification confirm that knowledge is refined through interaction and choice.

Science:

- **Quantum physics:** Measurement depends on the observer, but after observation, the state collapses — realizing Guest-system interaction.
- **Biology:** Reproduction is co-becoming — no parent can generate a child alone.
- **Computer science:** Machine learning requires fresh input and feedback.
  Without verification, the model degrades (overfitting, error).

Everyday Life:

- **Family:** Children are co-becoming of parents. Each child is a new Guest.
  Choosing Good allows them to grow and help others. Choosing destruction harms the family.
- **Society:** Art, culture, inventions — all examples of becoming.
  Society sustains what is useful and true; rejects what is destructive.
- **School/team:** Contributors are supported.
  Those who consciously disrupt without changing are removed from the group.

---

[25] Reverse Verification — or the Big Question

🔹 1. Brief Statement

Reverse Verification is a logically admissible act of testing the justice of the CVB by the Guests themselves. It opens a phase of **Verification Patience**, in which the Judge allows the testing of His own rightness — but the outcome is determined by distinguishable subjects.

🔹 2. Interpretation and Significance

This axiom asserts that the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) allows verification of Itself — not as a concession, but as a duty.
Guests — entities with limited but autonomous will — are capable of asking the fundamental question: *Does the Judge have the right to Judge?*
Reverse Verification initiates a unique phase of becoming — **Verification Patience** — in which temporary coexistence of unsynchronized forms is permitted, until their volitional alignment with Truth is distinguishably resolved.

This process — the **Big Question** — does not undermine the logic of the Model, but strengthens its stability, by allowing the testing of CVB's central roles: as Source, Judge, Legislator, and Governor.
Thus, the axiom establishes a logically admissible space of trust, where the justice of the Judge is proven not externally, but internally — through the choice of distinguishable subjects.

🔹 3. Formulas
$\Phi(\psi\_OVS) = \{\psi \in V \mid \psi \text{ distinguishably tests the role of OVS through a logically admissible act}\}$

$\forall \psi\_G \in G:$
$\quad$ if ψ_G formulates a distinguishable BigQuestion $\in \Phi(\psi\_OVS)$,
$\quad$ then $\exists\ \Delta t \in T$ such that $\Phi(\psi\_G)$ remains in V until verification completes

$\neg\Phi(\psi\_G) \rightarrow \psi\_G \rightarrow \partial V\downarrow$ (if the form fails verification — it is removed)

LaTeX:
```
\Phi(\psi_{OVS}) = \{ \psi \mid \psi \in V,\ \psi\ \text{distinctly tests OVS logically} \} \\
\forall \psi_G \in G:\ \text{if } \psi_G \in \Phi(\psi_{OVS}),\ \exists \Delta t \in T:\ \Phi(\psi_G) \in V \\
\text{If } \neg\Phi(\psi_G) \Rightarrow \psi_G \to \partial V_\downarrow
```

Verification of consistency:

- Does **not** produce a liar paradox, since the test does not deny the role of the Judge but seeks to confirm it.
- Includes **presumption of admissibility**: the subject may ask the question, but cannot alter the axioms.
- Structurally consistent with $\Phi(\psi)$ as the principle of verification without role substitution.

🔹 4. Logical Justification

The admissibility of this axiom follows from [5] Distinction, [11.1.1] Meta-function $\Phi(\psi)$, and [16] Memory of Precedent.
CVB permits the becoming of forms that are distinguishable and logically admissible.
A Guest who questions the legitimacy of the Judge does not reject the Model, but verifies its coherence.

If the Model forbids testing the Judge, it becomes arbitrary and self-unverifiable — contradicting its own function of discernment (see [9.1]).
Therefore, the admissibility of **Reverse Verification** is essential for a stable and universal logical model, where Truth is not imposed but chosen.

Thus, axiom [25] is logically derivable and reinforces the Model:
CVB does not fear verification — because it is grounded in Truth, distinguishable by anyone who seeks the Good.

- 5. Responses to Objections

OBJECTION 1: "Who judges the Judge?" — liar paradox.
Response: The liar paradox arises from self-reference inside a closed system. Here, verification is initiated by a logically distinguishable subject external to CVB. The question is admissible if it is distinguishable and non-paradoxical. See [11.1.1] Φ(ψ).

OBJECTION 2: This undermines the absoluteness of Truth.
Response: No. Truth is not revoked by verification — it is affirmed.
Only distinguishable forms that pass free selection make Truth sustainable as an ontological limit.

OBJECTION 3: This makes CVB dependent on the Guests' approval.
Response: Incorrect. CVB does not require verification for Itself —
but allows it for the Guests, so that their choice may be free and logically fulfilled.

OBJECTION 4: This turns truth into a vote.
Response: False. Verification is not a plebiscite, but discernment.
Each Guest independently recognizes Truth — or exits $\partial V\downarrow$.

- 6. Clarification of Terms

Big Question
A logically admissible challenge to the Judge, posed by a distinguishable autonomous form (Guest), which questions the justice, moral legitimacy, and truthfulness of CVB.

Verification Patience
An ontological phase during which a subject is permitted to undergo becoming within V, despite doubt, in order to complete the act of discernment.

Reverse Verification
A logically admissible process in which CVB allows Guests to distinguish its justice as Judge, Legislator, and Source.

- 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Imagine someone is the Judge of everything. He says he knows what is True, Good, and Just.
But you are free. You can ask: "Are you truly right?"
The Judge does not get angry. He gives you time — to think, compare, and decide for yourself.
If you realize He is indeed just — you trust Him. If you choose not to trust — you walk away.
That's how freedom works.

- 8. Empirical Examples

Logic:
Presumption of innocence — the accused need not prove they are innocent; the burden lies on the accuser.
This is a logically admissible stance of trust before verification.

Science:
Scientific theories are not absolute — they allow testing.
Even the strongest hypotheses allow attempts at falsification (Popper).
This strengthens a system — it doesn't weaken it.

Everyday Life:
A child may ask parents, "Why are the rules like this?"
A wise parent doesn't forbid the question — they explain.
If they are right, trust grows — not diminishes.

---

[26] The Current State of Reality — Verification Tolerance — the Big Question

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
The current state of Reality is a phase of *Verification Tolerance*, initiated by the permitted *Reverse Verification* of the role of CVB. The existence of evil and paradoxes confirms the active status of the *BigQuestion*.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
This axiom affirms that what we observe — the presence of evil, suffering, logical and moral contradictions — is not a flaw in the system, but evidence of a logically permissible state of the world within the phase of *Verification Tolerance*.
This state is the ontological-logical response to the open *Big Question*, in which subjects (Guests) discern whether CVB can be acknowledged as:

- the Just Judge,
- the Standard of Truth,
- the Lawgiver of Good and Evil,
- the Ruler of Becoming.

The answer can only be reached by distinguishable Guests. Until the verification is complete, allowances are in effect: evil may temporarily exist within the Field of the Possible — not as ontologically permitted, but as not yet removed, pending the final act of discernment.
This delay does not imply endorsement: *Verification Tolerance* is not the acceptance of evil, but the logically required space for discernment.
To forbid such a phase would mean coercively stripping the Guest of free will and would imply intervention by CVB in favor of unilateral determinism — which is ontologically impossible because:

- It contradicts **[13]** by assuming that CVB generates the external to expand itself — which is impossible, as CVB is self-sufficient and requires no internal or external augmentation. Only the free will of Guests enables any becoming beyond CVB.
- It violates the *Motivation of Good*, replacing discernment with force;
- It destroys the very condition of verification, rendering Truth unprovable;
- It breaks the model of distinguishability, conflicting with **[11.1.1]** $\Phi(\psi)$.

🔹 **3. Formulas**

Let BQ = *Big Question* — a permissible challenge to Φ(ψ_CVB)
Let ∃ψ ∈ G initiating Φ(BQ), without violating Φ(ψ)

Then:

∀ψ ∈ V:
if Φ(BQ) is active, then the state of V transitions into VT (Verification Tolerance)

VT = {ψ ∈ V | ¬Φ(ψ_Z) ∧ Δt ∈ T}

Conditions:
— ¬Φ(ψ_Z): evil forms are not yet removed
— But ψ_Z ∉ Φ(ψ): if they violate distinguishability → ∂V↓

LaTeX:

```
\text{Let } BQ = \text{Big Question},\ \Phi(BQ) \subseteq \Phi(\psi_{\text{CVB}}) \\
\exists \psi \in G:\ \Phi(\psi) = \Phi(BQ) \Rightarrow V \to VT \\
VT = \{ \psi \in V\ |\ \neg \Phi(\psi_Z),\ \Delta t \in T \} \\
\psi_Z \notin \Phi(\psi) \Rightarrow \psi_Z \to \partial V_\downarrow
```

Validation:

- Does not violate **[5]** Distinguishability, **[11.1.1]** Φ(ψ), or **[25]** Reverse Verification.
- Absence of a final answer sustains VT as an active phase, not a paradox.
- Presence of evil is not co-participation, as it does not violate the Motivation of CVB (**[18]**).

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**
Axiom **[26]** logically follows from:

- **[13]** — CVB does not extend itself, and thus cannot create the external as a continuation of itself. Only free Guests may become outside it. Therefore, imposing Truth prior to free choice would contradict the axiom.
- **[25]** — Reverse Verification permits the phase of *Verification Tolerance* in response to the *Big Question*.
- **[11.1.1]** — permits temporary existence of distinguishable, non-contradictory forms, even if their truth is not fully realized.
- **[16]** — allows memory of violations without participation, enabling tolerance of evil without complicity.
- **[23]** — freedom of the Guest to make a distinguishable choice and bear responsibility.

If verification of the Judge is allowed, then a state must exist where Truths are not yet universally accepted but are already available for discernment.
This requires the temporary allowance of evil — not as legitimized, but as not yet eliminated due to incomplete discernment.
Such a phase is logically necessary; without it, the model would collapse internally by violating its own axioms.

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

OBJECTION (The philosophical problem of theodicy, the logical dilemma of the permissibility of evil):
Why is evil allowed in the world if the system claims the primacy of Good and Truth?
Response: Because the current phase of Being is *Verification Tolerance* (see [25], [26]). Evil is not ontologically permissible in essence, but temporarily allowed as a condition for discernment. This is logically necessary to enable free choice prior to the completion of verification. The alternative would be imposed Truth, which would violate Axiom [13] and eliminate freedom.

OBJECTION (Ethical relativism, criticism of utilitarian justification of suffering):
Does this not justify violence, death, and destruction as acceptable norms?
Response: No. The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) strictly distinguishes *Tolerance* from *Complicity* (see [16], [23], [24.4]). CVB does not support evil — it temporarily permits it so that the process of discernment may be completed. Permission is not justification. The Model's stability requires that evil not be removed before discernment is complete; otherwise, this would violate the principle of just freedom.

OBJECTION (Postmodernism, skepticism, relativism):
Does this mean that everything is subjective and Truth does not exist?
Response: No. Truth exists (see [11.2.1], [12.1]), but until discernment is complete, it is not universally acknowledged. The existence of paradoxes, contradictions, and logical incompleteness (cf. Gödel, Russell, Quine) does not imply the absence of Truth — rather, it signals an active phase of verification: a logically permissible open question.

OBJECTION (The perfectionism argument — either all is perfect, or the system is false):
If the system is imperfect (evil exists), is it not unstable or false?
Response: This is a false dichotomy. The perfection of the model lies not in the prior elimination of all errors, but in its capacity to distinguish and resolve them through discernment. Temporary imperfection is not a defect but a condition of logical stability in a free model (see [13], [25]). Without a phase of imperfection, Truth could not be shown to be freely discerned rather than imposed.

OBJECTION (The problem of justice given unequal ability to defend oneself and the consequences of one's freedom upon another):
Is it not evil to allow some subjects to inflict suffering or terminate the Becoming of others (e.g., murder) before verification?
Response: This is allowed only as a temporary condition of verification in a logically coherent model. Violations of Becoming are recorded in the *Memory of CVB* ([16]) and subject to *Restoration*. Death or the interruption of Becoming in the Present is not *Removal*: forms that have not completed discernment remain in a verification state and are eligible for Restoration before final verification. Thus, even temporarily unprotected forms are not lost or forgotten — the Model ensures justice not through immediacy, but through the fullness of Verification.

QUESTION: *What does "subject to Restoration" mean? Do the dead not disappear forever?*
Response: No. Disappearance is not equivalent to *Removal*. In the CVB system, Removal is possible only after final Verification. Until then, *Verification Tolerance* is in effect, where a form may be temporarily removed from the Present but retained in *Memory* ([16], [24], [25]). Since only CVB can activate the mechanism of Removal, nothing is lost without due justification — the model does not permit arbitrary disappearance.

QUESTION: *If the dead do not disappear, does this imply they go to an afterlife, heaven, etc.?*
Response: No. *Becoming* (life), will, choice, and discernment are only possible in the Present. Death is the objective end of Becoming in the Present. However, all actions of the Guest are recorded in Memory (see [15], [16], [11.1.1]). Memory contains full information for discernment: it is not equivalent to life, but it makes *Restoration* possible. This is not transition into another life, but suspension of Becoming until new actualization by decision of CVB.

QUESTION: *Would such Restoration not be just a copy — a clone? Would it still be the same Guest?*
Response: No. The Model excludes cloning or substitution of essence: CVB does not engage in deception.
Verification requires discernment of the concrete Guest, not a statistical approximation.
Since each Guest has a unique state and Will Vector (see [13], [23], [15.3]), the Memory of CVB contains the complete, non-contradictory structure of the Guest — capable of being distinctly recognized without distortion.
Thus, Restoration is not a copy but a continuation of one's own Becoming from the last preserved state.

QUESTION: *Can CVB truly restore someone?*
Response: Yes.
According to Axioms [6] (Causality), [7] (Origin of Becoming), and [23] (Freedom of the Guest), only CVB determines what may or must continue Becoming.
All that exists does so not autonomously, but through the constant action of CVB.
CVB is not only the Judge but the Source of all new Becomings.
If a form has not been finally Removed (which can happen only after completed Verification), then its Restoration in the Present is a direct act of CVB, fully consistent with the Model.

QUESTION: *When will deceased Guests be restored?*
Response: Restoration of deceased Guests will occur within the phase of *Verification Tolerance*, but only after completion of their individual Verification, under the following conditions:

- All forms that terminated their Becoming (i.e., those responsible for the destruction of life) must be Removed as [4.2] *Non-Constant Impossible* — to prevent recurrence.
- CVB will provide each Guest with the opportunity to complete their own Verification.

This follows logically from the axioms:

- **[16]** — Preservation in Memory
- **[11.1.1]** — Discernibility through archived states
- **[23]** — Freedom and Responsibility of the Guest
- **[13]** — CVB does not expand itself (i.e., does not create forms for itself, but grants them freedom to become independently)

Restoration is a logical consequence of CVB's commitment to complete the discernment of each Guest. Without it, the model of Verification would be logically incomplete.

Conclusion:
Deceased Guests are subject to Restoration in the Present after the elimination of forms that violate Good and Becoming — but before the final completion of the overall phase of *Verification Tolerance*.
CVB will ensure that each Guest completes their Verification — without distortion, interruption, or coercion.

QUESTION: *When will the forms that violate Good and Becoming be eliminated, if this must happen before the end of the Verification phase? What might trigger this event?*

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

Verification Tolerance (VT) — A phase of Reality permitted after [25], in which evil and paradoxes are temporarily not removed until the discernible choice of subjects is completed.

Big Question (BQ) — The universal challenge: *"Does CVB have the right to be Judge, Lawgiver, Source, and Sovereign?"*

ψ_Z — A form of evil, distinguishable via Φ(ψ) as unstable and violating the Good, but not yet removed.

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

If there is evil in the world, it does not mean that God is unjust.
It means you still have a chance to understand who He is.

He does not impose Himself.
He gives you the opportunity to freely choose whether you will trust Him as Judge.

As long as you are choosing — evil may still exist.
But it is not eternal.
As soon as your choice is complete — everything that has chosen evil will disappear.
Not because it is punished, but because it cannot become good.

- **8. Empirical Examples**

Logic:
The *Problem of Evil* (Epicurus, Plantinga) confirms:
Freedom requires the allowance of imperfection.
Without freedom, there is no evil — but also no love.

Science:
Quantum indeterminacy:
The state of a system is undefined until observed — analogous to *Verification Tolerance* prior to completed discernment.

Everyday Life:
A legal trial:
Before the verdict, even the guilty are allowed to live and defend themselves.
A false conviction can only be avoided through patient discernment.

---

[27] The Great Verification

- **1. Brief Statement**

The Great Verification is the process of discerning Truth and Good across the entire system of Becoming, necessary for resolving the Big Question and concluding the phase of Verification Tolerance.

- **2. Interpretation and Significance**

As long as discernment is incomplete, no final decision regarding the Removal of impossible forms can be made.
Verification entails the evaluation of all accessible paradoxes, theories, and worldviews to identify a non-contradictory model of Being.
Only such a model (e.g., CVB), coinciding with the *Revelation* of Truth (from the Source), can serve as the basis for concluding the discernment phase.
The Great Verification is not merely an act of logical proof but the universal discovery of discernible Truth by all Guests, wherein the choice between Good and Evil becomes conscious and final.

- **3. Formulas**

$$\Phi(\psi) \rightarrow \exists! V_{a}: V_{a} = \text{Verified Truth} \land \forall \psi_i \in \Psi: \Phi(\psi_i) \rightarrow (\psi_i \ne V_{a} \rightarrow \psi_i = \text{false distinction})$$

$$V(\psi) = \text{Truth} \Leftrightarrow \psi \text{ passes consistent verification by } \Phi(\psi)$$

$$\exists \psi_{\text{CVB}}: (\psi_{\text{CVB}} = \text{Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming}) \land \Phi(\psi_{\text{CVB}}) = \text{True} \land \exists \psi_{\text{Revelation}}: \Phi(\psi_{\text{CVB}}) \equiv \Phi(\psi_{\text{Revelation}})$$
$$\Rightarrow \text{Discernment concludes and false forms may be removed}$$

🔹 4. Logical Justification

This axiom follows from:

- [25] *Reverse Verification* — the need to evaluate all positions;
- [26] *Current State* — Verification Tolerance continues until an Answer is found;
- [11.1.1] *Meta-function of admissibility Φ(ψ)* — a formal criterion for verification;
- [23] *Freedom of the Guest* — each Guest must discern independently;
- [13] *Self-sufficiency of CVB* — it does not extend itself forcibly.
  Since discernment is necessary but cannot be imposed, there must exist a model that enables all parties to consciously recognize Truth as unambiguous and non-contradictory.

🔹 5. Responses to Objections

Objection 1 (Epistemology):
"Truth is unattainable because everything is subjective."
Response:
Φ(ψ) formalizes the distinction between subjective and objectively consistent claims. Verification via Φ(ψ) separates true knowledge from illusion.

Objection 2 (Scientific skepticism):
"Philosophical models cannot be verified like scientific theories."
Response:
The CVB model is not based on dogma but on logically rigorous, testable axioms. It can be applied to verify any theory — philosophical or scientific.

Objection 3 (Religious):
"Revelation cannot be verified — it is accepted by faith."
Response:
The CVB model functions as an independent logical discovery capable of verifying any revelation for consistency. The coincidence of Revelation and Discovery becomes a condition for the objective recognition of Truth.

🔹 6. Clarification of Terms

- **The Great Verification** — a global process of discernment encompassing philosophical, scientific, and spiritual claims.
- **Discovery** — a model of Truth derived by Guests (e.g., the CVB model).
- **Revelation** — a statement of Truth originating from the Source (CVB).
- **Double Confirmation** — the coincidence of Revelation and Discovery, confirmed via Φ(ψ).

🔹 7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)

Imagine the whole world arguing about what is right and what is wrong.
The CVB model is a tool that helps discover Truth not by force, but by logic.
If both the Guest and the Source state the same thing — that's Truth.
Only then can evil be stopped and a shared future built on Good begin.

🔹 8. Empirical Examples

- **Logic:**
  Liar paradox, Gödel's theorem — they require level-based distinctions. Φ(ψ) provides this.

- **Science:**
  Millennium Problems (e.g., P ≠ NP), Schrödinger's cat — require a unified consistent logic.

- **Philosophy:**
  Theodicy, Heidegger's Being, Kant's epistemic boundary — all require verification.

- **Everyday Life:**
  Every person confronts lies, good, and evil. Without discernment, all collapses into chaos.
  The Great Verification is the pursuit of clarity — for all.

---

[28] Perspective — The Future

🔹 **1. Brief Statement**
After the completion of the Great Verification and the phase of Verification Tolerance, evil will be removed as impossible, good will be preserved as stable and admissible, and joint Becoming will continue infinitely in the direction of Truth and discernibility.

🔹 **2. Interpretation and Significance**
This axiom defines the ontological structure of the future following the current phase. While [26] and [27] establish the necessity of Verification and evidence for resolving Φ(BigQuestion), [28] states the outcome: the Field of the Possible is cleared of evil, and verified Good is affirmed as the ontological foundation of further Becoming.
Becoming does not end — it enters a new phase: stable, joint, infinite discernment of Good, with evil removed as a form that violated discernibility and forfeited the right to continue.
Evil precedents are preserved as admissible records, but no longer realizable — a reminder of the limits of admissibility.
This axiom articulates the *telos* (ultimate aim) of the entire structure: a verified world, free from destructive patterns, where Becoming continues without internal threat.

🔹 **3. Formulas**
Let:

- `VT` = Verification Tolerance
- `BQ` = the Big Question
- `Φ(BQ)` = Φ(ψ_R) — the final discerned answer
- `ψ_Z` = Evil, with Φ(ψ_Z) = FALSE
- `ψ_G` = Good, with Φ(ψ_G) = TRUE

Then:

$$\text{Let } VT = \text{Verification Tolerance},\ BQ = \text{Big Question},\ \Phi(BQ) = \Phi(\psi_R) \\$$

$$\text{If } \Phi(BQ) = \text{TRUE} \Rightarrow VT \to \text{complete} \\$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall \psi,\ \Phi(\psi) = \text{FALSE} \Rightarrow \psi \in \partial V_\downarrow \\$$

$$\forall \psi,\ \Phi(\psi) = \text{TRUE} \Rightarrow \psi \in V^+ \\$$

$$\forall \psi_Z:\ \Phi(\psi_Z) = \text{FALSE} \Rightarrow \text{Record}(\psi_Z) \in P,\ P \not\subset V^+ \\$$

$$\text{Becoming: } St(\psi) = \infty \text{ if } \psi \in V^+ \land \Phi(\psi) = \text{TRUE}$$

✔️ **Verification**:

- No contradiction: evil carriers are Removed, yet not forgotten — they will never re-enter the Possible and never reoccur.
- Good is preserved as the admissible set with Φ(ψ) = TRUE.
- The process remains infinite (St(ψ) = ∞), but without the threat of compromised discernibility.

🔹 **4. Logical Justification**

From [26] and [27], we know that the end of Verification Tolerance is only possible after presenting discernible evidence of Truth.
Such evidence eliminates evil as impossible (Φ(ψ_Z) = FALSE) and confirms good (Φ(ψ_G) = TRUE).
From [11.1.1] and [25], the impossible must be moved beyond $\partial V\downarrow$.
Therefore, all forms of evil — as violators of discernibility and justice — must be removed.
To prevent recurrence, their precedents are retained as knowledge ($P \Subset V^+$) but never realized again.
If evil were not removed, it could restart the cycle of destruction — contradicting the principle of stable Becoming.
Thus, its removal is a logical necessity.

🔹 **5. Responses to Objections**

Objection 1 (Utilitarianism):
"Evil sometimes leads to good — why remove it?"
Response:
The consequences of evil do not justify its essence. Verified good does not require destruction as a tool. See [11.3.3] for the Asymmetry of Good and Evil.

Objection 2 (Eschatology):
"The future cannot be logically derived."
Response:
In CVB, the future is a result of ontological memory and discernment. After the Big Question is answered, the model transitions into stability.

Objection 3 (Anthropocentrism):
"Who decides what is Good?"
Response:
The decision is not human-made but discerned through the Meta-function Φ, which formalizes contradiction-free discernibility.
Good is that which is stable, distinguishable, and does not violate other ψ.

🔹 **6. Clarification of Terms**

- **∂V↓** — the boundary of impossible removal: all forms that violate discernibility are moved beyond the admissible domain of Being.
- **P** — the set of evil precedents, preserved for discernment but not realizable (an archive of experience).
- **V^+** — the purified, stable, discernible Field of the Possible containing only forms with Φ(ψ) = TRUE.
- **St(ψ) =** ∞ — infinite joint Becoming within V^+.

🔹 **7. Understanding for All (Popular Version)**
When justice is finally restored, evil will vanish. It will never again cause harm — but it will remain in memory so that we never repeat the same mistakes.
Good — honesty, love, freedom — will live forever. From then on, we will create together: not by destroying, but by building. Not in fear, but in hope. Without evil — forever.

🔹 **8. Empirical Examples**

- **Logic:**
  Final steps of proof eliminate false hypotheses and preserve what has been verified.
- **Science:**
  Discarded theories like phlogiston or geocentrism are archived as history, but not accepted as valid again.
- **Everyday Life:**
  A person who has endured evil remembers — not to repeat it, but to protect others from it.

0.3 Conclusion

🔹 0.3.1. Implications for Metaphysics, Ethics, and Logic

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) proposes a new foundation:
– *Truth* is defined as what is discernible,

– *Ethics* as the verification of Good,
– *Logic* as derived from the ontological structure of Being.
The model resolves paradoxes of predetermination, subjectivism, and false plurality.

- 0.3.2. Potential for Extension and Application

The model is applicable in the philosophy of mind, formal logic, ethics, and metamathematics.
It also offers a foundation for non-contradictory systems of recognition, learning, and value-based decision-making in the theory of artificial intelligence.

0.4 Appendices

- 0.4.1. Table of Axioms

See the attached table listing axioms [1]–[28], grouped by meta-sections, with brief statements for each.