

Epistemology of Limit Search: From Cognition to Being – A Synthetic Perspective

Abstract

Faith and religion often understand themselves in such a way that they claim that consciousness creates reality – and that therefore every person bears responsibility for the whole of reality. Anyone who doesn't see it this way is acting irresponsibly because they are thereby also complicit in creating everything bad. If it were actually the case that consciousness creates reality, then one would have to bear this responsibility. However, I see it the other way around: For me, reality is objective, and we have no direct access to it. Rather, reality creates space, time, and especially the present – and from it emerges conscientia, consciousness. For me, consciousness is a product of reality and not its origin. In an infinitely long process, this consciousness created by reality approaches reality ever closer until it finally becomes identical with it. This is what I trust – that this is the kingdom of God, in which humanity, the world, and God become one.

For me, faith and religion must not contradict reason.

This article therefore develops a coherent epistemological model that can be metaphysically extrapolated. It underpins cognition, consciousness, and freedom as processes within a real, superimposed present. Past and future are understood as epistemic projections asymptotically approaching a limit, while the present represents the real interface. The uncountable set of possible chains of events allows for a fallibilist stance toward knowledge. The model integrates processual dynamics, causal necessity, and emergent self-organization, offering a bridge between scientific rationality and metaphysical speculation. It provides a robust framework for analyzing freedom, consciousness, and time without presupposing absolute determination or mystical entities.

1. Introduction: Starting point and pragmatic fruitfulness

The model is based on the hypothesis of an objective reality independent of the subject. This assumption creates a stable reference point for criticism and scientific progress. At the same time, the knowing subject is understood as an integral part of reality. Cognition is thus a natural, causally embedded process that overcomes Cartesian dualism and enables the scientific investigation of cognition itself.

At this point, however, a central starting hypothesis suggests itself: One can very well argue that the collapse in the Copenhagen Interpretation (CCI) presupposes genuine chance. Genuine chance is epistemically indistinguishable from a consciousness that decides about possibilities. Thus, the CCI appears dualistic because it imposes a second, non-deterministic layer on top of physical reality. **The model developed here avoids this dualism by conceiving consciousness not as an entity superior to physics, but as a causally embedded, natural process *within* the unified reality. The "decision" about possibilities is thus not a mysterious act of an extra-worldly consciousness or chance, but an emergent process of pattern reinforcement within the superimposed present.** The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) avoids a similar dualism but postulates a different metaphysical structure. We are thus faced with a genuine choice:

KD: Dualism between deterministic physics and non-deterministic chance/consciousness.

MWI: Monism, multiverse logically necessary.

The epistemology presented here: monism, consciousness as an emergent, causally embedded process within the one reality.

2. The processual model: superposition in the present

Reality is understood not as static, but as a dynamic result of superimposed possibilities. The present is the only ontologically real moment in which causal chains from the past interfere with the open potential of future possibilities.

Decision and freedom: Freedom is understood as emergent self-organization within the superimposed present. The subject itself is a superposition—a complex pattern of values, experiences, and impulses—in which certain patterns are reinforced and others weakened.

Consciousness: Consciousness is the ongoing process of internal pattern reinforcement. The coherence of the self arises from the stability of recurring patterns, without the need for reduction to neural mechanics or a metaphysical soul.

3. Horizons of Knowledge: Past, Present, Future

Past and future exist only epistemically. They can be described as open intervals that asymptotically approach a limit:

Past: Approach to the origin, reconstructable only fragmentarily.

Future: Approaching an end goal, fundamentally open and not determined.

The set of possible chains of events is assumed to be uncountable. This principle ensures epistemic fallibility and protects against the illusion of complete comprehensibility. Knowledge is thus understood as a continuous approach to epistemic horizons.

4. Metaphysical implications: unity of limits

The three limits—origin, present, omega—can be combined into a single real limit, the present. They constitute different perspectives:

1. Origin: Source of all potentiality.

2. Present: Place of actualization and self-realization.

3. Omega: State of complete self-transparency of reality, integration of all information in a coherent structure.

This circular logic combines epistemic projection and metaphysical speculation and shows how reality recognizes itself.

5. Plausibility check: Interface to natural sciences

Thermodynamics and Entropy: Local order (life, consciousness) emerges within dissipative structures, despite global entropy increases. The Omega point can be interpreted as a metaphysical maximum order without violating the physical framework.

Conservation of energy: Cognitive processes are embedded in the existing energy of the universe; conservation laws are respected.

Quantum mechanics (KD vs. MWI): The superposition and branching in physics serves as an analogy to the epistemological model of the present, not as an exact physical homology.

6. Conclusion

The epistemology of limit-seeking offers a precise, coherent framework that integrates knowledge, consciousness, freedom, and time into a unified model. It is fallibilist, compatible with scientific rationality, and provides a bridge to metaphysical considerations. Past and future become epistemically manageable as projections that asymptotically approach the present, while the present itself remains the real interface of all dynamics.

Compared to the Copenhagen Interpretation and the Many-Worlds Interpretation, it avoids the dualism of chance and determinism. Its strength lies in its synthetic, holistic view: the present is the real limit point where possibility and reality coincide—and it is precisely here that knowledge, freedom, and consciousness arise.