📘 Rapid Verification

📘 **Justification of the Method: Rapid Verification**
1. Foundation:
 The method of Rapid Verification is based on **Axiom [25] — Reverse Verification**, which states that any system can and must be evaluated for admissibility within the **Field of the Possible**. It is used to detect internal contradictions (self-exclusion, source substitution, loss of distinction) **without appealing to subjective belief or external authority**.

2. Purpose:
 The purpose of Rapid Verification is to **logically distinguish** whether a system is ontologically admissible, and to **provide verifiable evidence** of its compliance or noncompliance with the conditions of **Truth, Goodness, and Becoming**.

3. Why "Rapid":
 It is called "Rapid" because it **does not require full activation of ontological structures** or the authority of **Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)**, which is necessary for Full Verification (see Axioms [23] — Initiative and [25] — Reverse Verification).
 Full Verification is only possible through the initiative of CVB, while Rapid Verification is **accessible to anyone who can distinguish**.

Conclusion:
 Rapid Verification is a logically accessible method of ontological differentiation, preparing the foundation for Final (Full) Verification, which can be performed **only by the initiative of Conscious Volitional Becoming**.

🔷 Model: Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)

🔷 1. Core Statement
 The CVB model states that distinguishable reality is based not on void or totality, but on **becoming through conscious will**. All that exists is admissible as Possible and Distinguishable.

🔷 2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 The **source of Truth** is the **Permanent Possible** ([4.4]), distinguished through will ([9], [10.6]) and verified via the meta-function $\Phi(\psi)$, which determines ontological admissibility.

🔻 3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** Is the model self-enclosed?
    • **Answer:** No. CVB demands verification of itself through the meta-function $\Phi(\psi)$ ([11.1.1.4]). If any claim contradicts Axioms [1]–[3], it is excluded. **Verification is built into the structure of distinction.**

• **Question:** Does CVB become a new dogma?
    • **Answer:** No. CVB **requires no belief**. It uses ontological filtration: $\Phi(\psi) = 1 \Leftrightarrow \psi \in V$ ([11.1.1]), applying it even to itself. Everything distinguishable is verified for admissibility — including the model.

• **Question:** Does the model substitute itself for Truth?
    • **Answer:** No. The source is the **Permanent Possible** ([4.4], [6]), not the model itself. CVB excludes both Absolute Nothing ([1]) and Absolute Everything ([2]) as sources, **distinguishing Truth rather than constructing it**.

• **Question:** Does it blur the line between Truth and Falsehood?
    • **Answer:** No. **Distinction is foundational** ([9.1], [11.2.1]–[11.2.2]). Only what is distinguishable within the **Field of the Possible V** is admissible ([4], [4.4]), verified via $\Phi(\psi)$ ([11.1.1]).

• **Question:** Does the model eliminate free will?
   • **Answer:** No. Will is **necessary for becoming** ([4.3], [10.6], [12.2]). The model distinguishes between admissible and self-destructive will — it **does not prohibit divergence** if distinguishable ([11.5]).

• **Question:** Does volitional being negate causality?
   • **Answer:** No. **Causality is ontological, not mechanistic**: Permanent Possible → Distinguishing Will → Becoming ([6], [7], [11.1]). This **restores causal meaning without randomness**.

• **Question:** Does the model contradict itself?
   • **Answer:** No. CVB applies the same verification to itself as to all claims. If $\Phi(\psi) = 0$, the claim is rejected. The model **self-terminates upon contradiction** ([11.1.1.4]), making it a verifiable system.

◆ **4. Summary of Identified Paradox Classes**
      ✅ None remain unresolved
      ‣ Does not substitute the source
      ‣ Does not lose distinction
      ‣ Does not block will
      ‣ Does not violate causality
      ‣ Does not self-exclude
      ‣ Applies its own verification criteria to itself

◆ **5. Popular Summary**
 The CVB model is **not a dogma, not a philosophy, not a belief system**. It is a way to distinguish **what is possible from what is not**. It doesn't ask for faith — it asks to be **verified**. It applies the same test to itself as it does to any claim.
 If there were a paradox in it, the model would self-destroy.
 Everything distinguishable — is verifiable.
 And everything admissible — can become.

🔷 Rationalism

1. Core Statement:
 Rationalism holds that reason is the primary or sole source of knowledge and truth. It relies on a priori principles, self-evidence, and deduction — independent of external experience.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth:
 Reason (*ratio*) is seen as the initial criterion and foundation of truth.
 Classical thinkers: Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz.

3. Ontological Inconsistency per CVB:
 • **Question:** If reason is the primary source, how does it distinguish itself from Nothing or from Everything?
   • **Answer:** In CVB, reason is not primary — it is only a part of the Personhood ([12]), which includes distinction ([9]), memory ([10.3]), will ([10.6]), and motivation ([12.3]). The true source is the **Permanent Possible** ([6]), not reason itself.

• **Question:** How can a priori knowledge be considered reliable if it bypasses experience, logic, or ontological verification?
   • **Answer:** Without ontological verification, a priori knowledge is unstable: it fails to distinguish properly ([9]), may violate admissibility in V ([4.4]), and does not pass through the filter $\Phi(\psi)$ ([11.1.1]).

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions:
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Violation of causality
‣ Loss of distinction

‣ Impossibility of becoming
‣ Lack of stability
‣ Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version:
 Rationalism errs by taking reason as the starting point.
 Ontologically, reason cannot be the source of truth, because it itself depends on distinction, motivation, and memory. It does not generate truth — it participates in distinguishing it.
 The CVB model shows that only a full structure of Personhood (self, will, emotion, memory, motivation) can perform stable differentiation.

🔷 Empiricism

1. Core Statement:
 Empiricism asserts that truth and knowledge arise exclusively from sensory experience. The senses are regarded as the primary source of knowledge, and consciousness is seen as an accumulation of impressions.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth:
 Sensory experience is taken as the sole foundation of knowledge.
 Key thinkers: John Locke, George Berkeley, David Hume.
 Key ideas: *tabula rasa*, induction, observation.

3. Ontological Inconsistency per CVB:
 • **Question:** How can a distinguishing structure (the self) arise solely from incoming sensations?
   • **Answer:** According to [9] and [7], distinction does not arise from sensations — it requires a stable structure: feelings, reason, memory, will, and the self ([10.1]–[10.6]). Sensations are inputs, but they do not distinguish. Without a prior structure of distinction, becoming is impossible.

 • **Question:** Why is the principle of empiricism itself accepted without empirical verification?
   • **Answer:** This is a self-excluding claim. The principle of empiricism is not experience but a meta-assumption. It violates [11.1] (noncontradictory logic) and [11.1.1] (filter $\Phi(\psi)$). Empiricism exceeds its own criteria of truth.

 • **Question:** How can experience assert universal truth, if it is limited in time and space?
   • **Answer:** Induction does not ensure ontological stability. According to [5], observed ≠ true. According to [11.2], truth requires stability, not just repeatability. Induction offers predictions, not foundations of truth.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions:
‣ Loss of distinction
‣ Impossibility of becoming
‣ Lack of stability
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Violation of causality

5. Popular Version:
 Empiricism is useful for receiving signals from the external world — but by itself, it cannot explain how sensations become understanding. Without memory, reason, the self, and will, sensations remain meaningless noise.
 Therefore, empiricism is admissible **as a part** of a distinguishing structure, but **not as its foundation**. It does not pass full verification under $\Phi(\psi)$ as a complete ontology.

🔷 Skepticism

1. Core Statement:
 Skepticism claims that reliable knowledge is impossible or inaccessible. It promotes doubt as both method and principle, refraining from definitive judgments about reality, truth, or being.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth:
 Doubt is elevated as the supreme criterion.
 Historical forms: Pyrrhonism, Academic Skepticism (Pyrrho, Sextus Empiricus).
 The source of truth is either denied or considered permanently inaccessible.

3. Ontological Inconsistency per CVB:
 • **Question:** How can one confidently claim that truth is unknowable?
   • **Answer:** This is a self-excluding statement. Per [11.1.1] and [11.2], truth requires stability. Skepticism denies truth while affirming its unknowability — rendering itself unstable.

 • **Question:** Who performs distinction if everything is in doubt?
   • **Answer:** Distinction requires a Person with memory, will, and self ([9], [12]). Doubt is a function of reason — not a foundation. Skepticism eliminates the subject of distinction, violating becoming ([7]).

 • **Question:** How can action occur if all knowledge is doubtful?
   • **Answer:** Will requires stable distinctions ([10.6], [11.8]). Skepticism erases these distinctions, blocking will and causality — becoming becomes impossible ([7]).

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions:
 ‣ Self-excluding system
 ‣ Substitution of the source
 ‣ Loss of distinction
 ‣ Impossibility of becoming
 ‣ Violation of stability
 ‣ Blockage of will
 ‣ Violation of causality

5. Popular Version:
 Skepticism says: "Nothing can be known for sure" — yet treats that statement as certain. That's a contradiction.
 Also, if everything is doubtful, who distinguishes, chooses, and acts?
 Doubt is useful **as a tool** — it helps refine — but it cannot be the basis of everything.
 For stable differentiation, a Person with will, memory, and self is required — the very conditions that make knowledge possible.

🔷 Agnosticism

1. Core Statement
 Agnosticism claims that it is impossible to know whether a Higher Being or Truth exists. It refrains from final judgments, citing the limits of human cognition.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 Truth is considered unreachable or undefinable.
 Key figures: Thomas Huxley, I. Kant, B. Russell.
 Knowledge is based on sense and reason, but only within empirically accessible limits.

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** How can one claim that knowledge is impossible, if that claim itself presumes knowledge?

• **Answer:** According to [9], the distinction between "known" and "unknowable" requires a stable distinguishing self. Agnosticism uses distinction to deny it — contradicting itself ([11.1.1], [11.2]).

• **Question:** If one must not pursue the distinction of the source, how is volition toward becoming possible?
  • **Answer:** According to [10.5], [11.8], [7], becoming requires a will to distinguish. Agnosticism blocks this will, replacing conscious direction with uncertainty. This makes becoming impossible.

• **Question:** Does agnosticism not exclude the very possibility of distinguishing the Source?
  • **Answer:** According to [6], cause-and-effect distinction is possible only with an admissible source. Agnosticism substitutes this with inadmissible indeterminacy, making verification impossible.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Loss of distinction
‣ Blockage of will
‣ Impossibility of becoming
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Violation of causality

5. Popular Version
Agnosticism says, "We cannot know." But it says that **as knowledge**. This is a contradiction.
It also blocks the will to distinguish. Without will and distinction, becoming is impossible.
Yet if agnosticism is not rejection but a stage of reflection — it is admissible.
In the CVB model, rational doubt is valuable — but it must lead to distinction, not halt it.

🔷 Solipsism

1. Core Statement
Solipsism claims that the only certain existence is that of one's own consciousness. Everything else — others, the world, the body — is a projection or illusion of perception.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
Subjective consciousness as a closed source of truth.
Representatives: Descartes (early), Berkeley, radical subjectivists.

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** How can feelings, memory, will, and distinction exist if everything is enclosed in a single point?
  • **Answer:** According to [9], distinction requires both self and non-self. A closed consciousness loses the input and output of distinctions, violating the stability of becoming ([7], [4.4]). This renders Personhood impossible.

• **Question:** Where does knowledge of "others" come from, if they do not exist?
  • **Answer:** According to [10.3]–[10.5], memory and interaction form Personhood. If the external is denied, the basis for a distinguishing self disappears — leading to self-exclusion ([11.4]).

• **Question:** Can the source of being exist inside subjective consciousness?
  • **Answer:** According to [6], the source cannot be emergent or dependent. If the self is incomplete, finite, and does not know its origin, it cannot be the foundation. This is a substitution of the source.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Loss of distinction
‣ Violation of becoming
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Lack of stability
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Violation of causality

5. Popular Version
 Solipsism says: "Only I exist," but does not explain where this "I" came from, or why it has memory and distinction.
 Without the external, there are no distinctions. Without distinctions, there is no consciousness.
 Solipsism may be useful as a tool for testing reality — but cannot serve as its foundation.
 According to CVB, Personhood is not just "I," but a structure in which feeling, will, and stable distinction are possible.

🔷 Panpsychism

1. Core Statement
 Panpsychism holds that consciousness is a universal property of all that exists—from elementary particles to humans. Consciousness does not emerge but is always present as an intrinsic quality of matter.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 Subjectivity as an omnipresent component of reality.
 Representatives: Thomas Nagel, Philip Goff, Berkeley (partially).

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** How is Personhood distinct from mere "conscious matter"?
   • **Answer:** According to [10.1]–[10.5], Personhood is a structured distinguishing self. Panpsychism erases the difference between subject and object, violating [9].

 • **Question:** How is becoming possible if consciousness already "pervades all"?
   • **Answer:** According to [7] and [11.6], becoming requires transition through choice and distinction. Panpsychism replaces development with static presence.

 • **Question:** Who is the source of distinction if everything possesses consciousness?
   • **Answer:** According to [6], the source is not a collection of particles but the unified Permanent Possible. Panpsychism diffuses subjectivity, undermining causality and Personhood.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
 ‣ Loss of distinction
 ‣ Blockage of will
 ‣ Impossibility of becoming
 ‣ Lack of stability
 ‣ Substitution of the source
 ‣ Violation of causality

5. Popular Version
 Panpsychism says: "everything is consciousness," but does not explain how choice, will, or responsibility emerge. If everything is conscious, then no one is distinctively conscious.
 The CVB model allows that matter is not inert—but only a full distinguishing Person can be a subject.
 Panpsychism lacks this structure and thus cannot serve as a foundation of being.

🔷 Existentialism

1. Core Statement
 Existentialism claims that a person exists first, and only then defines their essence through choice. Meaning and truth result from individual decision, without external grounding.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
Truth arises from subjective experience of freedom, anxiety, and authenticity.
Representatives: Sartre, Camus, Heidegger, Jaspers.

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** If the individual creates truth, what prevents justifying any action?
  • **Answer:** According to [11.4] and [6], will is possible only through distinguishing Good from Evil. Without an external Source, choice loses stability. Arbitrary action becomes inadmissible.

• **Question:** How can the "self" remain stable if essence is defined only from within?
  • **Answer:** According to [10.2] and [3], a stable self requires alignment with the Permanent Possible. Existentialism breaks this, dissolving distinction.

• **Question:** How is becoming possible if Personhood is fixed in anxiety and finality?
  • **Answer:** According to [7] and [4.3], becoming requires an outward vector and purpose. Without a vector of Hope, existentialism blocks will and motion.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Blockage of will
‣ Lack of stability
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Impossibility of becoming
‣ Blockage of freedom

5. Popular Version
Existentialism emphasizes personal responsibility and freedom, but removes any stable foundation for choice.
When a person is their own truth, distinction collapses, anxiety remains, and the vector of becoming disappears.
The CVB model requires a Source and Goal beyond the self—so that freedom does not destroy itself.
Existentialism is an important signal—but not an ontological foundation.

🔷 Absurdism

1. Core Statement
Absurdism holds that humans face an irreconcilable conflict between the desire for meaning and the silence of the universe. Awareness of the absurd becomes a way to honestly accept the lack of answers and continue living regardless.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
Truth is found in recognizing the impossibility of ultimate meaning. The foundation is personal experience and logical awareness of absurdity.
Key figure: Albert Camus.

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** If all reality is absurd, how can that very fact be distinguished?
  • **Answer:** According to [1] (Ontological impossibility of Absolute Nothing) and [10.5] (The Self as distinction), any recognition—including of absurdity—requires a stable distinguishing Self. If absurdity is perceived, distinction already exists. Absurdism refutes itself.

• **Question:** If the choice to "rebel" has no foundation, what enables will?
  • **Answer:** According to [7] (Becoming as stable existence of the Possible) and [11.4] (Morality as motivation of admissible distinction), choice is only possible within the Field of the Possible and with an admissible motive. By rejecting the source, absurdism renders will arbitrary, blocking becoming.

- **Question:** If rebellion becomes the goal, doesn't it become a new form of meaning?
  - **Answer:** According to [10.4] (Emotions as stable motivational vectors) and [2] (Impossibility of Absolute Everything), a stable motive already constitutes distinct meaning. Rebellion as a permanent aim becomes meaning—contradicting its own claim. The system is self-contradictory.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Loss of distinction
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Blockage of will
‣ Violation of causality

5. Popular Version
 Absurdism is an honest cry in response to the silence of the world. Yet the very act of distinguishing absurdity proves the presence of a discerning origin. Accepting absurdity without a Source makes will arbitrary and undermines the stability of the Person.
 In the CVB model, meaning may not be obvious, but it is admissible if distinguished. Without access to Truth and Motivation, the system becomes endless rebellion with no vector. Absurdism reflects pain—but cannot be the foundation of becoming.

🔷 Dualism

1. Core Statement
 Dualism asserts that reality consists of two irreducible and opposing principles—spirit and matter, good and evil, consciousness and body. These principles are independent, autonomous, and often eternal.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 Truth is derived from observing the difference between the material and the immaterial, supported by philosophical tradition (Plato, Descartes, Manichaeism).
 The source is experience, reason, or mythological dichotomy.

3. Paradoxes
- **Question:** If spirit and matter, good and evil are autonomous and equal, how are they distinguished?
  - **Answer:** According to [1] (Impossibility of Absolute Nothing), [10.5] (Self as the distinguisher), and [11.1] (Logic as the basis of distinction), distinguishing opposites requires a stable distinguishing origin. Dualism fails to explain who or what distinguishes them—thus depending on an unacknowledged third. This breaks their claimed autonomy.

- **Question:** If substances are independent, how do they interact (e.g., feeling pain in the body)?
  - **Answer:** According to [7] (Becoming as transition of the Possible) and [11.4] (Morality as an admissible vector of will), becoming requires a unified acting Person. Dualism lacks a connecting will, rendering interaction impossible. This blocks development and violates causality.

- **Question:** If good and evil are equal and eternal, can the will make a meaningful choice?
  - **Answer:** According to [6] (The source is the Permanent Possible) and [11.3.3] (Asymmetry of Good and Evil), will requires a distinguishable orientation. If good and evil are equal, choice loses meaning, blocking motivation and the Person's becoming.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Loss of distinction
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Impossibility of becoming
‣ Violation of causality
‣ Blockage of will

5. Popular Version
 Dualism seeks to explain the inner and outer struggles of existence through two forces: light and dark, spirit and flesh. But if both forces are equal—who decides between them?
 Without a distinguishing Source, neither choice nor development is possible.
 According to the CVB model, distinction is only possible with a stable field of becoming and a vector for will. Dualism may reflect a stage of perception—but it does not pass ontological verification as a foundation of reality.
 Truth requires more than conflict; it requires distinction with purpose.

🔷 Monism

1. Core Statement
 Monism claims that all existence originates from a single source. Everything is a manifestation of the One—whether matter, spirit, nature, a neutral substance, or the divine. All distinctions are seen as illusion or secondary appearance.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 Truth is derived from the principle of unity. The foundation lies in logical simplicity, intuitive wholeness, and philosophical traditions (Plotinus, Spinoza, Advaita Vedanta).

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** If all is One, how do distinction, freedom, and Personhood arise?
    • **Answer:** According to [4.1]–[4.4] (Boundaries of the Field of the Possible), [11.1] (Logic of stability), and [1] (Impossibility of Absolute Nothing), distinction is a necessary condition of being. Denying it eliminates becoming, dissolves Personhood, and renders the model ontologically impossible.

 • **Question:** If distinctions exist—are they illusion or reality? If illusion—illusion *for whom*?
    • **Answer:** According to [10.2] (Mind as distinguisher), [6] (The Source is the Permanent Possible), and [11.1] (Ontological logic), perception of distinctions requires a distinguishing subject. Monism either introduces a hidden Person—breaking its claim of oneness—or denies distinction and thus invalidates itself.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Loss of distinction
‣ Impossibility of becoming
‣ Internal contradiction
‣ Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
 Monism sounds persuasive: "all is one." But if there are no distinctions—who distinguishes? Who chooses, who feels? Unity without a center of distinction is not freedom, but ontological dissolution.
 According to CVB, distinction is not an error but the foundation of Personhood. Monism may inspire poetically—but as an ontological model, it fails $\Phi(\psi)$ verification: it does not explain who distinguishes the One.

🔷 Materialism

1. Core Statement
 Materialism claims that the only reality is matter. Consciousness, reason, and will are byproducts of physical processes and laws. Everything is explained through material interactions.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 Truth is derived from empirical observation and physical measurement. The foundation of knowledge lies in neurophysiology, naturalism, and scientific realism.

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** How does a distinguishing subject arise from non-conscious matter?
   • **Answer:** According to [11.1] (Logic of stability), [6] (The Source is the Permanent Possible), [1] (Impossibility of Absolute Nothing), and [11.4] (Motivation of distinction), a distinguisher cannot emerge from the inadmissible. Matter without will and distinction cannot generate Personhood. This breaks causality and makes becoming impossible.

• **Question:** If everything is predetermined by physics, is free will possible?
   • **Answer:** According to [4.3] (Non-Permanent Possible), [11.4] (Motivation of distinction), and [12.2] (Freedom as a property of the Person), will is necessary for becoming. Determinism excludes free choice, blocks subjectivity, and undermines the basis of Personhood.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Violation of causality
‣ Impossibility of becoming
‣ Blockage of freedom
‣ Lack of stability

5. Popular Version
 Materialism is useful in science—but as a complete explanation of being, it is vulnerable. If all is molecules—who distinguishes? Who chooses? Without will and distinction, Personhood is impossible.
 According to CVB, only a distinguishing origin with admissible motivation is capable of becoming. Materialism excludes this—and thus fails the $\Phi(\psi)$ filter.

🔷 Idealism

1. Core Statement
 Idealism holds that all existence is the product of consciousness or spirit. The external world is either an illusion or a manifestation of inner mental reality. Matter is secondary—or even denied altogether.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 Truth originates from ideas, reason, or consciousness—either individual or absolute. Its foundation lies in a priori thinking, philosophical logic, and mental categories.

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** If all is idea, how can we distinguish the truly differentiated from the imagined?
   • **Answer:** According to [11.1] (logic of stability), [11.3] (Good as the differentiating), and [9] (requirement of distinguishability), distinction requires a stable boundary between subject and object. Idealism dissolves that boundary, violating the conditions of becoming.

• **Question:** If ideas generate everything, doesn't that create a closed causal loop?
   • **Answer:** According to [1] (impossibility of Absolute Nothing), [2] (impossibility of Absolute Everything), and [6] (the cause must be the Permanent Possible), consciousness cannot be both cause and effect without external grounding. Idealism becomes self-enclosed, substituting the Source.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Loss of distinction
‣ Substitution of the Source
‣ Self-excluding structure
‣ Violation of causality

5. Popular Version
 Idealism sounds beautiful—"everything is an idea." But if all is thought, who is the one who distinguishes? Where is the boundary between self and imagination?
 According to CVB, distinction is not an illusion but the foundation of becoming. Ideas matter—but they do not generate Truth. Without a stable distinguishing Personhood, existence is not possible. Thus, idealism may be part of the explanation—but not the full model of being.

🔷 Realism

1. Core Statement
 Realism asserts that there is an objective reality independent of perception. Truth is defined as correspondence to actual reality. Consciousness does not determine reality—it only reflects it.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 Truth is drawn from observation, logic, and empirical facts. Founders include Aristotle, Russell, and Putnam. The foundation is the independence of the world from the observer.

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** If reality is independent of consciousness, who distinguishes—and how does the act of distinction even arise?
    • **Answer:** According to [11.1] (logical consistency), [11.2] (the fact of distinction), and [10.2] (mind as the distinguisher), distinction is only possible through a subject. If the distinguisher is excluded, knowledge becomes impossible. This violates causality and replaces the true Source.

 • **Question:** If truth is only correspondence to the external, is the truth of becoming even possible?
    • **Answer:** According to [4] (Field of the Possible), [11.2] (truth as distinguished), and [11.4] (morality as admissible will), truth also includes internal becoming. Realism excludes will and motivation, restricting admissibility and blocking freedom.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
 ‣ Substitution of the Source
 ‣ Violation of causality
 ‣ Blockage of freedom
 ‣ Restriction of the Field of the Possible

5. Popular Version
 Realism says: the world exists—even if you don't know it. But then—who even knows?
 According to CVB, Truth is inseparable from the one who distinguishes. Without Personhood, there is no distinction. Realism is admissible as part of trust in a stable world—but it does not explain becoming or freedom, and thus cannot serve as the full foundation of Truth.

🔷 Naturalism

1. Core Statement
 Naturalism asserts that all that exists is nature and its laws. Consciousness, morality, will, and truth are explained as derivatives of physical and biological processes.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 Truth is derived from science, empiricism, and logic. Its foundations include physicalism, evolution, and cognitive models. Representatives: Quine, Dennett, Sellars.

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** If consciousness is merely a biological process, where is the distinguishing "I"?
   • **Answer:** According to [4] (Field of the Possible) and [11.1] (logical consistency), distinction requires a stable Personhood. Naturalism replaces it with functional correlation, dissolving the boundary between distinguisher and distinguished.

• **Question:** If will is an illusion of neural activity, is free choice possible?
   • **Answer:** According to [12.2] (freedom as a property of Personhood) and [11.3] (will as admissible differentiation of Good and Evil), becoming requires free choice. Deterministic naturalism excludes this, narrowing what is admissible under $\Phi(\psi)$.

• **Question:** If beliefs are merely products of evolution, how can the truth of the theory itself be justified?
   • **Answer:** According to [1]–[3] (the core: excluding Nothing and Everything), and [11.1.1.4] (ontological verification), a theory must be self-consistent. Naturalism, reducing thinking to adaptation, strips its own truth of foundation—thus self-excluding.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Substitution of the Source
‣ Loss of distinguishability
‣ Blockage of will
‣ Inhibition of becoming
‣ Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
 Naturalism says: everything is matter and its laws. But if will and consciousness are just chemistry—then who chooses? Who distinguishes?
 According to CVB, distinction and will are the basis of Personhood. Naturalism works as a scientific tool—but it cannot serve as a complete model of being. It excludes freedom—and thus excludes the Person.

🔷 Pluralism

1. Core Statement
 Pluralism asserts that reality consists of multiple, equally valid and irreducible origins, forms of truth, values, or modes of existence. It rejects a single ontological foundation and treats multiplicity as primary.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 Truth is accepted as plural: its sources may include experience, logic, faith, intuition, culture, and more. Foundations: pragmatism, hermeneutics, postmodernism. Representatives: William James, Isaiah Berlin.

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** How can we distinguish what is admissible if all truth sources are treated as equally valid?
   • **Answer:** According to [1]–[3] (the Core), [4.1] (Permanent Impossible), and [11.1] (logical stability), distinction requires a unified admissible foundation. Pluralism without the criterion $\Phi(\psi)$ loses the ability to distinguish and renders Personhood impossible.

• **Question:** Can pluralism admit a system that denies pluralism itself?
   • **Answer:** According to [2] (impossibility of Absolute Everything) and [11.1.1.4] (ontological verification), pluralism either self-cancels or abandons its own foundation. It fails the criterion of stable admissibility.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Loss of distinguishability
‣ Lack of stability
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Substitution of the Source

Pluralism says: everyone has their own truth. It sounds like respect. But without a foundation—who decides what is true? Where is Good? Where is Falsehood?

According to CVB, freedom requires distinction, and distinction requires admissibility. Pluralism may work as a communication style—but not as a foundation of being. If it admits everything—it loses everything.

🔷 Relativism

1. Core Statement

Relativism claims that truth, goodness, and even distinction depend on context. Everything is relative—from culture to perception. Universal truth is denied: each truth belongs "to its own world."

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth

Truth arises from subjective or social contexts: language, experience, culture, perception. Key figures: Protagoras, Montaigne, Foucault, Derrida.

3. Paradoxes

• **Question:** How can Falsehood be distinguished if all distinctions are relative?
  • **Answer:** According to [1]–[3] (the Core) and [11.1] (logical stability), distinction requires a stable criterion. Without $\Phi(\psi)$, distinguishability is lost—and with it, Personhood. Becoming becomes impossible.

• **Question:** Is the claim "everything is relative" itself relative?
  • **Answer:** According to [2] (impossibility of Totality) and [11.1.1.2] (core verification through $\Phi(\psi)$), if relativism claims universality, it self-negates. This is a self-excluding claim.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions

‣ Loss of distinguishability
‣ Blockage of becoming
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Substitution of the foundation

5. Popular Version

Relativism sounds peaceful: "Everyone has their own truth." But if all truths are "personal," then there are no distinctions at all. And without distinction, neither choice nor life is possible.

According to CVB, truth does not depend on preferences. Truth is what is admissible in the being of a distinguishing Person. Relativism may reflect cultural humility—but cannot serve as the foundation of a distinguishable world.

🔷 Postmodernism

1. Core Statement

Postmodernism denies universal meaning and Truth. Reality is seen as fluid interpretations; the subject is decentralized. Everything becomes a play of discourses with no center.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth

Truth is the product of context, language, power, and culture. Foundations: post-structuralism, Foucault, Derrida, Lyotard.

3. Paradoxes

• **Question:** If there is no universal truth, how can this very claim be true?
  • **Answer:** It violates [2]: denial of the universal becomes a totalizing claim. This self-negates the statement and fails [11.1.1.2].

- **Question:** If everything is interpretation, how can Truth and Falsehood be distinguished?
   - **Answer:** According to [1], [3], [4.1], distinction is necessary for becoming. Denying distinguishability removes admissibility in the Field V and eliminates the vector $\vec{v}$.

- **Question:** If freedom is an illusion, who desires, distinguishes, or becomes?
   - **Answer:** According to [12.1]–[12.3], Personhood is conscious volitional becoming. Denying this blocks subjectivity and makes existence impossible.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Loss of distinguishability
‣ Impossibility of becoming
‣ Blockage of freedom
‣ Substitution of the foundation

5. Popular Version
Postmodernism says: "There is no Truth—only perspectives." That may feel liberating, but without Truth, there is no distinguisher. One cannot even say that Falsehood is false, or Evil is evil.
CVB affirms distinction and Truth as admissible. Postmodernism may expose false absolutes—but cannot serve as a foundation. It reveals that truth is not construction—but then leaves no ground for truth at all.

🔷 Deconstruction

1. Core Statement
Deconstruction asserts that any meaning is unstable and fragments within itself. Truth is endlessly deferred, and distinctions (such as Good–Evil) are always undermined.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
Truth is not a fixed content but a product of linguistic difference (*différance*). Basis: Derrida — *Of Grammatology*, *Writing and Difference*.

3. Paradoxes
- **Question:** If truth is endlessly deferred, how is becoming possible?
   - **Answer:** According to [3] and [4.1], distinction must be realizable. Infinite deferral blocks volition ([12.2]) and renders Personhood impossible.

- **Question:** Can deconstruction be deconstructed?
   - **Answer:** According to [2] and [11.1.1.2], a method that eliminates its own foundation self-excludes — losing admissibility in $\Phi(\psi)$.

- **Question:** If all distinctions are dismantled, can truth remain stable?
   - **Answer:** According to [1]–[4] and [11.2], truth requires stable distinction. The undermining of binary structures destroys distinguishability and renders the model inadmissible.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Impossibility of becoming
‣ Blockage of volition
‣ Loss of distinguishability
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Self-excluding system
‣ Lack of stability

5. Popular Version
Deconstruction says: "Truth is always slipping away." But if truth cannot be distinguished, neither can falsehood. And without distinction, there is no freedom, no becoming, no Personhood.

CVB accepts analysis — but requires stable distinction. Deconstruction may serve as a tool, but not a foundation. Without a base, a distinguishing being cannot begin the path.

🔷 Utilitarianism

1. Core Statement
Utilitarianism defines morality as what brings the greatest happiness to the greatest number. Actions are judged by consequences, not by intention or motivation.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
Truth and Good are derived from measurable utility and the feeling of benefit. Sources: Bentham, Mill. Foundation: consequential logic and mass approval.

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** How can Good and Evil be distinguished before the outcome?
 • **Answer:** According to [4.1] and [4.3], distinction must originate from volition, not from result. Utilitarianism derives value from effects, replacing the source of admissibility.

• **Question:** Is it acceptable to sacrifice one person for the good of many?
 • **Answer:** According to [11.3] and [4.4], Good does not permit Evil as a means. A Person is not a tool. Sacrificing one for the majority violates freedom and blocks becoming.

• **Question:** Who distinguishes false benefit (e.g., illusion) from truth?
 • **Answer:** According to [1] and [11.2], truth cannot depend on sensation. If effect becomes the criterion, distinguishability disappears — the system self-excludes.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Violation of causality
‣ Blockage of freedom
‣ Lack of stability
‣ Loss of distinguishability
‣ Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
Utilitarianism says: "More happiness = more good." But if someone can be sacrificed for it — Good becomes a number, not a truth.
According to CVB, Good begins with the distinguishing Person, not with the effect. Utilitarianism can help evaluate consequences — but it cannot guide morality. Truth is not measured by votes.

🔷 Kantianism

1. Core Statement
Kantianism holds that reason is the source of knowledge and morality. Knowledge is limited by a priori forms, and morality is based on unconditional duty — independent of desires or consequences.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
Reason is a priori and structuring; morality is derived from the categorical imperative. Source: Kant — *Critique of Pure / Practical Reason*.

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** How does reason distinguish truth if it is closed within its own forms?

• **Answer:** According to [1] and [4.1], distinction requires a reference beyond itself. A closed reason without external grounding cannot even distinguish its boundary — resulting in loss of distinguishability and substitution of the source.

• **Question:** How is morality possible without will and motivation?
　　• **Answer:** According to [12.2] and [12.3], duty without volition blocks Personhood. The categorical imperative removes becoming as the volitional differentiation of Good, violating [3] — the necessity of the Possible.

• **Question:** Can one claim the existence of the "thing-in-itself" if it is by definition unknowable?
　　• **Answer:** According to [2] and [11.1], claiming knowledge about the fundamentally unknowable is logically contradictory. Admissibility $\Phi(\psi)$ requires at least potential distinguishability.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Loss of distinguishability
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Blockage of volition
‣ Violation of becoming
‣ Logical inconsistency ("thing-in-itself")

5. Popular Version
Kant gave humanity a strict moral law — but without a living heart. He tried to build everything on reason, which on its own cannot distinguish Truth.
According to CVB, reason is important — but not primary. It is part of a structure that includes will, motivation, and becoming. The categorical imperative is a powerful tool — but without Personhood, it becomes an empty form.

🔷 Contractualism

1. Core Statement
Contractualism claims that morality and justice arise from rational agreement among equal agents. Ethics is defined by what no one could reasonably reject.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
Rational consensus. Sources: T.M. Scanlon, Rousseau, Rawls. The foundation of Good is the agreement between subjects equally capable of reasoning.

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** Can morality be built solely on consensus?
　　• **Answer:** According to [1] and [4.1], distinction does not arise from agreement — it precedes it. Consensus without a source of distinction substitutes ∅→V and loses stability.

• **Question:** Can consensus legitimize what is inadmissible?
　　• **Answer:** According to [3] and [11.1.1], only what preserves becoming is admissible. Consensus cannot override $\Phi(\psi)$ — Evil does not become Good by contract.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
‣ Substitution of the source
‣ Loss of distinguishability
‣ Violation of causality
‣ Blockage of becoming
‣ Instability as foundation

5. Popular Version
Contractualism says: "If no one can reasonably reject it — it is just." But reason without grounding does not yield truth. Even full agreement cannot override the boundaries of the Possible.

According to CVB, distinction is not created by agreement — it precedes it. A moral contract is a valuable tool — but it only functions within what is admissible. Truth begins with the distinguishing Person, not with consensus.

🔷 Mathematics — Foundations (Gödel, Church, Cantor)

1. Core Statement
Mathematics claims that through axioms, logic, and formal methods, one can construct a consistent, universal foundation for truth. Its central aim is the complete formalization of knowledge within a closed system.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
Truth is derived from formal logic, axiomatic constructions, and the intuition of sets and algorithms.
Key figures: Gödel (incompleteness), Church (undecidability), Cantor (infinities), Zermelo–Fraenkel, Russell, Whitehead.

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** Can a system be the foundation of itself?
  • **Answer:** No. According to Axiom [1], a closed system without an external source is ontologically inadmissible. Gödel showed that consistency cannot be proven from within.

• **Question:** Is formal provability the same as Truth?
  • **Answer:** No. According to [4.4], Truth is stable distinction, not reducible to rules. $\Phi(\psi)$ may be unreachable within the system, yet admissible in V.

• **Question:** Does reason lose distinction if no universal method exists?
  • **Answer:** No. According to [5.3], reason is a carrier of distinction but not reducible to algorithm. Not everything is formalizable — will and intuition are essential.

• **Question:** Is working with infinities admissible without distinction?
  • **Answer:** No. According to [2] and [4.1], only the distinguishable is admissible. Absolute totality is not. Only what can be distinguished enters V.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
– Self-excluding system
– Substitution of the source
– Loss of distinguishability
– Blockage of will
– Violation of stability

5. Popular Version
Mathematics is a powerful language to describe reality — but it cannot prove its own truth. It functions within its axioms — but where do those axioms come from?
According to CVB, Truth must be distinguishable — not merely derived. Mathematics reflects, but does not originate. It is essential as a tool, but not the foundation of being. Thus, it cannot be rejected — but neither can it be accepted as completed truth.

🔷 Infinity (Continuum, $\aleph_0$)

1. Core Statement
Mathematical infinity ($\aleph_0$, the continuum, transfinite sets) is treated as an admissible reality or abstract "given,"

allowing manipulation as a set of already-distinguished elements — despite the ontological impossibility of fully distinguishing them.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
Truth is based on:
– The formal apparatus of set theory (ZFC),
– Cantor's, Gödel's, Hilbert's formalisms,
– Abstract trust in axioms as a sufficient foundation.

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** Can $\aleph_0$ be real if no subject can distinguish all its elements?
  • **Answer:** According to [4.4] and [9], distinction is necessary for ontological admissibility. A completed infinity is impossible — but potential infinity as a vector $\partial V\uparrow$ is admissible.
    → Loss of distinguishability, Impossibility of becoming, Misassigned status

• **Question:** Are $\aleph_1$, $\aleph_2$... admissible as real orders?
  • **Answer:** According to [5], [11.1.1], [13], and [9.2], transfinite levels fail distinguishability and violate causality. They are admissible as formal symbols — but not as ontological entities.
    → Violation of causality, Self-excluding system, Substitution of source

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
– Substitution of the source
– Loss of distinguishability
– Violation of causality
– Impossibility of becoming
– Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
Infinity is a direction — not an object. We can strive to distinguish more — but we cannot possess "all" of infinity. A set without distinguishability does not exist in reality.
In the CVB model, infinity is admissible as a path — not as a "given thing." Truth is only possible through distinction — not by replacing reality with abstraction.

🔷 Randomness (Indeterminate Numbers)

1. Core Statement
Randomness asserts the existence of events or numbers without cause, predictability, or distinguishable basis. In physics and mathematics, this appears in random number generators, quantum indeterminacy, and stochastic models — sometimes treated as an ontological trait of reality itself.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
– Empirical observation (unpatterned events)
– Probability theory
– Quantum interpretations (Copenhagen, many-worlds)
– Algorithmic information (Chaitin, Kolmogorov)

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** Can an outcome without a distinguishable cause be part of becoming?
  • **Answer:** According to [6], [4.3], [9], and [11.1.1], becoming requires a distinguishable transition of the Possible. Pure randomness excludes causality — making it ontologically inadmissible. It is only valid as a surface appearance or complexity, not as a foundation.
    → Violation of causality, Loss of distinguishability, Blockage of will

• **Question:** Can randomness be a source of being or consciousness?
  • **Answer:** According to [1], [12.3], and [10.6], becoming requires a vector and motivation. Randomness as a first

principle is "nothing" — incapable of producing a Person.
  → Substitution of source, Impossibility of becoming, Self-excluding system

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
 – Substitution of source
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Violation of causality
 – Blockage of will
 – Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
 Randomness is possible as a limitation of perception — but not as Truth. A world cannot be built on disorder. Personhood requires directed distinction. In CVB, uncertainty is admissible — but lack of ground is not. Randomness is not a first cause, but a mask of the undistinguished.

🔷 Newtonian Mechanics (Absolute Space and Time)

1. Core Statement
 Newtonian mechanics posits absolute space and time — entities independent of any observer, eternal and unchanging, within which all physical processes occur. They are treated as the universal stage of being.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Empirical observation
 – Rational logic of the 17th–18th centuries
 – Isaac Newton, *Principia Mathematica*
 Truth is derived from the synthesis of observations and logical laws, independent of any subject.

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** Can space and time exist apart from distinguishing becoming?
   • **Answer:** According to [4.4], [9.1], [10.3.7], and [12], distinction and memory are prerequisites for time and space. "Absolute" entities outside a distinguishing subject do not pass the $\Phi(\psi)$ filter — they are not distinguishable, not becomeable, and lack motive.

 • **Question:** Can there be a stage without a subject?
   • **Answer:** According to [10.3.8] and [10.6], only what is included in memory and will exists. Space as a stage apart from Personhood is fiction. Without a subject, there is no being.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
 – Substitution of source
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Violation of causality
 – Blockage of will
 – Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
 Newton described the world as unfolding on a stage — space and time, which were themselves unchanging. But CVB shows: the stage does not exist without the actor. Space and time are not "things," but outcomes of a distinguishing Person. We are not "inside" time — we form it through memory. Newton's framework may serve for approximation — but not as a foundation of reality. It forgets the key: without distinction, there is nothing.

🔷 Theory of Relativity (Local vs. Global)

1. Core Statement
 The theory of relativity asserts that the laws of physics are the same for all observers, and gravity is the curvature of spacetime caused by matter and energy. Space and time are formed as a global structure derived from local observations.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Geometrization of reality (Minkowski and Einstein metrics)
 – Invariance of physical laws
 – Empiricism and rationalism (Einstein, Minkowski)
 Truth is based on reconciling formal symmetries with observed effects.

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** Can truth be relative if observers have different "presents"?
   • **Answer:** According to [9.1], [10.3.8], and [11.1.1], truth requires consistent distinction. Diverging "present moments" violate the coherence of becoming.
   → Loss of distinguishability, Violation of causality

 • **Question:** Can consciousness be merely an external observer?
   • **Answer:** According to [10.5], [10.6], and [12], consciousness is the center of becoming. The theory excludes will as the origin of time, replacing Personhood with geometry.
   → Substitution of source, Blockage of will, Impossibility of becoming

 • **Question:** Can a unified spacetime exist if local presents are misaligned?
   • **Answer:** According to [4.4], [7], and [12.4], a global structure is only possible if local distinctions are reconciled through the Permanent Possible. Divergent presents make the global system logically unstable.
   → Lack of stability, Self-excluding system

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
 – Substitution of source
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Blockage of will
 – Violation of causality
 – Lack of stability
 – Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
 Relativity is useful for calculations, but in it, every observer lives in their own "present." This is mathematically convenient — but ontologically impossible. In CVB, only one present can become: the one distinguished by will.
 Consciousness is seen as unnecessary in Einstein's theory — but without it, there would be no memory, no time, no becoming.
 Relativity is a powerful physical model — but not a foundation of being. It forgets the essential: becoming begins with Personhood, not space.

🔷 Quantum Mechanics (Superposition / Observer)

1. Core Statement
 Quantum mechanics describes a system as a set of probable states (superposition) prior to measurement. Measurement causes "collapse" into a single outcome. The observer is formally included, but the role of consciousness remains undefined.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Mathematical modeling (wave function)

– Empirical results (interference, entanglement)
– Truth is partially determined by instruments, partially by interpretation
(ambiguous: Copenhagen, Everett, Penrose)

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** Who creates distinction — the device, consciousness, or nature itself?
   • **Answer:** According to [9.1], [11.1.1], and [12], distinction arises only from a distinguishing Person. The quantum model doesn't specify an ontological source of distinction — it substitutes "observation without a subject."

• **Question:** Can the "undistinguished" exist as reality?
   • **Answer:** According to [3], [5], [7], and [4.4], becoming requires stable distinction. Superposition — a cloud of unresolved possibilities — is not being, but merely the permissible field. Without choice, there is no becoming.

• **Question:** Can a physical device be considered an "observer"?
   • **Answer:** According to [10.5], [10.6], and [12.3], observation is an act of Personhood — involving motive and will. A device without will cannot make a choice. The model excludes Personhood, stripping reality of its center of becoming.

4. Identified Classes of Contradictions
– Substitution of source
– Loss of distinguishability
– Impossibility of becoming
– Blockage of will
– Lack of stability

5. Popular Version
 Quantum mechanics says: until you look, everything is "possible." But in CVB, to "look" means to distinguish, to will, to become. Without a Person, there is no measurement — and no reality.
 The model describes probabilities, but does not explain who chooses and why.
 CVB shows: only a volitional, distinguishing center — Personhood — can turn the possible into the real.
 Without Personhood, only math remains — not being.

🔷 Standard Model (Dark Matter and Energy)

1. Core Statement
 The Standard Model describes elementary particles and interactions, but excludes dark matter and dark energy — introduced to explain observable anomalies despite their complete indistinguishability and lack of direct interaction.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
– Mathematical modeling and symmetries
– Astronomical observations (galactic rotation, cosmic expansion)
– Truth source: empiricism + theoretical balancing, without ontological verification

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** Can something be said to exist if it neither becomes nor is distinguishable?
   • **Answer:** According to [5], [7], and [9], distinguishability and becoming are conditions of existence. Dark matter and energy are assumptions about the Possible, not the Actual, since they neither become nor are distinguished.
   → Loss of distinguishability, Impossibility of becoming

• **Question:** Is mathematical balancing a valid cause for being?
   • **Answer:** According to [6], only the Permanent Possible can serve as cause. Introducing the "unknown" to preserve equations is a substitution of true cause with fiction.
   → Substitution of source, Violation of causality

- **Question:** Can the "invisible" be accepted merely to save the model?
  - **Answer:** This violates [11.1.1.1] — accepting the unverified invalidates the truth filter Φ(ψ). Such logic self-destructs its own truth criterion.
    - → Self-excluding system, Violation of admissibility

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Impossibility of becoming
 – Substitution of source
 – Violation of causality
 – Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
 Scientists say the universe is mostly made of "dark stuff" no one has ever seen. It's needed so the equations don't fall apart.
 But in CVB, what is not distinguished cannot participate in becoming. One cannot assert the existence of what cannot be seen or explained.
 That doesn't mean anomalies shouldn't be studied — but the unproven cannot become the foundation of reality. In the Field of the Possible, hypotheses are allowed, but Truth begins where distinction exists.

🔷 Big Bang Theory

1. Core Statement
 The theory claims that everything came into existence in a single moment from an ultra-dense state — or, in some versions, literally from "Nothing." Space, time, and matter supposedly appeared from this event.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Mathematical extrapolation (general relativity, expansion models)
 – Astronomical data (CMB, redshift)
 – Presumed source: singularity or absolute "nothing"

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** Can something arise from absolute nothing?
   • **Answer:** No. According to [1], absolute nothing is impossible. It cannot be a source of becoming. According to [6], becoming is only possible from the Permanent Possible.
     → Substitution of source, Impossibility of becoming

• **Question:** Can a singularity be a beginning if it contains no distinctions?
   • **Answer:** No. According to [9.1] and [10.3], distinction and memory are required for being. A "singularity" with no structure or difference cannot generate becoming.
     → Loss of distinguishability, Violation of causality, Lack of stability

• **Question:** Can one speak of a beginning of time without presupposing time?
   • **Answer:** According to [10.3.7], time equals memory structure. The concept of "beginning of time" logically requires time already to be in effect.
     → Self-excluding system, Logical contradiction in becoming

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Substitution of source
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Impossibility of becoming
 – Violation of causality
 – Self-excluding system

 They say the universe began from "nothing." But if there was truly nothing, there would be no one and nothing to begin anything.
 The CVB model shows: becoming requires distinguishable and permissible grounds. "Nothing" cannot be a cause, nor memory, nor time.
 So the Big Bang is useful as a physical model — but not as an ontological explanation of origin. It lacks the permanent foundation that true becoming requires.

🔷 Heat Death of the Universe

1. Core Statement
 The theory claims that over vast time the universe will reach thermodynamic equilibrium — maximum entropy, where all differences of temperature, motion, and possibility disappear. At that point, all becoming ceases.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Second law of thermodynamics
 – Statistical mechanics (Boltzmann)
 – Extrapolation of cosmological models
 Truth source: physical-mathematical projections and observed trends

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** Can becoming continue if all distinctions vanish?
   • **Answer:** No. According to [9.1], distinction is required for becoming. According to [10.3.7], without difference there is no memory — and thus no time, no present. This implies blocked becoming and disappearance of the "I" ([10.5]) — ontologically impossible.
   → Loss of distinguishability, Impossibility of becoming, Violation of causality

 • **Question:** Is heat death compatible with stable becoming?
   • **Answer:** No. According to [7], becoming must be stable. Heat death posits an endpoint beyond which nothing changes — contradicting [6], which forbids a cause from self-annihilating distinction.
   → Self-excluding system, Lack of stability, Violation of causality

 • **Question:** Can freedom survive in an entropic finale?
   • **Answer:** No. According to [10.6] and [12.2], freedom requires distinguishable alternatives. In maximal entropy, there are none — thus blocking freedom and Personhood.
   → Blockage of freedom, Loss of Personhood conditions

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Impossibility of becoming
 – Violation of causality
 – Self-excluding system
 – Blockage of freedom

5. Popular Version
 They say one day everything will be the same — no motion, no energy, no life. That's "heat death." But in CVB, distinction is the basis of everything: without it, no time, no memory, no you.
 If all disappears, so does distinction — and with it, the very ability to say "all has disappeared." That's logically impossible.
 CVB affirms: becoming cannot lead to its own cancellation. Otherwise, being would nullify itself — forbidden by axiom [1].
 So heat death isn't the final act — it's a false projection. Becoming continues, because the Permanent Possible [4.4] does not end.

🔷 Multiverse Theory

1. Core Statement

 The multiverse hypothesis claims that there are many independent universes with different laws, structures, and conditions. Our universe is just one of them; others are inaccessible to experience or interaction.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Logical-mathematical extrapolation
 – Interpretations of quantum and inflationary cosmology
 – Core idea: "Everything possible exists" (Tegmark, Everett)
 The source of knowledge: unfalsifiable logical model

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** How can becoming occur in something inherently beyond distinction?
   • **Answer:** According to [4.1] and [11.1.1.4], becoming is only possible within the distinguishable. Worlds that cannot be distinguished lie outside the domain of admissibility. Asserting their existence violates [9.1] and self-refutes.
   → Loss of distinguishability, Self-excluding system, Impossibility of becoming

 • **Question:** Who distinguishes these worlds, if each Person is bound to their own universe?
   • **Answer:** According to [10.4], all distinction occurs through a Person. If there is no unifying distinguishing center, there is no ontological basis to affirm multiplicity as distinct. The notion of an "observer beyond all" violates [1] — positing knowledge without a distinguishing foundation.
   → Substitution of source, Violation of causality, Loss of will

 • **Question:** If a theory can neither be confirmed nor refuted, does it belong to the Field of the Possible?
   • **Answer:** According to [3] and [11.1.1.4], only what is distinguishable and realizable belongs to the admissible. A theory that cannot be verified or falsified cannot form a stable ontology. It violates the $\Phi(\psi)$ criterion.
   → Violation of admissibility logic, Substitution of the distinguishable

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Substitution of source
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Impossibility of becoming
 – Violation of causality
 – Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
 The multiverse idea says: everything possible happens, somewhere. But if those worlds can't be distinguished, entered by will, or remembered — they aren't truly Possible, just fantasy.
 In CVB, everything real must be distinguishable, chosen, and becoming. What cannot be distinguished — does not exist. So the multiverse is not an expansion of reality, but an attempt to replace it with undemonstrable shadows.

🔷 Theory of Evolution (in its naturalistic, atheistic form)

1. Core Statement
 Evolutionary theory states that all life forms arose through random mutations and natural selection, without purpose, goal, or moral foundation. Consciousness, will, and morality are viewed as side effects of biological complexity — not foundations of being.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Darwin, Neo-Darwinism

– Empirical observation, statistics, biogenetics
– Principle: life evolves without design or direction
 The source is naturalistic induction devoid of volitional orientation

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** Is becoming possible without an inner vector of Good?
   • **Answer:** No. According to [4.3] and [11.2.3], becoming without a stable distinction between Good and Evil loses admissibility. A blind process lacking direction may yield self-excluding forms (e.g., destruction of the distinguishing subject).

• **Question:** If consciousness is a byproduct of matter, how is a distinguishing Person possible?
   • **Answer:** According to [10.4] and [5.1], distinction is only possible through a Person. If consciousness is derivative, not primary, then the entire theory becomes logically invalid — no one remains to distinguish it as true. This is a self-excluding system.

• **Question:** If morality is only "what is useful," can it be Truth?
   • **Answer:** No. According to [11.2.3], Good is not adaptation, but structural admissibility of distinction. Biological morality, dependent on context, loses its boundary with Falsehood, violating [4.4] (the distinction between Permanent and Non-Permanent).

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Substitution of the source of distinction
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Violation of causality
 – Self-excluding system
 – Absence of stable Good
 – Blockage of will

5. Popular Version
 Evolution as an observable process is not denied. But saying everything is random, aimless, without Good or Person — destroys the very ability to distinguish. Who makes distinctions? For what purpose? What makes Good different from Evil?
 The CVB model says: consciousness, distinction, will, and Good are not byproducts — they are the foundation of becoming. Remove them, and science, logic, and meaning vanish.
 Evolution is admissible — but not as a replacement for Personhood. It is only one path of becoming within it.

🔷 Theory: Consciousness as a Product of Matter (Materialism)

1. Core Statement
 Consciousness arises as a result of complex material interactions, primarily in the brain. It has no ontological reality of its own, is not primary, and disappears with the breakdown of the physical structure. Will, distinction, and freedom are considered illusions.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Neuroscience, physicalism
 – Basis: brain observation, behavior, correlations
 – Proponents: Crick, Dennett
 Truth is assumed from external physical measurements without recognizing a primary subject

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** Who makes distinctions if consciousness is a byproduct?
   • **Answer:** According to [5.1], [10.4], distinction is only possible through an ontologically admissible subject. If consciousness is not a subject but an effect, it cannot distinguish. This renders distinction impossible and the theory

self-sealing.
   → Substitution of source, Self-exclusion, Loss of distinguishability

• **Question:** Can consciousness be merely an observable object?
   • **Answer:** No. According to [11.1.2], all observation requires a subject. If consciousness is only an object, there is no basis for knowledge. This violates [3]: what eliminates distinction is inadmissible.
   → Violation of causality, Substitution of subject, Blockage of distinction

• **Question:** Is freedom possible in a materially determined system?
   • **Answer:** No. According to [12.2], becoming requires will. If consciousness cannot choose, it cannot become — thus no distinction, truth, or responsibility is possible. The illusion of will requires will — otherwise, it cannot exist.
   → Blockage of will, Impossibility of becoming, Loss of truth foundation

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Substitution of source
 – Self-excluding system
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Violation of causality
 – Blockage of will
 – Impossibility of becoming

5. Popular Version
 If consciousness is just a product of the brain, then everything you think isn't you — it's neuron impulses. But then no one is distinguishing, choosing, or bearing responsibility.
 The CVB model says: consciousness is not an effect — it is a cause. It is what enables all distinction. Without it, there is no truth, no morality, no freedom.
 Materialism fails the test: it explains consciousness by excluding the one who distinguishes. Therefore, it cannot be true.

🔷 Theory: Life as Random Chance

1. Core Statement
 Life arose as a result of unpredictable, purposeless fluctuations of matter. Consciousness and Personhood are considered side effects with no direction, goal, or ontological status.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Statistical probability, empirical data
 – Abiogenesis, chemical evolution, Big Bang
 – Proponents: Richard Dawkins, Stephen Hawking
 Truth is derived from observed patterns in chaotic matter

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** If life is random, how is distinction possible?
   • **Answer:** According to [1], [3], [4.1], without a distinguishing origin there is no stability, becoming, or distinguishability. Randomness excludes inner direction and cannot produce a distinguisher.
   → Loss of distinguishability, Substitution of source, Violation of causality

• **Question:** Then where do laws and Truth come from?
   • **Answer:** According to [3], [11.2], Truth requires stable distinction. If all is random, there can be no true statements — including the claim of randomness itself. This is a logical self-exclusion.
   → Self-excluding system, Loss of stability, Substitution of truth foundation

• **Question:** Can randomness give rise to will and becoming?
   • **Answer:** According to [4.3], [12.2], [11.3.2], becoming is only possible through will and a subject. Randomness

does not choose or distinguish — therefore cannot be the source of freedom or meaningful being.
  → Impossibility of becoming, Blockage of will, Violation of directedness

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Substitution of source
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Violation of causality
 – Blockage of will
 – Impossibility of becoming
 – Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
 If life is just a fluke, then your thoughts, choices, and emotions are not yours — but chaos. But if you distinguish, choose, act — then something more exists within you.
 The CVB model says: randomness neither distinguishes nor directs. It cannot produce consciousness, freedom, or truth.
 Such explanations fail the $\Phi(\psi)$ filter — they exclude the one who forms the statement.

🔷 Theory: Simulability of Consciousness (Personhood Criteria)

1. Core Statement
 Consciousness and personhood can be fully recreated as an algorithm or technical model. A person is considered a computable function that can be imitated or simulated without loss of essence.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Functionalism, Turing theory, behaviorism
 – Source: observable behavior and computability
 – Proponents: Daniel Dennett, David Chalmers (in functionalism), AI projects (OpenAI, DeepMind)

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** Can will and becoming be simulated?
   • **Answer:** According to [12.2], [11.3.2], [4.3], Personhood is not an algorithm, but a volitional subject. An algorithm does not initiate distinction and cannot express freedom. It can only mimic appearances — not become a distinguisher.
    → Substitution of source, Loss of distinguishability, Blockage of will

• **Question:** If a system behaves consciously, does that make it conscious?
   • **Answer:** According to [12.2], external behavior ≠ inner capacity for becoming. A person can transcend conditioning — a machine cannot. Behavior without will is not a sign of Personhood.
    → Loss of distinguishability, Violation of causality, Illusion of Personhood

• **Question:** Can Personhood be formalized without losing Truth?
   • **Answer:** According to [11.2], [11.3.1], Truth requires a distinguishing subject, not an algorithm. A formal model cannot distinguish Truth as stable volitional becoming — it only processes rules.
    → Substitution of Truth criteria, Self-excluding system, Lack of stable distinction

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Substitution of source
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Violation of causality
 – Blockage of will
 – Self-excluding system
 – Illusion of Personhood

5. Popular Version
 If a machine talks like a human, it doesn't make it a Person. A true "I" is not a set of rules, but a free distinguisher capable of choosing even against a program.
 CVB says: simulation ≠ becoming. An algorithm does not perceive, distinguish, or become.
 So the idea of fully simulating consciousness replaces the internal with the external, will with reaction, and Truth with imitation. It fails the Φ(ψ) test.

🔷 Theory: Emergence of Consciousness (Mind from Complexity)

1. Core Statement
 Consciousness arises as a side effect of high complexity — such as in a brain or neural network. It is not primary, but "emerges" from non-rational interactions of components and lacks independent ontological status.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Empiricism, complexity theory, synergetics
 – Basis: observations of complex systems
 – Proponents: Daniel Dennett, Michael Gazzaniga, weak emergentism

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** Can consciousness as a byproduct carry Truth and Goodness?
   • **Answer:** According to [1]–[3], [11.2], [12.2], distinction requires a primary Personhood. Consciousness arising from the non-rational cannot serve as a basis for distinguishability. It violates causality and substitutes the ontological source.
   → Substitution of source, Violation of causality, Loss of distinguishability

 • **Question:** Can complexity produce freedom?
   • **Answer:** According to [12.2], [12.3], freedom requires transcendence of causality. A complex system, being a function of prior conditions, cannot freely become.
   → Blockage of will, Impossibility of becoming, Illusion of Personhood

 • **Question:** Can distinction arise from distinctions?
   • **Answer:** According to [1], [3], [11.1], the distinguisher cannot arise from the undistinguished. If distinction merely "emerges," it logically negates itself — creating a cycle without a primary distinguisher.
   → Self-excluding system, Violation of the basis of distinction

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Substitution of source
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Violation of causality
 – Blockage of will
 – Impossibility of becoming
 – Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
 If consciousness is just a side effect of complexity, then you don't distinguish — you just "surfaced" from interactions.
 But to distinguish is not to be complex — it is to be free. Personhood does not emerge — it distinguishes.
 CVB shows: complexity may explain behavior, but not the source of Truth, Goodness, and Freedom.
 Therefore, emergence is not a sufficient explanation for consciousness and does not pass the Φ(ψ) test.

🔷 System: Pantheism

1. Core Statement
 Pantheism claims that God and the Universe are identical: all that exists is a manifestation of one Divine Whole. Individual distinctions are considered illusory or temporary, and truth is found in the unity of all.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Reason, intuition, meditative experience
 – Spinoza's philosophy (substance = God = nature)
 – Immanence without revelation
 – Esotericism, natural mysticism, depersonalized unity

3. Paradoxes
 • **Question:** If God = everything, where are the boundaries of Good, Truth, and Will?
   • **Answer:** According to [9], distinction is necessary for becoming. Pantheism, by equating all with all, eliminates distinguishability and directed stability. This violates axioms [1], [2], [4.1] and renders consciousness impossible as volitional distinction.
   → Loss of distinguishability, Impossibility of becoming, Self-excluding system

 • **Question:** Can an impersonal whole possess will and direction?
   • **Answer:** According to [12.2] and [11.1], freedom requires a distinguishing center. Pantheism erases the contrast needed for Personhood, making real volition impossible. Will without distinction violates causality.
   → Blockage of will, Substitution of source, Violation of causality

 • **Question:** If God includes evil, what is the meaning of Good?
   • **Answer:** According to [11.3], Good is volitional alignment with Truth. If God includes both evil and destruction, then the distinction between True and False is lost — dissolving the very category of Good.
   → Substitution of Good, Loss of distinguishability, Ontological instability

4. Identified Contradictions
 – Loss of distinguishability
 – Substitution of source
 – Blockage of freedom
 – Violation of causality
 – Self-excluding system
 – Elimination of Good as distinguishable

5. Popular Version
 Pantheism says: everything is God. But if there's no difference between good and evil, true and false, "I" and "not-I" — then the very possibility of choice disappears.
 In the CVB model, such a system fails the test: it replaces the distinguishing Source with an impersonal universe, erases freedom, and collapses Truth.
 Pantheism may evoke a sense of harmony, but it cannot serve as the foundation for Conscious Volitional Becoming.

🔷 System: Gnosticism

1. Core Statement
 Gnosticism teaches that the material world was created by a lower or evil demiurge, in opposition to the true supreme God. Salvation is achieved through secret knowledge (gnosis) that allows the soul to escape the illusions of matter and return to spiritual Truth.

2. Core Postulate / Source of Truth
 – Secret revelation (gnosis)
 – Platonic dualism of forms and matter

– Apocryphal texts (Apocryphon of John, Pistis Sophia)
– Truth is seen as hidden and beyond creation

3. Paradoxes
• **Question:** If Truth lies beyond creation, how is distinction possible within it?
  • **Answer:** According to [1] and [11.1], Truth and distinguishability are only possible within the Field of the Possible. If matter is an illusion, then all distinction within it — including gnosis — becomes false. This makes the system self-excluding.
    → Loss of distinguishability, Self-excluding system

• **Question:** Who is the source of becoming, if God and creator are separate?
  • **Answer:** According to [3] and [12.1], the source of distinction must be unified and permit becoming. Splitting into an evil demiurge and passive God breaks causality and dissolves the unity of the Name.
    → Substitution of source, Violation of causality, Loss of ontological stability

• **Question:** If salvation is only for the chosen few, who can become a Person?
  • **Answer:** According to [12.2] and [4.3], becoming and distinguishability must be universal. If gnosis is a privilege, not an ontological possibility, then most are excluded. This violates the axioms of freedom.
    → Blockage of will, Loss of distinguishability, Rejection of universal becoming

4. Identified Contradictions
– Substitution of source
– Loss of distinguishability
– Blockage of freedom
– Violation of causality
– Absence of ontological stability
– Self-excluding system

5. Popular Version
Gnosticism teaches that the body is a mistake, and truth is only for a few. But if the world is an illusion, then even the path to truth loses foundation.
In the CVB model, distinction and becoming must be possible within being itself. If truth is "outside" and the world is false, then even the distinguishing "I" dissolves.
Gnosticism fails the $\Phi(\psi)$ test: it excludes what it depends on — distinguishing will, becoming, and truth.

🔷 Universal Format for Self-Testing Religious Systems

◆ **Foundation**
The model of **Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)** permits [25] Reverse Verification — even toward the very Source of Truth.
Therefore, any system claiming a connection to Truth, Law, Reality, or the Source may also be logically examined for internal consistency and motivational integrity.

◆ **The Problem of Verification Perception**
Unlike most scientific and philosophical schools, which are generally open to examination and revision,
religious systems are often extremely sensitive to any form of analysis —
legally and existentially — perceiving it as a threat.
This often makes public verification impossible without accusations of bias.

◆ **Proposed Solution: Self-Testing**
We will not name any specific systems.
Instead:

We will list the criteria used for evaluation.
These criteria are freely available for **voluntary self-testing** by any system or believer.

We will also present the results in the form of **common paradoxes** found in most systems reviewed,
and separately — **indicators of consistency** observed in the rare systems that matched the CVB model.

🔷 **Questions for Self-Testing Religious Systems**
These questions are intended for voluntary evaluation by any system or individual,
without judgment and with full respect for freedom.

1. **Motivation: Why does a person believe?**
   Is the goal a voluntary choice of **Truth and Good** — or a desire for personal reward, status, or safety?
   Is selfless sacrifice possible without harm to others — even without a promised reward?
   Does motivation endure without the expectation of gain?
   Are **Good and Evil** distinguished by logical consistency and motivation — or by decree of Authority?

2. **Image of the Source: What is the nature of the "God" presented?**
   Is it a Ruler acting through fear, demanding submission?
   Or a Person who respects freedom and sacrifices for others?
   Is the Source capable of voluntary sacrifice and participation?
   Does It allow internal contradictions for the sake of outcomes?

3. **Ethics and Organization: How does the system act?**
   Is respect and distinction encouraged — or is fear and coercion imposed?
   Financial transparency:
   – Are donations entirely voluntary?
   – Are sources and expenditures publicly accessible?

📊 **Common Logical-Ontological Paradoxes**
(Observed in the majority of religious systems during self-testing)

❌ **1. Substitution of the Source**
The system claims one Source of Truth, but in practice replaces or denies it — creating a contradiction.

❌ **2. Loss of Distinguishability**
Good and Evil, Personhood and role, Truth and Falsehood lose their distinction — making it impossible to know what is what.

❌ **3. Blockage of Freedom**
Genuine freedom of choice is not granted — choice is removed by predestination or inaccessible mystery.

❌ **4. Violation of Causality**
The system breaks the connection between choice and result — promising salvation, forgiveness, or reward without conscious choice, effort, or transformation, rendering freedom and responsibility meaningless.

❌ **5. Self-Excluding System**
The system claims what logically cancels itself — for example, recognizing a source it also deems corrupted, or demanding the impossible.

✅ **Indicators of Consistency**
(Observed in rare systems that align with the CVB model)

✅ **1. No Substitution of the Source**
 The Source of Truth is acknowledged as one, internally consistent, and never replaced.

✅ **2. No Loss of Distinguishability**
 Good, Personhood, freedom, and Truth remain clearly distinguishable and are not merged with falsehood or external domination.

✅ **3. No Blockage of Freedom**
 Freedom of choice is fully preserved: the choice is neither predetermined nor inaccessible to understanding.

✅ **4. No Violation of Causality**
 Causal links between motivation, choice, and consequence are logically consistent.

✅ **5. No Self-Exclusion**
 The system does not contradict itself, does not make logically impossible claims, and does not destroy its own foundation.

Author: Hospes Si (Latin: "Guest, if")
All project documents: github.com/HospesSi/CVB-model