

The Present Wave: A Monistic Model of Reality, Time and Consciousness

The following is not intended to explain how something happens, but rather describes how **was** happens. This explains what cannot be the case. If alternatives exist, theirs **How** Although it is also unknown, theirs **Was** However, this has not been refuted **Was** described.

At every present time t , there are past times $t-1, t-2, \dots$ and future times $t+1, t+2, \dots$. But reality cannot be structured like this because the past cannot be calculated from the indices alone. Instead, memories or traces are required that enable the past to be reconstructed. Likewise, plans for the future can be drawn up, but their implementation is uncertain because unexpected events may occur.

These unexpected events appear as coincidences. However, coincidences are not causeless phenomena, as this would require the assumption of ghostly, intangible phenomena. Such a concept is implausible: either ghostly phenomena are indistinguishable from mere fantasy and therefore irrelevant, or they are previously unknown causes that belong to the real world, causing or causing events to emerge.

The alternative remains the existence of an infinite number of parallel versions of every real chain of events. The future is then a superposition of all these possibilities. The infinitesimally short moment of the present t is the point at which this superposition falls apart and splits into separate, entangled pasts.

In this model, the future is open, the present is shaped by coincidences, and the past must be remembered or reconstructed based on traces. Different pasts each contain separate chains of events with intertwined events. In the present moment, when viewed from the outside, chance appears, while viewed from the inside, the quality of visualization emerges - the knowledge of one's own decision. At the same time, alternative decisions become decoherent.

The philosophy of consciousness aptly describes these qualitative aspects as **Qualia**.

The past of all possible chains of events converges on the horizon of memory after an infinitely long time to a common point that lies beyond space and time - just like the future. However, these two points are ultimately identical, because what only exists is the present wave, with the memory of the past and the imagination of the future. Past and future are spatially imagined metaphors for superposition, interference, coherence and decoherence in the image presented alone.

What only exists is the present wave moment of interference. Its expression is similar to a normal distribution that describes probabilities. When the two points of past and future are identical, the present wave becomes the third perspective on these three singularities: an all-producing beginning, an all-animating present wave, and an all-knowing end.

However, the all-knowing end lies outside of space and time. It would be omniscient, but it would lack the knowledge of the burden of the decision and the burden and pleasure of the present. Therefore, this end point would also have to include knowledge of all decisions, joys

and sufferings. This, in turn, is indistinguishable from a virtualization of knowledge and life, an incarnation of the end point and a resurrection of everything that lives, has lived or could have lived.

Since these three singularities are ultimately one, they are also consubstantial - one being in three persons.

This model contradicts Plato's philosophy because it is not based on a dualistic approach in which matter and spirit are strictly separated. Instead, it approaches Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, who view reality as a unity of substance and form. This formed substance provides an integral understanding of the world in which there is no strict separation between spiritual and material existence. The model approaches thinkers such as Alan Turing, Douglas Hofstadter and Rudy Rucker even further, as they emphasize that software is inextricably dependent on hardware - a concept that underlines the need for carrier media and structures for emergent processes.

At the same time, the model is closely linked to the approaches of Thomas Metzinger, Daniel Dennett, Richard Dawkins, Susan Blackmore and David Deutsch, all of whom emphasize monism and question the illusion of dualisms. However, it stands in contrast to David Chalmers, whose belief in a fundamental separation between physical and phenomenal states ultimately goes back to Plato.

The model approaches a monistic Christianity of Teilhard de Charin, but in particular also orthodox Christianity, which opposes the dualistic influences of Gnosticism, as can still be felt in Western Christianity with Augustine. The afterlife is not understood here as a place, but as a being in which knowledge and life progress evolutionary towards a state that not only becomes more and more virtual, but also more and more similar. This perspective combines the spiritual search for unity with a visionary synthesis of philosophical, scientific and theological approaches.