If one wants to reach knowledge through reflection, one should not look for an indubitable statement. Because with such a statement, unspoken assumptions creep in that you value, love or believe in. Instead, one should systematically note down all the statements that one doubts, examine the reasons for the doubt, and continue this process with the remaining alternatives.

For example, consider René Descartes' statement “Cogito ergo sum.” This statement carries dualism in that it tacitly assumes that consciousness exists independently of the world and the person's body. However, this is doubtful. If one assumes two separate worlds, they are either completely independent of each other - and the world in which I do not live would then be indistinguishable from a fantasy world - or they influence each other. In the latter case, however, they do not form two worlds, but rather a single, connected world.

The only logical alternative is monism, in which designed objects influence each other. Within such a monism there is no place for spirit beings from a world beyond, no space and time as a stage for designed objects, and no calculations or abstract objects as independent entities. Cause-free events are also eliminated, because chance would then be nothing more than a kind of spiritual being.

Instead, another possibility arises: causal chains of the same shape and objectivity influence each other through mutual impact in the infinitesimally short moment of the present. This visualization of the interrelated causal chains forms the basis for what we experience as coincidence, consciousness and visualization. These are not postulated properties, but rather the only remaining alternative.

On consciousness as a monistic phenomenon

Let's take a closer look at consciousness. A dualistic view would view consciousness as an entity independent of the body, but this again raises the problems of separation mentioned above. Instead, we could understand consciousness as a phenomenon that arises from the visualization of causal chains.

The classic idea of infinite regression—that consciousness requires infinite recourse to self-models—is dubious. Such a recursion would either take infinite time to complete or would result in a memory overflow due to finite resources. Both contradict the reality of biological beings that act in finite time and have limited capacities.

The only remaining monistic alternative would be that consciousness arises at the moment of visualization through parallel processing of self-models. Coherent and mutually reinforcing self-models overlap in an infinitesimally short moment in the present.

Biological basis of consciousness

Some might argue that biological entities are not quantum computers and therefore cannot create superpositions. But even in biological systems, such as neural networks, there are plausible mechanisms:

- Neurons can be described by activation patterns, which can be expressed mathematically as a matrix or tensor.
- At ever smaller levels, atomic processes – such as field effect transistors – could create superpositions that produce coherent patterns for infinitesimally short periods of time.

This effect could be an evolutionary side effect. Systems with coherent self-modeling may have had a survival advantage because they were better able to understand their environment and predict actions.

Resonance and reinforcement

A complementary idea would be that these processes are strengthened by resonance. Coherent patterns could influence and stabilize each other through resonance effects. As a result, consciousness would emerge not as a static phenomenon, but as a dynamic and constantly changing balance between the overlapping causal chains.

The role of evolution

Within such a model, consciousness would not be a planned phenomenon but the result of ongoing evolution. The superposition of coherent causal chains and the resulting parallel processing may have initially occurred in a rudimentary manner and evolved into increasingly complex forms through natural selection.

The consequences of monism

In order to avoid dualism, these similar versions of causal chains must have a common origin as a limit in an open interval that can only be reached after an infinite number of steps. Since nothing comes from nothing and something cannot suddenly be there, it follows that the entirety of these chains of events together is “nothing”. The limit of the future, like the starting point, would have to be understood as a point, indistinguishable and identical to this origin, and also be “nothing”.

The uncountably powerful set of all causal chains between these limit values would also always have to be “nothing” and therefore essentially the same as the other two limit values. These three indistinguishable and essentially identical limits would be the origin and enablement of all things.

In a monistic worldview, consciousness would not be an abstract property, but rather the dynamic realization of coherent causal chains in the present moment. This view excludes dualism and provides a consistent basis for integrating physics, biology and philosophy.