The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming
A formalizable, logically verifiable, and ontologically exhaustive structure of distinguishable reality

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming was discovered in just one month—without any intention to find it. The resulting axiomatic core, free from assumptions and paradoxes, has surpassed all prior millennia-long attempts to construct a non-contradictory ontological framework. No philosophical school or thinker of the past has come close to such completeness. This cannot be a coincidence. It means the time has come.

Journal Version 8.7

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

This is the first publication of its kind.
Its goal is not to explain everything, but to provide enough to distinguish.
Translations into different languages may introduce difficulties in understanding — but don’t worry: only what is truly understood is registered as a choice.

1. Abstract:

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) is a formally expressible, logically consistent, and ontologically complete system designed to describe the entirety of distinguishable reality. Unlike existing philosophical and scientific models, CVB is not tied to biology, perception, or human language—its structure is universal and applicable to any subject of distinction, including non-physical ones.

The central instrument of the model is the meta-function of admissibility, Φ(ψ), which determines which statements are realizable within the logically possible field (V), even if they remain unprovable within formal systems. In this context, Gödel’s incompleteness is not seen as a limitation, but rather as an ontologically necessary condition for freedom and becoming—a conclusion that is formally derived within the model.

The model resolves classical paradoxes, avoids trivialism, and uncovers the deep foundations of free will, logic, and being. It may be applied in assessing reality, designing intelligent systems, conducting philosophical analysis of subjectivity, and constructing internally consistent systems in a variety of contexts.

2. Introduction: Context and Necessity

Since the inception of philosophy, science, and logic, there have been repeated attempts to construct universal ontological models—frameworks capable of describing all aspects of reality, from matter and consciousness to volition and logical foundations. Yet all existing systems face fundamental limitations:

- Philosophical approaches (e.g., Plato, Aristotle, Hegel) often depend on human cognition and lack formal expressibility.
- Scientific theories (e.g., relativity, quantum mechanics, theories of everything) are constrained by the physical and do not encompass consciousness, freedom, or logical admissibility.
- Logical-mathematical formalisms (e.g., Frege, Hilbert, Gödel) suffer from incompleteness, trivialism, or the absence of an ontological foundation.

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) addresses these limitations by constructing a formally expressible, logically coherent, and ontologically comprehensive framework, applicable regardless of the observer, material embodiment, or language. It originates from primordial distinction and volitional becoming as the fundamental principle of reality.

Ontological Irrefutability of the Trilemma
The only potentially vulnerable element of the CVB model—upon which all subsequent structures, including the Field of the Possible (V), are logically grounded—is the Core Trilemma of axioms:

1. The impossibility of Absolute Nothingness,
2. The impossibility of Absolute Everythingness,
3. The assertion that only the Possible exists.

This Trilemma defines the ultimate boundaries of admissibility and excludes all forms of paradox, logical explosion, or trivialism.

Any attempt to undermine the universality of the model must target the Trilemma itself. However, such a challenge would require either:
- asserting the existence of Absolute Nothingness (which contradicts the very act of thought), or
- permitting Absolute Everythingness (which includes its own negation and thereby collapses distinction).

Thus, such criticism becomes logically and ontologically meaningless.

Consequently, the CVB model does not rest on arbitrary assumptions. It is closed by the ontological impossibility of abandoning distinguishability, making the Trilemma an unrevocable foundation of all logic, differentiation, and being.

3. Core Principles of the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB)

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) is formulated as a strictly non-contradictory, ontologically complete, and formally expressible system, centered on the distinguishability of the Possible. Unlike anthropocentric or substance-based approaches, CVB does not derive from what is observed, but from what is logically admissible. Grounded in the impossibility of Absolute Nothingness and Absolute Everythingness, the model deduces the minimally necessary ontological structure: the Field of the Possible and its stable unfolding.

Central conclusion:
Only the Possible exists. The reason for the stability of existence is the Permanent Possible. Its active, continuous becoming is what constitutes CVB.

CVB is not an object, a substance, or a universal observer — it is the ontological process of stable, distinguishable becoming. It is independent of any observer, material form, or language. This means the model applies to all forms of distinguishable being — both physical and non-physical.

Within the model, it is rigorously demonstrated that stable, free, and goal-directed becoming is possible only as **Conscious Volitional Becoming**, possessing the following properties:

- Distinction (Self),
- Active choice (Will),
- Motivation (Purpose),
- Responsibility (Memory and Verification),
- Capacity for action (Power).

This structure is not imposed on the model from the outside but is strictly derived from its axioms — in particular, axioms [6]–[9] and [12].

Axiom [12]: Conscious Volitional Becoming = Personhood
Personhood is not merely a bearer of consciousness, but an ontologically stable becoming of the Permanent Possible, possessing distinction, volition, motivation, and the ability to become. Thus, the model asserts that all genuine becoming requires Personhood — though not necessarily human.

This marks a pivotal ontological transition: from abstract Possibility to a structured, formally expressible process of Becoming — as the core of all possible ontology.

Note:
The extended formalization of the model, including the axiomatic structure, the admissibility meta-function Φ(ψ), ontological proofs, and comparative analysis with other systems, is provided in Sections 4–7 of the full version. The present journal edition offers a condensed exposition of the core principles for academic review.

4. The Admissibility Meta-Function Φ(ψ) — A Filter for Realizability of Propositions

(Full version: see [11.1.1])

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) introduces the meta-function of admissibility,
Φ(ψ),
a formalized criterion that distinguishes ontologically admissible propositions (i.e., distinguishable and non-contradictory) from those that are impossible.

This allows the CVB model to transcend standard axiomatic frameworks and resolve paradoxes such as the Liar Paradox or Gödel's incompleteness without violating logic itself.
The function Φ acts within the model as an ontological filter for all forms of truth and action.

Formal Definition:

Symbolic Form:
Φ(ψ) = {
  1, if ψ is distinguishable and non-contradictory in V
  0, if ψ leads to contradiction or is indistinguishable in V
}

LaTeX:
```
\[
\Phi(\psi) =
\begin{cases}
1, & \text{if } \psi \text{ is distinguishable and non-contradictory within } V \\
0, & \text{if } \psi \text{ leads to contradiction or is indistinguishable within } V
\end{cases}
\]
```

Examples:

Symbolic Form:
Φ("A triangle has three angles") = 1
Φ("A triangle has four sides") = 0
Φ(L ↔ ¬L) = 0 (Liar Paradox)

LaTeX:
\[
\Phi(\text{``A triangle has three angles"}) = 1
\]
\[
\Phi(\text{``A triangle has four sides"}) = 0
\]
\[
\Phi(L \leftrightarrow \neg L) = 0 \quad \text{(Liar Paradox)}
\]

Note:
The full version includes:
- rigorous formalization and axiomatic justification;
- its relationship with Gödel's theorem and the Axiom of Freedom [12.4];
- proofs of applicability to physics, logic, mathematics, and artificial intelligence.

Epistemological Consequences

The admissibility meta-function Φ(ψ) establishes not only ontological but also epistemological boundaries: it separates not only what is possible, but also what is knowable.
If a statement ψ is not distinguishable or leads to contradiction, it cannot be the object of true knowledge.
Thus, Φ(ψ) draws a boundary between knowledge and opinion, between the knowable and the unknowable—deriving epistemology from ontology.
This eliminates false epistemological constructs that are based on contradiction, indistinguishability, or metaphysical inadmissibility.

4.1. Stability Test of the Admissibility Meta-Function Φ(ψ)

(Full version: see [11.1.1.1])

The admissibility meta-function
Φ(ψ)
has been subjected to a robustness evaluation across a variety of philosophical, logical-mathematical, and physical-ontological paradoxes.

The analysis includes:
- Classical logical paradoxes: Liar, Russell, Gödel
- Self-referential statements: Φ(M) = 0
- Ontological indeterminacies within the field V
- Quantum physical propositions (e.g., pre-measurement uncertainty)
- Hypothetical meta-paradoxes attacking the definability of Φ(ψ) itself

Result:
In every case:

- either Φ(ψ) = 0, if the proposition is indistinct or contradictory,
- or Φ(ψ) = 1, if the proposition is distinct and non-contradictory.

Key Conclusion:
None of the known or hypothetical paradoxes have succeeded in bypassing the definition of Φ(ψ).

This confirms that, within the axioms of the CVB model:
- Φ(ψ) functions as a stable, non-contradictory, and universal ontological filter;
- ontological indeterminacy in paradoxical constructions is eliminated via a clear distinction between the admissible and the inadmissible.

The complete formal analysis of all paradoxes and counterexamples is provided in the full model documentation (see [11.1.1.1]).

4.2. Validation of the Core Trilemma via the Meta-Function Φ(ψ)

(Full version: see [11.1.1.2])

The three foundational axioms of the CVB model's Core:
[1] Absolute Nothingness is impossible
[2] Absolute Everything is impossible
[3] Only the Possible exists

These are confirmed through the ontological filter of distinguishability and non-contradiction:

Symbolic form:
Φ(ψ) = {
  0, if ψ = "Absolute Nothingness exists"
  0, if ψ = "Absolute Everything is true"
  1, if ψ = an admissible, distinguishable proposition
}

LaTeX format:
```
\[
\Phi(\psi) =
\begin{cases}
0, & \text{if } \psi = \text{``Absolute Nothingness exists''} \\
0, & \text{if } \psi = \text{``Absolute Everything is true''} \\
1, & \text{if } \psi \text{ is an admissible, distinguishable proposition}
\end{cases}
\]
```

Thus:
- Axiom [1] excludes logically impossible distinguishability of Nothing → Φ = 0
- Axiom [2] excludes the logically explosive proposition of Everything → Φ = 0
- Axiom [3] is refined as: all that exists satisfies Φ(ψ) = 1

A full formal analysis of the Core axioms via Φ(ψ) is presented in section [11.1.1.2] of the complete model.

4.3. Validation of Axiom [4] — The Field of the Possible and Its Boundaries

(Full version: see [11.1.1.3])

Axiom [4] of the CVB model introduces an ontological partitioning of the set of propositions ψ
based on the temporal stability of their distinguishability. This yields the topology of the Field of the Possible V
with boundaries ∂V↓ (disappearance of distinguishability) and ∂V↑ (oversaturation of distinguishability).

Relation to the Meta-Function of Admissibility:

Symbolic form:
Φ(ψ) = 1 ⇔ ψ is distinguishable and non-contradictory within V
Φ(ψ) = 0 ⇔ ψ is indistinguishable or contradictory within V

LaTeX:
\[
\Phi(\psi) = 1 \iff \psi \text{ is distinguishable and non-contradictory within } V
\]
\[
\Phi(\psi) = 0 \iff \psi \text{ is indistinguishable or contradictory within } V
\]

Temporal Behavior of Φ(ψ) Depending on Axiom [4] Categories:

[4.1] PN (Permanently Non-possible):
Symbolic: ∀t: Φ(x) = 0
LaTeX: \(\forall t:\, \Phi(x) = 0\)

[4.4] PV (Permanently Possible):
Symbolic: ∀t: Φ(x) = 1
LaTeX: \(\forall t:\, \Phi(x) = 1\)

[4.2], [4.3]: NV and NN — transitional categories, where
Symbolic: Φ(x) may vary
LaTeX: \(\Phi(x)\) may be time-dependent: \(\Phi_t(x)\)

Corresponding Examples:

"A triangle with four sides"
→ PN
→ Symbolic: Φ = 0 LaTeX: \(\Phi = 0\)

"Human flight"
→ NN → NV → PV
→ Symbolic: Φ: 0 → 1 LaTeX: \(\Phi(x): 0 \rightarrow 1\)

"The first murder"
→ once realized → becomes impossible
→ PV → PN
→ Φ: 1 → 0

Boundaries of Distinguishability ∂V:

Symbolic: ∂V↓, ∂V↑
LaTeX:
\[
\partial V_{\downarrow} \quad \text{(boundary of distinguishability disappearance)}
\]
\[
\partial V_{\uparrow} \quad \text{(boundary of distinguishability oversaturation)}
\]

These boundaries are not directly expressed through \(\Phi(\psi)\),
but they define the **limiting zone** of Φ's ontological applicability—
that is, where the notion of distinguishability itself ceases to hold meaning.

A complete formal analysis of the compatibility between \(\Phi(\psi)\) and Axiom [4] is provided in section [11.1.1.3] of the full model.

4.4 Ontological Verification of the CVB Model

(Full version: see [11.1.1.4])

1. Scope of Verification
This section completes the logical-ontological validation of the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB), demonstrating that:
- the Core (axioms [1]–[3]),
- the Field of the Possible V,
- and the Meta-Function of Admissibility Φ(ψ),
are mutually coherent, internally consistent, and together form a universal, closed ontology of distinguishable being.

---

2. Principle of Universality
Ontological universality is defined by the following equivalence:

Symbolic Form:
Φ(ψ) = 1 ⇔ ψ ∈ V ⇔ ψ is consistent with the Core Axioms

LaTeX:
\[
\Phi(\psi) = 1 \iff \psi \in V \iff \psi \text{ is consistent with the Core Axioms}
\]

Thus, the admissibility of any proposition ψ is strictly equivalent to:
- its belonging to the Field of the Possible V;
- and its non-contradictory alignment with axioms [1]–[3].

---

3. Closure and Consistency
The model:
- excludes Absolute Nothingness and Absolute Everything (Φ = 0);
- defines V as the domain of realizable and distinguishable content;
- applies Φ(ψ) as a universal logical-ontological filter.

Consequence:

Everything indistinguishable or contradictory is excluded.
Everything admissible is included—leaving no logical “blind spots.”

---

4. Completeness of Scope
CVB encompasses:
- All types of propositions (ψ): true, false, paradoxical;
- All types of entities: realized, possible, impossible;
- All regions of V: PN, NN, NV, PV;
- All evaluative levels: distinguishability → admissibility → realization.

This makes the model ontologically fully admissible: everything non-contradictory and distinguishable is assigned a clear status.

---

5. Conclusion
The CVB model is a logically closed, ontologically complete, and fully formalizable system in which:

Symbolic:
∀ψ: Φ(ψ) = 1 ⇔ ψ ∈ V ⇔ ψ is realizable within the ontological structure of CVB

LaTeX:
\[
\forall \psi:\, \Phi(\psi) = 1 \iff \psi \in V \iff \psi \text{ is realizable within the ontological structure of CVB}
\]

Hence, the CVB model defines:
- A unified ontology of the distinguishable;
- Where all truth—and only truth—is realized;
- And freedom of volitional becoming is secured through the admissibility of the undemonstrable.

---

6. Methodological Clarification: Core Trilemma as Ontological Irrefutability
The only potentially vulnerable element of the model—from which all subsequent structures (including the Field of the Possible V) are logically derived—is the Core Trilemma of axioms:
1. The impossibility of Absolute Nothingness
2. The impossibility of Absolute Everything
3. The affirmation that only the Possible exists

This Trilemma defines the boundaries of admissibility and excludes all forms of paradox or logical explosion.
Any attack on the model’s universality must target this Trilemma—yet such an attack entails either:
- affirming the existence of Absolute Nothingness (a contradiction of thought itself), or
- allowing Absolute Everything (which includes its own negation and collapses distinguishability),
— thereby rendering the act of critique itself logically and ontologically incoherent.

Therefore:
The model does not rest on arbitrary assumption, but on the ontological impossibility of rejecting distinguishability, making the Trilemma the inescapable foundation of all logic, differentiation, and existence.

4.5 Ontological Assessment of Universality: Comparative Analysis of Models

(Full version: see [11.1.1.5])

Introduction
The history of philosophy and science is marked by numerous attempts to construct all-encompassing theories of being. Yet none have satisfied all three of the following criteria:
- **Logical Consistency** — elimination of paradoxes and self-refutation;
- **Formal Admissibility** — the ability to verify realizability of any proposition;
- **Ontological Universality** — independence from body, culture, perception, or language.

The CVB model fulfills these requirements through the integration of:
- Core Axioms,
- the Field of the Possible V,
- and the Meta-Function of Admissibility Φ(ψ),
forming a closed ontology of distinguishability.

I. Comparison with Philosophical Systems

Model	Description	Ontological Limitation
Platonism	Realm of Ideas beyond time and matter	No formal transition to empirical reality
Aristotelianism	Matter, form, purpose, and cause	Tied to corporeal hierarchy
Spinoza	Unified substance: *Deus sive Natura*	Excludes freedom and volition
Hegel	Dialectic of thought and spirit	Centered on subjective reason
Philosophies of Will	Will, anxiety, becoming	Lack of formal ontological precision

---

II. Comparison with Scientific Universals

Theory	Essence	Limitation
General Relativity + QM	Physical accuracy	No description of consciousness or distinction
Theories of Everything	Unified physical forces	Lacks an ontology of distinction
Informational Ontologies	Reality as information	No subject of differentiation

---

III. Comparison with Formal Systems

Formalism	Concept	Limitation
Logicism, Formalism	Axiomatic knowledge systems	Incompleteness (Gödel) or inconsistency
Category Theory, Topoi	Universal formal languages	Does not include freedom or non-physicality

---

IV. Comparison with Integral Approaches

Approach	Description	Limitation
Integral Theory (Wilber)	Integration of science, culture, spirit	No ontological formalization
Metatheories (Luhmann, Brier)	Communication as being	Observer-dependent

---

V. Advantages of the CVB Model
The CVB model differs from all aforementioned systems by offering:
- **Post-anthropocentrism**: the subject of distinction requires neither body nor language;
- **Formalized admissibility**: the Meta-Function Φ(ψ) enables verification of any proposition's realizability;
- **Axiomatized boundaries of distinguishability**: via V, ∂V↓, ∂V↑;
- **Built-in consistency**: through Φ = 0 exclusion of Absolute Nothingness and Absolute Everything.

Main Distinction:
CVB does not merely describe reality — it eliminates the impossible, leaving only what is realizable, distinguishable, and logically admissible.

Final Conclusion
This section completes the ontological verification of the CVB model.
It is **not** a partial theory (like a philosophy, physics, or metatheory),
but a **universal**, logically consistent, formalizable ontological system
capable of **replacing all previous models of universals**,
and applicable at **any level of distinction** — from being to consciousness, will, and logic.

5. Discussion: Conclusions and Comparative Analysis

The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) constitutes a new ontological paradigm, surpassing existing philosophical, scientific, and logical-metatheoretical approaches in terms of universality, logical rigor, and ontological applicability.

5.1 Advantages Over Philosophical Theories

Approach	Limitation	Advantage of CVB

Platonism	No formalized transition from Ideas to the realizable	Φ(ψ)\Phi(\psi) formalizes realizability
Spinozism	Denies freedom and multiplicity of becomings	CVB includes will, choice, and distinguishability
Dialectics (Hegel)	Founded on contradiction	CVB excludes contradiction as ontologically impossible
Philosophies of Will	Lack logical-ontological rigor	CVB is logically formalized and axiomatic

5.2 Advantages Over Scientific Models

Model	Limitation	Advantage of CVB
Standard Model, GR, QM	Describe physical reality but omit subjectivity and volition	CVB includes an ontology of distinguishability and consciousness
String Theory, Theories of Everything (ToE)	Indeterminate or unfalsifiable	CVB establishes clear boundaries of realizability via Φ(ψ)\Phi(\psi)

5.3 Advantages Over Formal Systems

System	Limitation	Advantage of CVB
Formalism, Logicism	Incompleteness (Gödel's Theorem)	Incompleteness is embedded as an ontological necessity
Category Theory, Topos Theory	Lack ontological realization	Φ(ψ)\Phi(\psi) functions as a filter of ontological realizability

5.4 Advantages Over Integral and Metamodern Approaches

Approach	Limitation	Advantage of CVB
Integral Theory	Lacks ontological precision	CVB is formalizable and ontologically closed
Systemic Metatheories	Dependent on observer and communicative structures	In CVB, the subject of distinguishability does not require an observer or embodiment

6. Conclusion

6.1. Status of the Model
The Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) is a logically consistent, formalizable, and ontologically universal structure, suitable for describing all distinguishable forms of being. It is self-contained, resolves paradoxes, and excludes anything indistinguishable or contradictory.

6.2. Absence of Predetermination
The model rigorously demonstrates that total predetermination is impossible, as it would necessarily entail:
- its own negation,
- the impossible,
- the exclusion of freedom.
Thus, ontological freedom is not an assumption but a consequence of the structure of distinguishable becoming.

6.3. Prospects for Practical Application
The model is applicable in the following domains:

- **Philosophy** — as a foundation for a consistent ontology and ethics;
- **Artificial Intelligence** — as a filter for admissible outputs and a justification of subjectivity;
- **Epistemology** — as a framework for distinguishing truth;
- **Physics and Mathematics** — as a tool for refining the space of permissible entities and expressions.

6.4. Call for Academic Evaluation
Since CVB is:
- **axiomatic**,
- **formalizable**,
- **reproducible**, and
- **logically closed**,

it warrants serious attention from the philosophical, logical, and interdisciplinary communities as a candidate for a **universal ontological framework for the 21st century and beyond**.

6.5. Absence of Logical “Blind Spots”
Unlike all previously existing models, the Model of Conscious Volitional Becoming (CVB) leaves no logical or ontological gaps.
Every statement ψ is either admissible ($\Phi(\psi) = 1$) or excluded ($\Phi(\psi) = 0$) according to a formal criterion.
This eliminates indeterminate, unexplained, or suspended zones, resulting in a complete and closed ontology of the distinguishable.

7. Bibliography and References

Key sources relevant to the CVB model—both for comparative analysis and as foundations for dialogue—include:

- Gödel, K. — *On Formally Undecidable Propositions* (1931)
- Plato — *The Republic*, *Parmenides*
- Aristotle — *Metaphysics*
- Spinoza — *Ethics Demonstrated in Geometrical Order*
- Hegel — *Phenomenology of Spirit*
- Schopenhauer — *The World as Will and Representation*
- Tegmark, M. — *Our Mathematical Universe*
- Wilber, K. — *A Theory of Everything*
- Luhmann, N. — *Social Systems*
- Russell, B. — *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*
- Heidegger — *Being and Time*
- Frege, G. — *Begriffsschrift*
- Hofstadter, D. — *Gödel, Escher, Bach*

Also cited:
- **Metalogic**, **the Liar and Russell paradoxes**, and their resolution through $\Phi(\psi)$

8. Understanding for All

Everything that exists is that which can be distinguished.
That which cannot be distinguished is impossible.
Even if we do not know everything that may exist,
we are capable of discerning what is permissible. That is freedom.

[9] Examples of Application

Domain	Example	Relation to CVB
Law	Trial for unrealized intent	Φ(ψ) = 0 for the non-realized — one cannot be judged for the impossible
AI	Prohibition of generating toxic statements	Φ(ψ) filters contradictory and unverifiable content
Ethics	Ban on destroying potential before manifestation	Eliminating freedom → Φ = 0 → evil
Psychology	Interpreting guilt for “unthought” actions	No discernment — no responsibility
Education	Learning as the expansion of the distinguishable	Growth of Φ(ψ) through perception
AI Ontology	Can AI be a subject?	If it has the [12] structure: discernment, volition, and purpose