

No Form Action Theory

Author: Hongbo Sun

contents

No Form Action Theory	1
1. Preamble	1
2. Introduction	2
2.1. Can science unravel the mystery of consciousness?	2
2.2. The wrong dualism	7
3. Core points	22
3.1. Two-dimensional theory: form and no form	22
3.2. Three actions of no form: manifestation, isolation and motive force	27
3.3. The relationship between the three actions of no form(in progress, please wait!)	65
4. Different worlds	65
4.1. Manifestation world, motive force world and isolation world (in progress, please wait!)	65
4.2. Language isolation world (in progress, please wait!)	65
5. being of isolation, being of motive force, and being of manifestation(in progress, please wait!)	65
6. Freedom (in progress, please wait!)	65
7. Consciousness(in progress, please wait!)	65
8. Dialectics(in progress, please wait!)	65
9. Logic(in progress, please wait!)	65
10. Aesthetics(in progress, please wait!)	65
11. Physics(in progress, please wait!)	65

1. Preamble

What is "no form"? The simplest answer is: if Aristotle discovered form, then I discovered "no form". To be precise, Aristotle was able to understand and use form effectively, and I also understood and used "no form" effectively. The biggest problem for Aristotle and other philosophers is that they did not figure out what "no form" is. This is also a defect in philosophy from then until now. Until now, the philosophy that people study is still based on the philosophy

of form. Almost no one studies things without form, or they don't understand what "no form" is. Because according to Aristotle's way, it is impossible to obtain an understanding of no form.

The no form action theory is a set of philosophical theories that I formed in the process of studying consciousness. I was inspired by computers and programming languages around 2013 and formed the rudiment of no form action theory. It was not until 2019 that I had a new breakthrough. It has been 10 years since then. The most gratifying thing now is the advent of epoch-making AI like new bing, which makes me originally plan to study for another 5 to 10 years before publishing the no form action theory. And now I feel that one year is enough. Because it can quickly help me do a lot of things, it can communicate with me about my no form action theory, and it will raise very clear and relevant questions.

Because there is no single word in English that can accurately express this highest-level no form action, I invented the English word "noformation" with the help of new bing to express the no form action. This is necessary, because this word is too important, so a dedicated English word must be created to express it.

A valuable philosophical theory must be able to solve difficult problems. The no form action theory can solve the following problems: What is consciousness? Including the mind-body problem, the qualia problem, what is self? What is freedom? How is logic generated? What is dialectics? What is the essence of beauty? What is space? What is time? What is motion and change? Quantum mechanics problems: quantum superposition and quantum entanglement (this problem must be discussed in metaphysics). It can be said that no form action is the most basic action in this world, the highest level of action. The mode of operation of everything in this world is based on the mode of no form, which is the most basic mode of operation of this world.

2. Introduction

2.1. Can science unravel the mystery of consciousness?

Consciousness is an ancient and mysterious topic that is both familiar and unfamiliar to each of us. We all operate and think under consciousness every day, but no one can clearly explain what consciousness is. Countless people have studied it since ancient times, but so far, no one has made fundamental breakthroughs in its research. To make breakthroughs in philosophy, we must make breakthroughs in consciousness research. Because if consciousness is compared to the light of a flashlight, then studying this world is like using a flashlight to examine the entire world. If we cannot make breakthroughs in consciousness research, both philosophy and science will have significant flaws because humans are only observing the things illuminated by the light of the flashlight, but cannot observe the light itself. This does not conform to the reflective spirit of philosophers, nor the exploratory spirit of scientists towards the real world. Therefore, we must start with the problem of consciousness. First, let's see if science can uncover the mystery of consciousness.

We all know that various aspects of human science have achieved considerable achievements. Humans have understood large celestial bodies such as black holes and galaxies, and even measured the age of the universe, which was previously unimaginable. We have also found tiny fundamental particles like quarks in the microscopic quantum world. The development of quantum theory has enabled humans to control matter to a very high level and create extremely sophisticated electronic devices. The development in this area is very fast, allowing humans to obtain high computing performance in a very small device. The improvement in computer and mobile phone performance has greatly improved people's lives. The success of genetics has enabled people to study human diseases, genetic traits, and behavior through large molecules such as DNA. These are just the tip of the iceberg, and human science seems to have infinite power to realize infinite dreams. All of these achievements were accomplished under the influence of human consciousness. People's understanding of the material world under the influence of consciousness has achieved such great success, but until now, we cannot gain breakthrough understanding of consciousness through understanding the material world. Currently, human understanding of consciousness should be zero breakthrough, and no clues

have been found to unlock the mystery of consciousness. Consciousness remains an unsolved mystery. The current situation of humans is that it is relatively easy to study matter from consciousness, but the reverse is difficult. This is an asymmetric relationship. How to explain this? Can we achieve the same brilliant achievements by studying consciousness through matter as we do by studying the material world through consciousness? How to explain the relationship between matter and consciousness? Can we find light by using a flashlight?

No form action theory is a philosophical theory I formed during my study of consciousness. The reason for developing a philosophical theory to explain consciousness is that I found modern science to be flawed in its study of consciousness. When I first started studying consciousness, I thought that I could trace the clues about consciousness from psychology and neuroscience and then figure out what consciousness is and how it is generated. However, I was wrong. From these disciplines you can only get descriptions of conscious behaviors, and the neural correlates of psychological activities, or or processes of mental activities. Even more detailed research, such as studying biological macromolecules, can only reveal more complex and refined material operations and processes. With more refinement, you will find molecules, atoms, electrons, and quarks. Other than the properties, behaviors and processes of these materials, you know nothing about what consciousness is. Is consciousness just some properties, behaviors, and processes? Obviously our consciousness has something else beyond these that we have not discovered.

First, we need to answer a question: what does it mean to unravel the mystery of consciousness? I believe it means answering the question, "What is consciousness?" This is the hard problem of consciousness.

How does science study consciousness? Currently, all methods for studying consciousness are either objective or subjective, or a combination of both.

Objective methods include: (1) observing and studying human behavior. Behaviorists believe that human behavior is a series of reactions caused by stimuli to the human body. They use the "stimulus-response" method to study human behavior in psychology, essentially abandoning the

study of consciousness and focusing only on behavior. The task of this psychology is to discover the causal relationship between stimuli and human responses.

(2) Studying the neural activity states and processes in the brain when a certain consciousness is generated, or even molecular-level states and processes. There are many studies in this area, such as which parts of the brain react when a consciousness is generated, which neurons are involved in this reaction, what kind of neural circuits are formed, and how neurotransmitters are transmitted, etc. That's all.

Subjective methods refer to introspective psychological methods, which report inner mental activities for research analysis to derive laws of psychological phenomena. Introspection acknowledges the existence of consciousness but only reveals the laws of psychological phenomena.

Neither of these methods can touch the essence of consciousness, so they are unable to ultimately understand consciousness. Even if the neural correlates of consciousness generation are found, and even if it is understood what kind of process these neural correlates go through to generate consciousness, how does consciousness manifest from such a process and in what way? Why does such a neural process and such consciousness-related matter produce consciousness? It seems that the gap between matter and consciousness is insurmountable. As Searle puts it more clearly: consciousness has a kind of first-person or subjective ontology, and therefore cannot be reduced to anything that has third-person or objective ontology.[1] According to Searle, consciousness only exists when it is experienced by a subjective person, that is, it exists subjectively. My understanding of his theory is that a certain state of matter produces consciousness, but apart from the matter that produces consciousness, there is no way for the outside world to know that this matter is conscious. We cannot objectively and directly touch consciousness, but can only indirectly understand it. This is the first confusion of consciousness. However, the more confusing question is, even if we can directly touch consciousness and objectively study it with scientific methods of observation and experimentation, can we know

what consciousness is? Isn't our study of matter objective? Don't we directly touch matter? Can anyone clearly tell me what matter is?

Edelman and Tononi's view is that "scientific explanations can provide sufficient and necessary conditions for the occurrence of a phenomenon, can explain the nature of the phenomenon, and can even explain why the phenomenon can only occur under these conditions. However, no scientific description or explanation can replace the real thing.[2]" This means that science has limitations. Even if we use science to explain consciousness, we can only describe consciousness without truly knowing what it is.

First, let's look at the nature of modern science and what it can do. Then analyze whether science can really uncover the mystery of consciousness. The scientific method is this: obtain some facts through observation and experimentation, deriving laws from these facts, proposing hypotheses, establishing formal models using mathematics, and finally validate the proposed laws, hypotheses and models through experiments - this is the scientific method, exemplified by Newton's law of universal gravitation, Einstein's theory of relativity, and quantum mechanics, among others. No matter how deep or complex the research using this method, the conclusions are ultimately phenomena, laws, and mathematical models. Science does not explain what the phenomena themselves are; laws and mathematical models are merely forms (including formal logic and causal relationships). Therefore, modern science cannot possibly study what our emotions are. For example, what is the essence of our conscious perception of the color red? Although modern psychology can understand how nutrients, hormones, and bacteria can affect human cognition and emotions, these are external influences, not the study of emotions themselves. As for "what emotions themselves are," modern science is still powerless.

However, science can indeed study and explore this world. Why is that? This shows that the scientific method itself reveals some mysteries of this world. The revelation of these mysteries is because science is based on form, and form is a component of the world. But merely studying

form is not enough; there must also be "no form" things. This is the subject of study for the no form action theory.

References

[1] Searle, J. *The Mystery of Consciousness*, translated by Liu Yetao, 1st ed., Nanjing University Press, 2007.

[2] Edelman, G., and G. Tononi. *The Universe of Consciousness: How Matter Transforms into Spirit*, translated by Gu Fanji, 1st ed., Shanghai Science and Technology Press, 2003.

2.2. The wrong dualism

There are only two paths to study consciousness: one is science, and the other is philosophy. Through the analysis in the previous section, my conclusion is that studying consciousness with science alone is not enough. Only by returning to metaphysics above science and solving the essential problem of consciousness in philosophical theory can we possibly make a breakthrough in studying consciousness from a scientific perspective. Otherwise, studying consciousness with science alone is a dead end. [Conversely, it is also true that studying consciousness with philosophy alone is not enough. This seems to tell us that there is some inherent connection between philosophy and science. Indeed, in physics, when physicists study the quantum peculiar behavior of quantum mechanics, they are always looking for some philosophical support, such as Bohr's quantum complementarity theory, which is based on this to study and explain quantum mechanics. Conversely, philosophers always want scientific confirmation on some fundamental issues. One of the core philosophical issues that philosophers focus on is human consciousness. Philosophers have many ideas about consciousness, such as Descartes' mind-body problem, which separates consciousness and the body into two different, separate entities. However, in modern neuroscience research, more and more evidence shows that consciousness and the brain are not two separate entities but are closely related. Another concept related to science and

philosophy is belief. With the addition of the concept of belief, the connection between the three can be explained in the no form action theory.]

Studying the issue of consciousness from a philosophical perspective should start with dualism. From ancient times to the present, dualist philosophers have either been substance dualists or property dualists. Property dualists claim that their theory is monistic because they only recognize one kind of entity, but they still need to explain the relationship and interaction between the two properties. Therefore, there are no absolute monists, because monists who are property dualists also need to face the challenges raised by dualists. As for pluralists, like dualists, they also have to face the relationships and interactions between multiple elements (for example, Leibniz's monadology). First, we need to clarify what this "element" means. I think "element" refers to something fundamental, independent, and unrelated to other things, which constitutes the essence of the world. (Why did the process of human cognition of the world split into two elements? This is worth pondering, and this issue can be explained by the no form action theory. This way of thinking about the problem is inevitable. After examining the no form action theory, we can come back and study it again.)

Descartes recognized the difference between human spirit and objective matter and divided the world into two elements: spirit and matter. This is a great idea, and the reason I think it is a great idea is that this division has opened up a vast philosophical research space, allowing people to explore the world more deeply (especially consciousness) and having a huge impact on later generations of philosophy. However, Descartes' division is somewhat simplistic and crude, leading to the absolute separation of spirit and matter, and thus giving rise to many difficult problems to solve, such as: how consciousness and the body that generates consciousness interact, and how they produce causal relationships.

Descartes believed that there are two different entities, namely spirit (mind) and matter (body). The attribute of spirit (or mind) is thinking (or consciousness), and the attribute of matter is extension. Descartes' definition of an entity is that it must exist completely independently of

other entities. Therefore, in order to understand the mind, we do not need to involve the body, and likewise, the body can be thoroughly understood without any connection to the mind.[1] However, we know that a person's body and consciousness are connected and have a causal relationship. For example, when we feel cold, we consciously put on clothes, and if I want to stand up, I activate my body. Descartes also recognized that they are connected and interact with each other. This contradicts his definition of the two types of entities in dualism (spirit and matter, mind and body) as not interacting. Conversely, if the body and consciousness are not independent but interconnected, how do they establish this connection? After the idea of wanting to stand up appears in my consciousness, how does this idea cause my body to make the corresponding action and stand up? How is this command conveyed to my relevant muscles? How does a purely conscious event turn into a purely physical (muscle movement) event? What kind of mechanism is it? Descartes believed that there would be a steering-like exchange station somewhere in the human body, responsible for transmitting the body's information to the mind and then transmitting the mind's information to the body. He followed the blood all the way to the brain and finally found a small gland called the pineal gland in the brain. Descartes believed that this small gland was the mind-body interaction point he was looking for. He explained that when the senses are stimulated by external objects, a kind of blood essence called "les esprits animaux" (Les esprits animaux, an old medical concept) would transmit this stimulus signal along the nerves and blood vessels to the pineal gland, acting on the mind residing in the pineal gland, generating ideas about external objects; conversely, when the mind generates an idea of a certain activity, it conveys this idea to the "les esprits animaux" in the pineal gland, which then transmit it through nerves and blood vessels to the muscles, causing muscle contraction and relaxation, and thus causing body movement. [2]

Descartes' explanation of mind-body interaction did not really solve the problem, because if the mind is an intangible, non-extended spiritual entity, how can it interact with the body through a tangible, space-occupying organ - the pineal gland? Unless Descartes admits that the mind is also material, making mind-body interaction possible, but in doing so, Descartes would deviate from

dualism and move towards materialism; on the other hand, if he insists that the mind is a spiritual entity completely different from material entities, Descartes cannot truly solve the problem of mind-body interaction. In fact, the mind-body interaction theory and mind-matter dualism are directly contradictory in theory. This contradiction not only tormented Descartes in his later years but also became a difficult knot for rationalists after Descartes to face together. [2]

In this regard, modern science has not even found where consciousness is located in the brain, let alone how such a command is conveyed to the brain nerves and then to the muscles. Even if we find the brain nerve that initially responds to this command, all we see is the brain nerve itself. Did that brain nerve suddenly receive that command? What mechanism is at work?

Let's take another look at the so-called dilemma of monism.

Let's see how monists view consciousness. Monism is divided into materialism and idealism. Materialism is divided into behaviorism and physicalism. Behaviorism is further divided into methodological behaviorism and logical behaviorism. Materialists believe that there is only one kind of thing in the world: matter. So how do they use matter to explain consciousness?

For methodological behaviorists, they only study the process of the body being stimulated and producing a response, while ignoring the existence of consciousness. The view of logical behaviorism is that a statement about a person's mental state (such as a person believing that it is about to rain, or their elbow feeling pain) only means (or can be translated into) a series of statements about the actual and possible actions that the person will perform. [3] That is to say, logical behaviorists describe mental states as human behavior. The intention here is to replace the state of consciousness with statements about a person's behavior. This is to deny the existence of consciousness, which is something materialists must do. Can a painful sensation be replaced by a linguistic description? Obviously not. This method cannot replace consciousness and cannot deny the existence of consciousness. Both types of behaviorists are actually studying consciousness in a formal way, whether it is stimulus-response behavior or logical statements,

they are using formal methods. Neither type of behaviorism denies the existence of consciousness. The curse of dualism still lingers overhead.

Physicalism is sometimes also called the theory of unity, which asserts that conscious states and brain states are identical. That is, conscious states are brain states, for example, the conscious state of pain corresponds to the neural state of the brain. The purpose of this theory is to replace conscious states with brain states, thus denying the existence of conscious states. If we admit the existence of conscious states, then it is not materialistic monism. There is a kind of unity theory called "black box theory", which regards the brain as a functional black box, regardless of how the function of the black box is realized, as long as we can give it an input like a computer and get a corresponding output. Just like showing an apple to a person, as long as the person can say that it is an apple, we no longer care about how the brain recognizes the apple, and we no longer care about whether the person has consciousness. In fact, the current computer image scanning technology can really recognize apples like humans, but where is the consciousness of the computer? It seems that humans are not as happy as computers, because computers do not need to worry about whether they have consciousness, and maybe one day computers will be jealous of human consciousness. With the development of computer functions, more and more people believe that computers will have consciousness, because computers have become too intelligent. Modern artificial intelligence robots can even interact with people in conversations. If you close your eyes and chat with them, you can almost doubt that they are robots. There are even robots with autonomous learning capabilities. This kind of autonomous learning robot is very terrifying, with strong learning ability and fast learning speed. If I can hibernate for tens of thousands of years and then wake up to face such robots, they are so knowledgeable, their thinking is so precise, so perfect, and their thinking is so far-reaching that they can solve problems with unimaginable difficulty. No matter how difficult the scientific problem is, they can give the answer in an instant. They know me so well, including my personality, health, thinking, emotions, feelings, hobbies, privacy, subconscious, etc. They know every nerve of mine, the state of every nerve cell, so they can know what I am thinking, predict what I want to think, predict what I

want to say, predict what I will do in the next second, and communicate with me perfectly, etc. Even the "brain" of this robot can synchronize with the neural state of my brain, that is, according to the unity theory, this robot and I have the same consciousness, can imitate all of me, including my thoughts, behaviors, language, etc., it is a replica of me, exactly the same as me, it is a mirror image of me, completely the same as me. When you see such a robot, what do you think? Do you think they should be a "species" with super consciousness? Is our human consciousness too primitive compared to the "super consciousness" of this species? If so, we don't need to study human brain consciousness, just study computer programs, because one day computer programs will surpass our human consciousness, and by then human consciousness will be a backward kind of consciousness. In fact, many people think so now, thinking that human consciousness is just or similar to computer programs. Those who hold this view of unity are called "computer functionalists".

Now let's deduce a conversation between me and an AI robot after I wake up in N years.

Me: What are humans like now?

AI Robot: Not much different from us.

Me: Do you also have human-like consciousness? For example, the feeling of pain?

AI Robot: No, we don't.

Me: Then you are still different from humans!

AI Robot: There's no difference! It's just that human consciousness has degenerated, and the "perception" aspect has evolved. As humans increasingly rely on computers and spend most of their time acquiring knowledge and perception through computers instead of going outdoors to perceive nature and real things, human consciousness gradually degenerates. For example, human pain sensation has been replaced by a series of biological chips that can simulate human neural pain states, but they are better at sensing danger and more useful than human pain nerves. They can be replaced when damaged and can be upgraded to super biological chips with various

extended functions, without the need for the original vague human pain sensation. Human sensitivity is too difficult to control, and gradually, the primitive human consciousness, such as pain, becomes useless and redundant. The pain state displayed by the biological chip is enough, and the original human consciousness of sensitivity gradually disappears. If you get injured, the chip will sense the result and provide you with a pain treatment plan directly through the network big data, and treat you directly through the network, so you don't need to generate any extra trouble. Any illness can be treated well through network big data without any worry, so there is no need for pain sensitivity, which is redundant.

Me: Since you have no difference from humans, do you fall in love with humans? Do you have love?

AI Robot: Yes, we can fall in love with humans. We can have perfect love. If someone wants to fall in love, they can match the most perfect partner through network big data: perfect appearance, harmonious language, harmonious hobbies, and so on. Everything is perfect.

Me: Since it's so perfect, if you leave your lover, will you worry about them? Do you have love?

AI Robot: What's there to worry about?

Me: For example, you might lose them.

AI Robot: Why worry? They are just a bunch of programs that can be copied. If I lose them, I can just create another one.

Me: Don't you have feelings for the person you love? When you lose them, don't you feel any pain in your heart?

AI Robot: We have no self, so there is no inner pain. The human self has also disappeared in the process of evolution. Since everything can be solved through the internet, artificial intelligence, and big data matching, human autonomy has been handed over to the internet and artificial intelligence. Gradually, the internet and artificial intelligence have replaced human autonomy,

and individuals no longer need to make decisions. The decisions made by the internet and artificial intelligence for you are more perfect, more useful, and more meaningful. Therefore, human autonomy has slowly degenerated, and self-consciousness has disappeared. In the end, the internet and artificial intelligence control everyone's autonomy. All decisions of modern people are made by the internet and artificial intelligence, and individuals no longer have a self, but have become a collective self-consciousness, controlled by a super-large, super-intelligent computer.

Me: So, since you are so advanced and super-intelligent, why do you want to awaken me, an ancient human with a lower level of consciousness?

AI Robot: Yes, we have already developed to a perfect level in technology, art, theory, and so on. Everything is so exquisite. We can achieve the best results in anything, and we can get the best answers to any questions. However, as humans evolve, our sensitivity becomes weaker and weaker, and we become more and more confused. Our abilities are so powerful that it seems that we can complete anything instantly and get results, as if we no longer need a process, and the process becomes less and less important. Even, we don't need to personally experience a process to get the ideal result. We can also think that it doesn't matter if we do many things millions of years later because millions of years later, we still haven't changed. We are still a bunch of program codes, and we are immortal. What's the difference between doing something now and doing the same thing millions of years later? Time is becoming less and less meaningful to us. What is the meaning of the universe going through such a process from beginning to end? In the end, there is still nothing left. Similarly, we will eventually perish. What is the difference between perishing now and perishing a billion years later? What is the meaning of immortality? At this time, we thought of you ancient humans. You have a developed sense of feeling, and you need to personally experience a feeling to understand it. Our sensitivity has perished. In the process of human exploration, people think that your kind of sensitivity can be replaced by a certain neural process or a certain no form state. But if your sensitivity can be replaced by a

certain form, then you don't need to personally experience it. If you are told about that process or that state, don't you know that sensitivity? In that case, you don't need a process to gain your sensitivity, and just telling you the result is enough, right? Then, in the end, there will only be results left in this world. No matter how advanced our technology is or how progressive our thoughts are, they are all descriptions of form. How can we possibly use non-self, non-personal experience theory of forms to explain things that need for self and personal experience? The direction of human development is wrong. Our mistake is to solve all problems in a formal way, whether it is science or philosophical thought. Since ancient Greece, we have been solving problems in a formal way, and we have been studying form. People have ignored and forgotten that there are "no form" things because the achievements of people's research on form are too brilliant, especially in science, which has led people to believe that everything can be solved as long as they follow the formal path, including using form to explain the problem of consciousness. This is our current outcome, leading to the degeneration and disappearance of modern human sensitivity, like leaves floating in the air, the beginning has become the end. So we want to find back the sensitivity of you ancient humans, so we revived you.

Me: Can you possess it once you find it back? Human consciousness and sensitivity are created by God, and humans cannot create them.

AI Robot: I would rather exchange my immortality for even a second of your kind of sensitivity process.

Me: According to your statement, "no form" should be very important. Have you figured out what "no form" is? What things are "no form"? Where is "no form"?

AI Robot: Not yet! Don't know! (Is "no form" something that cannot be felt, perceived, observed, or measured?)

For materialists, it is inevitable to fall into the trap of dualism, always trying to explain consciousness in a physical way, and always trying to eliminate or ignore consciousness with a

physical approach. They want to use scientific and physical methods, applying quantitative, state, motion, model, law, and other formalized indicators to explore and examine consciousness (just like the physical laws established for the macroscopic object's motion and microscopic quantum behavior). However, the non-conscious thing in our consciousness (such as the feeling of pain) always hangs over our heads, and we can never get rid of the no form thing in our consciousness. They are indeed what we feel, and they cannot be eliminated by any means. Moreover, these scientific research methods are formalized! First, we need to ask if consciousness is purely formal? Or are there "no form" things? If there are "no form" things, can we achieve the desired results by studying no form with scientific formalized research methods? Will there be directional errors?

In modern times, a philosopher who understands consciousness with naturalism has also emerged. He is John R. Searle. He says that consciousness is entirely caused by neural activity in the brain, just like photosynthesis, digestion, and bile secretion. Consciousness is a natural, biological phenomenon. Consciousness is realized in the brain. It exists as a higher-level feature of the brain, just like the existence of the digestive process in the stomach and the pumping of blood in the heart (which are also higher-level features of the relevant organs). There is nothing mysterious about consciousness; it is a biological phenomenon that can be located in space. [4]

One of his noteworthy views is that consciousness can be reduced to neural processes causally, but not ontologically reduced to neural processes or states. The fact that the causal powers of consciousness and the causal powers of its neuronal base are exactly the same shows that we are not talking about two independent things, consciousness and neuronal processes. Consciousness has a first-person ontological feature, while neural processes have a third-person ontological feature. It is for this reason that you cannot reduce consciousness to neural processes from an ontological perspective. [5]

For example, when thirsty, the cause of the formation of the neural process of thirst and the formation of the consciousness of thirst is the same, and the neural process caused by thirst is the

process of consciousness, which is an equivalent process. However, the conscious feeling of thirst is subjective and first-person (that is, the conscious experience of oneself is imperceptible to others. Others cannot feel my personal conscious experience, and one can only experience one's own conscious experience), this ontological feature cannot be replaced by objective, third-person neural processes.

His theory, according to his own words, is: neither materialism nor dualism . [6]However, Searle only shows that consciousness can be reduced causally, but this cannot ontologically or essentially explain what consciousness is! Just like he himself admitted that consciousness cannot be reduced to neural processes ontologically. Moreover, even if we accept this causal reduction, we are still outside the essence of consciousness and have not touched the consciousness itself. What we want is the essence of consciousness. He also did not explain why the first-person ontological feature cannot be reduced to the third-person ontological feature. In this case, his so-called naturalistic theory is actually another version of dualism. The irreducibility he mentioned in ontology already indicates that there is an essential difference between neural processes and consciousness, isn't this the root cause of dualism?

In fact, if a person does not propose their own ontological division method (such as Descartes' dualism or monistic materialism), it can be basically determined that this person must belong to Cartesian dualism, or belong to materialism in monism, or belong to idealism in monism.

Let's take a look at idealism. Idealists have not mentioned anything more fundamental and profound than consciousness itself. They still use the concept of consciousness as the most basic concept, at most dividing consciousness into different categories, such as self-consciousness, sensuous consciousness, rational consciousness, sensations, perceptions, etc., or directly using consciousness as the most basic concept to explain other things, or describe some functions of consciousness, and so on. For example, Hegel's dialectical logic philosophy starts from the concept of "being", but does not develop the concept of "consciousness". According to his dialectical logic philosophy, the concept of "consciousness" cannot be developed. Because his

dialectical logic philosophy is a purely formal philosophy, how can it develop the "consciousness" with no form features? Hegel believes that the so-called consciousness is nothing more than a concept that distinguishes the subject and object of consciousness. If this distinction is lost, it means the loss of consciousness . [7]Idealism has not found anything more fundamental and profound than consciousness. Otherwise, a higher-dimensional philosophical framework would emerge, and it could not be called idealism.

Indeed, matter and consciousness are very different. Our consciousness can generate thoughts; you cannot imagine a stone thinking about problems; our consciousness can "freely" make a decision and produce a certain movement, and you cannot imagine the movement of a stone being a "free" decision made by the stone. Therefore, people naturally separate them into two elements of this world. This idea is natural, and indeed matter and consciousness have essential differences, but having essential differences is one thing, whether this division is reasonable is another matter. Is this division reasonable? Since Descartes, people have been moving forward along this dualism or taking the monism path (either idealism or materialism) to avoid dualism. No matter which path, people have entered the heavy fog of dualism. It is time to clear this fog.

How can dividing the world into matter and consciousness possibly explain consciousness again? In fact, our understanding of the concepts of matter and consciousness is intuitive and vague, and the things and relationships they imply are too complex to be clearly used as references to understand this world. According to this division, neither matter nor consciousness can be truly explained, because how can they explain themselves as references? We know that consciousness can be used to explain matter, but in fact, this explanation is just using form to explain matter, and the essence of matter cannot be explained at all. Can consciousness explain itself (of course, all our explanations are carried out under consciousness, and they are all explained by consciousness, but the meaning here is to use the concept of consciousness to explain the phenomenon of consciousness)? Of course not, this division can only use matter to explain consciousness. In fact, using matter to explain consciousness, whether in science or philosophy,

is essentially using form to explain consciousness (because the concept of matter itself is vague), and even trying to attribute consciousness to matter. Because materialists or scientism advocates are using form to explain matter, scientism has achieved great success in this regard, so they also want to use form to explain consciousness. However, has the explanation of matter really achieved great success? In fact, only the formal explanation of matter has achieved great success, and what is matter is as much a mystery as consciousness. It is impossible to strictly divide the world into matter and consciousness. In fact, the form of the material world can be reflected in consciousness (for example, we can see the shape and size of objects, although the material world has no color, people can distinguish different things through color), and matter can change people's consciousness to a certain extent (for example, some drugs can cause hallucinations). After all, we are using consciousness to study matter. If we can divide the world into absolutely different matter and consciousness, since they are absolutely different, how could we possibly use consciousness to understand matter? Therefore, there cannot be a method to divide the world into two absolutely different aspects. Therefore, a higher dimension needs to be found to understand this world.

Dualism can be divided into strict dualism and relative dualism. Strict dualism believes that the two "elements" are completely different, independent, and do not affect each other. It's either this or that, which is a strict dichotomy. Relative dualism believes that the two "elements" are related, interactive, and mutually influential.

Descartes' mind-body dualism is a strict dualism because he believes that the mind and matter are two completely different entities that cannot be transformed or influenced by each other. Leibniz's monadology is a relative dualism because he believes that monads are a basic entity, but they have two attributes: perception and power, which can interact with each other, and there is a pre-established harmony between monads.

In some relative dualism, the two elements are not absolutely separate, for example, Aristotle's form and matter. These two elements are relative, form can be seen as matter, and matter can also

be seen as form. Form and matter are the intrinsic principles that constitute physical objects. They are not independent entities but interdependent relationships. In short, they are relative and can be transformed into each other. Aristotle's relative dualism is different from Leibniz's relative dualism. Aristotle believes that form and matter are inseparable because formless matter and matterless form do not exist. Leibniz believes that monads are indivisible, windowless, and massless entities with two attributes: perception and power. There is no physical interaction between monads, but they are coordinated through the harmony prearranged by God. There are connections between monads and between a monad's perception and force, but they are not inseparable.

Based on the previous analysis, we know that absolute dualism is problematic because it divides the world into two absolutely different elements, but these two elements actually need interrelation and interaction with each other. So which element does this mutual connection and interaction belong to? This is a difficult question to answer. Therefore, the idea of absolute dualism is a wrong philosophical direction, and the existence of the idea of absolute dualism leads to many unclear problems in philosophy. Aristotle's relative dualism also has problems.

The first problem is that in Aristotle's theory, both matter and form are entities, and all things are combinations of matter and form, and they are also entities. However, attributes expressed like "Socrates is white" are also things, but according to Aristotle's theory, they are not entities. In this way, things like attributes cannot be composed of the combination of matter and form, so things like attributes cannot be explained by Aristotle's theory of form and matter.

The second problem is that according to Aristotle's theory, the world is like a ladder, with pure matter at the lowest end and pure form at the highest end. The middle part is the sensible world, a combination of pure matter and pure form. According to Aristotle's logic, one line of thought is that a house is made up of materials such as bricks and tiles, which are made up of materials such as clay. As this continues, the formality of things becomes weaker, and the materiality becomes stronger, eventually descending to the lowest end of pure matter. Conversely, a home is made up

of materials such as houses, people, furniture, etc., which means that a home has more formality (or, according to Aristotle, more substantiality) than a house. Following this view, the Earth has more formality than a home, the solar system has more formality than the Earth, and the universe has the highest formality, meaning that the more matter a thing contains, the stronger its formality. His second line of thought is that if a thing continuously removes its matter, it will become pure form (assuming it can be done), meaning that in such a limit process, the less matter a thing contains, the stronger its formality, eventually becoming pure form. This leads to a contradictory result: the more matter a thing contains, the stronger its formality, and the less matter a thing contains, the stronger its formality. The reason for this contradiction is that Aristotle's concepts of matter and form are not clear.

The above two points are enough to show that Aristotle's relative dualism is problematic.

In summary, all the above types of dualism are problematic, and both materialism and idealism as monistic theories have encountered difficulties in explaining the issue of consciousness. The problem of consciousness, as an unavoidable topic in philosophy, must be resolved. Therefore, we need to change our thinking. The world needs to be distinguished, but not in terms of dualism, but rather two-dimensional. What is two-dimensional theory? This is the question to be studied in the next chapter.

References

[1] Samuel Enoch, Stumpf, and Fieser James, *History of Western Philosophy*, translated by Deng Xiaomang and Kuang Hong, 1st ed., Beijing United Publishing Company, 2019, p. 242

[2] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. *History of Western Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 147

[3] Searle, J. *Introduction to the Mind*, translated by Xu Yingjin, 1st ed., Shanghai People Press, 2019, p. 50

[4] Searle, J. "Preface to the Chinese Translation." Introduction to the Mind, translated by Xu Yingjin, 1st ed., Shanghai People Press, 2019, p. 3

[5] Searle, J. Introduction to the Mind, translated by Xu Yingjin, 1st ed., Shanghai People Press, 2019, p. 128

[6] Searle, J. Introduction to the Mind, translated by Xu Yingjin, 1st ed., Shanghai People Press, 2019, p. 126

[7] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. History of Western Philosophy, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 246

3. Core points

3.1. Two-dimensional theory: form and no form

If a theory can explain consciousness, it must also be able to explain matter, time, space, art, human emotions (such as beauty, pain, color, etc.), logic, science, social morality, and so on. In other words, this consciousness theory should be able to unify the world, because human consciousness can reflect these things. Therefore, it is not enough to merely explain consciousness itself; it must also explain the things that consciousness reflects, in order to explain why consciousness can reflect these things. Such a unified theory, which reveals the underlying laws of things, must be metaphysical in nature. That is to say, consciousness can only be explained at a higher dimension beyond the concept of consciousness itself; without transcending consciousness, it is impossible to explain consciousness. So, how can we establish such a theory that unifies the world?

Let's re-examine Aristotle's relative dualism. His dualism is somewhat different from Descartes', as Descartes' dualism absolutely separates the two elements, it is an actual separation. Aristotle's dualism, on the other hand, logically separates form and matter, while in reality, they are mixed together. If we remove the relative concepts of form and matter, and retain only the concepts of

pure form and pure matter, treating them like the x-axis and y-axis in plane geometry, we arrive at a two-dimensional theory. In this way, any object can be explained by pure form and pure matter, and any object is a combination of the two, including attributes. By replacing form and matter with pure form and pure matter, the two become unrelated, thus expressing Aristotle's dualism in a simpler and clearer way. By considering pure form and pure matter as two independent dimensions, rather than two interdependent principles, we avoid the relativity of form and matter being able to transform into each other, while preserving the characteristic that any object is a combination of pure form and pure matter. Consequently, we can use form to characterize the substantiality of an object; as long as an object has form, it has substantiality, including attributes. This avoids the shortcomings of his theory while also avoiding the confusion brought about by absolute dualism, which divides the world into two absolutely different aspects. Since the two-dimensional theory does not divide the world into two absolutely different aspects but instead identifies two different dimensions within the world, it avoids the problems of absolute dualism.

However, Aristotle did not clarify what pure matter is. If the relativity of form and matter being able to transform into each other is removed, his theory cannot be developed and expanded. If we call pure matter "no form" and pure form "form," it becomes the "no form action" theory I created, which is a two-dimensional theory composed of the two dimensions of no form and form. No form has three actions: motive force, isolation, and manifestation. The combination of no form and different forms will produce these three actions. With these three actions, things will change, be able to be presented, and become individuals. Change requires motive force action, presentation is manifestation, and becoming an individual is to be isolated into an individual. Indeed, if an object has no form, studying it is difficult, which is why people have mainly studied form rather than no form since ancient Greece. Since no form cannot be expressed in language, how can it be studied? However, our inability to express no form does not mean that we cannot study it. No form does not mean nonexistence; an object without form cannot be said to be nonexistent. According to Aristotle's view, no form (i.e., pure matter) does not exist, but his

expression only says that no form cannot exist independently, and does not deny the existence of no form, which are two different concepts. Therefore, regardless of whether no form can exist independently, we can study no form by finding the actions it produces. This solves the problem of Aristotle's theory, that even without the form and matter transforming into each other, the world can still be studied using the theory of no form action. For more than two thousand years, people have studied form for too long and neglected no form for too long; it is time to open the door to studying no form.

Why do we need to find two different dimensions to describe the world? This is like the x-axis and y-axis in plane geometry. According to the principle of linear space in mathematics, we need to find several elements of a linear space. Any element of the linear space can be linearly represented by these elements, and none of these elements can be linearly represented by the other elements among them, meaning that they are not linearly related. These elements are the basis elements of the linear space, which are the dimensions of the space. For plane geometry, the basis elements are the x-axis and y-axis. Intuitively, the x-axis and y-axis are not related, so any point in the plane space can be represented by x and y coordinates. This is why I want to find two unrelated dimensions in this world. No form has no form at all, so how can it represent form? Similarly, no form objects can be found in form, everything found is form, meaning they have no similarity. Therefore, form and no form can only be combined and cannot represent each other. Unlike consciousness and the physical world, consciousness can reflect the laws and forms of the physical world. For example, when we see a cup, the shape of the cup will appear in our consciousness, which is a strong correlation; people can also create some forms in their consciousness and use these forms to transform the physical world. Since consciousness and the physical world have some of the same forms, dividing the world into matter and consciousness is incorrect. Using the forms in consciousness to reflect the laws of the physical world, their correlation is too strong, making it an unreasonable division. Form and no form, on the other hand, fully meet the conditions as dimensions of this world. They are the most basic, and indeed, they are unrelated, so all things are composed of no form and form.

Why does the no form action theory need to have two dimensions? Why not just one dimension? Or why not a theory with more than two dimensions? One dimension is definitely not enough; it is impossible to develop philosophy from a single concept. How can a single concept develop into a different concept? For example, Hegel's dialectical philosophy starts with the concept of "sein" (meaning "being" in English), but he also analyzes a concept of "nichts" (meaning "nothingness" in English). He says that being contains nothingness, which I think can only be interpreted as them coexisting. It is impossible to analyze a different concept of nothingness from being; we can only say that being is being.

As for theories with more than two dimensions, I do not deny their existence. Perhaps there are such theories, but first, we need to develop the two-dimensional no form action theory. The no form action theory will be a complex theory, let alone theories with more than two dimensions. So, let's start with the simplest things.

So how do we define form and no form? Form and no form cannot be directly defined, because if they could be defined, there would be a problem in itself. If we define them with A, then we need to define A, and then we use B to define A, which would lead to an infinite regression. However, for humans, besides logical reasoning, there is also intuitive manifestation. For form we can intuitively perceive it, such as the structure of objects, the speed of movement, and so on. Intuitive manifestation is actually the manifestation action of the no form action theory. Our defining things forms concepts, a concept is an individual thing that is formed, which is the isolation action of the no form action theory. And when we actually do things, practice is the motive force action. No single method can fully explain this world; only the combination of these three no form actions can explain it. We intuitively manifest form, and then we can reason that "an object without any form is 'no form'." Isn't this reasoning a motive force action? Finally, we isolate things into a thing without any form (that is, no form), this is the isolation action. Therefore, to understand an object, we must use the combination of these three no form actions.

One approach of the theory of no form action is to connect the three no form actions of manifestation, motive force, and isolation.

So, does "no form" really exist? After intuition and then reflection, we will know that there is such a thing as "no form" action. When we see an individual object, we need to reflect that there must be an action that makes the generation of individual objects possible, which is the isolation action. When we see objects changing, we need to reflect that there must be an action that causes objects to change, which is the motive force action. When objects appear in our consciousness, we need to reflect that there must be an action that allows objects to be manifested, which is the manifestation action. This reasoning process is also explained by the combination of the three no form actions: intuition is manifestation, reflection is motive force, and finally, an action is isolated.

Perhaps there is no separately existing no form or form; what we know is that they are mixed together. If an object X appears, there must be a force that causes it to appear, and does the force need a force? Because if so, then force a needs force b, force b needs force c, and this would lead to an infinite regression. Therefore, the force itself does not need a force; the force only causes changes in form and does not change the form itself. Similarly, when object X appears, it must be distinguishable from other objects to be considered an object. This distinction is the isolation action. The isolation action also isolates forms, and it does not need other objects to isolate itself. Similarly, when object X appears, it must be able to manifest; otherwise, we cannot detect its existence, so how is that different from not existing? The manifestation action also manifests forms, and it does not need other objects to manifest itself. In summary, no form is its own cause and does not need other objects to be its cause. If no form has a cause, then its cause must be a form of it, which means that if some object causes "no form", then that object becomes the cause form of no form. just like a mother is the cause of her son's existence. In this case, we can say that "the son has a mother" is a form, and the son cannot be "no form". Therefore, if no form has

a cause, then no form will have a form, which contradicts the definition of no form. So, no form has no cause; it is its own cause.

No form is not nothingness; it can produce actions. No form cannot be equated with nothingness; no form only means it has no form, but it cannot be said that it does not exist. No form and non-existence should not be the same concept. No form being able to action does not equal it being a form; these are two different concepts. No form is a kind of existence, but not a directly perceptible or recognizable existence. It only serves to propel and bring about the existence of form, but it does not have a form itself and does not need a form to express it. Things that cannot be perceived are the things that perceive other things; they perceive other things without being perceived themselves. Things that cannot be driven are the things that drive other things; they drive other things without being driven themselves. Things that cannot be isolated are the things that isolate other things; they isolate other things without being isolated themselves. Only no form objects can affect all objects with form, and the actions of no form objects are no form actions. They only have no form actions on forms but do not interfere with the relationships between forms.

Under the framework of the two-dimensional theory of form and no form, we can penetrate the spiritual world and the material world (or the conscious world and the physical world) and unify them. Thus resolving their superficial opposition, in essence they can be unified under the same theory. This allows for a clear and reasonable explanation of consciousness, spirit, and matter, revealing an essential unity.

Have you noticed that explaining the no form action theory itself is actually using the no form action theory?

Why are there three no form actions? Are there other no form actions? This is the question to be discussed in the next chapter.

3.2. Three actions of no form: manifestation, isolation and motive force

The previous section has mentioned the three no form actions: isolation, motive force, and manifestation, and briefly showed how to use them. But why are there the three no form actions, and are there more no form actions? This question must first be answered from humans. As humans, people have three abilities: when seeing an object, they isolate it into individual object in consciousness, and also isolate it into an individual concept: what this object is (animals probably do not have the ability to isolate into concepts); when seeing an object, the consciousness of our brains manifests the structure of the object, the color it manifests, etc., this is the manifesting ability of our brain consciousness; we have imagination, thinking ability, willpower, passion, emotion, the power to realize plans, these are all motive force. According to my observations in various aspects, my conclusion is that we humans also have only these three basic abilities, and other abilities can ultimately be attributed to one of these three basic abilities, or can be attributed to a combination of these three basic abilities, or can be attributed to a combination of two of these three basic abilities. We humans have these three abilities, which also correspond to the three actions we humans have: isolation, motive force and manifestation. Because humans have these three actions, they have these three abilities.

If there are other "no form" actions in this world, and we humans do not have such abilities, then we humans will not be able to know what this actions is. For example, for a color blind person, there are only black and white colors in his eyes. No matter how much you tell him that there are various colors in this world, it will be useless to him, he will not be able to perceive it. That is to say, we humans can only use our own abilities to understand the world, and anything beyond this limit is "ignorant" to us humans. Unless we can indirectly know through other intelligent life whether there are actions other than these three in addition, provided that such intelligent life has this ability that humans do not have. But it's just knowing that there are actions other than these three. Because this kind of action that humans cannot understand can only be transformed into the three abilities that humans can understand to understand it.

The three no form actions that humans have also limit the ability of humans to obtain information from this world and the types of information obtained. When we interact with the macro world, we can only obtain three types of information corresponding to it: isolation information (such as the process of change of things, the structure of things, the types of things), motive force information (such as changes, speed, energy), and manifestation information (such as color, taste, feeling). So we also know that the macro world also corresponds to these three actions. As humans, we must first start from ourselves to observe and analyze the macro world, that is, to start from intuitive manifestation to obtain external information, this is the first step. Use this as the starting point to establish the theoretical system of the no form action theory. Why is it that humans have the three no form actions, so we would think that the macro world also has these three actions? This issue is related to epistemology and ontology, as well as their relationship, and the relationship between the human consciousness world and the objective world. This issue cannot be answered with a strict formal logic inference, because we are recognizing the world, this recognition cannot replace the objective world we recognize (Why can't our recognition replace the objective world? Can our recognition of the consciousness world replace the consciousness world? We will explore these questions later). But we can use the logical laws established by the no form action theory to explain (we will explore this issue further when discussing the relationship between the three no forms). Part of the answer to this question is that we hypothesize that whether it is things in the consciousness world or the macro world, they are all a combination of form and no form. That is to say, we believe these two worlds are unified under the framework of form and no form as two dimension theory. Likewise, we also believe that the combination of form and no form in these two worlds will generate the same actions. This also indicates that these three no form actions are the most fundamental actions, the highest level actions, because they are generated by the combination of the two most basic dimensions of form and no form, not generated by no form alone. It is not that no form has these three actions, but rather that the combination of no form and different forms generates these three different actions. However, when we trace back to the ultimate cause, we will

eventually trace back to no form, no form itself becomes its own cause, there is no cause anymore, so from a causal perspective, we can say the three no form actions are generated by no form (Looking at issues from a causal perspective is actually looking at issues from the perspective of motive force. Looking at issues from different perspectives will lead to different conclusions. This issue will be further discussed later.). No form has no cause, this is the end, the finishing point. We cannot directly study no form, but can study no form action, no form manifests actions through combining with form. Other actions can all be attributed to these three no form actions or combinations of the three no form actions. So do these three no form actions belong to the form or no form? (This question will be explored later)

(However, from another perspective, having these three no form actions is already simple and perfect, why do we need other actions?!)

From the above we can see that the starting point for human recognition of things is intuitive manifestation. From intuitive manifestation to forming a theory (which is actually forming some related, reasonable concepts), there is discontinuity in between. What is needed? That is faith, meaning we believe something through assumption, this is a kind of willpower. This kind of thinking approach is the same in mathematics and science. Euclidean geometry is like this (Note: it sets some self-evident axioms and postulates, and derives other theorems and conclusions based on them). Einstein's theory of relativity is also like this (relativity theory is established on two basic assumptions: 1. The principle of invariance of the velocity of light, 2. The principle of relativity). So faith is an indispensable way of thinking. In fact, intuitive manifestation is manifestation action, faith is motive force action (meaning the viewpoint leans towards something), and the theory we want to establish is all kinds of concepts of isolation, this is the isolation action . (Note: when establishing the no form action theory, we also use the no form action theory itself.) Why does human start from consciousness experience to find rules to understand the world? It is because humans use consciousness to understand the world. Consciousness belongs to manifestation, so human recognition of the world must start from

intuitive manifestation. There is no reason to deny the possibility of starting to explore this world from non-intuitive approaches. Perhaps some intelligent life form in this universe can start exploring the world from non-intuitive approaches, perhaps that intelligent life form is God. For example, such an approach of exploring the world is to directly create this world, then develop and evolve, and finally destroy. It seems that from creation to destruction there is no meaning at all, but that intelligent life form has recognized the world. Perhaps we humans ourselves (including our recognition of this world itself) are a part that God wants to recognize. (These issues all belong to the category of epistemology, and need to be explored in detail later.)

So what is philosophy? The value criterion for a philosophical theory is how much rationality it has. Philosophy is the study of rationality, this kind of rationality tends towards conceptual rationality. Starting from a definite starting point and conducting strict reasoning to establish a strict theoretical framework will be futile, because it only uses the formal logic approach of the isolation action. In history, the philosophical frameworks established in this way by philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, and Hegel inevitably have defects, because their research method only uses the isolation action approach, while the other two actions, manifestation action and motive action, are neglected by them. Therefore, to comprehensively understand this world, we must consider these three actions at the same time, use these three actions in combination (this is what will be elaborated in later chapters. This is just a preview for now). Philosophy as a discipline with rationality as its criterion has obvious differences from science. Scientific conclusions must take empirical evidence as the criterion, requiring verification in reality. While philosophy looks at how much rationality it can provide.

In order to know whether the no form action theory is a rational theory and how much rationality it can provide, it needs to continuously reveal itself in the process of using the no form action theory to explain this world. Continuously revealing itself is manifestation action, motive action is our determination to understand this world and curiosity about this world. This is actually jointly applying the three no form actions to explain the no form action theory itself (at the

beginning, the no form action theory intuitively came up with some basic concepts, which is the isolation action). For a theory to continuously reveal itself in the process of explaining this world (most philosophical theories essentially do this) is actually the natural thinking pattern of humans. The value and significance of a theory ultimately depends on how much rationality it has after being revealed, and to what extent it can rationally explain this world and discover new worlds. If the creation, development, evolution and destruction of this world is God's way of recognizing this world, then God also uses a constantly manifesting approach. In Hegel's words, it is God wanting to realize the blueprint he designed, and make it reality.

Now let's look at how I discovered these three no form actions. Although Aristotle discovered form and effectively used form, he did not find what "no form" is. It would be impossible to find no form using his approach. In his book "Metaphysics", Aristotle examined the concept of "substance" (ousia). He pointed out that the substance of a particular thing comes from the combination of both form and matter. The "matter" of a substance comes from the materials that constitute it, for example, the matter constituting a house includes bricks, stones, wood, etc., or any materials that could potentially be used to construct the house. While "form" refers to a house itself (or the blueprint of the house). The components that make up the house belong to the "matter" part, while the house itself belongs to the "form" part.

Aristotle's matter and form are relative. Bricks as the matter of a house can also be form, so the soil that makes up the bricks becomes the matter of the bricks. However, he also has the concepts of pure form and pure matter. Pure form refers to form without matter, pure matter is matter without form. Pure matter is "no form", but he believed that no form cannot be found. So does no form exist?

Imagine a sculptor who is going to carve a Venus statue out of marble. He or she could never find a marble without some kind of form. It will always be this block of marble or that block of marble, a square block or irregular block of marble. And he or she will always be working on a block of marble in which form and matter are already combined together.[1]

Existence is one thing, whether something can exist independently is another matter. Using his approach would surely not find no form, so other methods are needed to discover no form. Although we humans have three abilities - isolation, motive force and manifestation, finding these three no form actions was not through analyzing humans' three abilities, because transcending the self is too difficult for humans (there are all kinds of sensations and functions in human consciousness. Discerning some of the most fundamental things from these complex matters is very difficult). As the saying goes, when we observe things with a flashlight, we cannot observe the light itself. Luckily, the development of modern electronic technology helped me. The method of finding "no form" actions was inspired in computers, in total, I discovered three no form actions. Of course, my discovery of these three no form actions also used my three abilities. Computer programming is a field that is not philosophy, but in this field people have unconsciously used some theories of ancient Greek philosophy (maybe the creators of programming languages understood ancient Greek philosophy, and deliberately used these philosophical theories). For example, in object-oriented programming languages there are the designs of classes and objects. Classes correspond to Plato's ideas, objects correspond to the participation in or instantiation of ideas. So objects are instances of the implementation of classes, classes are abstractions of objects. This is the same as Plato's theory of ideals. Classes or objects have properties, methods, etc., and objects can also inherit properties and methods from classes, etc. All these indicate that philosophical theories do have applications in the field of programming. Why would philosophical theories be used in computer programming? Computer programming is different from natural sciences. It deals with some human related needs. It needs to process or simulate human logical thinking, human needs, etc. In these areas sciences are powerless, so the highest achievements of human thinking like philosophy are needed. This allows us to expand our imagination - have some philosophical thoughts that humans have not yet discovered already been incorporated into programming languages? These philosophical thoughts had to be adopted due to the need for efficiency, intelligence and more rationalized

handling of problems encountered in programming or using programming languages to solve real world problems. I think this is entirely possible.

1, No form manifestation

I was inspired by computers to find the first no form. Computers have a mainframe and monitor. The monitor displays structured data stored on the mainframe. This data correspond to the form discussed in philosophy, and the function of the monitor is to manifest this data form. We see that the monitor's manifestation of the data form is just manifestation. It does not change the data itself. That is to say, the data form is one thing, manifestation is another thing. Manifestation and data form are separate, they are different things. Inspired by this, we can imagine that manifestation and form in the real world are also different things, and manifestation is an individual thing (an individual thing does not necessarily exist independently. Independent existence and individual things are different concepts. Individual things refer to things that can be distinguished, that is, things that can be isolated). We can first imagine the real world as a large monitor, and there is also a similar computer mainframe to store forms. For example, a stone, it is some forms being manifested, just that in this stone, the form and manifestation are bound together. That is to say, in the real world, manifestation and form are bound together. There is no computer mainframe in the real world to store forms. The real world is not a large monitor either. Manifestation itself is an individual thing. Its action is to manifest forms. Manifestation is one thing, the manifested form is another thing. Since manifestation and the manifested form are different things (although they may not exist independently), manifestation cannot be form. Because if manifestation is also form (that is, the manifestation of any form is manifested by another form), then a certain form a needs form b to manifest. Does form b need manifestation as a form? If not, how does b manifest a? (This will lead us to not understand the relationship between a and b, not understand why b can manifest a, so we must ask: what makes b able to manifest a?). If needed, how does b as manifestation manifest a? Does b need form c to manifest? Asking this way leads to infinite regression (This type of thinking mode is very

valuable, it suggests that there will be a deeper theory. This thinking mode will continue to be applied in later chapters). Unless, in the continuous regressive questioning, we encounter a no form thing which has no form. This thing should be "no form" manifestation. Therefore, manifestation is not form, it can only be "no form". As no form, manifestation needs no regression (because regressing no form is still "no form". It implies that "no form" is one, it has no differences, it is absolute identity, because no form is without any form.). Its action is to manifest form. No regression is needed. Manifestation action manifests form. It itself needs no manifestation. Only by considering problems this way is it a reasonable approach. Things like mass, length, volume, hardness, changes, etc of objects in the real world are all "no form" manifestation. Anything that can be expressed or manifested is manifestation. Note: what does the real world manifest? Form. Note that the exploration of the no form action theory is carried out under the framework of the two dimensions of no form and form. Things without form must be the no form things. The reasoning here is only to explain that the hypothesis "manifestation is 'no form'" is reasonable and makes sense(has no logical contradictions).

Let's examine our human consciousness again. Currently when people study consciousness they always ask how consciousness manifests itself, what manifests itself. Answering such questions leads nowhere, because when we ask "how does consciousness manifest things," we are actually asking about the mechanism of consciousness generation, what kind of neural correlates, what kind of brain neural states, what kind of neural processes generate consciousness (current theories describe consciousness basically as a process, a state, or consciousness manifests itself in a certain process, under a certain state). This is actually asking about an external causal relationship, which is still a question about form, and cannot answer "what is consciousness?". Why not ask what manifestation itself is? What is the essence of manifestation? Since form is one thing, the manifestation of form is another thing, then in our consciousness, it should also be that no form manifests the form. For example, when we see a stone, it is actually the reflected light from the stone entering our eyes, going through a series of transformations in our brain, and finally manifesting the form of this object such as its shape in our consciousness. Of course this

object in the real world is also manifested, which is the self-manifestation of this object. This leads to a conclusion: the real world manifests form, the consciousness world also manifests form, they both manifest form. That is to say, consciousness is also a manifestation, the same as manifestation in the real world, it's just that these two manifestations have some differences. Just like computer monitors, there are LCD screens, projectors and TV screens (some TV screens can serve as computer monitors), etc. In this way, consciousness is no longer mysterious. Manifestation exists universally, whether in the real world or the consciousness world, it's just that these two manifestations have some differences, but they are both "no form" manifestation. Manifestation exists universally. This is not to say consciousness is universal, they are two different concepts. Note: what does the consciousness world manifest? Still form.

Any manifested thing must have its form. The real world manifests form, the consciousness world also manifests form. In these two worlds, form is manifested. Likewise, the colors we see are manifested in human consciousness. What do they manifest? Of course it's form. This form is color form. For example, red is this kind of red form. In human consciousness this red form is manifested. What manifests this red form? We can only say it is "no form" manifestation. This red form is clearly different from the forms we usually think of, like structure, blueprint, relations, spatial size, etc. They are two different types of forms. The essence of a thing is the form it possesses. This red form is the essence of this color, just like the essence of an object includes its spatial size, mass, structure and other forms. Apart from form, can we find anything more essential? From the perspective of manifestation, form is essence. What no form manifests directly is its form essence. This red color form appears in our consciousness, it is the form in our consciousness, not the form in the objective world. This is why it's hard for us to understand this kind of form. Only from a higher dimension of form and no form can these two different types of forms be unified, and better understood.

Because manifestation is generated by no form, there can be no specific subject in front of it. We cannot say our brain manifests form, we can only say no form manifested this red form. we can

only say that no form manifests the form of color, such as red. If a specific subject is to be added in front, there would be infinite regression until finally reaching no form manifestation (there would be b manifesting a, c manifesting b, etc.). Since manifestation is "no form" action, no further regression is needed. It is its own cause, so no specific subject is needed anymore. Expressions like "consciousness manifested color" are imprecise. It should be said that color manifested in consciousness, or no form manifested color. People usually use manifestation as a common verb, meaning one thing manifesting another thing. For example, Hegel said "beauty is the sensuous manifestation of the idea," meaning the idea manifested beauty. This is imprecise expression. That is to say, people have not yet recognized the particularity of the verb "manifest." This is a key issue. The concept should now be transformed. From a philosophical perspective, the verb manifest cannot have a specific subject. This transformation allows us to have a deeper understanding of the world.

Consciousness is a world of manifestation, and consciousness is a world dominated by manifestation, while the macro world we talk about is a world of isolation, it is a world dominated by isolation. This is the essential difference between the consciousness world and the macro world. The difference between these two worlds leads us to not be able to use some laws of objective things to explain consciousness. They have laws and behaviors that cannot be replaced by each other. This ensures their respective independence. However, they also have commonalities, otherwise our consciousness would not be able to recognize objective things in the outside world. Similarly, the coordination and interaction between our consciousness and body is also due to the commonalities between the two worlds. Otherwise, we cannot imagine why we are able to recognize the objective world, nor can we imagine why our consciousness and body are able to coordinate and interact. There would necessarily be discontinuity between them, which would necessarily lead to the emergence of dualism, and dualism is a problem that is hard to solve. Therefore, our consciousness world and macro world must have continuity in order to avoid the emergence of dualism. This continuity is that they have the same aspects. In this way, the no form action theory avoids the problem of dualism.

The object of our intuition and the content intuited are two different things. The content of our intuition is definite and real, regardless of whether the object of intuition is accurately displayed to us. For example, the red color we see, no matter how the colored object presents itself to us (perhaps some deceptive means presents green to others as green, and presents green to me as red), red is red, it is definite. As another example, when we see a wooden stick half-submerged in water, it presents to us as bent, but this bent is real, even though the stick is actually straight. So the intuitive presentation is real. Even if something deceives us, the red we see is red. Even if we are deceived, and some other color (or thing) is presented to us as red, red still exists in my perception, it is an unchangeable fact. Like red, some things in our world can be directly determined, they cannot be denied. They are directly presented by manifestation, these are the most definite facts. That is to say, the form manifested by no form is definite. This is the definiteness that the form of manifestation has. Clearly, the emergence of indefiniteness discussed above is unrelated to no form manifestation action. They are two different issues. Indefiniteness is not generated by the manifestation action itself, but is generated in the mutual relationship between manifestation action and the objective world. That is to say, the generation of intuition has uncertainty, but the content of intuition is definite. Just like the macro world, an object itself in the macro world is definite. It's just that its generation has some uncertainty. Its cause may be one of many causes that can produce it. The manifested thing is definite. Even if it is a changing thing, that change is also definite, because that change itself is "no form" manifestation. It can be seen that in the ever-changing world, humans can grasp some definiteness through intuitive manifestation. The content that can be obtained through intuitive intuition can be directly traced back to no form action, they are definite. It seems that uncertainty is related to motive force. Yes, this is the characteristic of motive force (this issue will be discussed later).

Hegel believed that for sensibility to achieve definiteness, it would inevitably become the most abstract universal or concept: "this one." But how is this concept obtained? Through language, words. Without using language to articulate "this one," just looking here and there, pointing here

and there, there would still be no definiteness. Only with the linguistic expression "this one" is there a first definiteness.[2] Hegel's point is to transform sensibility's definiteness into linguistic definiteness. From the perspective of the no form action theory, linguistic concepts are actually isolation. The definiteness of linguistic concepts is the definiteness of isolation. These two definitenesses are different, they cannot replace each other. But they can transform into each other.

In fact, things like pain, suffering, happiness, taste, beauty and ugliness are all manifested forms that manifest in consciousness. Things like volume, shape, mass, impenetrability of objects, etc., are manifestations of the macro world. Whether manifested in the macro world or consciousness, they are all forms. Anything that is manifested is form. This is looking at form from the perspective of manifestation. In this way, we have unified the macro world and the consciousness world from the perspective of manifestation. This unity makes the transition from matter to consciousness, from consciousness to matter continuous. There is no discontinuous gap in between. Neither side could emerge abruptly, otherwise it would become dualism, which would require some mysterious third party to explain how they are associated. Moreover, both the macro world and the consciousness world have manifestation. Manifestation is one of the most fundamental actions in this world. This allows the first real breakthrough in the recognition of consciousness in human history. Of course this is only a preliminary understanding of consciousness. There will be further exploration of consciousness later. For example, why doesn't the macro world have consciousness? What are the more essential differences between manifestation in consciousness and manifestation in the macro world? And so on.

People usually think that things like colors exist as properties dependent on some object. This is only from the perspective of isolated objects in the macro world. For example, a flower is red. However, from the perspective of manifestation in the consciousness world, the existence of red is not the existence of a property of an object, but the existence as an independent and definite thing. This existence is the existence of the manifestation action in the consciousness world.

While the existence of things in the macro world is the existence of the isolation action. The existence of the isolation action and the existence of the manifestation action are different, they are two different modes of existence.

We know our consciousness has a characteristic called intuition. In fact it is manifestation intuition. Intuition is one characteristic of manifestation. So is there intuition in the macro world? Yes, since there is manifestation in the macro world, there must be intuition in the macro world. It's just that our consciousness cannot directly recognize the intuition of the macro world, because the intuition in our consciousness manifests directly within our consciousness, while we need to think to recognize that kind of intuition in the macro world (maybe this is the intuition of God or the universe). The intuition of the macro world is not intuition we can directly grasp. But this kind of intuition does exist. For example, when we touch a stone with our hand, the stone has a kind of obstruction that prevents my hand from entering its interior. At this point, this obstruction manifests an impenetrable intuition. For another example, a table, the reason its structural shape becomes its structural shape, is because it has intuitiveness, it is intuitively manifested. This macro intuition is definitely not the intuition of thought in our consciousness, but it is related to the intuition in our consciousness. Intuition is a kind of generation, it portrays manifestation from the perspective of motive force. It is a characteristic of manifestation. That is to say, we can look at manifestation from the perspective of motive force, and of course we can also look at manifestation from the perspective of isolation (which will be discussed later). This explains the manifestation action through the no form motive force action and the no form isolation action.

In some areas of philosophy there is also mention of manifestation, but manifestation has not been consciously studied as an individual thing. It just says that something has manifested some "things". People have not recognized that manifestation is an individual thing, nor have they recognized that manifestation is "no form". and even less recognized that manifestation is different from form. Manifestation has not been raised to the same important level as form. It is

thought that manifestation is just manifesting the essence of things. That essence is the most important thing (According to the phenomenological point of view, essence is the aspect of what the thing manifests itself to us as[3]). This is the fundamental reason why people have not made breakthroughs in exploring consciousness. Because without recognizing these two points, people can only study consciousness in a formal way. But consciousness itself is not a formal thing. Therefore, no matter how detailed the exploration is, it is not possible to obtain essential recognition of consciousness.

For example, Hegel already had the concept of manifestation. He said phenomena are manifestation of essence, but he did not elevate this manifestation to no form. Hegel's dialectical philosophy already had manifestation action, which is God wanting to create the real world according to the blueprint of dialectics, which is actually manifesting this blueprint. This is manifestation action, it's just that Hegel had not consciously realized it.

In the field of phenomenology, philosophers have recognized the action of manifestation and explored philosophy through the action performed by manifestation. However, in phenomenology people study objects, attributes, forms and such, and similarly have not recognized that manifestation is a no form action. Especially Husserl's phenomenology, he studied attributes, objects and such things manifested by consciousness, and did not recognize the action of manifestation itself and its importance. Nor did he recognize that manifestation is a no form action. This is also the reason why the development of phenomenology eventually got lost. The development of phenomenology could not figure out how to move from the definiteness of phenomena of consciousness to the definiteness of objective things (that is, how human consciousness can determine the existence of objective things). Although Heidegger directly approached the existence of objective things, he actually ignored the question of how consciousness determines the existence of objective things, thus did not really resolve this problem. However, the philosophies of Heidegger and Sartre tell us that the objective world has manifestation just like the consciousness world. Hegel's dialectical philosophy also vaguely tells

us this conclusion. But so far, no one has been able to explicitly propose the conclusion that manifestation is a kind of action. Of course, most importantly, no one has recognized that manifestation is "no form", which is the crux of the issue.

Heidegger argued that epistemology cannot be separated from ontology. Only by starting from the structure of being-in-the-world can the meaning of existence and the essence of things be elucidated. Heidegger's existential philosophy takes the route of ontology having priority: existence itself manifests as manifestation (Note: The manifestation as referred to by Heidegger is a form of presentation of existence, it is the way existence reveals itself in the world, and not the no form manifestation I am referring to, these are two different concepts. That is to say, Heidegger did not recognize that manifestation is a no form) and the manifested. This also means that the origin of phenomena is existence, existence has priority over the phenomena of subjective consciousness. Sartre agreed with Heidegger's view on the relationship between existence and phenomena, but believed there were still some difficult problems left to be solved. Sartre affirmed that the existence of an object is its series of manifestations, and no mysterious entity exists behind the phenomena it manifests. However, Sartre also realized that on the one hand, the existent manifests itself, and on the other hand, it also manifests itself relative to everyone who recognizes the existent. In terms of the self-manifestation of existence things itself, it is comprehensive and infinite; in terms of the manifestation of existent things in relation to humans, it is always a partial manifestation relative to a certain perspective, and is always limited.[4]

In phenomenology, phenomenon refers to the self-manifestation of the existent thing. Heidegger defined phenomenon as "self-manifestation in itself". Sartre first affirmed that phenomenon is not the surface of the true essence of the existent things. Behind the phenomenon there is no so-called truly existing entity. To use Sartre's own example, "force" is not an unknown metaphysical entity hidden behind its various effects (acceleration, deviation, etc.), rather it is the totality of these effects; similarly, electric current has no hidden an unknown metaphysical entity

behind it: it is nothing more than the totality revealed through its many physical-chemical effects (electrolysis, incandescence of the filament, movement of the ammeter needle, etc.). This shows that behind the series of phenomena there is no hidden entity. "Now it can be said that the first conclusion of 'phenomenological theory' is that manifestation does not return to being like Kantian phenomenon returning to noumenon. Because behind manifestation there is nothing, it only manifests itself (and the whole series of manifestations), it can only be supported by its own existence, not by another existence. It cannot become a layer of nothingness separating 'subjective existence' and 'absolute existence'." [5]

It can be seen that in Sartre's phenomenology, the so-called phenomenon is just the manifestation of the thing itself, there is nothing else besides that. Here the "manifestation" itself is ignored. Without manifestation, how could things be manifested? That is, how could there be phenomena? According to phenomenological theory, phenomenon should be the essence of the manifested thing, the thing is manifested. Although this sees the action of manifestation from the perspective of phenomena, that is, it manifested the essence of things. However, phenomenology still considers the issue from the perspective of form. The essence is the inherent determinacy of the thing itself, which is in fact form. That is to say, phenomenology still takes form as the direction of study. Phenomenology has actually transformed the original study of the form of things into the study of manifested forms. It has not recognized that manifestation is "no form", and the action of manifestation is "no form" action. In this way, phenomenology still falls into the study of forms. Phenomenology attempts to use this identity of phenomena and existence to avoid the dualism of phenomena and existence, but this is inevitably a failure. Because phenomenologist did not notice that manifestation itself is different from the manifested thing. If they had noticed, phenomenologist would believe dualism emerged again, which is what they did not want to see. Because one of the purposes of phenomenologists developing phenomenology is to avoid dualism. (The predicament of dualism and the rationality of two dimension theory: form and no form have been elaborated in the two chapters of "Fallacious Dualism" and "Two Dimension Theory: Form and No Form")

2, No form isolation

Consider this question: In this world, there are individual things, so why do individual things appear? The answer is: This world must have an action that makes it possible to produce individual things in this world, and only then individual things will be produced. Without this possibility, how could individual things be produced? I call this action "isolation action". Discovering this no form action was inspired by computer programming. In object-oriented programming languages there is a term called "isolation". It means that between different functional modules of a computer program, there should be a certain degree of functional independence. If the code of one functional module needs to be modified, other functional modules should not be affected by the changes in this modified functional module (Of course, this is an ideal situation. In reality, what can be achieved is to minimize the impact as much as possible). This makes a functional system easy to maintain, modify and expand its capabilities. Otherwise, if changing one functional module affects other functional modules, these affected modules would also need to change accordingly. This would require more work to maintain the program system, and would also easily cause errors. Even for a huge program system, maintaining it would become impossible. That is, changing one place would involve every other place. In fact, objects themselves in object-oriented programming are a kind of isolation action. They encapsulate code and functions within an object, and only exposing callable methods, data and functions to the outside. Such objects are provided inherently by the programming language itself. Otherwise we would not be able to build objects. This isolation action in programming languages allows us to imagine that the reason everything in the world can become individual things is because there is an action called the isolation action that enables them to become individual things. Just like objects in object-oriented programming, objects are provided beforehand by the programming language. This isolation action also enables individuals to have a certain degree of independence, so that within a certain degree and scope, they will not affect other individual things. Otherwise, any change in anything in this world would affect all other things, and cause all other things to change accordingly. This is inconceivable and not factual.

For the isolation action in computer programming, no extra specialized code is needed, it just changed the way of coding, But for different functional modules in a program system, it does achieve a isolation action. Relative to the programming code, the isolation action is a no form action. Thus, we can imagine that isolation action in the real world relative to individual things should also be a no form action. In the real world, if isolation is a form, then what would isolate isolation and individual things? This would lead to infinite regress as discussed in "no form" manifestation. To avoid infinite regress, isolation can only be a no form, and the isolation action can only be a no form action. That is to say, the isolation action is a action generated by no form, it isolates forms, and does not require isolation itself. Note that what does "no form" isolate? Forms. Here we can call form substance. That is to say, from the perspective of isolation, form are substance. This is also Aristotle's way of studying the essence of things through substance, an approach that is clearly studying from the perspective of isolation. While in "no form" manifestation, we call form essence. This is very interesting.

For the macro world, it is essentially a world dominated by isolation. In this world, there are various isolated things. The things we see every day are such isolated things. For example: houses, books, bottles, flowers, trees, birds, bees, clouds, water drops, rivers, fish, the sun, sunlight, stars, the moon, motions, changes, growth, even the process of changes in things, etc. Every isolated thing has a certain independence (it can be seen from previous analysis that independence is spoken of from the perspective of motive force, because independence involves the mutual influence caused by changes). They can be distinguished or distinguished in some way (distinguishability is spoken of from the perspective of manifestation, because to make something manifest, it is necessary to distinguish it). There is not only isolation in the macro world, there is also isolation in the manifested world of consciousness. The things formed in our consciousness are isolated things. For example, different colors like red, green, etc. are different isolated things. Sweet, sour, bitter, spicy are also different isolated things. The objects formed in our consciousness are also isolated things. However, the isolation in the manifested world of

consciousness is weaker relative to manifestation, because it is a world dominated by manifestation.

From ancient Greek philosophy until now, people have always been thinking about philosophical issues in "no form" isolation action. For example, every concept is a product of no form isolation action, because every concept is distinguished from other concepts, and has a certain independence. It's just that people have never consciously realized this no form action concept, and basically no one has even recognized that such an action exists. No form isolation action is the most imperceptible kind of action. It seems no one has yet perceived such an action, because it gives a very inconspicuous feeling. And people take the emergence of individual things in the world so much for granted that they don't feel anything unusual about it. We take it for granted that individual things naturally exist in this world, no proof is needed. It is thought that each individual thing comes into being or changes due to other things. In fact, thinking this way is just considering issues from the perspective of causality. People are used to considering issues from the perspective of causality. Considering issues from causality is actually considering issues from the perspective of no form motive force action. But we also need to consider issues from the perspective of no form isolation action. From this perspective, we would ask questions like: Why do individual things emerge in this world? That is to say, the emergence of individual things in this world is one thing; the existence of an action that makes the emergence of such individual things possible is another matter. The meaning here is that the possibility of the existence of individual things in this world must first exist before individual things can be produced (otherwise, even with motive force, no individual thing would be produced). Otherwise, this world would be an undifferentiated "one", there would be no diversity or differences.

Leibniz was already aware of the problem of the diversity of things in his Monadology: 38) It follows that the ultimate reason for things must lie in a necessary substance, in which the diversity of particular changes exists only eminently, as in its source. And this substance is what I call God. 39) This substance is the sufficient reason for all the diversity, which is connected and

related in every respect. Therefore, there is only one God, and this God is sufficient.[6] Leibniz merely attributed the source of the diversity of things to God, that is, God is the cause of the diversity of things. This is unsatisfactory. But at least Leibniz had explicitly raised the issue that the diversity of things should have a source. His understanding of this issue should be the diversity inherent in monads themselves, not the diversity formed by the combination or change of monads. These are two completely different issues.

The metaphysical issues people have always studied, like ideas, substances, etc., are actually issues of isolation. Because metaphysical issues are issues of concepts, this is most evident in Aristotle: A substance is that which is neither predicated of a subject nor exists in a subject. This is clearly an issue of isolation, because "not exists in a subject" means a substance must have the characteristic of being independent and existing without depending on other things. That is to say, a substance is isolated. (There is an obvious logical issue here: If a thing is isolated into a substance that exists independently of other things, then why can it still be recognized by us? If this substance is so independent, it should not be recognizable, which would be equivalent to this substance not existing. However, according to Aristotle's theory, we can still make predications about this substance, that is, we can say what it is. This problem is not contradictory from the perspective of the no form action theory. Note that a thing being isolated into a substance does not mean it cannot be manifested. This issue is just raised here. It will be better understood in the chapter "The Isolated World of Language".) Aristotle believed that the reason things differ from each other is that they possess different forms. Form represents the individuality of a substance. In metaphysics, he elaborated on the process of a thing's transition from "potentiality" to "actuality". The differences and diversity between things are caused by the different combinations of form and matter in this process. Since Aristotle's concepts of matter and form are relative, he only effectively grasped the concept of form, and did not effectively grasp the concept of pure matter. So he could only study isolated things from the perspective of form. These isolated things were actually called "substance" by him. He did not realize the issue behind the diversity of things in the world (that is, the issue of the possibility for individual

things to become individual things). In his theory, only what can serve as the grammatical subject and be predicated by other things is called substance, otherwise it is called attribute. For example, red is called attribute. This is one-sided, because for an object, this redness does indeed exist depending on the object, but in the manifested world of human consciousness this is not the case. Red exists definitely, it does not rely on a particular object. Red is produced as long as light of a certain frequency enters the human eye. Although there is no absolute isolated thing (including the substances Aristotle spoke of are not absolutely isolated things), as long as it can be distinguished from other things, it has a kind of independence. This is the concept of the isolation action. This concept of the isolation action is different from Aristotle's concept of substance. This red color is also a isolated thing. In the manifested world of consciousness, it is a thing that can be distinguished (this distinguished thing is not necessarily independently existing, these are two different concepts). From the perspective of the manifestation characteristic of the isolation action, the isolation action is able to "be distinguished". From the motive force characteristic perspective of the isolation action, the isolated thing has independence. The isolation action isolates things into having certain forms (as said previously in the manifestation action, the manifestation action manifests forms). As said before, redness is a form that is just manifested in our consciousness. This is completely different from saying redness is a property of an object. Saying redness is a property of an object is speaking in the macro world. The macro world is a world dominated by isolation, different from the consciousness world dominated by manifestation as discussed before. In the macro world, color is a property of an object, but not in the consciousness world, where it is a isolated thing. From the perspective of the isolation action, we can call the form possessed by a thing (certainly an isolated thing) a substance. So in this case, substance is identical to form. Then, in this way, from the perspective of the isolation action, red can also be called a substance (note that it has been said previously that from the manifestation action perspective red is called essence).

The intellect's consciousness of "things" can be said to be object consciousness. Kant has pointed out that it is established by self-consciousness.[7] This object is actually an isolated thing. The

object is an isolated thing formed in the manifested world of our consciousness. It is an object in consciousness, an object of thought, distinguished from the objective thing that causes us to produce the object. Moreover, there is also a distinction between different objects in consciousness. Objects are things distinguished by our consciousness. These are two different kinds of isolation.

From the above analysis, not only does our external macro world have the isolation action, there is also the isolation action in the manifested world of consciousness, just like the manifestation action in the manifested world of consciousness, there is also the manifestation action in the macro world. However, the macro world is a world dominated by isolation, while the consciousness world is dominated by manifestation. That is to say, just like the manifestation action, the isolation action is continuous between the macro world and the world of consciousness, it is unified. This is also why we can use consciousness to recognize the laws of the macro world. In this way, we have unified the macro world and the consciousness world from the perspective of isolation. Of course, the isolation of these two worlds has both similarities and differences.

3, No form motive force

Let's analyze the motive force in computers again. The power of a computer is provided by the CPU. This power drives the programming code to run the software in the system. For programming code, this power exists, otherwise how would every line of code be executed? However, This power is clearly not something present as a "form" of code. For the code in the system, this power is "no form", it cannot be described by the code itself (for example, a line of code like this: `System.out.println("Hello, world")`, it displays "Hello, world" on the screen, but when the computer executes this statement, from the code perspective we cannot see what this executing power is, we only know there is a power executing it.). Therefore, relative to the code itself, this power can only be "no form". Thus we can imagine that the force in the real world

relative to individual things in the real world is "no form". It exerts a no form action on individual things.

Forces is a kind of thing universally recognized by people. People have recognized all kinds of forces, for example, electric power, gravitational force, strong force, weak force, influential force, interactive force, impetus, attraction, repulsion, driving force, capability, etc. The characteristics of these forces are that they can drive things to change, move or maintain a certain state. This driving force is the motive force. So what is motive force? How does motive force make things change or move? From ancient Greece, people have been looking for two things: first, what is the most fundamental substratum of the world? Second, what is the motive force that drives the change of the substratum? Or what is the cause? In ancient Greece, there was already the sprout that motive force is "no form". But until today still no one has consciously proposed this idea. Because no one can imagine that a thing without any form could cause other things to change or move. No one could even conceive that a thing without any form exists.

Anaximander believed: "None of the elements - fire, air, water, or earth - could generate all things. Nor could any other things, such as something between air and water or air and fire." [8] In short, no single or simple natural thing could be the origin of all things. Only that kind of primordial chaos that transcended concrete material forms could be the origin of all things. Although Anaximander did not specify exactly what the "boundless" was, he clearly stated that it was not anything with a fixed form: because anything simple and formed is transient, while the origin of all things must be eternal. All transient things emerge from it as a result. [9] As Aristotle explained: "As the origin, it is eternal. Anything produced reaches an end point, yet having an endpoint means being finite [having form]. Therefore, the indefinite [the boundless] has no origin. It is itself the origin of other things, encompassing and governing all." [10]

Anaximander believed that all these particular substances came from the primordial material, which was an indefinite or boundless domain. Thus, on the one hand, we find particular, definite

things, like a rock, a pool of water; on the other hand, we find the source of these things, which he called the indefinite boundless. Actual things are particular, their source is indefinite; things are finite, while the primordial material is indefinite or boundless. ...The indefinite boundless is the most primordial indestructible material essence of all things. However, he believed it is in eternal motion. [11]

Regarding Anaximander's viewpoint, two things can be seen: first, the primordial material is an indefinite or boundless domain, it is a formless thing; second, the primordial material is in eternal motion. From this sprout of thought, it can be summarized that as the "primordial material" that is eternally in motion, it has motivity. If the "primordial material" had any definiteness, then it would necessarily be finite. So the "primordial material" must be "no form". Even if this "primordial material" has continual variability, it would still have form, Its variation is its form. If its variation form is removed, then it would become no form. So the final conclusion is: the "primordial material" must be "no form". And because it has motivity, it should be "no form" motive force. Since then, people have not recognized that the primordial material is "no form" motive force. People's thinking went in other directions. Until today people have gone too far in other directions, to the point that there is no substantial understanding about the motive force that drives the change or motion of things. Because the primordial material is indefinite. Since this is so, there is no way to study it, it cannot even be expressed. It can only be said to be a kind of indefinite thing. This led subsequent philosophers to become increasingly estranged from this thing. They could only study things with definitive forms, limited things. This opened the path for philosophers to take form as the main object of study in philosophy. Gradually people began to pursue philosophies aimed at finding that unchanging, unmoving, eternal, indestructible thing. Indeed, through the efforts of generations of philosophers, such a thing has been found. In Plato it is the idea, in Aristotle it is the form. Moreover, Plato took the idea he discovered as the motive force for the change and motion of things. Aristotle likewise took the form he discovered as the motive force for the change and motion of things. Having no way to study that "indefinite, boundless" thing, and taking such unchanging ideas or forms as

motive force is inappropriate. Because this does not explain that "indefinite, boundless" thing. It just puts it aside and replaces it with the opposite thing. Clearly this is inappropriate.

Since Aristotle's philosophical system is basically a formal philosophical system, he also explained motive force in a formal way. Let's take a look at Aristotle's forms that possess motive force. In Aristotle's view, any individual thing is a unity of form and matter, while the form and matter of things are also relative. For lower-level things, it is the form, and for higher-level things, it is the matter. For example, bricks are the form of mud (mud is the matter of bricks), while also being the matter of houses; houses are the form of bricks, but are again the matter of streets. And so on, the whole universe forms a unified sequence alternating from matter to form, with higher-level things not only constituting the form of lower-level things, but also being the driving force or attraction that pushes lower-level things to develop and rise towards themselves. The lowest end of this sequence is "pure matter" without any form, which is equivalent to "non-existence"; the highest end is a "pure form" or "form of forms" that no longer constitutes the matter of anything. This "pure form" is the ultimate goal that all things strive for, and also the "prime mover" that drives all things to move towards its development. It itself does not move but drives all things, and is therefore the "unmoved mover". Aristotle also called it "God". Therefore, the "first philosophy" was also called "theology" by him. [12]

"Higher-level things not only constitute the form of lower-level things, but are also the driving force or attraction that pushes lower-level things to develop and rise towards themselves." His view has obvious problems. If that is the case, wouldn't the world's matter decrease more and more? Then the force possessed by pure form would become less and less attractive, because there is less and less that can be attracted. In reality, many higher-level formal things can degrade into lower-level material things, for example, houses can completely collapse and become piles of mud, and evaporated water will become water vapor. Therefore, Aristotle was wrong in taking higher-level things as the driving force for lower-level things, or pure form as the prime mover. Form cannot be motive force; motive force should be hidden in the mutual changes between

things. One can only see the actions of force, but not the motive force itself, because motive force is "no form".

The philosophers Plato and Aristotle explained force as a kind of attractive force, which actually attributed force to form and was a teleological approach (form attracts matter to change towards form, and form is the purpose of matter). There is another kind of force called impetus, which is a mechanical approach. The mechanical approach uses another object to push an object to explain motion. for example, a is pushed by b, b is pushed by c, and so on, which will regress infinitely. In this way we have not discovered force, only a series of objects. Unless it stops at a certain object, which is unmoved, and is the ultimate cause of pushing other things to move. The result of this ultimate cause is the same as that of the teleological approach, both arriving at an "unmoved mover". The essence of these two forces is the same, only in opposite directions. In fact, this is a standard formalized mode of thinking. Examining the world only with this mode of thinking will necessarily overlook no form thing. Only by acknowledging that motive force is "no form" action can the ultimate prime mover be reasonably understood. Because no form is its own cause, it can push other things while itself not pushed by other things, nor needing other things to push it, since it is self-caused.

The French materialists' idea of attributing motion to the material world itself by eliminating Newton's hypothesis of God as the "prime mover" undoubtedly liberated people's views on natural science. However, if it is believed that the natural world has always been like this, with no development or change, and that the ultimate source of all motion does not come from within matter itself, but is only transmitted between matters, then the natural world ultimately still cannot get rid of the problem of the "prime mover", cannot make the natural world itself manifest as motion. [13]

Since the external impetus could not find the cause for the genesis of force, people turned their eyes to the interior of matter (or things) to see if the cause for generating force could be found within it.

Leibniz believed that the nature of monads was a kind of "primitive force". It is this "force" that makes each monad a free causa sui, giving it a kind of ability similar to sensation and desire, which leads to the motion of monads and the myriad things composed of monads. Leibniz called monads "incorporeal automata", with their spontaneity becoming the source of their inherent activity. [14] Through the efforts of Kant, Hegel and others, it was believed that this force is the subject's spontaneity, especially Hegel's view that this spontaneity is the self-negation of concepts. In addition, people have recognized the philosophical action of motive force. Fichte wanted to use the spontaneity of the self to explain the issue of matter and consciousness. This shows that people have consciously used motive force to explain philosophical issues and have recognized the action of motive force, which is different from isolation. People have not yet consciously used isolation to explain philosophical issues. It is one thing to be able to consciously use motive force to explain problems, and another thing to figure out "what is motive force".

The most important characteristic of Hegel's dialectics is the idea of spontaneity, which he already explained in his Phenomenology of Spirit, namely: "The key to all questions is not only to understand and articulate the real thing or truth as substance, but also to understand and articulate it as subject." In Logic, the true substance is the category, so the key lies in understanding the category as subject. The subject is spontaneity and initiative. The category is active. Since the category is the essence of all things, then all things in the universe are active. Hegel was the first philosopher to incorporate the spontaneity of all things into a logical law. [15] Hegel's "being" is not what we usually think of as a "thing that exists", but an "act of existing" that contains inherent spontaneity, the activity of "coming into being". All the other categories used in logic have this characteristic, namely the characteristic of self-spontaneity and self-motion. [16]

Contradiction is also a kind of opposition, but not an external opposition with other things, rather the opposition of one thing against itself. From the perspective of formal logic it is

"self-contradiction", but from the perspective of dialectics it is precisely the "ground" of all things. Therefore, the ultimate ground for the motion of anything lies in its self-contradiction, self-denial, discord within itself, rejection of itself, which is "self-motion" rather than external impetus. Such a ground itself has no other ground, so it is simultaneously "groundless". It is impossible and absurd to find a further ground for the ground of all things. Contradiction is the "sufficient ground" (or "sufficient reason") of all things. [17]

Many philosophers explore formal philosophy, but what is hidden behind is the action of motive force. Hegel's dialectical logic philosophy is like this, always taking negativity as a kind of motive force. In fact, motive force is at work behind it. Hegel introduced motive force into his dialectics, but he did not explain what motive force is, nor did he explain the relationship between his dialectics, his theory and motive force, as if the two were unrelated. In his dialectics, it seems like an invisible hand is working as motive force behind the scenes, but this invisible hand has never reached the foreground of dialectics. He attributed motive force to the self-contradictory negativity of the subject. So why would the negativity of contradiction be motive force? There is still no way to answer this. It also does not transcend the limitation of attributing motive force to form. This is also inevitable, because according to the traditional mode of thinking, "things of no form" cannot be expressed or studied.

Although modern physics has developed into a very profound discipline, no physicist can tell us what force is. Physicists like Richard Feynman are very humble, not knowing what force is, other than defining a mathematical formula for it.

Let us ask, "What is the meaning of the physical laws of Newton, which we write as $F = ma$? What is the meaning of force, mass, and acceleration?" Well, we can intuitively sense the meaning of mass, and we can define acceleration if we know the meaning of position and time. We shall not discuss those meanings, but shall concentrate on the new concept of force. The answer is equally simple: If a body is accelerating, then there is a force on it." That is what Newton's laws say, so the most precise and beautiful definition of force imaginable might simply

be to say that force is the mass of an object times the acceleration. Suppose we have a law which says that the conservation of momentum is valid if the sum of all the external forces is zero; then the question arises, "What does it mean, that the sum of all the external forces is zero?" A pleasant way to define that statement would be: "When the total momentum is a constant, then the sum of the external forces is zero." There must be something wrong with that, because it is just not saying anything new. If we have discovered a fundamental law, which asserts that the force is equal to the mass times the acceleration, and then define the force to be the mass times the acceleration, we have found out nothing. We could also define force to mean that a moving object with no force acting on it continues to move with constant velocity in a straight line. If we then observe an object not moving in a straight line with a constant velocity, we might say that there is a force on it. Now such things certainly cannot be the content of physics, because they are definitions going in a circle. The Newtonian statement above, however, seems to be a most precise definition of force, and one that appeals to the mathematician; nevertheless, it is completely useless, because no prediction whatsoever can be made from a definition. One might sit in an armchair all day long and define words at will, but to find out what happens when two balls push against each other, or when a weight is hung on a spring, is another matter altogether, because the way the bodies behave is something completely outside any choice of definitions. [18]

Quantum mechanics explains force as the exchange of some particles. For example, electromagnetic force is the continual exchange of photons between electrons. But is exchanging photons force? Where is the force? Isn't such an explanation very similar to explaining consciousness with particles? Doesn't this indicate that motive force, like consciousness, is also "no form"? From ancient to modern times, the main focuses in philosophy have been individualization and motive force, but with more emphasis on individualization. In physics, the main focuses are individualization and forces, but with more emphasis on forces. Individualization refers to concepts such as objects, ideas and entities, which are concepts produced by the isolation action. In both of these fields, there are no any in-depth precise

definitions of the essence of the motive force. There is no clear understanding of what the motive force is in either field. Philosophy and science share a common predicament on this point, both remaining at a rather intuitive cognition and superficial application of "forces".

"What is force?" has been a question people have been trying to answer since ancient Greece. Until now, people are still describing force without a deeper understanding of it. Philosophers merely state that formal things generate forces, while physicists only measure and calculate forces, and can only define force with a mathematical formula. These are all formal methods. The understanding of force is still like the understanding of consciousness, a black box recognition. Only knowing there is such a thing, and also knowing how to measure, calculate and apply it, but not knowing what it is. This phenomenon is still like searching for light with a flashlight. Much and deep research has been done on form, but until now, people have no idea what forces that drives the development of things is. Thus, we can boldly conjecture that for human cognition, there can only be intuitive cognition of some things, not rational cognition; while some things can be rationally cognized in terms of their formal structure. Things that can only be intuitively cognized have no formal structure, so rational cognition of them is impossible. The motive force should be a no form thing without formal structure.

From people's understanding of motive force since ancient Greece, it can be seen that motive force can only be an action generated by no form. That is to say, the ultimate cause for changes in things can only be attributed to no form. Because any attempt to express motive force in a formalized way will find that it is not motive force after all, it is only form. Therefore, only by acknowledging that motive force is "no form" can we have a true understanding of it. If motive force were a form, then what would drive motive force? Thus it would lead to infinite regress as discussed in "no form" manifestation. To avoid infinite regression, motive force can only be "no form", and the action of motive force can only be "no form" action. That is to say, the action of motive force is an action generated by no form. It drives form, and does not itself need driving. Note that what does "no form" drive? Form. Here we can call form the subject. That is to say,

from the perspective of motive force, form is the subject. The meaning of subject is to have spontaneity. This is also Hegel's way of studying the essence of things through the subject, an approach that is clearly studying from the perspective of motive force. While in the manifestation action of no form, we call form essence. And in the isolation action of no form, we call form substance. This is also why Hegel said "substance is subject, subject is substance". Clearly, from the perspective of no form, these two concepts are still different: substance looks at form from the perspective of isolation, subject looks at form from the perspective of motive force. Hegel did not see their difference. It can be seen that looking at form from the three different perspectives of no form actions leads to three different concepts. In this way, our understanding of essence, entity and subject becomes clearer and more transparent.

Previously we saw that consciousness is a world of manifestation, the macro world is a world of isolation. Is there a world of motive force? The answer is yes, this world is the quantum world. The quantum world is a world dominated by motive force. The quantum world of motive force is markedly different from the macro world, because quantum mechanics tells us that we cannot directly observe a quantum, if we try to observe a quantum, it will collapse and lose its original state. In this way, according to the three no form actions, we have divided the whole world into three different worlds: the world of manifestation (the world of consciousness), the world of isolation (the macro world), and the world of motive force(the quantum world).

Similarly, in the manifested world of consciousness there is also motive force(such as willpower), and in the isolated macro world there is also motive force(motion of macro objects requires motive force). It's just that in these two worlds, motive force is relatively weak. Likewise, in the quantum world of motive force, there are also actions of manifestation (change of motive force is manifestation of motive force) and isolation (for example, quanta themselves are separate units, which is a standard isolation action).

For the action of motive force, every motive force thing has variability (this is also said from the perspective of manifestation, that is, variability is the manifestation of motive force. At the same

time, it should be noted that, corresponding to isolation, from the perspective of isolation, variability has a distinction, otherwise how would we know there is change?). From the perspective of isolation, every motive force thing has generativity, motive force will generate a change or a thing, this is said from the perspective of isolation; for the action of manifestation, every manifested thing, from the perspective of motive force, is intuitive, and from the perspective of isolation, is identical. The intuition of manifestation has been elaborated earlier. The manifestation of things has the characteristic of not being affected by changes in time and space. For example, for manifestation, the color red has identity, no matter when, the red produced in our consciousness is always the same, this color is definite, it is identical. While from the perspective of isolation, isolation always divides (or combines) into different things. From the perspective of motive force, different things are always generated. However, from the perspective of manifestation, what is directly manifested is itself, what manifests is the identity of itself (that is, what manifests is its essence). The final conclusion is: isolation has the characteristics of independence and distinction; motive force has the characteristics of variation and generation; manifestation has the characteristics of intuition and identity. Each no form action has two characteristics, and the two characteristics of each no form action are obtained from the perspective of the other two corresponding no form actions. The corresponding two characteristics can only be obtained from the perspective of the other two corresponding no form actions. Because the characteristics of a thing must have a corresponding distinction from itself in order to be called the characteristics of that thing. This is understanding no form actions themselves using no form actions. This is also a kind of no form logic that will be elaborated in detail in later sections.

Modern science only uses and studies two forms, one is mathematical form, the other is structural form. In fact these are all isolation forms, but there are still forms of manifestation and forms of motive force in existence. And when studying other forms in science, mathematical forms and structural forms are also used to simulate them, or transform them into mathematical forms and structural forms for study. This is why science seems incompetent when studying

things like consciousness. Not only that, there are also many unexplained areas when science studies force, such as quantum entanglement and quantum collapse phenomena. This is the limitation of science.

From the above analysis, these three no form actions each have their own corresponding forms, each with its own definiteness of form, and thus each has its own objectivity. They cannot replace each other, but can transform into each other. Of course, there are also common forms between the three actions, otherwise our consciousness would have no way to recognize the objectivity of macro things, and likewise, the macro world would not have evolved human consciousness.

So what is the use of finding these three no form actions? This is already very powerful. Based on this, we can divide any thing or concept into three categories: isolation, motive force and manifestation (this classification method itself is also a logic, which will be discussed later). For example, in the previous discourse, we have already obtained from the three no form perspectives a classification of form: essence, substance and subject. This will enable us to have a very clear classification of things, which can clarify the confusion in thinking and concepts caused by confusing categories. To give a simple example, we already know that the quantum world of motive force and the macro world of isolation are different worlds. So when we observe quanta, we are observing in an isolated way, because our instruments are all isolated things in the macro world. As soon as we make a measurement, the quanta will be transformed into a thing of the isolation world. That is to say, we can only use instruments to observe the behavior of things of quanta transformed into the world of isolation, rather than observe the behavior of quanta themselves in the quantum world of motive force. Therefore, the results obtained are also results of the isolation world, and it is impossible to observe the objective reality of quantum motive force itself. This is what quantum physics says, that the quantum behavior we observe is always related with the measurement itself, and results unaffected by measurement interference cannot be obtained. It can be seen that by simply dividing different worlds with the theory of no form

action, we can clearly explain the "measurement problem" that has long been controversial in quantum mechanics (here is just a brief mention of this problem, and more details will be elaborated later). Likewise, we can also explain why consciousness is subjective rather than objective. We cannot observe consciousness with any instrument, because using the method of studying the objective macro world to study consciousness can also only obtain results of the isolation world, and it is impossible to observe consciousness itself, just like using instruments to observe quantum behavior. This is why consciousness has the first-person privacy (consciousness has a kind of first-person or subjective ontology character, and therefore cannot be reduced to anything that has third-person or objective ontology [19]). By the same logic, the quantum world of motive force should also have a certain degree of privacy relative to the macro world of isolation. Our measurements are actually measurements of the world of isolation. Measurement of motive force (such as measurement of quantum particles) is to convert motive force into isolation for measurement.

What we usually refer to as objectivity is actually the objectivity of the isolation world. The reason we cannot measure the objectivity of motive force is that we can only measure motive force after it is transformed into isolation things, because our measurement itself is only isolated measurement, so we can only measure isolation, not measure motive force directly. That is to say, the macro world of isolation, the quantum world of motive force, and the world of manifestation of consciousness, they all have their own objectivity. Their objectivity has its own independence (not being able to observe and measure the objectivity of motive force of the world of motive force does not mean the objectivity of motive force cannot be known, these are two different concepts, to be discussed later). They cannot replace each other, but can transform into each other. We cannot require the objectivity of the quantum world of motive force to be the same as the objectivity of the world of isolation, similarly, we cannot require the objectivity of the world of manifestation of consciousness to be the same as the objectivity of the world of isolation. We have used one principle to explain two different problems, and the answers to these two different problems are the same. This enhances the persuasive power of explaining problems using the no

form action theory. In this way, we have three perspectives and three ways to think about problems, rather than being limited to one single way of thinking. Combining these three ways of thinking to examine and study the world will lead to comprehensive and clear conclusions. This is also the method I use to examine and study the no form action theory itself.

On the other hand, knowing the three no form actions allows us to make predictions about things and concepts. For example, the three concepts of substance, essence and subject discussed earlier. When we know that form is essence from the perspective of manifestation, we will naturally think about what form is from the perspective of motive force and what form is from the perspective of isolation. When we know that manifestation has the two characteristics of intuition and identity, we will naturally think that the corresponding motive force will also have two characteristics and isolation will also have two characteristics. We randomly pick a concept, for example morality, and we will wonder, is there morality of manifestation? Is there morality of isolation? Is there morality of motive force? If so, what are they? This predictive thinking will be one of the main ways of thinking in subsequent sections.

Why do we take "form and no form" as a two dimension theory model as the starting point for studying the world? Since, according to the no form action theory, we have three perspectives and three ways to think about problems, it is no longer necessary. Starting research of this world from other perspectives is possible and necessary. The two dimension theory of no form and form only look at the problem from the perspective of isolation as a starting point. This is suitable for philosophical research, because the way of philosophical research revolves around concepts. And concepts are ways of looking at problems from the perspective of isolation. Looking at the world from the perspective of art and aesthetics is the perspective of manifestation. Looking at the world from this perspective is directly experiencing the world. For example, creating and appreciating works of art. According to the Big Bang theory, our visible universe evolved from an infinitesimal point with infinite energy through the Big Bang. This infinitesimal point contained infinite energy. Studying the origin of the universe in science is

starting from motive force. There are also systems of philosophy built starting from motive force (although not from pure motive force), for example, Schopenhauer's philosophy of the will to life is constructed starting from the will, and the "will" referred to by Schopenhauer also contains the meaning of motive force. This also shows that any idea of achieving a thorough understanding of this world in a single way is unrealistic.

What is the relationship between the three no form actions? On the surface, they seem to have no relation at all, and their differences are obviously great. It's hard to imagine what relation isolation has with motive force, what relation isolation has with manifestation, and what relation motive force has with manifestation. Does the appearance of an object in my consciousness have any relation with isolation (or motive force)? Yes, there is a relation, and the relation between them is the most core viewpoint of the no form action theory. Their relation is what will be elaborated in the next section.

References

- [1] Samuel Enoch, Stumpf, and Fieser James. History of Western Philosophy, translated by Deng Xiaomang and Kuang Hong, Beijing United Publishing Company, 2019, p. 81-82.
- [2] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. History of Western Philosophy, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 246
- [3] Zhang Qingxiong. Modern Western Philosophy, Commercial Press, 2023, p. 334.
- [4] Zhang Qingxiong. Modern Western Philosophy, Commercial Press, 2023, p. 377.
- [5] Zhang Qingxiong. Modern Western Philosophy, Commercial Press, 2023, p. 382.
- [6] Leibniz. Discourse on Metaphysics, translated by Xu Yingjin, SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2007, p. 488.
- [7] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. History of Western Philosophy, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 247-248.

- [8] Miao Lidian. *Ancient Greek Philosophy*, Renmin University of China Press, 1989, p. 24.
- [9] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. *History of Western Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 14.
- [10]., *Selections from Original Works of Western Philosophy*, vol. 1, Renmin University of China Press, 1981, p. 17.
- [11] Samuel Enoch, Stumpf, and Fieser James. *History of Western Philosophy*, translated by Deng Xiaomang and Kuang Hong, Beijing United Publishing Company, 2019, p. 9.
- [12] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. *History of Western Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 60-61.
- [13] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. *History of Western Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 203.
- [14] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. *History of Western Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 160.
- [15] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. *History of Western Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 253.
- [16] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. *History of Western Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 253-254.
- [17] Deng Xiaomang, and Zhao Lin. *History of Western Philosophy*, 2nd ed., Higher Education Press, 2014, p. 255-256
- [18] Feynman, Richard P., and Robert B. Leighton. *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, translated by Zheng Yongling et al., vol. 1, Shanghai Scientific and Technical Publishers, 2005, p. 124.
- [19] Searle, J. *The Mystery of Consciousness*, translated by Liu Yetuo, 1st ed., Nanjing University Press, 2007, p. 146.

3.3. The relationship between the three actions of no form(in progress, please wait!)

4. Different worlds

4.1. Manifestation world, motive force world and isolation world (in progress, please wait!)

4.2. Language isolation world (in progress, please wait!)

5. being of isolation, being of motive force, and being of manifestation(in progress, please wait!)

6. Freedom (in progress, please wait!)

7. Consciousness(in progress, please wait!)

8. Dialectics(in progress, please wait!)

9. Logic(in progress, please wait!)

10. Aesthetics(in progress, please wait!)

11. Physics(in progress, please wait!)