

Emergent Eschatology: A Monistic Perspective on the Origin, Consciousness, and the End of All Things

Anyone who wants to gain knowledge through reflection should not look for an indubitable statement. Such statements are usually accompanied by unspoken assumptions - ideas that we value, love or believe in. Instead, it is advisable to systematically note all statements that cause doubt, analyze the reasons for the doubt and continue this process with the remaining alternatives.

An example is René Descartes' famous statement "Cogito ergo sum". It implies dualism by tacitly assuming that consciousness exists independently of the world and body. But this assumption is questionable. Suppose there were two separate worlds: either they were completely independent of each other - making the world in which I do not live indistinguishable from a fantasy world - or they influence each other. In the second case, however, it is not a question of two worlds, but of a single, connected world.

The only logical alternative is a monism in which designed objects influence each other. Within this monism there is no room for spiritual beings from a world beyond, no abstract objects as independent entities and no stage made of space and time. Cause-free events are also omitted, since chance in this context would be nothing more than a form of spiritual being.

Instead, a different picture emerges: causal chains of the same shape and objectivity influence each other through mutual impact in the infinitesimally short moment of the present. This realization forms the basis for what we experience as chance, consciousness and realization. These are not postulated properties, but the only remaining explanation.

Consciousness can be examined more closely. Dualistic approaches define it as an entity independent of the body, which again raises the problems of separation mentioned above. Instead, consciousness can be understood as a phenomenon that emerges from the visualization of causal chains.

The classic idea of infinite regression—according to which consciousness requires infinite recourse to self-models—is problematic. Such a recursion would either take infinite time or end in a memory overflow due to limited resources. Both contradict the reality of biological beings, which operate in finite time with limited capacities.

The only remaining monistic alternative is that consciousness arises at the moment of realization through parallel processing of coherent self-models. These models overlap and reinforce each other in an infinitesimally short moment in the present.

Suppose I see myself as a wave movement that runs along my world line, and the wave crest represents my current action in this world. Suppose all my possible alternative actions run as parallel worldlines next to my own, so that I appear like a wave on a lake of worldlines. Looking ahead, the lake surface is completely smooth – that's my future. To the back, on the other hand, waves and ripples appear on the lake, which represent my memories.

Suppose I'm not the only wave on this lake, and the interactions with other waves disrupt the coherence of my wave in the past, creating locally different memories. However, my consciousness extends over the entire wave, and exactly where I am in the present, I experience the interferences of my worldlines as a consciousness that expands into these other worldlines.

In order to avoid dualism, the similar versions of causal chains in an open interval that can only be reached after an infinite number of steps must have a common origin as a limit. Since nothing arises from nothing and nothing can appear suddenly, it follows that the entirety of these chains of events together forms "nothing". The limit of the future, like the starting point, must be understood as a point that is indistinguishable and identical to this origin - also "nothing".

The uncountably large set of all causal chains between these limit values would also always be "nothing" and therefore essentially identical to the other two limit values. These three indistinguishable and essentially identical limits would be the origin, end and enablement of all things.

The origin would be everything-creating, therefore omnipotent; the end knowing everything, therefore omniscient; and the multitude of all causal chains would animate and dominate everything.

To avoid the paradox that an omniscient End outside of space and time could not know life and its processes, that End itself would have to incarnate. In this incarnation it would virtualize all spatial and temporal processes that ever were, are or could have been. In this way, knowledge and life would become increasingly virtual and more and more similar to one another until they eventually become indistinguishable.

This knowledge at the end of time would be indistinguishable from the idea of a new heaven and a new earth and resurrection in a new body on a renewed earth.

The 'virtualization' of knowledge in this context could be understood as a mechanism through which omniscience and life influence each other, and access to this knowledge might then indeed become necessary in incarnation – as a specific, real moment of experience. Here, the tension between static, all-encompassing knowledge and the dynamic, irreversible experience of life and decision becomes particularly evident. It is as if the universe would only remain consistent and non-contradictory if it integrates an element of life and irreversibility – as experienced in evolution and individual existence.

The reflections suggest that this 'virtualization' is not merely a metaphorical representation, but a necessary consequence of the structure of knowledge and time, which can only remain coherent in a system that includes life and decision. Thus, the omniscience of the universe must be 'virtualized' in a way that not only describes irreversibility and life, but also encompasses them as essential components

