**Did Wolfram Schommers (University of Texas at Arlington, USA & Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany) (2015) plagiarize my ideas?[[1]](#footnote-1)**

In 2015, Wolfram Schommers published the book *Mind and Reality – The Space-Time Window* at World Scientific publishing company.[[2]](#footnote-2) In this book, there are *unbelievable similar* ideas to my ideas published from 2002 to 2014!

**A very short summary of Schommers’ aproach**

Schommers starts his book with the notion of “observation”. This notion, which is my main notion, is the main notion in Schommers’s book! Just coincidence… Reading his book, I understood his main movements in the following sense: exactly as I have elaborated my EDWs perspective (especially in the first years), working within the Kantian framework, Schommers

1. Accepts Kant’s noumen-phenomen distinction
2. Rejects the existence of real space-time and moves all “phenomenological spaces-times” in the “brain (head) of the observer” (in 2014, investigating

Therefore,

1. In this way, he reaches exactly the existence of some worlds (levels of observations) in the “head”! However, he writes also about “levels of reality”. (See below).

For (1), in the first years, I accepted this distinction, then I rejected it. For (2), in 2014, investigating “spatial cognition”, I conclude that space and time do not exist in any EW. The main difference is that these “phenomenological space-time frameworks” are in our brain not in reality, since “reality” means Kant’s noumenon. His “levels of reality” and “levels of observation” would correspond to my EDWs. In my EDWs perspective, I consider that the EDWs really exist not in our “head”.

**The role of observer**

Let me start analyzing Schommers’ book. He accentuates the role of observations (and measurement apparatus):

Our observations in everyday life are of basic relevance for the development of scientific conceptions. Within the frame of such direct observations, trees, houses, the moon and a lot of stars appear spontaneously in front of us without any conscious action. (p. v)

Moreover, the world that we see dependents on human observer:

The world before us appears spontaneously without any intellectual help. We consider this “world view” as independent from the observer. This is obviously not the case and is particularly demonstrated by the following experiment: A human being who puts on goggles equipped with inverting lenses sees the entire world upside down, not forever but only initially. After a certain time the entire visual field of the observer flips over and the objects are seen as they had been before the goggles were put on. The process takes place without (conscious) action of the subject. This simple experiment distinctly reveals that the world we experience spontaneously is not independent of the human observer. The brain ignores the goggles although it belongs to the reality outside. We may in particular conclude that the brain of the subject manipulates the impressions that we have from the outside world, i.e., it is obviously a “constructed world”. How can we understand these facts? (p. vi)[[3]](#footnote-3)

This paragraph seems to be from my paper 2005 or from my books (2008, 2010, etc.)! Schommers introduces “evolution” that determined our mechanisms of perception of the “world”. He rejects the “absolute truth”: “*We do not base our theoretical considerations on what really exists in the basic reality, but on what evolution allows us to recognize*.” (p. ix)

Another paragraph that seems to be taken from my books:

The relatively new notions like “dark matter”, “dark energy”, “Big Bang theory” and all the other conceptions concerning the basic nature of the universe become therefore uncertain or even useless when we try to recognize absolute standards, i.e., they are only of limited value. This level corresponds to a world view, which is confined by the reality in front of us (its picture) and how we interpret and assess it, but it is by no means an “ultimate conception”. (ix)

Due to the effect of evolution, the world view is dependent on the biological system. The philosopher Immanuel Kant thought in this direction, and was firmly convinced that the impressions in front of a human being in everyday life are essentially influenced by his brain. In fact, modern behavior research supports that. We have as many world views as there are different species, varying in their biological structure. (ix-x)

I extended the human perception (observation) to all classes of entities (living and non-living). Schommers extends human observation to living species. However, see Searle’s famous example with bat but Schommers did not mention Searle![[4]](#footnote-4) Also, Schommers introduce Kant’s philosophy. It seems that this is the only philosopher mentioned by the German physicist, even if I did not seem that Schommers is specialist in Kant’s transcendental philosophy.[[5]](#footnote-5) Regarding transcendental philosophy, Schommmers just introduces few ideas from other authors. We cannot consider Schommers knows Kant’s transcendental philosophy, even if an Appendix of his book is dedicated to this philosopher.

 Important is that one of Schommer’s main idea is that space (and time) does not exist. This idea is not new, Schommer mentions Berkeley, Leibniz and other authors. Schommers main idea about space is that, since we cannot perceive space and time, these dimensions do not really exist.

An empty space (Fig. 5b) is principally not observable, and a space with only one body (Fig. 5c) is also not a realistic configuration because it is also not observable. (pp. 13-14)

If space and time would be physically real quantities, we come to an essential question: Are these basic quantities, i.e., *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ*, accessible to empirical tests? This is definitely not possible… We definitely cannot see, hear, smell, or taste single elements *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ* of space and time, that is, the basic elements of space and time, characterized by *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ*, are not accessible to our senses. (p. 20)[[6]](#footnote-6)

Obviously, there are other people who claim the same idea. In my book from 2014, I mention many times space and the representation of space do not exist. (I will introduce new arguments in my future book.) A reply to Schommers’s argument against the existence of space is that, exactly as we have no idea about electromagnetic waves in 14th century, maybe in the future we will be able to construct instruments that can “observe” space and time. So, his arguments cannot reject the existence of space. Schommers introduces the container principle:

This kind of world is grasped within so-called “assumption-less observations” in everyday life, and this kind of reality is experienced by each human being in the same manner. A typical example is given in Fig. 1. This world, which we often call “material reality” and which is experienced by assumption-less observations, appears to be embedded in space. On this level reality is considered as a “container” in which the masses are positioned where the container itself is identical with that what we consider as space. Let us call this concept “container principle”. (p. 2)

At page 3, there is another paragraph that seems to be taken from one of my book:

It is essential to mention that the images in front of us come not into existence through the information of the world outside alone, but the eye, the optic nerves and the brain work here together. In other words, the impressions which are in everyday life spontaneous in front of us are dependent on the observer itself and cannot be considered as observer-independent. Thus, the above introduced notion “basic information” is observer-dependent.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Section 1.1.2 “No Direct Access to the World Outside!” seems also taken from my books.[[8]](#footnote-8) Important for Schommers is the “projection”:

Within the container principle the material world is embedded within space. Projection means that the material world is projected onto space (space-time) and we obtain an image of the outside world, i.e., a “picture of reality”. Within this conception (let us call it the “projection principle”) reality outside does not contain the elements which are space and time. In other words, within the projection principle the material bodies (real masses) are not embedded in space and time, and this is of course in contrast to the container principle. (p. 7)

Furthermore, one of the reasons for the introduction of the “projection principle” (and for the rejection of the “container principle”) is the phenomenon of biological evolution. Evolution obviously prevents a human being from recognizing what is often called “absolute or true reality”. In other words, our observed world in everyday life, which appears directly in front of us, cannot be the absolute truth. (p. 8)[[9]](#footnote-9)

Both paragraphs seem to be taken from my books word by word! Following Kant’s philosophy, Schommers believes that space and time belong to human mind and do not exist in reality. Quoting O. Heckmann, Sterne, Kosmos, Weltmodelle, Deutscher Taschenbuch (Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, München 1980), Schommers argues that “*the absoluteness of space, which Newton has claimed, and which Einstein may have attempted to eliminate, is still contained in Einstein’s theory”. Also, for him “*within the General Theory of Relativity there is a problem with space and time, i.e., with the space-time block.”[[10]](#footnote-10) (p. 17)

However, instead of the conclusion by Krauss we may assume that the quantum field theoretical energy density of space is correct, but not the tenets of the General Theory of Relativity, in particular its space-time conception. In fact, the character of space-time can be absolute in the General Theory of Relativity (here the container principle is valid), and this has to be considered as a serious deficiency of the theory. How does this unacceptable peculiarity influence the theory itself? This is difficult to estimate. (More details in connection with the cosmological constant are pointed out in Appendix C.) The absolute space (space-time) is the source of inertia, that is, it is able to create physically real effects. (p. 19)

Essentially, Schommers believes that we

can observe space only if there are two bodies. “we can only observe “distances in connection with material bodies (masses)”, i.e., we need at least two bodies when we would like to make statements about space. Absolute space can therefore not be considered as a physically real something.”[[11]](#footnote-11) (p. 21)

This idea, related to the idea of interactions constitute the existence (Vacariu 2005) can be obtained from my EDWs directly. Important for me is Mach’s principle (section 1.4.2) who rejected Newton’s absolute space and time:

In other words, according to Mach, the space (space-time) can never be the source for physically real effects, that is, the space (space-time) can never act on material objects giving them certain properties (inertia). According to Mach, a particle does not move in un-accelerated motion relative to space, but relative to the center of all the other masses in the universe. (p. 22)

Mach’s principle is entirely based on the above discussed fact that we can never observe that what we call space (space-time) because its elements (coordinates *x*, *y*, *z* and time *τ*) are in principle not observable. We can only say something about distances in connection with masses, and time intervals in connection with physical processes. Again, space and time can never be the source for physically real effects, i.e., the space-time block is not a physically real entity like matter.[[12]](#footnote-12) (pp. 22-23)

Following Kant’s philosophy (very close to my EDWs perspective and Frith’s idea), Schommers believes that “we have recognized, these everyday life impressions do not reflect reality itself but ‘only’ an image of it.”[[13]](#footnote-13) (p. 23)

 In section “1.4.5 Consequences and Illustrations”, Schommers introduces the idea that if two bodies do not interact, then one body does not exist for the other body and the bodies do not interact with space, so space does not exist. Obviously, all these ideas are reflected by my EDWs perspective! I emphasize that we have to accept Leibniz’s idea about space and in my book from 2014, I denied the existence of space. In fact, in all my principles, I wrote nothing about space and time!

**In section “1.4.6 Existence-Inducing Interactions” Schommers introduces his main “principle” that is identical with my main principle from 2002, 2005, 2007, 2008, etc.!**

Let me quote certain paragraphs from this section:

Only such kind of systems, represented in Fig. 9, are able to exist, because only such kind of systems can be defined, and—as we already remarked — the definition of a property is the presupposition for its observation. (p. 29)

Let us come back to what we have called above “interaction”. It is, as we have pointed out, necessary for the construction of a realistic physical reality. What kind of interaction is required? It must be an interaction that is not in effect between already existing elementary bodies, but it is an interaction which begets and produces the elementary bodies itself. In other words, body *A* produces body *B* and body *B* produces body *A*. Such an “existence-inducing” interaction is necessary because body *A* and body *B* cannot exist as free, non-interacting systems (Sec. 1.4.4). As a matter of fact, we need body *A* and body *B* for the definition of space-distances (see Eq. (2)).

The existence-inducing interaction should be independent of the distance between the bodies because the existence of a body with definite properties (for example its mass) should be independent of the distance between the bodies. When both bodies are produced by this existence-inducing interaction, they may in addition interact via a distance-dependent pair interaction. However, for fulfilling the minimum information Eq. (1) only distance-independent “existence-inducing” interactions are relevant and necessary. (pp. 30-31)[[14]](#footnote-14)

*This is exactly my main principle written in all my works after 2002!* Still working within the unicorn world, Schommers write section 1.5 about “inside world and outside world”. Even if Schommers mentions Carl Jung (p. 33), these “worlds” are identical with my EDWs! Exactly as in my EDWs perspective, between these “worlds” there is no “one-to-one correspondence” (p. 36). Schommers emphasizes this idea many times in his book:

In other words, in the opinion of C.G. Jung we have an “outside world” and we have simultaneously an “inside world”. What does it mean in detail? When we touch with our fingers certain objects (tree, car, etc.) we definitely feel them, i.e., the objects and the observer’s body interact with each other. Both, the objects as well as the observer,

are considered as physically real objects. We make this statement on the basis of the facts of the inside world, but there are no material objects within this inside world. This is however no problem because it is normally assumed that there is an exact “one-to-one correspondence” between the reality outside and the inner picture of it. (p. 36)[[15]](#footnote-15)

Again, this paragraph seems to be taken from my works (2005, etc.): an object exists just because of the interaction between that object and the human observer! “Correspondence” is one of the main notions in my EDWs perspective, and in Schommers’ book this notion has exactly the same meaning!

 Following Kant about space, Schommer writes that the “brain organizes this ‘ensemble of extensions’ as *one* phenomenon which we call ‘space’. That is all what we can say about space within our assumption-less everyday impressions. (p. 37) This idea mirrors exactly my idea about “scene” (Vacariu 2014)!

The observer is not only positioned as a material object in the world outside, but he simultaneously appears as a geometrical object in the image; he feels the effects due to the masses *mA* and *mB* (their real interaction with the observer) when he touches the geometrical positions *A* and *B* in the image. There is a definite “correlation” between the observer’s touch in the image and the real effect in the world outside. Essentially, the observer feels the real bodies with the masses *mA* and *mB* at the geometrical positions *A* and *B* in the image that we have in front of us. The “minimum information” is fulfilled when we simply exchange “interaction effects” in the world outside by “correlations” in the inside world; that is, when we work with correlations within the image which is directly in front

of us in everyday life observations… This real existence-inducing interaction between these physically real masses becomes a strict “correlation” between the geometrical points *A* and *B* in the image. The interaction itself takes place in the world outside where the real masses are positioned. (p. 38)

It seems that these ideas were written under the EDWs perspective! “Correlations” (a word that is very used in cognitive neuroscience) is equivalent with my “correspondence”. Schommers uses commas for “correlations” and his main notion is “correspondence”!

 Important is the idea that a “non-interacting elementary body does not exist and, therefore, a space with only one geometrical position in the image (picture of this elementary noninteracting body) is not defined; a feature that is not defined cannot be observed.” (p. 45) Moreover, following Kant, the theory of evolution (and being very similar to my ideas from 2008), Schommers writes that

Nevertheless, an empty space or a space with only one body is thinkable. We have only to delete the geometrical positions (crosses) in Fig. 10 and an emptiness appears and we come to Fig. 12. In other words, an empty space is “thinkable” and can be defined formally, but it is not “observable”. This in particular means that the space is not permanently installed in the brain. Space and time only appear (in the brain) when there is actually something (objects of the world outside) to picture. (p. 45)

Within Leibniz’s framework Schommers writes that “the observation of one body, which is alone in the cosmos or does not interact with other bodies, is not possible; the minimal information Eq. (1) does not allow that (see also Fig. 7)”. (p. 45)

The observer interacts via his sense organs with the reality outside in order to get the necessary information about it. This information enters the brain of the observer, and the brain constructs an image of reality outside; an example is given in Fig. 1. The construction of the image takes place unconsciously, i.e., without any conscious actions of the observer. The inner world in front of us appears spontaneously.[[16]](#footnote-16) (p. 47)

**“Fictitious realities”**

About “fictitious realities” (section 1.6.3), Schommers writes that

Three things are relevant when we try to assess the observer’s relation to the world outside. The world in front of us, the image of the reality outside, is the most important fact that the observer can have about the reality outside. This image is a configuration in space and time. The second point is that space and time cannot be entities of the real world outside, and we can say nothing “directly” about this reality, i.e., about true (basic) reality; this world is not accessible to an observer because an image-independent point of view is not possible. We are only able to say something about the reality outside “indirectly” with the help of theoretical conceptions, that is, on the basis of intellectual imaginations. These theoretical conceptions have to be checked with experimental instruments. (p. 51)[[17]](#footnote-17)

We can say nothing about the complete contents of basic reality and we also cannot know the transformation laws that transform the information from basic reality onto space and time, leading to the “picture of reality” which we experience spontaneously when we restrict ourselves on assumption-less everyday life observations. This is exactly the difference between the true (basic) reality and fictitious realty. We never observe facts of the true (basic) reality. The reason for this fact is dictated by the principles of biological evolution, which is treated in more detail in the forthcoming sections. (p. 54)

Again, paragraphs exactly like these paragraphs can be found in my works (2005, 2008, etc.)! The ideas from these paragraphs can be found in Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason, including “spontaneous” thoughts. I used exactly the same ideas in my works with the same meaning as Schommers used many times.

 Quoting some authors, Schommers claims that in a scientific theory there are “real and metaphysical elements” (section 1.8). Such idea we can find in works written by many philosophers and scientists. Also, he rejects the notion of “infinite” (1.8.4), but again there are many people who have rejected the existence of infinite.

**“Levels of reality” and “levels of observation”**

At 1.11.4-5, Schommers investigates *“levels of reality”*, “principle of level-analysis”:

The theoretical conception is positioned on a higher level, higher than the level where the space-time images are positioned. In this way we come to the “levels of reality”. All levels are constructions by the observer and belong to the brain of the observer. These levels are arranged vertically in accordance with the degree of generality where the level with a higher generality is positioned above that with a lower degree of generality. (p. 86)

This seems to be different than my EDWs: for me these “levels” are, in general not in every case) EDWs and one ED does not exist for an EDW. So, such “verticality” is quite a wrong notion. Let me introduce another paragraph that mirrors exactly my EDWs:

**1.11.5 Principle of Level-Analysis**

All levels of reality as, for example, level *L*1 and level *L*2 in Fig. 17, reflect certain features of the same world outside which we have called the basic reality. We may assign to each level certain objects, which are qualitatively different from each other. In other words, to each level in Fig. 17 belong certain “objects”, i.e., geometrical objects in space (level *L*1*)* and symbolic objects (equations), which exist as “objects” but without space (level *L*2*)*. All levels of reality as, for example, level *L*1 and level *L*2 in Fig. 17, reflect certain features of the same world outside which we have called the basic reality. We may assign to each level certain objects, which are qualitatively different from each other. In other words, to each level in Fig. 17 belong certain “objects”, i.e., geometrical objects in space

(level *L*1*)* and symbolic objects (equations), which exist as “objects” but without space (level *L*2*)*. (p. 86)

Do you want more “unbelievable similarities” between my ideas (2002-2014) and Schommer’s ideas (2015)? Fig. 18 mirrors exactly my EDWs! Beyond this figure, it is the following text:

“Fig. 18 Real bodies (matter), real processes, metaphysical entities and that is what we have called the ‘theoretical

Conception’ of the world can be classified within the ‘principle of level-analysis’. Real matter is exclusively positioned in the basic reality, furthermore the real processes and real effects exclusively take place in the basic reality. However, basic reality is principally not directly observable because a picture-independent point of view is not defined for a human observer. Therefore, the basic reality has to be classified as a ‘metaphysical system’. We can principally not know the real structure and also not the theoretical structure inside the basic reality. But what do we know? We experience the world on certain ‘levels of reality’ (level *L*1 and level *L*2 in the figure). Level *L*1: Here the direct impressions in front of us in the observations of everyday life and specific systems (hydrogen atom, etc.), which are specific solutions of general equations, are exclusively geometrical structures which are positioned in space and time, i.e., on level *L*1. These geometrical structures have their seat in the brain of the observer.

Level *L*2: The “general equations” are also positioned in the brain of the observer and belong to level *L*2. (Sec. 1.11.4 and Sec. 1.11.5) and also reflect certain peculiarities of the basic reality. These equations are constructions of the observer. Again, the information on level *L*1 and on level *L*2 are ‘picture and symbols’ in the brain. There is a clear line between the metaphysical system (basic reality) and what appears as a picture in the brain. The entities which appear on both levels have to be considered as real objects, although they are not material in character, we experience them in connection with physically real effects and intellectual operations. The appearance of formulas and other physical statements is not mysterious; all these things belong to the brain, no less and no more. Everybody knows that.” (p. 90)

Indeed everybody knows this from Kant (and many other philosophers. Then why Schommers emphasizes these ideas so strong during his entire book? What is new in his book? Even his idea about the inexistence of space and time follows Mach’s principle, as he recognizes himself!

 At 1.11.7, it seems that we return to EDWs perspective: *“levels of observations”* (see my paper from 2005), but Schommers’s ideas send to an ontological paradox:

From the various levels of reality (level *L*1 and level *L*2, Fig. 17) emerge properties that are qualitatively different from each other although the various levels reflect features of the same reality, i.e., the basic reality. We may state that from each level emerges a certain facet of the basic reality, a facet of the world outside. (p. 91)

That is: “Basic reality → “Levels of reality” → “Levels of observation” (p. 91) The text behind Figure 19 is

**LEVELS OF REALITY LEVELS OF OBSERVATION**

Fig. 19 Levels of reality in relation to the levels of observations. The features of the “objects” on the various levels are defined differently and, therefore, the methods of observation must be different from each other. The correspondence between the levels is essential.” (91)

The difference between the “objects” on the various levels is not only reflected in their theoretical description but also — as we have recognized — by their effect they have on the human observer. Thus, we may assign to each level of reality a “level of observation” (see Fig. 19) because the features of the “objects” on the various levels are defined differently, that is, the methods of observations must vary from level to level and these produce certain level-specific feelings inside the observer. (p. 91)[[18]](#footnote-18)

Do you want more arguments about the unbelievable similarity between Schommers’s ideas and my ideas? Excluding the existence of noumen, this idea is one of the main ideas in my EDWs perspective: for me, using different “methods of observation” we observe EDWs! We can clearly see the same idea in the above quoted paragraph. Moreover, I inform Schommers that “Basic reality”, in Kantian terms, means “noumen”. Then I do not understand the relationship between basic reality and levels of reality! The only explanation is that we have here Kantia’s noumen and the EDWs!

Schommers believes that the “basic reality” is a “unified whole”:

The basic reality should be considered as a “unified whole” and not as a large system consisting of separate things, which are qualitatively different from each other. All aspects experienced and/or defined by the human observer do not exist in a separated form in the basic reality. The various levels of reality are constructions by the human being and belong to the brain. All levels reflect certain features of the same world outside (basic reality). Thus, the basic reality should be considered as a “unified whole” without levels separated from each other. Separation is in particular also a peculiarity at the material level where the objects appear as geometrical objects in space and time. Here separation is a feature due to the existence in space and time, but in the basic reality there is no space and time and no such separation.

Mind, matter and what we often call the “soul” belong to specific aspects positioned on various levels of reality, but should not exist in this separate form in the basic reality. Instead the features such as mind, matter, soul, etc., should exist in the basic reality as one (unified) state. In the analysis of the structure of the basic reality a holistic view and not the separation into parts or levels would be appropriate if we were able to recognize details of the basic reality, but we are not… However, this unified block appears in the “observer’s world” as a system of various levels. This in particular means that this feature is dictated by the observer’s peculiarities. (p. 92)[[19]](#footnote-19)

We can find here, again, Kant’s noumen-phenomen distinction.[[20]](#footnote-20) However, there are some contradictions in these paragraphs: how can we fit the basic reality with “levels of reality”? The main difference between my EDWs and Schommers’s idea is that he preserves Kant’s noumen and therefore “levels of reality” are still dictated by the observer: “all these ‘objects’, which belong to the various levels, are states of the brain (…)”[[21]](#footnote-21) (p. 93). In my EDWs perspective, levels of reality are the EDWs and their existence does not depend on any observer.

 It seems that Schommers’ answer to the mind-brain problem is the identity theory and he explicitly rejects Searle’s idea (mind is the product of the brain).

So, the material part of the brain, obeying the physical laws, cannot create the products of mind (phantasy) because these products do not in general obey the physical laws. A car may move in our phantasy (in our thoughts) from the

earth to the moon in a split-second. Such and similar thoughts exist but do not obey the physical laws. In a nutshell, the products of mind (phantasy) can obviously exist without the material part of the brain; the source of mind is obviously not of the material level. (p. 99)

To summarize, there is a certain connection between “mind” and “matter but — and this is important to say — matter does not produce the products of minds. Due to the correlations between mind and matter, the products of phantasy (and all similar things) may be influenced by matter but cannot be produced through matter. In other words, if the material part of the brain is changed (for example by an accident and/or in connection with a medical operation) the mind can be changed too but it cannot be created or annihilated in this way. (p. 100)[[22]](#footnote-22)

The ontology missing of these ideas are furnished by the EDWs perspective. Therefore, it seems as if Schommers wrote these paragraphs within the EDWs perspective! At page 131, he wrote

The mind-body problem is a central and most interesting point in connection with the nature of mind. Is what we call “mind” an independent unity, i.e., separate from specific physical phenomena as, for example, from neurological processes? Or is the mind the result of material processes within the brain? This question has been answered quite clearly in Chap. 1 within the frame of the projection principle: The mind is not a creation of the material part of the body of human beings. On the other hand, traditional thinking has more or less led to a materialistic view. (p. 131)

If the mind is not “a creation of material part”, and the mind is not something materialistic, than we can understand this paragraph only within the EDWs perspective![[23]](#footnote-23)

**More about “interactions”**

Schommers writes more about “interactions”.

We assumed that there is no interaction between the two bodies *A* and *B*. However, such a configuration may not exist. Therefore, we not only need the space coordinates *xA, yA, zA*, *xB, yB, zB* and the masses *mA* and *mB* of the two bodies, but there must in addition a “relation” between them, and such a relation is expressed by an interaction between body *A* and body *B*. This interaction leads to correlations between the coordinates, so that distances become

definable. If both elementary bodies interact, they are able to exist in space and a distance between them can be defined… What about the “interaction”? It is, as we have pointed out, necessary for the construction of a realistic physical reality. What kind of interaction is required? It is an interaction, which produces the elementary bodies itself, that is, body *A* produces body *B* and body *B* produces body *A*. It is an existence-inducing interaction, and must

be independent on the distance between the bodies. In a nutshell, “existence-inducing interactions” are necessary. This is a quite general statement and is independent of the conception, i.e., whether we work within the “container principle” or within the “projection principle”. (p. 105)

He continues with this idea: “Because isolated space-positions are not existent, a body cannot be defined relative to space, but only relative to another body. Nevertheless, the phenomena of space and time are existent.” (p. 106)

 Very close to my notion of “*scene*” from my book 2014, Schommers writes:

When we observe the world in everyday life, an image of it appears directly in front of us. However, we do not have objects in front of us that are embedded in space and time having the elements *x*, *y*, *z*, and *τ*. We merely observe “objects” and “extensions”. For example, two objects (geometrical positions in the image) have a certain “extension”. Here the notion “extension” has to be considered as a basic notion and we should not try to analyze it further. “Extension” reflects a qualitative effect. The effect of “extension” appears spontaneously in front us in connection with our assumption-less observations in everyday life, i.e., it appears without thinking. We have a lot of bodies in front of us and, therefore, we have a lot of extensions. The brain organizes this ensemble of extensions as *one* phenomenon which we call “space”. (p. 107)

Another Schommers’ idea very similar to one of my ideas from EDWs is the following: he introduces two observers S and S’ that belong to two classes of observers.

There might be no information overlap between both the material realities. Then, *S* does not perceive *S’* and vice versa. This situation is illustrated in Fig. 24. The bodies around a human observer *S* as well as what he calls atoms, molecules, elementary particles etc. do not belong to the material reality of *S’*, the other type of observer. In other words, *S*’ defines his own material reality on the basis of other entities. If there is a certain information overlap we come to Fig. 25. *S* perceives a certain part of *S’* and vice versa. To sum up, the term “material reality” does not reflect an “absolute” fact. It does not appear in the basic reality but is obviously a strict observer-dependent definition. The material entities defined by *S* are different from those defined by *S’*.[[24]](#footnote-24)

If the reader of my chapter read some of my books, reading this paragraph would have the impression as being written under the EDWs perspective! *The main difference between the EDWs perspective and Schommers’s approach seems to be that EDWs are transformed into “constructed realities” under Kantian noumenon-phenomenon distinction.* In section 2.2.4 (“constructed realities), Schommers introduces Figure 24 with the following text:

**Fig 24.** There is no information overlap between the human observer *S* and the other type of observer *S*’. *A*’ defines the material realty of *S*’, which is projected onto the frame with the elements *a, b, c,…*. *A* defines the material realty of *S*, which is projected onto the frame with the elements *x, y, z* and time *τ*. The large sphere *C* is the total information in the basic reality. (p. 123)

All the “products of mind” and the “products of phantasy” etc. do not appear in such images, but have to be considered as real as the images in front of us; both types of appearances are likewise states of the brain and reflect in particular certain facts of the basic reality. The products of mind also reflect certain features of the basic reality, but they are positioned on another level than the material objects and cannot be depicted within space and time. (p. 123)

Even when the “unconscious world view” is (almost) the same for all individuals, the “constructed world view” (extended world view) is in general different for different human beings, that is, it varies from individual to individual because each individual has his own world of ideas and thoughts, respectively. (p. 125)

Again, like many ideas from Schommmers’ book, these ideas seem to be written under the EDWs perspective! Moreover, in section 2.3, Schommers talks about “no principal difference between matter and mind”. This idea mirrors exactly one of my main principles: “All the EDWs have the same objective reality”! However, Schommers mentions Watzlawick’s work (1987) that follows directly Kant’s transcendental philosophy.[[25]](#footnote-25) Figure 26 mirrors again very important idea of EDWs perspective:

 → physics

 Fig. 26 Reality outside → constructed reality →

 → psychology

The reader can clearly see that this image mirrors exactly the EDWs! I sustain the same thing about the next paragraph:

Another type of observer, different from a human being, would observe another world, because he selects information from the basic reality which is different from ours. Therefore, the material reality of this other type of observer must be different from that of a human observer. In summary, what we call “material reality” is observer-dependent. It is a construction (definition) by the observer. The material entities do not appear as separate units in the basic reality.

There might be no information overlap between the both material realities. The bodies around a human observer as well as what he calls atoms, molecules, elementary particles etc. do in general not belong to the material reality of the other type of observer; he defines his own material reality on the basis of other entities. Essentially, the term “material reality” does not reflect an “absolute” fact. It does not appear in the basic reality but is obviously a strict observer-dependent definition. (pp. 142-143)

Within the EDWs perspective, “another type of observer” means exactly an entity that belongs to an EDW! “Another world” is exactly an EDW! All the ideas in these paragraphs (and in many other paragraphs in Schommers’s book) seem to be written under the EDWs perspective!

**“Other observers”, the “principle of objectivation” and “constancy phenomena”**

In Chapter 3, Schommers clarifies “other observers”. He emphasizes that all observers have the same objective reality.[[26]](#footnote-26) In 3.2, he introduces the idea of “equivalence of all observers”! *This idea is one of my main principles (the principle of objective reality) in my paper from 2005 and all my books!*

“In Sec. 2.2.3 we studied a human observer, marked by *S*, and an observer of another type that we have marked by *S’*. The material reality of *S’* was assumed to be different from the material reality of the human observer *S*. Both *S* and *S’* select spontaneously from basic reality (having the information content *C)* a certain part; it is *A* in the case of *S* and *A’*  in the case of *S’*. Due to the principle of “as little outside world as possible” we have*A < C*and *A’ < C*. Furthermore, we have *A’ ≠* *A* since we assumed that *S’* is different from *S*. In other words, the information *A* \_ should be different from information *A*. Information *A* defines the material reality of *S*, and *A’* defines the material reality of *S’*. What we call the “material reality” is observer-dependent. It is a construction (definition) by the observers, in this case *S* and *S’* ” . (p. 148)[[27]](#footnote-27)

Again, we can see here exactly my EDWs under Kant’s noumena-phenomena distinction! Moreover, another unbelievable similar idea is in the next paragraph:

How a human observer *S* experiences the world in front of him is known (cars, trees, houses, etc.), but we can at first say nothing about how the observer of another kind (marked by *S’*) experiences “his” world; it remains hidden to *S*. (p. 149)

In my articles from 2005 and my books, I wrote that the mind of each human mind is an EW! What do you want more to understand how Schommers’ wrote his unbelievable similar ideas to my ideas?

 Focusing on the notion of “reality” and “objectivity”, in section 3.5, Schommers writes about “different images of the same object”. Quoting Konrad Lorenz[[28]](#footnote-28), in this section he writes about “constancy phenomena”. I used the same notion from Merzenich and deChlamers in my paper from 2005! But the next paragraph is incredible similar to one of my principle, the “principle of objective reality”:

We have stated above that objects belonging to the various levels of reality are equally real, and we observe all these objects at the various levels by a common principle, which can be called the “principle of objectivation”. This principle is valid at each level, i.e., it can be applied independent of which level an object is located. (p. 164)

Read this paragraph (and the entire Schommers’ book), I was shocked! He called his principle the “principle of objectivation”! In my paper from 2005, I called an exactly the same principle, “the principle of objective reality”, so Schommers cannot be accused of plagiarizing my ideas! In the next page, we find another an idea incredible similar to my idea:

The principle of objectivation supports the view that there is no principal difference between the “states of mind” and the “states of matter”; there are only gradual differences. (p. 165)

In principle, the objectivation processes on the various levels are different from each other. Since the basic information have to be considered as discoveries and not as inventions, we may state that each “level of reality” is accompanied with a “level of observation”. Because the features of the objects on the various levels are defined differently, the methods of observation must vary from level to level. (Sec. 1.11.7). From the process of objectivation emerges the “objects”, and these produce certain level-specific feelings inside the observer. (p. 165)[[29]](#footnote-29)

These ideas mirror directly one of my main principles that all EDWs have the same objective reality and the existence of EDWs (i.e., levels for German physicist).[[30]](#footnote-30)

**About Newton, Leibniz, and Kant**

In Appendix B, section 9, Schommers writes about Newton, Leibniz, and Kant for rejecting the absolute space and absolute time in Leibniz’s framework and Kant’s phenomenology. We can find many paragraphs that mirror exactly my solution to quantum mechanics. However, instead of talking about real EDWs, Schommers moves all these worlds in the “head”:

Again, is the real world really embedded in space (space-time)? From the point of view of modern physics the vacuum (the space) has nothing to do with emptiness; just the opposite is the case: Empty space (vacuum) is a “*hyperactive player, a prolific producer of jittering fields and virtual particles* [8]. *The vacuum is the most complex*

*substance in the universe. The biggest challenge for theorists of all may simply be emptying the vacuum of all the trappings it’s acquired over the past fifty years.* “*They have filled the vacuum with so much garbage, there isn’t room for the cosmological constant*,” said Leon Lederman: “*Einstein freed us from the ether. Now we need to get rid of (today’s version of ether) again. We need to sweep the vacuum clean* [8].” No doubt, one possible solution for this problem is to work within the “projection principle” (Appendix F). In fact, here no physically real objects are embedded in space (space-time). (p. 216)

In Appendix D, Schommers writes that

The statement that there can be no one-to-one correspondence is, on the one hand, against the realists and, on the other hand, it is simultaneously against the position of anti-realists because it is a statement about the true reality. (p. 222)

In my paper from 2005, I wrote that the EDWs perspective is beyond the realism-antirealism debate!

**Appendix F: Quantum mechanics**

In Appendix F, Schommers writes about quantum mechanics and the inexistence of space-time. From what I understood from this appendix (with mathematical formulas), Figure F2 mirrors exactly my solution to the quantum mechanics: depending on our tools of observation, we observe either the wave or the particle. But, in Schomers’ approach, both the wave and the particle are in our mind, since we do not have access to “noumena”. The following sentence seem to be written under the EDWs perspective: “The “existence-inducing interactions” are produced by **p***, E*-fluctuations between system *i* and systems *j* and lead to distance-independent correlations in *(***r***, t)*-space. This kind of interaction produces the system (particle) itself, and the quantity Ψ∗ *(***r***, t)* Ψ *(***r***, t)* describes its form and shape, respectively; it can therefore be called form-interaction. We showed in [1, 2] that distance-dependent correlations can be introduced within the framework of projection principle.”[[31]](#footnote-31) (pp. 253-254)[[32]](#footnote-32) This mirrors exactly my solution to the quantum problem! Eliminating space-time, Schommers introduced the EDWs in other format! In the last sentence “correlation” means exactly my “correspondence”!

Within the projection theory we have in principal not only “one” material reality, but as many realities as there are different biological systems. Each species defines its own “material world”; the details have been pointed out in Sec. 2.2.3. Other biological systems experience a material world that is different from that of human beings, at least in principle. All is dependent on the information that an individual selects from the basic reality. Thus, the term “world equation” is not applicable here. Each species has its own “world equation”, which however can only reflect a certain part of the basic reality. (p. 261)

For the observation of the system *\_(***r***, t)* by *\_ref (t)* both systems must be coupled. In [1] realistic models have been proposed, and we came to the following result:

The states Ψ ∗ *(***r***, t)\_(***r***, t)* of the system under investigation will be systematically scanned by Ψ∗ *ref (τ* −*t)\_ref (τ* −*t)* and only those values of *t* which correspond with the reference time *τ* (see also Fig. F5) can be observed. This leads to an effect of motion. The sense of time *τ* is to select a certain configuration Ψ∗ *(***r***, tk)\_(***r***, tk)* with *tk* = *τ*. Clearly, Ψ∗ *(***r***, t)\_(***r***, t)* is a static function if it behaves stationary (see Sec. F.4, Fig. F1) and does not change in the course of time *τ*, and the effect of motion we experience in connection with Ψ∗ *(***r***, t)\_(***r***, t)* is entirely

due to the “motion” of the reference time *τ*. (p. 269)

Again these paragraphs mirrors exactly my solution to quantum mechanics! In F.10.2, Schommers writes that about “individuals”. For instance, a particle cannot have a spatial trajectory:

All these problems indicate that the interpretation of *ψ*∗ *(x, y, z, τ) ψ(x, y, z, τ)* in connection with a real material mass, which is embedded in space, seems to be an ill construction. This is the case for the conventional quantum theory, but the problems disappear when we enter the projection theory where no real material body is embedded

in space and time. (p. 275)

Again, this idea seems to be thought by Schommers within the EDWs perspective! Again, it seems that, avoiding space-time, Schommers can introduces the EDWs without mentioning the source! Without offering more details, I write some of Schommers’s paragraphs:

An observer, who is resting in the frame of reference *S*, is not able to observe the systems *i* and *j*; only the observers in the moving frames *S’* and *S’’* can give experimental statements about the systems *i* and *j*. (p. 278)

In summary, the quantities *Δk,***r** and *Δk,t* jump statistically through *(***r***, t)*-space together with the space-time positions of the probability densities, defined by *ψ*∗ *(***r** − *Δk,***r***(τ), t* − *Δk,t(τ)) ψ (***r** − *Δk,***r***(τ), t* − *Δk,t(τ)) , k* = *i, j,* (F62) i.e., both structures jump arbitrarily through space and time. These jumps are independent from each other.

The projection of *ψ (***p***,E)k, k* = *i, j*, onto *(***r***, t)*-space leads to the wave functions *ψ (***r** − *Δk,***r***, t* − *Δk,t), k* = *i, j,* and the geometrical structures (probability densities), given by Eq. (F62), should be considered as a definition of the forms (shapes) of the systems *i* and *j*; and, as we have outlined above, these geometrical structures jump arbitrarily relative to *(***r***, t)*-space. (p. 278-279)

Also, section F12 “Interactions and correlations” (mainly sub-section F12.1 “Interactions and correlations”) mirrors exactly my ideas that refers to the EDWs.

The projection theory opens up the possibility for another kind of interaction in *(***p***,E)*-space, leading to correlations in *(***r***, t)*-space that are not dependent on space-time distances between the systems and are therefore “distance-independent”. In other words, there can be correlations—between two systems, say *i* and *j*—where the strength is not dependent on the space-time distances **r***i*−**r***j, ti*−*tj*. Such interactions define the form (shape) of a system. (p. 286)

Again, “correlations” mirrors exactly my ideas about the
“correspondence” between the wave and the particle! Incredible Schommers writes that in

conventional physics we also use certain forms for elementary systems: We have point-like particles, strings, branes etc. However, these specific forms had to be assumed in conventional physics and could not be derived. In contrast to these developments, projection theory opens up the possibility to explain (derive) certain elementary forms in nature by means of this new kind of interaction; it leads to distance-independent correlations and create the geometrical form (shape) of systems in *(***r***, t)*-space.

In Sec. F.11 we have treated two systems *i* and *j* which can interact via existence-inducing **p***, E*-fluctuations in *(***p***, E)*-space that have the effect of “distance-independent” correlations in *(***r***, t)*-space, and the probability density *ψ* ∗ *(***r***, t) ψ (***r***, t)* defines the form of the systems.

Both systems *i* and *j* jump arbitrarily in *(***r***, t)*-space and their space-time distance at a certain time *τ* may be as large as the space-extension of the universe, where “large” really means with respect to the maximum space-extension as well as with respect to the maximum time-extension (that is, from the beginning to the end of time). Nevertheless, both systems *i* and *j* interact with a constant strength, even when the space-time distance takes the largest possible value. In other words, both systems interact, but this interaction is independent of the actual space-time positions of both systems. This property reflects the non-local character of the projection theory. (pp. 286-287)

These paragraphs mirror exactly my ideas about the relationship between wave and particle: they belong to EDWs! Schommers claims the same thing just in other words! At section F.12.3 (“Interactions within conventional physics”), introducing again the idea of “phenomenological space” that does not exist in reality, Schommers writes that

Within the projection theory there cannot be such kind space-time connections since the interaction processes do not take place in *(***r***, t)*-space. As we have outlined above, within the projection theory we have “merely” **r***, t*-correlations in *(***r***, t)*-space, and the real interaction processes are identified with **p***, E-*fluctuations in *(***p***, E)*-space. (p. 289)

Again, we can find exactly this idea in my book 2008 in other format! “Correlations” means “correspondence” in my EDWs perspective, no more or less. Again about “interaction”

In summary, there is no possibility to explain by a mechanism how the mutual influence between two bodies comes into existence. The notion of “interaction” has therefore to be considered as an irreducible primary property of matter. (p. 293)

There are many other paragraphs that mirror exactly my solution to quantum mechanics. I leave the reader to investigate them.

**Conclusion**

Does anybody need more details to understand the “unbelievable similarities” between my ideas (2002-2011) and Schommers’ ideas (2015)? For more details (if necessary), the reader is invited to read my articles 2002-2005, my books 2008-2014 and Schommers’ book 2015.[[33]](#footnote-33)

1. I mention that I wrote this essay in two days. I have no more interest in writing about such “unbelievable similarities” between my ideas and ideas written by other people (philosophers, physicists, cognitive neuroscientists, psychoanalists, etc.). It seems that, after 2011, many people published unbelievable similar ideas to my ideas from 2002-20014. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This book was published at “World Scientific” publishing company in 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. “The ‘unconscious world view’ is extended by the ‘products of mind’ leading to an extended world view for man. In this way we obtain a ‘constructed reality’.” (p. 144) In my works, the reader can see exactly the same relationship between conscious and unconscious states and the “constructed reality”! However, Schommers has no idea about these notions like conscious vs. unconscious states! I do not understand how he was able to elaborate this idea having no lectures on articles and book of cognitive science… “These space-time structures are the ‘basic information’ and come into existence spontaneously in an unconscious way, i.e., without thinking.” (p. 157) Again, this sentence is incredible similar to one of my ideas from 2005 and my books! From Kant, I used “spontaneous thoughts… [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. In 3.3, Schommers writes about “other biological systems”. He reminds us about Wolfgang Schleidt’s experiments on turkey and weasel which indicate that these animals perceive quite different from human beings. Exactly the same idea appears in Searle’s works. “Therefore, although the conceptions of the world of man and turkey are on the

one hand different from each other, they are on the other hand correct in each case. This means that neither of these two conceptions of the world can be true in the sense that they are a faithful reproduction of nature: Objective reality (basic reality) must be different from the images which biological systems construct from it. We already came to this conclusion on the basis of space-time arguments. (p. 150) Again, we have here exactly my principle of “objective reality”. (I mention that the expression of “objective reality” I borrowed from Kant’s main work.) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. In Appendix D, we can see the title of on section: KANT: SPACE AND TIME ARE ELEMENTS OF THE BRAIN”. This title showed us that Schommers has no idea about Kant’s transcendental philosophy: Kant never talked about brain but only about mind and self! It is a huge mistake! [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Schommers replaces space and time with: We never observe single elements *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ*, but we are only able to observe *distances in connection with material bodies (masses)*, and *time intervals in connection with physically real processes.* (p. 20) “Since we are principally not able to “observe” the basic elements of space and time (i.e., *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ*), space and time should never be the source for physically real effects as, for example, inertia. “Non-observable” here means “non-existent” as a physical and real entity. (pp. 2-21) “As we found out, it is made of nothing because it cannot be the source of physically real effects. This in particular means that the elements of space and time, characterized by *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ*, are not observable. Such a space-time block cannot have any physically real

existence. It is nothing!” (p. 23) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Referring to the difference between human and turkey, Schommers writes that the “mechanism for the construction of a picture within the head of an observer (*S* or *S’*) is given by geometrical optics and certain brain functions. Then, ‘similar mechanisms’ means that the ‘principles of geometrical optics’ within the projection frame (*S’*-space with *a, b, c, . . .)* of the turkey *S’* are similar to those within the projection frame (*S*-space with *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ)* of the human being *S*.” (p. 152) Again, this paragraph seems to be written within the EDWs perspective… [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Frith (2007) also has this idea in his book. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. “That is all what we can say about the world outside within the frame of the projection theory. We never can make statements about the basic, true reality that exists objectively, i.e., independent of human observers. Thus, within projection theory basic reality has to be considered as a “metaphysical system”. (p. 83) Many times in his book Schommers repeats Kant’s idea. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. [“In a nutshell, *the absoluteness of space, which Newton has claimed, and which Einstein may have attempted to eliminate, is still contained in Einstein’s theory* [6].” Willem de Sitter demonstrated in the year 1917 that Einstein’s field equations lead to the effect of inertia in the case of a lone body moving through space-time, that is, there is exactly that type of inertial motion which is defined within Newton’s mechanics. (p. 16) “Clearly, space-time and its basic elements *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ* can only appear in the inner world and they do not belong to the elements of the world outside. That is, the container principle is obviously an unrealistic conception. The coordinates *x*, *y*, *z* at time *τ* are exclusively the elements of a “fictitious net” which the observer intellectually puts over the image in front of him. Thus, space and time, constructed in this way, can never be the source of physically real effects.” (p. 44) “We never “observe” isolated space-time positions characterized by *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ*. At time *τ* we can only observe “distances” in connection with geometrical positions (Sec. 1.4.1), i.e., we need at least two bodies. We never observe the space-time positions of an empty space or the space-position of only one body; such situations are conceivable but not observable.” (p. 45) “It turned out that it is more realistic to assume that our direct optical impressions are ‘pictures of reality’ but not reality itself, i.e., the objects in space and time are geometrical figures and are not material objects.” (p. 59) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. “In summary, the basic elements of space and time *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ* do not reflect physically real quantities and cannot be the source of physically real effects. From this point of view, an empty space-time should not exist because it is not observable and, from the point of view of science, only those entities which can lead to physically real effects are observable.” (p. 21) “Clearly, the basic elements of space and time, i.e., *x*, *y*, *z* and *τ*, cannot be identified with a ‘real something’ in analogy to matter.” (p. 22) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. “Mach strongly needed to eliminate space (space-time) as an active cause. According to him there should be no physically real effects due to space (space-time) as, for example, the effect of inertia. According to Mach, a material body does not move in un-accelerated motion relative to space, but relative to the center of all the other masses in the universe.” (p. 24) “A body does not move in un-accelerated or in accelerated motion relative to space, but relative to the centre of all the other bodies (masses) in the universe. This requirement is often discussed in literature under the notion of ‘Mach’s Principle’. However, Mach’s principle is not fulfilled in Newton’s theory.” (pp. 172-173) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. “Thus, a body, say *A*, cannot be defined relative to space, but only relative to another body *B*. This is the reason why the space (space-time) cannot be judged as a physically real entity. In fact, we cannot put a “piece of space” on

the table, and also not a “piece of time”. The physical space (space-time) cannot be identified with a certain kind of substratum; there is no indication for that. The space-time is not made of a real something (substratum) in analogy to matter.” (pp. 32-33) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. At page 105, Schommers writes: “Let us go a step further and put into the same space ‘two’ elementary bodies (body *A* and body *B)*, and we would like to assume that there is no interaction between the two bodies with *mA* and *mB*. Then, body *A* is not existent for body *B*, and body *B* is not existent for body *A*.” [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. “The human as well as the object are positioned in the ‘basic reality’ and an interaction process takes place in the basic reality between the material objects (here the human and the object) as soon as the finger of the human touches the object in space.” (p. 85) [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Schommers writes that “the biological cognition apparatus develops the world in front of us from the information,

which we obtain from the outside world through the five senses (Fig. 1).” (p. 50) I quoted Konrad Lorenz works to support this idea and Schommers quoted the same author for the same idea! [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. “That is all what we can say about the world outside within the frame of projection theory; we never can objectively make statements about the basic, true reality that exists, i.e., independent of human observers.” Incredible, Schommers teaches us “new things” written by many other authors since Kant! Also he writes that “space and time do not belong to the basic reality. Nevertheless, all physically real processes exclusively take place in the basic reality without space and time. Our cognition apparatus can ‘only’ form pictures of the basic reality.” (p. 86) and he repeats that because “space and time do not belong to the basic reality, there can be no one-to-one correspondence between the processes in the basic reality and what we experience in space and time in the form of images, which are our direct impressions in everyday life in front of us (Fig. 1).” (p. 86) [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Schommers introduces the following: “The objects at both levels are positioned in the brain of the observer. However, there is a big difference: On level *L*1 we observe unconsciously and on level *L*2 consciously by thinking.” (p. 92) It is clear that Schommers has no idea about the difference between conscious and unconscious states and the related dichotomies: implicit-explicit, automatic-control, etc. Amazing, without offering details about this dichotomy, he uses quite wrong this distinction many times in the rest of pages! [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. “In this way we come to ‘levels of reality’. All levels are constructions by the observer and belong to the brain activities of the observer. All levels of reality reflect certain features of the same world outside (basic reality). We may assign to each level certain objects, which are qualitatively different from each other.” (p. 110) Again, we can see in this paragraph an idea that is “unbelievable” similar to an idea of the EDWs. “Quality” sends directly to the existence of EDWs. It seems as if, in order to avoid being accused of plagiarism, Schommers worked under Kant’s noumena-phenomena distinction… But, in this way, nothing new! [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Schommers introduce also “products of imaginations” and “spontaneously images in front of us” very similar to Kant’s ideas. Schommers has the impressions he introduced new ideas! [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. “Here we have a ‘basic realty’ and ‘levels of reality’ with certain objects, but all these objects on the various levels should only be exist in connection with space and time (material level) and/or as abstract pictures (intellectual level with the theoretical conceptions). The objects on all these levels are exclusively positioned in the brain of the observer.” (p. 93) He continues “Since basic reality should be considered as a ‘unified whole’ and not as a large system consisting of separate objects, the specific objects positioned at the levels of reality should not appear in the basic reality, particularly since space and time cannot exist in the basic reality. From this point of view it is not possible to transfer the objects from the levels to the basic reality and vice versa. The elements (entities) in the basic reality are not defined in the way the brain does. Such a correspondence is even unthinkable. This underlines and justifies our above made statement about the basic reality: It is not observable and has to be considered as a large metaphysical system. However, the objects on the various levels are not metaphysical in character, because none of them can give rise to physically real processes and effects. For example, the elements of space and time *x*, *y*, *z* and time *τ* do not belong to the basic reality and can therefore not give rise to physically real processes. Thus, the elements *x*, *y*, *z* and time *τ* should not be considered as metaphysical in character. Such statements only make sense when we work within the projection theory.” (p. 94) Nothing more than Kant’s philosophy in other words. Writing about “metaphysical elements”, Schommers believes that such “metaphysical elements and basic statements are not only in the ‘mind of the observer’ but belong particularly to the ‘world outside’ itself; they should exist without the observer within the frame of the container principle. The organization of matter in the world outside in space and time is also here achieved on the basis of such metaphysical elements and basic statements and, therefore, they should somehow be positioned in a reality independent of the observer’s mind.” (pp. 94-95) I really do not understand this paragraph: it seem to be some contradiction with other ideas that we find in Schommers’ book. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Mentioning some authors, Schommers writes: “The products of mind can exist independently of matter; the products of mind are not created by the material processes in the brain (its material part).” (p. 100) This idea sends directly to the EDWs. However, from the EDWs perspective, this idea is totally wrong. It seems as if Schommers did not understand completely all the main ideas of the EDWs perspective! [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. “Furthermore, ‘mind is not created by matter’, as in traditional physics, but mind and its products (phantasy, etc.) can obviously exist without the material part of the brain; the source of mind is obviously not on the material level.” (p. 139) [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. “The investigation of the relationship between the object outside and the object inside of *S* is not possible.” (p. 154) This sentence mirrors exactly my principle from Vacariu (2014) that one EW does not exist for any other EDW! [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Schommers quotes a passage from this author: “*I am in my own reality, just as you are in your reality. We naively assume that there is an objective reality. This however is not correct. If you ask me which reality am I in, then I will tell you I am in the reality constructed by myself, that is, I give the situation now and here a specific meaning. If you give the situation a basically different meaning we have an interpersonal conflict. Then the problems start.”* (pp. 126-127) [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. “It is however remarkable that, within the view of Von Förster, the structure in the inside reality is for an observer different from the structure in the outside world, and this is in accord with the projection theory, i.e., there is no one-to-one correspondence. There is a principal difference between the notions ‘quality’ and ‘quantity’.” (p. 146) If for Von Forster, the “basic reality is accessible”, Schommers returns to Kant’s noumena: we cannot observe it. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. “A human observer (let us mark him again by the letter *S)* has a certain image of his environment in front of his eyes; it is an image like what is given by Fig. 1. This image is a representation in the ‘space of *S*’. Let us assume that this space-time image contains another human observer, say *S*A, and a tree. The image in front of observer *S*A, represented in the ‘space of *S*A’, is almost the same, which *S* experiences; it is not exactly the same because the position of *S*A in the ‘space of *S*’ is different from the position of *S*. However, since both human observers are equivalent, they have images in front of them with exactly the same features. In particular, the ‘space of S’ is identical with the ‘space of *S*A.’ ” (p. 153) Another paragraph that seems to be written under the EDWs perspective! “In other words, the information *A*’ should be different from information *A*. Information *A* defines the “material reality” of *S*, and the information *A*’ defines the material reality of *S*’. This in particular means that the material reality is an observer-dependent peculiarity. It is a construction (definition) by the observer, in this case *S* and *S*’.” (p. 239) Again, we can see here the EDWs perspective! [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. “Konrad Lorenz (1903–1991) convincingly showed that these material entities are also discovered by objectivitation, just like the scientific laws. This process reflects in the case of material objects certain “unconscious actions” on the basis of physiological mechanisms, which are known as “constancy phenomena”. What does this notion mean? Objectivation in an unconscious way is for a human being a relevant factor.” (p. 159) Schommers quotes Lorenz’s paragraph about “constancy phenomena”. Incredible coincindence! In my works related to species evolution, I quoted some of Lorenz’s ideas… Schommers writes that the “objects recorded by measuring instruments are also observed unconsciously. At the level of the measuring instruments the observer imposes restrictive conditions on nature. This is done by the development of specific measuring instruments, leading to construction conditions that are imposed by the observer in order to get a specific answer on a specific question. Due to these specific construction we register only a few specific signals from a multitude of possible events in nature.” (p. 164) This is another paragraph that seems to be written under exactly under the EDWs perspective! [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. “The objects (material entities, physical laws) belonging to the various levels of reality are equally real, and we observe all these objects at the various levels by a common principle, which can be called the ‘principle of objectivation’. This principle is valid at each level and supports the view that there is no principal difference between the ‘states of mind’ and the ‘states of matter’; there are only gradual differences.” (p. 169) another paragraph that seems to be written under exactly under the EDWs perspective! It mirrors exactly my principle of “objective reality”! [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. “Willem de Sitter demonstrated in the year 1917 that Einstein’s field equations lead to the effect of inertia in the case of a lone body moving through space-time, i.e., there is exactly that type of inertial motion which is defined within Newton’s mechanics. In a nutshell, *the absoluteness of space, which Newton has claimed, and which Einstein may have attempted to eliminate, is still contained in Einstein’s theory* [6].” (p. 174) I need to analyze this idea in my future work. He concludes that “1. Mach’s principle does not work within Newton’s mechanics. 2. The examples above demonstrate that within Theory of Relativity Mach’s principle cannot be realized.” (p. 175) “According to Mach, space (space-time) should not be considered as a real physical entity like matter.” (185) So, the idea that space does not exist is Mach’s idea! [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Schommers writes that “It is important to note that within conventional physics only distance-dependent interactions are known, that is, form-interactions are not defined here. This is a very principal point, in particular with respect to the notion of ‘interaction’.” (p. 254) Having an identical meaning, “interactions” are the most important notion in my EDWs and Schommers’s approach! [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. “In other words, the interplay between the two systems (the reference system described by [Ψ *ref (t)*, Ψ *ref (E)*] and, on the other hand, the system under investigation described by [Ψ *(***r***, t)*, Ψ *(***r***,E)*] should lead to the selection process. This process obviously filters the configuration Ψ∗ *(***r***, t*0*)* Ψ *(***r***, t*0*)* from Ψ∗ *(***r***, t)\_(***r***, t)* out.” (p. 268) Again, we can find here exactly my solution to quantum mechanics! [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Important is that in this book, Schommers did not mention any of his previous works in which we can find one or more important ideas from this book published in 2015. We can conclude that he elaborated his entire approach in this book. To elaborate such completely new approach (with so many implications in science and philosophy) in a book means that Schommers is the new Kant (who wrote his Critique of Pure Reason in several months)! [↑](#footnote-ref-33)