

Introduction

Psychology is an important and necessary science since those who learn psychology most often want to understand themselves, find a place for themselves in society, and help others find that place. In other words, they want to know the truth about a human person. However, knowing this truth is not easy and straightforward, mainly because there are many answers to the question of who a man is and what he should do to achieve a sense of self-fulfillment in life. In bookstores, the whole shelves are panned with various psychological guides; seeing them, we wonder: which books are worth reading and which are not? Time is limited; the amount of money is also limited – how to make the most of it? What to choose? Who to listen to and who to skip? It is impossible to listen to all the teachers, nor is it possible to read all the guides to evaluate them yourself. We certainly need guides and tutorials, but how to choose the best ones which will not fail?

When it comes to teaching at universities with state authorization, you can certainly trust that the knowledge presented there is reliable and justified. However, different lecturers at these universities have different preferences and views; there are different schools, different authorities clash, and various discussions take place. Not everyone agrees on everything. The university ensures that you are familiar with the prevailing views, but you have to choose your own from these. As far as modern psychology is concerned, the most important are: Gestalt psychology, psychoanalysis, behaviorism, humanistic psychology, cognitive psychology, and evolutionary psychology. Each of these directions captures the human being differently and accentuates his/her different properties, aspirations, and abilities. Which one is the best? You can choose what you like best from each of them, and you can join one of them more than others. However, the problem of choice always remains. What should be the criteria for this selection?

What is needed here is certainly a good philosophy that teaches how to distinguish between truth and falsehood; however, the problem is that one of the significant features of modern psychology is precisely the programmatic break with philosophy, not to mention theology. That is why a professor of psychology, Stanisław Kowalik (born 1947), states that from contemporary psychology, "metaphysical and ontological questions have been excluded" (Kowalik 2013, p. 172). The effect of this exclusion is the accumulation in the psychology of an immense amount of empirical research results with neglect of their interpretation:

"It is safe to gather facts while leaving others to decide on their interpretation. Psychologists (...) do not know very well what the results of their own research should be related to – they do not have a more general view of human nature" (ibid, p. 173). – They do not have [it] because they are not based on philosophy but psychological theories. As for these theories, professor Kowalik writes: "Analyzing various psychological theories, I get the impression that their authors are less and less often wondering what the real reference of their theoretical findings is. Most often, it is another theory, which as a result of empirical research we reject, replacing it with our own" (ibid, p. 178). – The result of this attitude is to practice "science for science's sake" without any relation to social demand.

Doctor of psychology Urszula Tokarska also lists the following weaknesses of modern psychology: "detachment from philosophical roots in reflection on a human person, expanding the thematic scope of experimental searches at the expense of deepening it, and the primacy of the method over undertaken (often repeated) research topics" (Tokarska 2014, p. 65). – The author, therefore, points to an excessive emphasis on experiment and method, bypassing the more profound vision of human reality.

Similarly, professor of psychology Anna Gałdowa notes the excess of empirical data in the poverty of theoretical foundations: "The richness of data is a kind of situation *embarras de richesse*: they require a coherent system of explanation and obtaining it turns out to be rather

impossible. As a result, a significant number of theories with a low degree of generality relating to selected functions or psychological phenomena can be seen" (Gałdowa 2000, p. 18).

The multitude of theories, however, do not satisfy the mind, which by nature is seeking the unity of its knowledge and hopes that "as research progresses, it will be possible to create one great psychological theory that will allow a coherent reconstruction of the whole of mental life. The most basic principles will be established that organize the area of the reality of interest to psychology" (Kowalik, *ibid*, p. 173). – Is it possible? It must be said in advance that such theory that everyone will agree on cannot be created. Why? Because "it is not possible to unequivocally determine the nature of human being – it is a problem of faith rather than science" (Kowalik, *ibid*, p. 172). And that's why "we have a lot of philosophical propositions that define human nature. The problem for psychologists is the answer to the question: do we have to refer to these concepts, and if so, which ones?" (*ibid*, p. 173).

I will answer this question that – of course – we should refer to philosophical concepts; because if psychology is a science about a human person, then the psychologist should know who a human being is, where he/she comes from and where he/she is going. In addition, science is a set of statements that form a logical, non-contradictory whole, explaining some fragment or aspect of reality. On the other hand, these statements include terms specific to a given science, creating its dictionary. Both of these statements show the need for philosophy in psychology.

When it comes to which philosophy to choose, however, it is impossible to avoid personal preferences, just like in psychology. The Swiss psychologist and psychiatrist, creator of depth psychology, Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961), writes that philosophical criticism helped him "to see the subjective and confessional character of every psychology – and thus my own" (Jung 1982, p. 216). The author, therefore, states the same as Stanisław Kowalik: the role of faith in psychology. Still, Jung believes that awareness of personal preferences should not hamper our creativity: "I can't let my criticism deprive me of my own creative abilities. Although I know that behind each word I speak, there is my special and unique "I" with all its specific world and history, I will follow the need to talk about myself by referring to my own experimental material. Only in this way can I serve human knowledge, which Freud also wanted to serve and which he nevertheless did. Knowledge is based not only on truth but also on error" (Jung 1982, p. 216). – These words can also be like the motto of this entire book. In it, you can also notice the author's "personal preferences", especially when it comes to the selection of topics and ways of reasoning.

However, it cannot be done otherwise. Philosophy is not mathematics, in which always, everywhere, and for everyone $2 + 2 = 4$. Anyway, these preferences also appear in psychology. Stanisław Kowalik mentions this above, and Anna Gałdowa as well: "thinking about the subject of psychology is inherent in the psychologist's personal choices in the field of anthropological options. Adopting any version of psychology is, above all intellectual reasons, primarily an expression of one's own existential decision" (Gałdowa 2000, p. 38). – And that's why a beginner in psychology will have to choose one of its versions for himself/herself, guided by trust in his/her teachers, that is simply faith. So if someone is, for example, a Christian, they should look for a psychology that is consistent with their faith. Thus, the need arises to create or formulate such psychology, which Christians can accept without reservation.

However, one may ask: should the directions of modern psychology be assessed in terms of faith? Does science have something to do with religion? I answer this question: yes. Every psychology is based on some, more or less clear, philosophical assumptions about who a man is, what his/her aspirations are, and where (in what) he/she can find their fulfillment or satisfaction. So even if one cannot directly compare religion (or rather theology) with psychology, one can – and should – compare the philosophies that form the basis of different psychological directions. It is perfectly legitimate to discuss these foundations, criticize them,

and look for the best. There is no escape from these foundations or assumptions because psychology consists of theories based on some assumptions. Assumptions are necessary for science. As doctor Janusz Boczar claims, "most researchers believe that science can only develop thanks to the adopted assumptions. In their opinion, it is impossible to have a science without assumptions" (Boczar 2000, p. 183).

Thus, although psychology is an empirical science, i.e., referring to experience; experience is not possible without some theory because it is always the experience of something namable, i.e., not a chaotic set of impressions, but some specific phenomenon that can be named and described in a language developed in a given field of science. First, there is a theory based on accepted assumptions and then experience (observation); in other words: the ability to name is a condition of perception. That is a common position in today's philosophy of science. To prove it, I give some quotations. The first two represent the position of the influential Austrian philosopher of science Karl Raimund Popper (1902-1994):

"According to Popper, we always see the world, at least in science, in the light of theory, and without theory, we can't see anything" (Kutschera 2007, p. 27).

"Popper has already emphasized that in science, we do not start from observations, which then lead more or less unequivocally to theoretical generalization. Rather, we start from theory as creative projects" (Kutschera 2007, p. 119).

The next authors state the same thing:

"Modern theory of science generally rejects the existence of so-called naked facts, since the affirmation of any scientific fact is always dependent on the theoretical elements and methodological directives of the science in question, which determine in advance the ways of establishing, selecting and evaluating a scientific fact and the ways of explaining it based on an already accumulated body of knowledge" (Sokołowski 2002, p. 364).

"The scientific knowledge of natural sciences is not of purely empirical origin but requires a prior theory" (Kleszcz 2015, p. 252).

So first there is the theory, that is, the assumptions about reality, and therefore simply believing in something, and next experience, which verifies that belief. That is also true of human development. At first, a child accepts with uncritical trust everything that his/her parents or teachers tell him/her, and then he/she begins to critically assess his/her beliefs taken from them. And that is how research is often carried out: first, a hypothesis is proposed, and then it is verified. In any case, there is no science without assumptions; this is what Joachim Wehler (born 1950), a mathematician and philosopher, author of the book "Outline of the rational image of the world", claims:

"Since the premises cannot be infinitely derived from ever more primordial premises, there must be content at the starting point of any science whose truthfulness is recognized without proof" (Wehler 1998, p. 50).

That is also stated by the American philosopher John Rogers Searle (born 1932), regarding philosophy: "On most of the major philosophical issues, there is what we might call, using a computer metaphor, the default position. Default positions are the views we hold prereflectively so that any departure from them requires a conscious effort and a convincing argument" (Searle 1999, p. 9). – These views are nothing but faith that underlies scientific theories, as stated by the authors of the handbook of statistical methods for psychologists:

"The theory is a set not only of scientific laws but also of some general assumptions that underlie them. A significant part of almost every theory is not testable at all. These are the assumptions in which the researcher simply has to believe because only then can one logically explain enough phenomena" (Francuz, Mackiewicz 2007, p. 18).

Subsequently, there are no facts without theory and assumptions; you can't understand reality in a "clean, unbiased way." That is also stated by Ewa Bińczyk, referring to the views of the American science philosopher Norwood Russell Hanson (1924-1967): "Even the results of

measurements and the operation of scientific instruments are theorized because they contain an indelible theoretical component. There are no 'pure' observation sentences, protocol sentences, or purely empirical evidence. What plays the role of testimony is localized thanks to theoretical assumptions, as well as it is recognized and described in the language of theory. Hidden prejudices, previous expectations, language habits, and unconscious metaphorical structures direct research questions, underlying our methods of categorizing reality" (Bińczyk 2013, p. 326).

So it is clear that there is no science without faith because, in science, there are – often hidden – philosophical and world-view assumptions (beliefs). Thus also in psychology, one starts with some beliefs, and in their light, one interprets observational data. Also, in this book, there must be initial assumptions adopted without a proof (i.e., on faith), i.e., the sentences on which we base ourselves in formulating others and which we consider true. So I ask the question: what will a psychological system built on assumptions consistent with the Christian faith look like?

These assumptions can be divided into philosophical and theological. As far as philosophy is concerned, I have chosen the one with Aristotelian and Thomistic inspirations from among many proposals. Why this one? Because, according to Anna Gałdowa, psychology "must use a certain philosophical anthropology, and this one, if it is not to be 'suspended in a vacuum', must be based on the philosophy of being" (Gałdowa, 2000, p. 253). The author goes on to say that "it would be best (...) to base philosophical anthropology on the metaphysics of Thomas Aquinas, which is an expression of 'the most complete and fully consistent realism'. It seems that even for existentially oriented psychology, it would make the most sense to refer to these very philosophical roots" (ibid, p. 253). Therefore, the philosophy of being must take an important place in the work on the philosophical foundations of psychology. Besides, the Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy aims to explain the world as a whole.

And if I accept the way of thinking adopted in this philosophy, the following assumptions are consistent with it:

- the world is rational (comprehensible, ordered, harmonious, logical) and therefore cognizable,
 - if there is an image (representation, picture) of something, then there must be a reality presented in that image,
 - everything must have a cause, except the first cause, which does not have a cause, just is.
- There must be a source, an end to the interpretation and explanation of all phenomena. There must be some unexplained beginning. One can – and should – only reflect on the nature of this beginning. Everything must eventually be reduced to it.

The last assumption can also be formulated differently: you cannot give what you do not have; that is, nothing can change itself, set in motion, or organize. The term "self-organization" is an abbreviation of the phrase "something organized itself", which is false. That can be seen even in the definition of the term "self-organization" from Wikipedia: "Self-organization, also called (in the social sciences) spontaneous order, is a process where some form of overall order arises from local interactions between parts of an initially disordered system." – Note that this sentence mentions parts of a system that interact with each other. Could something that has no parts organize itself? I think no because you cannot be influenced by yourself, you can't be the cause of yourself. "If any being were a cause of itself, it would be that cause when it does not exist, and then we would attribute existence to the non-existent. Nothing and being would become the same" (Gogacz 1998, p. 34).

Let's move on to the theological assumptions. Let us take into account that as far as the criterion of selection of theorems adopted without proof is concerned, Janusz Boczar claims that "adoption of assumptions may stimulate or inhibit the development of science. It is also easy to establish that only correct assumptions guarantee its undisputed development. How do we know that any assumption or assumptions are correct? We obtain such awareness by

analyzing the final solutions of a given theory or hypothesis. Thus, the final results of a given science inform us whether the assumptions made earlier were correct" (Boczar 2000, p. 185). It is, therefore, necessary to make such assumptions based on which such a building of knowledge can be built, which will allow achieving the expected results. As far as the psychological theory of human development is concerned, there is undoubtedly a need for such assumptions that will help to reach the fullness (end) of this development. However, one cannot better imagine this fullness than living the life of God. There can be no higher or more perfect level of human development. I assume that achieving this state is possible. So the claim: "human person can live like God" I consider the unquestionable starting point in thinking about a human person's development and the criterion for judging the value of any philosophical or psychological claims.

Is this assumption appropriate? Will it enable the "development of science" and allow those who believe in it and try to live according to it to enjoy their full development? As far as the first question is concerned, the claim about the possibility of living as God will be a novelty in modern psychology, but – as I will try to show – it will make it possible to organize this psychology's claims and evaluate them. If it is true, it will also provide them with credible justifications. In modern psychology, behaviorism is considered to be the most "hard" or scientifically justified current because it is built on the formula of physics, which in turn is based on mathematics. Therefore, in the creation of psychology (and in psychological publications), repetitive experiments are highly valued, the results of which are elaborated using statistical methods. This method often gives interesting and valuable results, but with the help of statistics, it is impossible to determine the purpose of human development. Therefore, the notions of ideal, excellence, or perfection are not used in modern psychology. That is because they are not used in physics, on which psychology is based. However, without using these concepts, it is impossible to describe and fully understand the process of our development. Moreover, many human experiences are unique and cannot be analyzed with statistics.

Besides, the knowledge gained in this way is not always "hard". The authors quoted above state:

"Since every rejection of the null hypothesis is associated with a certain probability of making a mistake (...), we can be sure that among the hundreds of thousands of psychological articles published annually, some describe regularities that are simply untrue. (...) So if you read the so-called professional literature, be critical and carefully draw far-reaching conclusions from it" (Francuz, Mackiewicz 2007, p. 261). – So you can't uncritically believe the scientists. And who can be believed without reservation? The answer to this question can only be such: only God and the one who legally acts in God's name; who preaches not his/her own science, not the science he/she invented, but teaches what he/she has learned from God. I assume, that is to say, I believe that such person is Jesus Christ and that his teaching is faithfully passed on by the Catholic Church, which is as hard as a rock (Mt 7:24), so it can be relied upon to create psychology. That is why the reasoning contained in this book – apart from the philosophical theses – is also based on theological assumptions, especially the claims of biblical anthropology, according to which a human person:

- is created in the image of God (Gen 1,26),
- has a share in the divine nature (2 Peter 1,4),
- is part of the body of Christ, who compares himself to a vine (John 15,1-8).

I summarize these assumptions by saying that two natures can be distinguished in every human being, as in Jesus Christ, divine and human. So I consider such claims can be the norm and the criterion of truthfulness for philosophy and psychology. So I ask the question: what kind of philosophy and what kind of psychology "fit" in and result from these assumptions? One can find theories in philosophy and psychology that are consistent with them, and can they be used to form a coherent whole, i.e., a uniform image of the world? What kind of philosophy

and what kind of psychology are "demanded" by the possibility of human deification? Do philosophers and psychologists see dualism, i.e., two natures, in a human person, and if so, what do they call them and what functions they confer on them? Such questions also determine the method of work: to know the basic psychological and philosophical literature, and then choose from them such concepts (in practice: such quotations) that will be consistent with this assumption and put them into a logical and coherent whole, creating a true image of reality.

It should also be mentioned here that the main difficulty in constructing this image is the need to use different languages. Philosophers and psychologists speak of a human person in dissimilar words, and, what is more, many different schools are using different terminology within these two disciplines. Therefore, I tried to apply the "Occam's razor", i.e., the principle: "do not multiply beings, do not create fiction, explain everything as simply as possible", so I considered many terms to be synonymous or unambiguous if they seemed to indicate the same reality (designate). Maybe, sometimes it was too far-reaching, and I saw the similarities where they were not, so at the end of each chapter, I put some considerations on these terms, trying to justify the possibility of their interchangeable use.

Moreover, in order to precise my reasoning, I tried to create a basic dictionary because the language used in learning should, as far as possible, be unambiguous and precise; without this, there is no agreement. Language is a tool that allows us to know and describe reality. And how can you know and describe something? Only by means of sentences, whose basic parts are: subject, judgment, and appendix. They correspond to parts of speech: noun, verb, and adjective. These elements of communication and expression correspond to particular aspects (manifestations) of reality: things (entities), their actions, and their properties. Thus, the most general and basic scheme of cognitive grasping and describing reality is as follows:

Something (someone) [subject – noun] somehow acts [judgment – verb] and therefore is something specific, has some property [appendix – adjective].

The following synonymous terms can be given here:

- "something" – a thing, an object, a substance, an object, an entity, an agent; that which acts,
- "action – affecting, influencing, functioning, activity,
- "property" – feature, attribute, characteristic, quality.

Besides the fact that not everything can be proved, we have to accept some claims without proof; equally, not every term can be defined. In addition to the initial assumptions, therefore, non-definable (original) terms must also be given, for which only synonymous terms can be found (with the proviso that no unequivocal language can be created). These may include the following:

- Part, fragment – whole.
- Unit, individuum, individual, particular, element – set, team, group, collection, aggregate.
- Possibility, potentiality – actuality, fact, reality.
- An activist – a tool of an activist (an action).
- Cause – effect.
- The thing, the original, the object of the image – the image (representation, reproductions, depiction) of the thing.
- An event, a fact, a phenomenon.
- Change, movement.
- By using these terms, the following definitions can be given:
 - Process: a set of activities, events, or phenomena caused by beings stretched over time.
 - Relationship, connection, relation: a set of properties of entities that is potential actions between them.

- Becoming: actualization of potentiality.
- Situation, state of affairs: a set of entities and their possible actions in a given period of time.
- Structure: layout of parts.
- Arrangement: a set of entities (beings) and relations between them.
- Energy: the ability to act; an entity (being) has it.

I will try to describe each phenomenon or process with these terms. Based on the assumptions and original terms, it is possible to build a coherent, synthetic vision of reality. That is the task of philosophy because this science comes from the need to have a general, holistic vision of the world and a human person, although – of course – there are many concepts of philosophy. Here I assume, however, that its purpose is to grasp the whole reality with the mind and explain it synthetically in the light of one principle because "synthesis always requires the adoption of some principle" (Haeffner 2006, p. 40). – Nowadays, this principle in science is mostly the theory of evolution, which has long gone beyond the framework of biology and has become a binding pattern of thinking and explanation, also in philosophy. However, it has its difficulties, which I will point out later, so I propose another principle: one being can have two natures, and a human person has a divine and a human nature. It is, therefore, dualism (duality, splitting), expressed in the following juxtapositions:

being, reality, original – image (cognitive representation) of that being (reality)
 existence – being; what exists
 life – what lives
 I (subjective self) – self-image (objective self)
 what is creative, primary, source – what is reproductive, secondary, imitative
 source of action – a tool of action

In relation to psychological issues, it will be about distinguishing "I" from the "image of I", that is, the self-image, and the primary thought is: "I shape the image of reality and myself in it, to express myself through it and thus to become free." All other claims will be "matched" to this principle or derived from it.

The purpose of this book, however, is not only to outline the philosophical basics of psychology but also to concisely present the holistic picture of the world according to the most important fields of philosophy and to underline and emphasize everything that concerns a human person. It is primarily about understanding the human person and his/her situation in the world, i.e., answering the most important existential questions. So the goal is as John Searle set to himself:

"The present book is neither a survey of big questions nor a history. Indeed, it is a type that has gone out of fashion and that many good philosophers would think impossible. It is a synthetic book in that it attempts to synthesize a number of accounts of apparently unrelated or marginally related subjects. Because we live in one world, we ought to be able to explain exactly how the different parts of that world relate to each other and how they all hang together in a coherent whole" (Searle 1999, p. 7-8).

The above text reflects the content of my book quite well. It is not a textbook of the history of philosophy. Nor does it deal with various concepts of philosophy or discuss various philosophical problems. It is usually written in the style of Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy, but it is not limited to the statements adopted at this school, which is also not homogeneous. In addition, I quote authors from very different fields of science and various philosophical directions, assuming that there are no theories completely wrong and in each book, you can find true sentences; and if I have found them to be true – or better: if they fit the whole of my

reasoning – I included them in the text to show that someone had already come to similar conclusions. I do not want my beliefs to be original; I want them to be true.

What is more, sometimes it is difficult to move from the initial perception of a phenomenon or sense of the right solution to the problem to clear and explicit naming/formulation. That is because "human thought is most often a vague thought and difficult to grasp for the subject until it is expressed in words" (Bobryk 1981, p. 50). So, if someone else noticed or experienced the same as I did and could aptly name it, I thought it was worth using this proposal. The Polish philosopher Władysław Stróżewski (born 1933) thought similarly; he wrote about his book: "It seemed to the author that there was no need to speak in his own words if a thought he considered was right, was already adequately spoken by someone" (Stróżewski 1983, p. 6). – And that is why there are so many quotes in this book.

In addition, there are a lot of these quotes because the general vision of the world and a human being presented in this work was already in me somehow, and this vision only required systematization and appropriate expression. So I confirm what the English historian of philosophy Frederick Charles Copleston (1907-1994) wrote: "When a philosopher proceeds to expose his thoughts in a systematic way, he already has the initial idea of the direction in which he is heading, the leading idea or a general picture of reality" (Copleston 1978, p. 102)¹. Therefore, all my intellectual development aimed to fill this vision with concrete content, something like constructing a building with its overall plan, without many details. Quotes can be treated as individual elements of this building. I was looking for those that fit my assumptions. The same process occurs when arranging puzzles. The quotes are like puzzle pieces. A large number of them can hinder reading, but it increases the collection of terms used, and thus also expands the possibilities of understanding the world and naming it.

Therefore, this book gives not the broader and critical presentation of any philosopher's views but uses their own words, aptly expressing my intuitions. Also, I think a quote increases my reasoning credibility; it proves that not only I have this position. I hope that despite the multitude of quotes, sticking to the main – clearly outlined – the book's idea will allow a synthetic, not an eclectic approach to the whole issue. The purpose of this book is then to present a coherent vision of all reality. It is not essentially a polemical work, although certainly many of the statements in it are controversial. It cannot be otherwise when you enter the area of disputes that have been going on for centuries, raise problems that find many different solutions, and stand for some of them. Therefore, I do not enter into a discussion with other views, as this would require separate studies. However, sometimes – in favor of some solutions – I give arguments against other theories. Nevertheless, this is not the main content of this work. With this approach, it is necessary to cover many issues in a simplified manner or not to include certain positions. One just cannot do it in a book of limited volume; the more so that it is intended for a wide range of readers. That does not mean, however, that I did not see these simplifications or other possible solutions, but a critical analysis of various theories is not the purpose of this work. The goal is to create a system, especially:

- to give a concise but consistent and logical description of all reality, explain the world in a simple way, answer the most important philosophical questions; to find or build a dualistic philosophy and to find this dualism in the most important areas of philosophy,
- outline the philosophical basics of psychology.

¹ According to the Polish translation. Explanation: because I have written my book in Poland, it was difficult to reach the originals of some books written in English and translated into Polish. So sometimes it happened that I again translated the Polish translation of the English original into English. Therefore my text for sure is different from the original. I always point this out in a footnote writing: "According to the Polish translation". However, the sense is certainly the same.

That is undoubtedly a difficult task, mainly because of the vast literature on the problem. One cannot read everything nor have time to think it through thoroughly. Nevertheless, I decided that I knew the primary literature on the subject, and I could try to draw more general conclusions. The broadest outlines of the proposed picture of reality seem quite logical and justified, as well as based on the philosophy with hundreds of years of tradition.

I must admit that I feel a bit unsatisfied with looking through psychology textbooks. Each of them contains a description of the most important researches, theories, and concepts in a given field of psychology. Presenting many positions is needed, but you also need a reference point for your thinking and actions: someone has to be believed. So I'll try a different way: from these theories, to pick what is most important and aptly named and create one coherent system. Coherent, and at the same time, open to all other claims and observations from all psychological schools and practically from any book in the field of psychology. Therefore, the main criterion for the truthfulness of the proposed theses is their consistency. System thinking is not popular in philosophy today; the art of asking questions rather than answering is preferred, but systems still seem to be needed because a human person needs a holistic, coherent vision of reality.

Leon Festinger, an American social psychologist (1919-1989), is the creator of the theory of cognitive dissonance, which indicates that we are striving to remove contradictions in our image of the world. So I'll try to present a consistent and fairly extensive picture of reality, with particular emphasis on what the psychologist needs. Of course, it is impossible to write a book that satisfactorily answers all questions, solve all problems, and end all disputes. That is certainly not the case. Each author has its own – of various types – limitations. Nevertheless, from all the answers, suggestions, and positions, I chose those that seemed to be the most accurate and justified, and in addition, formed a whole.

The book is also supposed to be about psychology; that is why all its chapters end with a proposal to apply the presented philosophical solutions to psychology, including specific empirical research. Undoubtedly, many of them have already been carried out, but with different theoretical foundations.

Which philosophical problems can be considered particularly important, both in philosophy and in relation to psychology? The following can be mentioned:

1. Theory of knowledge. Its main questions are:

- What does "knowing" mean?
- What is knowledge?
- What is science?
- What are we getting to know?
- How is the image of reality created?
- What is the truth?
- How can we find out that our picture of reality is real? That is a question about truth criteria.
- What does our image of reality consist of?
- What does it mean to be aware of something?

2. Theory of being. Main questions:

- What is being?
- What is existence?
- What is the structure of being? What does what exists consist of?
- What makes something exist? Why does something exist at all?
- How can something exist?
- What is the difference between mental and real beings?
- What makes our life change?
- What is development?

3. Philosophical anthropology. Philosophy of human person:

- Who is a human being?
- Where did human being come from: by accident or by deliberate action?
- What is the structure of a human being? What does he/she consist of?
- What is "me" and what is "mine" in me?
- What determines human behavior?
- What is the cause and purpose of a human being?
- Is there life after the death of the body?
- What is the meaning of human life?
- What is the soul?
- What makes you change?
- What are the causes of human development?

4. Social philosophy:

- What does it mean that a human being is a social being?
- What creates a bond (community) between people?
- What is the impact of the environment on self-image and the identity of the individual?
- What makes individuals become a group?
- What is the law?
- What (who) creates the law?
- What is the relationship between human rights and obligations?

5. Philosophy of nature:

- What is the beginning of the world?
- Why does nature exist?
- What makes nature change?
- What is the meaning of all that exists, and what is happening?
- Does the world have a beginning, meaning, and purpose?
- Is there a purpose in nature?
- Where do the laws of nature come from?
- What is life?
- What is time?
- How did the diversity of living beings come about?
- What is evolution?
- Is the theory of evolution well justified?

6. Philosophy of God:

- Who is called God?
- Does God exist?
- What is God like?
- Why is there evil?

The above questions will be answered in this order. The starting point of the philosophy is – in addition to the initial assumptions – observation of some fact, the occurrence of a phenomenon, the existence of something, and the question: "why is it possible?", "what must be, or what existence should be assumed to explain a given phenomenon (a given fact)?", "without what it would not be possible?" That is a question about the beginning (source, motive) and end (goal). We observe the effects and look for their causes – this is a science-making process. However, science is content to find rather direct causes, while philosophy – though not every philosophy – is looking for the first cause.

Therefore, we will start with the analysis of cognition because it is beyond doubt that a human person knows the world and that everyone has an image of this world. Philosophy provides the most important rules for shaping this image correctly.