

# **Philosophy of Assumptions Summary**



# **Philosophy of Assumptions**

## **Summary**

Vilém Kmuníček

Brno 2023



## **Content**

Overview of Terms and Definitions	7
0. Preface	9
1. Introduction	15
2. The foundation of the Philosophy of Assumptions	16
3. Concepts of the Philosophy of Assumptions	21
3.1. On the Concept of “Momentary Mental Model”	26
3.2. Empirical Grounding of the Concept “Momentary Mental Model”	32
3.3. Speculative Deduction of Other Consequences of Virtual Reality Construction	38
4. Consequences of the Philosophy of Assumptions	45
5. The Practical Contribution of the Philosophy of Assumptions	52
5.1. Artifact Functioning	54
5.2. Virtual Reality	60
5.3. Other Benefits	62
6. Conclusion	65
Appendix: Philosophical Compass or From Philosophical Certainties to Practical Certainties	67
Reference	82
Editorial Note	85
Thanks	87



## Overview of Terms and Definitions

### List of abbreviations

MMM <sup>1</sup>	<i>momentary mental model</i> <sup>2</sup> – present content of consciousness
MMMS <sup>3</sup>	<i>momentary mental model from sensation</i> <sup>4</sup> – present content of consciousness created on the basis of direct perception of reality
MMMF <sup>5</sup>	<i>momentary mental model from fixation</i> <sup>6</sup> – present content of consciousness created on the basis of sensory fixation
FMM	<i>fixed mental model</i> – the memory-experience background from which MMM is given meanings
TCS <sup>7</sup>	<i>thought-conceptual system</i> <sup>8</sup> – what can be objectified from FMM – spoken, written; the subject's world view

---

<sup>1</sup> Formerly AMM, or CMM.

<sup>2</sup> Formerly *actual mental model*, or *current mental model*.

<sup>3</sup> Formerly AMMS, or CMMS.

<sup>4</sup> Formerly *actual mental model from sensation*, or *current mental model from sensation*.

<sup>5</sup> Formerly AMMF, or CMMF.

<sup>6</sup> Formerly *actual mental model from fixation*, or *current mental model from fixation*.

OM            *ontological model* – paradigm (general model of reality, e.g. religious, today scientific)

In my opinion, the terms defined in the list of abbreviations are in philosophical thinking as brought about by its development so far, anticipated by the philosophical terms opinion, mind (*rozmysl*) and reason (*rozum*) (compare Miroslav Slouka’s Facebook post *Jak (ve filosofickém kroužku) používáme rozum* (2019) and the entry of the *Stručný filosofický slovník* (1966, pp. 384–385) *Rozmysl a rozum*), in the following summary:

Opinion is the ability to create (power to create) MMM focused through FMM.

Mind is the ability to create (power to create) TCS.

Reason is the ability to create (power to create) OM.

Other concepts

*fixation* – memory or objective recording

*mental fixation* – memory trace

*instrumental fixation* – either objectification (utterance, writing) mental fixation, or citation of reality (image, sculpture, photograph, audio recording, film, holography); when it is perceived, MMM arises from fixation *beyond-conscious* – used in the sense of “generating consciousness”

---

<sup>7</sup> Formerly ISC.

<sup>8</sup> Formerly *idea-conceptual system*.

## **0. Preface**

In the final stage of my life, I decided to compile my philosophical reflections, fragmented into several articles, into a compact whole, which will include all my thoughts related to the philosophy of assumptions, in order to offer readers a definitive form of my texts, arising from the insight into the existence of the momentary mental model, as I called their key concept. These texts are accessible mainly on the Internet at <https://vilem-kmunicek.cz>, some were published in English translation abroad (domestic periodicals do not show interest in them).

This text is the result of my lifelong search to find my way in the world available to me, which began thanks to my study of philosophy, which mainly gave me questions, but not answers. I am trying to find those here.

My insight “Everything is given to us through the contents of consciousness” gradually crystallized into the “philosophy of assumptions”, an outline of which will be presented in the following text.

The search for the certainty of knowledge characterizes our present, but it has accompanied us since the beginnings of philosophical thought. The chaos of overlapping voices, which led Socrates to the statement “I know nothing”, and Descartes to the only certainty he

found, namely that doubting, and therefore thinking, leads us to the discovery that we *realize* things. This finding is evident, as are the other three certainties that result from it, which are the self that is aware, the consciousness that makes us aware of something, and the contents of consciousness, namely what we are aware of.

In addition to this certainty, the inquiry of philosophers throughout history has surprisingly found *four uncertainties* as certain:

1. We do not know for sure whether we are not deceived by logical forms of thought (L. Klíma).
2. We cannot assert anything certain beyond the contents of consciousness (R. Descartes).
3. We cannot assert anything certain beyond sense perceptions (G. Berkeley).
4. It is uncertain for us to know the substance beyond phenomena (Eleatics).

In order to reason further, we must establish the four assumptions (and hope that they will be confirmed in the further course of attaining knowledge by enabling us to explain all the contents of all consciousness):

1. First, we must assume *that our reasoning is meaningful*, i.e., that the thought-conceptual and logical forms in which our thinking is enclosed enable us to bring reality before consciousness in its most authentic form.

2. In the case of *the certainty of consciousness*, we intend to assume that there is something beyond its contents, and that is reality, and that the complex analytic-synthetic apparatus of the brain functions to convey reality to us, if possible, as it is.

3. Similarly, we assume behind the *sensations* that which is their source, that which is perceived, therefore, again, reality.

4. The relationship between a phenomenon and its essence then leads to the necessary assumption that through *phenomena* we get to know the hidden essence beyond them.

Thus, the cognitive process begins for us by making assumptions (based on an intuitive opinion), some of which will prove to be true in interpreting the contents of consciousness and others will not. The latter are then replaced by other intuitive assumptions that have the ambition to be proven, and so on.

The contents of consciousness are richly structured internally (we see something, we hear something, we think something, we feel something, etc.), yet they form a kind of whole that the brain constantly brings before our consciousness. When we close our eyes, the part mediated by sight disappears; the whole disappears when we lose consciousness. Let us call this whole the *momentary mental model* for the following reasons: we call the contents of consciousness a model because they model reality, i.e., because they are in a special relation to reality – they bring it before our consciousness so that we take these contents of consciousness to be the reality as it is (whereas it is only reality as it appears to us). This model is a mental model because it is created by the mind through beyond-conscious (in the sense of “consciousness-generating”) and deliberate processes. The expression “momentary” points to the fact that it happens in the present. However, we are aware of the

flow of momentary mental models rather than a mere present moment.

The complex analytic-synthetic work of the brain does not end there. It organizes the contents of consciousness thanks to the functioning of its System 1 and System 2, as described by Daniel Kahneman, who distinguishes two apparatuses in our minds, one of which thinks quickly, promptly and intuitively, and the other slowly, deliberately and deductively. In my view, System 1 produces a *fixed mental model* as the background on which the contents of consciousness happen (when we perceive, remember, imagine) and from which meanings are given to the contents of consciousness. The product of System 2 is then the *thought-conceptual system* that arises by abstraction from a fixed mental model and we move in it when we think. This can be spoken, and the words recorded. In this way, subjective knowledge is objectified, and a thought-conceptual model of reality can be communicated and confronted. The most global of these is the paradigm or, if you prefer, the *ontological model*, as opposed to the thought-conceptual system, which is individual and commonly referred to as a worldview.

However, I can only go beyond my consciousness by means of an assumption, namely this one: The contents of my consciousness are created by the constant interaction of being, reality, and the mechanisms of my self, my brain, which have arisen to enable the orientation of my self in reality.

In this way, we have created the possibility of relying on what is called *common sense*, i.e., a basic ontological

view, an ontological idea that is forced upon us without our purposeful effort to form it.

The assumptions of common sense became the starting point for the investigation of reality by philosophy and by the special sciences that have been separated from it depending on the definition of the field of research (the field of philosophy is then defined by the remaining questions, i.e., those that the special sciences do not deal with; its mission is to form a unified system of knowledge of the whole being, an ontological model, from the partial knowledge of the special sciences). These assumptions are corrected, changed, discarded and replaced by more adequate assumptions of reality in the course of the cognitive process.

One of the basic assumptions of common sense is the so-called naïve realism, i.e., the intuitive view that reality is given to us in perception essentially as it is. Modern science (dominated by so-called scientific realism) also relies on it when it builds a paradigm, an ontological model. In historical practice, this means taking intuition-based statements as assumptions that are either confirmed or not – which are then replaced by others, and the process repeats. A model example might be, for example, the assumed motion of the sun on the vault of the heavens, which led to paradoxes, and it was necessary to accept another assumption (namely that the Earth rotates).

According to my findings, one of these assumptions should also be the claim that reality is given to us only through the contents of consciousness.

For in order to become aware of something, it must become the content of our consciousness. The brain

brings before consciousness through sense perception the whole world, every thing, everything that we are aware of, the whole of reality, what we see, hear, taste, feel, etc., and it becomes a process in our mind, something distinct from reality itself, and it is always true: it is *reality-in-our-consciousness*, it is a fusion, an alloy of reality and consciousness. So, what is available to you, to your consciousness, is a kind of conglomerate of a special nature, a kind of third thing between reality and consciousness, the *content of consciousness*. Only when the reality is mediated before consciousness, before our self in this way, can we become aware of it.

This philosophical basis then makes it possible to interpret, for example, the particular functioning of an artwork and its relation to virtual reality, or to think of an artifact as a program.

My original inspiration was the discovery of the importance of philosophical awareness of the entity “present content of consciousness” (defined as “momentary mental model”). It was only later that an attempt was made to create a philosophical system around this notion, collectively called the “philosophy of assumptions”.

## **1. Introduction**

My final text wants to attempt a systematic interpretation of my theoretical findings in their entirety.

The context in which these ideas arose is, especially recently, the information boom, on the basis of which modern society is called an information society, or even a disinformation society, when we realize that we are so overwhelmed by stimuli that we get lost in them. While ideological distortion was the rule under the communists, today, similarly, even in the flood of factual information, we are once again looking for orientation, for a point of reference that we would grasp as a certainty in our reflections on the world around us.

We thus live in a time of unprecedented expansion of knowledge. However, the flood of knowledge strangely has the effect of disorienting us and asking, as generations before us have asked: What is certain in a world so uncertain? For we need to know it in order to act meaningfully. Only if our knowledge of the reality around us is certain can we successfully intervene in it. Can any certainty be found beyond the fact that everything is uncertain?

## 2. The Foundation of the Philosophy of Assumptions

As noted above, the search for cognitive certainties has its history. However, the history of philosophy leads us paradoxically from the discovery of what is certain to the statement of uncertainties.

The first uncertainty discovered by *Eleatics* (Zlomky, 1989, pp. 22–46) was the finding that we do not know the nature behind phenomena. Unless we assume that the essence manifests itself as it appears to us, we have no chance to say anything certain about it.

It was also *Plato* (Platón, 1921, p. 250) who, in his idea of the dark cave in which we observe only mere shadows of reality, realized that the divide between essence and appearance is difficult to overcome.

*Francis Bacon* (1990, pp. 86–88) understood Plato's cave as a metaphor that *de facto* reflects how the reflection of reality enters our consciousness, how the reflection of reality is created in consciousness, and then he named one kind of cognitive distortion as the idols of the cave.

*George Berkeley* (1995, pp. 62–63, 72, 83) attempted to depict in detail the cave in which man is enclosed. He concluded that there is a dam of the senses between man and the world, and that this dam is so impenetrable that we cannot tell anything about what is beyond the sensory signals. Even though we can assume that the senses, while separating us from reality, tell us what it looks like,

this does not change the fact that we have discovered a second divide between reality and man: the senses.

Having become uncertain about what is beyond the senses, *René Descartes* (1947, p. 40) sought at least some certainty and found the certainty of concrete human consciousness. This certainty, however, becomes a statement of another enclosure in which man is confined with respect to reality: all that man learns about reality are mere contents of consciousness, and it is possible to assume that nothing certain can be asserted beyond these contents of consciousness, unless we accept the assumption that reality enters our consciousness through these contents of consciousness. Either way, we must state a third divide between reality and man.

Líznar (2006, p. 51) states that *Ladislav Klíma* became convinced that we are enclosed in logical forms of thinking and cannot think otherwise – our thinking is bound by logic, and we cannot get out of this cell in any way. And this is the fourth divide between reality and man.

We have discovered four barriers between reality and man that seem to make cognition impossible. First, it is the caesura between phenomenon and essence; second, the impossibility of asserting anything with certainty beyond the sense stimuli, third, also beyond the contents of consciousness; and fourth, the impossibility of getting out of logical forms of thought to the certainty that they are justified.

Let us recapitulate them.

1. We do not know for certain that we are not deceived by logical forms of thought (L. Klíma).

2. We cannot assert anything certain beyond the contents of consciousness (Descartes).

3. We cannot assert something certain beyond sense perceptions (Berkeley).

4. It is uncertain for us to know the substance behind phenomena (Eleatics).

These four uncertainties are due to our *quadruple closure* into the contents of consciousness:

1. We are closed *in the mind*, in what we think, in ideas, in logical forms.

2. We are enclosed *in consciousness*: all that we are aware of are the contents of consciousness.

3. Many of the contents of consciousness are then mediated by the *senses*, which separate us from the reality that they already mediate, enclosing us behind a sensory dam.

4. These contents of consciousness show us reality only as it appears to us; essence is then hidden behind these *phenomena*, although it is also manifested by them; we are enclosed in the phenomena, and this divide is opened to us only by a long process of cognition.

We have identified these four fundamental uncertainties as certainties. However, only as long as our reasoning makes sense, i.e., if it can be assumed that the thought-conceptual and logical forms in which our thinking is enclosed are adequate to the reality about which they testify. If this is not the case, our situation is hopeless. In order to move on, we have no choice but to accept the unprovable proposition as a premise, and thus to assume that our reasoning is meaningful, i.e., that the thought-conceptual and logical forms, in which our

thinking is enclosed, make it possible to bring reality before consciousness in its authentic form, as it is.

It is the same with the other three identified uncertainties – the divides between consciousness and reality. Even in their case, we must make certain assumptions.

In the case of the *certainty of consciousness*, we are going to assume that there is something behind its contents, namely reality, and that the complex analytic-synthetic apparatus of the brain functions to convey reality to us, as much as possible, as it is.

Similarly, we assume behind the *sensations* that which is their source, that which is perceived, again, reality.

The relation of phenomenon and essence then leads to the necessary assumption that through *phenomena* we recognize the essence hidden behind them.

While it is clear that we must accept the given assumptions (otherwise our journey ends), and that therefore they are not accidental, the assumption that there is something behind the contents of consciousness, and specifically behind the sensations, seems to allow the possibility that there is anything or nothing behind them (philosophers, after all, have made ample use of it). However, this is not our way. We are going to start from the assumption that there is something definite and knowable behind them, that which *immediate intuition* shows us – namely, that there is an objective reality. We are going to start from the assumption that the contents of consciousness are what convey reality to us essentially, within the limits of possibility, as it is (for us). We are going to assume that reality is thus more or less, in essential features, knowable.

These *minimal assumptions* are necessary for us to even start thinking. If we accept them, we count on feedback to confirm them. If, under certain minimal assumptions, all the contents of consciousness can be explained, then we can say that these assumptions are justified. This certainty will only become apparent in the further progress of cognition, in the extent to which it enables us to interpret all the contents of all consciousness. For the moment, let us state that the cognitive process begins by making assumptions (based on the intuitive opinion), some of which will prove useful in interpreting the contents of consciousness and others that will not. These are then replaced by other intuitive assumptions, based on the previous cognitive practice, which have the ambition to prove themselves, and so on.

### 3. Concepts of the Philosophy of Assumptions

So far, we have only got to the uncertainties. Is anything in itself certain at all? When we assume that our reasoning makes sense, and thus we cross the innermost barrier between man and reality, we have reached the sphere of man's enclosure in consciousness, in which we can distinguish between consciousness and its contents at most.

The certainty which René Descartes discovered here is the certainty of consciousness, which is evident, obvious to every man. How did he find out?

Socrates' *I know that I know nothing* was foreshadowed by Descartes' *I only know that I doubt*. From there he came to the certainty *I think, therefore I am*, and we can reformulate it *I am aware* as the primary evidence, the certainty that is given to every human consciousness. Thus, three realities are so evident to man at the same time: consciousness itself, man's self, which is the bearer of consciousness, and the contents of consciousness.

Unlike the stage of consciousness and the self ("sitting in the auditorium" of a Cartesian theatre), the contents of consciousness are richly structured internally (we can see, hear, think, feel something etc.), but at the same time they form a kind of a whole that the brain constantly brings before our consciousness. When we close our eyes, the part mediated by sight disappears; the whole disappears when we lose consciousness. Let us call this

whole by the term *momentary mental model* (*MMM* for short), for the following reasons: we call the contents of consciousness a model because they model reality, i.e., because they are in a special relation to reality – they bring it before our consciousness so that we consider these contents of consciousness as the reality that it is (whereas it is only reality as it appears to us). This model is a mental model because it is created by the mind through beyond-conscious and deliberate processes. And the momentary attribute points to the fact that it happens in the present. It is also worth mentioning that we are aware of the *flow* of momentary mental models rather than a mere present cut.

The complex analytical-synthetic work of the brain does not end there. It organizes the contents of consciousness thanks to the working of its *System 1* and *System 2*, as described by Daniel Kahneman (2012, pp. 26–36), who distinguishes two apparatuses in our mind, one of which thinks quickly, promptly, and intuitively, and the other slowly, deliberately, and deductively. In our view, System 1 produces a *fixed mental model* (*FMM*) as the background against which the contents of consciousness happen (when we perceive, remember, imagine) and from which meanings are given to the contents of consciousness. The product of System 2 is then a *thought-conceptual system* (*TCS*), which arises by abstraction from the fixed mental model and moves within it when we think. This can be spoken, and the words recorded. In this way, the hitherto subjective knowledge is objectified, and a thought-conceptual model of reality can be communicated and confronted.

The most global of these is the paradigm, or if you prefer, the *ontological model (OM)*, as opposed to the thought-conceptual system, which is individual and commonly referred to as a worldview.

To build the ontological model we will have to start again with assumptions. First of all, as we have already seen, we need to assume that our reasoning makes sense. Then we can reason: From the established certainty *I am aware*, via Descartes' assumption *I think, therefore I am*, we assume that there is a sort of ontological entity that carries the contents of my consciousness, that there is my self, my consciousness.

However, I can only go beyond my consciousness again by means of an assumption, namely this: The contents of my consciousness arise through the constant interaction of being, reality, and the mechanisms of my self, my brain, which have arisen to enable the orientation of my self in reality.

In this way, we have created the possibility of relying on what is called *common sense*, i.e., a basic ontological view, an ontological idea that is imposed on us in a natural way without any purposeful effort to form it. What does common sense tell us? What are its assumptions?

*It is you and the things around you. The things around you exist independently of whether you perceive them. One of those things is your body, from which your consciousness, the self, looks out; the body and the self are so closely intertwined that the body is subject to your will and at the same time it shapes your needs.*

*The things around you are three-dimensional, spatial, material, mutually impenetrable, spread out in three-dimensional space. Things have weight and that determines the up-down coordinate. There is flat ground below on which things rest. You also have a place in this space, and accordingly you determine the other coordinates of things (right-left, front-back).*

*Things gradually change, come into existence and disappear. We call this reality time, and we understand it as a continuous and uniform change of what there is. In this process, we distinguish between the past (that which used to be and is not anymore), the future (that which is not yet but it will be) and the present (that which is now). We also recognize the passage of time by the regular alternation of periods of light (day) and darkness (night), which is due to the movement of the sun across the heaven's vault.*

*Things around you are of different kinds. We can distinguish between animate and inanimate. Of the living, the closest to you are those that are also bearers of consciousness and have a body formed like you – humans. You are one of them. You move among other things and subdue them, and thus keep yourself alive – you have the possibility to change things by intervening in their arrangements and to create new things from old. Thus, alongside the things that keep themselves in existence, there is a group of things that are kept in existence by human activity. Humans do this activity together and they individually specialize in its components. This is made possible by the fact that they communicate with each other. Etc. etc.*

The assumptions of common sense became the starting point for the investigation of reality by philosophy and, from it depending on the definition of the field of inquiry, by the special divided sciences (the field of philosophy is then defined by the remaining questions, i.e., those which the special sciences do not deal with; its mission is to form a unified system of knowledge of the whole existence, an ontological model from the partial knowledge of the special sciences). These assumptions are corrected, changed, discarded, and replaced by more adequate assumptions of reality in the course of the cognitive process.

### **3.1. On the Concept of “Momentary Mental Model”**

The central concept of this chapter is the concept of the *momentary mental model*, which we are trying to implement this way.

In the experience of every human subject endowed with consciousness, there is an empirically, introspectively accessible object, which we are concerned with, to which we want to point, and which we want to identify in our experience and name. It is a unit of the contents of consciousness perceived in the present time in all its forms.

In the state of vigilance, it is what we commonly call reality around us, the world, but de facto it is an optical image of reality, together with its conceptual focus, thoughts, and other sensory sensations of reality (auditory, tactile, olfactory, gustatory), body sensation, sense of balance, visions, emotions, feelings, moods, and dreams during a sleep.

As we have explained, these contents always form a whole and of this whole, which changes over time, we are aware in the present, currently. Let us call this whole the momentary mental model (MMM). “Momentary” because we are aware of the contents in the present. “Mental” because it is a product of our mind. “Model” because it is a reflection of reality. Any other conceptual connotations are misleading. We should understand this

phrase as a symbol, which we want to use to point to the reality that it names.

However difficult it is to point to the mentioned entity and name it, it is even more difficult to find the denotation, i.e., the object of this name. Therefore, it has probably not been identified in the literature yet, although everything is suddenly clear after gaining an insight into it. Then the following statements are also understandable.

The characteristics of individual MMMs is that they create a continuous flow of momentary mental models in time, where one MMM passes seamlessly into another, etc. The flow of MMMs is generated by a systematic complex analytic-synthetic work of the brain in cooperation with the sensory organs.

The MMM disappears for the sentient subject when he loses consciousness. In the state of vigilance, a substantial part of the MMM disappears for a sighted person when they close their eyes. The construction of virtual reality or virtuality is based on the significance of the participation of optical sensations in the creation of MMM: such artificial sensations are generated for the sight that the brain is able to produce from them the MMM, which is close to the MMM from direct sensation of reality and, at the moment of perception of artificial stimuli, substitutes reality with virtuality.

The particular MMMs differ from each other by focusing attention on different components of the contents of consciousness: the subject may, based on the situation, focus on sensory perception or on the perception with a specific sensor (and then the content of their consciousness is dominated by the image of reality),

on thoughts (through which he browses when thinking, without realizing the reality around him), on visions (overlapping any sensation), on experience, emotions and feelings (when the dominant content of consciousness becomes pain, joy, love, etc.), or, as has been seen, the sensory perception can be converted to the sensory perception of virtuality. But even those do not exhaust all the possibilities of generating the MMM. For example, art taught us to create virtual MMM from sensation of edited reality, be it paintings, sculptures, theatre, or film; or you can realize how the MMM from reading is created: the perception of words activates conceptual and image structures in our consciousness and even then, thanks to the “switch” of sensory perception to the decryption of the text, we find ourselves in virtuality.

MMM may arise through a direct reception of reality and the content of consciousness is then the *MMM from sensation* (which also disintegrates into individual entities, things), that is what, for the most part, disappears when you close your eyes, what is largely substitutable by the apparatus constituting virtual reality, but what is also replaceable, to an even greater extent, by the perception of fixations<sup>9</sup> (by reading, or listening to a text, particularly an artistic one, watching movies, etc., when the MMM from fixation is generated).

When we prevent sensation, the MMM from sensation disappears. Sensation is the most common, but not the only source of MMM. Yet, MMM is complex in terms of

---

<sup>9</sup> Such as somehow recorded text, photography, film, etc.

sources, rarely constituted by a single source, although we can usually find a prevailing source for the momentary MMM.

In the MMM from sensation, the senses are applied and the MMM of the outer world is created. But we cannot ignore the internal body sensation, which is, however, in comparison with the external one, usually minimal (apart from our awareness of the body surface and the position of body parts, it complements the MMM from sensation, for example, with inner pain).

The MMM from sensation can be described as authentic, as opposed to the *MMM from fixation*. According to their type, the MMMs of fixation can be divided as follows: Almost at the level of sensation, the MMM arises in the perception of **fixations**, which are artifacts (a painting, sculpture, music and other reproduction artifacts) and technical fixations (a photography, film, or holography); in the case of which we speak about a partial quotation of reality. Mediation through the word and thought-conceptual system (TCS) is evident in the creation of the MMM from fixation, which arises from an audible word or text.

The contents of consciousness can thus be the *image MMM* (when either words evoke relevant visions and whole fantasy worlds in us, or we ourselves, based on our thoughts, move in these fantasy worlds, or possibly solve problems or create projects in our visions),

*commemorative MMM* (MMM from the fixed mental model (FMM), when the content of our consciousness arises from our memory records of previously perceived MMMs from sensation),

but mainly *thought MMM* (MMM from the thought-conceptual system (TCS)), in the implementation of which we are aware of and form our thoughts on a darkened background of the MMM from sensation, when we concentrate on the thinking and do not fully perceive the momentary present reality,

and it can also be the *dreamy MMM*, when we either dream or recall our dreams.

Moreover, the contents of our consciousness can also consist of moods, feelings, and emotions, which can be experienced, depending on the MMM from sensation, such as its colour and background, or which can be directly induced by the MMM from sensation. Our wants, desires, needs, intuitions and hunches are also included in the MMM. Among the types of MMM, we can also differentiate the working MMM, which can be further divided into the working MMM from thoughts (I think that...), the working MMM from visions (I imagine that...) and the working thought-image MMM (I combine mental images and thoughts).

In fact, as has already been mentioned, the MMM does not disintegrate this way, but is uniform. The MMM from sensation may be coloured by feelings and emotions, may be focused, emphasized by the FMM and TCS, or focused on a particular segment of reality through attention.

All these components of the content of consciousness (participating in varying degrees) form a *whole*, which is precisely the *present content of consciousness*, the MMM. (This whole is generated as a whole by the brain in moments when we are conscious, either awake or dreaming.) However, the situation is even more complex,

since every MMM is a part of the MMM flow, in which one MMM transforms smoothly or disparately into another, thanks to which the MMM flow seemingly transcends the presence, is longer than the cut in the presence, which lacks the temporal dimension.<sup>10</sup>

The MMM thus incorporates everything we realize in a given moment, and every present content of consciousness as a whole is the momentary mental model.

---

<sup>10</sup> For example, when we think, our thoughts are continuous, passing from a certain present to another, without bothering or being reflected in any way: the form of opinion is a continuous flow of present, which is enabled mainly by our memory.

### **3.2. Empirical Grounding of the Concept “Momentary Mental Model”**

New times bring us empirical findings and sensory experiences which man has not encountered yet. Thanks to the invention of the telescope, we were able to explore the lunar surface with our own eyes, thanks to the construction of space vehicles, we could walk on the Moon and experience its six times less gravity. In the area of sensation, however, an absolute breakthrough is the phenomenon of virtual reality. It is so revolutionary that research into it seems to have philosophical consequences as well. While the theory has so far anticipated the practice (the Moon was assumed to be a cosmic body, and then we saw it as such, mapped it and visited it), virtual reality additionally shapes our ideas about the world by the surprising experience it evokes, by the sensual empiricism it mediates. How? That is what we will try to outline.

Probably the main source of discussion on the phenomenon of virtual reality is the publication *Silicon Mirage. The Art and Science of Virtual Reality* by Steve Aukstakalnis and David Blatner (1992).

The definition of virtual reality was formed in 1989 by virtual reality pioneer Jaron Lanier. According to him, it is “a computer-generated, interactive, three-dimensional environment in which a person is immersed” (Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 12).

The real meaning of this generalizing abstract definition lies in the fact that man, in order to “find himself in virtual reality”, needs sophisticated technical equipment (which now exists in a range of technological options and the optimal form of which is still being searched for). The principle of this device is based on a display inserted into the visual field of the subject, for each eye separately, on which a computer image is generated in a way that enables the spatial perception of the displayed reality to be created in the subject’s consciousness. At the same time, sound stimuli are transmitted by computer to both ears of the subject in an effort to induce in the subject the impression of a spatial sound perception originating from the “reality” the subject sees. Finally, the subject is wearing special gloves that are able to simulate the impression of tactile perception of the “reality” that the subject already sees and hears.

Equipped this way, the subject gets, in the activated device, the impression that they are in another world, another reality, different from the one in which they have been so far, i.e., in the virtual reality they can see, hear and touch.

Obviously, the creation of virtual reality is based on the understanding that it is possible, through an organized stimulation of our senses (organized acting on the sensors), to create a relatively arbitrary perception of reality that is different from the actual reality in the consciousness of the recipient. As it was first mentioned in Lanier’s definition, for the “perception of reality”, it is essential that the recipient gets the impression that they are “immersed” in this reality. The authors’ view of this

concept is as follows: “Being immersed means being surrounded by something; everywhere you look, it’s there” (Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 27). And they continue: “Being surrounded by stimuli that trigger these sensations enables us to be constantly creating and updating mental models of our environment” (Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 27).

The aforementioned definition of immersion expresses a revelatory finding, which is the fact that the sensory reception of reality creates in our consciousness such a model of reality surrounding the recipient that the recipient is immersed in it. Thanks to virtual reality technology, it is then possible to create in recipient’s consciousness a relatively arbitrary model, i.e., a model independent of reality surrounding the recipient, in which the recipient will be immersed in the same way as they are normally in the model of surrounding reality.

In our considerations, the term “model” has appeared. The authors, in an attempt to grasp the problem, started to use it intuitively to describe the current contents of consciousness. Sometimes it is obvious that they see it as a particular type of the content of consciousness, i.e., as an idea-conceptual, theoretical, cognitive model in the traditional sense (for example, compare “a model for how a company is organized” (Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 16)), and sometimes they are already aware that the entire current content of consciousness that arises from sensation, from the reception of reality, is also a model (see the quotation above from p. 27: “mental models of our environment”).

As mentioned earlier, the peculiarity of this model is the bearer’s impression, which the authors describe using

the term “immersion”. At the same time, the term of immersion captures the characteristic which virtual reality shares with the real current content of consciousness, with the model of reality in our consciousness. Compare: “If the movie is on television, the window is more like a small portal. The same is true of watching a computer screen. In a virtual environment, however, you no longer have the sense of looking into a different world, but rather of looking at that very world from within...” (Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 26).

The phenomenon of immersion is also a major barrier preventing us from using the term “model” for the current contents of consciousness arising from sensation, in their entirety. Only when we find ourselves *inside* an artificial model, in virtual reality, do we begin to understand that even the reality in our minds, arising from natural reception, is also a model. Compare: “After an early virtual reality session, those elements of reality that we think are as solid as a rock start to blur slightly” (Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 21).

At this point it is appropriate to summarize what we have arrived at.

We have learnt that as a result of perception, a model is created in our consciousness. To be able to distinguish it from cognitive models as we currently conceive them, let us call it the mental model. For it is characteristic of this model that it is defined by the present (and changes over time), let us complement this phrase with another attribute to get the final form of the momentary mental model (MMM) (which can also be supported by the following snippet: “... [it enables] us to be constantly creating and updating mental models of our

environment...” in a quotation from p. 27). In order to distinguish the MMM we want to constitute conceptually from, for example, the dreamy MMM (as well as other types and kinds of MMMs), let us call it, according to its source, MMM from sensation (MMMS).

This MMMS, as we already know due to the discovery of the possibility of virtual reality, can arise either from the reception of reality – and then it is the real MMMS, or from the reception of artificially generated (e.g. by computer) stimuli – and then it is the virtual MMMS.

Let us add some more thoughts to this report on virtual reality.

As the authors realized, the existence of virtual reality has shaken the certainty of reality, in which we normally live, in its very essence. As they assert: “If we hear a dog in front of us and then *see* a dog in front of us, not only do we tend to think that the dog we see is the dog that made the sound, but also that both the dog and the sound are ‘real’. Neither of these may be true.

Perhaps the key here is that instead of focusing on what reality *is*, we should think more about *what* is reality. That is, if we release ourselves from necessarily emphasizing that there is a reality out there, we are freed to look at what is relevant to us in reality” (Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 20).

It is now up to us to try to outline the answer to this question, which the authors tried to avoid. In our opinion, the possibility of virtual reality paradoxically confirms the existence of something certain behind the sensory experiences: If we know that the real MMMS in our consciousness is replaceable with the virtual MMMS,

and if we know how *strong* the real MMMS has been until this moment (before the construction of virtual reality), we also know that the strength of the real MMMS must be given by something, it must have a bearer (as we know that the bearer of the virtual MMMS is a complex technical apparatus). And this bearer is reality. In other words: If the real MMMS exists in our consciousness, outside our consciousness, there is also reality, by the reception of which the real MMMS is created in our consciousness. Thus, the uncertainty of the existence of reality has been overturned (by the fact of virtual reality) into its confirmation.

And there is another question which was left to philosophers by the authors: “What Is Reality?” (Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 20). We think we should answer it, too, and we think that the answer could be: Reality is what creates the MMMS naturally, i.e., without any technical intermediary, in our consciousness.

### **3.3. Speculative Deduction of Other Consequences of Virtual Construction**

Modern times break the shackles, by which man has been locked up so far. Gradually, the chains of gravity have fallen off and man first took to the air, then flew to the space and tasted even the feeling of weightlessness. These were the ties about which we knew that they burden us (“Lion spirited, we beat against these bars” (Neruda, 1878, p. 37)); but disappearing are also the shackles whose burden we did not realize. And this is, for example, the case of virtual reality.

For millennia, it was commonplace for us to leave the reality for dreams at the end of the day, and to wake up after the night to the same reality we left before the night. This reality was always here, we just needed to open our eyes and we could see it around us, as a constant background of all events. It was here as an immutable certainty. Today, however, it is not true anymore: the burdening shackles of reality have fallen off. We can at will leave the reality and enter into another reality – artificial, virtual reality – which instantly suppresses and substitutes the “real reality”.

Virtual reality allows us to experience a very special state: “to be sane”, and yet not to perceive the reality surrounding us as we are used to in such a state; but to perceive something different in the same way, as if it was the reality itself.

The experience of virtual reality has a great informative value. On one hand, it demonstrates that the current research in this area is based on the knowledge of how things are, but on the other hand, it also shows new views of how things are. For example, the studies of sensory deprivation are apparently confirmed. They state that the content of consciousness is shaped thanks to a continuous flow of sensory stimuli (if taken out from their pressure, consciousness loses its form, its shape, in the same way as the body of jellyfish pulled to the shore from depths). The evidence of this is also the shapeless jumble of dreams that is brought in front of our consciousness, when the pressure of sensory stimuli ceases in our sleep. Virtual reality has nevertheless developed procedures for the artificial generation of these flows of stimuli.

We found that the momentary mental model from sensation (MMMS) is generated by the pressure of sensory stimuli in front of our consciousness. This finding appears to fall within the field of psychology. This raises the question of how far virtual reality can be, in the present moment, of inspiration for this field of science. Our considerations in this regard are as follows:

What new findings does virtual reality bring into the view of this area? Its major finding is that through a certain set of sensations, namely visual, auditory, and tactile sensations, it is possible to create, in the consciousness of the subject, an artificial model of reality, which is comparable to the model of reality resulting from natural sensation. In this process, it is important that the incentives are complex (not isolated

sensations) and that also the result, the model of reality, is complex. What is interesting about this model of reality is the fact that, despite being composed of several different sensational complexes, which can even be distinguished in this model (if any of these sensations is interrupted, the relevant part of the model disappears from consciousness – e.g. if you close your eyes), it is perceived as a monolithic whole, i.e., impulses are brought in front of our consciousness in harmony. If there is a discrepancy (caused, for example, by imperfect generation of stimuli), uncomfortable feelings or even trauma<sup>11</sup> are induced in the subject, and at the same time, the analytic-synthetic brain apparatus is activated, leading to the re-establishment of sensual coherence, sensual harmony. (As evidenced, for example, by attempts at writing which is controllable only by looking in a mirror, or with glasses turning the image over, to which the subject adapts over time.)

Thanks to virtual reality, we had the opportunity to graphically find out that it is through sensation that the momentary mental model from sensation (MMMS) is generated in front of the subject's consciousness. Yet, it is important to emphasize that what gets in front of

---

<sup>11</sup> Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 263. "Almost exactly opposite in cause from normal motion sickness, VIMS (Virtual nausea) occurs when there is a compelling sensation of self-motion without any corresponding visceral cues." Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 269. "What would happen if you hear a baby crying behind you, but when you turned to look, the baby wasn't where the sound was coming from? Or if you picked up a pencil but felt the sensation on the wrong fingers? First you'd probably think you were going crazy or had a neurological disorder; then you'd realize you were just in a poorly made virtual reality."

consciousness this way is not the sensation itself (we know, for example, that the visual sensors are able to register only three specific colours, while the colour we see, or realize, is something completely different, “complex”), but a construct resulting from complex analytic-synthetic work of the brain, which is based on a set of such sensations, where the result arises as a whole and its parts are defined, or determined, by its context. The MMMS is richly structured. We realize its individual entities of various types, while in the structuring of the visual field, an important role is played by tactile sensations, or by perception of the manipulation of the elements of reality.<sup>12</sup>

However, the MMMS is not only structured, perceived as complex and split into entities, but these entities are also perceived with added meaning – the subject realizes not only that they see something, but also what they perceive. The MMMS is directed towards a sort of structure of meanings. Routinely, we do not directly realize its bearer (just like the MMMS); it remains hidden behind our consciousness. Its existence is projected into our consciousness only as an understanding of the reality

---

<sup>12</sup> That is probably what the following quote speaks about. Aukstakalnis, Blatner, 1992, p. 27. “Hands. One of the first things people do in exploring a virtual reality is to orient to their own virtual body. And because this virtual body usually consists of only a hand, people become fascinated with this virtual hand. A gloved hand is raised up in front of their face in order to see the representation of the virtual hand inside the display device. Moving a finger moves a finger in the virtual space. You make a fist and your virtual hand makes one, too. The simple fact that the computer can follow your body movements and recreate them graphically is so exciting to some people that this alone evokes a gasp or a giggle.”

we perceive. This bearer is relatively independent of the current perception, it is relatively timeless, fixed (the bearer probably emerges as a memory fixation of individual MMMSs and as a result of their analytic-synthetic processing), and at the same time constitutes a sort of unit that expresses, reflects the structure of reality; let us call it a fixed mental model (FMM).

It is obvious that the MMMS can be directly artificially generated (virtual reality, virtuality), while the FMM cannot; at the most, it can probably be modified by the experience of virtuality (through a prolonged perception of the virtual MMMS), which is in this case similar to the analogous functioning of natural sensation, normal experience.

The FMM seems to be a structure of visions with added meaning (where a vision is largely a memory trace of what has been separated from the MMMS as a single entity) and their mutual relationships.

But the brain does not stop at this level of analytic-synthetic processing. It is able to move in the plane of mere meanings, i.e., concepts and thoughts. Based on the structure of FMM, the thought-conceptual system (TCS) is formed through relative separation of meanings, creation of their relative independence from visions and their conjunction with words. (Briefly: TCS is what we verbalize when asked for our opinion.) Thanks to this genetic connection, words have the power to fix the TCS through its objectivization, uttering (through the construction of instrumental fixation, which is, for

example, a text). At the same time, words have also the power to induce visions connected with concepts in front of our consciousness and generate the MMM from fixation (MMMMF) (which is used, for example, in fiction to build a fantasy world, into which we can immerse almost in the same way as in the case of virtual reality<sup>13</sup>).

The MMM – FMM – TCS hierarchy attempts to capture and express the anchoring of all statements about the world in the individual experience of the subject. It tries to show that everything is based on a complex analytic-synthetic activity of the brain and that we, as sentient subjects, must rely on what it brings in front of our consciousness, whether it is a vision of reality (MMMS) and its meaning added through the FMM, or judgments and statements about reality – and even here we must rely on what comes to our mind. Although we can use our will to focus our attention on a certain problem, its solution is carried out on different levels, which are not subject to our will and present a result of a complex process directly in front of our consciousness, just like a computer screen or printer.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> There are at least two ways of creating an artificial MMM – from sensation of virtual reality and directly through TCS, which eliminates the problem of how to model the movement in virtual reality so that it is in line with the movement in the real world.

<sup>14</sup> Vladimír Levi mentions the opinion of Gleb Anfilov that man does not think in one of his books popularizing psychology (Levi, 1974, p. 128). Anfilov claims (Trans.): “... *a machine thinks for him* (...) The one in his brain.” Levi is surprised by this statement, but is unable to interpret what the author wanted to say. In our opinion, Anfilov realized the simple fact that only the results of the work of the brain are brought front in front of our consciousness, and this work cannot be consciously affected directly through our will

The introduced conception attempts to criticize the idea of “objective science” that is based on “facts” or “protocolar sentences” and wants to point to the fact that it is not possible to leave the subject out of consideration in science, that they must be wholly integrated, with everything, including the fact of analytic-synthetic work of the brain, in the conception of objective science.

We also want to indicate the roots of logic, which, whether we like it or not, stems from individual empiricism, but becomes a system of “the rules of the game” thanks to the relative independence of TCS (L. Wittgenstein<sup>15</sup>). What the rules will be like depends on the route from MMM to FMM and TCS.<sup>16</sup>

---

and we can only passively accept its results. (Which is not quite so: what is brought in front of our consciousness can be manipulated through our will.)

<sup>15</sup> Wittgenstein, 1993, p. 63. (Trans.) “But we talk about it [about the speech] in the same way as about chess pieces, when we are setting the relevant rules of the game [...]. The question “What is the word?” is analogous to the question “What is a chess piece?””

<sup>16</sup> The mentioned notion of the roots of logic in the TCS, FMM, and MMM corresponds to von Neumann’s intuition: “Mathematics is a secondary language, derived from a primary language, which is used by the central nervous system of the body.” Neumann, 1958, p. 82. Quoted according to: Coveney, Highfield, 2003, p. 18.

#### **4. Consequences of the Philosophy of Assumptions**

The most basic assumption of common sense is the so-called naïve realism, i.e., the intuitive view that reality is given to us in perception essentially as it is. Modern science also relies on it.

As far as modern science is concerned, at its base we usually find the so-called scientific realism, which is based on the following assumptions:

- The world is material and exists independently of humans.
- The world would remain the world even if humans did not exist.
- Ordinary physical objects and scientifically named entities exist objectively and independently of the human mind.
- An experiment cannot prove the truth of a theory, it can only indicate the possibility of truthfulness.
- An experiment can prove that a theory is not true (Košumberský, 2017).

And according to our findings, one of these assumptions should be the claim that reality is given to us in cognition only through the contents of consciousness.

To become aware of something, it must become the content of our consciousness. At the moment, for example, it is both the image of the text you have in front

of you and the idea you are reading. They are brought before your consciousness by your brain based on what you perceive, this text, part of reality. Similarly, the brain brings the whole world, every single thing, everything that we are aware of, the whole of reality, what we see, hear, taste, feel etc., before consciousness through sense perception, and it becomes a process in our mind, something distinct from reality itself, and it is always true: it is *reality-in-our-consciousness*, it is a fusion, an alloy of reality and consciousness. What is available to you, to your consciousness, is thus a kind of conglomerate of a special nature, neither reality nor consciousness, or both reality and consciousness; something in between, a kind of third thing between reality and consciousness, the *content of consciousness*. Only thus mediated before consciousness, before our self, can we become aware of reality.

If someone tells you (as your first impression or common sense, for example, tells you) that reality is given to us directly, immediately, do not believe them. Omitting direct contact with reality, practice, in cognition, what is given to us for awareness is the product of the complex analytical-synthetic work of the brain, which the brain presents to us so that we identify it with reality. That it is not reality itself is evidenced by optical illusions (perspective, for example, for all of them) and thought paradoxes that point out the places where this model of reality in your consciousness, the content of consciousness, “deviates” from reality. As Alfred Korzybski (1933) says, “a map is not a territory”. In the mind, before consciousness, we have only a map of reality, not reality itself.

What does this imply? The fact that recognizing reality is not as easy as it might seem and as science claims. Science, however, is successful precisely *because* of the assumption that we know reality in principle as it is. This methodological assumption is, however, only applicable as a starting point, not as a statement that this is the way things are. It is not the way things are, which we discover on closer inspection, as we have seen above.

The assumption that reality is given to us in cognition only through the contents of consciousness problematizes the relation of science to reality. It claims that it is always mediated through the human subject. For the philosophy of assumptions, the problem is, on the other hand, in scientific facts and data, which seem to be independent of the subject and objective on their own, being what the process of cognition is all about. (Cf. e.g., the New Positivist atomic fact.)

Let us therefore take a closer look at the meaning of the word *fact*. It is an insight into a partial fact that has been obtained by confronting the knowledge of several subjects. The essential thing here is that at first this partial fact had been viewed by the subject who reported on its state, i.e., the subject objectified, fixed their internal state, which can thus be eventually confronted with the fixed states, based on the same fact, of other subjects, through the momentary mental model and the fixed mental model of these subjects. It is therefore obvious that the objectivity of a fact does indeed rely on a kind of direct viewing of reality, but this happens within the subject through the contents of their consciousness, and only by interpreting this subjectively detected state of reality externally, by objectifying,

fixing, does it become objective and can possibly be confronted with other testimonies of the state of reality. And this confrontation takes place through the perception of fixations, records of looking subjects, and thus through their contents of consciousness.

When it comes to *data*, we are in a more complicated situation. They are predominantly acquired by various sensors and sensing devices and processed on computers completely independently of the human subject. However, only until it comes to their interpretation. Mechanisms for data collecting and processing are merely extensions of sensory (microscope, telescope, television image, etc.) and mental (fixations such as memory records, algorithms, programs) powers of the subject, who uses them to form a momentary mental model and a fixed mental model in their mind, and from there they come to a thought-conceptual system and an ontological model which they can then work with, as in the case of facts.

Among other consequences of the philosophy of assumptions, consider the following:

The content of consciousness is generated as a whole, which is internally structured. For example, optically, our field of view is broken down into things – which we are aware of what they are; these entities are thus gifted with meaning, made significant, focused by a conceptual network, thanks to the work of System 1 and System 2 (Kahneman, 2012). These systems both generate the immediate model of reality, the MMM, before our consciousness, that which constitutes the content of our consciousness in perception (via System 1), and, on the

other hand, its conceptual focus and interpretation, FMM (via System 2).

The immediate model of reality arises before consciousness mostly based on direct sensory perception of reality (we are excluded from this sensory pressure of reality in sleep), but recently there have been technical achievements that can simulate, replace reality in the senses. This is the so-called virtual reality.

In the context of virtual reality, we have the opportunity to think about the validity of the above mentioned assumption that there is something behind the contents of consciousness. It is possible to consider that there are contents of consciousness but nothing behind them, as it is the case with virtual reality. Is there really nothing behind virtual reality? Wrong: behind virtual reality, there is a complex technical apparatus that mediates it for us. Likewise, there must be something behind the contents of consciousness for them to arise in our consciousness. What do you suppose? Reality, indeed.

At the same time, in confronting virtual reality, we find out that the immediate model of reality, MMM, can arise before consciousness in other ways than direct perception. Think about what you see immediately: it is a text, or more precisely, spots. And the sensory perception of these spots allows your brain, your mind, a small miracle: that by perceiving them you can hear my voice, you become aware of my thoughts, you see with your inner sight the things I am talking about. This is due to the special organization of these spots, which fix words arranged in a certain way, whose gradual perception leads us to concepts and ideas. This arrangement of words can

be called a program because it programs its perceiver, the reader, creating in their consciousness, as they gradually perceive, an intended fictional model of reality.

Thus we can see that the recorded word allows us to fix and then to back-mediate the product of System 2, namely the conceptual model of reality in our consciousness (TCS), and not only that: it also allows us to reconstruct, before our inner sight, a model of reality from the sensation, an MMMS (the result of System 1 functioning) as an MMM from the fixation, MMMF (where the fixation is the perceived objective record), or even to create a fictional model (which happens, as we have seen, in the perception of literary works). Verbal art is then based on the aesthetic arrangement of words. The sensory source for a fictional, artifactual model of reality, in addition to words, can also be a quotation of reality arranged in a certain way, such as sculpture, painting, photograph, film, music, hologram (because an artifact in general is an aesthetic arrangement of reality).

In the previous text, in the enumeration of the assumptions that scientific realism accepts, we encountered statements operating with truthfulness (specifically scientific theories) that relies on the notion of truth. This is essential for our consideration. When we talk about the certainty of cognition, it is always true cognition – what is not true is not described as cognition but as an error, fiction, or a lie. What does it mean that something is true, that it is true?

We do not have to go far for the answer: we have an automatic pointer inside that constantly tells us what is true: the specific feeling “This is true”. This feeling has a

broader scope, so it can include states such as sleep (in a dream we have the feeling that it is true, which usually disappears when we wake up), an error or a delusion. However, we are interested in it as a guide to the state where we find out that what we think corresponds to reality.

This feeling has been formalized into what is called the correspondence theory of truth; it is so called because of the situation in which this feeling is based on the conformity, the correspondence of what we perceive and what we think – on the fact that the model of reality from sensation, the MMMS, corresponds to the conceptual-mental model of reality. Cognitively, we try to achieve this conformity by continually adjusting the thought-conceptual system to match our perceptions, but sometimes we fail to do so, and then we talk about delusions and paradoxes.

Science works with the thought-conceptual system, TCS, objectified – outspoken, written down, fixed; in this context we talk about it as a model in the narrow sense (it consists of a set of true statements, i.e., having a truth value 1, which means that it is a model of reality in the logical sense). All scientific papers are then written with such ambitions.

## 5. The Practical Contribution of the Philosophy of Assumptions

As the author of the philosophy of assumptions, I found that I had to ask for the meaning of the effort I was putting into it, and I realized that I had solved it and solved for myself a number of problems, one of which was fundamental – what to think about everything around me, more precisely within myself. This problem thus consisted in building one's own worldview. Its solution presented me with a set of questions and brought me answers. These answers are the sought-after result of my cognitive activity and I am happy to share them with you.

I base my worldview on my personal and universal experience and try to avoid any fantastic hypotheses and assumptions. I base it on the certainty that each of us has, namely on what we are aware of. With certainty, we are obviously aware of these facts:

- That we are aware, namely *the act of awareness*.
- That we are aware of ourselves as the one who is aware, namely *the subject of awareness*.
- That we are aware of *consciousness* as a stage for what we are aware of.
- That we are aware of what we are aware of, namely the *contents* of our *consciousness*.

The mentioned contents prevail over everything realized and we can examine them. Their classification is carried out precisely by the philosophy of assumptions

and thus brings a basic orientation to our consciousness in the reality whose image they convey to us. In reality which for us is initially a chaos of voices shouting over each other. The philosophy of assumptions is to understand that chaos is not a result, but a path to a true picture of reality, which we have a chance to assemble from the stones of mutually refuting and denying opinions. The philosophy of assumptions states the primary certainties and uncertainties as we are aware of them, the necessary prerequisites of these statements, it strives to arrive at a true picture of reality and on the basis of it to intervene effectively in reality.

## 5.1. Artifact Functioning

The above mentioned is the most important aspect of the philosophy of assumptions. However, it has something to say about a number of other problems and questions.

It shows, for example, that the contents of consciousness are brought before consciousness in the present and continuously as a flow of contents and as a whole. We call this whole the *momentary mental model* (MMM). The contents of our consciousness, as we assume, arise based on the complex analytical-synthetic work of the brain, both beyond-conscious and conscious, both on the basis of direct sensory perception of reality and on the basis of the internal activity of the mind's apparatus (thinking, imagining – daydreaming, dreams).

As the assumption philosophy makes clear, MMM can have different sources. This is precisely what explains, for example, the mystery realized by Maxim Gorky (1951, p. 269): he wondered how it was possible for the reader to see the reality that is verbally described on the pages of the book and could not understand how the plastic and colorful world squeezes into the printed sheets. Explaining the philosophy of assumptions: momentary mental model from fixation. The brain constantly creates a momentary mental model in front of our consciousness, and it can be based on a direct sense of reality, or it can be constituted indirectly, by sense fixation.

What are *fixations*? All records of sensations, thoughts and ideas, whether internal, memory, *mental*, or external, *instrumental* in the sense that external fixations are external, objective, material tools used to induce certain states of consciousness, specifically to create a momentary mental model from fixation, which is made possible by the structure of these tools.

*Instrumental fixations* are, from the point of view of philosophy assumptions, of a different kind. In principle, we can distinguish them, first, into those based on *citing reality*: sculptures, paintings, photographs, films, holograms, and second, into those based on *modeling reality* with ideas and concepts, i.e. words. Literary texts, so mysterious for Gorky, belong here. His astonishment is understandable: in perceiving them, we have to go through a long and complicated path from stains on paper through the deciphering of words and sentences to concepts, thoughts and ideas, which, thanks to the fact that fixation is a *program*, consist of an imaginary, fictitious, virtual world.

What do we see when we read? First of all, we see spots on the medium. We decipher these as letters that are combined into words and sentences. As we become aware of words and sentences, images, concepts and thoughts are activated in our minds. They create an imaginary, fictitious world in our mind (in which some characters live their story). And that's the point: that we "see" much more than we see.

Basically, we do not see the fictional world, or rather we "see with our inner vision", it is presented to us by our brain in the form of "inner images". Our sense of objective reality when reading is narrowed down to

deciphering spots on a given medium (e.g., a book, fixation in general), while what prevails is the conceptual and mental model of the world in our consciousness.

According to the philosophy of assumptions, the model of the world in our mind does not have to come only from reading, i.e., from switching perception to deciphering the text. For the most part, its source is the direct perception of reality, which is paralleled by the targeting of sensed things with concepts and thoughts. This is how perception takes place in general or the perception of such artifacts that cite reality (painting, sculpture, film), while when reading, the virtual world is made up of words like empty toy containers – we can imagine a word as a box with a picture and a description (with an idea and the concept) of that thing that was inside, a box that is actually empty. When reading, our perception does not relate directly to the thing, as in real reading, when the thing itself is perceived, but to its “box”, i.e., the concept and idea.

Thus, fictional worlds of fiction are built “from empty boxes”, while in direct perception, the model of the world in our mind is built from direct perception of things, objective reality.

In order for a momentary mental model of the fixation to arise in our mind when perceiving fixations, specifically when reading, the fixations must be somehow arranged. When reading, it is arranged in such a way that the letters are arranged in rows, and when reading, a letter or group of letters enter our field of vision in the order in which they are arranged in a row. At the same time, they are organized into words, sentences into sentences, sentences into paragraphs, etc., and when

perceived, they gradually bring to mind concepts, ideas and thoughts as the author of the text intended. We can name this arrangement with the word *program*. The fixation thus “programs” the reader, i.e., it evokes intended states in front of his consciousness that lead to the creation of a momentary mental model from the fixation, i.e., it constructs a virtual reality, virtuality in his consciousness, when he “sees” a fictitious, virtual world with his “inner vision” and events taking place in it.

Literary work and artifacts in general can therefore be understood as *programs* according to the philosophy of assumptions. They are of different kinds. The basic division consists in distinguishing *continuous* programs – the order of perception of elements is precisely determined (literary text, music) – and *discontinuous* – elements are perceived “volatily” – painting, sculpture.

*Continuous programs* can then be *linear*, for example, most fiction, or *branched* (programmed textbooks, computer games). For example, a literary work is usually a linear program – it is perceived in a precisely and unambiguously given sequence of individual characters, i.e., in a line in time. Every perception takes place in time, but a picture, for example, is not a linear program, but is characterized by the fact that the viewer starts from the perception of the dominant and continues on the basis of the internal relationships of the individual elements of the picture. In contrast, music is a linear program par excellence, and the spiral lines on, for example, a gramophone record testify to this.

Knowledge of the fact that artifacts and specifically literary works are programs, i.e., sequences of elements designed to be perceived in time, can then enable their

purposeful construction with the intention of creating virtual worlds with a precisely defined structure in front of consciousness.

So far, we have only thought about the structure, the order we have to give to the content of the artifact, and we have not considered the content itself. While the basis of (literary) creation is to find a topic, content, to have something to talk about and based on that to generate, associate a program as the basis of a fictional world. When finding out how this happens, it is appropriate to remember that there is the so-called daydreaming, i.e., experiencing a state where we let thoughts and ideas, associations and feelings flow freely in front of our consciousness as they come. I believe that literary authors often arrive at content and structure in this way. That they bring to consciousness what is otherwise the subject of real, sleep-dreaming, and that they use its mechanisms. Dreams – a spontaneous game of imagination. Dreaming – using this free-flowing game to construct fantasy worlds and the stories within them. As in a dream, this makes their characters seem internally arbitrary, necessary, and so does their behavior (as L. N. Tolstoy talks about when he describes what Anna Karenina “brought out” to him). In my opinion, this is due to the functioning of the unconscious experience of a fixed mental model, the mechanism of which shapes our dreams and daydreaming.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> An example can be the genesis of two works by Jan Weiss, namely the novels *Dům o 1000 patrech* (Weiss, 1948) and *Přišel z hor* (Weiss, J., 1957). The first of them is based on the imagination-experience dream complex and the second on the imagination-experience complex memory.

Fixations sometimes appear as a model of reality in the narrower, logical sense of the word, which applies especially to fixations of scientific theories, but not only to them, i.e., wherever it makes sense to think about the truth of a given MMM, i.e., the agreement of MMM with reality.

Some mental fixations fix the thought-conceptual system (TCS) for a given subject; some instrumental fixations are a tool to transfer my TCS to other consciousnesses. Thus, fixations are sometimes thought-conceptual models of reality, i.e., in their essential manifestations, they act like the reality modeled by them.

Fixations have a two-fold function: 1. Fix (some) contents of consciousness in such a way that they allow to recall the momentary mental model (MMM) from the fixation. 2. Some can then be a model in the narrower sense of the word of which part, level, structure of reality so that they can model the behavior of reality and therefore predict this behavior.

---

The *Dům o 1000 patrech* specifically grew out of Weiss's hallucinations during typhoid fever, which were so deeply etched in his memory that even after recovery he was able to reproduce them, derive from them, based on their internal regularity, the fantasy structure of literary stories, and assemble from them an artificial program – novel. So much for the dream as a source of the program.

The novel *Přišel z hor* was in turn derived from the method of daydreaming by developing a subconscious memory complex that was established in Weiss's psyche from early childhood experiences.

I then claim that literary authors base their work precisely on the aforementioned imagination-experience complexes of a fixed mental model and create by the method of bringing them to the light of consciousness and fantasy processing.

## 5.2. Virtual Reality

Virtual reality, according to the philosophy of assumptions, allows us to experience a completely strange state: “being sane”, and yet not perceive reality, the reality that surrounds one as one is used to in this state, but something else, as if it were reality itself. This state of withdrawal from direct sensory perception and the substitution of this source for another source is analogous to reading, especially fiction. Even then we find ourselves in an artificial, virtual world, this time based on words – on concepts and ideas. This condition is characterized by attachment to a fictional world.

The momentary mental model is given to us for sure and only it is given to us – we can only assume the reality behind it. We have the impression that reality is given to us directly, immediately, that we are “immersed” in it, so that reality is all around us, but, in fact, we are “immersed” in the momentary mental model. If we encounter virtual reality, we find that we are “immersed” in it just the same, although it does not actually exist. Then we begin to ask: What if there is “nothing” even behind the momentary mental model of sensation, what if actual reality does not exist? At the same time, we forget that behind virtual reality is a complex apparatus that mediates it; from there, one can move on to the consideration that there is also “something” behind the momentary mental model of sensation. What do you think? There is only one answer at hand: reality! Thus, we have reason to assume the existence of reality. This proof of the existence of objective reality was made

possible by the philosophy of assumptions. We can only speculate about what the reality is, it seems. However, the philosophy of assumptions goes further. It follows the path from individual, individual thought-conceptual systems to their mutual objective confrontation and the creation of a unified *ontological model* by social institutions, such as religion, whose role in this direction is taken over by science.

As the philosophy of assumptions shows us, we are only given an image, a model of reality, and there is no other way: even if we tried to build, for example, a robot that is aware of reality, it would also only have a model of reality in its consciousness, and not reality alone. Although we started from the assumption that the brain works to show us, to convey reality as it is, there is no getting around the fact that we will only be given its image in consciousness, which will be something other than reality itself. No matter how close this image will be to reality, it will still “detach” from reality somewhere, as evidenced by, for example, optical illusions (at the level of perception) or logical paradoxes (at the level of thinking).

### 5.3. Other Benefits

Among other benefits of the philosophy of assumptions, let us mention the independent naming of elements of the structure of the mind, such as System 1 and System 2, which Daniel Kahneman (2012) identified through his cognitive analysis.

We find that according to him (or the research of others, on which it is based) the brain works in two modes (and based on this, according to us, creates two entities). Kahneman refers to these two modes as *System 1* and *System 2*,<sup>18</sup> we refer to the corresponding entities generated by the brain as *fixed mental model* and *thought-conceptual system*. According to Kahneman, the modes of functioning of the brain are characterized by the following features: When we put the code names System 1 and System 2 side by side, we can describe this pair with the dualities of *fast* versus *slow* thinking, *automatic* thinking, requiring mostly no effort and resulting in free-flowing associations, impressions and feelings, vs. *intentional*, deliberate, effortful, orderly thinking that requires concentration; it seems possible to state the opposite of *intuitive* thinking versus *reflective* thinking (rational, calculating), when it is a conscious mental activity accompanied by the experience of action,

---

<sup>18</sup> Kahneman mentions that these terms can be somewhat misleading as personifying, that they are rather different modes of brain functioning, in the case of System 1 automatic functioning, System 2 then intentional functioning.

choice and concentration; I think we can also add the duality of predominantly *non-conscious* thinking versus *conscious* thinking, predominantly *non-conceptual* thinking versus *conceptual* thinking.

In the philosophy of assumptions, the products of System 1 and System 2 respectively correspond to the terms fixed mental model (FMM) and thought-conceptual system (TCS), whereby the fixed mental model is shown to be established as a generalization of experience from MMM, and the thought-conceptual system arises from abstraction from a fixed mental model.

The philosophy of assumptions has not yet commented on how emotions and feelings intervene, or impulses reflected by FMM into the conceptual grasp of reality by the thought-concept system, although their effect on the form of interpretation of reality is obvious. It is enough to point out that we prefer certain interpretations due to our emotional attitudes, or that we rationalize feelings and sensations, subordinate our understanding of reality to them, and when we do not know how to deal with feelings and sensations, we displace them, i.e., we overlay the factual interpretation with an emotionally acceptable interpretation. In my opinion, this is the functioning of the psychological defense mechanism referred to by the Freudian term “displacement” - cf. Freud A., 2023, p. 44.<sup>19</sup>

The term “displacement” captures a process exactly opposite to the tendency of the unconscious to become conscious, which is based on the fact that a fixed mental

---

<sup>19</sup> “Displacement consists in the conscious ego withholding or averting an idea or affect.” Translated from Czech.

model is gradually made aware through the thought-concept system. First, there is a reflection of reality at the level of the FMM and the unconscious, and only then a conceptual grasp at the level of the TCS.

Trauma is then that which has remained hidden in the unconscious and has not been brought before consciousness into the framework of conceptual grasp through the MPS, either because the time has not yet come for it, or because something prevented it (which is called displacement).

The ontogenetic development of a person also corresponds to the mentioned process: first, knowledge occurs at the level of the forming FMM, and only in the next step, mainly through communication, concepts and vocabulary are created, i.e., TCS.

It is obvious that in the case of childhood traumas (in addition to displacement) it will also be about experiences that have not yet been conceptually processed, which, after being “brought to light” by psychoanalysis, will be conceptually grasped and understood, integrated into the TCS, incorporated, and coped with. However, we can see it similarly in adulthood and more broadly: we experience and go through something at the FMM level without understanding what is happening to us, and only when the confusion of impulses and feelings has passed are we able to rationally, i.e., conceptually, assess what happened to us. Yes, displacement also plays a role here, but only to the extent that we prefer to forget or try to forget our lived experience (FMM) instead of consciously (through TCS) coping with it.

## **6. Conclusion**

We are not at the end, but at the beginning of the journey. What we have said in the previous text is only an introduction to the work that still awaits us. It is only an outline of the theory and it is not clear how it will prove itself in practice, if it is confronted with it at all and elaborated on that basis. At least for me, it now seems incomplete, and I can think of other possibilities to develop it.

For example, its initial intuitive assumptions of common sense, which underlie naïve realism, seem to be accompanied by assumptions which meditation leads us to postulate. Their acceptance and subsequent verification could lead us to a deeper understanding of Eastern philosophy. It is also possible to subject the verification process to religious motifs that fill the so-called white spaces where there “are lions”, i.e., spaces that are seemingly completely outside the knowable area because they are inaccessible to our experience, such as the existence of God, the afterlife, reincarnation.

The possibility of developing my theory suggests the idea that the basic way people orientate themselves in the world is practice, that is, a person’s constant contact with reality, which creates a continuous flow of momentary mental models in one’s mind, and then a fixed mental model and thought-conceptual system based on it.

This finding then leads me to add System 0 to Kahneman’s (2012) System 1 and System 2, which

produces MMM flow much like System 1 produces FMM and System 2 TCS.

With our outline of the philosophy of assumptions and its concepts, we have tried to show that we are immediately given only the contents of consciousness, namely the momentary mental model, not reality itself, and how to integrate this finding into science's approach to reality.

Such are the results of applying the assumption that the brain brings reality to our consciousness in the form of the contents of consciousness and that it is not possible otherwise.

## **Appendix:**

### **Philosophical Compass or From Philosophical Certainties to Practical Certainties**

Today, more than ever, we think about the truth of the information that the media throws at us, so we tend to call the society we live in not informative, but disinformative. Not only those who have experience with totalitarianism, but also those who try to navigate the informational chaos of a free society are sensitive to the truthfulness of information. Is it even possible to find something certain in general uncertainty? We will try to show that it is. Our starting point will be critical reflection, which should become our compass, which will always show the direction where to go.

Summary

I OFFER

**PHILOSOPHICAL COMPASS,  
ENABLING IN UNCERTAINTY  
NOT TO GET LOST**

We will begin our consideration by realizing that if we want to think about something at all, we must accept the assumption that it makes sense, specifically the assumption that the activity of our brain is aimed at providing us with a true picture of the reality that

surrounds us. We will then assume about this model of the world in our mind that behind it is the reality reflected by it, that this model does not only convey reality as it appears to us but allows us to arrive at its essential features.

These minimum prerequisites are necessary to even begin to think. If we accept them, we expect them to be confirmed by feedback. If all the contents of consciousness can be explained under certain minimal assumptions, then we can say that these assumptions are justified.

Summary  
IF YOU WANT TO THINK,  
YOU MUST ASSUME  
THAT IT  
**HAS A PURPOSE**

After this adjustment of the terrain, we can begin to find out what is given to us as certain in the general uncertainty. I think we are obviously given the assurance that we are aware of something. In this process, we are aware of three things: our self, which is aware of something, the consciousness with which we are aware of something, and the contents of consciousness in it. The self “sits in the audience”, consciousness is the “stage”, and what predominates are the contents of consciousness on that stage.

Summary

**EVERY PERSON HAS  
THREE CERTAINTIES:  
THEY ARE AWARE OF THEMSELVES AT ONCE,  
THEIR CONSCIOUSNESS AND ITS CONTENTS**

The contents of consciousness are very diverse. As can be seen, the plane of thought and the plane of feeling are the most developed, and they are interconnected; visual perception predominates among the sighted, but there is also perception from other senses: hearing, smell, touch, taste, sense of balance, body sensation. We must not forget about feelings and emotions, ideas, dreams.

The contents of consciousness can be assumed to be a model of the reality around us. The contents of consciousness unfold in a continuous flow, and their sensory, sensational, perceptual content is focused by meanings, so that we are not only aware of something, but, at the same time, we also know what we are aware of. The contents of consciousness reflect reality as an internally differentiated whole and, for example, the whole field of vision breaks down into individual things.

Summary

**CONTENTS OF CONSCIOUSNESS  
ARE GIVEN TO US AS A CERTAINTY  
WE CAN CALL THEM  
MOMENTARY MENTAL MODEL**

We can call this unit realized in the present, momentary, the momentary mental model (*MMM*). *Momentary* because it is created in the present, *mental*

because it is produced by the mind, *model* because it models for us the reality hidden behind it and mediated by it.

We can define the momentary mental model by *showing*: A substantial part of the momentary mental model disappears when we close our eyes; when we lose consciousness, the whole disappears. All people carry it in their minds, each person his own. People with sensory disabilities (blind, deaf and dumb) are not excluded either – their momentary mental model draws from all their other sources and compensates for their sensory insufficiency.

Summary

**MMM      MOMENTARY  
            MENTAL  
            MODEL**

The momentary mental model is given to us for sure and only it is given to us – we can only assume the reality behind it. We have the impression that reality is given to us directly, immediately, that we are “immersed” in it, so that reality is all around us, but, in fact, we are “immersed” in the momentary mental model. If we encounter virtual reality, we find that we are “immersed” in it just the same, although it does not actually exist. Then we begin to ask: What if there is “nothing” even behind the momentary mental model of sensation, what if actual reality does not exist? At the same time, we forget that behind virtual reality is a complex apparatus that mediates it; from there, one can move on to the consideration that there is also “something” behind the

momentary mental model of sensation. What do you think? There is only one answer at hand: reality! Thus, we have reason to assume the existence of reality. However, we can only speculate about what it is like. We are only given its image, its model, and there is no other way: if we tried to build, for example, a robot that is aware of reality, it would also only have access to a model of reality in consciousness, and not reality itself. Although we started from the assumption that the brain works to show us, to convey reality as it is, there is no getting around the fact that we will only be given its image in consciousness, which will be something other than reality itself. No matter how close this image will be to reality, it will still “detach” from reality somewhere, as evidenced by, for example, optical illusions (at the level of perception) or logical paradoxes (at the level of thinking).

Summary

REALITY BEYOND THE CONTENTS OF  
CONSCIOUSNESS,  
BEYOND MOMENTARY MENTAL MODEL  
**ONE CAN ONLY ASSUME**

The brain does not create one momentary mental model or isolated momentary mental models, it uses memory to bring their continuous flow to our consciousness. I try to explain this fact with the existence of a not so empirically obvious...

Summary

**THE CONTENTS OF CONSCIOUSNESS CREATE  
A COMBINED FLOW OF  
MOMENTARY MENTAL  
MODELS**

... *fixed* mental model (*FMM*), i.e., by the fact that behind consciousness, somewhere in our mind, a fixed, relatively constant memory structure generalizing the experience of individual momentary mental models can be sensed. It forms their context, which distinguishes them, i.e., it enables us to be aware of the meaning of what we see or perceive. We move in a fixed mental model when we remember, perceive, or imagine something.

Summary

**TO THE CONTENT OF CONSCIOUSNESS IS  
ASCRIBED MEANING  
THANKS TO THE CONTEXT THAT CREATES  
A FIXED MENTAL MODEL**

Abstraction based on a fixed mental model creates a thought-conceptual system (*TCS*), i.e., a structure of thoughts and concepts, which is a *conceptual* model of reality. We move in the thought-conceptual system when we think. It is characteristic of it that it can be pronounced or recorded.

Summary

**ABSTRACT BASED  
FIXED MENTAL MODEL  
ARISES A PRONOUNCABLE  
THOUGHT-CONCEPTUAL SYSTEM**

By confronting the thought-conceptual systems of different people, a unified conceptual model of reality is then arrived at. This is currently, unlike in the past, systematically created by science and we can call it the ontological model (*OM*). It can be equated with another concept that is already established – scientific paradigm.

Summary

**BY A CONFRONTATION OF THOUGHT-  
CONCEPTUAL SYSTEMS OF ALL PEOPLE  
EMERGES A SCIENTIFIC PARADIGM,  
ONTOLOGICAL MODEL**

How is an ontological model created? It is formed in the history of human knowledge. In the beginning, there were ideas that man understood as self-evident and became basic assumptions for him, e.g., that there are inanimate and living things, gifted with consciousness or even reason like us, and perhaps even that the Earth is flat and the Sun moves along the sky. Only in the confrontation with other equally certain statements, with the elimination of contradictions and paradoxes, did it arrive at a unifying world view, the historical form of the ontological model. It is formed with the aim of being able

to explain all momentary mental models of all people.  
Which confirms its force, truthfulness, validity.

Summary

**WE CONFRONT EVIDENT ASSUMPTIONS  
WITH EACH OTHER  
THE QUESTIONABLE ONES ARE  
ELIMINATED OR MODIFIED**

I think that science is only playing at objectivity if it does not fully recognize the role of the subject, namely the fact that we are each locked into our own consciousness. If we think about how we would define a “scientific fact” in this situation, the fact is, after all, what each individual consciousness perceived in its model of the world that the brain brought to its consciousness. This consciousness gave a report (objectified the fact) about the fact (part of the model of the world) to another consciousness, and through confrontation, these parts of the model are unified, made the same in different consciousnesses. Thus, the factum is inherently subjective and becomes an objective interpretation from concrete consciousness to the outside – communication and confrontation.

Summary

**A SCIENTIFIC FACT  
CAN ONLY BE INTERPRETED  
IN ESTABLISHING THE EXISTENCE OF  
MMM, FMM, TCS AND OM**

When we talked about the confrontation of different thought-conceptual systems of different people, we introduced into the interpretation of the content of consciousness the assumption that besides our consciousness there are other human consciousnesses that come into contact with ours. We can say that it happens in different ways, for example, these consciousnesses convey to us the conceptual orientation of reality through language and then its value orientation through education, which all takes place within a social framework. Social institutions also originate from it, such as those that carry out mass communication (mass media), mass education (school) or those that create and mass mediate an ontological model (religion, science). These institutions work in a complex and mediated way, because at their core is the activity of individual people, which must be coordinated by supra-individual structures to achieve the intended result, and thus there is more than enough opportunity for dysfunction. Every person has to reckon with a certain degree of dysfunction of these institutions in their worldview, thought-conceptual system.

Summary

THE EMERGENCE OF  
THE ONTOLOGICAL MODEL  
IS CONDITIONED  
**SOCIALLY AND INSTITUTIONALLY**

It is clear from the above that the chaos of “shouting voices”, as we know it from a free society, is not the goal of knowledge, but the way to it. It is about not taking any

of the voices too seriously and leaving room for your own worldview, thought-conceptual system. It should be based on an ontological model and personal experience. The ideal is a thought-conceptual system identical to the ontological model of science, but since science is a historical process and constantly evolving, where it is not yet certain and where there are “white spaces” on its map (we mean those that will never be filled, such as the question of life after death, etc.), the certainty of personal experience or faith must come into play there.

Summary

**CHAOS OF SCREAMING VOICES  
IS A WAY TO KNOWLEDGE  
AND TO OWN  
WORLD VIEW**

A thought-conceptual system is an ontological model as it is embedded in the momentary mental models and fixed mental model of a particular person. An ontological model is created by aligning the thought-conceptual systems of a community of people. It gradually evolved in different modifications in different communities, and as civilization became globalized, so did the ontological model. The way it was fixed evolved, from simple existence in the minds of community members to objective records, and the form it took, from myth to religion to philosophy and science. Even the existing ontological model is not uniform, in modern times its various varieties coexist or compete, because its development is far from the goal, even though it seems to be taking shape under the baton of global science.

Summary

**TCS IS EMBEDDED IN MMM AND FMM  
OF A SPECIFIC PERSON  
OM ARISES BY MATCHING TCSS  
OF COMMUNITY OF PEOPLE**

Let's try to summarize what certainties we have reached by previous reflection of chaotic reality. Our idea of the world is created through social contact with the ideas of other people as they developed in history. In modern times, a special institution has been established to unify these ideas, to eliminate contradictions between them and to create a kind of global model of reality. It is science that is gradually taking over this role from religion. The goal of the global model is to explain the momentary mental models of all people. Because the process of forming a global model is complexly mediated, each person's own individual experience is necessarily involved in the formation of their world view. It is precisely this that guarantees the necessary distance of a person from socially mediated global schemes and enables them to have their own critical insight into a situation where the global model is subject to ideological distortions.

Summary

**A GLOBAL MODEL IS CREATED  
INSTITUTIONALLY,  
THE WORLDVIEW IS FORMED BY  
ONE'S OWN EXPERIENCE**

The above theoretical construction allows us to explain phenomena from specific areas of life. We were interested, for example, in the fact that when we read, only spots on the medium are available to our senses, and yet somehow we “see” much more, depending on what we read. When reading fiction, whole worlds and their inhabitants parade in front of our “inner vision”, and we do not know where they came from. At least this is how Maxim Gorky was amazed when he “like a savage” looked at the pages of the book against the light to get to the bottom of this magic. We think that thanks to the theoretical scheme that we have developed above, we can explain this mystery. The key concept here is the momentary mental model.

Summary  
WE HAVE ALSO  
**INNER SIGHT,**  
BY WHICH WE SEE  
**VIRTUAL WORLDS**

The sources of the momentary mental model in our consciousness can be different. We started from the basic idea that reality arises in our mind based on direct perception, and we have not yet said anything about such power as ideas or conceptual thinking. When we think more closely about the “spots on the medium”, we find that they are organized in a certain way, and because of this they bring concepts, thoughts and ideas to our consciousness.

Specifically, we can state that man creates products of a special kind, which have the ability to call up before the

perceiving consciousness contents that he would otherwise forget if they were not fixed in a certain way. We will call these special products fixations.

Summary

MMM

- **FROM THE SENSE OF REALITY**
- **FROM SENSING FIXATION**

Every objective record (e.g. writing) is a fixation, an instrumental one at that (as opposed to mental fixations, which form memory traces in our memory); instrumental fixation is then a tool for evoking the content of consciousness that it fixes.

Summary

FIXATION – RECORDS

- **MENTAL**
- **INSTRUMENTAL**

There is a large range of fixations in which the word, whether memorized or written down, plays a crucial role, but there are also a number of fixations that “quote reality” (sculpture, painting, film, hologram).

Summary

INSTRUMENTAL FIXATION

- **REALITY QUOTES**
- **WORD MODELING**

Man has come to the realization that he can, for example, with a written word not only fix what was the

content of his consciousness when he perceived reality, but that he can also fix his images, fantasies or bizarre ideas, in short, that he can assemble fixations that create imaginary images in the consciousness of the perceiver, fictional, almost real or unreal worlds. A special sphere here is represented by art objects, artifacts, and in the case of written artifacts, fiction.

To understand how fiction works in reading, we need to consider how its text is organized. We decipher those “spots” as letters that combine into words and sentences. As we become aware of words and sentences, images, concepts and thoughts are activated in our minds. The text is structured in such a way that the letters are arranged in rows, and when reading, a letter or group of letters enters our field of vision in the order in which they are arranged in a row. At the same time, they are organized into words, words into sentences, sentences into paragraphs, etc., and when perceived, they gradually bring to our mind concepts, ideas, and thoughts as the author of the text intended. We can name this arrangement with the word *program*. The fixation thus “programs” the reader, i.e., it evokes intended states in front of their consciousness that lead to the creation of an actual mental model from the fixation, i.e., it constructs a virtual reality, virtuality in their consciousness, when they “see” a fictitious, virtual world with their “inner vision” and events taking place in it.

## Summary

A LITERARY WORK IS A PROGRAM,  
ORDERED SEQUENCE OF  
WORDS THAT WHEN PERCEIVED IN  
CONSCIOUSNESS  
**CREATES A VIRTUAL MMM**

On the interpretation of a literary work as a program, we tried to show the practical application of the philosophical starting points that we formulated in the introduction, i.e., especially the certainty of the momentary mental model.

## References

Aukstakalnis, S. and Blatner, D. 1992. *Silicon Mirage. The Art and Science of Virtual Reality*. Peachpit Press.

Bacon, F. 1990. *Nové organon*. Praha, Svoboda.

Berkeley, G. 1995. *Pojednání o základech lidského poznání, kde se zkoumají hlavní příčiny omylu a nesnází ve vědách, spolu s důvody skepticismu, ateismu a bezbožnosti*. Praha: Svoboda.

Collective of authors, 1966. *Stručný filosofický slovník*. Svoboda, Praha.

Coveney, P. V. – Highfield R., 2003. *Mezi chaosem a řádem: hranice komplexity: hledání řádu v chaotickém světě*. Praha, Mladá fronta.

Descartes, R. 1947. *Rozprava o metodě, jak správně vésti svůj rozum a hledati pravdu ve vědách*. Praha, J. Laichter.

Freud, A., 2023. *Já a obranné mechanismy*. Praha, Portál. Translation of the English original *The ego and the mechanisms of defence*. 1975.

Gorkij, M., 1951. *O literatuře*. Praha, Československý spisovatel.

Kahneman, D. 2012. *Myšlení: rychlé a pomalé*. Brno, Jan Melvil Publishing.

Korzybski, A. 1933. *Science and sanity. An introduction to non-Aristotelian systems and general semantics*. International Non-Aristotelian Libr.

Košumberský, T. 2017. *Filosofie vědy – stručně a názorně*, <https://time-theory.info/2017/02/02/filosofie-vedy/> [21. 12. 2020].

Levi, V., 1974. *Myšlení, děj neznámý*, Praha, Mladá fronta.

Líznar, M. 2006. *Filosofická terminologie Ladislava Klímy* [Master's thesis]. Brno, Masarykova univerzita v Brně, Pedagogická fakulta.

Neruda, J., 1878. *Písně kosmické*. Praha, Grégr a Dattel.

Neumann, J. von, 1958. *The Computer and the Brain*. New Haven, Yale Univerzity Press.

Plátón, 1921. *Ústava, 7. kniha*. Praha, J. Laichter.

Slouka, M., 2019. *Jak (ve filosofickém kroužku) používáme rozum* [online]. Facebook: Filosofický kroužek, <https://www.facebook.com/groups/mudrci/permalink/2438217349557730/> [31. 7. 2019].

Weiss, J., 1948. *Dům o 1000 patrech*. Praha, družstvo Dílo.

Weiss, J., 1957. *Přišel z hor*. Praha, Československý spisovatel.

Wittgenstein, L., 1993. *Filozofická zkoumání*. Praha, Filozofický ústav AV ČR.

*Zlomky předsokratovských myslitelů*. 1989. Praha, Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.



## Editorial Note

This English edition of *Philosophy of Assumptions* is a translation of the parallel published Czech version of *Filozofie předpokladů* (Tribun EU, Brno 2023).

Partial translations were processed on the basis of commercial and internet translations by Dita Trčková, Renata Chlumská, Jan Kmuníček and Markéta Kmuníčková, the final preview was made by Kateřina Urubková.

In the final edition of my reflections, I decided on the following terminological change, which also solves the problem of translation: instead of the phrase “actual mental model (AMM)”, or “current mental model (CMM)”, and in derived terms I introduce the phrase “momentary mental model (MMM)”. Furthermore, in the case of the expression “idea-conceptual system (ICS)” I also refine the translation to “thought-conceptual system (TCS)”. I hereby apologize for the confusion this may cause and am also trying to resolve it.



## **Thanks**

I would like to thank Pavel Materna, Jiří Gabriel, Jaroslav Peregrin and, last but not least, Helena Pavlincová for reading and commenting on partial texts.

Vilém Kmuníček  
Philosophy of Assumptions

Cover illustration downloaded from Google under CC0  
license

Published and printed by Amazon  
(amazon.com)  
Edition one  
Brno 2023  
88 pages  
ISBN: 9798867346584  
Independently published  
www.amazon.com