

# Beyond “Nature” and “God”

*Xin Yan Z.*

[zyx@live.de](mailto:zyx@live.de)

## **Abstract**

With this article, the author argues that in reality nothing is or isn't itself, that everything is both a relative proof and an absolute proof of God's existence, and that our language, such as “nature” or “god”, is the only obstacle between Nature and God.

## **Keywords**

Metaphysics; Ontology; Nominalism; Language; Cosmos; Life; Mind; God; OC

Please find the older and the newest version (17.07.2021) of this article from:

<https://philarchive.org/rec/ZHABQA>

## **Contents:**

[Introduction](#)

[The OC](#)

[OC in different languages](#)

1. [Ontology](#)
2. [Epistemology](#)
3. [Axiology](#)
4. [Logic](#)
5. [Mathematics](#)
6. [Language](#)
7. [Time](#)
8. [Science](#)
9. [Cosmos](#)
10. [Life](#)
11. [Mind](#)
12. [Humanity](#)

[Conclusion](#)

## Introduction

If there is something that may be called as “knowing” or “doing”, there must be something that may be called as “understanding”. In other words, if there are both knowing and doing, there must be an understanding intermediating between them.

Knowing may not be called as “knowing” if doing may not as “doing”.

A knowing or a doing is not, but an understanding is always a creating.

The unity or the interdependence of knowing, understanding and doing may be called as either “humanity” or “God”, or as neither “humanity” nor “God”. <sup>(1)</sup>

If it may be called as either “humanity” or “God”, then, knowing and doing are only communications between humanity and God, and they are therefore not proofs, at least not ontological proofs. And *creating is the only ontological proof of humanity as humanity or God as God.*

God’s understanding finally creates something called by us as “reality”. Human’s understanding finally creates something called by us as “ontology”, as “language”, or as “the unity of ontology and language”.

All kinds of religions are created as such unity.

All kinds of philosophies are created as such unity.

All kinds of logic and mathematics are created as such unity.

All kinds of sciences are created as such unity.

Even all kinds of persons, families, societies, nations and cosmos are created as such unity.

Ontology is the only meaning of all their languages.

Reality is also the unity of ontology and language. There might be differences in language but there

should be only one ontology as ontology, as the only meaning of any and all languages.

This ontology might be conceptualized and symbolized as “OC”.<sup>(2)</sup>

If OC is the only meaning of “OC”, it is an ontology.

If OC is an ontology, it is the only ontology.

If OC is the only ontology, it is the only meaning of reality.

Footnotes -----

(1) The unity of knowing, understanding and doing is a universal existence. It may be found at least from every cell of any plant, any animal and any human body. There is always a creative understanding at the end of any knowing or doing, not only inside but also outside us. There is no understanding possibly inside us if no understanding possibly outside us.

(2) The term, “OC”, appeared first in my book, *The Ontology of Nature or God* (2020, [Amazon kindle book ASIN: B08NC1VBVL](#) or [Google Book GGKEY:2RCWWU73239](#)) and *Be Human in the Paradis* (Google book [GGKEY:GQ7SA3L4HBE.pdf](#) or Amazon kindle book [B00IHE5QS2](#)), in which the O is an abbreviation of Parmenides’ One and the C is an abbreviation of Heraclitus’ Change. Though the term remains the same, such literal connection has been given up in this article since the O is also experienceable as the C.

## The OC

The OC itself is nothing more or less than change or change's change.

The OC may be described or defined as the unity or the oneness of an O and a C, since any change as change always means both of them. In other words, the O may be a description of certain change, the C may be a description of other change, but their unity or oneness must be the explanation, the only ontological explanation of any change as change.

OC is therefore an ontological prediction that says that *neither any O change nor any C change may ever exist by itself*.

The O may be described or defined as a return change without the same direction, and the C as a one-way change with the same direction. And an entity, such as a cosmos, a particle, a life, a human or a society, is always a part of both an O change and a C change. In other words, no one has ever had experience of substance or entities. O and C are our only experiences we get from our knowing and doing.<sup>(3)</sup>

The O change may be described or defined with non-deterministic concepts such as “relativity”, “contingency”, “finiteness”, “discontinuity”, “symmetry”, “reversibility”, “divisibility”, “consistency” or “perfection”. And the C change may be described or defined with deterministic concepts such as “absolute”, “necessity”, “infinity”, “continuity”, “asymmetry”, “irreversibility”, “indivisibility”, “open” and “transcendence”.

And the O change may also be described or defined as reciprocal or circular causality, and the C change as irreversible causality, since the C does not allow an effect to become its own cause but the O does.

For example, all what Thales' “water”, Anaximenes' “air”, Empedocles' “four elements” and even Pythagoras' “number” tell us are reciprocal or circular causality. What Anaximander said, “from what source things arise, to that they return of necessity when they are destroyed; for they suffer punishment and make reparation to one another for their injustice according to the order of time”, and what Heraclitus said, “fire

lives the death of earth, and air the death of fire; water lives the death of air, earth that of water”, are also reciprocal or circular causality. So are Leucippus and Democritus’ “atoms” and Leibniz’s “monads”. And so are Heraclitus’ “logos”, Socrates’ “totality”, Plato’s “forms” and Aristotle’s “categories”, Spinoza’s “God or Nature”, Kant’s “thing-in-itself”, Hegel’s “Absolute”, Schopenhauer’s “sufficient reason”, Kierkegaard’s “individual human being”, Nietzsche’s “eternal recurrence”, Frege’s “pure logic”, Russell’s logical atomism, Wittgenstein’s “language games”, Husserl’s “intentionality”, Heidegger’s “Dasein”, Quine’s “ontological commitment”, Habermas’ “communicative rationality” and Kuhn’s “scientific paradigm”.<sup>(4)</sup>

All self-consistent concepts and theories, such as those in mathematics and logic, say only reciprocal or circular causality.

All the entities described by science, all the particles described by the standard model of particle physics, all the conservation laws and symmetry in physics, including the uncertainty in quantum mechanics<sup>(5)</sup>, including the concept of “string” or “loop”, including the so-called “quantum fluctuations”, say only the reciprocal or circular causality. So is either Carnot cycle or Noether’s theorem.

What called as “the conservation of information” says only the reciprocal or circular causality.

All those biological theories that deny the directivity in biological evolution say only the reciprocal or circular causality.

All what called by us as “an individual human being” says only the reciprocal or circular causality.

The “justice”, the central idea discussed in Plato’s *Republic*, and many other political or sociological concepts, such as “freedom”, “equality” and “democracy”, say also reciprocal or circular causality.

The OC means the equality among all reciprocal or circular causalities, or the equality among all equalities. In other words, the “OC” means to tell us that, in reality, not as Parmenides thought, there is nothing that is or isn’t itself.<sup>(6)</sup>

(3) Monism is not a good explanation of substance, and dualism is not a good explanation of properties. And they do not tolerate each other. Foundationalism is a good language but never a good explanation of reality.

(4) Definitions and discussions of the concepts mentioned in this paragraph can be found from every comprehensive book about Western Philosophy. And, for a definition of Thomas Kuhn's "scientific paradigm", please refer to his book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, 1962, 1970, 1996 and 2012.

(5) If quantum state may be understood as the O change, what called as "wave function collapse" should then be understood as the C change. The many-worlds interpretation says only the O change, not an interpretation of the irreversibility of the C. And it is the same misunderstanding to put an irreversible causality between certain superposition state and the state of Schrödinger's cat.

(6) Here "is" means the O, and "isn't" means the C. What Parmenides said, "the thing that can be thought and that for the sake of which the thought exists is the same; for you cannot find thought without something that is, as to which it is uttered" (John Burnet. *Early Greek Philosophy*, 3rd ed., London: A & C Black, 1920), did not say anything about existence itself but means only that language must follow the logistic law of identity, noncontradiction and excluded middle. From philosophers in ancient Greece to physicists in today's world, "A=A" is always what wanted, sought, believed and worshipped. However, the OC, what the "OC" means, is not a language but the existence itself, the unity of the past, the present and the future.

## OC in different languages

OC also means the equality between “OC” and all other languages. In other words, the “OC” alone is never enough to tell the OC.

### 1. Ontology <sup>(7)</sup>

Reality = OC, but OC  $\neq$  reality, since reality  $\neq$  reality.

Ontologically, words such as “Being”, “being” and “to be” mean only what the “O” means. The C determines however that nothing may ever end in itself, neither nature nor humanity nor logos nor God.

Existence is never the O alone or the C alone. OC means that the O and the C are one and the same thing. Therefore, *there is no causality between the O and the C*. And, therefore, the history should not be explained as Hegel did, the evolution should not be explained as Darwin did, the cosmic origin should not be explained as Edward Tryon did, the social progress should not be explained as Karl Marx did, and the scientific progress should not be explained as Thomas Kuhn did. The O can never explain the directionality of the C.

OC means that no O may be a cause without cause or an effect without effect. Therefore, no ultimate concern, neither religious nor physical, is possible. And, therefore, there is no ontological difference between religious believers’ gods and physicists’ elementary particles.

And OC also means that we may still know and do a lot more with our O, but never more than the O. In other words, we may never change the C, no matter how much we may know or do.

Footnotes -----

(7) The O is an attribute. The C is an attribute. Ontology is not about any attribute but about the existence of attributes, about the structure of existence. And the OC, as I understand, is the only structure of existence, which means that the O is C’s attribute and the C is also O’s attribute. Other ideas about existence may be found from: van Inwagen, Peter and Meghan Sullivan,



"Metaphysics", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2020/entries/metaphysics/>.

## 2. Epistemology <sup>(8)</sup>

Knowledge is always relative, always about certain relative divide and relative relations within the O of our OC. And the C of our OC is the only way to get us out of solipsism.

There is no objective truth or subjective truth, not as monists thought. There is only relative truth of the O and absolute truth of the C, and, still, the O and the C are one and the same truth.

*Subjectivity and objectivity may only together be the relative truth of the O.*

Inductive reasoning is the way to approach the relative truth of the O, but never the absolute truth of the C. And synthetic judgment is only the way to express the relative truth of the O, but never the absolute truth of the C.

Either experience or logos may bring us nothing more or less than the relative truth of the O. Therefore, the practicability and the provability of science have no ontological meaning.

Ontology may never be our knowledge or *priori* knowledge.

Footnotes -----

(8) What called as Kant's epistemology are processes that may be found from every single cell in every living organism. Please refer to the HOS described in [section 10](#). All what we may create are only some relative relations within the O of our OC, not "general laws of nature", not as Kant thought. Please refer to Rohlf, Michael, "Immanuel Kant", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2020/entries/kant/>.

## 3. Axiology <sup>(9,10)</sup>

OC means that value is only a part of the O, that truth, virtue or beauty is only a part of the O, and that C

is the limitation of value as value, truth as truth, virtue as virtue or beauty as beauty.

OC means that freedom, equality and fraternity are one and the same thing, nothing more or less than the O of OC.

The OC means to say that *the C should be the only source of our happiness.*

Footnotes -----

(9) Axiology is only a different language for ontology. The C of OC determines that there is no universal and eternal value for us. A general discussion about the axiology or the theory of value and may be found from: Schroeder, Mark, "Value Theory", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2021 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/value-theory/>.

(10) OC means that there are two kinds of morality: the O as the relative morality and the C as the absolute morality. Neither moral subjectivist, such as David Hume, nor moral realist, such as George Edward Moore, has ever caught fully the moral meanings of the OC. Please refer to: Hume, David, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Express, 2000). And Moore, G.E., *Principia Ethica*, ed. Thomas Baldwin (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

#### 4. Logic

OC means that *the O is the only ontological basis of logic.*<sup>(11)</sup>

Any proof as proof, no matter if it is of logic or of mathematics or of scientific observation and experiment, is nothing more than an O funded, enabled and driven by the C.

Footnotes -----

(11) Our logic is based on O but our reality is OC. This is the tragedy of Western Philosophy for more 2500 years. And it is

also a tragedy to scientists who believe the physicalism and to physicists who try to find the theory of everything and to mathematicians who try to find the final mathematics for quantum field theory.

## 5. Mathematics <sup>(12)</sup>

OC means that *the O is the only basis of any number or number system. And, therefore, number or number system has no ontological basis.*

Different numbers or different number systems are different divisions of the O. Number or number system is not possible if without such division or with infinitive division.

All what geometry deals with are also divisions of the O.

The C of OC determines that, ontologically, no number or mathematics may ever complete itself as an O. All numbers or mathematical systems must be limited and open. Zero may not always be zero, and no number may always be the same.

The C must be the only origin of Kurt Gödel's incompleteness theorem.

Footnotes -----

(12) The C of OC determines that there is a limit or a fundamental inability hiding in mathematics. Experimental physicists will find it one day.

## 6. Language

OC means that *nothing may or may not be language, that no language carries semantic meaning<sup>(13)</sup>, and that no language as language is analyzable.*

All abstract concepts mean concrete to the C and all concrete concepts mean abstract to the O. <sup>(14)</sup>

Therefore, the OC is the only concept that is more abstract than any abstract concept and more concrete than any concrete concept as well.

No language may ever complete itself as an O.

Footnotes -----

(13) For example: Being or “being” may be both being and “being” but certainly not the same being or “being”. Maybe, physics and metaphysics are only different languages. Maybe, metaphysics is only the language about the beginning, the end and the boundary of the field in which any logical language is possible. That is, no language as language may exist by itself.

(14) Therefore, neither realism nor nominalism is possible, at least not as Goodman and Quine thought. Please refer to: Goodman, N., & Quine, W. (1947). Steps toward a constructive nominalism. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 12(4), 105-122. doi:10.2307/2266485

## 7. Time

There is no time outside the unity or the oneness of O and C. <sup>(15)</sup>

Every OC has its own time and clock. The C is the O’s time, and the O is the C’s clock. The O is dividable but the C not; the O may remain at the same speed but the C not. And no clock may ever explain the directionality of the C.

What called as “time” in Einstein’s special theory of relativity is only the frequency of a clock or the relative relation between two clocks.

McTaggart’s A properties are also relations and his B relations are also properties. <sup>(16)</sup> *All properties are relations within the O.*

Footnotes -----

(15) OC means that none or nothing may exist at the present.

(16) Definition of and discussion on John M.E. McTaggart's ideas on time may be found from: Emery, Nina, Ned Markosian, and Meghan Sullivan, "Time", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/time/>.

## 8. Science

OC can never be found or proved by science. And *the O is the only thing that scientists may know and can do.*<sup>(17)</sup> Different areas of science are based on different divisions of the O.

Different divisions of the O mean different subjective and objective properties. And those subjective and objective properties are interdependent and interchangeable. For example, both the subjective and the objective properties involved in Einstein's relativity are just opposite to those involved in quantum mechanics.

Either holism or reductionism is such division. And no such division means any ontological difference.

OC also means that, no matter how much scientists may know or do with the O, they may never change the C.

The C of OC is the only conservation of our reality, and the only origin of all CP violations in particle physics and cosmology.

*The C of OC is the only way to get us out of essentialism.*

Footnotes -----

(17) Both, the observer and what observed, the experimenter and what experimented, are always relative parts of an O of our OC. All what we may know is also knowledge about ourselves, all what we can do is also actions on ourselves, and all what we create is also creation of ourselves. Physicalism or scientism is nothing more than a faith in O.

## 9. Cosmos

Our cosmos is an OC. In other words, both its space and all the entities in the space are the unity or the oneness of O change and C change.

As O change, our cosmos may also be divided into four phases. One of the four phases may be understood as a pure energy without any dimension, and its opposite phase as a pure matter with only dimensions. There is no temperature difference in either of them. And therefore, they are the limits of thermodynamics and its directionality.

And there are two phases between pure energy and pure matter, through one of which pure energy becomes pure matter, and through another pure matter becomes pure energy.

The phase from pure energy to pure matter consists of dual energy and dual matter, both of which appear as both energy and matter at the same time.<sup>(18)</sup> If compared, the dual energy may appear faster, hotter, more changeful, more microscopic, more unified or simpler, more synchronous, more symmetrical, more evenly and equally distributed, etc., while the dual matter the contrary.

Dual energy is the more microscopic explanation of everything and dual matter is the more macroscopic explanation of everything. Everything in the phase from pure energy to pure matter may be explained only when explained both microscopically and macroscopically. Nothing alone is the explanation of anything.

The C of OC is however the only explanation of the phase from pure energy to pure matter, *the only explanation of its beginning and end, and the only explanation why it changes from one dimension to more and different dimensions.*<sup>(19)</sup>

(18) “The phase from pure energy to pure matter” means that it is ontologically possible that our cosmos may begin without any elementary particle.

(19) Cosmos’ “big bang”, “inflation” and “accelerated expansion” may all be understood as the increase and the differentiation of its dimensions. And the only comparable differences between “space” and “dark matter”, or between “visible matter” and “black hole”, are that the latter has more dimensions than the former. And the Hubble constant may not be the same if the dimensions of our cosmos are not everywhere the same.

## **10. Life**

A cosmos is always a life but a life is not always a cosmos. In other words, a life is always an OC.

Theoretically, life may be understood as the O change, as paired dual energy and dual matter that change into each other, as the dynamic equilibrium of their changes, and as relativity, contingency, finite, reversibility, divisibility, symmetry, discontinuity and consistency of the dynamic equilibrium. However, in reality, a life is always the unity or the oneness of the O and the C. In other words, there is always a death in the distance waiting for each and every life.

There are two kinds of lives in the phase from pure energy to pure matter, with opposite directions of their C or towards different deaths in the distance. The one following the direction of the phase may be called as “autumn life”, and the one following the contrary direction may be called as “spring life”.

Since autumn lives dominate the phase from pure energy to pure matter, it may also be called as “autumn universe” or “U. Autumn”. And the U. Autumn is one and the only home for plants, animals and humans.

A spring life consumes dual matter and creates dual energy, while an autumn life consumes dual energy and creates dual matter.

It may be called as “heat death” when a spring life loses all its dual matter, and “cold death” when an autumn life loses all its dual energy. The dual matter left after the cold death of an autumn life may be called as “frozen”. The so-called non-living matters, such as protons, neutrons or atomic nuclei, are all such frozons, deeply frozen by their environment.

The origin of autumn life is always a result of the emergence of certain dual energy, and the origin of spring life the emergence of certain dual matter.

Both herbivores and carnivores are autumn lives, so are human beings. The direction from pure energy to pure matter is the fate of all autumn lives. The most natural death of a person or an animal or a plant is always a cold death.

This direction also determines that there are three generations of spring and autumn lives existing at different periods of the U. Autumn. The generation that emerges at its beginning may be called as “life of high energy”, the generation at its ending may be called as “life of high matter”, and the generation between them both may be called as “life of high organization”. All plants, animals and human beings are derivatives of the life of high organization.

Typically, a life of high energy is composed of dual energy almost like pure energy and dual matter with only one dimension. Typically, a life of high matter is composed of dual matter almost like the pure matter and dual energy close to the thermodynamic absolute zero. And a life of high organization is different from either of them.

Lives of high energy arose on the frozons created by pure energy. Lives of high organization arise on the frozons created by lives of high energy. And lives of high matter will arise on the frozons created by lives of high organization. This is the kinship among all lives during the U. Autumn.

Lives of high energy depend on energy, lives of high matter depend on matter, and all lives of high organization depend on the organization of both dual energy and dual matter for their occurrence, existence and development. The basic units of their organization may be called as “high organization system” or “HOS”.

The HOS may be divided into four parts and called as “input part”, “output part”, “react part” and “feedback part”. And there are three changes that may ever occur in a HOS, called as “life change”, “form change” and “location change”. Location change may be found in any part of a HOS, form change mainly in input and output parts, and life change only in react part.

Brain’s activities cannot be explained only with neurotransmitters and nerve impulses, since impulse moving along a nerve or neurotransmitter released from a synapse is only the location change, and that nerve impulse converts into neurotransmitter or vice versa is only the form change. The interactivities and the interchanges between consciousness and memory are all life changes.

Dual matter or dual energy that enters the input part of a HOS may be called as “sensation”, that leaves



the output part may be called as “behavior”, and that remains within HOS, being neither input nor output, may be called as “memory”. And there are two kinds of memory in every HOS, called as “hereditary memory” and “acquired memory”.

The HOS, with biological macromolecules such as sugar, fat, protein and nucleic acid as its components and environment, may be called as “biological HOS”. In a biological HOS, the hereditary memory is its structures determined by gene and the acquired memory is its structures determined by the interaction between the HOS and its environment.

If the sensation and the behavior appear as dual energy, the memory will appear as dual matter, which may be called as a HOS with “EME system relation”. And, if the memory appears as dual energy, the sensation and the behavior will appear as dual matter, which may be called as a HOS with “MEM system relation”.

The HOS with both system relations may be called as “complex HOS”. Human mind is such a complex HOS.

A HOS may exchange dual matter or energy with others, called as “communication”. *No information is conveyed during such communication since information is nothing that can exist out of the context of the system relations.* <sup>(20)</sup>

Both the lives of high energy and the lives of high matter mean that large biological molecules are not the limits of life. Life may arise from any kind of frozons. And the HOS means that biological entities, such as cells or bodies, are not the limits of biological life. Biological life may arise from an environment that is neither a cell nor a biological body.

Without a full understanding of the directionality, the life, the frozon, the kinship, the HOS and its system relations, it is impossible for us to explain the origin of species or their evolution.

Footnotes -----

(20)  $OC \neq$  information, and, therefore, there is no information existing in the reality of our world and ourselves. What called as “information” or “computation” may be understood only as the relative relation within the O of OC. However, the C of OC determines that no O may ever complete itself as an O.

## 11. Mind

A mind is always an OC, a life, especially a complex HOS that follows the direction of U. Autumn. The direction of U. Autumn is therefore the fate of every human mind.

As U. Autumn, a mind is composed of components that may be divided into four categories. Among all of them, consciousness and behavior are dual energy that is more like the pure energy, hereditary memory is dual matter that is more like the pure matter, subconscious is dual energy that is less like the pure energy and acquired memory is dual matter that is less like the pure matter.

Mind does not accomplish anything that may be called as “ego”, “self” or “soul”, since all of which are only different names of the O. In other words, *mind only accomplishes OC*.

Different from behavior, consciousness is the dual energy produced by the activities of spring lives in mind, and may be neither input into mind nor output out of mind. The dual energy of sensation from sense organs may initiate or influence the production of consciousness but may never become the consciousness itself. In other words, *the mind is just producing it whenever consciousness appears.* <sup>(21)</sup>

Consciousness by itself does not sense or feel or will, does not remember or recall, and does not start a body action. The activities of consciousness are never the same as what “I think” or “I think something” or “I think myself” means, not as Descartes or Husserl thought. In other words, *consciousness is neither subjective nor objective nor both subjective and objective*.

Subconscious is the consciousness interacting with memories, not what as Sigmund Freud thought.

Memory is the dual matter that appears as the mind’s structure. All mind’s structures are its memories. The hereditary memory is the mind’s structures produced as the results of the gene-determined interactions among different cells, and the acquired memory is the mind’s structures produced as the results of the interactions between a mind and its environment.

As a complex HOS, the human mind is the EME system relation between sense organs and motor organs, and the MEM system relation among inner organs. As the unity of both system relations, the human mind may have the dynamic organization shown as below in Figure (1).




Figure (1) Mind's general organizational relation

The areas between the peripheral circle and the central circle are mind's hereditary parts, and within the central circle are mind's acquired parts. Area 0 is CM. Area 1, 2 and 3 are EM, SM and BM. Area 4 to 9 are all IB. And the cloud stripe between SB's hereditary part and acquired part is where consciousness is produced.

A human mind may be divided into seven parts: a sense brain (SB), an emotion brain (EB), a behavior brain (BB), three intermediate brains (IB) and a feedback brain (FB). SB has more direct connections with the sense organs that compose the surface of the body. BB has more direct connections with the skeletal muscles. EB has more direct connections with inner organs. IB has more direct connections with SB, EB and BB. And FB has more direct connection with all the hereditary parts.

Each mental brain is composed of a hereditary part and an acquired part, the structures of either hereditary or acquired memories. The acquired memories that are not shared among mental brains are called as SM, EM, BM and IM, and the shared are called as "central memory" or CM. CM is where consciousness and acquired memory interact with each other.

The interaction between consciousness and hereditary memory determines our hereditary behaviors or instincts. The interaction between consciousness and acquired memory determines our acquired behaviors or intelligence.

What created in CM by the interaction between consciousness and acquired memories may be called as "thought". The same as consciousness and memory, thought, as a whole, may be neither input into mind nor output out of mind.

There are communications among SB, EB and BB. Through the communications, a man's thought, even though his language is not its component or the relation among its components, may be translated or interpreted part by part by BB or EB, and then output as his language or behavior. In other words, one's language as language never joins one's thought, and the meaning of language or behavior never leaves one's thought, since there is no semantic information exchanged during those communications. In other words, *analyzing the structure of one's language may never be the same as analyzing his thought.* <sup>(22)</sup>

Language or behavior output from EB is called as "hereditary expression" and from BB is called as "acquired expression". Hereditary expression is the language or the behavior with which humans may communicate with not only other humans but also some other animals.

*The body may be understood as the present of a mind. And the mind may be understood as both the past and the future of a body.* In other words, the relationship between mind and body is the one between the C and the O of OC.

The power of a human mind is its transcendence, the knowing and the doing beyond spatial and temporal limitation of the body. And the body-mind relation might be that the present acts on the past, to create together the future.

Our knowing or doing is always a relation within the O of an OC. Neither of them exists completely inside or outside of the mind. In other words, our knowing or doing is one event that happens both inside and outside of a mind at the same time. All our knowledge about the world is also the knowledge about ourselves. All what we may change in the world are also changes of ourselves at the same time.

If a mind is an OC, the C of the OC determines that there is a direction of what the mind may know or do, just as there is a direction for every autumn life and every U. Autumn. And we may never really understand our minds if we do not really understand this directionality.

And, as the OC, nature or God has all what a mind has, the consciousness, the behavior, the hereditary or the acquired memory, and the relations among them.

(21) The fundamental principles of consciousness are the same as those of a TV set. When we watch a TV program, the light emitted from TV screen is the same as our consciousness. The dual energy of the light is produced by the TV set even though the production is somehow controlled by incoming TV signals. Everything we see in the light are not those things themselves, neither objective nor subjective nor both objective and subjective.

(22) One of the differences between thought and language is that thought always creates itself but language never. Please refer to: Rescorla, Michael, "The Language of Thought Hypothesis", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2019/entries/language-thought/>>.

## 12. Humanity

Humanity is always a part of an OC. The O of our OC is more macroscopic than elementary particles and more microscopic than the cosmos. The C of our OC determines that humanity exists as the extreme of the past and the future together. In other words, *humanity is the extreme of OC.* <sup>(23)</sup>

Just as a cosmos or a particle may never end in itself or in God, humanity may never end in itself or in God, neither as Kant thought nor as Kierkegaard thought. And humanity even did not begin from itself or from God.

As an OC, humanity is always more and less, larger and smaller, more complex and simpler, longer and shorter than a beginning or an end or a self. In other words, a beginning is never the beginning, an end is never the end, and also, a self is never humanity itself.

If freedom is said as the essence of humanity, it means only the equality between the C and the O, the equality among all the OC and among all equalities.

If intellect is said as the feature of humanity, it means only the equality between the C and the O, among all the OC and among all equalities.

If morality is said as the difference of humanity, it means only the equality between the C and the O, among all the OC and among all equalities.

And if poetry is said as the uniqueness of humanity, it should also mean the equality between the C and the O, the equality among all the OC, and the equality among all equalities.

Such an equality is the only way for us to get out of anthropocentrism. In other words, the C of OC is the only way for us to get out of birth and death, the only way for us to find ourselves.

Footnotes -----

(23) Egocentrism is nothing more than a faith in O. However, the O is never our reality. And only from the O or a self we may never find the meaning or the value of our lives, the same sense as what Wittgenstein wrote, “the sense of the world must lie outside of it”. See: Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, pp. 6.41, (available with its German origin and two English translations at: <http://people.umass.edu/klement/tlp/tlp.pdf>)

## **Conclusion**

Neither the C alone nor the O alone may ever defend or deny the existence of God.

What Stoicism said, “God in everything”, means the same as what the O means. So is what Plotinus said, “God as the One”, and what Augustine said, “God is the eternal truth”. So is all what Anselm said, “the best, highest, greatest and perfect one”. So are what Avicenna, Maimonides and Aquinas said, “the first cause” or other “proofs”. <sup>(24)</sup>

And OC is the only way through which we might understand the existence of God.

The O only tells us God’s creativity and originality. It is the C that may help us to understand eventually God’s absoluteness, eternity, perfection and limitlessness, including God’s omniscience, omnipotence, absolute freedom and independence.

All facts say only the relative truth of the O. God is however more or less than facts.

Either a start or an end says only the relative truth of the O. God is however more or less than any start or end.

All entities say only the relative truth of the O. God is however more or less than an entity.

A self says only the relative truth of the O. God is more or less than a self.

God may not be understood as either a one or more than one. The one says only the relative truth of an O and the more only the divides of the same O.

God may not be understood only as truth, goodness, beauty and perfect, all of which are only parts of the O. So are untruth, badness, ugliness and imperfect.

God may not be understood only as the maximal greatness, which, as part of the O, only sets limit to God’s greatness.

It is a misunderstanding to say that God is or is not the first cause.

It is a misunderstanding to say that God changes or remains the same.

It is a misunderstanding to say that God acts or not, create or not, is or is not the creator or the destroyer of things and humans.

*It is also a misunderstanding to say that God is or is not us.*

There is nothing that is or is not God, since nothing is or isn't itself.

God, the eternal creation!

Our language is certainly the only obstacle between us and God, between us and Nature, and between us and ourselves.

Footnotes -----

(24) God has been described as an O by all monotheistic religions. But, as an O, God's absoluteness, eternity, perfection, omniscience, omnipotence, freedom and independence are then limited.