

The Foundations of knowledge:

There was an era that humankind, proud of his discoveries, had found a very different style of life, that he based his concept on the rational explanation of the world. For the first time, Christian theologians, began this process. They intend to explain and justify the religious bases founded on Arabic translations of Aristotle accessible to the west European Philosophers and theologians in that time. This attempt resulted to a new Renaissance in literature and art realms, however, at first sights, the minds were focused on the classical literature and art, the process was begun in Literary, artistic, scientific and technological advances. Before these advances, we should mention too many attempts to fix the Philosophical foundations of these progressions. Humans were learning that the science they were going to apply to obtain empirical knowledge should be based on stable and consequent philosophic Propositions. Therefore, he explained the restrictions of human experience possibility and states of human knowledge and Reciprocal epistemological challenges. In line with this process, we can recognize two major philosophical schools of thought: Rationalism and empiricism. As well-known empiricists, we can mention Hume and Locke. These philosophers considering, the sensory possibilities of humans and concepts such as causality, noted the restrictions and in, the, next step the impossibility of human knowledge. We should recall that writing about philosophy based on empiricism is impossible because philosophy attempts to accomplish a steady generality for the existence if there is such an inclusive generality. Whether there is such a steady generality that includes the existence and human knowledge or not, discussing philosophic affair and knowledge Continuum and generally the totality of the world and its explanation and inclusive generality in the framework of empiricism is impossible, because if we aim to transcend any kind of connection between the particular cases of knowledge, it means to pass the empiricism. Hence, talking about empiricism as a philosophical school of thought that can guide us to a detailed and exact explanation of the world is impossible. Some philosophers such as Kant attempted to" approach these methods but, the epistemological problems are yet unsolved. Descartes began from skepticism, at last, he chose COGITO ER GO SUM", but the problem is unsolved. It seems this term expresses two concepts which are not explainable, unless with Intuitional understanding.

Moreover, these two concepts are the two questions that we must answer to them.

Therefore, beginning from the final Purpose is not an authentic base for the epistemological process.

Furthermore, Descartes could never argue the outcome knowledge for the conscious object was not accomplished through fancy or delirium or drunkenness. We can ask when the conscious object accomplishes understandings through intuition. The epistemological process was shocked in the 19th century through a technical bankruptcy. For the first time, Nietzsche proposed "the axiom of alteration": Nietzsche explains that this axiom is inclusive and, human cannot find the substance and the nature of truth. Wittgenstein disputed the principle of a precise definition that narrows the set of things that meet the definition. He noted that we cannot limit any concept to its content. He prepared a logical foundation for this new epistemological situation.

Wittgenstein, 1953, parts 3-5.

Einstein moved toward the relativism to justify the origin and the quality of motion. Today, it seems that postmodern philosophers continue the way of above-mentioned philosophers and physicists. What should we do? How can we overcome this epistemological crisis? We should move through two steps. First, we make sure that whether there is the possibility thesis eliminates some kinds of theories. Even we do not believe in any logical and epistemological foundation, we cannot dispute that each event is not possible in the universe, or at least we have difficulty in the theoretical explanation of this issue like the practical expression of the same. If the anarchistic explanation of reality is possible, magic will be the better and the only way to explain reality for us. Certainly, we do not argue that the lack of occurrence of some events has a scientific reason. It is the most doubtful face of reasoning that we ask how we can ask why some events never happen. It seems the answer to this question is not simple. We cannot definitely conceal the role of consciousness in occurring events. We bring up this subject later. Finally, we should analyze naught or the existence of occurrences under the shadow of metaphysical and teleological issues. There is the other reason for the benefit of the scientific method to reach the certain and without intermediary knowledge. It is the reason: Science determines its purposes and methods and performs all the defined and determined styles in each condition and situation. Science during the crisis does not give up its claims and does not revise its explanatory methods. Naturally, it refers to us to accept the presupposition of the rational foundation of existence. The problem of the rational foundation of existence expresses more in relation with the offered principle. Probably, we cannot exactly define the concept of explanation. The definition of explanation depends on the specification of the concept of knowledge since explanation is one step to attain it. At beginning, we can point that explanation is the disambiguation of the relation between

consciousness and the plural forms of existence, as any question does not remain for knower object and it may be possible to achieve the epistemological foundation that as a teleological and ontological point of view is steady and sure. It means this epistemological foundation should eliminate doubts. In the knowledge process doubt means restriction. When we believe it is possible that reality may be different from our notion, so probably there will be other forms of consciousness or the entrance of consciousness and the plural forms of existence based on different methods. Naturally,

consciousness and the plural forms of existence, as any question does not remain for knower object and it may be possible to achieve the epistemological foundation that as a teleological and ontological point of view is steady and sure.

It means this epistemological foundation should eliminate doubts. In the knowledge process doubt means restriction.

When we believe it is possible that reality may be different from our notion, so probably there will be other forms of consciousness or the entrance of consciousness and the plural forms of existence based on different methods. Naturally,

this kind of theorizing about the concept of skepticism from an epistemological point of view is considerable. There is direct and certain knowledge, a process that we finally find consciousness through it. That explains knowledge so that any question does not remain in the mind and, doer beings can act based on consciousness. It means that the conscious doer being can create variant worlds and some kinds of behaviors. So maybe there are some other worlds and other forms of consciousness beyond our vision. It is necessary to consider that the definition of consciousness as an aim is not the vicious circle because consciousness itself is not the last segment of the conditions that are needful for immediate knowledge, but we should ask about the origination of consciousness. The next step to obtain knowledge is the determination of conditions that consciousness has grown in it. This step banishes us from the origination circle of consciousness but, now we should note that consciousness is the basis of knowledge. Consciousness manifests itself in many signs because of its plurality. These signs are many various forms of consciousness. The origin of consciousness is ambiguous. This ambiguity of consciousness origin is one of this conundrum aspects. When we pay attention to this unidentified and non-empirical essence of consciousness, we should verify that the scientific system purpose for knowledge ---based on cause and effect relationship--- is not complete, unless the system can recognize the teleological concept of existence and direct and certain knowledge. It is not a disappointing problem to begin to know the circle of scientific knowledge, because we can study the eternal origin of consciousness based on some reasons of the phenomenological faces of existence. This problem is not unsolvable. If the origin of consciousness is naught, like other phenomenon of existence, it will be possible to do empirical research and phenomenological explanation. If consciousness is the originator of eternal existence, naturally, it will explain itself. For the probable explanation of this eternity, we should pay attention to time as the key to discover this phenomenon. We can regard the problem of the circle of knowledge depletion and cause and effect relationship from the two points of views. If we consider phenomenological faces of existence, this observation will be so valuable to achieve immediate knowledge. From point of view of existence phenomenon, all the occurrences that are the arena of knowledge grew through the way that is specified by the upper consciousness. We can manifest the process of the corporal world presentation by the following of consciousness variations. Cause and effect relationship observation through eternity origin of existence is possible too. If consciousness has resulted from an eternal origin, thus we cannot conclude that consciousness is the result of cause and, effect relationship. Perhaps, it has formed by another creator. We must notice that the phenomenological face of existence is always the same presentation of the universe and finally, the possibility of this existence phenomenon explanation. In other words, we can explain this phenomenological aspect of existence at the time and place of the consciousness and the plural forms of existence and its mixed historicity and at last, finality of the universe confrontation.

This historicity that forms time, should be considered in the analysis of consciousness. On the other hand, consciousness phenomenon is not formed in a vacuum condition. Thinking about the probable conditions of growing consciousness is the key to decipher consciousness. We cannot evaluate the hidden consciousness signs in the depth of occurrences. They engage us in the meaning of consciousness. We can only go the same way. Consciousness is not tangible in its abstract face. We consider consciousness, mainly in corporal form as the phenomenological face of existence. This impurity of consciousness shows the relation between consciousness and, alteration. This alteration explains the relations between consciousness, motion and the plural forms of existence. Finally, under the shadow of this temporal consciousness the study of cause and effect relation confronts us the pure and the objective consciousness. It is necessary to say that the conclusion of the pure consciousness without any material cover through existence from a philosophical point of view is possible because the existence phenomenon does not exclude senses. The discovery of uncategorized phenomena among materials is the evidence of this reality. Also, the evolutional instrument of scientific knowledge is very important to know all phenomena and their appearances in the circle of existence. The tracking presented the phenomenon in the circle of their existence and explanation through the paleontological cycle which, points that consciousness began to enter the plural forms of existence in a place near the time beginning. It means that the progression of consciousness through the plural forms of existence in time the first step begins time. Tracking of the consciousness alteration cycle may make knowledge available to us, but how is done explain consciousness before its entrance to the plural forms of existence. To obtain this purpose, we should search about the birth of existence possibility and a motion explanation will for creation. These two problems have resulted from the consciousness will and, the phenomenological presentation of these two states. The phenomenological face of existence defines recusant the formation possibility of existence and the first motion will through a meaningful vacuum. We can explain the teleological explanation of these two problems through an irrational way, but we can clear the phenomenological face of the two positions through irrational methods. Talking about the process and, the possibility of direct and, certain knowledge is not right unless we define and determine it. Talking about direct and certain knowledge, that when the border of human power to obtain knowledge is not unknown and we do not know what we should know and the restrictions of the possibility of consciousness access and the explained knowledge of the universe how it really is founded on the incomplete instruments and undetermined issues that we should know is not indefinite and accurate. How can this situation guide human toward direct and certain knowledge? Human cannot define the consciousness border and the possibility to achieve it, unless researching into the consciousness category. The two main adapted COMPREHENSIBLE parts of this universe with our minds are material and consciousness. We should begin to explain the universe through these two categories. At the best state of creation, materials were captured by the EVOLUTIONAL SITUATIONS. Materials in varied and multiple compositions are the instruments that consciousness applies to create elaboration and development and the evolution of the states of being. If materials are effective in the origination of existence, we can talk about materials apart from material bases. We will mention that we can never talk about the universe without the aid of categories that are not translatable into incorporeal elements. We cannot overcome metaphysical issues regardless of each methodology that we apply to explain the universe. Some materialistic ideologists and philosophers, to justify their opinion, may refer to the restriction points of science as an institution that claims to know the universe and, they also argue the discovery of materialistic foundations of the universe is a process that science will succeed to do it in the future. These thinkers are not aware this moment is the moment that we should find the right way to exit science from the impossibility of the universe explanation. It is maybe just a way to know the universe the way it is. Materialism does not show any outstanding solution to solve these problems. Materialism as, a school of thought that claims to have convincing explanations, proposes very loose and unfounded theories. Uncalculated chance and the

explanation of chaos about the universe do not solve the problem which, justifies that the analysis of materials as the base of formation of the plural forms of existence apart from the evolutionary occasions is impossible. Moreover, there are not any elements of consciousness in the accidental explanation of the universe to explain occurrences that happen in the universe. It ignores mediums and events as different chains that are the makers of cases and explains the universe under the shadow of unclear human science or feign ignorance about the issue. It is not necessary to note that the choice of theory among the codex of impossible hypotheses by an unconscious observer while knowing anything about the reality is not a sample of accidental states. If we theorize about the universe as the observers of the universe and our hypothesis is an expressive theory about reality and the probable objectivity of existence, surely it will not be a random status. Because when we choose a hypothesis, there are many mediums that each one is a variable of the specific incoming forms of consciousness in any plural form of existence. Our theorizing about reality is apparently far from consciousness forms however, this behavior is the conclusion of consciousness. An ignorant person cannot fundamentally theorize in any case. More accordance between theorizing and reality depends on the information of theorist about the matter and the arrangement quality of the information. The more these elements channels are toward the right direction, the closer the explanation is for a reality. The mediums of the doer consciousness have an influence on the selection of one hypothesis from the collections of possible proposed hypotheses to an unconscious observer and his comprehension of reality. When we ask an observer for speaking about a particular case that he does not know anything about it, he has some complex physical, chemical, organic and finally genetic states that are definitely effective in his judgment about the reality. So even his judgment about the reality that he does not know anything about it is not far from consciousness effects, and it is the behavior that is accomplished by consciousness. We can study the judgments of observers, apart from any answers to questions about the reality. The answers that are given by an unconscious observer to questions about the reality are not Empirically in the vacuum of consciousness, and these opinions are the behaviors that are specified by consciousness effects based on the planning framework. We will explain about planning element and its role to happen occurrences. Finally, materialism does not propose a way to solve the epistemological crisis. It is not enough to say that there is a future that science can solve problems and determines the materialistic origin of the universe. This future time is unknown. We should find a way to finalize the explanation. Emphasizing on science as a final explanation is not very beneficial. Science is nothing except the human discoveries about the universe. These are human findings and discoveries that are acquired by the deep thinking about the universe. The absolute emphasis on science (Scientism) does not help to solve this mystery. We would note that sensational perceptions and empirical knowledge as the sources of knowledge, now has described empirically despite of none-convincing explanation. The description of the resulting process in our sensational perceptions is the description of the quality of consciousness entrance in the plural forms of existence. how we can reach science about the universe? To answer to this question, it is necessary to elaborate. The foundation of consciousness is based on empirical science. Even we regard skepticism as the base for our opinion about the corporeal world, we can observe the reasons for existence and consciousness presence in the corporeal world. When one side argues how we can make sure ---we are questioner objects--- that our knowledge is not the outcome of notion or mania, or drunkenness and the other uncertain states. He talks about the status that we cannot mean it except as an epistemological reality. Imagination, drunkenness, or each state that we recognize as an uncertain state of knowledge is a state that a person can determine their benefit or harm and authenticity or inaccuracy in line with immediate knowledge in a logical paradigm. When we talk about imagination, drunkenness, delusion or every status of uncertain knowledge, we can analyze all these states in an epistemological realm. Therefore, talking about certain and immediate knowledge apart from epistemology is impossible. Talking about states of human knowledge must be in a way that includes talking about the quality of connection of consciousness and knower object. When we talk about immediate knowledge or every other uncertain status of knowledge, we cannot ignore the final problem namely, a perception of the complex connection of consciousness and questioner object. Finally, this solution has an epistemological context. When we believe in the epistemological foundation of existence, we accept this presupposition. The corporeal world is a phenomenon. Nevertheless, occurrences have this possibility to occur. Consequently, if there is a real corporeal world and epistemological substantiation steps, undoubtedly, the present corporeal world will result from the presentation of these foundations as concepts by the superior originating consciousness of existence. If the epistemological foundations of existence are real and presented, the basic foundations will ensure us about certain knowledge, unless we must find constant foundations for knowledge. Now a practical regard prevents us from the activity. This regard is the ontological base of existence. We cannot translate the ontological basis of existence except into nothing. It is not obvious that scientific researches can confirm our theories, whether existence is a single phenomenon or we can present it as we want.

Scientific researches can confirm our theories. By now, ontological steps are not translatable except to epistemological foundations. We encounter a dual 1-0 state and being-naught state. The Epistemological foundation of existence reminds us that existence in a way that we confront it and how it has encircled us cannot be presented except in a dual state and we cannot present it in another state. Another point is the restriction of the questioner object. The questioner object can doubt about each step of the knowledge process. This epistemological foundation ---skepticism--- either can be interpreted the authentic knowledge or any kind of uncertain knowledge such as imagination, fantasy or drunkenness and delusion, etc. This is one step to consolidate epistemological foundations of existence unless the ontological steps experiencing deep alterations. By now, because of the ambiguity of the origination, and variations process of consciousness, we cannot determine which epistemological or ontological steps are more fundamental. Though the confrontation of existence and nothing has an epistemological function, and this axiom makes a certain and constant foundation for knowledge. Let us return to the discussion, skepticism is a condition that can be appeared through the way of the certain or uncertain knowledge in every time and every ontological step. Skepticism, as the highest phase of the knowledge process is important because its possibility of being loaded into each knowledge state. It is the sign of restriction too. If we presume that the final knowledge is captured in each one of the two possibilities, we will have a valuable guideline. If the present knowledge is the conclusion of each uncertain status of knowledge like imagination or delusion or each other state of uncertain knowledge, the impossibility of assurance will be the sign of the knower object restriction. This impossibility of assurance about the constancy of knowledge removes the difference between knower object and external witness. If knower object or external witness is sure about one of the immediate knowledge states like

being imaginary of the whole process, the knower object will achieve the victory over the restriction as a conscious object, and knowledge is not the subject of thought. If we can be sure about the originality, and the reality of the knowledge process, the issue will be free of the restriction and the problem of knowledge credibility is not a disputable case. The transmission of the justification process center from a conscious object to the restriction as an epistemological foundation has a prominence. This action will increase the responsibility of the knowledge explanation by existence and all its variations. Moreover, we cannot follow the traces of existence. If we can explain certain knowledge based on the restriction of a knower object, at the beginning steps of this process, we will not need to substantiate the existence of a knower object. It is necessary to explain consciousness by a new method to guide us towards fundamental, certain and immediate knowledge. This new method of consciousness explanation necessitates the special philosophical presupposition that considering it results in the observation of the knowledge process as a new renewed process. We can acquire our expected answers at the end of the process. At the end of this process, we make sure about our existence and consciousness. If existence has a meaning, finally, at the end of this circle, the meaning of existence will be comprehensible. The consideration of the restriction as the foundation of knowledge makes the personal explanation of the knower object an unnecessary action. It is a problem that some philosophers have endeavored to explain how the observational propositions work.

There are different methods to explain the gathered facts by observation, such as refutability, conformability, induction, etc. although there is a great difference between the meaningfulness of observational statements.

Since the Descartes era, inter-subjectivity and the knowledge of knower object in relation to the other knower beings that possess the privilege of knowledge have been an issue that philosophers regarded to explain it convincingly. These attempts came to this conclusion that philosophers accepted the power of knowledge without the emphasis on any empirical implications, or they explained the power of knowledge by the individual transcendental power of understanding.

Though, the convincing explanation of the transcendental process of knowledge is not accomplished. The Empirical description of sensational possibilities of human indicates the variations of this transcendental process. It provides the unique base of the inter-subjectivity possibility of human versus the individual transcendental knowledge and the transcendental understanding that were scattered in relation to the other knower objects. The problem of conscious and questioner object is a problem that we cannot ignore. The consideration of problem makes challenge with logical foundations. A new epistemological foundation is made based on psychology. Fundamentally by the consideration of the new proposed scheme, in order to begin and to continue the knowledge process based on the restriction of knower object and the explanation of cognitive predicates, the necessity of the personal explanation of knower objects will be dissolved. We do not require to prove the existence of conscious object and consciousness, rather consciousness must guaranty our immediate knowledge. Consciousness is one of the epistemological steps that its explanation is possible based on hierarchy.

Meanwhile, we do not encounter any ontological problem to explain the epistemological process of knowledge. The confrontation with the new science to explain the knowledge process is not within the competence of ontology, because as we mentioned, we cannot track the sign of unity of the existence in the corporeal world. We should provide a new foundation for modern science to develop our knowledge about existence, and based on this science, we can infer knowledge explanation to explain it. Through this step, we must avoid the mutilating obstacles. The ontological explanation of a knower object is not the problem that its consideration gives us the valuable help to solve the mystery, which the problem should be realized via our total surrounding existence with our complete knowledge. We should mention that skepticism as an epistemological state in each step of the knowledge process and connected with every ontological positions of the questioner object is always an authentic criterion and firm foundation to assign the restriction. Therefore, thinking about the restriction of the knower object is a firm foundation to keep logical principles from psychological doubts. The lack of necessity to prove the knowledge founded on the knower object and its impersonal essence is the other privilege of this firm foundation to begin the knowledge. Attention to the restriction and the impossibility of its elimination as the beginning point of knowledge process makes unnecessary each argument about the personal essence of the knower object. To remove a great hindrance from knowledge it is an important step. On the one hand, theoretically, in the past, there was not a distinct border between knower object comprehensions and perceptions and the impossible knowledge, but the criteria of uncertain knowledge are now consciousness. Everywhere that knower object cannot follow and understand the signs of consciousness has become far from reality. Based on this epistemological foundation, we do not need to make sure about an ontological steps of questioner object, because doubt about ontological steps of knower object and the impossibility of knowledge achievement is like doubt and the impossibility of certainty about the ontological steps of knower object. We encounter the negative conditions because of the missing conditions during the first step of the knowledge process apart from each ontological step. In other words, it is not important that the questioner object considers the necessity of its existence or tries to explain its existence, rather the problem of the impossibility of certainty about existence and naught is outstanding. If the questioner object is original, and is a being, he will be the pioneer of the circle of credit knowledge. If he is not, the knowledge achievement based on nothing is impossible. The problem is the certainty and the impossibility of each one of these states. The problem is the impossibility of assurance. There is the restriction until there is skepticism. If we are not an original being as a knower object because we cannot remove doubt about our existence, this subject will be the decisive cause of restriction. The impossibility to prove the lack of restriction is restriction too. This restriction is beyond the ontological situation of the knower object. Skepticism removes all the opinions that assume logical foundations as psychological statements. When we can doubt, it proves that we encounter consciousness, and our restriction to be certain about knowledge and logical foundations is the consequence of the impossibility to navigate the depth of the absolute consciousness. If we consider restriction as a step to pass the knower object and consider restriction as an epistemological foundation of knowledge, the problem of assurance about the origin and the content of knowledge will remain unsolved. It is possible to ask which certainty can always guide us to the absolute answer, confronting us with consciousness at the beginning of the process of the knowledge. Our criterion is consciousness. Are there other kinds of knowledge that we can find in the corporeal world? Can we think about the fundamental creation of the corporeal world by a kind of epistemological affair? Is this epistemological affair certainly a phenomenon? What different ontological positions do we probably encounter? What relation is there between the privative criteria of restriction and ontological steps? What relation is there between

restriction and other probable kinds of epistemological conditions? Argumentation about the relation between restriction and other kinds of knowledge is not only a theoretic issue that gets lost in the philosophical labyrinth but by highlighting this topic, we can be sure about the beginning point of knowledge affair. By considering the salient point, we are free of doubt. This is obvious that consciousness moves us toward the authentic knowledge. Our turning point and constant foundation of knowledge as an epistemological proposition is also restriction. By now, based on our little science, disillusion and explaining about probable kinds of epistemological terms and propositions are not effective. This ambiguous position contains the motives of questioning about existence and consequently, the content of consciousness. The main problem in front of us is not the probable contingent epistemological conditions, but we encounter the thinking possibilities about the problems. This subject that what possibility of anyone of epistemological contingent conditions in existence must discover the corporeal world is not actually accessible for the confined human being. The scientific method, except consciousness, does not know any method that can be narrated step by step and becomes a lingual phenomenon. This possibility of narration is not stereotypical. Certainly, many lingual features are not quotable. Thus, here we can mention qualities that we cannot have their specific quotation. Then we encounter consciousness to find a scientific method as the key to certain and immediate knowledge. The essence of consciousness is narration and uncovering the presentation of events. Everywhere that there is no consciousness, then there is no narration. It seems that we encounter the corporeal world; narrative and inexpressible. If we go beyond this step and we refer to the ontological problems and its relation to foundations of certain knowledge, thus restriction and the question about existence or the lack of the corporeal world will be the location of epistemological doubt. We can interpret the epistemological doubt in relation to any resulting position in certain knowledge. We begin with the presupposition: the possibility of corporeal world presentation. Regarding the essence of consciousness, ---the possibility of narration--- we suppose consciousness as the window of certain knowledge. The consideration of absolute consciousness is either the solution of problems that psychologists discuss about logical postulates as psychological foundations or eliminates each postulate that asks how we can be sure of the beginning the knowledge process based on consciousness and achieving certain knowledge via consciousness. Any measure to ask or to begin the knowledge process accomplishes throughout language. A language is a system that contains signs of consciousness. Theorizing about the negation of consciousness as the window of the certain knowledge process concerns everybody that thinks otherwise. When a knower object encounters knowledge affair, he does not involve any reality except consciousness. Doubt as an epistemological step is the sign of restriction of questioner object. Fundamentally topics such as the origin and the quality of immediate knowledge are not discussed in psychology.

Not only cannot psychology determine the authenticity of immediate knowledge successfully, but also it does not intend to do so. It does not have a decisive criterion. The claim of the psychological perception of knowledge affair is propounded, but the claimants cannot prove its authenticity; because the foundation of every argumentation and every type of knowledge ---either decisive or indecisive--- is a scientific and epistemological context, not a psychological context. The psychological context of immediate knowledge apart from consciousness and its role does not connect the psychological postulates and consciousness mainly and effectively. Many psychological features through the unconscious concept entrance to the psychological realm can be explained; but we mentioned that nowhere is empty of consciousness. Existence is full of consciousness. Psychological argumentation about immediate knowledge prefers to avoid the dispute about foundations of knowledge because it does not possess the tools that can excavate the basis of these foundations. On the other hand, it is not possible to prove the psychological foundations of knowledge by this method. We should add that the analysis of the knowledge process is important in terms of its negative face. We cannot be sure of the positive face of knowledge, "decisive knowledge" similarly, we cannot be sure of the negative face of knowledge. Do we have achieved certain knowledge or do not. Not giving an assurance that it is possible, is the consequence of the restriction of knower object. The impossibility of making sure of anyone of the ontological positions of knowledge is the sign of knower object restriction. This restriction is the reason of reality presentation and the phenomenological face of the corporeal world and consequently, the initiation of the scientific affair. Restriction of the questioner object is the sign of its termination, and questioner object can choose some possibilities among all the probabilities and finally, it is a kind of planning to form a complete action in present conditions. Restriction expresses everything will ever be terminated. This termination without the presentation of the action is impossible. Termination cannot be presented, if there are not planning and consciousness. Everywhere things will be terminated, consciousness accomplishes it. Termination is the sign of planning for the achievement and presence of termination, the will of consciousness. The planning process is the matter of scientific action. Consciousness goes beyond passivity and submits itself to restriction. Consciousness creates through innovations and mixing in the plural forms of existence. This restriction is not essential for consciousness, rather, it is phenomenal when consciousness encounters the plural forms of existence. Creativity is the consequence of restriction. Doubt is the consequence of restriction. Doubt is an epistemological step that is appeared before the ontological steps of knowledge because it can be interpreted either the positive face of knowledge or naught. The connection between ontological problems and existence phenomena is very significant and outstanding. We should answer this question if our perceptions about ontological foundations change fundamentally, and we can explain a new ontological position and we can present a contradictory situation based on a hypothetical situation- an existent can exist, and it does not exist at the same time how we should treat the foundations of existence phenomenon. For example, if human exists and does not exist at the same time, how we can explain restriction as a point to begin the process of existence. We should remember that the form of the proposition is not different because the plural forms of existence are the subject of the scientific affair and the consequences of restriction. If the plural forms of existence- based on the new ontological hypothetical position- experience being and naught situations at one time, this new experience will be certainly interpreted the two states of knowledge with their ontological position equally. The restriction is always alongside and a part of the essence of things. If we can overcome our restriction as a questioner object and an excavating existent and have a new experience about ontological situations and positions ---for example, the experience of being and naught at one time--- this new situation will not be accessible for us. Therefore, it cannot express a new point about the restriction of the phenomenon that is the matters of the scientific affair. It cannot emphasize the scientific and the phenomenological affair of existence based on restriction as the point of trust to the knowledge process. Surely doubt is expressed as subjects beyond a sense or

opinion along with some reasons. Even we do not regard the contexts of doubt; the antecedence of the epistemological step of doubt proves its truth. The lack of certainty about every two parts of this equation is the consequence of the consciousness restriction of a knower object. We can present the two negative faces of knowledge: first, there is not any circle of knowledge. In this case, there is not a knower object for coming to the circle. Second, there is a questioning knower object about immediate knowledge. Consider, the restriction of consciousness does not allow to make sure of anyone of the two options. Undoubtedly, the lack of certainty about these two options is related to the consciousness restriction of knower objects. The restriction is the deficiency that is far from the views of Evidentialism. This point of views does not pay attention to the restriction as a deficiency in the way of certain knowledge. At present, the restriction of evidences as an external phenomenon outside of the knowledge process gets attention in a few cases. An external witness features counting can be effective on the change of knowledge process. By the consideration of the phenomenological point of view, the knowledge process does not require the external witness. Restriction plays a dual role in a knowledge process. On the one hand, the consciousness restriction of knower object interprets the doubt as certain and uncertain knowledge. This doubt is a constant epistemological basis of knowledge, and on the other hand, this restriction must be regarded to choose the criterion of knowledge and the probable witnesses. Surely consideration of the phenomenological point of view makes the external witness unnecessary. The phenomenological face of existence contains an important theme about the method of modern science. Because existence is a phenomenon and we can present it. Consciousness accomplishes it over the plural forms of existence, consequently, this ability of action is presented. The presentation of existence does not occur except in planning affair. This planning exhibits itself in language possibilities. Certainly, this planning ability is not a posteriori and a neutral affair that studies behaviors after their occurrence in the existence realm, rather this planning is essential and the consequence of the phenomenological face of existence. Phenomenological face of existence provides a constant basis for the certainty about the decisiveness of knowledge and the presentation of the corporeal world and finally, the possibility for research according to the empirical science paradigm. The answer of this question has a determinant role for making sure of certain and immediate knowledge. Why epistemology is the last step in the way of immediate knowledge? If we have a proper answer to this question the lack of the external evidence and the other consequent doubts about the lack of consciousness will not threaten our certain knowledge. Why epistemology and the related issues have priority over the external witness achievement? It seems that this problem that epistemological postulates are the most fundamental concepts that we take them into account, and we must establish our knowledge based on these concepts depending on the hierarchy that we encounter to obtain science about existence. We cannot explain more at the present epistemological conditions about it. It means that at first, we must gather information and then we can obtain science about our world. The gathered information framework is happened occurrences. The information is provided based on the facts. Empirical observations construct the foundations of knowledge. By the comparison or based on these facts we can infer about the corporeal world. Till now, the process of information generation is done by induction regular. Though, at first, we must gather documentary information based on the empirical observation about the corporeal world. The next step is the management of gathered information by the empirical observation with loyalty and the minimum alteration. Here, the philosophy of science exhibits itself. Therefore, we must regard how we gather information and facts about the corporeal world. There are different and antithetic methods to produce data that the usage of anyone can result in a specific philosophy of science. For example, induction is the consequence of the scientific point of view that researches the corporeal world traditionally through the study of consciousness containers. Gathering facts is not only a fundamental factor to achieve science about the corporeal world that consolidates the reality of hypotheses but also comprises this presupposition that knowledge about the corporeal world is not possible except through the consciousness window. If we can know the corporeal world via consciousness, it will be possible to present the knowledge of the corporeal world through consciousness and epistemological context. If we do not consider knowledge as a self-sufficient affair, eventually, our attempts will be ineffective. Finally, we should choose between the gathering information from the corporeal world and finding authentic evidence to confirm our knowledge. Argumentation based on external evidence in relation to the direct operation of science production means that facts gathering to obtain consciousness about the universe is not a self-sufficient affair and requires a supplementary thing. Surely this sense of the insufficiency of science is the consequent of a technical misuse that is emerged because of deficiencies in the knowledge methods of scientific categories. These deficiencies are removable. If the difficulties connected with the technical inadequacy of classification and the scientific knowledge remove, we can have a chance that certain and immediate knowledge does not require external evidence. For Making sure of certainty and decisiveness of knowledge some thinkers usually propose a model of objective and external hegemonic criterion, but the features of this external witness and decisive criterion are always ignored. If we can prove that the corporeal world is a united truth and its plural forms are translatable into one form, the border of the corporeal world and its exit possibility from it must be recognized to be an external criterion for certain and immediate knowledge. We can present these borders. If the corporeal world is composed of the plural forms of existence, and if truth exhibits itself and the external criterion is self-sufficient, we can find much evidence to prove the decisiveness and immediacy of the corporeal world without any considering the other cases. For example, a small piece of stone can confirm human claims because it is an external witness. It is perceivable that external evidence is not just enough to prove certain and immediate knowledge. The problem exhibits itself when we seek a conscious evidence and informer criterion to prove the decisiveness and immediacy of our knowledge. Moreover, the border of the corporeal world is unknown to us yet. Therefore, for a better understanding of this problem, we must determine the border of the corporeal world and the variations of existence appearance and many kinds of existents regarding this context that what factors are effective on the origination of existents. It is another question that must be considered. How many kinds of beings such as the human can have a practical operation as an external object in relation to the corporeal world? If we look at the problem only based on the witness as a criterion for decisiveness and immediacy of our knowledge, the last presented step will be that we focus on ontology as the final place of occurrences formation at present epistemological circumstances. In this step, but we can doubt, and ask ourselves whether existence is the consequence of a presentation or every irregular situation of consciousness vacuum. Therefore, to choose the criteria, there is the presupposition of the consciousness of witness and informer criteria. This outcome tells us that epistemological and semantic questions have priority in relation to the external witness. The excavation of meaning, as a criterion for comparing knowledge with evidence and witness is a

complex problem. Perhaps meaning is related to human nature contracts in daily life. the greatest system of human nature contract is probably the language ability in the most general sense. We can define the vocalic language as the variable multifunctional arrangements of sounds that a human being organizes his mind through it. The other contract is "money" that the change of its value and symbol is different in different layers and societies. On the one hand, these contracts make some treatments of humans meaningful and on the other hand, they provide abilities for new other human collections of treatments. We cannot consider these contracts totally nonsense. In other words, these contracts are not constructed by the human mind. These contracts contain the developed series of consciousness and the new behavioral conditions. Human creates new forms of treatment in different conditions based on the presuppositions of each contractual element in different behavioral conditions. To answer the question of human's behaviors meaning, human expresses either the forms of present contractual system among some active members of a society that have common comprehension or uses a lingual contract that reveals his content of conscious mind. It is true that in our daily life meaning and human contracts are very close, but meaning is not confined to human contracts. Human contractual systems are influenced by treatments and events and historical and biologic factors that affect our life. Many of these human contractual systems are segments of human behaviors continuum. For example; Money organizes human economic activities that sometimes because of human innovations takes other forms but it preserves its role and importance as a standard criterion for economic activities. We cannot surely ignore the important role of Money as a variable in behavioral systems. The role of Money should be considered apart from its economic and Contractual essence. Based on the proposed axiom, there are no conventional systems except as human behaviors forms or consciousness containers. It means that we should not consider these treatment patterns as non-historical systems and epistemological categories. Human contractual systems never possess epistemological value and often are influenced by these facts. Surely it does not mean that these human conventional categories are out of epistemological enclosure since these systems are not out of epistemological context because of their behavioral role and inclusion of truth and false concept. These systems because of their historicity from internal content view do not have epistemological value and we cannot fix the foundations of knowledge based on contractual spectrum. The historicity of contractual systems creates different forms. Historicity comprises all systems that we can find an element or elements of contract in them. The domain of historicity even embraces one of the greatest human contractual systems namely (language). (Language) with all its extensions and complexity and as it is the foundation of philosophy, we can classify it as one of human contractual systems. The conclusive historicity of language prevents us to locate this phenomenon to fix the basis of certain and immediate knowledge. These systems are not never empty of consequence of true and false and in the paradigm of these systems, every theorem is true or false. Therefore, one of the knowledge criteria is true and false ability on the present and a form of knowledge. This subject is true in every human contractual system. This is one of the special features of meaning that can lead us to new forms of behavioral conditions. When we ask what usage of money means in the system of human economic relations, it can be said that in bazaar we can buy goods by paying equal contractual value of money. In other words, money payment operation ---a behavior--- makes a new form of treatment that it is purchase operation and buying goods. The Other feature of meaning is that meaning denotes a realistic concept and symbol. When we ask what painful means, we want to know a collection of alphabetic characters that are composed of (P A I N F U L) that denotes this meaning in a peculiar language. For example; in English, it can be asked that the form of concrete nouns or abstract nouns and adverbs of manner or adjectives or extensions denote what concepts. The third characteristic that we should regard in connection with meaning is finality and purposive termination. When a child asks his father why we should walk so much, the father tells him we should walk to arrive at the home. Therefore, decoding of corporeal world and knowledge about the meaning of existence can contain every one of the three faces of meaning or complex equivalent meaning system formed by the semantic equivalents patterns. Maybe there is a widespread horizon of the treatments against active beings or the implications of corporeal world to realities or symbols that express things or the system of purposes that were located against existents and these existents newly began their lives or treatment process to obtain them. Probably the cause of many doubts in modern philosophy is the removal of concepts and meaning. This question is an important question. Why is meaning eliminated from modern philosophy realm? Its answer can solve this problem. At first glance, it seems the elimination of meaning from knowledge process and so much emphasis on external evidence are the consequences of the philosophic theory that defines corporeal world as the series of non-universal and non-connected events that the mind cannot bridge between them. The elimination of essence from modern philosophy that the English empiricism provided its accessories without the replacement of inclusive category that has played an important role from this perspective in relation with corporeal world. Under the shadow of generalities and induction ability human can organize the information and the facts in the concepts and the meaning paradigm. The empirical science is basically based on the same conception that was founded on the particular extensions. Under the shadow of Descartes' representation about science, the corporeal world is schemed based on collection of the mathematic subject -predicate theorems that the contravention of them is impermissible. Despite of insufficient representations about corporeal world and the elimination of general categories, the universe now demonstrates itself to us. On one hand, we encounter a mechanical representation about corporeal world and on the other hand, we cannot categorize the particular cases in general concepts. The one- sided representation about corporeal world constrains the concept of meaning. The only meaning that can be inferred from corporeal world is the mathematical meaning, but as we mentioned, we cannot determine any of above-mentioned kinds of meaning as the decisive concept of meaning. Now only we can say that the mechanical meaning of the corporeal world explains the mathematic certainty of the corporeal world, so we can categorize our particular knowledge in general concepts. It was cleared that concepts are overflowing based on the philosopher's surveys like Hume and ultimately in Nietzsche's radical thinking system and also it is impossible to define an all-inclusive concept for events in the corporeal world. Therefore, it was supposed that the corporeal world was constructed from particular and separated events that no common feature links them to each other. These events were assumed as nonsense islands in the vast existence ocean. The lack of metaphysics claimed that there is not any kind of finality for the corporeal world. Simultaneously against the mathematic layers of the corporeal world, none-mathematical aspects of human and the universe, literal and artistic creativity and human as a spiritual existent against the rational power were emphasized by the thinkers. So, as it was mentioned, if it is true, we should solve the problems of knowledge by the removal of the technical errors in the scientific

categorization. The categorization problems arose because of the study of consciousness containers. As we will mention we can study the hidden forms of consciousness in the corporeal world to solve the knowledge problems. The ability and the probability of doubt about ontological steps is the consequence of widespread qualities that until now empirical science has not been able to achieve their origins. In every time, human can ask himself whether all this process is a notional imagination. Maybe, the question is true. He wants to be sure about authenticity and decisiveness of his knowledge. What we can do? What is the final solution? How can we free of the vast domain of the destroyer doubt? If our proposed scheme is successful to obtain the signs of consciousness in events, certainly the realm that until now has been far from the deep empirical studies will contain the signs of consciousness that can be excavated. The other problem is the teleological position of the corporeal world that later will be mentioned. We just add here that talking about teleology is not a theological issue. This means that we should discuss about the problems in an inclusive frame under the title of religion and dedication of all the supreme righteousness to a transcendental source and the banishment of any hideous features and malfunctions from him. Surely, it seems that there is an able and conscious dominant power to program all of events in the universe, but discrepancy between our knowledge method and the theological knowledge of God is very deep and these two thinking-methods point of view is fundamentally different. At the end of knowledge process, we should rich to the step that firstly, the corporeal world is not hidden for us, and we can behave based on our consciousness. secondly, there are no teleological problems and if we encounter a question in the consequence of skepticism, we can influence the essence of the flowing categories of the corporeal world by following consciousness signs and making questions about them and under the shadow of teleological issues ending up the circle of making questions and attempts to remove obscurity from the relation and the quality of the consciousness entrance to the plural forms of existence and as a questioner object we cannot continue to make questions. We should emphasize that if we do not ask questions, it is not the conclusion of the refusal of the questioner object because it is the behavior that if it happens or not, depends on the action of consciousness on the questioner object. While we mean that kind of the lack of questioning that is the outcome of epistemological and teleological conditions. We do not mean a kind of lack of question as a treatment that makes a questioner object and does not originate from teleological and epistemological foundations. It is necessary to mention some points about the above proposed axiom. The usage of deductive method naturally to extract the forms of consciousness in all of existence is not possible, since all events that happen in the objective universe are not accessible. Many occurrences happen and we do not know anything about them, however, we can take a look at the problem from an epistemological point of view.

It means that any kind of argumentation is impossible except it contains the signs of consciousness; either we talk about our knowledge or our emotions. The matter of our knowledge is obvious. The meaning of consciousness is fundamentally hidden in science. About emotions we would say that they are kinds of planning that the signs of consciousness are hidden in them. The planning of categories that do not have obvious relations with science comprises vast matters from natural emotions and instincts of all living existents to all kinds of movements in the corporeal world. Perhaps the comparison of epistemological landscape considering the instruments of accessibility to knowledge is not true or at least adequate. The question that whether human can overcome the sensational circle or obtain the pure consciousness and meta-sensory perceptions is a case that we can talk about it considering the evolution of instruments to access to consciousness materials. In the best state, the instruments of knowledge are formed in an evolutionary line. We should ask our questions in evolutionary conditions. The answers such as human cannot go beyond the sensational circle and search in the consciousness signs is like the scientific and dogmatic answers. Fundamentally, when the questions such as "what the direct consciousness is and where the end of human possibilities as a conscious human is" are true that human can appraise the landscape over the instruments and possibilities, free of evolutionary situation. Later we talk about it more. The Location of consciousness as a beginning point of knowledge process considering the present human science pictures quite ambiguous future. We can argue that consciousness is not an observable and necessarily an empirical matter, so we can provide a firm foundation for science by objective study, but it is necessary to mention that we encounter the consciousness signs in the corporeal world and consequently we do not observe consciousness in abstract forms. On the other hand, building a constant foundation for the empirical knowledge is not merely a logic problem that two discussant groups argue against another. Maybe, the proposed axiom is just an exclusive way to exit from the deadlock. The puzzle should be solved. Human does anything to solve the existence mystery. Hence this way is a subject beyond the logic debates and one of the last chances of human to decipher the existence mystery. Walking in this way is better than asking that where consciousness is and how we can have a perception about consciousness. This question when is helpful that it basically can change our comprehension and our way. The Different forms of existence are meaningfully coextensive with the hidden forms of consciousness in existents. The development of existence means the variations of the consciousness forms. The discrepancy between human as an existent and the door as an existent apart from their substance is the different consciousness forms that have created the discrepancies between the human and the door. The problem of substantial change generally in the corporeal world by considering the hidden forms of consciousness is explicable: the destruction of things as we can grasp is not an ontological process and substances do not perish by the changes of forms of consciousness. Things continue their lives and we can just talk about physical particles. The Analysis of death from this point of view requires a new method of study. Does human reduce to material in the corporeal world and do not his remains preserve? It seems the answers to these questions are positive. When we make static electricity by touching a piece of woolen cloth or producing the electricity from atomic energy or wind and the transmission and the production operation ends, electricity also runs in the corporeal world. Electricity is the collection of electron particles that human science can manage to exploit and direct it. These particles do not perish after the exploitation operation: but the problem is that how and where particles continue their motion. The Corporal parts of human body accept new forms of consciousness. Maybe this variation comprises other parts of human life. What is the termination of the pure consciousness to form human personality? Believing in the separation of mature consciousness and corporal human body is created in mind because these two phenomena go to different ways. The corporal human body participates in the changes that generally happen in the corporeal world, but we cannot talk about the mature forms of consciousness decisively. Historical and evolutionary position of material in connection with living existence ---especially human--- is the situation that compels us to have probable rethinking about the pure consciousness that empirical scientists have ambiguously informed us about it. Before human appeared on earth, material was the origin of many

various creations and we cannot guarantee what happened for material after the rise of human kind in the corporeal world. In the meantime, to recognize the connection between material and consciousness in a new method of the knowledge process, pale-zoology plays a very significant role. Meanwhile at present, to establish a new scientific method and the explanation of its relation to consciousness in the route of knowledge process, its paleontological history is very significant. The Separate way that material has passed before the rise of human in connection with consciousness to create varied creation in the corporeal world reveals this matter that the materialistic basis of human body is one of the possibilities that consciousness has made such peculiar world through the interference in material. Therefore, human entrance to the creation circle must be taken in account as a historical event that is the result of consciousness around the creation affair. In accordance with this phenomenon, special forms of consciousness were loaded on material to create kinds of privileged anthropologic beings. The rise of human on earth at a special juncture of time indicates us the consciousness interference in material as a historical process. It expresses that the special forms of consciousness provided material to create and conceive human species. The ability of consciousness interference recognition in material at a particular time juncture reminds this point that human is certainly the consequence of an especial kind of consciousness effect on material, therefore we cannot prove that human body does not contain the forms of consciousness and antithetic theory is preferable. The historical supposition about the rise of human on earth in accordance with a general scientific method to contact with consciousness as the pioneer of the phenomenon is very valuable and significant, because it reminds us that human is the consequence of a special juncture of time and surrounded by it. In other word the rise of human on earth is temporal and this temporality historicizes human being. The remembrance of human historicity in a general scientific method is an important issue. We should not forget that we are the members of the corporeal world and all of rules and processes that excavate existence in a scientific discipline framework can and must know human. If human is a historical existence, we should not ignore its consequences. Human being with all biologic and behavioral variations and plurality was originated from consciousness. In a general view, maybe there is not convincing empirical explanation about the termination of the hidden forms of consciousness in anthropologic beings, but regarding the beginning of the issue ---the way it is--- makes the problem complicated for us. The problem of the human rise should be regarded as a peculiar kind of consciousness variation in different forms of material and its creation from nothing. How is the organization of consciousness appeared in a material frame? The stranger\ paleontological history of human is, the more wonderful its future is. So far, we have elaborated the necessity of study of human substance as a consciousness container. Now we mention an obscure problem that distinguishes human and other living being, so far as it is known to us, thus he acts in his life against other creatures. To follow consciousness in the corporeal world, we should regard alterations and changes with a revised outlook. We should translate alterations to an epistemological language to rethink its connection with existence substance more precisely. Alterations and changes --as at present we can talk about them in the scientific and empirical statements--- is the change of the plural forms of existence and their transubstantiation based on consciousness interference as their origin. We will elaborate that restriction as an ontological event does not occur and in the corporeal world, as we can understand, alterations are the consequences of the continual circulation of existence and consciousness. When a house is destroyed because of missile attack as we can see; fall of the walls and death and wounded humans and probably conflagrations. If we express these events in an epistemological language, what do the events tell us? These events are the new forms of consciousness containers that have made the occasion of the house destruction. If we want to rebuild a destroyed house, in an epistemological language, it will be necessary to repeat the event and we should have another house in the same location based on the new form of treatment and consciousness should be entered in the material to rebuild the new house. This house, whether is the same or not, is not significant here; because we discuss about the detection of the consciousness forms of the old house. The construction of a new house as a new treatment may contain more complicated consciousness forms of the previous house. For example, if we apply the material of the old house to build the new one, a lot of efforts should be involved to sort out the materials. We should know that constructing a new house over the house that was ruined by the missile attack requires the new forms of consciousness. We are not able to recognize the old forms of consciousness that for example caused to build a special house or any treatment in the past. The cause of this problem is our restriction to go beyond time in its general meaning. Time should be regarded as the parallel concept of consciousness that flows and we cannot return it to the past. Therefore, if the interference of consciousness in the plural forms of existence creates new destructive treatments in the existence circle, material will not preserve the forms of consciousness that is influenced by them or at least this statement will be true in our present conditions of our perception about occurrences, but a remarkable case is the rise of life on the earth planet. Life in its imprecise statistical and observational meaning is a kind of mobile organization ability with a mechanism of growth. We talked about destructive treatments that affected materials and we observed that materials exchange the old forms of consciousness with the new forms. We cannot find the occurred events in the past by following the forms of consciousness in materials in time realms, but is the position of living beings the same? We should think about a positive answer to this question. There is a main difference between materials and living beings and it is the ability of automatic organization that material has no similar ability. We should surely mention quantum mechanics that altered our perceptions about the forms of hidden consciousness in materials. Based on quantum theory, if we accept that materials have an electric context, so we can find a constant foundation for alterations and it is the electric context of the quantum that to refute it the quantum theory must be rejected. Regarding the above-mentioned point, it is obvious that some forms of consciousness -beyond the corporeal substantial alteration- are changeless. We should not ignore that the domination of these forms is very inclusive and general. Only in accordance with these changeless forms, the dependency of variables to material circle is provable. The teleological termination of automatic living being is more complicated. After the collapse of living being material corporality, what happens to its organizer? The two problems are significant: death and the historicity of human. We should observe death as a presented and programmed phenomenon. Death because of its presentation is free of secret and its historicity indicates that death is an event on the surface of existence and the consequence of consciousness entrance in the plural forms of existence. Death is the occurrence that by it the organization ability of a living being will be separated from its corporal body. If this organizer ability is the part of corporal substance, human body cannot be represented without it. We cannot present materials without volume, without dimension and without a context of electric arrangement. The disintegration of death as a separation point between consciousness and material is significant;

because it comprises and exhibits the signs of consciousness to us. At this point, death risk is more significant than death itself. However, alteration and death are the last way of before all beings, thinking about the possibility of death is very applicable. Beings in addition to death itself and alteration during their lives, they are always surrounded by death and alteration situations in different form. Now if the conditions of death or alteration appear, these events will occur. The possibility of death or alteration appearance or its disappearance depends on the conditions that consciousness determines and finally organizes them. This hypothesis is confirmed by the existents' death experiencing and alteration approach and at the same time, its denial two situations. The possibility of death and alteration and at the same time, the possibility of dodging of these two situations indicates that consciousness has an effective role to finalize the situations and the rise of variables to form the conditions. If we accept consciousness as the context of death and alteration, the possibility of study about the substance of the two mysterious phenomena at least is theoretically provided. Until now death has been regarding as the channel of destruction of consciousness. Consideration of death and alteration as a treatment that are the consequences of consciousness is significant for the scientific method; because it can provide possibility to bring out science from its traditional borders. Until now science has been far from the substances of the meanings and the teleological affairs. The study of death and alteration may either reconcile science with the substances or revise the new possibility of the termination of occurrences again. Some postulates such as "death is the end of all things" and "we cannot follow alterations at the realm of time" can be rejected. Another important point in connection with death explains that death as an epistemological affair is not the end of life. Death phenomenon is not necessarily accompanied with the destruction of corporal body of living being. The lack of this necessity provides the possibility of discovery of the consciousness main forms before death. Through the study of human body, we can mark genetic construction of human and many consequent features of the consciousness that leave some effects, such as fingerprint and all disease and pathologic accidents and all the body transformations. Via the comparison between the ancient human body remains and its accordance with the present human society members, some paleontological features and some estimation of the probable primary immigrations of this zoological type are accessible. If death occurs in a way that human body as the place of the consciousness forms registration is not hurt, we can study the inactivated forms of consciousness after death. This reality indicates an applicable point. Probably death is an organic reality not an epistemological position. Surely, we can say that our explanation is more connected with living beings and especially humans. The organic term does not mean the lack of organic disorder in living beings when death occurs, because when death occurs, the self-organic system --- the living being --- stops or discomfits itself by an organic or mechanic change. In this case, organic and mechanic systems both are active. The problem that must be studied is but the organic changes that are accompanied death and are a prelude to mechanic changes. We should understand that what the effects of death on living beings are. The strategy of consciousness has necessarily created them, even these effects are organic. We can study and follow them. The same possibility of the consciousness forms to solve the mystery is very efficient, --- even after the organic passivity of the system and after the inactivation of the system ---. Any way many events that occur in connection with living beings after death are traceable by the following of hidden consciousness signs. If we find fossils, we can seek the diseases and other signs of organic and mechanical events and alterations in them. Here, the important problem is the lack of exclusiveness of mechanical occurrences for events. We can recognize occurrences that are the consequences of alterations and deficiencies and some other organic effects. For example, if the cause of death is an immunologic alteration or deficiency, we cannot even diagnose it precisely; we can just conjecture the previous quality of the position. Based on the aforementioned issues, death is either an organic event or a mechanic occurrence, the process that caused it is logged in the consciousness sign system of living beings. We can follow it through the knowledge realm. The lack of necessity of body destruction alongside death is the probable reason for organic postulate antecedence of the death phenomenon. Considering the authenticity of organic postulate as the possibility of this phenomenon appearance based on the commands prepares the occasions of this event. If we accept that in the first place, death is an organic phenomenon, we must accept that this event is not out of specific related planning. The consideration of the planning possibility of death provides the expanded horizons of study about this mysterious phenomenon. We indicated that materials do not preserve the forms of consciousness apart from their inclusive and invariable substances. There is probably the electric context that provides the possibility of a kind of memory for materials. If they possess alterations and the new forms of consciousness, the following and the detection of occurrences and the old previous phenomenological forms of materials based on the old forms of the hidden consciousness are at present impossible. If death is an organic phenomenon and not necessarily an epistemological affair and it appears without pathological aftermaths in human and other living beings body, there is the possibility of the consciousness forms registration and the possibility of study, and also there is the solution of the death problem and in an expanded horizon, it leads to the outlook of life recreation by the excavation of the consciousness forms and commands that generate events. Naturally, the evolutionary forms of consciousness in the human body are not empirically observable, but we can analyze and discuss these forms of consciousness based on the phenomenological appearances of existents. The phenomenological inference is indeed the motive of the thinking model in line with the orientation of empirical science to estimate the possibility of study in the depth of the consciousness forms. If we refer to the existence, we can observe cases in which consciousness accepts a passive situation. For example, in medicine, we can mention an incubation period of some diseases or generally the stabilization of natural processes such as the discharge of kinetic energy and the fixation of potential energy after the motion. We can explain this phenomenon as a kind of dormant consciousness. Maybe, the lack of ability to follow the termination of characterized consciousness in the human corporal body is related to this latency period. We can follow the consciousness effects by studying about the latency consciousness. The study about the latency consciousness is very significant. Because it provides the background of a clear picture from existence and the perfect paleontological strategy of the phenomenon without any interruption. It also enables us to overcome time as an obstacle against certain and immediate knowledge. The imposed Alterations on the human body are related to existence and the consciousness variations. If some parts of the human body comprise the pure consciousness, it cannot be presented that these parts are omitted from the circle of existence and consciousness variations. It is a supplementary principle to study of consciousness. By the study of consciousness signs, we can obtain applicable guidelines for consciousness explanation. If the change and variation of the consciousness forms follow the regular scientific analysis, we witness a hopeful future. The explanation of the logical principle that each syllogism is true or false reaches a new concept under the shadow of the

above-mentioned proposed axiom. On the expanded horizon of the axiom, we can ask questions. If it is possible to have different forms of consciousness in one objective existent. Its explanation is possible by the study of its phenomenological existence. We must recognize the incoming conditions of material in existence. We must know what the qualification of present existence was. Here, the main problem manifests; it debilitates the scientific empirical study. We are not able to clarify the paleontological history of the phenomenon and generally existence because of the effects of the studied phenomenon sometimes disappear and are inaccessible. This impossibility for judge of the paleontological situation of existence prevents to draw the historical vector toward the present world. Now our existence description suffers from historical poorness and the lack of historicity. The unknown role of materials in existence is also related to an applicable concept. Probably material is the same thing that we grasp in close a connection with space. It seems the comprehension of the space concept is only possible by the grasp of the material essence. We cannot present materials without space concept. Some parts of our presentation of time connect with space and the time order. We think in the space paradigm. Our thinking possesses a kind of time and space order. The time order contains our sequential thoughts and the space order. It means that we cannot think except in the space framework. The presentation of existence for humans without dimensions and space concept is impossible. Decoding the connection between the phenomenon and space approaches us to solve this mystery that what time and its concept are. Phenomena in the space concept have differences, we can touch material, but we cannot touch and grasp the types of electromagnetic spectrum only with a quick contact. The Study of the material substance as a part of the existence phenomenon provides us many possibilities to discover the connection between material and space and time. The knowledge of space and accordingly, time is a way the of existence knowledge. It is also possible to excavate the forms of consciousness that must be situated and presented in the material package. The material is a part of phenomena. Regarding this issue that causes to increase the possibility of study of other incorporeal forms of existence every day. Materialist thinkers only regard the corporeal face of existence. they do not think about other possibilities of the existence phenomenon: While the late technical advances of human have indicated the expanded horizon of the incorporeal aspect of existence phenomenon in front of the questioner object.

Behavior as a window to the knowledge process:

We must pay attention to a problem. The categorization of knowledge patterns and the knowledge techniques are main problems. We talk about them. We mentioned that the new logic science removes the principle of all-inclusive definition and proves that we cannot define concepts inclusively, for example, the concept of the game. Because we can limit game from some points such as, its performers, the used tools, and individual playing or as a team work and many other points. Regard this participle phrase. Boxer women, in this phrase, women are not the only one that do box in the world, and boxing, is not a sport that only women do. Finally, the participle phrase of (boxer women) cannot be categorized neither in each type of sport nor in human behaviors.

Moreover, the all-inclusive definition axiom of classical logic has a main epistemological deficiency. Definition of substances and things to be categorized has this deficiency that begins by the presupposition of the pre-existing order of the defined objects and concepts. Therefore, one expects that occurrences and behaviors happen based on the pre-existing order and the pre-supposed expectations according to the previous presentations and the expected order. This kind of definition could not explain plurality and variations of the corporeal world. If we take the axiom of the flowing consciousness in the corporeal world into account, we can solve the problem, and We can regard the consciousness affair instead of the categorization of cognitive categories based on the similarities between them by the acceptance of consciousness categories and we can finalize explicable and precise encoding process of the corporeal world by the knowledge of the consciousness keys that there are in all of existence. The change of our point of view, surely does not mean the concepts cannot abstractly be presented and we cannot have a general presentation of concepts and consciousness forms according to things, rather it tells us the corporeal world is not surrounded by our conception. We can have in our mind a general presentation about categories apart from extensions, but the circle of occurrences does not warrant us that this kind of conception is be corresponding with the corporeal world reality. Existents ---when it is connected with them as a behaving being--- are able to create and grasp very complex behavioral situations that necessarily do not fit in stereotypical presentation of concept and therefore presentation of the pre-existing order about existents and their behaviors. Regard the behaving existent --- ---that he is playing. We can present many kinds of games that have mutual features and differences. The intention of behaving being also can be very miscellaneous and different. A person because of avoiding the depression proceeds to play while another person wants to obtain the skill and third person seems the game as a practice for the future match, but maybe we can define a restrictive border for the game spectrum and it is all the three persons do not look to the game as a serious action. They only participate in games to entertain. We must not forget the possible situations that games may end up with scuffles, wounds or murder and also somebody takes a game seriously and plays in the context of retaliation.

These positions do not prevent the study of behavior and concept, because phenomenon should be studied by behaving objects no by behaviors and the concepts and no the intentions. We can study actions and reactions of behaving objects individually based on the incoming consciousness to the plural forms of existence. We can conclude that corresponds with the reality and determine the causes and the aftermath of behaviors and the passive reactions and the actions of behaving being. These situations must be analyzed in the behavioral background ---here games---. The possibility of behavioral study based on behaving beings' intentions and motivations is a contestable problem. At the present time, there are many main obstacles to study behavioral the intentions and the motives of behaving beings. If study of behaving beings is considered as general frameworks for scientific study in all the empirical circles, we cannot warrant that the expressive view appeared in the behavioral narration ---the participating in the studied behavior--- necessarily be participated in the reality of an occurrence. The deficiency is deeply related to our limitations to obtain consciousness. To acquire the substance of the appeared consciousness in every behaving being and arrive its depth, we must pass through the surfaces of the lingual narrations that reflect behavioral motives and intentions. Passing through the intentions and motives of behaving being is the consequent of the technical method that is formed by modern science. Registration of the person's fingerprint, the encoding of the human genome, and its effects in relation to the crime reality, the indication of criminal law medicine aftermaths are samples of the determination of the personal motives and intentions without

consideration of personal plural lingual narrations. The attempts to transcend the lingual personal narrations surface create a great alteration in psychological studies. The independence of psychology as a science that studies the human behaviors and motivations in an expanded horizon is the conclusion of the impossibility for an internal study of human mind. The human mind and spirit are regarded as inexplicable and esoteric phenomena because of their inaccessibility for scientific research. This impossibility for explaining causes the hidden signs of consciousness in the human spirit, either as notional positions or because of inaccessibility, are regarded as the basis of the philosophical intuitive schools and the other intuitive schools such as the mystical intuition. If the technical progressions in the criminal law medicine and psychological studies are regarded as effective references in line with the perception of human motivations and desires principally, there are not regularly theoretical obstacles to transcend the seemingly impassable wall. When the independence of psychology as an empirical realm is valuable that it does not get an unscientific substance. The exclusion of the super-scientific categories in empirical sciences causes ambiguities and confusion that modern science involves. On the one hand, empirical science is based on the observation of natural objects, on the other hand, psychology is a science that its studied objects are excavated through the appeared objects and its studied occasions indirectly. Spirit, as the matter of psychological researches, is never directly studied because the analysis of its content is not possible and only through the appeared human objects is observable. Maybe human and living being spirits are very far from accessibility because the observation of its hidden consciousness forms is impossible. If we want to categorize psychology as an empirical science, we should accept that its subject should be analyzed based on the scientific method of gathering observational facts data. To reach this purpose, it is necessary to explain the reality based on a model of empirical sciences. Psychology cannot be regarded as an empirical science whereas it does not explain the gathered psychological statements of its objects based on the gathered propositions from the translatable matters of the objects or each other resource based on the reality. Psychological statements do not necessarily break the deadlock if a moral statement encounters it. The cause of the impossibility for explaining the moral propositions is the consideration of different value situations along the different metaphysical prejudgments. The main subject in psychological studies is the same identification of the studied category, and a person that is studied based on an identifiable value situation. A person as the subject of psychological studies either is described based on the pre-existing gathered information or the psychological attitudes, he finds his desirable situation. Social psychology, if it has a descriptive demand, it includes such a similar regular. The situation of the proposed solutions and the situation of social psychology are more complex than, Because of the elaboration of the value situation of the societies. Though, it is necessary to clarify the relation psychological statements and empirical sciences. If psychology is an empirical science, it must follow it methodologically and thematically. Psychology is a realm of empirical sciences that we must specifically regard it, because of its ability to transcend the personal statements and the lingual narrations to obtain the consciousness substance. Many experts ask what the role of psychology in the context of empirical sciences is. We can mention some attempts to dislocate the logic foundations instead of psychological attitudes and the technical description of psychological statements. Protectors of psychology as an empirical science have a task; they must define the finality and the methodology of it and answer to this question that we can obtain to a psychological truth well-founded on the empirical location through the statements and methods of the empirical sciences. Further, the regards of protectors of psychology as an empirical science the definition of psychology location in relation to empirical sciences, can be effective and efficient to transcend the crisis of consciousness analysis and removal of the problem from these sciences point of view. The analysis of behaving beings' motivations is the turning point that decisively alters empirical sciences more and more. The gathering and the analysis of necessary facts to explain the reality from behaving being point of view is the scaffold that empirical sciences should prepare to spring toward the immediate knowledge of existence in near future. To achieve the consciousness substance in behaving beings, it is necessary to accept this philosophical and prescientific presupposition that the consciousness forms in all appeared objects and occurrences in all existence are detectable. We must mention that the motivations of behaving being is not just the effective factor of the done behavior or appeared event, as we cannot expect that before the invention of the car, we compare the behavioral skills in connection with driving. In addition to the behaving beings' motivations, the study of a behavior depends on many variables that appear in a practical project field. In other word, to analyze a concept somehow, it is more inclusive than of widespread behavioral groups, we involve the expression of the behavioral spectrum. In addition to the concept and the behavioral spectrums, we must study actions and reactions of behaving beings and their chosen possibilities and generally the effects of the variables on the occurrence possibilities of behaving beings' actions. It is possible about the games behavioral case we can see from the most serious purposes and motivations such as preparation for a match to the most probable unserious behaviors such as the hobby. How can we regard this behavioral spectrum? How many different intentions allow us to study behaviors? What is the role of these differences in the motivation of behaving beings to do a behavior or the determination of the conceptual limitation of behaviors? To determine the behaviors causes, and motivations, all behaving beings must be surely studied particularly and empirically. Here, we talk about another definition of behavior that difference can determine the central role of this concept. Behaviors delimit because of their differences. Anywhere there is a difference, there is different behavior. We can ask why human languages have different expressions and for many occasions, inexpressive terms and words to report an event. Answer is the belonging the various lingual societies to the various corners of the lingual delimitation spectrum. Sometimes the lingual societies do not regard differences and sometimes look to differences between behaviors from different points of view because of it the chosen expressions, to narrate behaviors are inexpressive. It is possible some players play their role with the purpose except hobby. We must mention that the distinction between the persons who play for the hobby, is recognizable, and has a behavioral aspect. To determine the behavioral forms, it is ultimately and especially necessary to study all the incoming elements of the occurrence of a behavior empirically and particularly. If we do not study empirically the connection between existence and consciousness, we cannot talk and conclude about a behavioral occasion. This particular and specific empirical study also includes the behavioral beings. The possibilities of actions and reactions and the behavioral limitations in the conceptual frames or the behavioral spectrum must be studied, moreover behaving beings should be considered particularly and empirically. The specific empirical study of a behaving being based on its hidden signs of consciousness is very complicated and meanwhile crucial. When we can discover these signs that consciousness is in the life realm be tracked. The signs of consciousness are registered in the human genome. Therefore, the channel of the empirical science

acquisition is human genome. From the genetic point of view the study of the quality of the complicated consciousness forms in human being that has caused life on earth, is very interesting. If human is the subject of empirical studies, we will probably see dispute over this subject that human is not a robot, but we will respond to the opposing views of the empirical study of human beings that science as it claims to really and directly know existence, it do not have any determined pre-supposition and if it chooses a method this method is the conclusion of the internal affair of the cognitive system. The disapprobation of the empirical sciences entrance to study the daily life of human is the output of humanistic predominant presuppositions of some academic minds and circles. The study of human being within the natural paradigm is a part of human's phenomenological presentation in the corporeal world. Human being is a part of this great and complicated phenomenon. The construction of a science to the epistemological language is related to the study of the consciousness entrance to the plural forms of existence, from a recognizable point of view that consciousness creates a collection of phenomena or a single phenomenon that they should be studied empirically. Now we do not aim to restrict modern sciences that it is possible to emerge quantitatively, because this affair depends on an exact presentation of the consciousness variations development. This matter that which phenomenon or a collection of phenomena is the subject of an empirical science is appeared through the progression- towards the excavation of the hidden consciousness signs of any phenomenon. Human is the existent that we can study the entrance of his inner consciousness and the plural forms of existence. To study his life, we cannot suddenly establish a new science. Human is the conclusion of a natural affair and till we could not detect the relations of consciousness and the plural forms of existence in a specific method and in the modern science paradigm the institution of a new science to study human being is unnecessary. The study of behaving being depends on the signs of their hidden consciousness. If this study model develops, scientific studies experience some large changes. In the first scale, many events that were taken in account as the daily life matters can enter to the empirical study realm. In the present scientific situation, many situations are not categorized as a scientific subject, because this kind of study analyses the phenomena from negative face point of view by now. In existence, many behaving beings are far from the scientific study access, for example till some decades ago the causes and the motivations of many animal behaviors were not attractive for zoologists. The behaviors of some behaving beings are considered by human because of its interest for us such as the quarrels of felines in nature or because of study of any related phenomenon to his life such as the language ability of monkeys. However, these behaviors indicate a small part of inhuman behaving beings acts and reactions because of their singularity and practical usage at the first step. At the second step: the study of these particular and behavioral cuttings does not have any effective role to recognize the behavioral pale-zoological alterations of human behaving beings, and the variations of consciousness in the corporeal world. The study of the consciousness signs in a behaving being can develop our choices and preferences circle in existence expansion. When a human is patient, he goes to the doctor to treat his deficiency or illness that hampers his body organization, but the study of the consciousness signs in a behaving being ---here a human--- can cause human is not even sick. He chooses possibilities that are better and interest for him. In addition to the study of the consciousness signs in a behaving being can remove this deficiency that we obtain more exact behavioral pale-zoological presentation. In many cases, because of the removal evidences the empirical study is impossible. by the help of the consciousness signs study in some behaving being, ---if it is necessary--- by helping the empirical evidences that were preserved in the behaviors or the physical effects of them we can obtain the expanded horizons of the paleontological study of existence. The study of the consciousness signs entails to pass from the appeared behaviors which are done by the behaving beings. By the study of the hidden consciousness signs in behaving beings we can obtain to behavioral potential possibilities and probabilities. The main problem related to the recognition of behaviors that are possible to occur is our disability to recognize the behaving being's possibilities chooses not the impossibility of behavior occurrence. The lack of ability to produce the behavioral potential possibilities is displaced by the impossibility of behavioral anticipation. Surely, the location of this topic is special philosophical foundations and the collapse of the united lingual logic and the lack of consciousness about the philosophical analysis. The Teleological Possibilities of a behavior occurrence and achievement to the right cognition about consciousness variations is also important. The Transition of gravity point of scientific studies from behaviors to behaving beings raises the problem of scientific categories. This challenge plays an important role in our analysis about the negative categories of existence. What is behavior's definition? How should the transition be done when we determine behavior as the conceptual gravity point of a scientific study? The subject of behaving beings studying is generally very complicated. At present time we can tell, there is not the possibility to restrict behaving beings. Maybe behaving beings are widely varied as well as the all-studied scientific behaviors. Maybe, this is a proper point that we can cognate behaving beings from their behaviors. When we observe a special behavior, we can place its doer in the subject of an empirical study instead of investigation about behavior as the studied subject. Surely this doubt remains that maybe it is probable that there is an indeterminate behaving being in the different behavioral positions or it is inaccessible, but we must keep in mind that we can regard this fault for behavior as the subject of the empirical study, and the obtained knowledge of behavioral study is not originally exact and full scale. The other point is the protection of the scientific categories that shapes our knowledge in the frame of classification and categorizations. We can benefit from these standard categories by the utilization of this new methodology. For example, regarding the zoological prevalent categorization: if animals are again classified based on their registered features in the genome and their family relationship in view of the new empirical methodology, the current categorizations are also useful. However, the prevalent categorizations contain similarities between the studied objects but these categorizations when reflect the reality of existents that the empirical facts observation is expressed by the variations of consciousness. Everywhere that consciousness has altered its variations and the classic scientific observation cannot follow these variations, the categorizations lose their relevance to reality. The study of behaving beings and the scientific study face another challenge. There is already a problem for an empirical study. We can practically research on the subject, but it is possible that the study of behaving beings to make a difficulty to achieve the subjects of an empirical study. We must keep in mind that the problem of empirical study in relation to its origin is the predicament of the scientific method till now. The study of psychological health is a good example. Many humans omit their disease symptoms and their exquisite problems and the aftermaths and the later phenomena because of different reasons. These causes are very various. The range of these causes embraces all causes from social causes to psychological reasons. Many illnesses such as the AIDS are often studied in the health organizations based on approximate statistical data. Though the subject of a scientific study is a

general category, but these general categories do not always reflect the reality of existence. We cannot decisively talk about the same general categories of the growth of two apples. Because the observer is not able to exclusively observe the quality of each apple growth. We told that we can grasp the problem of the behavior consideration as an issue of a scientific study. It is not the smaller scale of the study of a behaving being meanwhile the study of a behaving being creates widespread and varied empirical possibilities horizons against an empirical scientist. If we really regard the phenomenological face of existence by studying behaving beings, we study a planned system in existence surface. The planned system of existence is even so much varied as well as any behaving being has a separate planned system. We can follow the quality of this planned system, because this planning is presented before the accomplishment. Not only the possibility of existence presentation provides the possibility of its studying, but it also makes clear the quality of its genesis and presentation. The Emphasis on the possibility of the presentation of existence studying is necessary because of some especial considerations. If the planning predominant systems are plural in existence, the doubt about impossibility for an empirical study is strong. If planning systems are plural, if behaving being is the gravity point of a scientific study, anarchy and suspension embrace all the scientific study realms. The emphasis on the possibility of the phenomenological face of existence studying is really the possibility of research on the quality of the variations of the plural planning systems. Surely the quality of some main planning system variations knowledge on the existence surface is possible by analyzing of the active circle processes in different realms such as the planets orbit or chemical rolls and some physical models and genetic mutations, but the planning systems are plural in the existence surface. The possibility of the particular cases of studying that is out of this inclusive and general processes missed. If there are not the major models of planning systems; thus, the formation of planning and consequently the anticipation of a behavior are impossible. The above explanations illustrated the different possibilities of a behaving being consideration as the center of gravity of scientific study. This view change to the empirical research has many consequences to fertilize scientific knowledge. It reduces even its generality and inclusiveness. The Other problem is the restriction of behavioral spectrum by logical contradictions. If we say a game is a serious act, undoubtedly it is a paradox. The incoming of any behaving being with the aim except entertainment should be studied in a separate submenu apart from the game concept. To other word, for example if a person joins to the game process and he wants to disorder the game this person does not play though his intention is hidden from recognition by the game behaving researchers. This reality indicates that the researchers cannot realize all aspects of a game. This problem is related to the possibility of the empirical behaviors study rather than the impossibility of investigating behavior. Knowledge is a possible affair if the possibility to obtain the behaviors essence and their empirical inclusive studying is provided. We want to claim the studied behaviors related with entertainment spectrum have always some mutual determinative features. In many situations these behaviors do not have any common feature and it is probable that their common features with the other behaviors of out of spectrum are more, but these behaviors that are far from another at a glance are not paradoxical and their common point is entertainment. For example, if a competition does not have common point with entertainment, it does not have any paradox with a competition too and it is possible to be categorized in the behavioral entertainment spectrum. The seriousness is also defined by an especial manner. If a person contravenes from the regular of seriousness, he should accept the behavior aftermath and he certainly is a reprehensible person. Though these behavioral effects cannot be located out of a behavioral spectrum and we can estimate those with the same behavioral probability. In order to study which behaviors are connected with the spectrum and this question that their limitation is determined with common nouns and adverbs and some other grammatical features and logical contradiction behaving beings must particularly and empirically be studied. Each out of spectrum behavior that contradicts with the lingual reference that signifies that concept or has some different features by means of the other variations of consciousness with the main behavior similarity must be studied as a separate variable with its especial parameters. Hence, there is no restriction to study the new behavioral variables of a studied behavioral collection. This diversity of variables and behavioral various circle development necessitates historicity for each kind of behavior critics and every behavioral science. If behavioral sciences eliminate historicity and temporality from the cycle of knowledge, they do not obtain the original and real knowledge. Unhistorical knowledge is which cognition that does not consider variables and cannot report happenings; because events always alter the reality. Therefore, behavioral sciences to have an exact presentation about reality and provision of the cognition materials must follow historic critics and temporality to be able to observe the continually divergent corporeal world reality by analyzing and the cognition of variables and the behavioral various circles and preparation a probable and useful report about the corporeal world cognition. So much the spectrum is larger and more inclusive than and the circle of behaving beings aims are more developed around one or more various behavior, a behavioral science expert can study a vast behavioral circle. Therefore, they can develop the behavioral definition. Probably, one can say this is begging the question. Because a concept, ---here game--- is the consequence of the language usage. We will explain, but references are the consciousness representative not, consciousness. Meanwhile, there is not, the used contrary concept of entertainment or fun condition for the game. This subject illustrates the restricted lingual possibilities by means of which appeared consciousness in the logical contradiction. In language, there is however, a logical contradiction, the lingual possibilities to reflect reality end up. Then language has no relation to reality, and it is just the sign of which behavioral kind that we can call it expression. The expression feature is the impossibility to follow the consciousness signs and the study of the plural forms of existence around the discussed subject. The Lingual possibility is Just an option to explain a logical contradiction. We can only talk about a contradiction and express it without any possibility of its empirical excavation. The language for the abstention from the lingual possibilities mixture generally gives a free will to its lingual actors, and a collection of lingual words to express their purposes. They do not find the inadequacy of the lingual possibilities. This subject is also surely related to the development of a lingual society. The lingual vague circle is mostly related to indeterminate and mental situations between two or more behaving beings on the back grand of the more general and more complicated behavioral collections or metaphoric and emotional situations. For example, we can mention some adverbs that have no obvious referral definition and make for a person the possibilities of different choices, such as grammatical adverbs: here and there. To express the determinate behaviors and the conceptual disintegration, language makes some developed possibilities for a lingual society. The degree of lingual possibilities in each language for referring to concepts has some behavioral backgrounds. To other word, the dedication of the developed collection of words to disintegrate concepts and ambiguity of some languages to allocate referential forms to

behavioral concepts and situations is even a problem that as a behavior must be studied and excavated. There is surely doubt about the foundation of human knowledge ---which is the sensory perceptions--- too. We must remember the certainty is which kind of behavior that the human obtains it by considering the above-mentioned issues under determined circumstances. If the quality of the human's mind is like that, it cannot be assured even by the rational convincing that filling always remains in mind. At the outset, but, until the explanation of the corporeal world and obtaining the certain and immediate knowledge, we must rely on which explanations that some statements such as the certain mathematical propositions propose us. If the mathematical proposition $(2+2)$ proposes $=4$, (if we add two things to two other things we will possess for things), then it will be better that we commence the explanation of the corporeal world by the gifted consequence of the proposition, till if our principle in line with the consciousness flowing in all of determined realms of existence is truthful. The proponent consciousness proves our right knowledge and lack of imagination and reality of the corporeal world. Since consciousness is not a phenomenon except the ability of creation and organization of existence. If consciousness exists, it explains itself. As we will notice, the mathematical realm has a high behavioral aspect. The human's behaviors and generally the dependent behaviors on consciousness determine Many situations that we require to do a mathematic operation. But mathematical propositions refer to some proportions between the components of nature that have nominated by the human so that he can categorize topics in accessible ways. On the other hand, if we intend to doubt about the process of questioning to begin the knowledge process, we may never have a possibility to begin the process. Because at the outset, we can ask how we can directly and undoubtedly perceive the questioner object has entered into a certain knowledge process. Skepticism exclusively plays no effective rule in the certain knowledge process. It is the problem; if there is not any reason for the lack of delusion of the sensational circle that concludes that certain knowledge is obtainable, there is also not any reason for the delusion of this circle. Meanwhile, we must remember the utilized propositions by the knower object in the different situations indicate different corners of consciousness; Such as the ability of contradictions perception. If we ask two questions with two different answers, we can answer them equally. The conflict between the two contradictions is covered by the given answers. To the epistemological word, the contradiction of a theorem means the consciousness occurrence and the lack of consciousness occurrence cannot happen at one time. A contradiction is as an epistemological concept can be inferred and has an epistemological context. The concept of contradiction will fundamentally change, if ontological foundations change. In other word, when we can define the substance of existence, and we can answer to this question that what is existence? We can prove or disapprove the possibility or the impossibility to be existence at one time. It is possible to know which situations may lead us the invalid responses by our proposed axiom. If all of the occurred events in the corporeal world contain an element of consciousness and we suppose the knowledge of false acts and sentences as an occurred event, we can obtain the consciousness effects. The hidden aspect of consciousness in the resultant events to the invalid knowledge about the corporeal world is the same planning. All the false and true propositions in relation to consciousness are explicable. A theorem is false when it does not reflect the hidden forms of consciousness in an event, or it does not describe the right forms of consciousness entrance in plural forms of existence. It is equal to the reality that reflects the elements of consciousness in a considered proposition. The Reality of the corporeal world is which realm the knower object has some situations to act and behave. Based on this definition, the border between human and the corporeal world is a faint color. Surely the issue distinguishes between human as a knower object and existence is the questioning about existence. This dualism between human and existence does not prevent to study about existence by the human. Since reflection of consciousness in existence is a criterion for the experience of existence. The human can follow consciousness everywhere he is. He can study not only himself, but also the widespread corporeal world realm. If the knowledge process that has originated from the consciousness effects in existence is Even a delusion circle, the hope to obtain direct and certain knowledge is more than other resultant ways to reach the authentic knowledge. The thinkable ways are: We can talk about direct and certain knowledge. There is no dialogue and will to begin the process of direct and certain knowledge. It is possible that some existents are busy to work in this realm except humans. It is the third probability there are responses other than we response to the questions based on human knowledge. Whichever way it works, we leave to it to their followers and wish them success. Our proposed methodology for a convincing answer is the confidence in science as a structure can lead us to the origin of existence. It can answer to our questions correctly. Now, if we must excavate the hidden forms of consciousness and the different layers of existence to obtain a convincing explanation of the corporeal world, how can we solve the problem of topics categorization to begin to draw scientific inferences? If there are all the things in families of the topics have common features and they also have some differences, how we can categorize them so that this categorization is useful for science? It is true that differences between things are very large, but the corporeal world that we are confronted it, has proceeded to equalize, and form the families of existents. Modern science based on these families and categorization of topics is also formed. Science is not able to explain the differences and the variances and finally the plurality of the corporeal world Because of the centralizing the similarities between things of the consciousness acceptances. We must answer to this question that how we can obtain the forms of consciousness behind all of diversities and what do connect all the different and incomparable and unbalanced collections of phenomena with each other? Science utilizes a logical method that is recognized as induction to study the similarities between categories. Induction is a method of passing through the particular truth to the conclusion of a general concept. The Assurance point of science is the report of particular observations and making conclusions about the linking element of these particular cases through the reported cases. For example, by observing cows pasturing freely and without industrial interference on a plain, we scientifically conclude that cows are herbivorous. That there are cows feeding on anything except grass to survive means whether science cannot explain this phenomenon or it probably creates a new featured category that includes that troops of cows and generally other inexplicable collections of phenomena and the rare cases.

The problem of induction has involved minds of philosophers. Because of the sunrise view on this day, can we certainly talk about the sunrise at tomorrow? Considering the hidden consciousness element of occurrences, the answer will be simple. Induction is generally the consequence of the outdated scientific approach that believes the corporeal world explanation is only possible based on similarities between the particular categories. Surely, this approach is not profitable and it cannot effectively aid in discovering the hidden corners of the corporeal world.

Thus, the method of science should be based on the study of the hidden consciousness in events not the judgment about consciousness containers, but induction which is the consequence of classical logic does exactly that. Namely based on those consciousness signs which are the consciousness containers it inexplicably intends to excavate consciousness. How can he inform about the sunrise at tomorrow when a person is not conscious? Therefore, in accordance with the above preliminaries, inductive argumentation based on the plural signs of consciousness--- is inexplicable and does not reach to any purposes. To obtain constant forms of consciousness at the beginning we need to know existence realms, even it is not possible in a good manner and even it does not include all of events that occur in the corporeal world. The explanation of existence realms in the ontological and epistemological steps that we can perceive and justify them can effectively help to explain the corporeal world. It is surely possible through the perfect and final process of certain and immediate knowledge and the appearance of other different ontological and epistemological steps the explanation of these realms alters on a large scale. Till then, by helping these inclusive realms we can know better the corporeal world and explain it a little more positively. The two main playing role realms of existence to know and explain the corporeal world are material and life. Probably the definition of these two realms, is not possible, but at a glance, these two significant realms leads to the solution of the problem. Probably we cannot yet define material and life, but we can now determine its border. The Determination to recognize these realms is possible by statistical methods and this inexact scientific prevalent categorization. Our knowledge about material and life in some sentences such as: we can tell there are more than of 100 chemical elements, or materials can be observed in three forms: gas, liquid and solid. is summarized. The categorization of living beings in the world is the main issue that its foundation was only constructed of appeared similarities between the different acts of existents in life. For example, mammals are categorized as a species because of the same method of their generation and productive glands of milk but (Arthropods) comprise a category because of their similar (multi-banded feet). The discrepancy between insects is more than of it. Hymenoptera and grasshoppers have no relation to another. Hornets and mosquitos have no resemblance in communal life. Hornets and ants choose different styles in their communal life because of different possibilities. Another acute case of disorderliness of the standard scientific categorization goes back to the biological categorization of human specious. Science could not convincingly categorize human till now. Human as an existent can speak by possessing the ability of tool making and invention has a potential possibility of epidemic immigration from proto settlements to long distances. The lingual ability of human has made a problem. How should we explain the correspondence between human ethnic and lingual groups among human societies? Sometimes we can see radical attitudes among anthropologists. They work in which societies that they had vast cultural relations and exchanges. Therefore, they mainly argue that ethnology is a cultural issue. Sometimes the peoples, by considering the cultural facts make some ethnic identities to denote and recognize themselves as a specific clan in their environment. Another problem that affected the study of biologic human species is the crisis of the Second World War and the NAZI regime use of racial debates. when everybody talks about the human ethnologic problems, this thought immediately rises in the mind that this discussion is not a scientific issue and some totalitarian political regimes recourse to it to benefit in line with their special purposes. Maybe it is now necessary once we talk about this problem farther human feelings. There are free discussions under the shadow of empirical science to categorize the human species convincingly. Undoubtedly this categorization will prepare a beneficial knowledge about ourselves for us. Based on the above axiom, human treatments and behaviors have an element of consciousness within themselves. The map of this consciousness element, in our view, can be seen in the human genome. Therefore, the behavior of each human being can be followed and studied in the genetic map of his body.

The explanation of the incorporeal substance of the foundation of consciousness reflected in the human genome is very significant. If the materialistic explanation of the genes is possible, the creation of human or each other living existent must also be possible. We must explain material action in the context of a chemical pattern, and the quality of this action must be justified in the genetic system. Materialist scientists must be able to produce a human from pure material based on these two sciences. Insisting on the ability of materialistic science to produce humans as a physical machine in the genetic and chemical paradigm is impossible. There is no theoretical obstacle to rich this purpose, and it seems the lack of possibility of realization of this goal is a consequence of the incompetence of materialistic science. We should not certainly ignore the genetic mutations that play a deterministic role to occur a behavior. For example, any human being is not only a copy of his or her parents. In other word, any human being cannot be summarized in his or her parent because of containing the parent's genetic factors, we cannot consider their children the same parents. This problem means consciousness is not a passive phenomenon that transmits from a generation to another generation, rather it is an active phenomenon that when it transmits, it alters. Diversity is fundamentally the consequent of the variation and mutation of consciousness in the corporeal world. The same feature of consciousness confirms its mystery and ambiguity. Contrary to present inexplicable standard academic scientific methodologies, human behaviors provide the possibility of the studying and anticipation of circumstances that affect the variables of the human behaviors like other affective variables of all of behaviors. Surely the ethnic issues must be regarded with consideration of biologic accordance and lingual features. On the one hand, based on the knowledge about bio-human species and on the other hand, by the scientific confirmation of lingual families the problem of correspondence between ethnic entities and lingual families of categorization is soluble by scientific method adoption. It is true that some human societies barrow a language or languages from other cultures during their life, but at the beginning, every cultural society, whether they belong to a special lingual family ---known us till now--- or speak an isolated language at the time of their berth they had their particular language. For example, the presentation of the people speaking to the hypothetic proto Indo-European that historical linguists of the 19th century have reconstructed it is not strange, and we must determine its status. The problem is that human knowledge cannot make a decisive comment about the lack of these peoples. There are some undetermined situations to study human the behaviors process that we must explain those situations based on the above axiom. Some behavioral situations raise in the mind the question that how a specific behavior involves many persons with plural situations and forms of consciousness. For example, why only one person survives in a car accident? About the airplane crash, we can present different situations, but some persons usually survive. In other disasters such as earthquakes, inundations or wildfires and other natural disasters, apart from how many persons survive, what is the reason for vulnerability or invulnerability? How do humans save themselves from hazardous situations and death? In some situations, but some persons die because of a simple accident. Does the end of human life or its continuity follow a specific rule? The explanation of a behavioral

situation is not certainly only restricted to deadly accidents. It also includes many daily ordinary situations of human life. The peculiarity of these situations raises many questions in mind about the quality of events occurrence. The two persons who know nothing about each other get married. Some meetings cause deep friendships and even destructive spiritual and emotional shocks. How do these meetings affect? Do we believe in random situations to explain these undetermined behavioral situations, or do they follow the above axiom? Undetermined behavioral situations seem not to be restricted to the above-mentioned situations. We can categorize many human abilities in the same undetermined behavioral situations. In many cases, humans can learn when needed. They use their abilities. The ability of invention is the same human ability that is not restricted at any specific time. The ability to choose between things is which ability that humans use by considering the specific behavioral situations that own themselves. The above-mentioned situations follow the same axiom. the problem but is a few complicated. Probably these undetermined behavioral situations are under the control of each body planning system, which is linked to the genetic system and the hidden signs of consciousness in each person closely. Probably studying the electro-magnetic process in the body will help to gain insight into these undetermined behaviors. Many neurotic actions of the human are performed under the shadow of the body's electro-magnetic system. Probably the territory of this system is extended more than of our thought and we can hold this active body organization responsible for these undetermined behavioral situations. Maybe many random occurrences and events that we consider to be the result of a chance occur in a determined and especial electro-magnetic circumstance. A human that has survived in an airplane crash, a human that has made an important decision in his life, a president who survives in a revolutionary assassination and changes his country and society history, plus metaphysical deterministic conditions and non-mechanical considerations that are affective on the determination of events situation and... ---we will discuss them later --- can possess different electro-magnetic positions. Though it is a widespread context of determination to occur events circumstances and we must consider it more. In this step, our discussion is linked to the inclusive realms of existence namely material and life, but some points about the deficiency of the beings' categorization clarifies that we must revise new scientific methodology and foundations. We said that the inclusive realms of the corporeal world give us keys to solve the problem. The Hidden form of consciousness in a living being is the gene. The life of living beings depends on the behavior and genes decoding in the context of amino-acids and proteins. We know no living being that has come to life outside of this context. In the light of the above discussion it probably turns out that that we can find some common features between the plural forms of existence to categorize them in especial groups. The situation of the hidden forms of consciousness detection is more complex in materials. At first glance we cannot probably find any resemblance between the materials and we ask ourselves how the materials behave that the forms of consciousness appear through them. It seems that we must positively answer this question at least about variables that affect materials in different circumstances. Consider the behavior of a piece of metal per moon, the piece of metal is lighter in the moon but because of the atmospheric pressure its gravity is starker on the ground. Water near the null degree begins to expand counter its normal behavior. We can find many extensions of the difference of materials behaviors in the subatomic world. We cannot anticipate the speed and direction of the particles exactly and without error. Therefore, the difference in materials behaviors is an issue that science must accept it, but behind these behaviors is there a decisive affair. Which are our alleged forms of consciousness hidden in materials? Is this form or these forms really hidden in the materials? Science undoubtedly must answer this question. We propose a method that can possibly help answer this question easily. To detect the hidden forms of consciousness in material it is necessary to consider the subatomic world. Namely the location happens wonderful events. One of the important theories that explain what is happening in under atomic particles is the Heisenberg theory known as the uncertainty principle. The theory states it is impossible to accurately measure the direction and velocity of subatomic particles at a same time with a (0) error coefficient. The cause of this issue is certainly partially technologic obstacles. We cannot know what happens in the subatomic world of particles Because of optic spectrum interference, but it seems that science to be able to prove the motion in the subatomic world. In addition of motion in the subatomic world the polarity of particles with positive and negative charges is the other factor that determines the behavioral conditions of materials. Because of abstruseness of motion and the impossibility of its comparison of motion without the probability of error coefficient in the subatomic world we should commence the comparison of motion in the subatomic world from the surface layers of materials, which layers that are the subjects of modern chemistry science studies. For a better knowledge about the features and the behaviors of each element – individually or along with other elements--- we must consider some parameters. Among these parameters we can mention the density that represents the mass of the material and its relation to water and atomic mass and atomic number and the disaffection of some element to be compounded with other chemical elements. Regrettfully now these parameters are being studied in academic circles as essential features of chemicals without the analyzing these parameters to follow the effects of our proposed axiom. The parameters of each element are assumed as an essential feature of it which means these parameters are not subject to the input of consciousness in the plural forms of existence. One consequence of these inputs is related to the formation of the chemical element. However, consciousness is always present in all of occurrences as a substantial and phenomenal feature. As an occurrence in the existence realm, the formation of each element is also presented therefore, this occurrence becomes subject to the presence of consciousness in its content. Namely, consciousness is the interfering element in all the substantial and phenomenal features of chemical elements, and there is no exception to this inclusive rule. Therefore, when we study the material scientifically, the reflection of the consciousness presence can be considered. Till now, these parameters of the chemical elements have not been studied in line with the consciousness presence and have only been assumed to be essential features of materials and unquestionable issues. While consciousness is the active element in all the events and the formation of chemical elements, we cannot present this subject without the input of consciousness in the plural forms of existence. Consciousness consequently appears in the formation of substantial and phenomenal features of materials. These parameters are not perfect and independent and unquestionable factors, but they are the consequents of the quality of the consciousness effects on the plural forms of existence in the process of materials formation. If based on non-Newtonian mechanic motion can be traced back in the deepest layers of materials therefore, it is probable that we can detect and study the effects of motion on the surface layers of the material. Certainly, empirical science must confirm this hypothesis. The consideration of the consciousness presence, in the formation of chemical elements has a major impact on modern chemistry attitude. With the consideration of the consciousness presence the substantial and phenomenal features of the

material are not supposed as total affairs, rather they are empirical issues. We can describe the quality of each element specialty, whether substantial or phenomenal feature based on the epistemological axiom of the consciousness presence. By considering the impossibility to study the world of fundamental particles ---it is probably due to the technologic deficiency---a proper perspective is needed to study the chemical elements. This right perspective even is crucial to recognize the occurrences in the fundamental particles' world meticulously. This new attitude allows us to study the chemical elements more deeply and more seriously. It can help to find an exact science about fundamental particles that are now suffering from the lack of technological capabilities. Modern chemistry must carry out a general study of the paradigm of the consciousness presence in all occurrences, an all-inclusive studying about chemical elements properties such as density and atomic mass and atomic number and even the issues like this: why materials in three states of solid and liquid and gaseous are? Perhaps we must revise the rules of gasses ascending by considering the above epistemological axiom. With this new methodology, the exquisite and seemingly insoluble problems of fundamental particles will gain a clear horizon. This horizon is a comparison of the motion aftermaths on the outward layers of materials. At present, the comparison of the motion of fundamental particles is impossible. The technologic possibilities deficiency along the measurement of direction and velocity of a particle are the most significant reasons. It must be born in mind that motion affects the external behaviors of the material in the deep layers of the material. The effects of motion on the external layers are very complex. Probably these effects manifest themselves in the reaction of materials and one of the behavior occurrence circumstances. Consider a simple event. Imagine a glass that falls on the floor, but it does not break. Probably not to break the glass is partly related to some reactions of the fundamental particles. In a specific status, the motion of ions can alter the molecules gravity of the glass, as can be seen in this event, ---namely not to break the glass--- is effective. Though it is true, we should talk about the metaphysical basis of occurrences that we will return to later. We should add our chemical revised study allows us to observe new aspects of the actions and reactions of materials, which we have not probably noticed them exactly. This aspect of material actions goes back to the connections of ions with motion and their counter-effects. The analysis of the mutual connections of ions with the motion and their actions and their reactions can construct a new chemical attitude called "electro-chemistry". Instead of studying in the deeper and inaccessible layers of materials, we can discover the motion in the external layers, and we can estimate it profitably. The answer to how connect the subatomic particles, and all the variations in the structure of chemical elements undoubtedly depend on a close study of the association of fundamental particles with chemistry. Quantum theory seems to be an explanation of a part of reality before it is an estimate about the subatomic world and of the fundamental particles. We face in the great world to the specific variation of chemical materials, while in the subatomic layer we encounter an almost uniform layers of particles. How do these particles exhibit themselves as a chemical element? Does the motion of the fundamental particles affect materials status and their kinetic features in nature? How is the circle of the particles' progression toward a chemical element? These are the questions that we answer by studying the fundamental physical particles in a close relation to chemistry that considers these issues. The motion within materials reduces the certainty and harmony of behaviors with the standard mechanical paradigm in academic institutions. Now here, consider circumstances cause to move the fundamental particles and the subatomic realm. It is crucial for this issue. At present, based on technological abilities, it is not possible to talk about the fundamental particles directly. Still, but there is another way. This motion of seemingly undetermined and lawless certainly has a decisive reflection on the macrocosm. The first step to know this decisive reflection is the knowledge about the present elements in nature. The scientific tendency for the more accurate understanding of materials must be based on the foundation of modern chemistry about knowledge of inter-molecular cross-links of the different types of elements. The motion in subatomic layers is fluid, and this fluidity probably can explain the different behaviors of the material. Why can we find materials in the three different states solid, liquid and gas in nature? Why materials have different boiling points and freezing points? In addition to the atomic arrangement of materials, what other factors influence the different behaviors of the materials? By establishing and study of the modern chemistry based on understanding inter-molecular cross-links and their effects on the motion, we can probably answer to these questions. The trace of consciousness forms in living beings is probably attainable. These advances led us to witness a dynamic science called genetic engineering. The human progress in the genetic realm is very hopeful. The ability of cloning and genetic reform productions---specifically farming--- creates a shining future and a new human knowledge. One of the slow reasons for human societies development is probably the lack of genes consideration as the key to decode occurrences. A greater focus on genes as a starting point for scientific studies can help us to gain insight into scientific elaborations. Why the human's brain is not properly known to us? Certainly, the answer is the elaboration of this strange mechanism. In connection with the human brain, some problems seem insolvable like retention ability. The other peculiarity of the human brain is that different parts of the brain collect the information to observe one thing, but the final step, the overall conclusion, and general recognition, and the process causes it, is unknown. Probably we must not only study these occurrences in the paradigm of a neurotic phenomenon. The role of the genetic system in this occurrence is still unclear. To achieve ultimate recognition, at a specific time, multi-visual points probably operate under a single command. If it is true, the determination and estimation to recognize this process without genetic studies is impossible. The study of the human brain without a genetic approach is an incomplete study, and the reason for the lack of progress in its cognition is probably related to it. The process of knowledge of genetic encoding must also be based on the smallest unicellular beings. These beings play a confined role in nature. It seems we must start with this presupposition that the confined activities of unicellular beings exhibit the restriction of their hidden consciousness. If that's true, that's a good sign. External restriction of activities is the sign of the restriction of the hidden consciousness forms that has appeared in their body and their genetic system and their actions. Studying so many restricted beings allows for a precise comparative operation of these beings and their encoding quality and genetic appearance based on an empirical observation. At the first step, it is not beneficial to look at the genetic system of complex organisms such as humans because humans can act in a vast space and it is difficult and even impossible to observe empirically their indeterminate behaviors. To solve the consciousness mystery a comparative genetic studying between human's death and life is also necessary. Death of human is a historical situation that it does not necessarily interfere to alter the human corporeal body. This lack of necessity of certain organic interference of death is a sign of the possibility of human body preservation and its genetic system formation in the same fixed form before death. This issue states that all hidden consciousness system in the human body or at least a large part of that does not alter after death.

By this presupposition we must be able to see the death from the perspective of genetic alteration. Answering the question that death, what changes make in the human genetic system, can help to detect the consciousness secret. The preparation of an inexpensive and effective drug for the treatment of some serious illnesses such as AIDS has been a time consuming and costly task for scientists for many years. The solution is not to study a virus structure to gain insight into its immunological features, rather we must study the genetic system of a virus to paralyze and disable it by a simple way and low budget. Reforming the approach to genetics studies would be faster and more straightforward if the control of pharmaceutical capitalist corporations were limited to research projects and this issue is considered as a scientific issue. If genetic studies are presumed as a genetic map of the hidden forms of consciousness in living beings, they can be a guide to attempt to explain existence. Therefore, forms of consciousness in the existence spread realms are detectable while we can recognize and purposefully explain those. By considering the definition of our start point it is necessary to pay attention to a topic about scientific methodology. Today one of practical methodologies in sciences is environmentalism. There is no probably organized school of thought as environmentalism, but we can categorize a collection of methods and approaches that believe in the effects of the environment on behaviors under this title. This is the main deficiency that is associated with this methodology. We cannot logically define environment. If we ask from a believer in environmentalism about the relation of depression and the appearance of violence meanwhile, he says the environment is effective on the appearance of violence. If modern psychological science in the context of appearance of violence and a factor ---for example genetic factors and hereditary--- has concluded, he adds those to his knowledge and responds the environment in which the patient inhabits, works and commutes determines the connection between the appearance of violence and depression. If now we ask what is generally the definition of environment and the patient living environment of the patient? He mentions all of events that happen in his life and all of conditions that the patient has had in an especial time and generally all possible events as the environment. He defines the environment without restrictions and boundaries. It is interest that if we ask the same question about a patient that the aggressive behaviors did not appear in him the above-mentioned scientist wants the environment to help him to answer that question. He recognizes the environment as the most important or one of the most important causes of the issue and wherever the scientific propositions have reached some conclusions about inheritance interference, he accepts inheritance effects. Our emphasis on definition to determine the concepts limitation is in line with the consolidation of knowledge foundations and methods. We have mentioned that it is impossible to define and categorize the environment by considering plural forms of consciousness and if we can define and categorize the environment, no explanatory knowledge would be afforded, but this impossibility of defining of environment makes a vicious circle that is far from the explanatory knowledge. There is, of course, an important issue that we must mention to avoid from confusion and clarifying of the proposed methodology. It is likely a doubt some concept cannot be also defined and typify the existence concept in support of the claim that has not yet been decisively defined, and it is not possible to recognize its substance and common and inclusive features. The existence concept includes all the things that we can perceive, and we cannot analyze those out of existence. Meanwhile, other corporeal and other unknown extensions of existence have not been apparently denied by human science. Therefore, what difference between environment and existence as two concepts? What does afford to deny environment in the scientific explanation as a loose-fitting garment in which we incorporate everything, it but we accept existence as a constant concept and perhaps a concept to which sensorially we depend on it? We response by considering our present epistemological conditions as a human, and our comprehension of the corporeal world, the definition of existence against itself is impossible, but the definition of the environment can encompass all paradoxes. We mentioned the case of a patient that has perpetrated aggressive behavior. If his doctor believes in environmentalism and we ask him, what is the cause of appearance of violence in this patient, he will entrust all the responsibilities to the environment by assigning an outstanding role to the environment. While he is not able to limit its concept, and in the same time, if we ask about another patient that is depressed but he does not exhibit aggressive behavior, his answer is an unknown and inexplicable responsibility of the environment. The environment is a utopia that science cannot discover its essence. Surely science looks at studying about existence concept and science never ignore this inclusive concept ---if there is an inclusive concept of existence---. Ultimately, this complexity and access to an explanatory picture of existence is based on the success of studies in recognizing the conditions that institutionalized consciousness. By discovering the concept of consciousness, which is itself the origin of existence, we can attain the conditions through which existence exists and the substance of existence in general. Certainly, there is also the doubt of the lack of definability of consciousness. How we can trace an element of consciousness in all occurrences. Even we associate consciousness with all occurrences that do not happen. This problem will be solved by studying the ways of achieving to the concept of consciousness, but what happens that we base our studies on consciousness? The threat of inclusiveness of consciousness extensions trembles this concept like existence and environment. Two points of view negate this destructive threat. 1. Consciousness is not defined, such as existence against itself. We cannot define consciousness against itself. If a person says, "I do not know," we cannot present any epistemological concept for this word except to be far from knowledge. 2. Another separation point between consciousness and other concepts that cannot help to commence the explanatory knowledge is the emphasis on this inclusive concept to begin the knowledge affair that gives us the keys for an explanation. We can trace back the hidden forms of consciousness. We can express and explain and compare the alterations of the hidden forms of consciousness in all beings and all occurrences. Defining behavior as the meaning unification of occurrences that are considered unrelated islands at first glance brings up a specific problem, that it must be solved. It is necessary to mention before addressing this issue that considering behaviors as a window into the knowledge process has no contradiction with the transition of the scientific studies gravity point from behaviors to behaving beings. We can study these behaviors when we accept that we do not encounter existence as individual and particular and singular and meaningless behaviors. Meanwhile, the study of behaving beings as a behavioral unit does not alter the substance of a scientific study. This substantial stability illustrates an epistemological and methodological point in this type of study. In other word, the transition of the focus of scientific studies from behaviors to behaving beings does not eliminate the effects of the epistemological axiom of tracing consciousness at all occurrences. We can trace back consciousness in behaving beings. We can precisely understand that tracing forms of consciousness at behaving beings has a privilege. We can avoid radical focus on observations, and this is also a criterion for analyzing the reality substance. The behaviors relation to substances and their proportions to one another in a scientific study is which issue that we must consider and explain it

convincingly. Where is the place and proportions of substances in the corporeal world with so many particulars? If consciousness creates this varied and divergent world by the interference in plural forms of existence, can we say things have a changeless substance? Must we determine definitions based on substances? To determine the substance of a concept in a scientific study, if an extension has even the slightest discrepancy with the substance defined by us, can we, as an empirical scientist, consider it a substance? There are many such discrepancies in existence. Do these particulars invalidate the concept of substances? We must judge this problem by considering its complexity. It seems a mention to the variety of conceptualization in the corporeal world is a good starting point. We encounter two types of conceptualizations. 1. Conceptualization based on qualities. 2. Conceptualization based on quantities. These two types of general conceptualization include all types of conceptualizations in any circumstances. For example, the definition of a square is a conceptualization based on quantities. Because the square is equal to a closed shape that its length and width are equal, but the human definition is a conceptualization based on qualities. Because an inclusive definition of the human based on quantities and specific relation is impossible and any feature that mentions is a qualitative trait that its contrary or its contradictory ---leastwise theoretically --- is possible, thus we cannot limit the human definition to which is at present that we know as a human. It is just one of the ways that consciousness has gone into human existence with all its differences. This principle is true when human definition has no logical contradictory with each one of its parts or with other beings' definition. Qualities when have common features, are the consequences of the circulation of consciousness that has led to the specific situation of their studied present creation, and their differences are the consequences of the plural acts of consciousness in these situations that each part finds its different aspect. We can explain these common features by observing and tracing consciousness. We can present proportions and quantities as invariable categories, but if existence does not precisely behave based on these substances, we cannot claim these substances are meaningless. For example, if a rectangular stone with a little regularity observes in nature, defining the rectangular as a substance and a concept is meaningless. It is true that we can explain the plurality of consciousness based on behavior, but because of the restriction of existential forms, there are proportions in nature. These proportions force existence to act around these restrictions. By considering these restrictions, we can define substances that have a quantitative aspect. These quantitative substances explain some features of beings that exist. In general, questioning about substances in the present evolutionary conditions of our knowledge is not a complete and easy question. Because answering the question about the essence of occurrences and behaving beings is possible when any corner of behaviors is discoverable to us. The root of substances essence is the consequence of substances teleological conditions. If we want to know why the human comes to this step of his diversity, we must know why and how consciousness originates the human being. The knowledge about this depends on a clear presentation about the paleontological routes of consciousness in line with plural forms of existence in all dimensions of existence. Therefore, the discovery of probable substances necessarily depends on the discovery of the ultimate and teleological forms of existence and consciousness. In the modern scientific methodology, we must consider the behavioral essences and tracing the forms of consciousness at all occurrences, but we cannot deny the concept of substances specifically about quantities.

Language and consciousness; historicity or the lack of historicity.

The aspects of consciousness explanation appear on the scientific institute. The consciousness explanation reveals itself in language. Because human consciousness as a behaving being is in varying degrees and the methods of thought and value systems and perceptions and meanings of human societies are not also similar. Different lingual appearances are observable. Languages are in fact, sets of the signs, but signs of consciousness, not the consciousness carrier. The language, as current postmodern circles presume is not the origin of consciousness, rather it is the carrier of consciousness. Loanwords of other languages in every lingual set and the different views of the lingual spokesmen confirm this notion. In Farsi, for example, the spokesmen use the infinitive (کردن کردن) for making a compound verb and new meanings, which means acting (doing)---. In English, While English language uses the verb get (which means in Persian to take). These differences of views indicate each group of lingual speakers has a different way of viewing. The presentation of every lingual set of the appeared reality is a sign of different value system, a set of different meanings, and ultimately different behavioral context. Furthermore, looking at language as a perfectly formed totality fundamentally contradicts all the pluralistic and historical approaches that the main postmodern circles are their supporters. The elimination of history from the language negates all pluralistic approaches. The picture of language as a general and inclusive phenomenon makes the language as an unhistorical phenomenon. An unhistorical system of the signs remains that any historical variable such as cultural and social and economic factors do not affect it. Here we do not want to ignore the unhistorical aspects of language completely. There are main categories that members of diverse lingual societies can have a dialogue about those without any problem. Generally historical or unhistorical aspects are the consequence of the behaviors of activist societies that we can see their reflections in the language. Probably historical and value aspects that different human languages reflect those, are considered as the obstacles to immediate knowledge, but we can consider the lingual action as a carrier of two different reflective acts of a lingual activists. The first context reflects the human's common and unhistorical behaviors that all societies practice throughout their lives or problems that all human beings must deal with. For example, eating reference when is expressed with all its significations is a concept that is presented in all human history and all lingual societies with all the differences of views and all the differences of choices of words, but the second context encompasses all the especial heterogeneous attitudes and value judgments and views that are unique to the lingual activist society. Then we can tell that language carries two expressive layers that are the carrier of two types of hidden consciousness in the corporeal world. First is the expression that is common to all the lingual activists and all activists have a common comprehension of it, namely the same appearances of existence that in philosophical tradition are known as the quantities are the matter of empirical sciences. The other layer comprises forms of consciousness that include a vast spectrum of comprehensible human qualities such as value judgments and different points of view on existential categories. As human experience is shared in numerous lingual active societies, lingual phrases are the same or have little difference. We must certainly not completely forget the individual style of each lingual activist for choosing words and different syntactic frameworks, but this personal style to use words or different syntactic framework is not an obstacle to the reciprocal comprehension of a lingual activist. In the same unhistorical layer of language any person based on his hidden forms of consciousness and consequently its outcome behavioral forms, also behaves and we cannot expect a single lingual reaction. If so, we should hear similar sentences in similar situations. When we cross this

unhistorical surface, we come to a variable layer of language that comprises the smallest spectrum of lingual activists or has a personal aspect. In this point in the discussion, we refer to the basic question we asked above about the search for specific fundamental philosophical concepts such as existence, and at this time, we ask the same question about the concept of consciousness. If consciousness is indeed the cause of all occurrences and all the various appearances of existence, how we can know this concept has a substantial oneness. How must we explain the corporeal world plurality under the shadow of consciousness unity as a unique affair? Why must not we present, consciousness itself is a plural affair in a challenge with the corporeal world? If the consciousness concept is a fragment and a plural affair, we made a futile effort. What do we answer to this question? Does this epistemological paradigm prove his claims? If consciousness is a constant affair, what is the cause of many alterations and diversities in the corporeal world. How a historical and eternal phenomenon can be the cause and the motivation of many behaviors and temporal and unstable motivations? About the unity and lack of plurality of consciousness --- certainly by considering the limitation of empirical sciences and our knowledge about the corporeal world--- We can point out that we encounter the regularly restricted appearances of consciousness in existence. The consciousness appearances in the corporeal world are motion, growth (life), which is probably the peculiarity of living beings and plural forms of existence. These issues are the consequents of consciousness. They are used as the tools of consciousness. Consciousness creates and fosters in existence by the emphasis on the three above-mentioned categories. All existents are the consequents of the art of consciousness producing plural forms of existence, in their motion and their arrangement. By considering the above issues and in line with some phenomena such as motion leaves signs in existence. When we talked about existence categories and their relation to historicity, we also pointed out motion and life and plural forms of existence. They are general and fluid forms in the corporeal world, but we can again ask whether these categories are searchable as the subjects of empirical sciences or are merely lingual categories such as classical logical conceptualizations. We encounter limitations neither for our inadequate knowledge about the corporeal world nor to order a systematic discussion. It means that when we talk for example, about motion, we cannot determine all motion extensions in the corporeal world, rather the part of the motion is our issue that has been the subject of physics or some empirical sciences such as biology. However, we mean motion its meaning into a materialistic paradigm and comprehensible to humans from the perspective of empirical sciences. This deficiency is true about growth and life. As explicitly, the possibility of life among other beings in other corners of the corporeal world has not yet been explicitly negated by empirical sciences. Plural forms of existence also suffer from their peculiar confusing diversity. We can physically define motion as the transition of limited material from place to place within a finite time that we can quantify it. We cannot certainly doubt to challenge the bases of this definition. As space is itself an arguable concept that we can probably define it in a close association with the material, but now we do not consider this issue since we consider motion as a general concept and a matter of empirical sciences and an epistemological category. We can analyze the concept of life and growth in living beings in line with this discussion and a constant definition of motion despite of discrepancies. It is better to say about the lack of a biological definition of life, we can trace the organized continuity of motion in living beings. Plural forms of existence have an epistemological limitation that the concept of existence will be free from limitlessness and free from scientific inadequacy. By considering these issues, the definition of consciousness and the related categories to it as tools for all diversions is based on a firm epistemological foundation that we can gain benefit from it, as a reliable foundation for empirical and scientific knowledge. Consciousness, apart from its mystic conditions and methods, is a kind of planning for diversity. Consciousness is the command of variation or invariability. Consciousness is a kind of possibility beyond existence. We can say about the question of historicity or the lack of historicity of consciousness. Consciousness is an ability that is the consequence of the unknown scientific conditions. Consciousness means the ability to behave. Wherever there is consciousness, there is a possibility of behavior occurrence. The possibility of behavior occurrence is a dual possibility that if we epistemologically define it against itself, there will be no contradiction. Certainly, there is this epistemological possibility for time, but time apart from consciousness does not have meaningful usage. Keeping this in mind provides a point of trust for analyzing nothing phenomenon and avoiding from the traditional perspective. If we believe that consciousness affects the nothing category, it means we can believe that nothing has two origins. First, nothing is a conclusion of lack of consciousness, the second nothing is a consequence of consciousness, and the lack of consciousness will to behave. If there is no occurrence, time is meaningless because we can measure time by the consequence of occurrences. It certainly is probable that we can define the hidden consciousness in plural forms of existence against themselves, namely, we can say and present an existent in the corporeal world does not know. Though, we do not mean the limitation of consciousness, but we must consider the transcendental source of consciousness that the corporeal world is its consequence. That super-consciousness and that hidden consciousness in behaviors that we can discover and study them are not definable against itself, because we cannot present the limitation as the spatial and temporal. We are epistemologically not able to present materials limited to time and space and this issue must be our paradigm to choose consciousness as the origin of the corporeal world and diversity. Consciousness as the possibility of behavior also involves as finite cuts with plural forms of existence in the corporeal world. Therefore, historicity of the corporeal world is the consequence of dealing the infinite consciousness with the plural and limited forms of existence, not the consciousness substance. Apart from the mystic substance of consciousness, the contact of consciousness with the plural forms of existence affords to overcome historicity and the restriction of consciousness. We must point out the epistemological analysis of the existence origin must distinguish between the source of consciousness that creates existence and consciousness that it is its biggest challenge with limited and plural forms of existence. These plural forms of existence, due to limited forms in motion, must accept orders that create occurrences in existence. It is probably possible occurrences could happen without unobservable corporal orders. In this situation, we must certainly consider the restriction of the plural forms of existence. I do not intend to overemphasize on the infinite character of consciousness, before the final verification of this matter depends on our more evolved knowledge about the corporeal world, but the discovery of existing forms that are not proper for materialistic analysis, such as the electro-magnetic spectrum or new trends in quantum mechanics, seems to

support this view. The other problems are the impossibility for consciousness definition against itself and maintaining its epistemological utility. Defining consciousness against itself means defining nothing that its inexplicability requires to no descriptions. The lack of consciousness equals lack of possibility of behavior. It does not mean that any behavior will not occur, but rather there is no possibility to happen no behavior. Apart from the enigmatic origin and content of the signs of consciousness, we can understand the signs of consciousness comprise many interesting points about the substance of consciousness. We will argue below that consciousness, by considering its signs, is discoverable and searchable in large parts of the corporeal world. One of these parts is the life and the hidden sign of consciousness in it, the gene. By studying the living beings' genome, we can precisely analyze behaviors and their substantial features along specific planning. If we agree with this and recognize genes as the hidden signs of the hidden consciousness in living beings, we face an interesting and significant issue. The point is that consciousness itself is more powerful than of history. In other word, consciousness itself is history-making. Consciousness is a kind of command and planning and the possibility of an occurrence for every behavior. Consciousness makes possible behaviors either to occur and to appear or being missed and disappeared. History is not just time. Rather history is time +consciousness. Time without consciousness is not measurable, because measuring is an activity that results from consciousness. Therefore, we can say consciousness is not neither unhistorical nor historical. Rather consciousness has a trans-historical role because history is itself made and produced by consciousness. This is consciousness that through time makes history or breaks it. History is a set or line of the behavioral continuity in time. When this behavioral continuity contravenes consciousness, historical behavior or behaviors occur. Based on that has been said, we can explain the main deficiency and disorderliness of the current academic circles. The error of present science is That does not consider consciousness that should be the measure of its study occurrences as the origin of behaviors but rather it considers the language that is the sign of the carried consciousness within occurrences as the same consciousness. This failure to differentiate the main points of a scientific subject under study has led all ambiguities. Choose the language as a starting point and the emphasis on a scientific study weakens scientists and does not make him possible to separate historical and unhistorical behaviors and affairs. When it is not possible for him to do so, he cannot analyze the probable continual processes of existence. However, he intends to conclude a general rule. A mass of particular and unhistorical evidence does not allow him to work. Meanwhile, modern science suffers from a logical technic deficiency. In addition to depriving the empirical scientist of his ability to distinguish between historical and unhistorical affairs he is besieged by highly philosophical oriented language-centered approaches that negate the possibility of unifying language conclusions and generally a united lingual presupposition. This failure of lingual notion as a general category is a consequence of the traditional epistemological collapse of the 19th century. Thus, necessarily by repairing this epistemological collapse, we can revivify a new presentation of the lingual notion certainly with a new content that explains our corporeal world ---how it really is ---. Therefore, to analyze language like other aspects of the corporeal world and to succeed in overcoming the complexity of the superficial surfaces of things, other orders of thought systems except structuralism and post structuralism are necessary.

Deconstruction: language has some systematic aspects that includes the collective and constructive actions of the actors and it also reflects singular actions that do not correspond with any construction and do not accept any constructive narration. If the implications of consciousness guide us to study behaviors, we do not need construction and deconstruction and other systems of thought to explain occurrences. Each two tendencies are radical and negligent points to consider behaviors and occurrences. Structuralism recognizes behavior as a formed narration in the language cycle in which we can reveal lingual strategy. Conversely deconstruction in every occurrence sees an element of absence and the lack of totality of appearance that may manifest itself at any time. Death is always concealed in life and is presented within the studied text that is in front of the person. The findings of deconstruction in the other types of thought and the deformation of the possibilities proposes certainly some open widespread horizons; But this attitude also challenges itself to destroy all foundations. Jacques Derrida is one of the outstanding thinkers that have such attitude. We point out some issues that he was interested in them. (Democracy to come). (Kublai khan) the poet of Coleridge, its interview: this strange institution called literature and etc. these titles flashes in mind this doubt, a kind of framework is shadowed on the interested and criticized subjects by the thinker.

Jacques Derrida, 1992, page 34. As we can see the framework has itself based on the contexts that those contexts had formed its especial skeleton. For example, when we talk about the (Kublai khan) of the English poet, Coleridge, this presupposition was hidden in the study of this poem that this is a literary verse ---with all the concepts we define it about literature ---. Here we do not consider Meta textual and psychological foreground and the many cultural and social and political factors that had influenced the text. We cannot claim that the mentioned titles have a structural effect on the literary verse, but we cannot study and criticize and transform this text apart from its constitutive structures and backgrounds. Maybe this text belongs to Coleridge, probably if Coleridge made it into another psychological condition, we would benefit from some different possibilities for reviewing this poem.

Another point is the lack of any substantial characteristic of literature. Why must we know this poem as a literary work if we encounter deconstruction as a literary school that destroys all constructions? One can admire a masterpiece and another person never accept it as a literary work.

Another point is the lack of ability of deconstruction for synchronic criticism. For example, consider one of the most significant notions of Derrida that (to come democracy). This term presupposes democracy as an evolutionary phenomenon which its appearance is the consequence of the (Counter future) and an element of the lack of totality presence in democracy, but we cannot explain and justify conditions which we can present democracy as a synchronic phenomenon at the same time. In this context, we should speak of the lack of democracy as a beneficial phenomenon, while by considering the growth of deconstruction in western culture for which democracy is a value, the presupposition that the existing and appeared democracy and its absence are considered in comparison with the future model and not a synchronic phenomenon. Therefore, in deconstruction, the cultural contexts appear and cause to hide some possibilities of thought and variations and ultimately, the lack of realization of deconstruction totally. Thus, we are probably going to have to look at deconstruction like democracy in a receiving in the future manner. Another problem in deconstruction is the emphasis on secret and concealment as an inseparable part of occurrences and the lack of totality and concealment of death in life. This attitude depends on the lack of decision making and the lack of anticipation and its continual appearance in occurrences. It leads us to the proposed axiom based on the appearance of consciousness in all existence

and occurrences. It means any occurrence is the result of the action of a form of consciousness on a form of existence. Therefore, in that situation, every occurrence in existence has no secret to hide, rather it is about our ignorance of the quality of consciousness operations on plural forms of existence. By studying this point, the corporeal world will immerge from the mystery of secrecy, and appearance is leaked to concealment. Deconstruction as a possibility of metamorphic thought with the presupposition of all thought possibilities suggestion has revealed itself as the western method of thought. This presupposition is very effective, but we must appraise its possibilities. When the scientific notion about the reality is approximate, deconstruction opens a new point of view to the existence by proposing different thought possibilities, but when we confront with the lack of consciousness, and we have no way except consciousness, how can we find the way. What possibility is there to think?

In conclusion, we can mention the selection of thinking possibilities is not always effective. In other word, when we encounter a new situation, we require the newer possibilities of consciousness to think. Imagine equipping a brick building with modern heating tools using that building's furnishes is not useful. Therefore, to explain existence, we must gain a widespread consciousness, and we must renew it daily, and we must find its sources, and we must categorize it by a critical thought to benefit the science institution. Here we discussed Derrida's thoughts, but the paradoxical expression and metamorphic thinking consideration of the possibilities and inexplicable insight are characteristics of all thinkers belonging to the post-structuralism schools of thought.

Behavioral paradigm and the scientific method:

It seems that language merely expresses the links between the plural forms of existence and their relations to the hidden forms of consciousness in occurrences. Therefore, language is the medium of immediate knowledge. Lingual actors can correct judgments that do not correspond with the true theorem. Lingual actors can seek a right path for direct and certain knowledge under the shadow of specifying dialectical limitations and methodological explanation of an issue, while it does not accord with the attitude that the postmodern schools define for us. Language is a carrier of consciousness, and language is like a vessel which in consciousness flows and we express it. We must not exaggerate the limitation of knowledge and the possibilities of language for begging the question. Lingual games as human behaviors themselves have their specific origin that we must not seek in language that carries consciousness. To purify language the word games we must consider the hidden forms of consciousness in lingual behaviors. Consciousness by the creation of plural forms of existence is free of the repetition circle. Consciousness to create occurrences has provided varied forms of existence. One of the occurrence elements is the involvement of different forms of existence in one another. The lack of occurrence is a consequence of consciousness. Because every occurrence needs preliminaries to happen, as we will mention below. To happen an event or not to happen, it is needed there are preliminaries. Consciousness has a different position in connection with existence. Lack of occurrence is the consequence of consciousness, wherever we can trace forms of consciousness. For example, if a human is abused by another human and does not show any reaction, this passivity is presumed as behavior that forms of consciousness interfere in its occurrence. The arrangement of forms of consciousness in a human being that reflects the characteristics of existence in the corporeal world determines all occurrences, whether positive or negative. Even thus, we can ask why an event happened in existence. This question is searchable from this view, and its answer depends on teleological issues. In other word, why is arranged the connections model of consciousness and existence in a specific form? It is the question which its answer is the solution of the teleological aspect of the corporeal world. Also, if we want to answer this question when does a questioner existent ask, we must discuss it by considering consciousness and the link with existence. When there is the concealment of the connection of consciousness and existence that we can explain it, the questioner may ask. The questioner asks to explain this concealment of the connection of consciousness and existence and finds his answer. Determining whether consciousness with specific forms of existence has created an occurrence or not is a question that its answer depends on the solution of the teleological complexities of the corporeal world. Consciousness has created the forms of existence. It composes the preludes of occurrences by their arrangement on the chessboard. Now the answer to this question depends on the study of consciousness itself. It is the question. how consciousness has succeeded in finding different forms of existence? Meanwhile, we could not still explain the undetermined concepts in human mentality convincingly. Probably this lack of determination to decode the human undetermined behaviors is related to the confusion about the explanation of consciousness as a motive of human behaviors. We can categorize the concept of Learning among these concepts. We can learn at all time. We can learn new matters. We can invent. We can decide on new things. We can judge them. We can compare. We can distinguish good things from bad things. We can choose. We can leave out our opinions we had in the past and we can probably do many other behaviors that we can present for the creature that has determined behaviors and his Proprietary reactions at specific times. Consciousness has the ability of make decisions, and the lack of decision-making in its phenomenal conditions. We can present it in some way, as our actions reflect this dual possibility. We can act or not. We can do something, and we are able not to do. In this context, it seems consciousness is more inclusive than existence. Consciousness is the ability to create and organize existence. Moreover, consciousness is the ability to transform and to destroy existence. Consciousness can create and annihilate. Certainly, we cannot present the annihilation ontologically. It means that we cannot remove things ontologically now. The destruction of things refers to alterations that have been imposed on forms of consciousness. The nature applies the remaining materials in other forms to originate some other new organizations. Indeed, the hidden forms of consciousness in the previous step change. In other word, a continual flow of consciousness and existence diversity in the corporeal world--as we can perceive--- does not occur in an ontological and epistemological paradigm of removal. With the help of modern science, we can prevent the irregular plurality to determine the origin of consciousness and existence. For modern science, the determination to recognize hydrogen as the primary material which is the origin of the atomic alterations in the formation of chemical elements is one of the steps to reconstruct the origin of existence in its corporeal form. Achieving the features of life among all living beings is a significant key. The most common feature among living beings is the organization of consciousness and motion over amino-acids and proteins. Both abilities as a phenomenon of consciousness appear in the corporeal world. There are either evolutionary processes in the corporeal world in line with creation of complexities and the production of more complex kinds of beings or processes and occurrences that cause to destroy things. At first time, Charles Darwin first referred to evolutionary processes in the corporeal world. The Theory of evolution is now one of self-explanatory theories of science, but he emphasized on species competition in line with

guaranteeing that the fittest survive, when counting evolution factors. He stated that species in an inclusive competition test another to survive. Nature selects the best among them. Nature grants surviving tools to the better. Nature equips them by the sharpest weapons and finally it gives the chance for opening their way to continue their life amidst the problems of nature. The nature cycle chooses some groups of species and it gives them lordship as super eminent groups among living beings. For example, among Mammals human has achieved a superior evolutionary situation and among plants those species that preserve water in the climatic conditions. Darwin himself probably believed in the tree-shaped theory of evolution as saying that among different species of living beings, some species attain the superior situation. Darwin's theory, however, has some main deficiencies. First: he does not give us any horizon from the origin of occurrences and quality of life commencement on earth. The second problem is that Darwin's theory has the same difficulty as all environmentalist theories involve. This means if a Darwinist wants to answer the possible questions about the quality of the natural selection process, he certainly will refer to nature. To define nature, it is necessary to refer to the extensions of environment. The environment is not definable and we can express anything to determine its extensions and refer to it to answer all the questions asked. There is another deficiency: in this theory the different behaviors causes is excluded competition factor which is the consequence of natural selection. Monopoly is the deficiency of all the super hypotheses that were theorized in the 19th century to explain the thought foundations such as the economic and psychological and biological realms. These super theories often have a main problem. The claimed clues do not include the studied submenus. For example, Darwin's theory does not include many behavioral motivations and many aspects of living beings. In Addition to competition it seems that other factors such as epidemic diseases, external fights, lack of generation, and natural factors such as natural phenomena and climatic changes and the incompatibility with new environment and epidemic immigrations are effective. We cannot trace the claimed competition by Darwin in all parts of living beings' life. Darwin's Theory does not explain the quality of natural selection. This super theory referring to nature, such as an environmental reference to a utopia, does not seem to achieve any objective purpose. The corporeal world knowledge is incomplete and insufficient without paleontological considerations. We cannot explain the variation of consciousness and the paleontological cycle that has created the present situation by the theory of evolution. Surely this failure to draw on the paleontological function of living beings is almost related to the inaccessibility to effects and fossils of these creatures, but it seems the failure of this theory in a convincing proposal of natural explanation is the consequence of a false philosophical tendency that in the theory of evolution has grown. This is an interesting point about Darwin's tree-shaped theory. It is possible to classify this theory among theories that presume there is no meaning and planning in existence, and we must eliminate these concepts from empirical studies. While this theory itself believes in a type of evolutionary process planning that has guaranteed the biological situation of the corporeal world. This apparent discrepancy between the paradigms of scientific theories in academic institutions is very wonderful and strange. Now, if we can see the growth of statistical and probabilistic theory and finding of a far and close connection between the different scientific and non-scientific propositions, Darwin's tree-shaped evolution super theory as a valuable thing still shines over the science tower. Even the most anarchistic academic circles appreciate Darwin's theory of evolution. How can we reconcile this tendency that believes there is planning in existence and all tendencies that presuppose to eliminate planning from empirical studies? Thinking about this question reminds us the scientific confusion resulting from the anarchistic collapse in our current epistemology. For a more detailed explanation, let us take a brief look at the other two super theories. Freud, founder of modern psychoanalysis, claims that all human's psychopathic disorders go back to a sexual point. He also explained many behaviors of human, such as civilization and ownership, based on his celibacy of sexual disorder actions and Libido. Here we intend to look at the different aspects of sexual behaviors among humans, but before we must first explain that in some situations, the model of sexual behaviors does not correspond with the ordinary model of human relationship. Some creatures are Hermaphrodite and have androgynous organs. Some creatures are associated with the natural intermediaries to transmit the factors required for sexual activities and generation. This way of sexual intercourse can often be seen in plants. Many plants are associated with a natural factor such as wind blow. Apart from this, Freud's proposed paradigm does not encompass the beings that never have sex. There are Model of various sexual intercourse among humans. Many humans have never had sex because of illness or lack of required behavioral factors. There is masturbation behavior among the two sexes. We can observe homosexuality among men and women. Homosexuality behaviors need to be studied. This behavior normally involves two partners. Among homosexuals there are men who want to do behaviors that commonly are referred as the womanish behavior as well as men who do so-called a mannish behavior. The same is true for female homosexuals. Homosexual women are who would like to do a mannish sexual behavior, and homosexual women are who accept the so-called a womanish sexual position. In normal sexual intercourse among men and women, there is noticeable variation. Some women would like to control the men when they have sex, while some other women play the same usual role or at least the same role that society has recognized as their usual role. In addition to the variety of these relationships, many other factors such as cultural factors play the main final role in determining this behavior. This plurality reduces the inclusiveness and the totality of the behavior that Freud has considered as sexual behavior. We cannot consider this behavior as a determinative behavior with some specific aspect and origin. This behavior occurs under specific circumstances that must be studied in each case. The study is based on the necessary factors for the behavior occurrence and the behavioral situation and consciousness recognition. We can say the sexual behavior is not just a psychological issue that we can consider it psychologically. In the genealogy of this behavior causes, we should pay attention to other categories such as biological and social factors. Freud's proposed method is inadequate for the genealogy of Psychopathy that we know as psychoanalysis. The Presupposition of This method is the interference of undetermined or at least inaccessible factor for the human knowledge that we can reach or approach it in some way by agreeing on a lingual contract. There are some preventive factors to achieving this purpose. What are lingual factors effective on the lingual presuppositions of patient and psychoanalyst? We cannot determine these factors. By what criteria can we distinguish Probable errors in the real genealogy of psychotics? In many cases, it likely it depends on the patient's presuppositions about his illness and his view of the situation. Generally, psychological presuppositions are based on an undetermined perception. A type of the suspended knowledge is also based on the patient's perceptions and presuppositions about his situation. By considering our proposition based on the consciousness element appearance in all the occurrences taking place in existence, this floating situation and each person's perceptions and his value system are based on the foundations, we can recognize the

elements of consciousness in these categories. Meanwhile, Freud's perception of the constant factor of sexual pathological aftermath is not compatible with lingual presuppositions, and the patient's variable perceptions. Freud does not determine the border of these invariables and constants. Supporters of psychoanalysis likely remind that the lingual connection between the patient and the psychoanalyst operates to reach a damaged point in the depth of the patient unconscious, neither stabilizing the patient's perceptions about his or her situation nor specifying the role of this value system in the illness state. With the deleterious constant sexual factor, we can achieve a stable cure for the psychopathic patient by using empirical methods ---based on psychoanalysis, it must be the same---. Nevertheless, there is no need for lingual relations between the patient and the psychoanalyst. The role of lingual games and different presuppositions of the patient and psychoanalyst to lead to a dialogue about the patient perceptions and interests itself is debatable. We point out to another super theory. It is the inclusive theory of Marx to determine the economic factor as the leader of human societies to obtain wealth, while we cannot trace economic factors in all human societies. At present many human societies have remained in the early stages of economic actions. The anthropologists have studied these primitive gathering and agricultural societies.

These are some of the anthropological works on the contemporary primitive societies:

Bronislaw Malinowski, 1913. Claude Lévi Strauss.1948.

If we look at the economic behaviors among these different societies, we can observe there is not such a movement in the economic history of these societies and consequently, among humans. There is a great deal of considerations about the emergence of capitalism in western Europe from many different perspectives, from the influence of Protestant Christian Communion's effect on encouraging religious people to work to organize the bourgeois cities in the 12th century---. The work division organization in societies is as various as economic behaviors.

Conclusive analysis of the protestant religion and its historical and moral context and capitalism in Max Weber 1930, translation and preface by TALCOTT PARSONS. Merchants and the Origins of Capitalism

Sophus A. Reinert

Robert Fredona

Working Paper 18

-

021

Working Paper 18

-

021

Copyright © 2017

by

Sophus A. Reinert

and

Robert Fredona

Working papers are in draft form. This working paper is distributed for purposes of comment and discussion only. It may not be reproduced without permission of the copyright holder. Copies of working papers are available from the author.

Merchants and the Origins of Capitalism

Sophus A. Reinert

Harvard Business School

Robert Fredona.

Uneconomic behaviors among human societies occur during wars and in times of crisis and in normal periods that do not correspond with any type of economic behavior such as rich generation and benefit growth. This is the main deficiency of this theory that presupposes the history of capitalism emergence for all parts of the world and teaching so-called to be free of its harms. All theories that fail to indicate the claimed factor in the inclusive considered cases generally suffer from a kind of mutilating inexplicability that are not able to open a way to connect the lacked rings of consciousness and the rise of explicable consciousness in line with a general and inclusive knowledge. In the beginning we talked about science as a system is loyal to its presuppositions of the knowledge chain following and we pointed out the differences between science and other irrational systems claiming obtaining knowledge that are not loyal to their own presuppositions or they do not fundamentally believe in these presuppositions such as magic and other systems. We considered a new methodology is needed to rid science as an epistemological system of its entanglements. This new methodology is the study of phenomenal affairs based on the concealed consciousness within them, not the study of phenomenal affairs and occurrences based on emerging similarities. We cannot surely refuse that appeared similarities between phenomenal affairs and occurrences mean there are the similar forms of consciousness in those phenomenal affairs and occurrences, but the differences between phenomenal affairs and occurrences means there are other different forms of consciousness in the two comparable phenomenal affair and occurrences that cause to differ. We must call behavior the appearance of consciousness and its formation of a stream of different occurrences on the context of existence. The behavior is a term that used for many situations in this new scientific methodology and we can find it as a suitable replacement for occurrence or incident words. Since science as a cognitive system believes in its presuppositions and definition of its categories used to achieve a direct and certain and criterion for knowledge, it is therefore necessary to define what the term behavior means in such a system. What exactly restricts the concept of behavior? Do we also take in account occurrences that prevent consciousness as behavior from happening? Is behavior threatened by the same limitlessness that threatens the environment as an inexplicable concept? Epistemology is responsible for answering this question. Because if the answer to this thinkable question is positive, the foundation of this building is not very robust and this system that claims to gain knowledge cannot answer that question. Thus, defining behavior as a consequence and appearance concept of consciousness and keeping it away from such a threat is a turning point in the process of direct and certain knowledge. Everywhere there is consciousness, it is possible to occur a behavior. Where there is no consciousness, behavior does not happen. Behavior is the interference of consciousness into existence, and its guidance to happen. Whatever happens in the corporeal world is a consequence of the interference of consciousness into existence

---in its plural sense--- and its organization in line with occurrence. We cannot present a behavior except as a consequence of consciousness, then the suggestion of a lingual definition is interesting. Behavior is the smallest lingual information unit which has a true logical subject and predicate, without contradiction within the framework of a sentence. Thus, when all occurrences are not inconsistent, in the present epistemological condition, they are subject to the concept of behavior without deficiency associating with defining behavior as an infinite concept. Probably it is true to criticize that the definition of consciousness, as the carrier of consciousness ---namely language--- is the deviation from the confirmation of the consciousness proof axiom in existence, but language only expresses the rise and fall and appearance of consciousness when we believe that consciousness even interferes with passive behaviors.

It means consciousness is the same ability to organize existence. It is also able to organize existence in line with the prevention to act. In other word, consciousness is also the ability of the lack of consciousness action. As we have pointed out this is the difference between consciousness and existence. Existence is the tool of consciousness therefore, consciousness always prevails over the existence, and the destruction and growth of existence in plural directions is the consequence of consciousness. Thus, when we attribute the consequence of consciousness, namely behaviors, to the carrier of consciousness, it does not mean that we benefit from consciousness to define its substance. In human languages, the words that express antonym and paradoxical adjectives reflect the ability of the consciousness to perform operations on the existence or not. Behavioral forms are human behaviors that under the title of grammatical role present in the language grammar as the abstract nouns and the infinitive and infinitive groups. Abstract nouns are combined from infinitive and abstract nouns along with adverb groups which can be complimentary to adverbs and adjectives and all types of abstract nouns and infinitives. Behaviors are the smallest syntactic models that we can identify them as sentences. An adjective expresses the mood of behaving being. The more complex behaviors are the compounds of the simpler forms of behaviors in a sentence.

For example, anger as an applicable adjective for behaving beings is itself a name that is applied to a behavioral form by native speakers. Anger is an abstract noun which adjective is made of it angry, expresses the mood of behaving being that anger behavior has appeared within him. The sentence of [Babak is angry] confirms that the immersion of anger behavior in the behaving being that is called (Babak). The phrase of [Babak has hit Hamid] --- when he was angry--- can be divided into a number of behavioral models. [Babak was furious] [when Babak was furious, has hit Hamid]. In addition to report behaviors, words may inform other variables that can potentially cause other behaviors. Take, for example, the sentence [when Babak was angry has hit Hamid]. Angry is an adverb, and in addition to the adverb grammatical role of the word, it encompasses some kind of potential behavioral variables. It means that if Babak was not angry, it might not have hit Hamid. Considering sentences as the smallest lingual meaningful unit that are the variations of consciousness narrator does not mean that our comprehension about the corporeal world is dependent on the sentence. The corporeal world is not the objectivity that is associated with the sentence. A sentence is just the smallest unit of our narrative corporeal world. The sentence is the first attempt to commence a narration and the first substantiated narrative for us, but the corporeal world is not necessarily subject to our narration. Our narration expresses the reality in the best circumstances. Before we can express the corporeal world, we must understand it. Comprehension existence is an epistemological pre-narrative principle. If the subject of comprehension is not expression, the original narrative is in the vacuum. We have naturally no narrative.

Nonetheless, stopping knowing the corporeal world through a lingual analysis is the intentional stopping in knowing the corporeal world. It is not to follow which path knowledge comes to us on the wings of the narrative. The scheme of the plurality of narrations does not seriously disrupt this theory. The Plurality of narrations indicates the variation of consciousness in the context of existence domination, so it is not a sign of anarchistic plurality of existence. Certainly, plurality means the lack of planning and anarchism that we have claimed that predominates in existence. We can take in account the possibility of lack of human and the corporeal world narration as documentary evidence for the primacy of the epistemological notion of the corporeal world comprehension to the narrative. Many plural comprehensions in the corporeal world never appear as a narrative.

The phenomenon of the plurality of narratives in the present situation of analytical philosophy that have ambiguities about the concept of true and false is a sign of the collapse of the lingual notion as the foundation of knowledge. It is probably impossible to limit and enumerate the true concept properties based on a lingual analysis because the foundation of language is the plurality of narrations. We may now ask for the mathematical propositions to help stablish agreement between the foundations of the true concept. Surely the study of mathematical foundations will seemingly form a firm foundation of the true concept, but because of the lack of knowledge about the foundations of mathematical propositions, the true concept is seen as a subject of analytical philosophy and undisclosed secret as before. The possibility of desertion from the narration of a plural comprehension of existence obviously indicates that the narration itself appears in the linguistic form as a resulting behavior of consciousness action. Furthermore, the corporeal world potentiality of perception sometimes resists the narrative. Many behaviors and abstract situations verify this notion. We are not able to explain our instincts. Lingual codes do not decipher our emotions, instincts and appetites, And many abstract indicators of the body. Those far from the accessibility of language indicators are perceptible, but they sorely resist the narrative. We can express them, but this narrative cannot progress further than the superficial levels. At that time, ambiguity and abstraction are not far from the narrative. If the resulting knowledge of analytical philosophy completes the process of knowledge, at least we will conclude that these phenomenal affairs that resist the narrative are outside the claimed knowledge of analytical philosophy, and we cannot know them. A sentence seems only to be the smallest organized unit of a narrative that expresses our understanding of existence, not the foundation of our knowledge about the corporeal world. We cannot discuss about this issue that the first step to begin the knowledge process is a narrative, and the framework of a narrative is a sentence, but we must remember that we cannot recognize the corporeal world in its unexpressed form of the sentence. Consider, for example, the sentence of [the dog ate the sheep]. This sentence illustrates a number of behavioral situations: the dog attacked the sheep, the dog's enthusiasm, or any other motivation to eat sheep, but it refers to a potential spectrum of behaviors that is probable to occur. It is possible that the dog is saturated or not, and there may be motivation for other behaviors or not to behave. Surely, this confrontation with the behavioral spectrums does not prevent us from knowing the corporeal world but referring this confrontation to the complexity and strangeness of existence, that we must consider it in the knowledge process. We can benefit from the

complex behavioral spectrums and groups by shifting the focus of an empirical study from behaviors to behaving beings. Existence is associated with behavioral patterns that have formed the sets of infinitive plus abstract nouns and adverbs and adjectives. We cannot surely recognize that the super-consciousness creates narratives in the framework of a sentence. As a questioner object, we confront with an unexpressed world, and we are confronted with a phenomenon outside our understanding. We know the corporeal world through behavioral spectrums and groups, and we make some narrations to express them in the framework of a sentence. The narrative of existence and the probability of lack of its accordance with the unexpressed world is an acute issue. Science now faces a major issue. How can we talk about the matter of empirical science, if we assume that, the causes and motivations of a behavior are out of the scientific narration. How can we talk about a narrative surrounded by the scientific model? Take, for example, the economic science. We can analyze the causes of inflation in its paradigms, but are all the causes of inflation economic? Are all the issues that modern economic science considers the causes and motivations of inflation related to human economic actions that we can categorize them as economic topics. Do the benefit and personal gain that took in account in liberalism and Adam Smith's school as the motivation of economic act have economic substance? We cannot consider the effects of personal interests as merely an economic issue. The other human sciences have studied many effects and aftermaths of this causative motivation. Therefore, these behavioral motivations are not just economic in nature. In the main economic texts, whether descriptive aspects, or the analysis of conditions and the economic anticipation the discussions are related to an uneconomic topic which in the same condition, science never moves in line with its claimed subject. How can we deal with the unexpressed existence while the topics of empirical sciences are discussible in standard models? If we ignore the standard scientific categorizations, which methodology can we replace with specialism? At present, empirical sciences neither fall outside the scope of the claimed topics nor it can draw a complete picture of the subjects under study. How can we obtain immediate knowledge about existence despite the current situation of empirical sciences and their confrontation with the unexpressed world? Can we gain such immediate knowledge by eliminating specialism? Till now, specialism has achieved significant results in developing our techniques and improving our scientific tools. Now how can we ignore it without a proper alternative? The solution of course, is not the ignorance of specialism as a technique for acquiring knowledge, but rather the main issue seems to be related to the knower object limitation on the choice of occurrences in the framework of the narrative. Let us look at this from another point. To answer the question, it is it necessary to record all the corners of the narrative in order to obtain complete knowledge. Is the concept of knowledge pluralistic? Before considering the question of plurality, we must ask how must we determine to achieve to reach a purpose to distinguish the restriction of knowledge? What do we have to do with valuation? Answering these questions depends on solving the teleological complexities of the existence crisis, but now we hold specialism as a technique for acquiring knowledge, we must refer to a territory of thought that the title of "knowledge of behavior" is likely proper for it. To be precise, "knowledge of behavior" is probably a synonym for philosophy. In addition to studying the intricacies of traditional ontological and epistemological issues, philosophy must meet the basic task of examining unexpressed existence and its guidance on immediate knowledge. Empirical sciences are also gathering evidence based on reality. They are studying them from a different perspective. "Knowledge of behavior" or new philosophy plays an important role in examining these strange narratives and their reference to the unexpressed existence. Distinguishing between the unhistorical and historical and universal and qualified-center context of language provides some complex situations that science must consider in studying the corporeal world. For example, we must refer to society as a topic of the main realm of humanities. Is society one extension of the lingual human contracts, or can we find a none-metaphysical extension with an empirical study? Where is the place of society in the realm of human sciences? Is society one extension of the philosophical generalization, or is it really a formed general category? We can probably argue against the generalization of society and in line with its spuriousness. One can say this social unit does not appear in all human life realms. Its border and contrast with the human individual, has always a statistic aspect. Nevertheless, supporters of this generalization refer to the mass humanitarian groups such as trade unions, nomads, cities, rural communities, and workers unions and etc, but there is doubt about the lack of feasibility of studying this general category. It opens the way to ask about the substance of this generality. Here we develop the concept of society to explain that it is not always easy to distinguish between the historical and non-historical context of language and their border and their consequential behaviors. An external observer cannot probably at first glance recognize that a set of human beings are members of a particular society. Secondly, it is not easy to distinguish between the types of society, and the model of organization? When an external observer has a lingual contact with members of a probable observed society how can he or she identify what kind of society he or she is facing? The recognition of society as a concept that we can study it empirically is very recent and depends on the cause and effect attitude to study the corporeal world. This fact illustrates the difficulty and complexity of this concept. Until the foundation of modern science, the man had not attained the ability to innovate the concept of society as a general category.

For the relation of the human with groups and social affair, individual and the concept of this general term: Karl Manheim, 1954. Preliminary approach to the problem, page 19.

This fact probably reinforces the doubt about the contractual aspect of this concept to facilitate empirical studies. We cannot restrict the society because of the ability of its members to act. This means that despite of the membership of the human individual and his relationship with his society we cannot determine the borders of his free will and his possibilities of behaving in many of almost private realms to which he belongs, such as religious and ethical realms and etc. the study of society as an inclusive generality does not guaranty the quality of each member's behavior. It is another disadvantage of society as an inclusive generality, that is supposed to be the basis of a large part of human studies, the lack of possibility of restriction as well as the lack of resolvability of this concept are other weaknesses of society. Society itself is a variable --- as much as the empirical sciences presumes it as a set more than one human--- and may be formed for various causes and in different ways. This symbolizes the claim that society encompasses the largest human collections such as nations to the smallest human collections like family. The other deficiency that is related to the disintegration of society is that the smallest societies can be formed within the largest societies. For example, if we regard a nation there are thousands of families, tens of workers unions, hundreds of trade corporations and thousands of youth clubs within society. We cannot limit human societies in terms of the quantity continuity period, functions, the relationship between the subgroups, and the purposes of formation and many other aspects. This is an important reason of the necessity of

revision about society as an inclusive and basic concept that collectability is a variable that can be loaded onto many behaviors and has no substantial necessity for many cases. Many behaving beings join to the short-lived societies to achieve their preferences and when they have attained their purposes or removed the cause of joining to the society or a group, they leave it or they behave passively. In the present situation we cannot determine what it means a human individual membership in a society. What should a person living in a family do if we are able to tell if he or she is a member of this society or the lack of participation in what kinds of behaviors does cause to prevent him or her to be a member of a society? Do we like some elitist societies have to believe in active and passive members? This is not very applicable alternative. Because a society is not a preferential institute rather it is the basis and subject of a territory of empirical sciences. In all situations the activity and passivity of its member do not determine the functions, purposes, and contents. A citizen whether participate in political activities or does not, is a member of a nation that lives in its geographical space. In other words, the concept of society in addition to the lack of its restriction possibility within a conceptual framework of the individual seriously contradicts the ability to behave. Indeed, to what extent society is a contractual concept and to what extent is it a consequence of scientific generalization connected with induction? The Answer to this question is important either because shaping the concept of society that is a large part of human studies based on it or it eliminates the challenge of reciprocity between the two contexts of language that we it as an empirical researcher face. Indeed, where and how can we determine the boundary of the two floating contexts of language? In which language context is a complex and plural behavioral spectrum categorized? How can we explain a society whose members are interested in what we are likely to understand in the historical context of language as well as in the qualities and values and strategy behavior of commonsense? To answer this question, we must determine where the boundary of these two contexts is and to what extent a contract can be divided into its constituents? As we have explained, society as a prevalent inclusive concept in human studies can be divided into the smallest components. We can observe in a society the particulars that belong to the historical context of the language, such as interest and jealousies of the members, competitions and preferences, privileges limitations and etc. There are also some elements that belong to the non-historical context, such as the common physiological and biological human features. Another problem in enumerating the characteristics of a society and considering them in each of the two contexts is the lack of possibility to predict behaving beings' behaviors. For example, if a member of a clan in North Africa contravenes from its tribal strategy and intermarries with another clan or tribe, that person has endangered his tribal strategy and his probable personal interests. We are dealing someone who probably he did not have done a non-historical behavior that is appropriate to him in tribal strategy and he did an unexpected behavior. An important point in recognizing these two lingual contexts is the impossibility to examine the conceptual bases and lingual perceptions. It is not a problem here to examine the concept of the elements of society by the breaking down into the smaller degradable components rather the problem is the inefficiency of this concept and the impossibility to disintegrate it. This problem can be solved when the focus of empirical studies instead of behavior and generally variables loads onto behaving beings. Collectability is a behavior and a variable. It is a behavior that means that happens under special circumstances by the behaving beings and it is a variable meaning that this behavior is in many situations a consequence and function of other behaviors. This problem can be solved if the empirical study circle is organized around the human individual, but it is the main problem that if the individual human is the subject of empirical studies we can analyze and open up by studying the hidden forms of consciousness in the individual human and the qualities and quantities of human behaviors that are the indicators of the two floating contexts of language. The two floating contexts of language contain some variable situations that compel behaving being to behave. This floating context of language necessitates studying each phenomenon and occurrence to draw conclusion about its consciousness forms in a particular model, but the floating context of language, contrary to Post-modernism claim, is not a major obstacle to the process of knowledge because as we have noted, language is a carrier of consciousness, and we can reveal its inefficiencies by logical comparisons and epistemological criterion and contradictory constraint. "The true" word, in the phrase of "the smallest true informer lingual unit" is also debatable. "True" comprises the concept of truth while there are arguments and disputes over the concept of truth. The truth seems to be a direct and certain knowledge that the knower object cannot ask any questions and can behave within the framework of the consciousness associated with the lingual theorem considered. The truth that the consequence of the true theorem is indicates the appearance of the element of consciousness in the existence and formation of the occurrence that is the subject of the smallest syntactic lingual unit. Thus, by considering this definition and meaning of truth, we can obtain direct and certain knowledge: as the same knowledge that truly and without contradiction expresses the process of carrying consciousness and the plural aspects of existence. Probably using the "true" word is considered as begging the question, but that's not true, because it is the responsibility of the methodological system of empirical studies in line with the rational and epistemological affair to remove the contradiction and determine the true. This system always is loyal to its principles. This system is referred as the institute of science. We are faced with some arguments that negate the general concept "true" that we attempt to answer. Take, for example, the sentence all theorems are relative. If this statement is true, it is necessary to include the concept of this sentence and in this case, it is not true. If all the theorems are relative and all the occurrences are affected by the variables, we can say that all the occurrences occur under the influence of the variables. If it is true, a variable must be regarded as an invariable factor, nonetheless this sentence is not true, but we must remember that, the concept of a variable is a general concept like existence. It is very heterogeneous and can be easily categorized.

I also want to answer a question that can be asked like it is about the challenge of the existence and consciousness relation. The question is that, how existence as a concept is free from definition against itself. We can limit that concept, but we cannot recognize the variable as a general concept right or wrong. Why should not we see sentences like "all theorems are relative" as a general judgment? Usually the answer is existence as an epistemological concept is not definable unless as its substance, while if we want to define variable as a general concept, it will absorb different forms of existence and consciousness relation. For example if we talk about a set of variables that affect the immergence of psychosis, we deal with some situations such as family status, psychological stress, and personality factors and etc., but when we talk about a set of variables in the realm of meteorology science, we are confronting with some variables such as air pressure, air front, and wind blast direction, and etc. this variables list in any empirical science that examines the relation between consciousness and existence from a particular perspective illustrates the diversity of this concept. It also

indicates that we cannot categorize this concept. Some persons are likely to argue that the progression of empirical sciences raises questions about the unique concept of existence that we are now talking about it, but it seems that whatever happens we cannot define existence by considering the present epistemological situation unless as nothing. The same lack of definability unless as nothing makes existence a constant concept for scientific and epistemological explanation. We should add this point that a variable such as consciousness is truly a kind of possibility that if it does, it will cause different occurrences and different situations to happen. Therefore, consciousness is not a lingual generalization that we load on some unrelated situations. The variable is the consequence of consciousness. The variable is the possibility to load consciousness on plural forms of existence. To other word, we can define the variable as the possibility of consciousness variation and the will of consciousness to change. The variable is not a predicated accident on the substances rather it is the will of consciousness to alteration. In many situations variation of consciousness is the motivation and origin of behavior or a widespread spectrum of behaviors. In fact, this means that the variable need not be a constituent of the behavior has occurred or is occurring, in other words, has an internal and included relation with the main behavior. In some cases, one or more behaviors or a large behavioral spectrum affect a behavior or a behavioral spectrum, which in an empirical study has related to the same behavior that is defined as a variable. The main behavior is a behavior or behavioral spectrum that is based on the subject of the lingual definition of an empirical study. As long as it is not based on a definition of behavior by considering a criterion such as true or false, contradiction restriction, we cannot define otherwise, we take in account all types of behaviors or a behavioral spectrum that are studied together with the main behavior as a variable. It is not possible to define variable restrictions because of the plurality of metaphysical ratios of existence. Lingual contracts limit this issue. Studying variables reduces the generality of knowledge, but, undoubtedly, that knowledge is true and certain. Variables boundaries are identified by the lingual coherent context and the hidden forms of consciousness in a phenomenon under study. We can discover quantity and measure of the variables by considering the hidden forms of consciousness and one of its most important manifestations, namely planning. The floating context of the language reflects the potential and active variables of an empirically studied phenomenon. For a deeper and broader study of a behavioral spectrum and its consequences and singular behaviors associated with variables, the solution is shifting the focus of an empirical study from behavior to behaving being. If we study behaviors, there is always a doubt as to we must assume which behavior to be the underlying behavior under study and which behavior we must consider as the conclusion of the interference of a variable or a variable group. It is possible to define behavior in the lingual context, but in many cases where we are confronted with the context of language floating and encompassing the broad core and main qualities of existence, there is no preferential ability to evaluate main behavior in relation to the variable. Until the probable teleological issues related to existence are not still solved, we cannot make a value judgment between a psychopathic violent patient and a normal person. If less psychopathic and less appetency for violence human is presumed as a criterion for health, this is probably a pragmatic opinion of everyday life and its relation to the reality of existence is not yet accurately known to us. We cannot definitely answer such questions as who carries out the main behavior in existence, for example a having appetite for violence psychopathic patient or a healthy person. Considering behaviors and the possibility of behavior relation to behaving being in an empirical study helps to initiate a scientific research and find an important key to discover variables. Meanwhile the notion of a behaving being, in addition to pragmatic simplicity, partially marginalizes the value judgment crisis. Studying variable in the framework of a behaving being is the study of behavioral facts in the connected context. We have mentioned two related points about reasoning against the concept of true. Imagine the card written on one side of the card: the sentence that was written on the other side of this card is false, and on the other side of the card was written: this sentence is true. How can we determine the truth of the sentence? Despite the written sentence on the other side: this sentence is false? Really the two sentences written on both two sides of the card seems to be unrelated as components of a logical theorem that their contradiction removes the truth of each other. The first sentence is a claim or information about the second sentence. In other words, the first sentence informs or claims that the second sentence is false, although it is stated at the heart of the second sentence that it is true. Now our question is which sentences content is true. Which statement is true means the information about the other side of the card is false or the statement on the other side of the card against its claim is not a true sentence and the information is true. If these two statements are assumed as a logical theorem, this theorem still has no contradiction. The written sentence on each side of the card that is presumed as a preliminary to the other side of the card is a claim about a judgment. While the claim about the judgment, if it has no reference, is a lingual game and it is not subject to a logical theorem. The question that which of the two sentences is the preliminary to the other is a contractual subject whose determinants are lingual spokesmen. The liar paradox theorem cannot harm the (true) concept. If one claims that I am never truthful and that his speech is true, it he seems to be defying it, and we cannot regard this claim as a contradiction of the true concept. We should bear in mind that this claim cannot destroy the concept of true. This claim means that if a person has lied during his or her life and wants to make a statement about his or her past, he or she will face a contradiction. It represents our limitation in achieving the true affair rather than a shock to the true concept, but it is necessary to mention one more point about the external criterion for certainty about true and immediate knowledge. The issue that we discussed above epistemologically confirms the concept of direct and certain knowledge, but we can analyze this issue in terms of human teleological and objective hegemony of human over his knowledge perspective, but there seems to be no convincing criterion of human knowledge so far. Determining an objective and external criterion for pure human knowledge depends on two issues. The first: the solution to the teleological problem of the corporeal world, and the second is the increase in human knowledge about the relation between an occurrence and its creating elements, namely consciousness and plural forms of existence. Generally, in order to reach a criterion of certainty about the truth of direct and true knowledge, one must acquire the science to study the appearance of occurrences in the corporeal world. The way of studying the corporeal world seems to be an ontological strategy. Increasing our knowledge of the substance of the corporeal world from the empirical science perspective faces us with a promising future. Another important issue becomes apparent in line with studying behavioral paradigm. That is our presupposition about the behavioral spectrums. When we study existence through behaviors what relation is between the resulting knowledge and the phenomenon of existence? Is the resulting knowledge objectively the reality of existence or a manifestation of it? We have stated above that the corporeal world and the questioner object are presented because of their restriction and consequently the result of planning. Based on this hint we can conclude that when we study existence, we are confronted with a phenomenon of

the corporeal world. The subject that appears existence as the original forms of a phenomenon, rather than its manifestations, is the systematic diversity of consciousness and the regularity of consciousness interference in the plural forms of existence. Philosophy of mind deals with the role of human understanding as a manifestation of behavior. Certainly, this is due to the lack of a determinative criterion for distinguishing between true knowledge and other indecisive cognitive situations. Behavior is neither the post-empirical notion of the mind nor the notion of the consequence of the mind activities. Rather behavior is the reality of the consequence of consciousness, which we can identify it by following the hidden signs of consciousness in all behaving beings as a living reality. The question of how the role of a behaving being is performed by a being is illustrated by clarifying the teleological realm and studying the consciousness variations. We will discuss about metaphysics and its role in knowing existence. Here we only briefly mention the dualistic school that plays a major role in empirical studies. Existence cannot be created by a mixture of physical and a metaphysical notion and an amalgamation of them, because material is more limited than consciousness. Material is the consequence of consciousness. Consciousness builds and applies it as the primary foundation of creation. Material has a limited substance and can be understood in the context of space. For this reason, material is studied under the scope of traditional empirical sciences such as chemistry and physics. Special methods are necessary to study consciousness. Naturally, we do not mean that consciousness is abstractly and barely and far from other components of existence researchable. This notion certainly does not negate the study of pure consciousness that created the corporeal world, but eventually the path to study the substance of consciousness passes the phenomenon of existence.

Analysis of scientific method: We discussed about the foundations of knowledge and the quality of consciousness study, as the root of knowledge and the definition of behavior as the gateway to the process of knowledge and the explanation of variable as the possibility of consciousness variation, we now need to give more clarity about scientific methodology. This explanation and clarification are related to the comparison of tradition and modern scientific methods. In the new proposed method, such as the previous methodology, documentary information gathering about reality is still the starting point of a scientific activity. These facts are collected by the empirical methods without a least interference of the researcher ---that usually is an empirical scientist---. Collecting facts to gather the consciousness carriers is necessary to start a scientific activity. In the new proposed scientific method, consciousness gathering is the applicable principle. Next, we need to organize the knowledge process by categorizing consciousness and conclusion. This is the same point of separation between the new and the old scientific methodology. Whereas the traditional scientific methodology recognizes induction based on a model of general knowledge over a context of a particular set of knowledge consisted of some singular facts on the basis of an empirical observation, the modern scientific method believes that the original method depends on the discovery of the ordered models of consciousness in occurrences. The gap between the traditional scientific method and the new method is very large. The traditional science, based on observation in an inductive paradigm, gathers some parts of reality that emphasizes on them to indicate the claimed generality of existence. The construction of science based on limitation of human knowledge and rational explanation of existence which inevitably leads to collective and secular kind of understand of science based on evidence related to the topics under study provides the possibility to consider existence from different perspectives. This plurality of views appeared in scientific theorizing. A theory is an estimation based on the existing evidence, and different experiments, and new information, and the logical and statistical and inductive probabilities that former theorists are unaware of its existence and revolutionary discoveries and inspirations and many other variables that altogether obscure the future of theorizing the same as scientific discovery. In addition to explanatory rules, Theorizing is the place of true description of existence. Traditional science confronts existence in three ways: First, a type of explanation that is more common recently, and it is the probability explanation that a specific probability is suggested within a chain of consequent occurrences and its occurrence is regarded in a determined circle of events repetition. Meteorological forecasts are just a type of probable explanation, despite a possibility of the high probability of occurrence.

No one guarantees that these predictions will be true. The second type is the statistic or inductive explanation, whereby statistical teams measure a specific behavioral factor and its dependent variables in a particular statistical community. The statistical counting of people with lung cancer among smokers is a sample of this type of explanation. Sometimes one or more qualifications restrict these statistical studies. For example, a statistical study is sometimes conducted over a five-year timeline or part of an experiment with participants with an experimental team and a control group. The Third explanation is a logical explanation which is mainly expressed with a potential way in the style of a counterfactual sentences model which quotes a kind of attitude to a certain probability and probably logical in nature is true to a great extent despite the possibility of non-occurrence. One of these explanations is graham's law which shows the kinetic situation of gases. As another example we can mention the classical thermodynamic laws and the law of energy and mass equivalence and many more. Theories, as we can understand from their names, have high theoretical aspects, and are mainly theorist understanding of reality. Laws logically encompass a high risk to be probable and untrue. Moreover, we cannot guarantee their logical truth and at best situation scientific laws are categorized as probable explanations. It is in line with these multi-aspects and pluralistic attitude notions that methodologies such as Popper's refutability proposes a circle of alternative and consequent theories to discover the truth.

Popper, 1994, page, 13, writes: We have seen that our negative reply to *L* means that all our theories remain guesses, conjectures, hypotheses. Once we have fully accepted this purely logical result, the question arises whether there can be purely rational arguments, including empirical arguments, for preferring some conjectures or hypotheses to others. There may be various ways of looking at this question. I shall distinguish the point of view of the theoretician--the seeker for truth, and especially for true explanatory theories from that of the practical man of action; that is, I will distinguish between *theoretical preference* and *pragmatic preference*... But when he has fully digested the fact that we can never justify empirically that is, by test statements--the claim that a scientific theory is true, and that we are therefore at best always faced with the question of preferring, tentatively, some guesses to others, then he may consider, from the point of view of a sicker for true theories, the questions: What principles of preference should we adopt?

Are some theories 'better than others'?

These questions give rise to the following considerations.

(1) It is clear that the question of preference will arise mainly and perhaps even solely, with respect to a set of competing theories; that is, theories which are offered as solutions to the same problems. (See also point (8) below.)
(2) The theoretician who is interested in truth must also be interested in falsity, because finding that a statement is false is the same as finding that its negation is true. Thus, the refutation of a theory will always be of theoretical interest, but the negation of an explanatory theory is not, in its turn, an explanatory theory (nor has it as a rule the empirical character of the test statement from which it is derived). Interesting as it is, it does not satisfy the theoretician's interest in finding true explanatory theories. (3) If the theoretician pursues this interest, then finding where a theory breaks down, apart from giving theoretically interesting information, poses an important new *problem* for any new explanatory theory. Any new theory will not only have to succeed where its refuted predecessor succeeded, but it will also have to succeed where its predecessor failed; that is, where it was refuted. If the new theory succeeds in both, it will at any rate be more successful and therefore 'better than the old one...'

By considering what we have said, we will find nothing but many probable explanatory situations. We cannot logically deny the occurrence of consequent occurrences by chance. Either variables can disrupt the flow of a scientific law, or there is no logical reason it does not coincide with the circle that the scientific law claims that it is a logical circle. salt decreases the freezing point of water, and the rate of diffusion and evasion of gases is inversely proportional to their root of molecular volume. It was a brief statement of the theories and laws in the great traditional scientific methodology of the study. What progress have we made in the methodology of modern science? What is the opinion of modern science about explanatory rules? Here there is a significant point to consider. Science must have a strong confidence point of trust to ensure that its foundations are firm. This firm point is an epistemological foundation. This epistemological foundation is the same discovery of the effects of consciousness on all occurrences that occur in existence. At the outset, we discuss the situation of the theories in the methodology of the modern scientific study. We must remember the discrepancy between the perspectives of the theories in traditional science is deep and varied. Some super theories have a different and sometimes an antithetical epistemological horizon. Einstein's and Newton's mechanical theories in modern physics are two instances of this discrepancy. In addition to a different description of existence, these two super theories observe different epistemological perspectives by different conceptual categories. The theory of General relativity is probably more epistemic in color. Relativity is itself an epistemological category. This epistemological category contains a philosophical claim that confronts humans with existence and examines his epistemological possibilities. Another theory that is not free from epistemological tendencies is the theory of quantum mechanics, which if we accept its truth on the basis of the lack of space measurement and the velocity of a particle with a "0" error coefficient, many traditional philosophical categories such as causality can be challenged. Surely this challenge will not be free of epistemological tendency. Now we again remember that the anarchistic proposition of this mechanical theory is largely a consequence of technological problems, and such an anarchistic position is epistemologically impossible unless we explain the prior epistemological status of this anarchy. The second separation point between theories is the value aspect. Probably the most famous value-based theories are Marxian theory and liberal economics. Some have argued that Marxian economics is science or not, but we point out here that counting this theory as a value-based theory shows both a value theory and defines the modern science approach to the phenomenon of value. Because of the ambiguity of the teleological status of existence, we are now unable to deny or confirm the possibility of referring to the general value of Marxian theory of economy, but the Marxian theory is an inefficient and collapsed because of its neglect of the plural complex substance of human economics. This theory is more like a sectarian cult than a scientific theory, because science tries to express existence --- as it really is --- while this theory proposes an economic strategy without considering the submenus under studied based on the presuppositions of the theorist society. If we look at the problem in all directions, the task of science is not to study the unexpressed existence. As we have pointed out, the task of narratives, namely, referring to the unexpressed existence, is the task of philosophy. From this point of view, we can probably regard the theory of Marx the philosophical one because it sought to take responsibility for referring the economic narratives to the unexpressed existence. Let us not to depart from the main argument. Indeed, the significant difference between the Marxian theory of economy and liberal economics is their value separation. There are many disagreements between the two theories, so we cannot count them here. We cannot count many various aspects of theories. For example, we can explain revolutionary discoveries by any law or any rule. These differences also have an evolutionary aspect on the timeline. Many theories are the conclusion of increased experimentation and sciences over a long period. The personal accuracy and intelligent of theorists and taking into account the far-fetch probabilities are the other factors of the perspective differences and consequently, theorizing. If we go beyond the micro-factors in traditional science that create a variation of theorizing, we must consider a crucial and significant factor in the plurality of perspectives and a variation of scientific theorizing. This crucial factor is the lack of any decisive criterion for a logical explanation, despite a documentary observation of the topics under study. We have mentioned that we can decisively accept the logical explanations of traditional sciences and define their potential and actual hidden risk. It is the same point where theory and a scientific law join together. Here is the place that we theoretically must notice the consequent vacuum risk of the lack of operation of a scientific law. Because there is no criterion for the regularity of subjects studied and affairs, by traditional science. The science by observing particular cases, infers that there are generalities. In this observation process, the substances are out of view. How it happens is not significant, as it happens, it is enough to be a law deducible. The issue is that science does not adhere to the borders of the study of qualities and substances and does not differentiate between them. Qualities are highlighted in fields where scientific studies or, to put it better, researchers want to make technical progress. In some sciences such as medicine and chemistry, qualities are at least significant in particular topics, but we consider these qualities no longer in general scientific laws. With the logical and probable and statistical explanations that all types of these explanations have a percentage of risk, ---no matter how small this probability is--- we cannot obtain a real and general and certain knowledge that is ultimately the purpose of science. The scientific thought has not yet precisely achieved its goal if its purpose is the knowledge of existence ---as it really is ---. Finally, because of the lack of a specific criterion, the philosophical presupposition of the plurality of truth is developed on the basis of secular theorizing and scientific laws, so it is not almost possible to talk about any certain occurrence. Theories have emerged from the conceptual categories and new historical contexts and a different explanation of existence without destroying the remnants of other previous super-theories. During this process, nonscientific and meta-scientific trends daily play an increasingly significant role in relation to the scientific

theorizing aftermaths. Until then, it is impossible to perceive science apart from the cultural, social, and psychological contexts and etc. The role of the explanatory scientific laws depends on the consideration of the existing (WHYS) in existence. These (WHYS) are out of the view of the current secular traditional science. (WHYS) have no place in current traditional science. Science does not discuss them. Science is alien to the world of substances. Science deals with qualities. While considering this, the effects of substances on qualities are far from the science view. By ignoring (WHYS), we likely ignore some parts of the knowledge process. Certainly, from a historical perspective, it is justified to ignore (the WHYS). It is decisively to avoid the theological polemics realm. The fear of entering into polemical realms like theology is a real fear, because the analysis of the documentary evidence gathered from existence is not done based on any firm epistemological axiom. Today, we deal with observability both as a technique for gathering scientific documentations and as an inspiring source for explaining streaming processes in existence. The authenticity of laws and theories in scientific academies is decisively based on true observable data which is verified its truth by a scientist as repeatable cases. In general, an explicable law is a generality that occurs in a chain of observable and repeatable events. The three elements changing a generality into a scientific law are objectivity, repeatability, and the possibility of observation. Objectivity is the same as the identity of studied cases that are repeatable and observable. A law beyond its logical generality which corresponds to the same objectivity of empirical events being tested, is not based on anything other than observation. An observation reports counterfactual cases that do not correspond with the considered objectivity and science claims it. It is exactly the problem. The observation is not the place of analysis of the knowledge obtained by observation. The scientific method deals with a destructive confusion. Observation is a technique not a method. When we apply this technique, we provide the necessary preliminaries to obtain certain knowledge about existence, but observation tells us nothing about the analysis of existence and the discovery of meaning and substances. The solution to this significant dilemma must be based elsewhere and on the basis of another firm foundation that is truly epistemological foundation. Avoiding epistemological issues as a foundation for knowledge is a very long debate that has its own philosophical and historical and even cultural contexts. The analysis of these contexts is necessary to choose a new scientific method. The first attempt to avoid epistemology seems to have begun by English empiricism. Influenced by the cultural atmosphere of the 16th and 17th centuries this school of thought gave a mystic substance to the human empirical behaviors with an emphasis on the psychological aspects and unrepeatability of every empirical situation. The intertwining technique and scientific method occurs through observation at this step in the history of philosophy. Here the human empirical affair gathers scientific facts, while this empirical tendency is presumed as the finality of science and replaces scientific analysis. The human experience is a consequence of observation. Man gains this experience in its particular historical circumstances. Super-theories deal with a lack of historicity. Traditional science embraces and emphasizes empiricism as a heritage of renaissance and pre-colonialism era. Observation has based on human empiricism. It is a historical affair either considering observers or by means of its variables and conditions and instruments influencing it. We must note philosophy that philosophy before the 19th century did not have the conditions to consider the historical plurality of human empirical observation and to create the scientific method appropriate to it. This consciousness of the plurality of human experience can exist since the 19th century, which unfortunately probably did not happen except in the theoretical layers. So far, there has been no systematic strategy that considers empirical plurality. Ignoring the epistemological foundation of knowledge certainly causes to emphasis on observation as a place of scientific analysis, just as Hume's view is that causality is the consequence of two synchronic phenomena.

Hume 1902, in Sect. VII, Part 1. Of the Idea of necessary Connection, page 50, writes: When we look about us towards external objects, and consider the operation of causes, we are never able, in a single instance, to discover any power or necessary connection; any quality, which binds the effect to the cause, and renders the one an infallible consequence of the other. We only find that the one does actually, in fact, follow the other. The impulse of one billiard-ball is attended with motion in the second. This is the whole that appears to the outward senses. The mind feels no sentiment or inward impression from this succession of objects: Consequently, there is not, in any single, particular instance of cause and effect, anything which can suggest the idea of power or necessary connection. From the first appearance of an object, we never can conjecture what is its result, but were the power or energy of any cause discoverable by the mind, we could foresee the effect, even without experience; and might, at first, pronounce with certainty concerning it, by mere dint of thought and reasoning.

It is the top of staying away from the substance of occurrences. Surely, some persons argue against Hume's point of view. We are not going to discuss it, but there is a problem here that avoiding analyzing the substance of occurrences has remained for current traditional science as a negative approach. The observation of occurrences forms the scientific laws as united generalities, not the logic of occurrences happening. The inability to analyze the substances and logic of occurrences without considering its theological aspect is the consequence of the departure of the scientific approach from its real and original place. Scientific analysis must not be based on the observation that it is a technique of science, but rather on an epistemological realm that has no historical authority and its notions are sufficiently well-founded. The general categories studied by science, such as motion inertia and consciousness, have an epistemological authority, but modern scientific super-theories do not consider the epistemological authority. Many theories have an epistemological authority and point out the borders and possibilities of human knowledge. The most significant examples of these super-theories are physical theories that certainly have an epistemological authority. Einstein's theory of general relativity and Heisenberg's uncertainty principle are related to the two categories of motion and causality. So, by establishing the epistemological foundations, we must be able to have a constructive dialogue with these physical super-theories or any other theory that has an epistemological authority and must able to accept or deny it. The confusing contact with the epistemological category of truth and the attempts of philosophers of science to replace its proper alternatives are the consequences of the lack of a distinction between the epistemological discourse and other discourses and the lack of its relevance to theory. If we are to somewhat to depart from the generalities in some way and propose a progressive solution to science, we must begin the epistemological preliminaries for accepting or denying a theory. We will talk about the explanation of Einstein's kinetic theory and its relation to epistemological issues, but here we say that Einstein's alleged relativity, is epistemologically impossible and this impossibility indeed paralyzes this theory. The resulting probable anarchism of the uncertainty principle based on quantum mechanics does not correspond with the epistemological axiom of the appearance of consciousness in any occurrence. We explain that the criterion of a scientific

law must be an epistemological criterion based on the appearance of consciousness in all occurrences and their plurality. An explanatory law of an occurrence is not the consequent objectivity of observation of the particular cases but the hidden forms of consciousness in each occurrence.

The explanation is not the observation of the generalities. The explanation is a description of existence as it is, apart from all the claimed generalities. In terms of observation as a scientific method and the position of scientific analysis, it causes a major loss that has so far taken the skirt of science as a field of thought claiming direct and certain knowledge. The emphasis on observation as a place of scientific analysis prevents the breakdown of occurrences to their constituents. All methodological Submenus of traditional science suffer from this main deficiency. Induction believes the logical consequence of occurrences coincides with their generality, and refutability emphasizes alternative theories to reach the truth. The Feyerabend's (against method) model emphasizes a scientist's personal attempts and discovery and generally dynamic imagination in line with scientific activities.

He explains 1993, page, VIII. Preface to the third edition: The history of science, after all, consists not only of facts and conclusions drawn therefrom. It consists also of ideas, interpretations of facts, problems created by a clash of interpretations, actions of scientists, and so on. Feyerabend, 1992. Page 28.

To achieve a scientific knowledge far from any probability risk, we must find a criterion for centralizing scientific activities. On a large scale of scientific activities, the theoretical paradigms must be epistemologically criticized based on the discovery of consciousness in its claimed topic. In the more particular cases of anarchistic theorizing, which is largely based on a personal tendency of a theorist, the plurality of truth is replaced by the discovery of signs of consciousness in the topic under-study. To discover these hidden signs, it is necessary to break down an occurrence under-study or a phenomenon into its smallest components. Surely, our proposed methodology in line with the breakdown of phenomena and occurrences into their smallest constituents must not cause the simplifying the issue. Sometimes it is not easily possible because of technologic problems or the interference of many variables, but we must keep in mind that the breakdown of an occurrence and a phenomenal affair into their smallest constitutive particulars by creating modern sciences or adopting of different perspectives in many cases is possible. If we go through the process of occurrences analysis, we confront with the signs of consciousness so that this process must continue, we cannot analyze the signs of consciousness because of the mysterious substance of consciousness, and it seems that they are the last step of occurrences analysis process. What solution is there to go beyond the obstacle of the lack of possibility of the signs of consciousness disintegration? The suggested solution is referring to the epistemological notion of the existence presentation. The presentation of existence means planning occurrences and phenomenal affairs. This planning describes the preliminaries and possibilities that a potential behaving being can apply in different ways and doing different behaviors, and it is only consciousness that is ultimately the sufficient condition to make things happen. These potential possibilities, despite the fluidity, accept which fundamental conditions consciousness has provided in their frame. They are topics of empirical sciences. If we have treated the signs of consciousness as the last step of an analysis process of phenomenal affairs, then, there is only one way left for us to study the planning of behaving beings. This study must be of comparative substance. This is a significant point in shaping modern scientific methodology. The Study of phenomena planning encompasses emphasizing the different aspects of phenomena that differ in different sciences with different perspectives. Naturally, it is necessary to deny this prevalent presupposition in academic institutions that occurrences do not have any meaning and programmed aspect. In many cases, we can observe phenomena are out of a specific scientific topic. A new look at the charged particles may be needed to detect what is going on at the subatomic layers of the material, considering how they affect the composition of the material from a new scientific perspective called electro-chemistry. To study the life, we need to revise and study neuroscience, based on genetic considerations again with a profound change. We refer to these two examples as the super-models of consciousness signs here to indicate how we can obtain a different method of studying the quality of phenomena planning. Obtaining a method for studying phenomena planning may be outside the scope of a specific science. This consideration has further complicated the issue. Furthermore, the wide range of planning affair and its transcendental concept expresses our confrontation with the unexpressed existence. We cannot categorize this transcendental concept in the scope of a specific science. Determining to choose the quality of a new and creative perspective is a task for scientists who research on related fields. In addition to topics that less accurately reflect the general behaviors of behaving beings, in the new methodology of scientific study, the questions have been particularly significant. This is the question that drives the scientist in the empirical sciences, and it is based on the question that the researcher explores and gathers evidence. Finally, answering or not answering to the question determines where the border of science is. The failure of science is indeed the inability of science to answer questions. We can achieve a proper perspective for the study of phenomena by a rational and open discussion based on the signs of consciousness in the context of an empirical science. In addition to a theoretical aspect and a possibility of analyzing phenomena, the Study of phenomena planning encompasses a pragmatic notion of the field works. For example, it is crucial to decipher human life as a theoretical and pragmatic aspect of the genome the quality of the interaction between each particular gene and its behavioral submenu is also significant. Emphasizing on the relevance of a pragmatic study of consciousness and an occurred behavior confirms the plurality of consciousness and the variables and their action in different circumstances. There is another significant issue in exploring phenomena planning, we must determine how much directly does consciousness interfere to occur a behavior or behavioral spectrum. It does not, however, mean that consciousness ignores when necessary the corporeal mediums of behaviors doing; which may beyond the traceable forms of consciousness in the hitherto known arenas of floating occurrences generalities of consciousness, or we can present there are indirect ways of applying consciousness to create phenomena in existence. We must consider the probability of deciphering existence and the suggestion of new scientific methodology more seriously. Perhaps this is the secret of the fluidity of consciousness and the unpredictability of behaviors up to now. On the other hand, we can more accurately look at these options as highly probable alternatives to failing to decode and to stop studies on the human brain. This estimation can be seen as a new and innovative effort to obtain methods for studying phenomena planning. The appearance of consciousness in occurrences is a very inclusive point that we must not only look at from a philosophical point of view as a philosophical notion, rather it is an inclusive axiom that is alive and floating in all existence and in all behavioral and phenomenal realms and we must consider it as a purpose in all studies with direct and certain knowledge. We must strive for new and innovative ways to influence the planning of the realms of

phenomenological affairs based on this meaning and its direction. The Appearance of innovation to suggest a new scientific solution to analyze phenomena to their smallest constituents is one of the most significant foundations of new scientific methodology. The idea of breaking down behaviors and occurrences to their smallest constituents can help to solve the technical problems of studying these occurrences and phenomena. Probably some technical problems are the conclusion of lack of occurrences and phenomena analysis. Analysis of occurrences and phenomena attempts to improve the holistic tendency in line with the knowledge and emphasis on behavioral variables. By considering the variables, we can look at occurrences and phenomena from different perspectives that comprise different empirical sciences. The Emphasis on observation enables us to look at varied faces of occurrences while we cannot correctly define what logic governs the plural circle of occurrences and phenomena. Consider the High risk of lung cancer from smoking. Statistical observation of the experimental groups indicates what the risk percentage is, while the risk is attributable to the quality of the action of the variable smoking on each of the behaving participant objects in the experiment. The Action of this variable on the objective participant is not the same. The smoking variable itself can be divided into many other variables. We can even probably say that when we come across a behavioral variable we come across a behavioral spectrum. Many varied behaviors in this variable submenu are observable. At a glance, we can observe the amount of tobacco consumed is not the same in all the experimental objects. Next, the amount absorption of matter consumed within the corporal organization of each person is probably different. We must more carefully consider it as an effective micro-factors risk for lung cancer. Analysis as one of the components of the new scientific methodology is an acute issue that ignoring some of its points can end the discussion. By looking at the current methodology of science, we can find some concepts that conclude specific extensions that we can recognize and apply to the development of scientific perception. We can mention some general categories, such as electron and material. Electrons have some specific properties such as specific electric charges. Material also has its physical and chemical properties, but we cannot enclose these two categories in their present extensions. The issue here is how they are defined if these two categories are topics of the different rules. Indeed, in the observation process, what we call an electron and what we call matter? What do we mean when we talk about electrons? how must we explain our definition? Naturally, when the components of a chain of definitions are not related to a concept, it is an irrelevant chain. The answer to this question involves some complexities. Two explanations are needed to solve this problem first, to refer to the current state of scientific studies and then to the future horizons. Electrons are clearly visible in the atomic layers and with a negative electric charge. The problem of the quality of the reference to all its varieties is related to the unknown relationship between the subatomic and atomic layers and the composition matter. Concerning material, we can add the lack of possibility of defining this concept is related to the lack of stability of its ontological place and the lack of a clear grasp of the quality of the path it has created it in existence. To determine the phenomenological substance of the concepts that science deals with seems to be the final solution to the analysis. Determining the type and the border and substance of the phenomenological realities in existence is an expanded horizon; because we have not yet been able to determine the border and end of existence. Really because of existence complexity, consciousness is concealed in these phenomenological affairs. At present time, we cannot decipher and estimate the signs of consciousness in some phenomenological realities; because we do not have any precise information about the approximate progression in line with the origination of these phenomenological realities. The present tools do not also provide the possibility to refer to a true presentation of hidden forms of consciousness in phenomenological affairs. So, the only way to phenomenologically decode existence is to see the plural action of existence under the shadow of the efforts to discover its planning system. To clarify some phenomena such as material and electro-magnetic spectrum, our choice is to study subatomic particles, which have been unfortunately suspended because of technological problems. Although we have explained that to discover the quality of the performance of subatomic particles, we must consider their action in the subatomic layer of material composition. What happens to the definitions needed and applied to science? These definitions must be suspended until an explanation of the substance of a phenomenon in existence has a general aspect, but we can pragmatically benefit from statistical utilizations. Certainly, some paleontological and cosmological explanations help to clarify the origin of some phenomena such as material and the electro-magnetic spectrum. Scientific studies and present theories about the cosmos situation in the probable point of its origin contain some information about the quality of the formation of materials based on very light and Hydrogen gas. This vague and concise historical attitude provides the possibility of consciousness variation based on the primary material. Now, we cannot explain the logical place of phenomenal material, but historical consciousness based on a probable common path of originating materials in nature reinforces this probability that we are confronting with a particular type of material. Furthermore, the consideration of Hydrogen as the basic element of materials production indicates that consciousness has gone a specific way of variation that we can decipher this phenomenological presentation type in existence by following the signs of consciousness historically. The situation is more difficult in the case of the emergence of the electromagnetic spectrum. However, it does provide us with evidence of its presence in existence dating back more than ten billion years. Because of the absence of any evidence of decomposition of this spectrum, the speculation about the constituents have less scientific implications. Until some decades ago, we involved in debates about the visual nature of a member of the spectrum, photo rays. The only type of phenomenon that allows us to do scientific research is the material. We can analyze materials from different perspectives. Material provides vast empirical possibilities based on observation because of its combination and relationships to the motion and automatic organization within the empirical sciences of physics chemistry, and biology. Explaining the relationship between material and other types of phenomena can be a shortcut to decipher the substance of other phenomena in a systematic scientific paradigm. We pointed out emphasizing the pragmatic status of phenomena and concepts can be a step towards the certain foundation of the circle of occurrences and variation of consciousness because of the general and indefinable concepts and the different references in existence. Is disintegration proper alternative to define phenomena and concepts? If the answer to this question is positive, where are the efforts of the scientific process directed?? Before discussing this issue, it is important to note that because of the expansion of the universe and the lack of determining its borders, we must limit the discussion to empirical science in the context of human propositions. Human beings confront with various issues in existence through observing occurrences and phenomena. The domain of these issues is widespread and comprises WHYS and qualities. The proposed method of categorization and benefiting more from observations is the reduction of the generality of categories and framing these observations into smaller and more specific categories instead of emphasizing the analysis

of the information gathered from the observations into their constructing components. This analysis works in tandem with the constituent material components of phenomena to discover the hidden signs of consciousness in them. In the observation process, for example, when looking at apple tree species, they are different from the different angles. Their zest and smell and form and size and etc. are varied. The suggestion of the new scientific methodology is a specifically and descriptively analysis of information about all variations based on the genetic characteristics of each variation. We must ask why the present situation of this variation is the same. We might say that issues have been precisely analyzed in the current scientific methodology with two approaches, namely a descriptive quality of variations and more recently, the state of consciousness alterations in the genetic shortcuts; if genetic science seems not to be shifting in line with consciousness variation and a philosophical approach. Rather probably a random discovery that empirical science has acquired. Now philosophers and scientists do not consider genetic science as a philosophical affair and a determinant of occurrences, but they regard it as one of the determinants of the quality of behavior without us being able to understand its role. It is related to the substance of the gene and its role in determining the quality of behaviors. The quality of genes function is still an exciting matter for empirical scientists. The association of genes as signs of consciousness with phenomena and behaviors is not exactly known right now. We do not precisely know each gene is responsible for which action or operation. One of the most complex confusing problems for a scientist is the same. There is a technical issue that needs to be addressed in the remaining time. Consideration of genes as hidden signs of consciousness in the phenomenon of life and its consequent behavior and behavioral spectrums may play a significant role in accelerating and facilitating this process. Another problem is the elimination of probabilities and statistical trends from the domain genetic science. In scientific genetic propositions, the scientific method is based on the expression of showing a characteristic with the gene factor by a statistical trend. The expression of the probable auxiliary descriptive propositions shows a kind of neglecting the quality of formation and fixation of genetic processes that provides the conditions for specific behaviors and occurrences to occur. If we consider the differences that have a genetic origin as different variations of consciousness ---which we believe to be the determinative factor in all occurrences and phenomena of all organisms that have a genetic structure---then we cannot present genetic science empirically. It expresses unknown processes that lead happening specific occurrences and behaviors. It is currently presumed that gene appearance based on the presupposed pedigree based on observation of members of a related genetic family may or may not expected an occurrence or behavior to happen or does not. We do not have considered the conditions of consciousness varying because of emphasizing observation as a science. These circumstances are now unknown to us. Genetic such as other empirical sciences, seems to put aside observation as a place to explain phenomena. Observation is just a technique of gathering facts and information. We must explain it through a specific epistemological process. This epistemological explanation makes us consider the creative epistemological circumstances of phenomena for the attainment of the substances. It is probably true that the probabilistic and statistical theory of the academic science of genetic now prevents to regard the genetic processes to create behaviors and occurrences. The Description of qualities based on the specific characteristics of each variation appears in such a way that if we encounter a variation of apple that is sour in the process of observation, we do not presume this sour taste an accident on apple, but we take in account the sour apple as a kind of variation and exertion of consciousness over the general apple. Here we can ask where the range of problems and questions is. Among many especial observed apples, if we found an apple that differed in one or more directions from the other apples, it was slightly smaller or could withstand the blight, how we must explain these differences. Is this case worthwhile as a singular case to spend time and budget studying it? If so, there is nothing left of the scientific generalities, and we must strive to find all the variations of consciousness. Observation is the technique of real documentary information gathering from the surface of existence, but we do not stop. It is the first step of scientific practice, but we do not stop here the consequence of observation is the categorization of information and circumstances. We can predict the expected behaviors of the objects under-study by observing one apple or more and gathering the required information and decoding it in the next step or change the behaviors in the direction of our favorite. The analysis by considering a probable historical path based on a common probable phenomenological background that has not yet been confirmed by empirical observation, strives to explain some general concepts such as to explain both whys and qualities and some observable phenomena ---that we could not define so far--- and find the substances and finally if possible define them or explain them in other ways based on deciphering the hidden forms of consciousness in occurrences and phenomena. Consideration of decomposition to the smallest constituents, if it is to be presumed to be the paradigm of modern science is on the basis of this epistemological assumption that degradability is an explanatory methodology at any time if it is based on historical elements and variables. As a result, this approach is based on the presupposition that any particular occurrence can be disintegrated in depth before an occurrence is observable. Naturally, if any particular occurrence can be analyzed, modern science, which is a symbol of the consciousness variation explanation in existence, is a category established upon the analytical affair. The Disintegration based on behavioral variables is not possible because the variables are both historical and abstractly the manifestations of consciousness. This problem can be solved by changing the empirical study perspective. In particular, the new scientific method emphasizes the privilege of the study on behaving being instead of the behavior as the substance of empirical study; because study of behaving beings facilitates the attainment of behavioral variables, and the relationship between behaviors and form of scientific logic can be more clearly explained. As we explained, the phenomenological existence mainly does not deal with narrative, but there are behavioral spectrums that encompass behavioral possibilities such as the potentiality for a behavior to occur. At the particular step, the new scientific method goes beyond and departs from the claims and demands of traditional science. At present, science to avoid theological polemics, does not enter into some crucial realms whose lack of consideration causes that knowledge is not total and determinative. These realms or will theoretically be either always unopened or presumed to belong to some realms such as religion. This approach has led to a lack of information about the substance of existence. Philosophy is responsible for the consideration of the substance of existence in the current cultural atmosphere. Science provides the preliminaries of the existence substance study, and philosophy constructs the arrangement of cognitive categorizations based on these premises that organize and qualify our progress toward the obtained answers to the questions. In this case, we can likely analyze the approach that incline to accept the epistemological plurality in relation to the scientific advancement of the 19th century and the discovery of families and specious and cognitive categories. Though science and philosophy influence another because the organization of cognitive categories is science-based, and it is impossible to enter the cognitive

process without acquired science of existence. Surely, there is always the danger of inclusive philosophical perception of the existence and the instrumental utility as a tool for applying power and the threat to the freedom of thought that philosophy has born as its consequence. Thought always suffers from the threat of dictatorship and totalitarian systems that claim to move toward the right philosophical insight or even misuse of philosophy to consolidate their power. Despite the impossibility of teleological judgment about existence, there are not ways to avoid irrational behavior and counter-thought behaviors, but we can ask a question about what efforts can we make and what possibilities can we use to guide our freedom of thought to direct and certain knowledge of existence. The solution is undoubtedly to move away from the market and mass production as a modern capitalism consequence. The way of life that the economic approach of modern capitalism of mass production imposes on the authority of the totalitarian modern state in modern society. A modern totalitarian government in the realm of thought can easily limit or disrupt the access of its citizens to the possibilities of creative thought. Disrupting or limiting the access to the possibilities of thought is the logical continuity of its creative technological forms. Media possibilities allow to report news massively in modern society. These media possibilities of information have a fluvial color because of information technology, and the government can take any desired action along the way by controlling these arteries. The possibility of the influence of a modern state is not limited to the freedom of thought, but in many cases, it can limit the freedom of action of the modern individual. However, these limitations often do not occur entirely because of the lack of the elites' unity of the totalitarian society and the scientific and practical possibilities of limiting thought and other problems. These limitations are the consequences of government control over the production tools and broadcasting information. These limitations certainly include science. A classic example is the science utilization as a power tool to build the atomic bomb in the World War II by the participant powers. We cannot certainly prevent to utilize science in our life, but we must find a solution to prevent the process that helps destroy freedom of thought. This solution depends on changing the scientific method in order to control over the tool making flow. Now, this is only the way for science to progress and develop the services and the horizons of thought, in the future. In many cases, we must omit this perspective from science. The proper alternative thought here is a reference to the horizon of traditional thought. Returning to the horizon of traditional thought in line with the reduction of the role of toolmaking never confirm the role of traditional authority. Modern authority depends on the instrumental authority, or at least the instrumental authority of the modern state, and the traditional authority originate from traditional religious institutions and traditional secular institutions or the community as a whole. The difference of modern toolmaking denial in the modern style is the equalization of the authority possibilities and its distribution in all layers of society and its inclusive exit from the realm of government any modern or traditional totalitarian institution. Modern toolmaking must enable all citizens of the new society to make the most possibilities that individual freedom grants to others by respecting the liberty of others. Below we will explain more about the quality of toolmaking. Why do we insist on the discovery of existence substance? Since the substance of the corporeal world is an inseparable part of phenomenological existence. At first glance, it is significant, how we can guarantee the style of being and behaving the creatures how much depends on their substance and their temporal place in the corporeal world. In other word, the knowledge of the substance of existence is inseparable from the knowledge of existence, and any kind of knowledge without consideration of this significant substantial cognitive component is not complete. Meanwhile, modern sciences treatment of the meaning category and substance of existence is the passive one; this means we cannot even arrive at negative conclusions from standard scientific approaches as to whether existence is a meaningful and a substance or not. The emphasis on the destruction of the generalities of existence and the partial approach to knowledge is the consequence of the collapse of the scientific categorization, not a philosophical attitude that has dictated itself to scientific categories. It is not just a claim because the truth plurality approach cannot yet explain knowledge as an independent phenomenon convincingly. The question of logical rules is still debatable. The lack of explanation of knowledge as a philosophical phenomenon decreases the philosophical value of pluralistic epistemological claims. We cannot deny that consideration of the substance of existence ultimately leads to the discussion of teleological issues, but we must note that knowledge of the meaning and substance of existence is an integral part of phenomenological existence. To gain ---direct and certain knowledge--- we must ask why science as a claimant for all-inclusive knowledge of existence, does not consider theological and teleological issues in relation to existence as much as the categories of the substance of existence. An estimation of this is likely to draw us into the realm of Christianity as well as the secularization of European culture. On the other hand, the substance of science as a secular institution encompasses all the thoughts and ideas of its participants. This secularization and temporal way and the lack of a unique concept of rationality reduce the probability of religious and theological polemics, but we must keep in mind that leaving out the questions of the substance and meaning and termination of existence is to renounce the claim of complete and definitive knowledge. It is true that the secularization of science has prevented theological polemics, but it has played the role of a hidden presupposition in the context of scientific approaches that have given a particular direction to knowledge. Any knowledge gained by science is based on a secular presupposition of science without any religious notion. We must keep in mind that the way religion teaches and the method of science and their perspective in relation to existence are fundamentally different. We mean the interpretation of each one of these two schools of thought about existence. The difference between religion and science in the explanation of existence is that science by a rational way describes the processes of existence while religion invites believe and only expresses some generalities about existence and promises full knowledge in the future, but the is the final explanation of existence. How does science explain existence? How does science explain its life as a cognitive system? Which situation necessitates the scientific activity fundamentally? We can ask why questions can be asked about the scientific topics studied, but they cannot and must not be asked about the substance, termination and meaning of existence in the framework of a scientific system? Science has no answer to these questions despite the claim of knowledge. If there is final explanation of existence and this final explanation is a value explanation the methodology of traditional scientific cannot attain it or must abandon its claims based on secular knowledge; while knowledge in the new scientific methodology has no presupposition and accepts any conclusion of rational method that results from the discovery hidden forms of consciousness in phenomena and occurrences. The dual status of the explanatory premises of existence made by science and its final narrative by philosophy raises the question of what the responsibility of each one of these two realms of thought is. We can say that the insistence of science on to abandon all sorts of presupposition, such as religious beliefs really disrupts the operation of this realm of thought. It is true that abandoning these presuppositions whether religious or nonreligious can cause

interfering science in realms so far considered nonscientific or even antiscientific, but if this is part of scientific method, we must not blame it. When we say the explanation of moral behaviors of human depends on the unraveling of teleological categories of existence, it means that this teleological explanation must be done in a philosophical realm, but the premises of this explanation should be provided in the scientific realm of thought. Therefore, this presupposition that science must take in account the teleological aspects of behaviors and phenomenon cannot be presumed as a nonscientific notion. When science does not enter such realms, it cannot obtain the conclusions necessary for a certain and immediate knowledge. When the notion of teleological aspect of behaviors and phenomena is not considered as a scientific presupposition by this domain of thought, it does not affect scientific studies and research. Introducing of this presupposition into the realm of science develops the proposed presumption of quantum mechanics on the basis of material fluidity and opens up a new physical field to other scientific realms. This collaboration of physics and other empirical sciences provides us with tremendous possibilities in the behavioral and phenomenological fields that ultimately speed up the process of acquiring certain knowledge. In the following reference to the traditional scientific method we should consider the possibilities of observation in line with the facts gathering for scientific explanation. Positivism is probably a reaction to the limitation of science for observing existence. The state of science is currently confusing with issues such as the existence of god. Even seemingly simpler and more manageable issues than such as psychological theories also have the same, status and science when faced with them it experiences a type of confusion and defense position. To gain an inclusive knowledge about existence, this presupposition as a claiming school of direct and certain knowledge must be eliminated from science. The presupposition of the lack of observability and the lack of ability to attain to conditions that leads to discover the mystery and meaning of existence are the consequences of the lack of an epistemological foundation, and we suggest solutions to get out of situation. Here we only point out that the present state of science based on the lack of the possibility of existence knowledge has nothing to do the reality of existence; but it is a presupposition that is the result of the particular historical conditions in which it has grown and evolved. Another example of disturbance of scientific presuppositions is humanism. Human has an especial place in the field of science because on the one hand he is the leader of the scientific system and on the other is the subject of a part of this system. Because of morality, human beings confront with specific aftermaths of experience related to scientific actions. Some aftermaths have been recently discussed in dealing with the cloning phenomenon. The preferred view is that every human has the option of being experienced with all the information about the circumstances and consequences. Any human being who does not have such a right and possibility, given the uncertainty about the quality and timing of life, he must not experience such a situation. The topic is more related to humans in a scientific study than the theme of his experience and circumstances. The humanistic presupposition reveals itself in such categories as consciousness and the human free will. Often the possibility of behavior doing or a behavioral reaction or the ability of its doing is confused with the behavior, and this possibility or ability is presumed as behavior and free will. These presuppositions have a devastating effect on human studies and their acquired conclusions, the price of which is at stake in discovering the reality of human behavior. The humanistic presupposition can once again be suggested, if first it explains the role of reflective behavioral spectrums like instincts and ETC... and secondly can suggest an alternative to consciousness in human existence; because human as a behavioral unit cannot be broken down and is real and explicable. At present, science now confirms the possibility of studying human beings within the smallest component framework. Types of Empirical science that study human behaviors and biological characteristics from different perspectives can also confirm this. In conclusion, it is necessary to point out another point despite, the link between this issue and the content of science, it is difficult or possibly impossible to answer the question of what behaviors and occurrences are concluded scientific activities with emphasizing the new scientific method. We cannot decisively say what facts are necessary to know the existence and which facts are less necessary or unnecessary. The ultimate solution is to unravel the complicated mystery of the existence termination, but in a closer look, perhaps exploring consciousness will show us the general principles in refining all the necessary facts for knowing the existence. At this step of knowledge, value judgment about any component of knowledge is never correct because it is a kind of ignorance of all the information and particular facts. It is also harmful to direct and certain knowledge; therefore, there is currently no value difference between quantum mechanics and pearl-brocade art in line with gathering facts and studying them because they each represent some spectrums of behaviors and occurrences in the realm of existence. Mythologized science and the knowledge process in a deadlock:

Probably statements such as living in an advanced world and being civilized and modern human compared to our ancestors are likely to be popular. However, we keep in mind that these contents of thought ---simply through various terms--- are scientific thoughts' models that surpassed the academic circles and are popular with people. One of the most significant features of western civilization is the imperialistic recording of narrations and renewing their narrations. Postmodern ideas have attempted to attract some narratives of other cultures, but for some reasons, such as the creative superiority of Western civilization and its instrumental supremacy, these trans-cultural narratives are largely recognized from the perspective of Western culture and civilization for citizens of Western Europe and North America. When we discuss general categories such as science, we certainly ask these questions, and we talk about Western civilization and the citizens of Western Europe and North America. Perhaps the appropriate answer is that new empirical science has been a consequence of the flow of thought in the west. As in the past, most of the significant theories and practical innovations have been mainly formed in these countries. So, the debate about the current presuppositions of science is confined to western countries. We do not intend to deny modern science the consequence of western civilization in a general statement that has designated as mythologized science, because it is against our purpose to explain the presuppositions of present science rationally. Mainly speaking about general topics without specifying their extensions --- as is common in western civilization--- is an irrational task that organizes a fundamentally mythical content. The Pragmatic mythologizing, ---as in the European-American civilization is common practice--- has heterogeneous and different layers. The most significant of these layers are the identification and generalization of political thought and the mind and language of the western individual. We commence from the first perspective. Identification is probably the first misunderstanding on which western civilization is based and has created such a great foundation. The appearance of the human person as a conscious body in Descartes philosophy has motivated to theorize philosophers such as Locke, companions of Encyclopedia, Voltaire, Alexis de Tocqueville, August Comte, Marx and many others political and philosophical thinkers with consideration of classical heritage about human and his role in the world. Of course, there

were early theoretical trends in human-nature relations as well as inequalities in human relations as well as in the analysis of the rule of historical reason and human progress in line with absorption in an absolute ideal, but these were either in the situation of the opposition have been confiscated in favor of humanitarian notion on the basis of humanism or served by the leftist ideologies critical of western civilization, now, we do not intend to talk about the political role of this identified person in the west. The argument is that this identified person is now confronted with protests that challenge the foundations of rational progress and enlightenment. We have explained that nor consciousness neither existence does not provide an explanatory basis for explaining the questioner object individuality. In addition to the great philosophical challenges that Appear to the concept of individuality as a conscious body and a questioner about existence, the human person as a conscious object also is biologically diverse. What is relevant from the perspective of the concept of identification is the question of the concept of individuality that if we know the human person as a conscious and questioner object about existence, then address the substance and origin of existence being manifested in the institution of philosophy attracts the only a specific group of the conscious and questioner members? Another question is: what are the interests a conscious person? Every human being has his or her interests and pursues his or her way of achieving consciousness of his or her interest or interests that he or she believes is to be good for him or her or he or she is talented for them. Probably some persons would argue that we are talking about the consciousness of someone who pursues the study of existence based on a philosophical approach definitely, yes, it is true, but the generalization of the individual concept as a conscious object involves a great danger. Probably so far because of the specialization of the institution of science in western civilization, we have had less fatal consequences. The generalization of the conscious object to include all persons human beings involves the danger that one may theoretically have a similar situation to think about existence based on a philosophical context, and if they wish to do a little further study of philosophical matters and a little power imagination he can to express their personal views and probably their nonsense theories in a dynamic philosophical paradigm. As some current trends of thought are not fundamentally philosophical and have grown on the basis of the thought deadlock in the mid of the 19th and 20th centuries. Existentialism has abandoned thinking about epistemological and ontological issues in traditional philosophy and, by presuming them, explores other areas of life that have a direct and inclusive connection with ontological issues. Now, we ask what the difference between this thought circle and some humanities is, such as psychology and sociology that like existentialism think about human issues from their perspective rationally. By the elimination of the notion of meaning from today's philosophy and replacing the plurality of existence based on postmodern beliefs, claiming the plurality of truth, any person can like [against method situation] Feyerabend describes, with little awareness of philosophy explains existence or anything interesting to him, without us being able to answer questions. Surely, this issue can be partly explained based on the plurality of truth, but some significant questions that challenge the concept of the human individual are forgotten. Everyone tries to answer the question of are some people are attracted to thinking about existence. The answer to this question is crucial because we need to know how to explain the inclusiveness of the human individual on the context of the western philosophy conceptualization. Even the postmodern spectrum beliefs cannot ignore the answer to these questions because though these thought circles ultimately from their perspective, explain the existence and, in a particular sense human being and their behaviors. Postmodern moral theories believe the super-narratives have failed and are invalid, and value systems and categories have come to an end. This belief firstly, affirms that one must give up the concept of a unique human individual, but this abandonment of the concept of the human individual does not necessarily accompanied by the abandonment of consciousness and human questioning as in the past. The concerns of questioning human continue to exist so that he can no longer conceptualize the concept of the individual as a questioner and a conscious object like before. So far, the identification of the human person has not been destroyed, but has appeared into an existential aspect and has grown around the human being and has been the theme of numerous theorizing about membership in the society power-based, and economic-based and socio-based the human activist, while traditional beliefs and modern mythical person presentation also continue to their life alongside these new theorizing circles. We do not want and cannot ignore the steps of the movement of modern thought has caused to fail the modern conceptualization of the human individuality and replacing it with the postmodern plural individual, but we also cannot overlook the concealed mythical affair within this thought movement. This mythical affair is human who at one time, wears a mask of a conscious being, and at another time wears a mask of an understanding plural being of existence, the differences of this plural existent can be explained. Whether the modern perspective with that the emphasizing a perfect presentation of human has some mythical aspects because it ignores empirical observations that show clear differences between human beings or all approaches believe in the plurality of human existent because, the two sides of the spectrum are based on the reality documented empirical evidence cannot explain human differences and similarities. In this case, we used the word myth very much and it is inevitable that we do not explain the concept of myth. Myth explains human desires and favors things in a delocalized and eternal and irrational way. Consider the modern human individual. At any time and place he can think about existence. The Irrationality of the mythical matter is that it does not explain the organic and spiritual differences of the singular human individual. Certainly, it must be noted that in some of the intellectual instructions of western civilization some non-mythical ideas such as the expression and theoretical possibility of a scientific study of all concepts and realms of existence and of free experimentation in all scientific disciplines, are incidentally revealed, but looking at what is really happened shows the inequality between philosophical approaches and acute pragmatic problems. This acute problem is the lack of ability of conceptualization to explain the universe plurality in such a way as to encompass all empirical singular evidence. Such identifications have been constructed in many situations in western civilization which are not relevant to our discussion. On the identification based on the human individual this explanation is important that if the human being that is a behaviorist who thinks about being, instead of a mythical a rational conscious and questioner object as the foundation of philosophical experiencing in existence either the plurality of human individuality will also be explained or the answer to this this question is why not all singular human individuals think about existence. In this case, the motivation and reason of some peoples thinking about existence are clear to us and the reason for the lack of such an occurrence without the need for such a mythical conceptualization. Moreover, a behavioral and sequential action on the signs of consciousness along with thinking about existence eliminates this theoretical problem of which individual originally thinks about existence and which one express his or her own views., Certainly we do not claim that problems resulting from irrational dimensions of existence, are fully solved, but the explanation of these problems is possible and presented in line with clarifying the

teleological dimensions of existence. Another point about the science mythologizing goes back to the mythical and irrational generalization. The Collapse of traditional epistemology and its consequent absolutist induction which at that time was the spiritual protector of empirical science provided an explanation of existence as expressed in its most radical and most general than form of this proposition: there is fundamentally no explicable and certain and reliable truth in existence that we can make the epistemological propositions necessary for empirical science, but at the same time, the great system of thought was formed around human the existent who wanted and saw the universe and existence around him. Under the shadow of humanism, logical propositions became irrelevant. Naturally, there were philosophers and thought circles who tried to explain the closed and lingual foundations of logic because the collapsed notions of language unity in the realm of thought were not yet common. Philosophers such as Frege, and a little later, Russell and members of the Cambridge school of philosophy of language attempted to maintain and fix logical foundations, but this thought circle was mainly concerned with logical categories because of its lingual reality and was less concerned with epistemology issues. We can conclude that epistemology as the solution to the problems of thought is a missed opportunity. The matter that will be discussed later as phenomenology is merely the continuation of the same issues of traditional philosophy, such as consciousness and phenomenological existence, without sufficient specific epistemological innovation. The explanation for the lack of the truth of existence has accompanied the myth that man exists apart from the lack of the truth of existence and is living therefore, we must understand this living being and think around him and his desires. Whether this is paradoxical or a mythical and irrational affair, the existence of humans is presumed as a truth that makes no ontological sense. The elimination of rational foundations if were accompanied by the negation of logical propositions and free from contradiction could be acceptable for direct and true knowledge of existence, but that has not happened. The elimination of rational foundations of existence has not been in harmony with the elimination of logical propositions, but it has been accompanied by mythologization and generalization and a mixture of the plural reality of existence with the mythical proposition of the lack of the truth of existence. This proposition that the reality is a plural affair does not have any logical necessity for the proposition of the lack of the truth of existence. The subject and the predicate of these two theorems do not have accordance with each other. Truth is a plural affair. There is no truth. We can take in account the plural truth proposition as a consequence of empirical researches and 19th century inventions and scientific discoveries, but we can only trace the origins of the proposition "there is no truth" to the cultural status of western European societies and to some extent the North American societies. The main critics of Nietzsche, as the mastermind of postmodern beliefs, are humanistic critics. Referring to ancient Greece, he wished for the joy and happiness and liberty that he is thinking that modern human had lost under the shadow of the church and the slavery ethic of Christianity and the bond between Hegelian and Kantian philosophy and the dominant idealistic absolute of the cultural and intellectual atmosphere of the time. In a divergent attempt to break away from Greek post-Socratic philosophies, under the shadow of Dionysian and Apollonian rituals, He explained the confusion of humans and the tragic foundation of existence that is the common content of existentialism. These humanistic criticisms can ultimately be analyzed by a theory of moral value that determines the way of life, not the logical and epistemological system. Therefore, it seems the elimination of logical propositions in relation to the statement "there is no truth" is acceptable and defensible. The mixture of plural reality with the particular reality of existence is an occurrence that has taken place apart from the progress of western thought. This problem is not the logical consequence of the rational thought movement of the enlightenment towards the removal of logic from the realm of thought. This occurrence is a consequence of cultural turnaround in line with the expansion of the existentialist approach against traditional philosophy owed as in the past to the paradigm of survived categories of Greek Socratic philosophy. In this situation, what remained meanwhile, was the current mythical human always present in western thought as an absolute generality which despite being divided into some particulars in the postmodern beliefs circles remains open as a referable pluralistic contradictory generality. The confusion of the plural reality of existence with the lack of its truth that it has itself a mythical meaning has deepened with this mythical generalization, which determines the stalemate of knowledge. Mythical generalization is needed to overlap the similarities that we can discover based on empirical evidence of the existence and observable documents. For example, there may be different species of sheep, but many similar points exist, such as the similarities of skeletal structure with other mammals and generation ways, and many other factors associated with other animal species that we have categorized as sheep. By the way we must accept the differences of the existents. In short, we can say that happened is the plurality of existence reality has expressed based on the mythical lack of rule and the particular reality of existence without its acute logical consequences and elimination of epistemological issues and without proposing an adequate empirical and logical evidence for this mythical presupposition. As we explained above, the causes of this new approach were cultural backgrounds, and we cannot explain its process by analyzing the history of thought. Therefore, we cannot consider this change of approach as the stalemate of the logical and epistemological and historical attitude of science. Science can eliminate the logical and epistemological deficiencies in the light of a new organization. It can also modify the scientific categorization techniques and avoid a hazardous mythical presupposition in the way of knowledge and guide this process to its certain termination. The next point of connection with mythologized science refers to the political myth of the eternity of the Bourgeoisie and western civilization. This political myth does not directly affect the scientific studies process, but when we indirectly imagine that western civilization is the last step in development. Naturally, the answers to human questions about all matters, especially epistemological questions, are supposed to be the only possible answers. The unanswered questions are presented unsolvable crisis in their substance or fundamentally unanswered questions. It is worth noting that the question of myth and its place in modern civilization is properly discussed in a book entitled "myth and the modern world" by Professor Jalal Sattari, printed in 1379/2000. By Markaz publisher in Tehran. He notes that the myth is not yet dead and continues to live. This work encouraged us to talk about this matter. The political approach has shifted towards some kind of directing of scientific experiences. This mythical political tendency has limited the horizon of science to the present situation. Changing the current situation is not considered as the goal of science. It may be marginally interesting to some academic persons and institutes, but there is no attempt to discuss it. However, it is interesting that today western civilization is devoid of criticism of thoughts. The current academic thinkers and institutes tanks are largely the conclusion of some kind of epistemological collapse or the stabilization of the present situation. It is true that as in the past, the principle of freedom of experiencing and scientific discussion is the paradigm of modern science, but the problem is we must find an innovative response to scientific questions to exit modern science from the epistemological deadlocks and

explanation of existence ---as it really is ---. Modern science explains things in a way that they are separate occurrences and unrelated islands without it can explain the resemblances. There are resemblances, whether in the same way as artificial human objects or many natural occurrences. Moreover, some thinkers have fundamentally challenged the explanatory role of rationality and intellectual power. It is true. Many images of existence and many efforts that we can see to explain the present situation have taken the form in the context of free argumentation and rational circles even made their reasons based on free and largely rational discussion, but it is the problem, these free and rational argumentations do not theoretically benefit from a creative and critical landmark. The political notion of western civilization as the last step of progress and knowledge existence has contributed to the lack of innovation and criticism. We must mention that at no time in the history of human civilization has knowledge been as mythologized as in the modern time. Pre-modern far human progress was acquired without theoretical backgrounds. There were of course, theoretical innovations, but in a few cases, there have provided the theoretical backgrounds of pragmatic techniques and skills achievement. For the first time in modern civilization, science was based on the physical presentation of existence and the ability of reasoning to infer its reality based on the secular actions of the humans. Surely, we must not ignore the historical role of Christian theology and the religious polemics of enlightenment. Religion has played a dual role. Religion on the one hand, based on some generalities such as "the God who created existence based on the rationality" and man as a whole in the presence of god, prepared the context of a rational explanation of existence, on the other, the sectarian polemics of Christianity provided the foreground of the exclusion of religion from the domain of rational action to avoid polemics. The appearance of a physical presentation of existence and the stability of scientific studies based on it is naturally the consequence of the historical status of science in the renaissance epoch. One must begin the scientific experiences from experimental and available materials. These materials do not imply anything other than a physical presentation of existence, because the only way to infer the Enlightenment historical conditions that required a belief into self-foundation wisdom was to observe and gather facts through them and explain them based on physical and material principles. In addition to accepting the rational foundations of the formation of modern science and the explanation of the historical quality of its appearance, we must remember that this physical presentation of existence is not free from mythical aspects. It is true. Scientific study is not possible except by observing material reality, but this limitation of the knowledge of the observable elements in any circumstances does not seriously induce the rationality the presupposition. We must add that if the historical conditions of the corporal foundation alteration of scientific and empirical studies are to be seen in the realm of Western Europe, we must accept that these foundations have their restriction and weaknesses. Much has been argued in favor of rationalism about the limitation of experience in deducing in particular cases to infer a general category and in principle, its inefficiency in theoretical problems. The result is that empiricism is only the method of science, and the analysis of facts must be devolved to the reasoning. It is rationality that can separate all things from myth, and empiricism is not at all worthy of judging the mythical foundations of modern science, just as empiricism itself captured the criticisms that rationalism has made of its mythical presuppositions in a historical context. Emphasis on experience as a method of modern science has made the epistemological reality of consciousness and the trans-empirical properties of theorizing forgotten; while it is a subject that has led to the failure of science to identify the termination of the knowledge process and answering human questions is the theoretical collapse of science, not the lack of possibility of experience and corporal observation. If experience and observation are limited, this limitation is related to the lack of continued innovation in the construction of new tools in the shadow of the theoretical collapse of modern science. We discussed above about the impossibility of reducing scientific knowledge to matter and experience. The scientific knowledge reduction to experiencing indicates the mythical presupposition and irrationality of a scientific study. The answer of supporters of the myth of materialistic explanation of existence to the question that why our fundamental question about existence such as the meaning of existence, termination of existence is still unanswered, is a noncritical proposition that (the justification of the existing universe) by no means does not correspond to the reality of existence. The elimination of rational tendencies and replacing them with irrational alternatives such as ontological experience encompasses other variations of life but does not eliminate the phenomenological human questions that associated with knowledge. Why rationalism itself and its consequent questions have not yet been removed, but exist as an out of fashioned cultural thought and choice or study pragmatic issues of everyday human life? This replacement of irrational methods with rationalism attracts human to the great movement of previous civilizations. The most prominent example is the Greek civilization whose vivid pre-Socratic questioning and challenge of the substance of truth by the sophists and Plato's and Aristotle's responses to these take its place in the human ethical substance of existence within the model of stoicism and human withdrawal from the scene and the decline of Greek civilization. Of course, modern man was not necessarily excluded from the social scene, but the world for fall indicates the facts that questions first arise and at the end of the question whether the question is fundamentally of the wrong or its answer is the same present situation, but the question remains if we are to reach the status quo, what does mean asking questions, and what is its historical place in the historical conditions of the realm of a civilization? If a question is asked and attempted to find a true answer, it leads to some techniques and complexities, certainly, that question relates to the issues in the cultural realm that encouraged those pioneers to ask such questions --- here, western civilization--- and therefore the claiming to explain reality in the masses of irrational and antirational thoughts supporters cannot claim to eliminate the questions raised on rationality and enlightenment. The democratic presentation of science is in line with the political mythologized science and the replacement of rational and critical thinking with the political myth of the democratic legitimacy of reality. This tendency is clearly reflected in the assumptions of the philosopher of science, Thomas Kuhn, in the structure of scientific revolutions. The agreement of the core group of scientists or scientific academic institutions determines to presume what is the substance of the matter that to be the default science. Although a group of scholars may not capriciously agree on the issues. Kuhn's emphasis on group agreement is a sign of democracy preference for reality or at least its pragmatic justification. It is true. The well-known liberal thinker John Stuart Mill's idea of the potential appearance of the truth in the people has led to the collapse of the myth of the personal truth, but perhaps the myth of democratic legitimacy has replaced the reality of existence. From the intersection of the democratic scientific pathology and misunderstanding of Descartes individual as the conscious object, this tragic event has happened that every adventurer person with a little study of the basics of any science expresses opinions that are inconsistent with reality and only with his or her desires and interests. It raises the likelihood of such an event occurring that there is no criterion for distinguishing between right and wrong in the light of the weakness of rational

theories, and the explanation of reality based on an irrational and antirational and nonsensical foundation. Another sign of the strengthening of the democratic tendency of modern science and the reality of existence is a statistical tendency in scientific descriptions. Strengthening this democratic statistical trend can create a comedic situation. Each of the two hypothetical debaters can rely on the various statistics provided by various research groups and individuals in their tendency to reality and portray it as the only possible reality. Here, reality becomes statistics and science ignores the rational content of things. Although these contents are not publicly denied, they are so marginal that no trace remains. Democratic ideas are probably indicative of free and rational discussion in academic scientific institutions. Democracy inspires the motivation that in the light of free discussion are provided innovative ideas for scientific growth and nonstop movement towards progress, whereas innovation and criticism are behaviors created in the circumstances beyond free debate. The stereotype of free talk cannot guarantee that such behavior will happen. There may be such a theoretical tendency in a community or communities, but such a tendency is not enough to make such behavior happen. Free debate and rational stereotyping are a theoretical tendency that has preserved for us since the Renaissance, and we must keep in mind that in our day, the historical conditions are very different from that of the era. In these circumstances, there are many obstacles to rationalism and a firm belief in self-foundation reason and its enlightenment ability, so it is not possible to perceive the depth of this concept by the reminder that the possibility of free discussion is not deeply rooted in this concept, or if such behavior occurs, it is in conflict with various understandings of the other existences and expressing the plural existential experiences in order to share other beings within it, rather than achieving a common view of the rational explanation of existence. A free and rational discussion stereotype is a myth that continues to live apart from time and place and away from the historical context in which it grew up. This myth does not consider the political presentation of science that serves as an institution for capitalism in the present state of modern science. The free discussion stereotype substance has now changed as a criterion for distinguishing between civilized societies and primitive societies. It is not useful to explain the context of a rational discussion. It is the same hidden political presentation, in a context of free and rational discussion stereotype and in a general sense of the eternal Western bourgeois civilization. As long as such a mythical notion exists, there is a rational explanation that many arguments have been suggested to prove its viability and applicability deal with the irrational and non-sense tendency. The need to pay close attention to the political myth of the eternity of Western civilization points to a historical point. This historical point reveals that this myth's claim is unfounded. A brief look at the technological and economic advances of Western Europe from the formation of the first free urban center of northern Italy in the Middle Ages to the Dutch and Spanish and Portuguese and Britannic colonial imperialism and continually the largest financial organizations and international companies illustrates in the western civilization like any other Primitive civilizations cannot yet overcome the costs. It is possible to explain this phenomenon to reduce the volume of raw materials and depreciation of capital. Until the revolution in the transportation industry, with the invention of fossil-fuel cars and airplanes and ocean-going vessels, trade gains and losses were balanced even with the increase in losses. The revolution in the transportation industry helped develop commerce, but there were other problems, such as the end of energy reserves. However, as in the past, there was a cost-benefit cycle, and Western civilization could not escape it. The circulation of cost-benefit still exists at the largest scale, as in the past. While the end of the energy and raw materials reserves will certainly destroy the technological superiority of the centers of development and progress of western civilization. Considering the very near possibility of the collapse of the superiority of Western civilization due to the depletion of the treasures of raw materials and energy, it is an explanation of a historical point that shows an irrational explanation of the historical course leading to the current technological state of Western civilization. The eternity of Western civilization is, of course, an imaginary, irrational and unhistorical point that never happens. The point is the consequence of the same political imagination that alerts: the western civilization is the last step of human progress without being able to deeply analyze the past and the possibilities of the future in a historical horizon. Defining toolmaking as the only emergence of progress is the same kind of prevalent mythologizing in western civilization. The progress of the western civilization will end with the end of energy reserves and raw materials. In many cases, western toolmaking reveals its inadequacy. These were possibilities that emerged in the light of a particular type of thought resulting from particular historical circumstances, and the possibility of leaving scientific advancement could be presented and practiced. The paths that led to the creation of Western civilization cannot be the matter of perpetuity that does not change under any circumstances, but the environmental conditions and value constraints of man and the expansion of his horizon and the expansion of his expectation of progress that necessitates the change of such methods. The mythologizing of the knowledge process is a hazardous phenomenon that is the peculiarity and consequence of modern civilization. Modern civilization, by theorizing knowledge in historical circumstances, has delocalized and perpetuated the limits of the human mind through the process of knowledge along with the effective elements to achieve this termination as inclusive affairs. It granted them a mythical aspect in a rational society. To demythologize science, we must return to more firm foundations from historical conditions to construct an authentic knowledge. These foundations are certainly epistemological foundations, and our criteria for comparing these foundations are signs of consciousness in existence. The failure of the categorization technique of scientific knowledge is the collapse point of scientific epistemology that follows the historical condition of the last several centuries. By refining the technique, the mythical status of its immortality can be eliminated. In the light of a rational analysis, we can achieve an improved technique that that will explain the new epistemology on which science will begin a more advanced life. Modifying this technique can eliminate the mythical aspect of its eternity. In short, we can say that the Western human mind, which is the consequence of American and European civilization, is simultaneously rational and mythologized. The status of mythologizing of western civilization are comparable to the civilization of Israel, which in ancient Canaan made a myth about the reality of God and assumed to be itself God's only chosen people. Western civilization has not created this mythical halo around religion, rather around the human individual, and because of the loss of a critical motivation, it cannot think of other ways and cannot even imagine in his mind. The just one way of to be free from a mythical atmosphere is to rethink the epistemological foundations and presuppositions that have led the present situation by considering their historical contexts and removing the mythical aspect of their historical and temporal conditions to have the benefit of a real and original and rational scientific tendency. Two points need to be taken in account about the relationship between man and myth. First, the place of man in existence, which in the last two centuries has assumed to play a central role in Western thought. This central role is the consequence of this mythical motivation that the truth is constructed around human and humanity. The suggestion for the possibility of

concealing the super origin of consciousness in humans causes to consider an important role in the unraveling of existence for humans, but the assumption that truth turns around the human is strongly mythical and has grown up around antirational circles of thought. It is true. Man is capable of altering and reproducing the components of being, but this power is not infinite. This limitation sometimes arises from the nature of man and sometimes refers to human abilities, and in many cases, originates from nonhuman beings living in nature. For example, one wants to build a building that cannot reach its goal due to a sudden flood and suffers from many losses. It is a real event that happened against the wishes of man. As we explained above, in the realm of existence, we deal with occurrences. An occurrence is a consequence of one or more behaviors. These behaviors are the results of the interference of consciousness and its operation on plural forms of existence. From these explanations, we can understand that man is a realm of consciousness operation and consciousness has probably caused such a strange existent on a large scale, but the operation of consciousness is not necessarily related to man and his actions and motives, but in many cases, the human being is receptive to the behavioral actions of other beings, which ultimately result in conscious and affecting behavior and consciousness concealed in man. Humanism is a reduction in the role of human beings and their behaviors and their desires and thoughts. Moreover, it is an irrational reality that has no real manifestation. The heavy task of science is studying the behaviors and substance of occurrences apart from their human aspects and its necessity to consider their ontological aspects. The second point concerns the presentation of modern human. Modern civilization is the last step of human progress. It is really the same political myth of the bourgeoisie that recognizes capitalistic production and its necessities as an eternal reality. This mythologized thought is in stark contrast with the historicity that western civilization is its consequence. This myth confirms the recent issue. Progress cannot be possible except in Western civilization, and then there is no progress except in the Western civilization paradigm. While many technical successes of western civilization if there must be taken in account them as progress it is necessary to be judged by a value system even the generality of western civilization and civilization affair is no exception. If one wants to live in the cave, one cannot be blamed. Western civilization with its corporal progress, has only complicated, and altered the situation. The mass production of capitalism is only an alternative to hunting, agricultural, feudal and micro-industrial production and bourgeoisie, the situation is more complicated, and the cycle is wider; nominating a complicated situation for progress and especially limiting it to a specific time and culture and civilization is nothing but the value judgment. Toolmaking as the only main way of Western civilization to attain complexity is just one behavior that results from the European mental context. Limiting progress to its western form causes to depart from other applicable probable possibilities to obtain complexities. This idea negates the historicity. We can attain its origins by analyzing its constructive causes and factors and circumstances. A brief look at the progress of Western thought from Plato to Nietzsche shows the continuities and breakdowns in which we can see signs of mythical beliefs. Without an empirical system, Plato chose its forms as the ideal truth that that was indivisible. This mythical sense has played a role in religious thought, as it did without a rational discussion, was mythologizing about the metaphysical affair. As noted above, the conscious person was the subject of Renaissance philosophy, and this centralization continued until the nineteenth century. The moral revision of modern human was the matter that prompted Nietzsche to criticize sharply metaphysics, but this radical revision was not made from a rational point of view but was founded on a mythical aspect. Rationality has lost its credit and appreciation because of positivistic radicalism. It is not the problem. Why a mythical explanation of reality has played the role of rationality, because talking about the progress of thought guides us to value judgment, but this point must be illustrated, how we must explain the remaining problems of rational justification for existence. The myth of alteration and the lack of reality continuity have replaced the rational possibilities of singular real truths. The plurality of truth and its hermeneutic interpretations have taken into account without paying attention to other interpretations of truth-comprehending objects such as contradictions of perceptions, paradoxical disinterest in truth, and so on. In addition to humanism, Western thought inherited the unilateralism of nineteenth-century thought that has emerged in the conception of man as a being who can grasp the truth. In line with the positivistic movement of the 19th century, some movements such as the Parnassian movement and some philosophers such as Kierkegaard and Henri Bergson had ontological assumptions about modern human to balance positivistic views about human, but there is a common ground between ontological and positivistic assumptions. This unilateral conception of human contains the (1 and 0) view about human. Diversity and alteration are contents in the Nietzsche's thought that he uses to criticize epistemological propositions. His follower thinkers emphasize this content more. Of course, they also did not benefit of this intellectual theme to rationally explain reality just as diversity in the minds of thinkers such as Gilles Deleuze and Jean Baudrillard was used to illustrate the difference and cultural representation of reality by the modern human. a look at the progress of western thought and its epistemological disorder, the causes of this fact can be explained. The plural reality of existence finds an ontological flavor and is considered as the place of human understanding. We have explained that the belief in the ontological value of being is a mythical fact that can be broken down into its constructive components, as much as lacking the necessary historical foundations to process and result in the aesthetic change of European thought in the nineteenth century. The presentation of particular reality has caused the elimination of essentialism and prevalence of a kind of fluidity of concepts that results from the epistemological rapture of traditional philosophy. This epistemological rapture replaced some concepts such as diversity and difference, which are the most famous contents of postmodern thoughts in explaining existence. Diversity and difference can be a basis to explain the ontological plurality of the universe in the circumstances that we refer to the rational processes of occurrences apart from inexplicable mythical assumptions except at the psychological level and the human desire and aspiration at the historical level based on epistemological categories. The convincing justification for explaining the plural reality of existence is explaining the difference of the consciousness movement in line with the origination of existence. Behaving consciousness has behaved to originate existence. Wherever the uniformity and resemblances have created species consciousness has behaved so. These sheared features that in the traditional and logical and scientific discussions are called generalities are the consequences of the consciousness behaviors to create generalities to describe modern science the resemblances between members of a logical Species and genus. Wherever we observe unknown scientific uncategorized singular behavior and phenomena, we must seek its explanation in the consciousness plurality and variable and separate behaviors to create it. Considering human being as a place to justify behaviors causes to avoids (1 and 0) view of human reactions and confusion to explain the components of human reactions or any other behaving being. We encounter behavioral spectrums. Thus, human performs a range of variable reactions to actions and behaviors.

Power is the behavior that human acts as an active behavior and an occurred behavior that he is its acceptance. Conducting a power-seeking behavior or accepting it or responding to it is a behavior where historical conditions arise from the role of consciousness in creating it, an ontological situation, not a mythical situation that would be the irreversible and inevitable way of human life. The emergence of power requires at least two existents. These two existents are its doer and its acceptance. This situation of the necessity of two behaving is so inclusive that it encompasses different cases such as the greatest human wars and the cosmic collapse of supernova and galaxies. Nietzsche has never paid attention to the circumstances of power emergence in spite of the efforts to revise the moral values of his time and the sharp criticism of metaphysics. The emergence of power is a consequent behavior of the variables. We can analyze its circumstances based on the historical and social and psychological factors and etc. humans are behaving existents that sometimes intend to force some people to accept power, and sometimes they accept themselves power, and sometimes avoid the power race and etc. power can be broken up into its causal components and circumstances within the language paradigm. Power is the spectrum of behaviors whose historical and psychological variables and etc. are its explanatory elements. We have already criticized non-historical tendencies and unilateral lingual presuppositions. Here, we remember again power can also be narrated in the lingual presentation paradigm; if there is not such a possibility, no one would read Nietzsche's message. Another example of the unscientific assumptions of Western civilization is a myth that has no reference to rationality when it is historical. This myth describes the current reality as the only possible type of reality. This myth considers the present world to be the only possible occurrence of this situation. On the matter of the physical or metaphysical substance of knowledge, we will explain that many of the categories of existence relations are metaphysical rather than logical. The relation of present reality to the possibilities of its occurrence is a metaphysical one, and the presentation of the universe ---as it is now--- by other possibilities, is both possible and real. It is possible because we can present that the present world as we confront with it might have emerged through other possibilities, and there was no logical and epistemological barrier to it. The emphasis on its reality is reminiscent of this possibility that we must pay attention to this reality in an empirical study. This fact consideration leads us to the crucial way that we cannot achieve complexities through toolmaking alone. Toolmaking is just one and one way to gain complexity. In the shadow of consideration of toolmaking we have forgotten other possibilities of achieving complexity. Non-instrumental processes have many privileges. Some of these privileges are the lack of depreciation and a better ability to control energy and its little dissipation. The Non-instrumental processes can be used in multi-billion-year long cycles. In the shadow of the instrumental science founded on a mythical value and was presumed as the only way of progress and complexity, these processes neglected. We must consider sunflower as a source of heat and energy of the earth. Apart from the technological problems of nuclear fusion, which is our main obstacle to pursuing the method used in this star, the massive structure of large volumes of gases and their combustion has been the topic of few studies so far. Perhaps more than the technological problems of human futurism and the monopoly of ways to obtain energy through the nuclear reactor are obstacles for developing non-instrumental methods of scientific innovation. It is important to note a point about historical studies. In spite of the high level of historical studies in Western countries, there is a great gap in technical methods derived from other civilizations. Research in other civilizations has had very little to do with philosophical theorizing and the inclusive dignity of theoretical notions. In drawing his picture of communism, Friedrich Engels has referred to Morgan's American anthropological works. Freud cites primary societies to support family and parental order, without suggesting historical and anthropological evidence to explain the origin of the Oedipus complex. Nietzsche also refers to the liberation of ancient Greece and euphoria in explaining the moral slavery of modern man without giving any further explanation and stating what the point of separation between modern and ancient man was. He admires the impertinence and the new affair.

Siegmund Freud, 1924. Friedrich Engels, 1884, band I Vorgeschiedliche Kulturstufen. Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, 1883-1891, , Zoroaster Vorrede, Teil 1,6. Der Seiltänzer und der Passenreißer.

The limitations of the consciousness of European philosophers are of European historical origins, and of the historical notions known to European culture. The strengths and weaknesses of European intellectual heritage and the personality of European thinkers have played a significant role in their conceptualization and ultimately in defining the thinking and culture of their claiming society. Certainly, the non-instrumental methods of the ancient world have been more successful than ever before, despite the lack of expansion of scientific study and its foundations, largely on a practical basis without the developed theoretical background for the use of human resource, but with a deeper study we can gain very broad technical skills. In the field of artificial irrigation, for example, in addition to the canal technique used with great expertise and hard work in ancient Mesopotamian civilization, it is necessary to refer to the underground canals used in the eastern and central Iranian plateaus. This technique had its privileges and deficiencies. We can point to the easy eruption of water from the bottom of the earth as its advantages. There are many disadvantages, such as the excessive use of manpower to periodically ditch a canal and increase its volume of water and dredging and the loss of water due to continuous outflow. However, this method, with all its shortcomings, was the only way to find water for the people living on the Iranian plateau. Reference is made to this historical analysis that the quest to live in different parts of the world continues without regard to access to the tools. The Creative minds were trying to compensate the lack of tools with creative techniques. We discussed another example of technical complexity. The technique of cavalry war based on a long-distance volley based on historical studies, was invented among Indo-European cavalry men for the first time. In the ancient world, Scythians were famous for using this technique. This technique involves a theoretical discussion that is used in our military weapons industry and its organization like before, and that is long-distance war. It is the same principle that guided the development of long-range weapons such as missiles and rockets. The same principle has taken into account in archery bow shooting. These examples are certainly of historical value at present, but we can regard them as human efforts to develop methods and techniques for controlling the environment. These methods must increasingly serve as a guide for the comparative study of the history of civilization and other sub-branches that study each manifestation of civilization in a historical aspect. We must try to put this tendency away from the program of scientific studies. The knowledge process is not devoted to any individual or civilization, and any effort anywhere in the world to contribute to this project is valuable and we must accurately consider it.

Science and existence:

Here we look to the critics that Heidegger has made of scientific methodology. Unlike traditional Western philosophy and the ontology that emerged from that, Heidegger challenged Descartes' new subject-object scheme. Heidegger, 1967, page 59, Das Erkennen von Welt (noe\vn), bzw. das Ansprechen und Besprechen von »Welt« (Iōgoj) fungiert deshalb als der primäre Modus des In-der-Welt-Seins, ohne daß dieses als solches begriffen wird. Weil nun aber diese Seinsstruktur ontologisch unzugänglich bleibt, aber doch ontisch erfahren ist als »Beziehung« zwischen Seiendem (Welt) und Seiendem (Seele) und weil Sein zunächst verstanden wird im ontologischen Anhalt am Seienden als innerweltlichem Seienden, wird versucht, diese Beziehung zwischen den genannten Seienden auf dem Grunde dieser Seienden und im Sinne ihres Seins, d. h. als Vorhandensein zu begreifen. Das In-der-Welt-sein wird – obzwar vorphänomenologisch erfahren und gekannt – auf dem Wege einer ontologisch unangemessenen Auslegung unsichtbar. Man kennt die Daseinsverfassung jetzt nur noch – und zwar als etwas Selbstverständliches – in der Prägung durch die unangemessene Auslegung. Dergestalt wird sie dann zum »evidenten« Ausgangspunkt für die Probleme der Erkenntnistheorie oder »Metaphysik der Erkenntnis«. Ibid, page 66, Das »Umherum«, das für die Umwelt konstitutiv ist, hat jedoch keinen primär »räumlichen« Sinn. Der einer Umwelt unbestreitbar zugehörige Raumcharakter ist vielmehr erst aus der Struktur der Weltlichkeit aufzuklären. Von hier aus wird die in § 12 angezeigte Räumlichkeit des Daseins phänomenal sichtbar. Die Ontologie hat nun aber gerade versucht, von der Räumlichkeit aus das Sein der »Welt« als res extensa zu interpretieren. Die extremste Tendenz zu einer solchen Ontologie der »Welt« und zwar in der Gegenorientierung an der res cogitans, die sich weder ontisch noch ontologisch mit Dasein deckt, zeigt sich bei Descartes. Durch die Abgrenzung gegen diese ontologische Tendenz kann sich die hier versuchte Analyse der Weltlichkeit verdeutlichen. Sie vollzieht sich in drei Etappen: A. Analyse der Umweltlichkeit und Weltlichkeit überhaupt. B. Illustrierende Abhebung der Analyse der Weltlichkeit gegen die Ontologie der »Welt« bei Descartes. C. Das Umhaffte der Umwelt und die »Räumlichkeit« des Daseins.

He chose this general view that the ---understanding being of existence and the existent who asks about existence--- is not against the universe, but he is in the universe he is a member of the universe and in other word he is in the universe. This "being is in the universe".

Heidegger, 1967, page, 52.

As Heidegger suggested, the necessity of Descartes' object-subject scheme disappears. When DASEIN is in the universe, it means that it is not separate from the universe and the universe as the matter of knowledge is not against him. DASEIN appears in the universe. DASEIN understands the universe, DASEIN creates and is reproduced in the universe. Certainly, Heidegger does not deny the scientific value of existence.

For the explanation of the relation between phenomenology and things and the science designation, Heidegger, 1967, pages 34-35. Also page 289. He writes: »Leben« ist ein »Geschäft«, gleichviel ob es seine Kosten deckt oder nicht.

Und so besteht denn mit Rücksicht auf die vulgäre Seinsart des Daseins selbst keine Gewähr, daß die ihr entspringende Gewissensauslegung und die an dieser orientierten Gewissenstheorien für ihre Interpretation den angemessenen ontologischen Horizont gewonnen haben. Trotzdem muß auch die vulgäre Gewissensentfaltung das Phänomen irgendwie - vorontologisch - treffen. Perhaps this pre-existential meeting is the scientific place of phenomena interpretation by DASEIN.

In his belief when we scientifically act, we go beyond the hermeneutic surface of occurrences and we become involved with the logical and apophantic surface of occurrences. Heidegger believes that the applied logical theorems by science having a subject-predicate order only consider the logical surface of the universe and reflect it, but ultimately the issue is that the universe is no exception to the logical surface of the theorems and the hermeneutic surface is vast and the place for the largest part of occurrences in the universe. Heidegger explains his theory and cites to everyday life as an example that DASEIN mainly deals with the hermeneutic surface of occurrences at this level.

Heidegger, 1967, page 126. §27. Das alltägliche Selbstsein und das Man

He identifies existence with its appearances.

In our daily lives we are informed little things about scientific judgments. Heidegger believes that the complete objectivity is not possible ---as science means--- and that all scientists are influenced by their interests, possibilities and restrictions. Heidegger, 1967, page 83, 18. Bewandnis und Bedeutsamkeit; die Weltlichkeit der Welt: Zuhandenes begegnet innerweltlich. Das Sein dieses Seienden, die Zuhandenheit, steht demnach in irgendeinem ontologischen Bezug zur Welt und Weltlichkeit. Welt ist in allem Zuhandenen immer schon »da«. Welt ist vorgängig mit allem Begegnenden schon, obzwar unthematisch, entdeckt. Sie kann aber auch in gewissen Weisen des umweltlichen Umgangs aufleuchten. Welt ist es, aus der her Zuhandenes zuhanden ist. Wie kann Welt Zuhandenes begegnen lassen? Die bisherige Analyse zeigte: das innerweltlich Begegnende ist für die besorgende Umsicht, das Rechnungstragen, in seinem Sein freigegeben. Was besagt diese vorgängige Freigabe, und wie ist sie als ontologische Auszeichnung der Welt zu verstehen? Vor welchen Problemen stellt die Frage nach der Weltlichkeit der Welt?

Die Zeugverfassung des Zuhandenen wurde als Verweisung angezeigt. Wie kann Welt das Seiende dieser Seinsart hinsichtlich seines Seins freigeben, warum begegnet dieses Seiende zuerst? Als bestimmte Verweisungen nannten wir Dienlichkeit zu, Abträglichkeit, Verwendbarkeit und dergleichen. Das Wozu einer Dienlichkeit und das Wofür einer Verwendbarkeit zeichnen je die mögliche Konkretion der Verweisung vor. Das »Zeigen« des Zeichens, das »Hämmern« des Hammers sind aber nicht die Eigenschaften des Seienden. He believes there is no constant universe. Being in the world is designated by a set of relations between DASEIN and other things. DASEIN confronts with an in advance universe, therefore there is no calm universe. DASEIN and all things are becoming. Consequently, there is no contrast between DASEIN and the universe, because all things are becoming. Thus, there is no objectivity ---as Descartes means---. Each understanding is a part of the being in the universe process. The problem is not the true or false concept. The issue is the perception of each DASEIN of the universe. Each DASEIN can understand. Each understanding is objective. Therefore, science is not free of the socio-economic and cultural motivations of the society in which scientific activities are conducted. Therefore, Descartes's scientific endeavors never benefit from complete objectivity, and the scientist's motivations and mental contexts always distract him from the objectivity he desires. It mainly appears in the humanities,

whose subjects are related to human beings who interact with other human beings and continue to their life with effects and influences on each other. A researcher can not only play the role of a referee either on the subject matter or on the purpose of the study; in addition, in an empirical experiment perfect control and reproducibility of the "one hundred percent success experimental conditions" is almost impossible and such as utopia.

Therefore, in Heidegger's belief, complete objectivity is not achieved in most cases. Because of his existentialist stance, Heidegger believes that the study of objects in the Cartesian pattern is to separate those objects from the context of He says since the central theme of history is the possibilities of (the never seen before) existents and there are existence. always potentially such facts in the historical corporeal world, so these orientations can relentlessly demand such actualizations. 1967, page 395. Science develops scientific researches and upsets instruments, effects culture human's spiritual knowledge and history's ideas as their own objects. Ultimately, he says science has a close growing connection with his virtual themes. He adds: a historian who has been observing the world view of old times from the outset has not still been proven that he understands his object virtually and historically not only aesthetically.

Therefore, in many situations, objectivity is not obtain based on the Heidegger's belief and claim. Heidegger believes that studying Cartesian categories is to "disentangle" the categories and objects and place them in a context that leads to them being inferior. Finally, Heidegger seeks the crisis of today's society in the inadequate attitude of the 'epophantic' to the theories and homelessness of today's humans, that technology has meant to change existents to the tools used by humans.

He writes: Um an die Zeugwelt »verloren« »wirklich« zu Werke gehen und hantieren zu können, muß sich das Selbst vergessen. Sofern aber in der Einheit der Zeitigung des Besorgens je ein Gewärtigen führt, ist gleichwohl, wie wir noch zeigen werden, das eigene Seinkönnen des besorgenden Daseins in die Sorge gestellt. Heidegger, 1967, page 354.

Heidegger makes some major criticisms of the situation and method of science. Science is not capable of explaining its substance and possibilities and any kind of talk about the substance and subject and method of science is out of the question of science and related to philosophy. Science with a subject-predicate tendency toward propositions leads to the extrapolation of subjects and categories from their ontological domain and used for tool making and alienation. Empirical sciences cannot define their subjects. For example, physics, which is the subject of movement and nature as it really is, we can never find the depth of the issues for which it is intended because objects such as the motion of God and human and nature are issues that philosophy deals with and empirical knowledge cannot look beyond their borders. Heidegger believes; science does not really think and the gap between science and thinking is not bridgeable. Heidegger, Die Vorlesung im Wintersemester 1951-52 ... Die Stundenübergänge pages 3-

4. The study of things apart from their ontological contexts involves nothing but the crisis of modern societies. Now we are not discussing other solutions that are very personal, but the flaws raised should find the expected answer answers as science can continue its way to discover existence. The subject-object scheme of Descartes was coupled with a mechanical presentation of the universe to continue the process of knowledge. Descartes finally thought that we could know the exact working points of the human brain as we can know all the details of the clock work. This mechanical presentation has led Descartes to know the laws of the current world that can never be defied. Newtonian mechanic also affirms this tendency. When a systematic generality is presented, its constituents and preliminaries will naturally follow their special laws. Any lawlessness can be traced to the smallest components of this generality. We can find the emergence of the lawlessness of components and the lawlessness of methods in the subject-predicate propositions of empirical sciences. These statements, together with our conclusions, guide us to the ordered substance of the universe, but in the light of our proposed axiom based on the pursuit of the hidden forms of consciousness in existence and changing the mechanical presentation of materials in a flexible way to the kinetic laws in the subatomic layer, we must state otherwise. We doubted the mechanistic presentation of the material in the light of Heisenberg's proposed principle and noted that materials behave differently at different times. This conclusion is in the light of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle that modern science must change its descriptive mechanistic tendency toward the world and explain the kind of fluidity in which materials behave differently. The fluidity has some profound consequences for changing our perception of the universe. Given this fluidity and flexibility and the mechanical surfaces that were hitherto considered to be levels free of flexibility, we can present a broad horizon for describing the behavior of beings. I do not intend to claim that with this new tendency of science it will be free from the logical and systematic approach because the logical approach is the only common place that the scientist can achieve a common description of the universe. So, we can ask what is the determination of hermeneutic level that Heidegger states in his works. That level of the universe that encompasses our daily lives. That surface of the universe that comprises our unscientific and non-logical and personal judgments, how can we justify it? Should we neglect all the differences between beliefs and judgments and preferences and values? Can we categorize the level of hermeneutics as a descriptive face of the universe? The answer to this question in the light of the above axiom is positive the hermeneutic surface is not free from the hidden forms of consciousness. All the values, preferences and non-scientific layers of our daily lives can be full of hidden forms of consciousness. By studying the hidden forms of consciousness in every human object we can find an especial criterion for his hermeneutic universe. By moving away from induction as a model for collecting scientific data and avoiding the replacement of consciousness with consciousness, we can solve the problem of the consequence of Cartesian differentiation between subject and object. If the scientist instead of tracing the hidden forms of consciousness and drawing conclusion from a particular affair and its projection to a general applied empirical scientific concept, considers the realities and occurrences and beings as the consciousness carriers, then he can go beyond the surface of phenomena and perceive the universe as it really is. We cannot claim that a scientist's challenge with the subject under study has been fully resolved because much of the research is aimed at studying DASEIN's preferences and aspirations, but many of the problems of empirical sciences are related with confusion about the tendency to confront the subject under study. At present empirical sciences approach to the subject under study is mainly a statistical approach, heard hear of such news from television and radio is ordinary. Fatness Increases the risk of diabetes or sport is at a percentage affective in gaining self-confidence. The lack of

empirical sciences determination to specify their subjects increases tendency for induction and probabilistic and statistical generalizations. In the meantime, these probabilistic and statistical trends never fully benefit from complete certainty. Thus, an inductive tendency, in addition to some major deficiencies, is raised, unable to bring the scientist closer to the subject under study and does not help eliminating this challenge. Heidegger's critique of Descartes's for the inadequacy of knowledge obtained by subject-object confronting can on the other hand be his own. In his existentialist view, Heidegger recognizes Dasein as the center of the universe. He completes DASEIN universality by going through three stages of existence, temporality and language. From this point of view, it seems that other beings, along with humans, have been taken into consideration. This is human that is the center of knowledge, creativity discovery and reproduction in the universe. The DASEIN chooses among the possibilities of other existents and selects existents based on his favor type of creativity and reproduction, but it seems that choosing a slightly different point of view will help broaden the horizon for a more complete view of the universe. There are consciousness and plural forms of existence in front of us. If there is a difference between the phenomena, it depends on the appeared difference in the plural forms of existence. Humans are also members of this series but at higher levels of consciousness, but the formula of existence +consciousness about him is although true. He goes on to point out the metaphysical origins of beings in his understanding of the origins of metaphysics. He states that metaphysics from Plato to Nietzsche only focused on existents in general and ignores existence as a present concept that encompasses all existents. This ignorance of existence in its inclusive sense as made us forget and depreciate the questioning about the other causal possibilities of the universe origination.

To explain a broader concept of causality Heidegger, 1954, page 2. He writes: Wohin gehört dergleichen wie ein Mittel und ein Zweck? Ein Mittel ist solches, wodurch etwas bewirkt und so erreicht wird. Was eine Wirkung zur Folge hat, nennt man Ursache. Doch nicht nur jenes, mittels dessen ein anderes bewirkt wird, ist Ursache. Auch der Zweck, demgemäß die Art der Mittel sich bestimmt, gilt als Ursache. Also, to criticize Platon, not to obtain to the whole truth concept ibid, page 8 he writes Wir Spätgeborenen sind nicht mehr imstande zu ermessen, was es heißt, daß Platon es wagt, für das, was in allem und jedem west, das Wort eidos zu gebrauchen. Denn eidos bedeutet in der alltäglichen Sprache die Ansicht, die ein sichtbares Ding unserem sinnlichen Auge darbietet. Platon mutet jedoch diesem Wort das ganz Ungewöhnliche zu. Jenes zu benennen, was gerade nicht und niemals mit sinnlichen Augen vernehmbar wird. Aber auch so ist des Ungewöhnlichen noch keineswegs genug. Denn idea nennt nicht nur das nichtsinnliche Aussehen des sinnlich Sichtbaren. Aussehen, idea heißt und ist auch, was im Hörbaren, Tastbaren Fühlbaren, in jeglichem, was irgendwie zugänglich ist, das Wesen ausmacht. Ibid, page 13-14 «Wesen», verbal verstanden, ist das Selbe wie «währen»; nicht nur bedeutungsmäßig, sondern auch in der lautlichen Wortbildung. Schon Sokrates und Platon denken das Wesen von etwas als das Wesende im Sinne des Währenden. Doch sie denken das Währende als das Fortwährende (aei on). Doch sie denken das Währende als das Fortwährende (aei on). Das Fortwährende finden sie aber in dem, was sich als das Bleibende durchhält bei jeglichem, was vorkommt. Dieses Bleibende wiederum entdecken sie im Aussehen (eidos, idea), z. z. B. in der Idee «Haus». In ihr zeigt sich jenes, was jedes so Geartete ist. Die einzelnen wirklichen und möglichen Häuser sind dagegen wechselnde und vergängliche Abwandlungen der «Idee» und gehören deshalb zu dem Nichtwährenden. Nun ist aber auf keine Weise jemals zu begründen, daß das Währende einzig und allein in dem beruhen soll, was Platon als die idea, Aristoteles als to ti en einai (jenes, was jegliches je schon war), was die Metaphysik in den verschiedensten Auslegungen als essentia denkt.

moreover, Heidegger, under the influence of Nietzsche, threw away the prevailing presentation of the constancy of the universe and of a wise agent who had been founded prior to Plato and Aristotle and was firmly established in the Middle Ages in relation to Judeo-Christian beliefs. The rational scheme of history was totally refused, the constant foundation of the universe and occurrences were seriously doubted. Nietzsche in a general revision denied the necessity of any kind of absolute truth and even presumed it as an illusion and phantasy. He called philosophers lawyers that trying to forge their claims as objectivity and a step to discover the truth. Heidegger eventually, under the influence of Nietzsche's sharp criticism, preferred to avoid metaphysical issues and explained existence in a non-metaphysical paradigm therefore, he emphasized the appearance as the rise of existence in front of nothing. This is existence that occurs in the different forms on realm of time, and we must grasp the appearance of plural forms of existence to attain the substance of existence. Perhaps such a perception about existence knowledge has led him to blame Descartes and the western tradition of philosophy till his time, but the problem remains. The main problem of Heidegger in contrast to Descartes theory must be considered. Descartes considered the confrontation between subject and object to begin the process of knowledge, and Heidegger emphasized appearance as the rise of existence in plural forms. Descartes believed that the object and subject are two separate affairs that in Heidegger's view have confronted human as a knower subject in front of the universe which is ultimately the cause of human's homelessness and the lack of his universe, but Heidegger himself had to understand existence to use an indefinable and indivisible concept into its constructive components. We do not encounter the abstract existence in its bare sense. Existence never reveals itself to us except in its extensions. Heidegger goes on to criticize the philosophical tradition until his own time that the tradition of Western philosophy was in conformity with the existing tendency to govern metaphysical discourses in a self-centered manner, namely it is presumed to put man at the center of the universe and truth in his service and his life and gain power. This tendency makes human beings see the world from their perspective, and in Heidegger's view, the last step in believing in existence priority is the belief of technology users that the world is the source of raw materials for change and artificial production. Man evaluates everything as his tool and raw material for change. It is the same tendency that causes DASEIN to lose his home and his universe. Man uses the earth technologically more than his possibilities capacity. The same metaphysical belief in existent of the tradition of western philosophy has caused human and universe dispute in the final Cartesian subject-object scheme. Man is outside the world and in front of it and must study it as an object outside the subject under study in order to know it and its consequence away from the lack of universe and rootlessness and nihilism. This critique has led Heidegger to conclude that the solution to the metaphysical questions and issues is the question about existence and its unique concept against existents. Heidegger conceptualized existence for the elimination of Cartesian subject-object dualism and spoke of existence as the only one that puts the appearance of clothing on existents. Heidegger himself negated any non-historical foundation in the formation of the universe and historical occurrences because of the rejection of the theological god by following the beliefs perhaps expressed at the highest level in the Nietzsche doctrine. Historical occurrences and the universe are shaped by the temporal and spatial conditions and by the change of many other

variables and processes and are completed and destroyed and eventually dispersed. Plural forms of existence such as beeswax are captured by temporal conditions and positions and many other unknown variables. Thus, Heidegger's scheme for experiencing existence incorporates a non-historical, indivisible element into its constructive particulars. Contrary to the Heidegger's claims to represent the historical and temporal conditions of existence he never recognizes any explanatory signs of the appearance in the universe. The hermeneutic level of occurrence is full of plural forms of existence and encompasses the various appearances of existents in the universe, but this level of appearance of existence does not explain any knowledge. The hermeneutic level of occurrences is full of the preferences of the appearances of existence. It is possible that this level expresses the various perceptions and experiences of existence, with no explanatory relation between them. We can fundamentally answer these kinds of questions in order to explain the ontological categories that follow the same Cartesian subject-object proposition and to believe in the existents in Western philosophy, but contrary to this thought the question arises: what is the concept of the confrontation between the hermeneutic level and the logical level of occurrences in Heidegger's view? Where did these logical inadequate categories come from and what do they contain? Another point is the common universe of DASEINS. If there is not any common comprehension between DASEINS how can we talk about DASEINS as a whole concept? What are the features of DASEIN? DASEIN himself does things contrary to Heidegger's claim in line with the presence in the universe and his appearance in existence. Heidegger recognizes technology the main cause of the rootlessness and homelessness of modern human and his deprivation of the original experiencing of presence.

Heidegger, 1954, page 12. Writes Das Wesen der Technik ist als ein Geschick des Entbergens die Gefahr. Die gewandelte Bedeutung des Wortes «Gestell» wird uns jetzt vielleicht schon um einiges vertrauter, wenn wir Ge-stell im Sinne von Geschick und Gefahr denken. Die Bedrohung des Menschen kommt nicht erst von den möglicherweise tödlich wirkenden Maschinen und Apparaturen der Technik. Die eigentliche Bedrohung hat den Menschen bereits in seinem Wesen angegangen. Die Herrschaft des Ge-stells droht mit der Möglichkeit, daß dem Menschen versagt sein könnte, in ein ursprünglicheres Entbergen einzukehren und so den Zuspruch einer anfänglicheren Wahrheit zu erfahren. So ist denn, wo das Ge-stell herrscht, im höchsten Sinne Gefahr.«Wo aber Gefahr ist, wächst Das Rettende auch.» he believes das Gestell wokes das Rettende. The real throat is concealed in the substance of human. Thus, in the contrary of all unhistorical approaches he presupposes a universal substance for human. Human can be saved or can be perished. He propounds the possibilities and throats in relation with human life and experiences. Also about (being without the world) Heidegger, 1967, pages 55-56. Es gibt nicht so etwas wie das »Nebeneinander« eines Seienden, genannt »Dasein«, mit anderem Seienden, genannt »Welt«. Das Beisammen zweier Vorhandener pflegen wir allerdings sprachlich zuweilen z. B. so auszudrücken: »Der Tisch steht ›bei der Tür«, »der Stuhl ›berührt die Wand«. »der Stuhl ›berührt die Wand«. Von einem »Berühren« kann streng genommen nie die Rede sein und zwar nicht deshalb, weil am Ende immer bei genauer Nachprüfung sich ein Zwischenraum zwischen Stuhl und Wand feststellen läßt, sondern weil der Stuhl grundsätzlich nicht, und wäre der Zwischenraum gleich Null, die Wand berühren kann Voraussetzung dafür wäre, daß die Wand »für« den Stuhl begegnen könnte. Seiendes kann ein innerhalb der Welt vorhandenes Seiendes nur berühren, wenn es von Hause aus die Seinsart des In-Seins hat – wenn mit seinem Da-sein schon so etwas wie Welt ihm entdeckt ist, aus der her Seiendes in der Berührung sich offenbaren kann, um so in seinem Vorhandensein zugänglich zu werden. Zwei Seiende, die innerhalb der Welt vorhanden und überdies an ihnen selbst weltlos sind, können sich nie »berühren«, keines kann »bei« dem andern »sein«. Der Zusatz: »die überdies weltlos sind«, darf nicht fehlen, weil auch Seiendes, das nicht weltlos ist, z. B. das Dasein selbst, »in« der Welt vorhanden ist, genauer gesprochen: mit einem gewissen Recht in gewissen Grenzen als nur Vorhandenes aufgefaßt werden kann. Hierzu ist ein völliges Absehen von, bzw. Nichtsehen der existenzialen Verfassung des In-Seins notwendig Mit dieser möglichen Auffassung des »Daseins« als eines Vorhandenen und nur noch Vorhandenen darf aber nicht eine dem Dasein eigene Weise von »Vorhandenheit« zusammengeworfen werden. Diese Vorhandenheit wird nicht zugänglich im Absehen von den spezifischen Daseinsstrukturen, sondern nur im vorherigen Verstehen ihrer. Dasein versteht sein eigenstes Sein im Sinne eines gewissen »tatsächlichen Vorhandenseins«.1 Und doch ist die »Tatsächlichkeit« der Tatsache des eigenen Daseins ontologisch grundverschieden vom tatsächlichen Vorkommen einer Gesteinsart.

Technology itself is the consequence of any kind of tendency is undoubtedly the result of human activities away from an original experience of existence that comes from Heidegger's thought. If DASEIN is a unique existent thus why all DASEINS do not have the chance to experience directly and originally existence and for example the poet becomes an intermediate for DASEIN relationship with the heaven. Therefore, DASEIN is not the existent which its scheme can be traced to Heidegger's thought. The wars and quarrels that many have exemplified in human history are generally in line with the confrontation between the hermeneutic contradictory interpretations of active DASEINS in the universe. By ignoring the logical level of the universe, problems remain as they were in the past presenting themselves to us. Moreover, any system of thought that does not take into account the historical and spatial conditions and the variables of its matters in general will be doomed to failure. As Heidegger not only fails to analyze the concept of existence, he cannot correctly understand the cause of the failure of empirical sciences, but in the knowledge of the universe the relation between the plural forms of existence and consciousness is forgotten. Paying attention to a point in analyzing the concept of existence can be crucial. To solve metaphysical problems, in order to benefit from them in order to consider their utilities for life, plural forms of existence are necessary. This means that the plural forms of existence are obstacles to our contact with existence as a bare and inclusive concept. In the shadow of the above axiom what do mean the plural forms of existence? The answer to this question is crucial and significant. Plural forms of existence encompass the appearances of consciousness and for this reason we can find many variations of existence. Perhaps we can ask that the hidden consciousness in things is not necessitating plurality and why heterogeneous consciousness should not prevent us from being considered it as a concept. We can point out that consciousness is a mystery of the universe, and we can never know its substance unless we say that consciousness is a process and we can understand the signs and effects of it in all existence realms. If one asks about the definition of consciousness, consciousness cannot be quantifiable except in its manifestations such as language, planning, and choice. The issue, which we do not know its substance relates to the conditions and contexts of consciousness formation. In addition to the hidden consciousness signs in all phenomena causes the appearance of difference. However, if we are to consider existence as the origin of beings apart from its extensions, plurality is so diverse that we will be confused. Consciousness signs in the universe are interestingly

systematic; such a way that advances in empirical sciences are impossible except in the shadow of tracing the consciousness signs in the universe.

Ultimately, consciousness as a plural phenomenon can be analyzed from a variety of perspectives, but existence because of having no specific sign except at the hermeneutic level cannot be understood as a positive concept for scientific analysis. Here we will discuss the critics raised about logical subject-predicate theorems. We mentioned that the apophantic level of occurrences does not reflect all reality. Many of the inaccessible aspects of an occurrence are far from this level. All empirical scientists have been studying the phenomena from their own perspective and ultimately the picture of the studied occurrence or phenomenon is only part of the reality, incomplete and indecisive.

For example, water, according to a chemist, is composed of its constituent elements and is summarized in formula H_2O while other scientists consider water from other perspectives. Another critic is related to the indetermination to recognize empirical sciences matters and the inability of these sciences to analyze their claimed matters to drive from the realm of empirical sciences. It is natural in scientific knowledge that each science studies about existence from its own view and its considered topic. Because existence knowledge is ultimately the determination to recognize the relation of consciousness and the plural forms of existence, each set of branches of empirical sciences analyzes a kind of existence variation and a path of consciousness concealing into a specific type of variety. Understanding existence through a general concept of existence is an inadequate understanding of the universe. In this kind of conceptualization of existence, there is still a separation between the apophantic level and the hermeneutic level. If theorems are not adequate to discover the truth, why are there in such an imperfect state, and what do they reflect in existence. Perhaps the existence of a logical level is the consequence of the hidden common universe of all existents. Moreover, empirical science can be established as long as general researchable models are available, and they have a new topic to discover and explore, and there is no limit to adding a new title to the list of empirical sciences. Whether their topic is a general concept or is a specific and single case of one's behavior. Empirical sciences are the sources of information about various appearances of existence. To know the universe, it is necessary to be conscious of it. We need to study to gain consciousness. As we have stated, the universe is the consequence of the praxis of consciousness in relation to plural forms of existence, and empirical science, to succeed in knowing the matters, must replace the relation of consciousness and plural forms of existence in the matters studied with induction to obtain a scientific explanation. No one expects science to give us information about things outside its scope. Because of the diversity of forms of existence and its relation to consciousness and the complexity of the phenomenon of consciousness to obtain its substance, we must consider the strange phenomenon and the miracle of existence from various perspectives. The general approach to existence and understanding it is the responsibility of philosophy and the preparation of preliminaries of this knowledge and the detection of the various corners of existence in the hands of empirical science. Philosophy is also responsible for proposing ways for methodologically explaining the movement of empirical sciences toward direct and certain knowledge. Thought and forms of thought in the paradigm of philosophy are the places of existence knowledge, but to think we must know. Someone who does not know he cannot think. So, expecting science to judge of the related matters to thought is an unjustified expectation. The climber first collects information about the summit route and weather conditions and any information needed. He must not expect a weather station or a clothier sport that guides him in choosing cloth or gathering information about the climatic conditions leading him to his destination or deciding which route to go or stop hiking or continue camping. The other problem is the lack of presentation of DASEIN. DASEIN not only biologically has no specific content ---this field claims to have an apophantic knowledge about DASEIN--- has no specific content but also does not pursue any specific categorized generality at the hermeneutic level. Humans have been very heterogeneous behaviors in their appearance history on earth. Due to the lack of documentary evidence from the late paleontological timeline of human life, we cannot report an acceptable documentary picture of the history and course of human life. A large number of different causes and perspectives have recently been suggested for the study of life phenomena, most of which are doomed to failure due to the lack of study of the signs of consciousness and their relation to individual and social human behaviors. There is a dispute between the two circles of thought, one focusing on structures and the other on cultural factors. Structuralism mainly emphasizes non-historical factors and determinism and the cultural circle emphasizes historical and cultural circumstances and human creativity and the possibility of behavior. Conflicts, different value judgments, disputes, different preferences and conditions that cause human confusion and the many factors and variables that make human behavior real are issues that still have a long way to go. Until we can draw a picture that is most consistent with the reality of his substance, we must continue to study him, but Heidegger seems to follow the man in the tradition of Western philosophy as a definable generality if all non-historical tendencies to study other universe are doomed to failure. To explain the world, it seems that concepts must be accompanied by behavioral models. Instead of talking about the concept of causality, we want to talk about the contexts and backgrounds of an occurrence and behavior in order to come closer discovering the set of conditions that cause occurring a behavior to get to know the universe. Another shortcoming of existentialism against the belief in the existence is that there is no sign in the plural forms of existence and the inability to obtain signs or explanatory signs. Perhaps the reason for the prevailing viewpoint of belief in existents in the Western philosophy tradition was the lack of ability to find explanatory signs in existence. Another issue is the logical explanation of scientific propositions. The hermeneutic approach to existence is not fundamentally a cognitive approach. This approach expresses a non-cognitive understanding of existence. The hermeneutic understanding encompasses the judgements, preferences and various perspectives and many forms of behavior that opens the way for the various perceptions and experiences of existence, without being able to provide effective horizons for solving complex problems such as the termination of the universe, the relation of consciousness and plural forms of existence and the quality of the existence creation from nothing. Heidegger, to consolidate the new metaphysical tradition was influenced by Kant and his contemporary new-Kantian philosophers

The work of Paul Gerhard Natorp. 1921. Platons Ideenlehre, EINE EINFÜHRUNG IN DEN IDEALISMUS o. Professor der Philosophie an der

Universität Marburg Leipzig — Verlag von Felix Meiner — 1921 Druck von Ernst. Klöppel in Quedlinburg.

https://archive.org/stream/platosideenlehre00natouoft/platosideenlehre00natouoft_djvu.txt ERSTES KAPITEL. Die Erinnerung an die verbale Herkunft ist

aber gerade im platonischen Gebrauch von *Idia* noch kräftig.

Sehr oft ist bei diesem Wort, im Unterschied von *slodo*, nicht bloß passivisch an das Gesehene, den Anblick, den die Sache bietet, sondern mindestens zugleich aktivisch an das Sehen, die Sicht oder Hinsicht, den Anblick als Tätigkeit des Blickenden zu denken. So war dies *V/ort* wie *ausersehen*, um die Entdeckung des Logischen, d. i. der eigenen Gesetzlichkeit, kraft deren das Denken sich seinen Gegenstand gleichsam hinschauend gestaltet, nicht als gegebenen bloß *hinnim.mt*, in ihrer ganzen Ursprünglichkeit und lebendigen Triebkraft auszudrücken und dem Bewußtsein festzuhalten. *human is an active being in relation with IDOS. In addition to understanding IDOS is related with his appetite for life. In Heidegger's view the criterion for truth is the lack of concealment and discovery of the universe for DASEIN, but Plato believes in the correspondence as a criterion for truth and the universality of reason power.*

On the one hand, who believed that metaphysical problems could not be solved, and on the other, by Nietzsche, who generally regarded metaphysical issues as hostile and he eventually abandoned the discussion of these categories or postponed to other circumstances. To find metaphysical categories in thought systems that claim to eliminate these categories we do not need to go far beyond discussion any choice in existence is a metaphysical affair because we cannot analyze it with taking a materialistic approach. Metaphysical categories are not just dedicated to the non-sensible appearances of existence or the super creator. Metaphysics is flowing in all stages of our lives. In his analysis of existence and its common relation to metaphysics, Heidegger was influenced by his new Kantian contemporary philosophers, who in Kant's insight, Kant's believed in the restriction of the reason for knowing the universe. The restriction of reason appears in the analysis of noumenon and phenomenon, reflecting the conflict between empiricism and rationalism. Before Kant, philosophers such as Hume, skeptical of certain logical concepts, such as causality and induction, set out to explain the restrictions of human epistemology. To explain the degrees of human knowledge, induced to innovate the concept of noumenon and phenomenon. This conceptual dualism not only opened the way for a degree of knowledge but also satisfied the empiricists who believed that the substance of things is beyond human empirical accessibility. Nietzsche was a thinker who challenged the epistemological context of his era. He doubted the paths that thinkers had taken from Plato to his day, fundamentally doubting metaphysical premises, saying that we could not attain the objectivity claimed by philosophers. On the other hand, in the first decades of the twentieth century, positivism emerged as a movement with a belief in a mechanistic and empirical approach, and increasingly used these propositions and claimed that propositions that could not be logically verifiable basically invalid propositions. It is true that thought went a different way in Europe, but the limitation of the ability of the human reason to know the universe and the denial of metaphysics as an effective tradition remained legacy. In addition to the tradition of thought, Heidegger has also inherited the cultural destruction of European societies. By that time, science had proven his inability to answer human questions. So it was time for the emergence of an approach to the universe that claimed the experience of existence rather than the claim of normative knowledge. In other words, science and technology were to blame for all human catastrophes. Heidegger's perception of the appearance of existence on existents opened the way for a kind of cultural pluralism. Technology and the originality of tools and desire to change the land arbitrarily and exploit it beyond its capacity made it far from the existential originality of experience. To return to the origin of existence, we must open the way for the appearance of existence on existents, and we must allow the universe to speak to us. Scientific knowledge of the universe is considered inexplicable and inadequate, and its consequence is that technology is to blame for all human problems. If apart from that time, European cultural atmosphere takes hold of the situation, then science will find its way into the path of knowledge, and we can overcome the problems of technology by changing the applied scientific technique. So far, scientific knowledge was founded on observation of the particular phenomena studied in the empirical sciences and the conclusion of a general concept or a general behavioral model from the observed empirical cases. Science selects the matter under study through consideration of laws and scientific experiences. An empirical experiment must be repeatable and can be verified, but in addition to the complexity of many cases and the lack of observability and repeatability associated with more or less different conditions, it is difficult to decide on the scientific method, but these discrepancies are the consequences of the foundation of Western philosophy on the unstable basis on which science has grown. The inability of science to answer human questions and the technological crisis is not a consequence of scientific inability and lack of the foundation of scientific knowledge. Current problems are the result of inadequate technique of scientific categories and excessive emphasis on toolmaking as the only way to suggest that science must be continued in order to reach the goals and answer human questions. Rather than studying the relation of consciousness and the plural forms of existence, science has focused on the carriers of consciousness. The superficial resemblance of the two existents is as far as important that the appearance of consciousness is one way. We must replace toolmaking by other possibilities as the only way to achieve one's wishes and only answer human questions. The evolution of life on earth, as the earth does not have the capacity to meet human needs, is what comes from technology in the sense of looking at the world as a source of raw materials and change of beings in the direction of human desire. Modern science must pay attention to the automatic processes by which nature governs massive systems of material and energy. This suffering from technology is due to over-emphasis on toolmaking. Tools are now extending to human life. Every activity we can do, man has made a tool to do it better. Existing tools have imported another variable in human life that which may be the root cause of many problems, and that is the hastiness variable. The human's brain is not able to quickly analyze all the signals, waves and stresses it receives. Perhaps, the reason for many of disputes conflicts, and the emotional and psychological crisis of human is the hastiness variable. The main reason for the hastiness expansion in human's life is technology. Technology has unprecedentedly accelerated human activity by streamlining activities and rapidly converting raw materials into products, but the human brain lacks the ability to adapt or react to it with its recognized abilities. Human is a consequence of nature and returns to nature. In order to live a better life, he must be united with nature. Nature is the real place of his life. The human cannot run away from nature except by embracing destructive conflicts. The solution is not immersing in toolmaking as an alternative approach instead of the less advanced steps of toolmaking. It is not true to say that we can compensate costs and aftermaths of current tools by making them simpler and cheaper. Here we do not mean that the

toolmaking is totally omitted from human life. Toolmaking as one of the ways forward man has shown his respectful success in repairing some defects in expensive and inefficient tools. For example, we can point to a computer that has at least partially inhibited paper at least for writing, or in the field of digital cache and the emergence of new formats, the use of raw materials to produce cassettes, books, the notebook is down. Achieving automated processes of nature management offers us a wider horizon of toolmaking rather than nature control with technology. Surely, we should not regard toolmaking as an ended process in human life. Access to automated processes of nature can even fundamentally change toolmaking. One of the horizons of this approach is to simplify and reduce tool aftermaths. Imagine a piano, For example. To make this musical instrument, a lot of preparations we need to make hear a sound. The wood needed to be reproduced. A certain amount of metal is required. Ultimately, high expertise is needed to make a piano, but if we present the horizon of toolmaking, life will be very different. Instead of processing a great deal of wood and metal and imagining a great deal of skill and technology to build a piano, we can look for ways to manage any amount of energy we want in less material. We make tools just to get us to our goal at any cost. With this approach, we never pay attention to the costs and the consequences and the lack of possibilities to do better. If we can manage the amount of energy needed to build a piano on one or more pieces of paper, can we imagine how wide the horizon for making a musical instrument or in general, any kind of toolmaking in any future human life? To achieve the flowing automated processes of nature and to integrate it with systematic toolmaking without harmful consequences, we can avoid the effects of technology and human emotional conflicts and alienation. At present toolmaking is unrestricted and uncontrolled. This uncontrollable and savage devil takes man wherever he pleases, and man can do nothing. Nature's automated processes, coupled with toolmaking, can give humans a better life. We'll give an example. By using the aircraft as a tool, we can travel on specific routes that are difficult for humans to reach, such as continental routes in a short time, but how and at what cost can this fuel be prepared? The source of fuel is mainly old fossils that are hidden deep in the ground. These resources will end soon. We need to look for larger resources to respond to human fuel needs. Our gaze to the sun is the warmest star on the planet; A place where one of nature's automatic processes, in a continuous way, provides the preliminaries of the good-hearted sunlight. This process is nuclear fusion. The sun produces fuel without pollution. The process of generating energy in the sun has no cost. We have the lowest cost by producing aircraft fueled the way energy is produced in the sun and can experience higher speeds in less time. Another point about restricting the tool horizon as the only method of scientific advancement is to obtain short ranges and the minimum possibility of experience. Consider the space around our planet. The farthest distance that man has been able to travel is the moon, which is almost Earth-bound on a cosmic scale. Now consider how much of this endless space is unknown to man. How much of the known space has been directly studied? If we were to travel the world space shuttle at the current speed, we would have to travel several billion light-years. Thus, we must reach high speeds in less time to travel longer distances. The current toolmaking approach does not promise such a broad horizon. On the one hand, current tools do not have the capacity to travel such distances, on the other hand, fueling these tools is expensive and discouraging, and probably impossible. We need to build new tools and reduce the costs and aftermaths of the tool. Still, science's suggested approach to know the universe ---as it really is--- seems conclusive, and its problems stem from the inefficient technique and inappropriate path picture determination.

Philosophy as diversity and difference.
Here, we discuss a significant issue among postmodern philosophers, which is critical to eradicating the doubt about the scientific categorization technique and further explaining the pivotal efforts to eliminate dualism between the Cartesian subject and the object. Here we will discuss diversity and difference as the two principles governing life and two fundamental themes of the French thinker Gilles Deleuze. Deleuze believes that life is a realm of creativity and change and mutation and must be presumed as a place of endless experiencing and creativity, not a step to reach or depart from a general truth. Because in Deleuze's view, any general and inclusive status of truth does not guide us to an immediate change and a termination of existents. Deleuze extends the concept of transformation and believes in the experience of life not only by man but by any other non-human being that can exist.

Gills Deleuze, 1968, pages 23-24.

In a better word, life is the same diversity and creation of difference and different experiences without any kind of progression and retrogression towards an especial termination.

Deleuze and Guatari, 1987, page 238.

The deleuze's efforts to continue Heidegger's proposed scheme are interesting not only eliminating the dualism between Cartesian subject and object but also for scientific categorizing and knowledge.

Deluze, 1968, pages 40-41.

Deleuze proposes a new scheme to eliminate dualism in which concepts and existents are not substantially as the matters of discussions, but through their interdependent reciprocal determinative effects on the universe, are perceptible.

Deleuze, 1968, pages 46-47.

In this way, we do not substantially encounter the human being. We encounter a collection of intensive factors that by means of and in relation to individuation, determines human in the universe.

Deleuze, 1968, pages 151-152.

In Deleuze's view, the relationships

between animals are bound up with the relations between man and animal, man and woman, man and child, man and the elements, man and the physical and microphysical universe. The history of ideas must never be continuous; it should be wary of resemblances, but also of descents or affiliations. It should be content to mark the thresholds through which an idea passes, the journeys it takes that change its nature or object.

Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, pages 235-236.

He believes there is a determinative identifying relation resemblance between human beings and animals, and explains its theory based on the totem concept and Freudian unconscious and the hidden wolf in the childhood period. Human species identify themselves by referring to a totem by some differential relations or distinctive oppositions. He differs between the identification of human groups by referring to a totem and scientific studying of animal species.

Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, page, 236.

He defines the identified relation between men and women by the same differential relations and distinctive oppositions.

He says: the warrior has a certain astonishing relation to the

young woman, we refrain from establishing an imaginary series tying the two together; instead, we look for a term effecting on an equivalence of relations. Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, pages 235-236. Thus, he looks for some resemblances and differences that make up the structures of manhood or feminine institutions. We can infer that a human is structured in relation to his proportions to other humans by his resemblances and differences to other individuals by considering the identifying differences. For example, western civilized human is recognizable by some subsequent becoming effects in relation to time such as white skin and tall stature and industry and etc. Surely, for a woman to enter the category of west human, he believes a patriarchal perception of humans encompasses the substantial, and focused on object perception about human and therefore, (woman's diversity) is a step of human diversity and variation. Thus, human has no place in the existence and the centrality of knowledge, and only as a being among other existents and as a knower object, human avoids confronting the universe. Needless to say, this focused on the effects approach blocks the way for any kind of scientific knowledge, and this approach fundamentally negates the possibility of scientific knowledge. With this approach, we can only recognize existents by their effects on the universe and will be imagined by them. Moreover, this picture itself is based on the model of diversity axiom and the acceptance of the different burden upon which we load. Probably in the above example, the western human is a temporary term to recognize a kind of human at some specific step in his life history. If a person who belongs to American and European societies obtains none-western countries citizenship or experiences a none-European culture can exit from this definition. None-Western people become part of this culture by participating in the experience of Western culture and civilization. Experience is an open field that indicates the windows of becoming and difference to life. Any new experience of life is a diversity of life that we must not view as the ultimate form of life; because life is not a close circle that we can narrow down and define its borders.

By considering the same little lines to explain the spread and complex thoughts of Deleuze, we can perceive that his fundamental thoughts, namely becoming and difference and the manifestations of existents in their effects that are observable in the universe as the pictures were reproduced on a more fundamental concept and a present presupposition of existence and life. The forms of experience take place in the vast expanse of life. Existents have experience of a new form of life in their diversity. Life is the institutional point of becoming that appears itself in difference and the varied picture of existents. There is no explicable and detectable termination in the life realm. The horizon of life is endless, but this endless horizon in Deleuze's view is the only dimension of existence knowledge and there is no other horizon for this issue that existence has experience about being before or after life or not. The contrast between life and death and the origin of life and its termination, and in general, the situation of life and existence in Deleuze's thought are far-reaching issues. Perhaps this sprightly tendency to the power of life represents a kind of Deleuze's existential approach. These spectrums of the thinkers know life as an APERIORI immanent category that its accepting is evident. Therefore, Deleuze with his life's preference could construct his foundation of thoughts based on an inclusive concept. In the first step, we can note Deleuze, by ignoring the opposition dimension of life, namely death, has been able to provide a monistic widespread for the heterogeneous variations of difference and becoming, but we can forget this problem by regarding death as a form of life variation, but this subject will have two main consequences, first if we consider death as a variation of life, we must define life against itself which cannot be proved its epistemological context. Perhaps this is possible by providing its epistemological context. Even we consider death as a diversity of life against itself and we suppose this as a process, we cannot simultaneously observe both phenomena at the same time. The opposition of life and death is the opposition in the line of time. Even in the most Deconstructive and the most radical spectrum of postmodern thoughts, beliefs values and processes cannot simultaneously coincide with their antithetical concepts. Second, in the philosophy of Deleuze's life manifests itself as a kind of trans-substantial value to which all existence goes toward it. Again, it is not to be overlooked that death is a complex approach in the mind of Deleuze. If there is not a termination of life, if the ultimate value as the truth is a fantasy, then why and how we can talk about life as the realm of the experience of diversities and differences without considering death. How can we turn away from the thought of whether other creatures after death accepting another kind of diversity or continue to experience life and being in another way? Striving for life is an attempt to choose. Selection even if it is not a value and is merely the only option to go forward or the path to be taken by coercion, manifests itself as inevitable truth and can be recognized throughout the universe. It remains to be seen how we can discover life in all existence. Can we do such a thing in the pattern of human life? Is it possible and authorized? This is done with scientific data if the methodological assumptions of science are heavily questioned and debated. Probably the method of life discovering in all the realm of existence is a kind of system or a cognitive method apart from science that we are not aware of it. It is necessary to explain here what we mean by life is a self-sufficient organization of a quantity of matter that we can statistically account for the characteristic of growth and motion. The starting point for Deleuze is becoming in the vitality realm of life and other variations of life experience which manifests itself in the framework of difference each time finding a different picture. These any time regenerator pictures show themselves to other beings. There is not any being in the center of existence to destroy the object-subject thesis; existence does not focus fundamentally on beings but on life. Every existent has the possibility of some kind of life experience. In this continuous diversity every existent has another effect on existence and becomes another picture. These pictures have no substantial signs and alter every time because there is no constant truth in the universe and all existence are temporary appearances of life and its deconstructions. This may be an exaggeration in conceptualization here, as the previous case. In other word the only deconstructed concept of life is difference. It is as there is no resemblance in existence and there is only difference. If there is not any resemblance who can understand thinker's notions except him. What can a thinker talk about? Deleuze gets caught up in the same criticism as the transcendental empiricism that he has himself brought to the empiricists. Difference is never as a strategy and a transcendental phenomenon. The APERIORI form of antecedent of difference is the consciousness that makes it possible to grasp the difference. Deleuze and postmodern thinkers give up the process of explanation inadvertently or unintentionally and choose the path they want to take. Perhaps a new definition of explanation is applicable to end this process. The explanation is the attempt to know now in such a way that there is not possible to ask a question and the behaving being and knower object can act on the context of teleological point determination based on the revealing hidden points of the relation of consciousness and existence. The emphasizing on (based on determining the teleological point) necessitates the determining the teleological status of truth if there is a termination of the universe. Let us not depart from the main argument, the paralysis of scientific analysis and

categorizing from the postmodern philosophers point of view is the consequence of the lack of following the relations of consciousness and the plural forms of existence in the knowledge process and in our opinion is the result of the weakness and inefficiency of categorization techniques for scientific knowledge as we have explained. Deleuze wants to explain the existence by decentralizing the universe and adorning the difference while this ornament of difference causes to ignore resemblances between beings and thus the reality of the universe. The scientific system is never criticized because the problem is that the scientific categories do not include the resemblances of the species but that the interpretation of the differences has a proper place in the scientific system. For example, the resemblance of ship and cattle ---even we consider the appearance of this two species--- is more than to that of fish species. Thus, these two animals took account in the mammals specious. The problem is that we cannot explain the differences between cattle ship and monkey by their categorization among mammal species, not the category of mammals cannot explain some of the resemblances between its members. Therefore, the explanation of all existence by means of difference is only the personal theorizing of the thinker and it has nothing to do with knowledge ---as it should be---. Another criticism of Deleuze is the form of appearance of difference over life. Deleuze knows beings as pictorial simulations of life, that appear without any termination behind the accepted effects. This is certainly understandable in light of his efforts to eliminate the dualistic scheme of Cartesian subject-object, but if we take, for example, a Western man who believes that Deleuze is beyond recognizable effects such as white skin and civilization and ETC... then the question arises as to why the white ass living in one of European societies should not be considered a European human.. It is possible that Deleuze responds that the white western donkey cannot diverse to grasp western culture. Again, it can be answered unless western acculturation is a manifestation of the experience of life and if so, how can it be assigned to a special group of living beings? At this point, do we not believe in a substantial or at least restrictive trait? Perhaps we can present the western white donkey is a being that during one of many diversities in his life has varied to the western civilized human who deserves to receive this title from MR. Deleuze. Why should not we take serious so far innovative and creative forms of diversity in life? In our opinion diversity can exhibit us a widespread spectrum of occurrences in existence, but while experience or any other concept does not take a transcendental place except its epistemological context explaining. If consciousness is transcendental in our proposal, first of all it is that there is no claim and attempt here to be free of from transcendental situation because it has not been assumed at all. Second difference epistemologically is definable in its contradictory concept namely the concept of resemblance, while resemblance is a concept that its extensions whether artificially or naturally is debatable, but it is impossible to define consciousness in its contradictory concept in the present epistemological conditions.

Relativism and absolutism a debate about motion:

We discussed the question of consciousness and its role in knowing existence. Now let's talk about another factor that is floating in all existence. We can track the effects of motion down, wherever something happens or a being behaves. From moving a speck of dust in the farthest than stars in the farthest imaginable galaxy to walking a happy man of the street; from the biggest atomic explosion in a galaxy that collapses a supernova to the attempt of a small ant or a plant in an arid desert to absorb water to survive. All of these are the appearances of motion. It does not mean there is not stationary in the universe. Everywhere any occurrence happens there is stationary. Motion and stationary are two consequences of consciousness. This is the appearance of consciousness determines whether a behavior will happen or not. Motion is very significant issue for knowing the universe as the foundation of a main physical super theories for explaining the universe rests on analysis and speculation about its origin. In the early decades of the 20th century, Albert Einstein, a prominent theoretician, put forward a coherent scheme that according to its content, motion is a relative affair, the source of motion is the observer, from their point of view everyone can estimate the speed of motion. Relative motion is fundamentally constructed on a relative concept of relative space-time. In Einstein's view, space-time can be curved. He writes: Es ist unklar, was hier unter „Ort** und „Raum**^ zu verstehen ist. Ich stehe am Fenster eines gleichförmig fahrenden

Eisenbahnwagens 'und lasse einen Stein auf den Bahndamm fallen, ohne ihm einen Schwung zu geben. Dann sehe ich (abgesehen vom Einfluß d^ Luftwiderstandes) den Stein geradlinig herabfallen. Ein Fußgänger, der die Übeltat vom Fußwege aus mit ansieht, .bemerkt, daß der Stein in einem Parabelbogen zur Erde herabfällt. Ich frage nun: Liegen die „Orte**, welche der Stein durchläuft, „in Wirklichkeit** auf einer Geraden oder auf einer Parabel? Was bedeutet hier ferner Bewegung „im Räume**? Die Antwort ist nach den Überlegungen des § 2 selbstverständlich. Einstein 1920, page 6.

This theory was suggested based on advances in non-Euclidian geometry in the 19th century. These geometries have disproved some principles of Euclidian geometry such as this one. The sum of the angles of a triangle can be more than 180. Degree, if we draw a triangle on a sphere surface. In general, non-Euclidean geometries turned their attention to spatial geometry and to explaining volumes. Einstein came up with other expressions about the path of light in the universe based on non-Euclidian geometries specifically Riemannian geometry. Einstein explained that, the light diffracts and curves against a spherical volume or something like that, ---although perhaps not all volumes are a perfectly ordered geometrical---. Therefore, the motion of light, is performed at a slower rate than the object moving in a curved volume in space, if it approaches a curved volume. This reality leads to the relativity of space-time. Compare two persons: An observer that watches the motion in a curved volume and an observer outside a curved volume, are not able to grasp time equivalently, because of the effects of volumes on the motion. Objects cannot always preserve their constant speed against the volumes, even the light ---that is the fastest in the universe--- and therefore, the time that two particles reach a point with the same starting time cannot be equal. Relativism dominates on motion and observation of motion. It is the observer object that determines the occurrence and speed of motion. The source to determine to recognize motion is the observer. The earth does not rotate from its inhabitant observer's point of view but can be seen as a moving mass from the perspective of those outside it. Indeed, which perception is really right? The answer is hidden in the flowing relativism

of existence. Everybody determines and observes the motion from their perspective. We cannot fix a criterion to determine to assess the measure and direction of motion unless the observer's perception. Does the research on the origin of the motion among its observers guide us properly? Indeed, is really there no determined criterion for knowing the foundation of motion and no constant for comparing this significant variable in existence? How does solve the conflict between two observers of a single motion from two different points of view? What must we do with a scientific explanation, if one observer finds the earth non-mobile and the other mobile? If we accept relativism in the universe as a universal principle and everyone's view as an observer is the source of a true explanation for the universe, how can a constant perception take?? The criterion for truth is individual perception, but we think a matter compels us to rethink. It is the (Heisenberg's uncertainty principle). This principle provides a more general and more inclusive explanation of Einstein's theory of general relativity. Einstein at least believes in the constant of the light-speed among a set of variables, but Heisenberg even did not believe in this constant. He said: we cannot determine the velocity and direction of a particle with error coefficient 0. When Einstein expressed his views, he said: God does not play dice. In addition to this alternative theory, Einstein's proposed theory does not conform to our epistemological axiom. If we recognize observer as the origin of the motion's foundation determination according to Einstein's theory, we cannot explain the hidden forms of consciousness in the origin of motion. Einstein's presupposition is the only observation to determine to recognize the origin of the motion. This kind of approach against the origin of motion does not have any explanatory aspect, but merely states what is happening. From a relativistic perspective, there is not a criterion for comparing the absolute truth that we intend to determine fundamentally. There is no conflict between the two observers and their perception of the motion or stationary because there is no criterion for truth. Interestingly, Einstein's theory is in complete agreement with the atmosphere of nineteenth-century thought. The appearance of Nietzsche as an avant-garde and challenger thinker of classic philosophical perceptions and the formation of relativistic movements such as pragmatism made it possible to predict Einstein's relativism. Returning to the above point, the theory of Einstein of relativism of motion contains no explanatory element. We do not find any constant foundation to build a firm house by saying that each observer has a self-reference authority to interpret motion or stationary. The foundation of knowledge cannot be built upon such a foundation. As we have said at every occurrence, there is an element of hidden consciousness. In present epistemological circumstances, every occurrence in the realm of existence is formed by the corporal premises and an element of consciousness. Einstein's approach to motion, lacks the hidden forms of consciousness in the substance of the origin of motion, and in the minds of observers, it seeks presented forms of motion. So, Einstein sees observers as the ultimate reference for the interpretation of motion in the universe, whereas we must construct an explanatory knowledge based on the hidden forms of consciousness in the moving object. In the present epistemological condition, this new foundation closes the door to the conflicting beliefs of two observers of an occurrence of motion because to move, he believes in an element of consciousness that without it, motion cannot be presented. The motion apart from its basics is a kind of the will, and the will does not occur except through consciousness. As soon as a form of consciousness will not, any motion will not occur. We must take into account that motion is seen as an occurrence that also is performed by rules that lead to occurrences in existence. We must add about the inexplicability of Einstein's theory that this theory does not believe in a criterion for comparing truth. Not looking for it either. In the shadow of Einstein's theory, the questioning about the universe is impossible. Given Einstein's criticism of how we must understand his reports of particle behavioral changes in different environments. What does confirm light diffraction when photons approach a curved mass and then continue the path normally? Undoubtedly Einstein, fundamentally changed our view of the world with the help of non-Euclidean geometries. He reminded us that the situation of the universe is very different against curved masses, He also explained things behave differently against curved masses. It was a new perception in geometry, and the physical explanation of the universe was unparalleled until then. The behaviors of things against curved masses explains behaviors of things in different conditions and situations. Curvature, as a variable in the masses itself explains another situation. The change of situation under the influence of variables cannot be considered as relativity. Relativity is a situation. We cannot determine it by any criterion. If the assumption of the uncertainty principle based on the lack of possibility to determine the velocity and direction of the particles with an error coefficient, is true, we confront with a complete relativistic hypothesis. A hypothesis in which there is no criterion for determining the velocity and direction of particles at a time, but in Einstein's theory, in addition to the constant factor of the speed of light, we find that the state of motion can be presented in both curved and non-curved volume positions, which in each one the material has a different behavior. This behavior change has nothing to do with the authority of relativism and the indetermination of the origin of the motion. It goes back to the formation and creation of the motion. Fundamentally the creation of motion like any other behavior without an element of consciousness is impossible. Therefore, we cannot evaluate an occurrence of motion free from its hidden forms of consciousness or with an aspect of a personal perception. Moving along with its practical premises is a kind of will. It means, if there is no will, the motion will not happen. So, in our view, the origin of motion is not relativistic, and the motion must not be interpreted as a kind of personal perception, and in order to determine its origin like any other behavior in the universe, we must trace the hidden forms of consciousness and reveal them. The other issue is Einstein's attempt to limit the universe and assess its spatial dimension. It is done by estimating the amount of matter in the universe and the farther space navigated by photons, whereas in the present epistemological situation, the concept of place is indefinable and vague. We can ask what is there for us when the universe ends. More importantly, what the infinite place means. Whatever we confront with in any place where we are not facing space. Infinity mathematically cannot be presented. We can call and count the digits endlessly, but when it comes to practical contexts, the issue is more complicated. What are the characteristics of material infinity? Where and how can we present the restriction of material? This restriction can be never presented. Einstein's work, therefore, to estimate the infinity of the universe is a philosophically meaningless action with no epistemological foundation. Certainly, this impossibility to present endless space is naturally a consequence of our information shortage of the quality of the material creation from phenomenological existence, and empirical study makes it possible to do. Now the restriction of material is also the consequence of another restriction. The order of occurrences is the origin of time. At present, we cannot present any end to time, and thus, there is the possibility of time extension in the endless consciousness. The possibility of expanding infinite material at time does not make it possible for us to present space in a finite state. Time-space is the same concept that is paid attention in Einstein's super theory. Einstein's theory of general relativity was a significant theoretical move to

go beyond Newtonian mechanics and propose a new perception of concepts such as mass, space-time, and mechanics generally. Physics is a super science within which theorizing has had a wide range, as some of its topics, such as light, have been the focus of human exploration. Theorizing in physics also includes philosophical perceptions in addition to scientific aspects. The rise of super physical paradigms raises questions about the quality of consideration of some philosophical concept such true and false and the quality and importance of theories. Some of Newtonian mechanics perceptions have continued to live on our planet. We can ask how Newtonian mechanics answered the questions before Einstein's theory of general relativity was proposed. Now that Einstein's mechanics have changed the concept of some theoretical conceptions, does Newtonian mechanics incorporate the wrong propositions? If so, what was the role of this super theory in answering questions and developing science? The answer to this question is crucial for determining the scientific methodology as well as for determining the purpose of this methodology. In a relativistic approach, does science aim at discovering the secrets of existence in an infinite context, or does science have a specific purpose? As we have noted, our criterion for initiating the knowledge process is the analysis of the variation of consciousness on plural forms of existence. Propaganda about the quality of pursuing consciousness in the chaos of existence disappears by studying the signs of consciousness. Symptoms of consciousness are explained by deepening in the substance of consciousness. Of course, what is the mysterious nature and the out of access definition of consciousness is the condition that consciousness emerges from nothing. However, by observing the signs of consciousness we can begin to recognize the phenomenon of consciousness. We explained about the consciousness appearance in the language and we will talk about the consciousness aspects of planning. By consciousness given these two issues, which are methodologically the appearances of flowing consciousness in existence our perception about the scientific method and the termination is positive. When the scientific method is the pursuing of consciousness signs in existence and its relation to plural forms of existence the scientific method will naturally interpret the consciousness signs as it expresses itself circle of consciousness. Explaining the method naturally leads us to explain the current inefficient categorization techniques we mentioned earlier. In the relativistic theories of the philosophy of science the termination cannot be presented for the scientific affair and scientific operation is personified as an endless process, since existence is perceived as a multilayered secret and probably infinite process, whereas in the proposal we consider a specific termination for the scientific affair, and it is an explanation of the variation of consciousness into plural forms of existence by the pursuit of forms of consciousness by empirical observation technique. Perhaps, it is a proper definition to commence the scientific affair. Science establishes a new field of empirical science for the study of a collective phenomenon or a singular phenomenon by discovering any collective or singular phenomenon that raises a question about the relation of consciousness to the plural forms of existence in a questioner object. Therefore, the termination of any scientific affair must be the openness of all concealing of consciousness variation into plural forms of existence, and the elimination of all question and action based on any kind of teleological approach. So, in this situation, true and false must be considered from this perspective and any lingual meaningful unit that is true in this respect is regarded as a true proposition, rather than a false one. Now what must we do with super mechanical theories? Do these theories consider the relationship between consciousness and the plural forms of existence and from this point of view how much successful they have been in knowing existence? We explained about general relativity, Einstein's theory, which the proposed epistemological axiom criticizes this theory. It cannot withstand the challenge of such a critical state under any circumstances. We mentioned issues about the genealogy of the change of position of the masses reported by Einstein. If we ignore the theories that believe in the impossibility of comparing scientific paradigms, these two theories have a general approach. It is the reaction of the material to motion, but each of the super theories interprets the reaction of the material to motion, using its own assumptions and the specific system of conceptualization. Apart from the epistemological premises that bring the challenge to Einstein's theory to mind, there are likely to be different mechanical and physical explanations because this operation is not founded on consciousness variation to plural forms of existence. Meanwhile, in other words, some parts of Einstein's theory are expressed in the Newtonian paradigm of mechanics. Newton explains the end of motion in terms of gravity power, and Einstein analyzes it by the motion concept. The rejection or acceptance of each of these theories has empirical verification that, at present, cannot be done due to real and laboratory limitations. In addition to what we have explained above, general relativity theory, apart from its conceptual system distinction and its view of Newtonian mechanics, explains the behavior of materials at two curved and flat surfaces. The final judgment of whether true or not each of the super theories is founded on the criterion of the variation of consciousness into plural forms of existence may be a little hasty, given the limitations of empirical possibilities. Of course, this is not related to a perception of the scientific process as an infinite process. In the shadow of proposing the criterion of variation of consciousness into plural forms of existence, we must establish a mechanical theory that explains the behavior of the material in different conditions. At the same time, competing theory and the more radical quantum mechanics challenge Einstein's claims. Physics or metaphysics: the termination of existence. Considering the proposed axiom based on the concealing of an element of consciousness at all occurrences, some implications emerge that may be in sharp contradiction with current approaches to the philosophy of science. The philosophy of science is founded based on the scientific studies and the presupposition of the non-metaphysical universe. By studying the physical structure of the universe, we can come to the substance of the universe and answer our current questions. Perhaps the culmination of such comments is Kant's views on metaphysics, which he believed were impossible to enter this realm. Hume's understanding of the nature of the human experience also opened the way for an end to this debate among later thinkers. Perhaps at this time, thinkers would like to see metaphysics as part of categories such as religion, mysticism, or ethics. There are generally two types of beliefs about metaphysics. First, it is impossible to enter this realm. Second, this category has nothing to do with the category of thought. Emphasizing the above principle opens the way to this realm. The strategy of hidden forms of consciousness in any occurrence is founded on this presupposition that consciousness is not the consequence of the material and is superior to it. The material cannot create and reproduce consciousness. A reason for verifying our view is the evolutionary line in the phenomenal existence. We mentioned that for the first time, Darwin revealed this evolutionary lineage among living beings, which is now a self-evident matter in science. Explanatory citations to consciousness, to build a firm foundation for immediate knowledge, open the way that the material cannot create a new form of existence and the origination of consciousness singularly. If the material can create and produce in a unique way, then ---as the supreme appearances of corporal organizations--- we cannot do anything beyond consciousness and talk about any matter and

become the origin of occurrence; this means that humans in the present epistemological situation are the results of two general types of action and reaction. Actions and reactions that are planned for destruction and ruin creation and we recognized as the disease, disability, decentralization and etc.

The other actions and reactions planned for creativity, such as innovation, construction and evolution and These denominations are not nonsense but represent the origin of these actions and reactions in consciousness. He must explain the problem that matter is not a captive evolutionary state, and we can release material from any evolutionary situation that cannot be analyzed by any material preference otherwise, the theory of non-physical interpretation of the universe would be more appropriate for laying a new paradigm for the future of science. Apart from answering this question, we must enter the realm of consciousness. It is necessary to answer a question before continuing the discussion. Materialists can ask what consciousness is. As we have mentioned in the chapter of "the foundations of knowledge": unraveling from the concept of consciousness and existence is the same endpoint that the knowledge process must reach. If the answer to the question of the riddle of consciousness and existence were possible at this step of the knowledge process, the knowledge of existence would have been a solved problem, and we would not have to go that long. The matter of the discussion is not the mystery of consciousness and existence, because the materialists have any answer for it except by chance and other far probabilities. The problem is the way to a real and certain and immediate knowledge. The question is which methodology proposed to carry through the cognitive process reveals the secret of consciousness and existence. Our proposal claims that by following the signs of consciousness, we can decode the path and model of its variation, and ultimately the variation of consciousness. We mentioned at the outset that this is possible even at the near future, given the phenomenal aspect of existence. Evaluating the universe with the concept of matter and nature, on which this concept is founded, is impossible and inefficient. When we ask a question about the universe, our answers go beyond materialistic interpretations and cannot be interpreted to a foundation that has completely materialistic explanations.

Determining to recognize the physics domination or metaphysical origin of existence is a significant matter that requires more justified explanations and reasons and causes. The first point we want to make is related to evolution. If we want to explain evolution in epistemological language, we can point out that evolution is the entrance of a form of existential inner consciousness that enables that structure to perform newer and sometimes more complex tasks than the previous being, compared to the evolved being is not capable of Not to do it. The two beings, when compared in the context of empirical sciences in an evolutionary sense, it means that they are different. This distinction has difference aspects. The range of these distinctions are wide, from the amount of ingredients in an organism to one's biological and environmental functions. When zoological categories refer to the dinosaur body being more massive than its predecessors, more of the material is applied in dinosaur organs. This wide range of differences also includes the existential cues of other beings. We can restrict these differences to the corporal features of beings. Many empirical sciences have attempted to study aspects of behaviors that are not directly material. For example, we mention a passive case in human beings. Human reactions to stress factors are different. Some people have more power to adapt to or gain from these factors, and others sometimes die from incompatibility with these factors.

The difference manifests itself in all realms of existence. Differences occur either in material terms or in processes that have not been directly observed so far, and their causes and motives are still vague. The appearance of difference has no aspect that we can recognize merely its origin materialistically. Materials and their isotopes are themselves the consequences of the differences in the arrangement of atoms and difference in the number of neutrons or difference in the arrangement the motion of subatomic layers and the equilibrium of electric charges. Some elements, such as hydrogen, are very light, while others, like argon, are resistant to combining with other elements. Therefore, if the difference has a corporal root, we must be able to study the behavioral properties, features, and index markers of materials, to move in line with solving the mystery of existence by physics and chemistry as two fundamental sciences that study the characteristics of The dynamics and make-up of the particles of materials; On the other hand, considering the difference in the shadow of the emergence of consciousness in any occurrence is a reason to verify this principle. In other words, the possibility of being different states and the cause of the difference between occurrences and phenomena is the presence of consciousness within them, which makes them different. We can suggest this perception against approaches that recognize existence as a separate set of occurrences and phenomena in particular. The Separation of occurrences and Phenomena While it is claimed by thinkers to be the scattering of existence, it also signifies the vastness of the differences of occurrences and phenomena present in existence. We cannot explain the difference except based on the difference of consciousness forms. As we told above, the difference is not the consequence of corporal origin, and we cannot summarize the difference in materials because the different materials themselves are the consequences of making a difference. It is a crucial point that paves the way for a sustained epistemological analysis of the meaning of difference in existence and its explanation based on the presence of consciousness in occurrences and phenomena. The explanation of the differences based on the unhistorical conditions is the ignorance of the consciousness variations in the different ways of existence that appear in the framework of philosophical linguistic approaches and scientific-empirical dehistoricization claiming systematic generalities.

The only inclusive alternative to our proposal to reach the basis of differences are expressions that claim there is no logical generalities in existence. Apart from matching each model to the phenomenal reality of existence, we can confirm that the two models are epistemological models. Some thinkers have attempted to justify the difference by linguistic models. It was perhaps first proposed in Wittgenstein's theory of the language function. We have said that language is never a place of explanation and is only an intermediate step. By the way, every linguistic explanation itself has profound epistemological consequences. Many heterogeneous Answers and solutions are proposed to eliminate the failure of empirical science in the way of knowing existence, but none of these efforts are effective because none of these methodologies could find the root cause of this failure. The great evidence of plenty of these efforts is to find a scientific and experimental approach to highly experienced models. Among the scientific study methods induction, undoubtedly has a long history, but perhaps a long history might better reveal its flaws. The greatest crisis of this methodology is the failure to explain the reasons for the numerous particular cases in the realm of existence. When the inductive model of knowledge does not include a particular case, we cannot understand why we must categorize it outside the inductive model. This model is just an observational mode without asking about essences and attempting to reveal substances.

With the inductive model, many issues remain out of the science view. For example, with the current horizon of empirical sciences, we can never accurately estimate the origin of existence. Certainly, the threat of the entrance of empirical sciences into theological polemics is effective in limiting the realm of science. Other methodologies also have had their specific weaknesses. One of these methodologies is the proposed methodology by the famous philosopher of science Karl Popper called: refutability. The main shortcomings of these methodologies are explained in detail in references to the philosophy of science, but as a disadvantage of all these systems, we can note that these methods either guarantee the generality of the matters under study, such as induction or because there is no strategy to insure the assumptions underlying the continuity of work, such as refutability, they have been defective. In refutability we can endlessly propose a contradictory theory as a temporary step towards the truth without presenting a horizon to obtain the final truth. Next to these methodologies was the against (method) of Popper which believed that science as a methodology placed a highly value as far as other methods of claiming existence knowledge such as magic. Our purpose in referring to some of the short terms in the history of philosophy of science is to note that a glance at these efforts proves that we cannot observe any work of physics that is the matter of the movement in these scientific and philosophical endeavors. We must ask why the materialists do not attempt to propose a scientifically well-documented methodology based on the science of physics. To be sure, we must add that physics has always been closely associated with theorizing in the realm of the philosophy of science; but physics had the role of predicate of methodologies that are included by philosophical categories. In other words, it is physics that takes on a philosophical color to explain the category of motion in existence, and it is really philosophy that speaks the language of physics and expresses its categories in this paradigm. The themes of empirical science are recognized in the light of difference. The claim of empirical sciences was the knowledge of generalities. This means that science takes into account the resemblances. The generalities necessitate equality and resemblances. How must we explain the relationship between material and difference? This is a significant and interesting question whose answer can be a turning point in answering the problem in general. When we say "water" a special trait is formed in our mind. This means we consider a chemical element with the formula (H₂O). When we compare water with alcohol another different chemical formula comes to mind. Likewise, understanding the elements and chemicals necessitate differentiation between them. If there was no difference, there would be no more than one chemical or element. Therefore, we can even conclude that the difference is pre-physical before it is physical. It means we believe that any material in the same time or before it is another material is itself. It means this ---itself being--- necessitates difference and ---otherness --- with other materials. Physics according to materialist scientists is the science that studies materials as the effects of motion and its related topics. So, physics has to say its decisive vote about the difference from the motion perspective which is its matter, and it causes to know materials as materials. By considering that difference is something other than motion, and any physical discussion of difference is something other than motion, therefore, physics cannot explain the universe in the paradigm of related categories by motion and theorizing about existence depends on issues such as consciousness and difference that are obviously outside the realm of physics. This science is apparently incapable of explaining the existence in a materialistic way. We believe that the main origin of difference is not the fundamental motion that the science of physics wants and to be able to theorize in this realm and achieve a complete corporal analysis of the matter, but the main and substantial origin of difference is the consciousness that produces beings by different arrangements and by entrance into plural forms of existence. We propose such an argument based on the difference between the non-moving forms of existence. Comparing two non-moving cupboards in one place is an interesting case. One can argue that the motion is flowing in the subatomic layers of these two objects, but it must be noted that the outer surface of the two cupboards indicates stationary. Moving into the deepest layers probably reflects their specific actions related to the company, as a component of any occurrence, for example, breaking a part of the wardrobe and falling over a person and dying as a result. While moving in their deep layers of the objects have a limited amount of motion in their deeper and subatomic layers and make the action according to still remain undiscovered laws, with an immobile surface. The motion takes place in the deepest layers of two things, but these two things are different as in the past. This difference is not the consequence of the motion to which it is dependent and limited, but it is the consciousness that determines the measure and quality of the motion. These differences are observable for the study of behaviors in their historical cycle. The behaviors have similar origins of motion but are different as in the past. The other problem to recognize the origin of motion is the study of the signs of consciousness. For example, if we recognize the gene as a sign of consciousness hidden in the human body, the proposed explanation is efficient. Assuming all the commands the human mind receives to plan and execute behaviors are the consequence of his or her genome, then a study of the human genetic map must identify his or her behavior. The main question here arises. If the science of physics studies materials from the motion perspective and its effects and aftermaths on materials, genetics study is studying the commands of these genes to human objects. Therefore, the study of the genetic map is the study of the quality of the initiation to determine motion. It is apparently out of the realm of physics since the discussion of the substance and quality of phenomena has at least been outside the traditional scientific philosophy, and the matter of theology and Philosophy is presumed as an ontological topic. We might say in an exclusive materialistic system, this is a motion that flows into the plural forms of existence, but at the same time, it does not give us any estimates of the origin of existence and does not eliminate the inefficiency of challenging the subject of physics. Even if the randomness is presumed to be the source of the events, it usually means that the randomness is likely to occur in a very remote likelihood, for example, from material in the Earth and the solar system based on a very remote probability, an especial amount of constitutive material of the cosmos can be estimated. Even if there is a pure random model, there is no scientific and philosophical explanation for it. Perhaps in favor of materialism, we can argue that in order to prevent an event from happening, we can intervene in such a way that such interference can no longer be interpreted as anything other than materialism. If one wishes to impede an occurrence, he or she may be able to eliminate or render inappropriate the cause and intermediaries of another event of a material substance. For example, if a person intends to prevent another person from behaving, he or she can poison him or her and thus not do the job of eliminating another, but it is not all reality. We cannot always limit behavior or occurrence to an agent or intermediary. It is possible. If an intermediary is eliminated by poisoning, the behavior can be done by one or more other intermediaries. Moreover, the elimination of intermediaries is a possibility that is always accompanied by its contradictory possibilities. For a person who is ignorant of the future, behavior can be done at any time. The emphasis on the lack of events is equal to the inefficiency of materialism. The emphasis on the lack of events is naturally equivalent to

the inefficiency of materialism in explaining them. If we can explain occurrences by their corporal origins, it is necessary not to be presented counter-theoretical possibility against them. While quantum theory in modern science explains that, due to the inhomogeneity of matter, the concept itself provides the context for a variety of behaviors and occurrences due to its association with the fluid bed of motion. It is also significant to remember that the exploration of material and its substance is in no way separate from the hidden consciousness within it. The necessitation of two behaviors is also a problem that must be solved. A specific event that is considered as a result of its previous occurrence, or indeed it is, has a logical necessitation with its previous behavior. The cause-effect considerations have been questioned almost since the mid-nineteenth century by Hume's skeptical considerations. Later a set of conditions replaced a cause or a set of causes. It means that every occurrence occurs through a set of conditions in other words, we cannot recognize each condition of interference as the definitive cause of a behavior or occurrence. We must consider conditions as necessary factors, not sufficient factors. Many factors are required to create a fire, but we cannot recognize each as sufficient condition to create fire because at any one time, a negative cause may prevent the effect of one or a set of conditions. The same inability to predict conditions is enough to make the occurrence of behavior and occurrence unpredictable. When a set of conditions are replaced with a cause or a set of causes to happen, a behavior or occurrence planning is also taken the place of the unilateral cause-effect motion of a scientific foundation. We cannot limit the set of conditions sufficient for a particular behavior or event to be specific, this fact does not mean that behaviors and events do not occur. At any time, we can see a new behavior or occurrence. Occurrences and behaviors happen, the issue is that we have not been able to grasp their logical rules. If we consider the conditions that interfere with behavior or occurrence, then we must admit that any of the causes in the set of conditions studied may be omitted from the scene of influence in the circle of behavior or occurrence. This possibility of removal or pass through the interfering conditions behavior or occurrence is the same matter that we can remember as planning. Planning is opposed to those common mechanical tendencies in academic circles that believe that materials act in constant positions and conditions. Quantum mechanics has a better explanation for the alternative set of cause conditions or set of causes. This mechanics says, there is motion in subatomic layers. Certainly, we do not agree with the suggested anomalies in the subatomic layers of materials, and we outlined our methods for discovering the laws and studying subatomic layers. If we believe in absolute anarchy in the fundamental layers of material, then the question is surely why this anarchy does not manifest itself on the outer surfaces. So why can we precisely determine the location and purpose of a piece of rock?

Termination and knowledge

It seems that, we encounter two types of necessitation in the universe. First logical, second metaphysical. It may be difficult to define these two types of necessitation, but to begin with, we can say that logical necessitation is that kind of necessitation that expresses the constant relations in nature and existence such as mathematical relations. $(2+2) = 4$ if we add two things to two, we'll have four. The two number apart from its extensions, is a concept. It means based on extensions the behavior of division and restriction is done twice. If two things are added to the other two, we have considered binary sets that have a boundary and divide each other while keeping the divisor but one larger unit. For this reason, even if units subjected to addition operations or any other mathematical operation become smaller or larger during operation, or if any other modification — except elimination — is applied to them, no mathematical operation failure occurs because mathematical operations are observing ratios and boundary behavior. So logical necessitation is a kind of necessitation that results from an operation, and behavior is associated with constant relations. Now it is possible to argue the behavior of restriction is the consequence of consciousness and partly a contractual behavior. We answer the names of digits are the representatives and the symbols of the constant concept of restriction. When we say two, we mean the number two without any extensions. Here we do not refer to the ontological questions as the related issues to logical necessitation because the steps of the consequence of present ontological questions are not clear to us. Certainly, this is purely a philosophical foundation of the concept and has a philosophical aspect and does not alter the foundation of the discussion. That is, the way to discuss the physical and metaphysical necessitation of ontological foundations is open. At any time, we can discuss and challenge these foundations. The concept of existence and ontological propositions and their place as a foundation with the assistance of epistemological categories as the cement of direct and certain knowledge is authentic and efficient like the past. We can see the ambiguity in the necessitation categorization of epistemological problems. One cannot argue that any floating event in the universe in which some hidden form of consciousness is the result of a particular rational course or a logical process that rests on constant and continual foundations. Of course, the question of whether the epistemological proposition of consciousness conceals within any occurrence or behavior has any metaphysical or logical necessitation, at the moment, does not disorder the foundation of certain knowledge based on this axiom. Perhaps the cause of the foundation concealing is our science shortage about the universe that we must eliminate it under the light of more information. There is the same uncertainty about the logical or metaphysical necessitation of meaning along with the theorems and the present propositions of existence. We certainly cannot say that the consequent meanings of the propositions and theorems are metaphysical or the logical consequence of the propositions. Perhaps about the propositions that allow us to interpret them, this meaning depends on the same interpreter object of the proposition perception and is therefore, a metaphysical consequence. Extending this phrase to the whole of existence given our science shortage is not possible, maybe the solution to the problem associated with the openness of the teleological mystery of existence. If the teleological dimension of existence is affected by a metaphysical necessitation, we cannot certainly conclude based on its contextual processes ---floating occurrences and behaviors in existence---. Perhaps the determination of to notice the teleological dimension of existence necessitates going beyond the traditional boundaries of the philosophy of science. If these questions are considered teleological questions as in the past, we can probably never discuss them scientifically. The solution to the teleological problem of existence can verify our certainty about our knowledge of existence. Determining the teleological dimension of being is naturally the answer to the causes of occurrences and behaviors. If we respond appropriately to the causes of events and behaviors, the concealing of existence seems to have disappeared, and no researchable matter remains to study for the pioneers of truth. Determining and integrating the borders of metaphysics and logic is a daunting task at this step, but we must keep in mind that consciousness, referring to the starting point of the origination of existence, has a general planning scheme of

occurrences. Given the same logical perception, we can consolidate the foundations of the proposed scheme for studying the hidden consciousness signs of beings. Whatever the methodology of knowledge, the issue is that we encounter a universe that can be presented and explicable. In the universe, we encounter occurrences. These occurrences can be expressed in a lingual paradigm and transmitted to other existents who know our lingual system like us. We express our universe to other members of the homogeneous lingual system within the framework of the lingual system. We have our independence and our separation from other members of the language community. Regardless of what we have in our minds about the world, we can express the world. The universe can be presented by us. Naturally, the universe means the universe of every individual, including their perceptions and experiences and value systems and beliefs and knowledge and sciences. This presentation of the universe for the human existents expresses two propositions: First, this presentation as the consequence of the absolute and the super-consciousness encompasses the universe and plays an effective role to explain the universe. To conceive the world, we need to reassure the presentation of the world in the framework of language and follow the same path. Second, the presentation of the universe has no manifestation except in language, and this presentation of the universe is the result of our cognitive tools and conditions that we can modified it at each time. Now we can ask how the presentation of the universe can be according to reality. We response, our criterion for verifying the truth of knowledge is the pursuit of the hidden consciousness signs in occurrences and the knowledge of the hidden consciousness. We say that consciousness certainly had a presentation of existence during the origination of existence because the origination of the existential forms without understanding them is not possible. It is impossible to originate existential forms without consciousness. The origination of existential forms without presentation and grasp means the vacuum of consciousness, but we remind that the vacuum of consciousness is impossible.

By looking at the origination point of existence, we can see if existence has a teleological dimension. Perhaps the termination of existence is related to the perception of consciousness from each of the semantic comprehensions mentioned above. If the sense of existence is exclusively a metaphorical or contractual system, then the presentation of the termination of existence is a little complicated. The world may be in vain or created for entertainment. We can ask the question of the existence termination in line with this epistemological proposition that the purpose of the researches in existence must be the analysis of the consciousness relation to the plural forms of existence, such that there is no question left to ask. The question of the meaning and purpose of metaphors or conventions, as in the past, remains in the mind of the questioner object if we present that the sense of existence is a metaphor or a system of the contracts. Another point is the conscious origin of existence. That is to say, existence must be a consequence of some kind of rationality and thought, and necessarily it must be a rational answer to explain existence. The rational origin of creation does not mean to reject the irrational dimensions of existence. The irrational dimensions of being are the consequence of higher consciousness and are a kind of planning with them. Apart from these irrational dimensions of existence have a meaning or termination, these processes are not free of consciousness but maybe are not quantitatively explicable. So, considering the conscious origin of existence and its consequence of existence and the possibility of questioning about the causes of the irrational dimensions of the universe, we encounter the high percentage of the purposefulness of termination of the universe. One cannot present the irrational dimensions of existence, for example, human sensations and emotions or destructive instincts such as the collapse of supernovas and the loss of billions of tons of materials and energy from the luminosity of the stars in the sky have been created without their grasp by the originator consciousness of existence. Even if there is no termination of these phenomena in existence, the path of the phenomenology of existence, suggests that by studying the hidden signs of consciousness we can discover the termination or the absurdity of the universe. Considering the termination or absurdity of the universe is interesting from another point of view. Considering this from a historical phenomenological perspective can give us a good horizon for solving this mystery. In the first step, we must answer the question that the movement of occurrences is conducted towards termination and specific purpose. The strange heterogeneous and plurality of occurrences in existence give a particular direction to a specific termination in mind. At first glance, it seems the originator consciousness of existence has scattered different occurrences in every presented direction to vary consciousness. To limit discussion and frame it, we refer to humans as complex creatures. Human has very peculiar abilities. Perhaps one of these prominent abilities is the ability to process information in a language format, but we must note that some people cannot speak or process information for physiological or medical reasons. Without referring to extensions, we refer to a variety of human information processing skills. The rise of different people at different times with strange special abilities that we can call genius is the reason for this matter. Certainly, counting the variation and plurality of occurrences in terms of variation of skills and complexities or human disabilities and failures depends on the delivery of evidence and statistics that is actually not the subject of discussion. We cannot deny the variation of behaviors among humans. If we academically and from a modern scientific view, look at human life, the disputing problem is not the kinds of behaviors or the complexity of behaviors, but it is the origin and motivations of behaviors; in other words, in behavioral science such as sociology and psychology the matter is clear and the problem is the theoretical interpretation of data not several types of behaviors. It is to say that there is no difference in the two-way orientation of events, which may be said to be inaccurate with the two ends of the spectrum of destruction and creativity. The multilateral variation of consciousness in all possible respects is a matter on which much evidence and statistics can be prepared to prove its truth. But, as we have noted, this debate is broadly linked statistics and the introduction of empirical sciences. From this evidence, we can deduce both evolution and decadence. Naturally, we do not mean from evolution its value aspect, but evolution encompasses complexity. Wherever there is talk of evolution, other than its potential value burden, it means the complexity of the mechanism in question that results in the preservation of skill or technical superiority and higher steps of progress within the framework of the theory under discussion. Where there are both evolutionary and degenerative veins in human life, where does the debate finally go? We can use such expressions; Human life is a dual cycle of evolution and decline, but with a constant evolutionary pattern. This constant paradigm may have been formed since the first attempts to establish the institution of philosophy. The attempts to decipher existence in the context of the quality of thought that has led to the establishment of the institution of philosophy may be our only constant point and sign of the evolutionary line of existence recognition. Attempting to know existence though formed among a limited group of human societies, within the frame of the institution of philosophy far from a value judgment was along with a kind of complexity. Knowledge of existence, in the philosophical context, depends on finding the skill to think. This skill is assessing the data gathering from the realm of nature and the theoretical interpretation according to the reality

of existence. The Human goes beyond everyday life through the institution of philosophy to discover. The question about the truth, and the diversity of existence and its epistemological foundation was an attempt in that direction. As we have said, the knowledge of the termination or the absurdity of existence in the shadow of its phenomenological face and its presentation gives us a clear horizon. This phenomenological presentation even encompasses the qualitative aspects of existence, such as the senses, approaches, preferences and other hermeneutical aspects of existents and existence. The phenomenal notion of existence is the consequence of the consciousness notion about this origin of existence. This phenomenological appeared consciousness in the real occurrences of existence, and the plural forms of existence cannot be questioned except from an epistemological point of view. Now the teleological origin of this phenomenological existence and the exploration of the borders of physics and the role of metaphysics in the presentation of phenomena are always in front of science as an institution that claims to be able to gain knowledge. Looking at existence, we can see that metaphysical necessitations have surrounded many realms of existence. It is the justifying reason for the smallness of the field of constant ratios in the realm of existence. The only domain of constant ratios is the field of mathematical propositions. In this field, we are exclusively faced with the constant foundation of invariant constant ratios. Even many of the current scientific options are metaphysical ones. It is not possible to list all scientific propositions here, but the move to replace a set of conditions with a cause or a set of causes is evidence of the meta-physicality of the necessity of scientific propositions and even logical theorems. The question of whether a theorem is true or false at one time may be true and useful in ontological or epistemological terms, but if there are other ontological and epistemological terms, they may not be as true now. It must be noted that current epistemological conditions are the consequence of a load of consciousness on plural forms of existence, which itself represents a limitation. It is currently impossible to determine the stability or change of epistemological conditions because of the mystery of the substance of consciousness and our lack of information about the ontological steps. The meta-physicality of the necessitation of propositions to the humanities is more than ever shown. For example, I'm referring to a common statement. Civilization is the consequence and the result of urban life. Logically there is no inseparable link between the subject and the predicate of this statement. We accept that historical evidence has supported this approach for the last several millennia, but no fact prevents this statement from being put forward with any other predicate. The earliest cities were probably constructed in large villages with high population density or the development of one or more small villages. The notion of the development of civilization elsewhere in the city is probably one of the metaphysical necessitations that we have mentioned above. Whenever it was possible, or it is possible, a design of some kind of technical, instrumental, or intellectual progression or complexity can be accomplished in any supposedly none-European society. As with most advances, it has happened in the most ancient epochs of human civilization in semi-nomadic societies. For the first time, the Indo-European peoples, by taming horses and using chariots and some sort of military strategy, succeeded in winning over the people who were superior in some ways and the so-called civilized and later making brilliant progress in the history of civilization. So how do we not see strange and extraordinary occurrences in every moment, despite the expansion of the metaphysical necessitations in existence? It should be noted that no event occurs in existence unless consciousness determines the program and the quality of its occurrence by the interference with the plural forms of existence. Surely existence is not a mechanical and inflexible and unchangeable system that all its principles and its smallest corners planned since the beginning of the universe, but these details are organized in terms of occurrences and probably based on teleological dimensions. Existence is full of occurrences that their explanation is not possible by the logical rules. The second problem relates to actions and behaviors that are performed by and through consciousness. The above-mentioned metaphysical necessitations mainly determine the origin of existence or the teleological elements of occurrences. Each occurrence, however strange and beyond the logical rules, is a consequence of the interference of consciousness in the plural forms of existence. The same interference of consciousness in the plural forms of existence is the point of emphasis of science in empirical studies through the observation corridor. We return to the significance of the metaphysical necessitations to know the physical or metaphysical origin of existence. The matters that we explain above and the perception of quantum mechanics about the motion issue within materials reject the materialistic perception of the origin and dominant way of existence. Motion in existence is discoverable, but it seems that the quality of the interference of motion in existence degrees is a consequence issue of metaphysical necessitations. Substances that are the matters of physics science and Newtonian mechanics are instruments under the authority of the metaphysical impulses and motivations, that in line with the horizon of consciousness, must be a vast context to study empirical sciences. The lack of the function of physics does not harm empirical sciences as an institution that claims to be able to gain direct and certain knowledge as the lack of a traditional method of gathering information, or inducing does not harm a new way of doing empirical studies. Science as an institution whose sole specific purpose is the knowledge of existence ---as it really is --- has any eternal fidelity in any instrument and methodology. Induction is a method of observation. Why must we keep the old ways when we can observe in a more useful and better way and gather accurately the facts? The observation was formerly made by more inefficient tools than today's tools but has replaced inefficient old tools since the more efficient tools were invented. Methodologies like tools are not free of evolutionary aspects. They can also become better and more efficient. Our imaginations are sometimes a major obstacle to reaching the wider and brighter horizons of progress. Perhaps from the earliest scientific studies, the notion of the physical origin of the universe was on the minds of scientists and philosophers at large. Physics has encouraged science and scientists to come up with great scientific innovations and advancements, but the reality is that the physical origin of existence is made by our notion of science. Our conception of knowledge is a kind of generalization based on the resemblances around us. We can obtain a real knowledge about existence by particular knowledge and adapting it to other phenomena by emphasizing peculiarities that possess the same logical genus and species. Upon deeper study of the universe, the man realized that his methodology for examining the phenomena of existence does not explain their heterogeneity, so he chose the way of nihilism, and he suspected that occurrences and behaviors occur without any rule. Some have recognized the origin of existence comprehensible material for human without being able to explain how the process of existence came out of pure material, while they do not ignore other elements in existence. Now we must erase science from our imaginations. Now is the time to study existence, far from any approach that prevents us from attaining the Truth and accepting any results of this impartial and without any discussion devoid of our imaginations. We will now discuss another aspect of consciousness and its relation to the metaphysical context of occurrences. If occurrences contain a form of consciousness, then every occurrence is performed

by creatures not naturally free of consciousness. Considering the above discussion about the lack of material superiority for the origination of existence and of occurrences naturally, we can claim that consciousness is the origin of existence and naturally occurrences. We can call this appearance of consciousness in occurrences, planning. We would like to elaborate on this. There is no action free from planning. You may ask, even chaos? Naturally, our answer is yes. How convincing an explanation is there that planning can be observed and explained even in chaos. Certainly, the answer is not definitive because the definitive answer necessitates the empirical study of all existence while we do not yet know whether existence is a finite affair or not. We can only give one reason that it is the end of chaos. If consciousness is not hidden within each occurrence, how we can present the movement of an occurrence can carry through. Of course, it is clear that, when we speak of chaos, we cannot say with certainty that our considered occurrence is also considered from the perspective of consciousness to be the cause of that chaos; Because the chaos term is a moral term whose final judgment is a teleological judgment that is bound to illuminate the teleological darkness of existence. As we said, this is only one a reason. We do not yet know the continuing cycle that we can recognize as the rule of existence unless the temporal consequences of some events such as death and life, but this reason does make up for the idea that existence is full of planning. If not, we must observe occurrences that are impossible to analyze. It is true. We encounter strange events and such a big problem to explain, but our explanations have so far identified that the main problem for explaining the world is the technique of knowledge categorization, not the interference or non-interference of consciousness in the behaviors and occurrences in the different realms of existence. Certainly, we do not want to say that all philosophers agree that such an issue exists because the conceptualization of such a concept as an epistemological foundation in the present circumstances is a rare matter. Planning as the formulator of consciousness in all existence itself follows undiscovered laws. These laws actually are far from our view. We can expect planning to help us understand existence. We can follow the headings of planning in existence and know it. At this step of the cognitive process, a problem that presents itself that solving it, can make it easier to follow this planning system in existence. We explained consciousness creates, when encountered plural forms of existence. Does the plurality of forms of existence cause the plurality of planning centers? How can we for example, be timely informed of the planning of a criminal gang? How can we identify and prevent the planning of consciousness for a fatal accident? Despite of the plurality of existence forms, we can present such. The interference of super consciousness to order planning is also apparent and discoverable. It turns out that our consciousness is super-consciousness because at least this consciousness is superior to the creatures created by it itself from nothing. It is impossible to present existence if there is no supremacy in the idea of innovation and in its practical development. This evolutionary category, of course, has been presented in all the realms of existence because if it had not been, the matter could have experienced forms of creation. As we argue above, the origin of existence is certainly not physical. If we can study super-consciousness as the source of planning in existence and have information about its intended planning for events, we can probably prevent them from happening or accelerate them. This planning in all aspects of life, even the most particular and the smallest behaviors of beings are presented, because we cannot present any behavior without planning. There is Another hypothesis about the planning center. One of these hypotheses can be related to individual external factors or extrinsic influences or other present beings in existence. Undoubtedly planning for the occurrence or appearance of an event or behavior is not a simple matter and can be influenced by the variety of factors, but the decisive factor is definitely the hidden consciousness within each being. Concealed consciousness in each being is not inflexible and invariable in an entity that is not affected by any external variables or internal mutations. The same issue makes consciousness like a riddle and makes the research on the side more interesting. Any existent as an organized system of consciousness and existence, ---as simple as a virus or as complex as the human being--- can be influenced by its organized systems of consciousness or its own internal consciousness mutations. From the evolutionary history view, despite common genus, the different strange variations in the resulting subcategories of a species can be seen. There is no reason other than the internal mutation or the consciousness diversity for this variation. Darwin's natural selection scheme with the elimination of consciousness cannot be a good suggestion for the evolutionary process because we cannot deduce a philosophical and scientific meaning. Let's not get away from the argument. The quality of discovery planning centers may be related to the empirical study of two sources. First, the system of consciousness that actually or potentially is the matter of empirical study or susceptible to the type of planning in question. The question may raise, how to determine the probability of planning an occurrence? The only possible answer is to study consciousness and determine its relation to planning. If planning is directly related to super consciousness, this fact prevents the planning centers from collapsing. It is most likely true because by studying the source of consciousness, even at this current level of science, we can understand the effects of consciousness such as growth and movement that are discoverable in all existence. The difference between these aspects of consciousness depends on the difference between commandments and programs. While consciousness is a scattered affair it is very unlikely to switch to each one of these centers definitely by studying consciousness and the knowledge about its processes. To understand phenomena, we must observe. Observation is a window that brings us into the cycle of observing phenomena. Meanwhile, observation is a technique on which the scientific method is founded and explains phenomena from the scientific point of view. Observation helps us gather the facts needed to know existence. Observation is what drives us to conceptualize. We observe the resemblances and differences of the particular facts and conclude from the comparison of particular observations whether such specific particular facts can be categorized in a category or concept. Naturally, if something is not observable, it is out of the bounds of empirical study, not because of the positivistic approach that experience in an unobservable matter is meaningless, but because of the inaccessibility of the scientific method to potentially unobservable objects. Many potential researchable realities or fabricated generalities normally in the humanities are among the categories that are still being discussed as an observable affair. Positivism was apparently a move to delineate the scope of the method of science based on empirical criteria and the rejection of any phenomena that cannot be understood and explained in this paradigm. The result was that many philosophical thoughts that could not be analyzed by formal logic were regarded as unauthentic and meaningless statements. Observation as a technique of the scientific method led us to choose fragments of the phenomena ways. We cannot observe phenomena since the beginning of their presence in existence to the end of their presence in that form and in that specific substance under the specific linguistic terms under study. So far, science has not been able to formulate the same trend of occurrences on a continuous observation foundation. Belief in the equality of the premises of an occurrence with all including definitions is deeply theoretical. In the domain of science, those entering

observable occurrences into the realm of physical appearance, and their effects can be understood and recorded with five human senses. The preliminaries and the necessities of occurrences are either denied due to lack of physical appearance or are investigated in the framework of empirical science with specific utilities that there are many debates about it. The fact that behaviors after occurring and the appearance of physical properties are the scientific study matters, adding to impeding complete, accurate and all-inclusive knowledge of occurrences, does not explain the causes of the differences and the variety of phenomena. For example, in the case of a very complex human being, such as human beings, it can be explained that many human-like behaviors have different and perhaps conflicting motives. Consider a hypothetical situation. Some persons collude in killing another person. These individuals may have different motivations and plans for this action. Someone expects to own his assets someone is going to take revenge for old hatred. The third enters the story because of the adventure and the psychotic obsession. All of them have worked together to accomplish a murder scenario, apart from their role in conducting one behavior. We cannot understand the intent and motivation of the different behaviors participating in this behavior by judging the physical appearance of this behavior, which is the same as the conspiracy to commit murder. Perhaps we can ask what the significance of understanding the motives of behaving beings' comprehension is. Answering this question is significant when we get far from the value judgment view of science, and we think with avoiding from this notion that the narration of existence is not according to we think. Our narrative is probably the consequence of our choice between different occurrences of existence. We must abandon all epistemological and logical and practical presuppositions to gain direct and all-inclusive knowledge of existence. Thus, the knowledge of any behavior apart from our narrative depends on its origin and motivation as much as the quality of movement and variation of its causal consciousness. If a behavior, apart from its causal context, is identified, it will provide both a misrepresentation of the emergent behavior of scientific research materials and not a component of the super-narrative of existence. Emphasizing on the choice of our narrative of existence does not mean the lack of narrative in existence. We must emphasize the current narratives in existence are not always equal to our narrative in the framework of a sentence. If the non-physical motives of the behaviors are not apparent to us, we cannot replace any of the probable different floating ancillary narratives of the motives leading to a specific collective behavior in the super-narrative patterns –And gain real and immediate knowledge of existence as theorists of the method of science. Thus, so far, it has become clear that the knowledge of the causes and motivations of identical and different behaviors is effective in the process of original and authentic knowledge. Now how can we reconstruct and recognize these largely non-physical motives with the help of the only technique of science that is observation? Observation is a process that is only possible through the five senses and we cannot define and constrain it in another way. Once again, the role of planning and consciousness becomes more prominent. To obtain the substance of reality, we must first break it down into its constituent elements and second recognize the sign of hidden consciousness within it. Return to this point every occurrence is the consequence of consciousness operation on plural forms of existence. It may be necessary to remember that consciousness creates non-physical motivations for doing behavior. Observing the motivation for a behavior that has a non-physical appearance depends on discovering forms of consciousness of its origin. We cannot directly observe the origin of behaviors with five senses, but we can understand and follow their causal forms of consciousness. Our era is full of contradictions. There is a range of evolutionary ideas to denial approaches to any kind of planning and meaning in existence together under the name of science with tolerance. Seeing the small things is sometimes the solution to the problems that are often the matters of thought circles. We mentioned two genetic disorders whose consideration is the solution to a main problem and invalidating dogmatic views based on the lack of possibility of observing many non-physical behaviors. Syndrome XXX and XY syndrome are two examples of chromosomal disorders, the first common among one-thousandth women and the second in one-thousandth men. The first is associated with learning disorders and the second with behavioral disorders. The common and interesting point of these two chromosomal syndromes is their natural phenotype. It means that people with these syndromes do not show any physical appearance of the disorder. The interference of the genetic element in these disorders indicates the effect of these elements on behaviors that have a non-physical appearance. Here we also consider the negative manifestations of these disorders as non-physical manifestations. It is an example of the appearance of planning in behaviors that shows that their non-physical emergence is crucial to the future of science. Confirming the probability of the effects of the genetic element on some psychotic disorders such as schizophrenia, with varying percentages, expresses the belief in planning for some operations that relate to some non-physical aspects. Referring to mental illness as a spectrum of non-physical behaviors is related to the fact that despite some common clinical symptoms in a range of diseases such as schizophrenia and Alzheimer's, we cannot attribute these symptoms to specific clinical and laboratory features as the disease is other than Symptoms do not appear. We must bear in mind that the myth of the impossibility of observing the facts is a devastating presumption that has obscured the horizon of new science. The creation of this presupposition depends on the theology of secular science and its attraction to the epistemological presupposition that the universe is not except matter and its kinetic actions and reactions, which are the matter of the physical paradigm studies. Another issue is the quality of the interference of consciousness in planning. Consciousness confronts with the consequent variables of plural forms of existence. The same variables that confuse empirical knowledge to understand the stability of existence and its order is the explanation of this reality because the source of the knowledge of super-consciousness does not exist in philosophy. How these variables systems govern existence? It remains unclear. However, studying variables and their possible effects on consciousness can also help us better understand the planning process. Knowing more than planning makes the myth of the unpredictability of behaviors - specifically human behaviors - unauthentic. This myth may be the result of the conceptions of scientists and philosophers and the limitations of human understanding of science in past centuries, such as the physicality of the origin of existence. In any case, the debate over the physical or metaphysical origins of existence may still continue, but those who claim to have abandoned metaphysics can hardly support their claim. Metaphysics seems to be more inclusive than one might think. Not all those who eschew metaphysical categories have gone further than metaphysics in the final analysis. As the debate begins, consciousness comes to mind and consciousness in the concepts makes sense to human. The concept is what one understands, a form of consciousness that applies to objects, and deeds. The way to reach a purpose is a choice between two or more possible affair and many other behavioral situations. Metaphysics represents the same material aspect of the human life that cannot be analyzed and the same flowing metaphysical aspect of the universe. We cannot reduce it to purely material function. The main philosophical rings, from the most skeptical philosophers and

philosophical systems to the ideal philosophers and philosophical systems, all have inevitably begun to discuss metaphysical foundations, but some thinkers accepted this metaphysical history and presupposition, and some thinkers chant to eliminate metaphysics. The main challenge is with the movement that has chosen the elimination of metaphysics as its watchword since the early decades of the nineteenth century. Nietzsche inspires a determinative line in the "postmodern" "anti-philosophy" movement that left the starting point of the debate to purify the knowledge from metaphysical elements. Nietzsche, of course, was the founder of the ideas that have underpinned the "anti-philosophy" movement due to the technical dilemmas --- the process of knowledge - and his specific epistemological view of the changing components of the universe, but in the end, Nietzsche failed to adhere to his epistemological foundations - which demanded that cognition be a process devoid of metaphysical elements because such purification is basically impossible. Abandoning material processes will inevitably lead to some kind of cognitive elements arrangement that cannot be justified by material elements. Nietzsche's analysis of the impossibility for obtaining knowledge --- in our words --- in the final analysis somehow deals with the premises and contexts for behavior not to occur. Human knowledge is a behavior that occurs or does not - as discussed above - contain a hidden form of consciousness. Discussion about the context of occurrence or non-occurrence of any behavior is necessarily following the hidden form of consciousness underlying that behavior and pursuing the hidden forms of consciousness at each occurrence entails metaphysical discussions. In the final analysis, the conclusions that can be called "anti-philosophical" are founded on the inability of human knowledge to achieve the "substance of things" and the impossibility of knowing, based on "metaphysical" presuppositions and proposes the choice of some kind of ultimately non-corporal elements that we cannot analytically explain to material elements. Nietzsche's purge of the knowledge process from metaphysical elements has been largely unsuccessful, and his set of epistemologies - like previous epistemological circles - despite overwhelming claims - is still bound by metaphysical presuppositions. Moreover, Nietzsche's epistemology remains captive to metaphysics in the more practical realms of life. His proposed epistemology recognizes our understanding of the universe as an interpretation among many possible interpretations. It has no preference over other interpretations, but the value system, --- which if not his favorite, has at least been emphasized in his work, and one of Nietzsche's most important works is called "the will to power" is a system of "power" and conflicts - has various forms of existence if such a form exists in the world --- at its center. Another point in Nietzsche's philosophy is (Übermensch) which expresses a neutral situation in the choice of "value system". This value choice is fundamentally inconsistent with his epistemology. about Übermensch Nietzsche writes: Höhere Menschen.

Der steigt empor — ihn soll man loben!
Doch Jener kommt allzeit von Oben!
Der lebt dem Lobe selbst enthoben,

Der ist von Droben! Die fröhliche Wissenschaft 1892-1915, page 18, part 60.

Lack of authority can also be found in the works of other philosophers that we can call them Nietzschean with tolerance, but they have gone the other way against Nietzsche's strategy. Some of these philosophers are sometimes more skeptical than Nietzsche. Derrida is one of these postmodern philosophers and advocates of deconstruction. The Nietzscheans strategy is the appreciation of the values of western society. In the shadow of pluralism as a consequence of the lack of preference of any interpretation of the universe, these philosophers again speak of values such as freedom of human rights and democracy. Beyond these contradictions, this anti-philosophical movement, which has a main social and psychological and cultural strategy to analyze the universe, cannot explain its foundations. If there is no metaphysical foundation upon which our world is built, what is the task of material and nature to govern this dispersed world? Why must we accept the proposed counter-method methodology of Nietzsche? This epistemic anti-knowledge system rejects all preferences, but it cannot explain its privileges over other systems. So, in other words, this system cannot explain its foundations and the reasons why we need to adhere to it. This fact that obtaining the truth of things is impossible and the truth is fundamentally the fragmented and disperse affair if we can speak of such a concept, and if such a concept exists, itself a claim and needs to foundations that can be examined and can epistemologically justify themselves. If cognition is not possible, then what we can do with the particular cognition that Nietzsche has himself believed in it and has defined it as useful but not an accurate phenomenon. How can human beings achieve particular cognition, but it is unavoidable to develop this process and general and all-inclusive cognitions? What enables human to attain particular knowledge, and what precludes human to achieve a general, certain and immediate knowledge? These are questions that remain unanswered, and no way is suggested to answer them. It is not right to speak of philosophical affair under the shadow of this thought method. Consciousness and its representations in the universe can never, under any circumstances, be inclusively analyzed by material foundations. We cannot appraise the origin of the language in a material way. People living in the same environment speak a variation of languages, and planning is even different among family members. Certainly, the theories that are common among academic circles are looking for the causes of some diseases and disorders as the results of the lack of intake of some chemicals by the body, but this approach cannot solve any problem for two reasons: First, we must pursue consciousness in each occurrence based on the above-proposed axiom to appraise the problem in an explicable way in addition to the material, at least we have statistical knowledge. Second, the discrepancies between living beings are so diverse and heterogeneous that mere material analysis does not solve any problem. Moreover, these diseases shortcomings and discrepancies are not that need to be justified, but also many issues such as innovations that cannot be solved in the light of material effects. Therefore, in every occurrence, there is an element that cannot be analyzed based on a material foundation. It is this consciousness that the definition as a principle of classical logic ignores it. Human science is founded on the definition of things as the appearance place of the material element, and it cannot even present other things except the material is effective to create an occurrence, but the element of consciousness cannot be analyzed by materialistic tools. Language and planning as aspects of consciousness cannot be defined as material appearances. Planning means the quality of arranging an occurrence as it is in our favor. Language is the quality of arranging sound and making words based on the sound arrangement. So, no matter how effective material factors are in these arrangements, we cannot reduce all aspects to material factors. This is the content of consciousness that presents itself as a complex issue for us. Consciousness and its aspects are metaphysical elements that are not subdued by materialistic analysis. This is the same determinative element of any occurrence that

philosophers of science seek it. Consciousness is the same thing until it does not exist, any occurrence does not happen, even if all the necessary conditions are met for it to happen. Consciousness is the same sufficient condition that philosophers of science seek. What we mean here is that the manifestation of consciousness can be effective in a behavior, and that is planning. There is no work to do until there is no planning. This axiom is floating in all existence. From the smallest daily chores to the largest and most crucial events that occur in the universe, all of them have originated by this fundamental planning. For a more detailed explanation of the study of forms of consciousness we must add that this operation is done by determining the same form of consciousness in the universe. We must consider this thought horizon that how is done the planning of occurrences and events. Achieving the quality and substance of planning is a manifestation of consciousness which guides us to decipher existence. Perhaps the randomness is a term that we use many times in life. We have no sense of randomness. We believe, for example, that something happened by randomness, but we have no convincing meaning to the randomness, unless the disorder is the result of chaos, but there is no irregular chaos in the world. All anarchistic situations are the consequences of planning that occur in nature. Chaos is the consequence of motion and the result of forces acting in different directions. Things move, they collide, they move apart, they come together, they affect each other, they influence each other, and they eventually form occurrences. The crisis times of nature are anarchistic in our view, and because we are not aware of the premises and finality of the affairs, we think there is no rule and the rise of superior power is the conclusion of chaos and irregularity, while the rise of superior power is the conclusion of planning, and the special behavior that material appears in the conditions of action. One of the most important factors that have affected our minds in the absence of any laws in nature is the standard general perception in academic circles of a mechanical understanding of the material. The science of physics is founded on certain mechanical properties of materials, and our minds are full of the motto of the immutable properties of materials. The motion has specific rules that do not change under any circumstances. This presupposition has made our perception of material not change. Certainly, the recent advancement of fundamental particle physics has been enough to force us to revise the foundation of material formation. Certainly, the perception of the current theories based on the same mechanical assumption still inclines to declare the same results that behind the motion of particles in the subatomic layers, there are any discoverable rules and particles move and turning arbitrarily and randomly, but this theorized chaos is not consistent with the epistemological principle proposed in the present article. Technological dilemmas also impede the study of the subatomic world. As we have explained, our solution, is the study of new chemistry based on the molecular composition of the material. The study of the material composition associated with this approach, however, reveals the determinant and directive state of motion in the particle world that we can observe its reflection in the molecules. How does planning guide occurrences in the world in a large scale to do? The answer may be simpler than usual. The notion of how the world is manageable and programmatic in such dimensions expects a complex and deliberate response in mind, but we do not think so. Because the keys to decipher macro planning code are two more. Planning for occurrences and using the motion element to arrange the chessboard of occurrences. These two headings can be discovered in the world. Therefore, studying motion to determine its quality and changing our understanding of the mechanical substance of materials is crucial. It is very easy to study the realm of existence, as mentioned above. The first step is to know about the inclusive existence realms. We have mentioned the most two significant realms, namely material and life. The key to studying matter is the science of physics and chemistry in the field of empirical science. With the development of genetic science, we can decipher the realm of life. So, we can study both motion and planning in the world. Anyone of these two realms is inaccessible and unrecognizable. Of course, there are other realms in the world around us that we have not yet gained knowledge about their substance. One of these is the electromagnetic spectrum, which is neither analytic in life nor categorized in the realm of matter. Although we know the components of this spectrum by and through materials, they are not scientifically classifiable among the materials, and decoding this field requires deep research in consciousness. Studying the hidden forms of consciousness in occurrences will lead to an enormous complexity that we will deal with here. If we must study the planning and motion in particular cases in order to identify occurrences, then we will have many small details that we cannot categorize into inclusive categories. It is a significant issue. Two issues help us simplify the problem. First, we encounter the nature of classifying and generating inclusive families of categories, themes and things. It is probable that these inclusive categories and families have summoned the primary human mind to define the categories and things surrounding it whose effects have so far even affected our perceptions of the science and categories of existence and the definition of objects. There are definitely inclusive categories in the world. This fact simplifies the recognition of forms of consciousness, but our proposed approach encompasses all seemingly out of the ordinary and inexplicable cases by current processes and rules. To study the hidden forms of consciousness in an occurrence, there is also a shortcut to studying the centralized set of consciousness. The study of consciousness itself guides us toward finding a way to overcome current forms of world consciousness. Here is an example. Major advances in computer science have led to a collection of information that was impossible to imagine until decades ago. Access to a set of information is an example of access science that helps us to produce science and develop the realm of information. The study of consciousness enables us to understand the originator processes of consciousness and to describe these processes and to benefit from these processes to gain more sophisticated forms of consciousness. Consciousness is a process that can only itself explain it and its creating conditions. Therefore, when we are confronted with consciousness, we are not confronted with many particular cases. There are always inclusive generalities that provide the subjects of science. However, it is not the only way to discover the hidden forms of consciousness behind it to gain insight into originator processes of the qualities of occurrences and the inclusive knowledge of an occurrence. If the hidden forms of consciousness in an occurrence do not fall within the generality that science studies to know, we must study it as a particular case. With these approaches, the scientific generalities may have a smaller cycle of inclusiveness, but our understanding of the world is a real, certain and valuable knowledge.

Perhaps the appearance of any occurrence comes with a conclusion and termination. Perhaps behind every event is reason and meaning. Is this really the case? The answer to this question is very complex. We cannot answer this question directly. When we can answer the question that our knowledge of the world is certain and direct and that the ontological issues and the riddle of consciousness are solved. We can consider some probabilities to appraise the finality of the universe. Maybe all the events in the world are used as components of a car with the same purpose. Maybe occurrences

are planned in different directions. The third probability returns to the determinative conditions of finality and termination that we can never assess. Other possibilities can be suggested. The lack of termination and the finality of actions and the probability that the universe, along with the known epistemological and ontological stages, are steps for shaping other steps of the life process that may be more complex or simpler than the present one. We can answer All these questions in the field of deep research in the field of consciousness. It is possible to determine the conditions for an event to occur --- which we believe to be the hidden consciousness--- on a background of teleological conditions. The study of these issues is mainly concerned with the field of theology. The work of science is exclusively the study of qualities, and it has nothing to do with the substance and WHYS of its matters. The current methodology of science believes that entering into a debate about the substance of the matters under study causes some polemics among theological schools. The consideration of existence from a teleological window is fundamentally a theologian question, and entering into it encompasses the same issues, but it seems if science wants to answer to all human questions, as a rational efficient method, it must avoid this kind of bordering and its limitation to know the universe. Theology does not claim that has the scientific knowledge and methodology and does not rationally explain the universe. The eschatological anticipations of theology, which also have a teleological status, are not observational and empirical statements, but dogmas and commands applicable to believers. Therefore, the point of view and the methodology of science and theology to explain existence are different. We cannot argue that any kind of science speech about teleological subjects is beyond the bounds of science. The science claims to obtain certain and immediate knowledge, or at least it wants such knowledge. Any question that arises in the mind of the questioning object that seeks to explain the connection between consciousness, and the hidden forms of existence is a logical question, and science cannot depart from its answer. The question of the teleological status of being --- apart from which group of human emotional and methodological possessions is to be categorized into existence is a question that occupies the mind of questioner object and each cognitive system that which claims to know the universe must have a proper answer according to the reality of the universe; otherwise, that system will merely claim to know the world as it really is. We can just hope for one thing. The only teleological explanation of existence is the pursuit of forms of consciousness and their relation to plural forms of existence. One of the most significant issues in existence is death. What is the termination of the beings after death? Will human be annihilated after death, as materialism claims, or must it be held accountable for the good and the bad in monotheistic religions beliefs in the other world? Should human expect some kind of life in the future? Science is too weak to answer these questions, and our tools are very inadequate. We have noted that changes and alterations in the universe are only changes and alterations in relation to consciousness and plural forms of existence. We cannot pursue the ontological replacement for things, in the universe. To explain the universe from the teleological point of view the question of death and its meaning must be answered. Is death a stage in the labyrinth of life, or is it the end of the road itself? The solution to these problems gives us a light horizon in line with the connection between consciousness and the plural forms of existence. Perhaps studying the consciousness and organization of living beings and nature will guide us in the path they take in their lives. We must not limit ourselves and consequently, science to time. One of our limitations to know the universe is time. For us, as the object of questioning what is past, it is no longer recognizable and retrievable. Understanding of existence, there is one main obstacle, and that is the inaccessible past of time. Time passes like a river pulling water away from a thirsty person. Can we return this process to the previous state? It is a question that its answer --- even at the boundaries of our restricted presentation of science--- is positive. For the past two hundred years, we have been able to preserve, maintain and rebuild the effects of our past behavior. Audio and video recording based on the electromagnetic orbit has helped this purpose. So far, science has helped us to record our behavioral effects. So, this is one way to spread the knowledge about the universe that we can overcome time by studying consciousness and its relation to existence which is the main obstacle for us. We must go beyond this obstacle. We can see how the species and realms of existence originated. We are not talking about the past tense, but the time generally detracts human from knowledge. The future is also a barrier to know existence. To know existence free of time we must pass and observe further time.

Time, an unknown phenomenon on the context of space and consciousness: what is time indeed and how can we overcome it? A brief glance may help to open a far horizon, to identify time. In the first glance we cannot get any presentation of time. There is no rational explanation of time. Time analysis itself probably does not help solve this complex puzzle. We must start with other phenomena. Our proposed scheme is time analysis based on its probable particulars. One of these probable particulars is motion. We keep and adjust time with the help of motion. Our criterion for recording the minimum time until the invention of the atomic clock was the motion of the sun, according to our predecessors, and in our belief the motion of the earth. Idioms such as day and night represent the time periods specified by motion. So, we might imagine that if there were no planets moving, time would or would not, but it is not very true. Because there was time before the sun was born. For example, you say Big Bang happened at such and such a time. Here we can go one step further. Time may be related to occurrences in addition to motion. Because we cannot reasonably limit time in motion, because to obtain the beginning of motion we must necessarily return to the interference of consciousness and the plural forms of existence that its consequent is occurrence. Here we conclude time is the continuation of the motion that in its extension consciousness operate on plural forms of existence that its consequent is occurrence. From another perspective we can look at the issue. What is the time? The answer that can be offered here is: Apply consciousness to the plural forms of existence in the context of place. In explaining this, it should be said: The movement we have previously referred to as the bedrock of consciousness operation on the plural forms of existence, is nothing but the extension of space. In this sense, time and space is the twin. As soon as there is space, time is also present because the plural forms of existence are finite. Consciousness operates on the plural forms of existence in the context of space and this limitation in the context of space rises because of the limitation of the plural forms of existence. Is it possible to be free of temporality? The answer is an infinite form of existence. If such a form exists, we may be out of time. The consciousness to overcome the limitation of the plural forms of existence, and the interaction with the plural forms of existence creates motion. The plural forms of existence are limited, and they move to operate themselves and the other forms of existence to overcome their limitation. This motion grants them the timing feature. We can call time the motion of the plural forms of existence on a context of space. Now that we have the limited idea about the constitutive particulars of time, we may be able to draw a horizon of time, though incomplete. If time is the act of consciousness on the

multiple forms of being in the span of space that its consequent is the occurrence, one can obtain a proper explanation of time by each of the particulars of time study. First, we will first discuss the dimensions of space. The human is not able to have a presentation of categories apart from space. From a human point of view ((no space) is meaningless. Given the above explanation, perhaps the reason for this is obvious. Human, as a consequence of the consciousness operation on one or more forms of existence is, limited. This constraint forces him to move on to his wishes. It is impossible to get rid of the notion of space except in the shadow of the idea of infinite existence. When the existence is unlimited, there is no requirement to be in a place. Any time it is anywhere. Some phenomena of existence propose a presentation of (no space, though far and limited). Of course, no space presentation is also in the context of space and its continuity so that we can present that existence in the context of space is infinitely continuous. It is impossible to present existence continuing without volume. Some particulars of the electromagnetic spectrum, unlike material, have no volume and do not occupy space. We cannot trap photons in a chamber or capture electricity. These phenomena are likely to have a location since they are not present in more than one place at each time of their motion. We also cannot recognize vacuum as a sign of lack of space because the consequence of the operation of consciousness on plural forms of existence across space is true in these conditions. Perhaps the current extensive research on the Geneva project to estimate the origin of the universe and one of the decisive consequences of finding particle mass is effective for solving this problem. Maybe we can gain unlimited existence and the presentation of no space by changing consciousness in line with diversity. The other case of consciousness action on the plural forms of existence is the occurrence. Wherever there is consciousness, there is time. However, paradoxically, consciousness creates in contact with a limited form of existence. The consciousness that itself is self-being creates in contact with the limitation. Certainly, we must not be inclusively and decisively restricting the creation of consciousness to deal with finite forms of existence, but existence, as we can observe, is the consequence of this encounter. Another matter is the occurrence and its relation to time. The occurrence is the consequence of a consciousness operation on a form of being that cannot be repeated. Probably this lack of possibility of repetition is because of the restriction of the forms of existence. Every behavior is the consequence of the interference of a form of consciousness into one or more specific forms of existence. Happening is much like communicating an electrical circuit with a switch. An occurrence happens or does not happen in a limited motion phase. Because of the restrictions of the forms of existence, every occurrence necessarily ends. For example, when you put your hand on a piece of paper, a chain of physiological action will allow you to hold your hand on the paper for a specific time. When you lift your hand, the particular circle of behavior or occurrence ends because of the limitations of the body's capabilities or the will of consciousness. The onset of one's behavior is itself a sign of the restrictions of the existential form and the involvement of consciousness. You want to put your hand on the paper. You did not want that before. Basically, you did not think of it, and you did not intend to. Time is the distance between restrictions. Not knowing and the lack of abilities. The end of an occurrence is a sign of restriction. The will of consciousness not to do a behavior or to wish for another behavior or the lack of possibility of occurrence itself is also a consequent of the restriction of existential forms. Time is the context in which it is possible to occur parallel events at one time. When you put your hand on the piece of paper, it is possible, a person falling you on the ground by shoving. If you repeat this behavior, a parallel behavior may occur. The phone rings or one of you wants to do something. Perhaps one cause of the lack of repetition of the temporal path of a behavior is the impossibility of limiting the probability of parallel behavior. Another issue is the ontological status of occurrences. Consciousness is there at one time, or not? The comparison of the action of consciousness with electrical communication in the circuit board is very expressive. When the behavior ends, the motion of consciousness does not stop. As such, consciousness strives to find a variation of ways to work on existential forms to originate other behaviors. The same flowing consciousness itself continues time. At any time, we can ask how consciousness operates on existential forms. Even there are not any existential forms, their possibility of origination from nothing makes consciousness a temporal affair. The current epistemological situation we are confronted with whether inadvertently contains a kind of temporality that cannot be presented apart from this situation. There is everything or there is not. Any gap between the two (to be) encompasses the concept of time. Therefore, now it seems logically impossible to go backwards in time, since the possibility of occurrences occurring in the plural forms of existence is very vast, and the possibility of consciousness variation even at intervals of vacuum is a continuous possibility. An occurrence in the context of time means a sequence of the actions of consciousness on the forms of existence that can be projected from the perspective of events and teleology. If an occurrence starts happening the circle of other occurrences, it is time, which is the order of these events and order of the action of consciousness on the form of existence and repetition of the process. Achieving terminations beyond what is occurring opens a new approach to time and opens new possibilities for liberation from temporality. Temporality necessitates being in space and till human is in space, he is not free of temporality. To be rid of temporality, we must get rid of space, and we must set the range of motion to (0). To reach the range of motion to (0), we must not be limited. Limitation means being far from the possibilities of the occurrence and necessarily trying to find them. As the content of these efforts is the context of occurrences, being in space persists and the time is its creation. Prevailing and getting rid of the time gives another characteristic to our acquired knowledge. Our current knowledge of existence is a consequent of tools. We know the universe through the window of the tools that enabled us to know the universe. Certainly, the tools move in the direction of our cognition accuracy, but they also have the problem of assuming that cognition is the ultimate boundary of existence. Consequently, by emphasizing the role of tools, we forget that our cognition is the consequence of tools and is surrounded by situations that are evolutionary and consequently variable; Time also makes it impossible to have a complete and without deficiency observation of what is happening in the universe. For example, we refer to the Paleontological history of plants and animals. By the current technical methods, we cannot obtain a reliable estimation of the paleontological history and origins of animals and plants species. While these species have undoubtedly appeared on the earth at some point in time, they have grown and developed. It is never possible to determine this paleontological history for observing with this present limited method; in many situations, there is no observable organic relic of the phenomenon under study on which we can estimate. As a result, these problems do not seem to be solved due to the temporality of observation. This issue manifests itself in historical studies. We can never back to the past because there is no capacity for time and time kept us away from observing it. Despite escaping these events from observation, their estimation is significant for reproducing a certain and immediate knowledge. The temporal knowledge and the knowledge which time disables it to inclusively analyze their required

evidences can be never certain and direct. Therefore, to obtain immediate knowledge temporal situations whether future or past and evolutionary situations whether tools or method of observation must be solved problem. Solving these issues preserves our understanding of change. Solving problems of cognition and time is a theoretical arena in which philosophical inquiry enriches it. To solve this problem, one must consider the constituent elements of an occurrence. If an event is the result of an overlap of consciousness in the plural forms of existence, and the order and quality of this interaction over the context of space is called time, then study of the constituent elements of an occurrence must lead to the solution of the problem of time. Exploring the substance of consciousness and its relation to the plural forms of existence in the quality of happening events, illuminates the true meaning and temporal order, as well as its probability or certainty and gives us a perspective on how far time can be prevailed and events can be analyzed far from a temporal and spatial perspective. One of the definite dimensions of temporality is (being in space). It seems studying the material substance and the quality of the material creation from no mass state and n (no space) to be crucial to determine this constitutive dimension of time. The question of (being in space), in addition to the empirical approach, also has an epistemological and ontological status. Is it possible to have a presentation of the end of space? When space ends what does happen? The answer to this question is very inaccessible. At the moment we do not know whether we are facing a limited universe or not, because we do not have a clear epistemological and logical presentation of the limitations of existence. We do not know where and how space ends. What does mean the end of the space basically, and how is it possible? Is (being in space) only just a form of phenomenal existence or is it just an option of phenomenal existence? This question cannot be answered at this time, but these answers play an important role in discovering the secret of existence, and future empirical sciences must consider them. A part of the present time is the possibility of motion over the span of space. Each behavior is lineally spatial. We can see parallel lines of behavior in the framework of space. Studying the concept of space helps to decode the concept of time. Considering this fact that material has a close relation to the concept of space and cannot be basically presented apart from it, therefore, study of the paleontological history of material certainly helps to decipher the mystery of time. Space is a kind of phenomenological and ontological possibility. Probably (being in space) extent is wider than of the phenomenal material study field, Because the famous theoretical premise of the universe beginning of the Big Bang is conceivable over a spatial extent, it is only possible to discover the concept of the space of discovering the phenomenal secret of existence. This revelation depends on the discovery of all kinds of phenomena and their paleontological history. To obtain certain and immediate knowledge the hidden consciousness in existents must be studied beyond time. The important question to achieve a certain and immediate knowledge here is that we need to know whether forms of consciousness in the beings that ontologically have altered and have transformed into other beings in their diversity can be discovered or not. A positive answer to this question inspires us to delve deeper into the discovery of these forms of consciousness whose relation to existential forms has been cut off or altered. If consciousness disappears in the course of existential change, we must study and analyze the substance, quality, and cause, as well as the consequence of this phenomenon on temporality and its relation to a certain and immediate knowledge. It is very difficult to answer whether consciousness changes, removes or not in confronting with plural forms of existence. Answering this question involves explaining the motives and behaviors and discovering the law for them to occur. However, given the current state of science, we cannot determine the boundaries of behaviors and their causes and motivations. This question also undoubtedly relates to the meta-physicality of consciousness. It is true that Newtonian mechanics was challenged by modern physics proposals, but so far, no case has been reported against the law of energy conservation and fundamentally cannot be understood logically in epistemological terms. The ontological removal of material cannot yet occur, but we cannot speak so about consciousness and its changes, because the substance of consciousness is unknown to us. These are questions we may be able to answer by studying the depth of consciousness and its relation to plural forms of existence. Speaking from a distant horizon probably indicates a great deal of complexity, but it is necessary to study these theoretical perspectives in order to gain certain and immediate knowledge of existence. In teleological terms, analysis is related to a very important issue, namely ethics in human life. Ethics from the consciousness window: what is role of ethics in human's life and the formation of his behaviors? If one believes in moral commands why does he do so many immoral behaviors? If one does not believe in moral statements why he attempts to solve this complex problem? Is ethics a justification to overcoming power by weak persons by resorting to the weakness for persecuting the defeated group? Is ethics merely a reflection of the teleological conditions of our behaviors? Is ethics the manifestation of a previous step in our lives as human beings? What is the answer to these questions convincing? Our starting point is against the proposed principle of masking the forms of consciousness in occurrences and observing the flowing occurrences as a behavior. Human morality is the consequence of the highest appearance of consciousness and a new cycle of conditions creation around this center. The human can distinguish between good and evil however, there is still no definite agreement on the extensions of good and evil. The human can choose. He can choose between bad and worse or good and better. The human can skip something, fall in love, punish, and take revenge. Many of these behaviors are only the consequent of consciousness when one is not conscious, we cannot call revenge his retaliation of behavior. Instincts make the wild animal react to enemies or rivals, but the human can intensify or alleviate his behaviors against other beings. However, we cannot deny this fact that the observable behaviors of a human can be observed in different ways in other living beings, but this resemblance is the consequent of the consciousness complex appearance in living beings, and this appearance is so much complex, the ability of maneuver in that being is more. The final analysis of moral propositions depends on determining the probable teleological conditions of life. Ethics is the kind of system that determines whether or not it happens under conditions that govern the general system of human behavior. Human behavior as a moral being is the consequence of the conditions in which human acts in the context of behaviors. The lack of discussion about behavior or specific behaviors is not outside of the spectrum of these behaviors, namely the necessary conditions to occur. Human life as a creature whose social behavior is at least part of its behavior needs basic foundations to prevent chaos. On what basis must this idea be founded, and what is the foundation of man's guide to the way of life? What reference is there for human values? Each person or group has their own way of thinking and seeing the world through their own perceptions and feelings and decisions. How can we reconcile these separating points? What saves human life from collapse and chaos? What general law will cover the whole process of life? The answer seems to be the form of tolerance and the recognition of the individual as the smallest self-organizer unit of consciousness. Any challenge that disregards the individual or group of human beings as a living

being must be regarded as a threat to morality; Here, of course, there seems to be no boundary between law and ethics, but we believe that the law also guarantees the protection of moral propositions, and in the final analysis the law is not free from moral propositions. We must point out that we do not agree with the dictatorship of society. Some human societies are probably at fault. We add, then, the collective agreement and the preservation of individual boundaries define the boundary of morality. It is not result of lack of discourse preference. The lack of discourse preference is a slogan that has never real aspect because human societies behave, and each behavior that arises, is a present cultural element in society. In every society, collective behaviors occur or do not. Doing or not doing behaviors may not be agreed upon within the context of the individual discourse of anyone of members of the society. Moreover, the will of the people in the community is not the only factor in conducting behavior and accepting opinion. The occurrence of a behavior and believing in an opinion are due to many factors that must be studied according to the situation. It is virtually impossible to allow to be satisfied any instinct in society. If so, "homosexuality" has the right to express and practice in society solely on the pretext that it is a kind of "institutional sex", hysteric individuals can also form a society, saying that - ---Even if it is considered a disease--- it is an institutional and inherent human disorder, demanding the right to express and apply it at the community level. If all kinds of sex are freely applicable in society, why are not all kinds of methods of death and other types of instincts? The lack of discourse preference - as it is common today - is also not faithful to its principles, as it is condemned, for example, by a homosexual assault on a sex object among those who believe in the lack of discourse preference. This condemnation - if expressed with the genuine and heartfelt conviction, for the lack of discourse preference - is certainly a matter of priority for the individual rights of the citizens of society. For example, while developing the discourse element of a community, politicians, sociologists, and thinkers must accentuate the boundaries of freedoms and practices of discourse. At present, this limiting presupposition is the inter-discourses tolerance, while some discourses do not basically have the ability to participate in the process of discourse, and some other thought systems that probably we cannot call them a discourse; are fundamentally incapable of common discourse-based thought systems. These systems have no place in the environment of discourse and must, without a doubt, be destroyed immediately. We cannot only compare based on values absolutely. First of all, we are human beings who behave towards other existents in a moral circle. We must behave between the two situations of holding the discourse environment and removing it. Eliminating a discourse like a discourse can be behavior by which creatures are totalitarian, and if we truly want to maintain the status of discourse, we must behave like a totalitarian. Living in an all-embracing value-centered moral state is impossible. We say these words are not limiting discourses, but we need to find an appropriate answer to delineate discourse boundaries. Another link between science and prevalent discourse is the kind of discourse that science has to choose. We can refer to the types of discourses common in the human communication layers under the title of four headings. 1. Normative discourse. 2. Functional discourse. 3. Fantastic discourse. 4. Communicative discourse, normative discourse is the realm of rights and law. Fantastic discourse is the realm of arts, and communicative discourse is the realm of the society. The only discourse consistent with the scientific methodological practice is the functional discourse that differentiates science in terms of a cognitive system. Habermas, 1982, page 39. writes: Das Konzept der Begründung ist mit dem des Lernens verwoben. Auch für Lernprozesse spielt die Argumentation eine wichtige Rolle. So nennen wir eine Person, die im kognitiv-instrumentellen Bereich begründete Meinungen äußert und effizient handelt, rational; allein, diese Rationalität bleibt zufällig, wenn sie nicht mit der Fähigkeit gekoppelt ist, aus Fehlschlägen, aus der Widerlegung von Hypothesen und dem Scheitern von Interventionen zu lernen. Das Medium, in dem diese negativen Erfahrungen produktiv verarbeitet werden können, ist der theoretische Diskurs, also die Form der Argumentation, in der kontroverse Wahrheitsansprüche zum Thema gemacht werden. Im moralisch-praktischen Bereich verhält es sich ähnlich. Although these phrases are not directly related to scientific theory, they refer to the unity of action of the rational person in the practical and theoretical realms. Learning in relation to the praxis of the rational person is interpreted as action. Also pages 40 - 41 Auf dieses intuitive Wissen stützen wir uns immer dann, wenn wir moralisch argumentieren; in diesen Präsuppositionen wurzelt der »moral point of view«. 29 Das muß noch nicht bedeuten, daß diese Laienintuition auch tatsächlich rekonstruktiv gerechtfertigt werden kann; allerdings neige ich selbst in dieser ethischen Grundfrage zu einer kognitivistischen Position, derzufolge praktische Fragen grundsätzlich argumentativ entschieden werden können. 30 Aussichtsreich ist diese Position gewiß nur zu verteidigen, wenn wir praktische Diskurse, die durch einen internen Bezug zu interpretierten Bedürfnissen der jeweils Betroffenen charakterisiert sind, nicht vorschnell an theoretische Diskurse mit ihrem Bezug zu interpretierten Erfahrungen eines Beobachters assimilieren. Ein reflexives Medium besteht nun nicht nur für den kognitiv-instrumentellen und den moralisch-praktischen Bereich, sondern auch für evaluative und expressive Äußerungen. Rational nennen wir eine Person, die ihre Bedürfnisnatur im Lichte kulturell eingespielter Wertstandards deutet; aber erst recht dann, wenn sie eine reflexive Einstellung zu den bedürfnisinterpretierenden Wertstandards selbst einnehmen kann. Kulturelle Werte treten nicht wie Handlungsnormen mit Allgemeinheitsanspruch auf. Werte kandidieren allenfalls für Interpretationen, unter denen ein Kreis von Betroffenen gegebenenfalls ein gemeinsames Interesse beschreiben und normieren kann. He believes that societies are able to describe norms under the best circumstances in the light of everyday needs and the description of common interests through rational discourse. He highlights the element of interpretation. The basis is the cultural values in any society. The same cultural values can identify the norms and interests of all groups. Science as a substantially functional system has specific purposes, and the same termination forces science to accept specific functions that cause to utilize functional discourse. Our purpose is science, and science as a cognitive system in the process of knowledge itself must be the methodological affair to attain the purpose of existence knowledge. Specifying the type of scientific discourse necessarily has its negative way. It is the elimination of the other discourses of the scientific atmosphere. It is the first step in removing relativistic discourses from the current scientific atmosphere. Science, as a purposeful and objective system, does not accept any kind of none-functional discourse. Issues arising from confronting with the practical form of science and moral questions must be presumed as issues outside of this circle. If a destructive tool ---resulting from a scientific progression-- - causes life to be ruined somewhere, there is not any immoral conception of its agents and empirical scientists unless that scientist or a specific group of scientists directly and purposefully conduct scientific research for the purpose of destruction. The issue of the devastating use of scientific advancement is a matter that is debated in the general domain of ethics and is the responsibility of the moral object. The lack of preference of discourses is an inefficient principle to classify the beliefs that a society needs to continue living and to manage its actions. This approach is more useful in

cultural issues and literary criticism. Considering this approach, we can help develop this realm, but we must not expect to explain a community's problems by this approach. Determining these boundaries can be achieved through rational dialogue and in the shadow of freedom of expression. All of them are behaviors that the human individual and society do not perform unless the circumstances are right. To study the occurrence of behavior, it is necessary to examine the hidden forms of consciousness among the members of the society under study. Behaviors of individuals are very heterogeneous and can be categorized into a wide spectrum. Many individuals in society influence on groups of individuals or all members of the society under study. In empowering individuals and groups to master power tools such as the military, radio, and other power tools that may be whatever the circumstances may be everything, is the behavior that particular individuals, and groups or a spectrum of groups do it. In general, the influence and interaction in human societies are very plural and varied, and the determination of the criteria and factors affecting human behavior must be studied in detail and the outcome to be appraised by considering the probability of interference and effects of incoming variables. Human law must not take account part of ethically accepted behaviors that are not justified by the foundations of consciousness to protect the individual. For example, if a pedestrian crosses the street and another person slaps on his ear for no reason, this behavior is in no way justified by the basics of consciousness. This person has slapped another person for no reason and has to accept responsibility. Of course, it is very difficult and perhaps impossible to infer the form of pure consciousness of this complex behavioral system; it is the case with very different legal systems around the world. Of course, other factors, such as emergency, are also effective in determining legal issues. Determining the human strategy is a behavioral category, not ethical. Sometimes human societies or individuals ignore all moral rules, and their behavior is called chaos. There is no guarantee of ethical behavior other than the action of the behaving beings. However, taking refuge in morality and trampling on the law is an effort to ensure a mixed sense of human consciousness to be better. In the meantime, some realms of human behavior continue to live apart from conflict with the individual and human society, and the attempt to rule them is futile, and their interpretation may depend on the resolution and solution of teleological issues. Until man has come up with an acceptable interpretation of the end of the world, humans are free in these realms and can act according to their desires beyond the rule of law. Another realm that like as ethics can only be understood and interpreted with the aid of consciousness is mathematical propositions that are considered as certain propositions by propositions. These are the foundations of human cognition. The reliable point of human knowledge is mathematics and its certain propositions, but indeed what subjects are explained by these propositions? What explanatory points do these propositions contain? This answer is has risen in mind of human knowledge researcher since many years ago. Mathematical statements seem to have no meaning except in the shadow of human consciousness. How does find a number meaning? A number means dividing things into units for categorizing. We divide and restrict some parts of the universe to pay more attention to these facts. This bordering itself is a behavior that cannot be explained and justified except under the shadow and scope of consciousness and behaving. Human is conscious, human is a behaving being, Man divides and restricts and establishes the foundation for the behavior and other propositions based on the behavior of division and restriction of parts of the universe. Bordering behavior itself is fundamental to many other heterogeneous behaviors that humans do. The humans generate new lives through natural and artificial borders. In many cases, these borders cause wars, alliances and strife, and many other behaviors such as innovation, progress, and confrontation with constraints, though, bordering itself is a behavior that is the foundation of other behaviors and as a variable, causes to create new other behavioral spectrums and states. Mathematical practices such as division, multiplication and subtraction are actions in the environment of consciousness and within the framework of bordering behavior. When there is no consciousness, no mathematical operation can be done. Two things cannot be added to each other and cannot be subtracted from each other and the square root of a number cannot be taken and any two (X) equation cannot be equated. The conceptual color of mathematical propositions is very prominent. Number two has many extensions: two apples, two walnuts, two stars. Number two is a concept that human as a conscious being generalizes it to many extensions. The (1 and 0) theory applies to explain numbers. It means the real number is just (1) and nothing number is (0), but the behavioral aspect of human is a little broader than its mathematical and conceptual aspects. Humans are able to categorize creatures that are in many ways different, but in other respects, depending on the particular variables that interest them. Imagine a situation where a family went shopping and put their items in separate baskets or packages after purchase. For example, fruits in one package and beans in another. In a packet of fruit, 1 kg of apples and 2 kg of cucumbers and three kg of oranges, a state of three values of three different fruits but with the mathematical connotation of numbers. If asked about the amount of fruit purchased, the answer is the number that indicates the amount of fruit. However, in a broader sense --- if one is to ask for packages containing family purchases --- numbers are used to express the amount of purchases in the form of packages. The behavioral point in mathematical theorems and the broader notion of the mathematical aspect is that the numbers - if we believe in the theory of 1 and 0 - can be applied to the contents of a group without being able to fit them into a particular group. In order to express the content of the target group, it is necessary to avoid the similarities in some respects, and to give a detailed expression of the categories under the category. When asked about the contents of a packet of fruit, we must keep in mind that it contains one kilogram of apples, two kilograms of cucumber and three kilograms of oranges. It is not possible to transmit the reference values to a reference type. However, mathematics is a field that cannot be explained except by consciousness. Theory (1 and 0) is authentic provided that the numbers in the group in the reference category are not one, while they may exist in nature be very similar objects which can be considered as extensions of a concept. In addition to human-made objects, in many cases, they have a degree of similarity and homogeneity that can be understood as the extension of a concept. If there is more than one reference to a concept, the numbers can no longer be limited to 1 and 0. The use of numbers is the behavior that humans do for simplifying classification and mathematical operations. Mathematical behavior is inextricably linked to bordering behavior. In fact, because of the lack of a uniform reference in conveying bordering behavior, --- the contractual substance of divisions and borders being different interpretations of mathematical propositions are possible. Some math operations are purely mental in nature, and no form of meaningful consciousness - - can be imputed to them. Operations such as "multiplying" and "rooting" are ways to get easier access to simpler or more complex forms of numbers.

Automatic systems an alternative for toolmaking: One of the successes of modern science is the success of the European human in toolmaking. The pillar of modern human knowledge, Western Europe, owes much of its success in science to

the extent necessary to build the tools needed to produce and enhance scientific support. Many of the scientific achievements of human have come about in the light of human's access to efficient tools and the technological sophistication resulting from them. Advances in medical science and various branches of engineering are the most obvious evidence of this. Understanding the "microscopic" world and discovering the farthest galaxies --- sometimes up to billions of light-years away from our earth --- was not possible except in the shadow of such an efficient tool. Introducing new medical techniques such as --- the use of anesthesia in surgery and laser therapy - result from the sophisticated tools that technology has made available to humans. Perhaps the tool-based civilization has reached its ultimate extent so far. Today, transportation is the easiest and most affordable way for us. Even the thought of moving distant planets has drowned man and showed him far horizons, but this civilization, which owes its advancements to such great success in toolmaking also encounters a number of complex problems, largely due to its use. One of the major problems is the power supply for the tools needed for different fields of life. Energy supply has two major consequences. One is the supply of raw materials for energy extraction day by day, and the other is that energy supply has many environmental implications for --- even human life. Second, energy production has many ecological aftermaths for human life. These days, air pollution, overcrowding, noise pollution, overwhelming work for urban communities, food shortages for a wide range of underdeveloped communities and water scarcity are issues that human societies seem to be dealing with. It seems that European civilization and its scientific apparatus --- have failed to provide an acceptable solution to these acute dilemmas. These problems still haunt people. Humans are suffering from physical and mental distress - which may not be the case with modern city equations - and are looking to improve their lives, but despite the epistemological status of current science, the prospects for progress are not clear. Moreover, after the secularization of human life, which is at least an indicator of some human societies, science has failed to grant an eminent meaning human life and to discover its hidden meaning - if such a hidden meaning lies there. The human is a conscious being and intends to become aware of the meaning on which his life is founded, but European civilization, which relies on toolmaking, seems to have reached its climax and lacks the capacity to respond to mass human questions about its surroundings. Tools made by Western civilization enabled man to provide the strong support for his science and to deduce those forms of science that were observable, but the world around us is too complicated to be justified by observation far from analyzing its substance. The world around us is not just a mechanical set of objects and simply a matter of classifying objects and categories. As noted above, all beings - in a limited area - are capable of motion and organization that can be evaluated by empirical methods. Instead of relying on the power of human toolmaking, we need to discover and explain the system of variables and the self-organization that governs it. By looking at the cosmological and paleontological evolution of the universe, we can understand automated systems have a very prominent role. From the smallest living mono-cell organisms to the largest producing energy super-mechanisms of galaxies, they do not apply the simplest possible tools. The emergence of man on Earth as a conscious creature and surviving all these deadly dangers that at the beginning of its origination was a threat to humanity is truly a wonder. The presence of man on earth is then scientifically interesting to consider, the human is a conscious being of the substances and qualities of existence and trying to answer his questions. The appearance of a conscious existent on earth is undoubtedly the consequent of consciousness and the complex processes of diversity and the evolution of consciousness affair. Acknowledging this and looking scientifically within the framework of this epistemological notion helps the field of thought not to lose its cohesion in analyzing the diversity and complexity of existence, and the impossibility of observation of the acting object and the controller of variables not to be misled by denying consciousness and meaning of existence, the same confusion that considers particular occurrences as deserted and far islands in the vast expanse of cosmic space. There was a detailed debate about the impossibility of law-free chaos at the level of the universe, which given the epistemological notion of the presence of consciousness at the heart of every event, also explains what distinguishes the phenomenon of automation in the universe from chaos is undoubtedly the categorization of the consciousness origination in existents and phenomena. The classification of levels of consciousness - with all the unpredictability of beings' behavior - is scientifically observable. The materials have an interesting variety. The most passive material - which has a very low affinity for other elements such as argon - can be placed against the most active material such as plutonium. Living creatures, from protozoans to super-complex organisms such as humans, are observable and scientifically studied. The behavioral spectra of living beings also confirm this diversity of consciousness classification.

From instincts that are repetitive and mainly passive behaviors to the most complex of rational human behaviors, they fit into this diverse range of behavior. There are, of course, behaviors that cannot be explained by the concept of type and evolutionary class. Some behaviors result from specific mutations of consciousness that occur in particular situations. The issue is that based on the phenomenological epistemological notion of existence, one can explain these variations of consciousness that have led to different behaviors and conditions. These singular behaviors, which cannot be estimated statistically in existence, are expressed in the lingual perception of consciousness containers. Apart from the enigmatic substance of consciousness, its self-organizing feature can be deduced, that is, the strange feature that has been interpreted as a semantic vacuum. The evolutional categorization of consciousness must take us further in our knowledge of the general meaning of existence. This categorization offers a variety of possibilities for how the universe is targeted. However, relying on the scientific method of automation rather than toolmaking, the scientific method provides broader scientific possibilities for achieving authentic, precise, certain, and immediate knowledge. This position has creative consequences for human life and even for the future of science. Many of the events in our lives today are systematic and automatic, from circulation and palpitations to neurological shocks and cancerous processes. It even seems that one of the human mental functions --- learning --- comes from a vital automated system. If we can build our own organisms and mechanisms, the way of knowledge will be simpler. With the opening of this new horizon, perhaps the content of many of our current imaginations or impossibilities will come true. Interplanetary trips, going computers to modern-day museums, completely controlling all illnesses, and perhaps overcoming death; some of these present-day effects are aspects of that dream life. Tooling is the step we must go beyond at this point. Of course, the tooling and all the problems that come with it - maybe it was necessary - to get to this mysterious passage leading to knowledge. Deciphering this complex system and thus integrating with nature can avoid the costly and sometimes crippling consequences of toolmaking. By taking refuge in nature and learning from it, human achieves ways that are both less expensive and more efficient in meeting his needs. Moreover, certain and immediate knowledge ---if such a process is possible--- can only be achieved in this way. It

is interesting that after such complex steps, human knowledge has acquired such a simple perception of existence. Of course, it would be very unlikely to find the signs of consciousness except under these circumstances by considering human science circulation. This route itself is one of the possible paths that human beings have taken to reach such a level of science, but in any case, it has been this way, and we are now in the current situation.
Wittgenstein, Ludwig 1953

In: Ludwig Wittgenstein Werkausgabe Band 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1999) S.231-485

JACQUES DERRIDA AC
TS OF literature, EDITED BY DEREK ATTRIDGE
ROUTLEDGE

NEW YORK • LONDON

Prefaces, Published in 1992 by

Routledge

An imprint of Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc.

29 West 35 Street

New York, NY 10001

Published in Great Britain in 199z by

Routledge

it New Fetter Lane

London EC4P 4EE

Copyright C 199z by Derek Attridge

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Library of Congress cataloging in publication data

Derrida, Jacques.

Acts of literature / Jacques Derrida : edited by Derek Attridge.

p. cm

.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-415-90056-5

ISBN 0-413-90057-3 (pb)

The family among the Australian aborigines : a sociological study

by Bronislaw Malinowski, Publication date 1913, Publisher London : University of London Press. La vie familiale et sociale des Indiens Nambikwara. [article]

sem-linkClaude Lévi-Strauss

Journal delasociétédesaméricanistes / Année 1948 / 37 / pp. 1-132.

MAX WEBER

THE PROTESTANT ETHIC

AND THE
SPIRIT OF CAPITALISM

TRANSLATED BY

TALCOTT PARSONS

Tutor in Economics, Harvard University

WITH A FOREWORD BY

R. H. TAWNEY

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

LONDON:

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD

FIRST PUBLISHED IN GREAT BRITAIN IN 1930

SECOND IMPRESSION 1948

THIRD IMPRESSION 1950

This book is copyright under the Berne Convention

No portion of it may be reproduced by
any process without written permission.
Inquiries to be addressed to the publisher

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BUTLER AND TANNER LTD., FROME AND LONDON
http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/18-021_b3b67ba8-2fc9-4a9b-8955-670d5f491939.pdf

Ideology and Utopia, An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge: By KARL MANNHEIM, London School of Economics and Political Science, (University of London) Formerly Professor of Sociology in the University of Frankfurt/ With a Preface by LOUIS WIRTH, Associate Professor in the University of Chicago NEW YORK HARCOURT, BRACE & CO., INC LONDON: ROUTLEDGE & KEGAN PAUL LTD 1954 Translated from the German By Louis Wirth and Edward Shils (University of Chicago) PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY LUND HUMPHRIES LONDON • BRADFORD.
KARL R. POPPER

Objective Knowledge

An Evolutionary Approach

Revised Edition

KARL R. POPPER

Objective Knowledge

An Evolutionary Approach

CLARENDON PRESS. OXFORD

*Oxford University Press, Walton Street, Oxford OX2 6DP Oxford New York Athens Auckland Bangkok Bombay Calcutta
Cape Town Dar es Salaam Delhi Florence Hong Kong Istanbul Karachi Kuala Lumpur Madras Madrid Melbourne Mexico
City Nairobi Paris Singapore Taipei Tokyo Toronto and associated companies in Berlin Ibadan*

Oxford is a trade mark of Oxford University Press

Published in the United States by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Karl R. Popper 1972, 1979

*First published 1972 Reprinted (with corrections) 1973 and 1974 (with corrections) 1975 Revised edition (reprinted with
corrections and a new appendix 2) 1979 Eighth impression 1994*

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form

or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press. Within the UK, exceptions are allowed in respect of any fair dealing for the purpose of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms of the licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside these terms and in other countries should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser

ISBN 0-19-875024-2
Printed

David Hume, DAVID HUME
AN ENQUIRY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING.

Extracted from:
ENQUIRIES CONCERNING THE HUMAN UNDERSTANDING, AND CONCERNING THE PRINCIPLES OF MORALS,
BY DAVID HUME.

REPRINTED FROM THE POSTHUMOUS EDITION OF 1777, AND EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION, COMPARATIVE TABLES OF CONTENTS, AND ANALYTICAL INDEX BY L.A. SELBY-BIGGE, M.A., LATE FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

SECOND EDITION, 1902, An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/9662/9662-h/9662-h.htm#section7>
Paul. K. Feyerabend, against method, First published by New Left Books, 1975 Revised edition published by Verso 1988
Third edition published by Verso 1993 © Paul Feyerabend 1975, 1988, 1993 All rights reserved
Verso UK: 6 Meard Street, London W1V 3HR USA: 29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001-2291 ISBN 0-86091-481-X
ISBN 0-86091-646-4

Friedrich Engels - "Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats" Zur ersten Auflage 1884in: Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels - Werke. (Karl) Dietz Verlag, Berlin. Band 21, 5. Auflage 1975, unveränderter Nachdruck der 1. Auflage 1962, Berlin/DDR. S. 30-35.

Korrektur:

Erstellt: 20.03.1999

Sigmund Freud, Der Untergang des Ödipuskomplexes, (1924*) Gesammelte Werke 1893-1939 1920-1939.

<http://www.textlog.de/freud-psychoanalyse-untergang-oedipuskomplex.html>.

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, also sprach Zoroaster, 1883-1891, Publisher: Ernst Schmeitzner.

SEIN UND ZEIT

VON

MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Elfte, unveränderte Auflage
1967

MAX NIEMEYER VERLAG TÜBINGEN

Zuerst erschienen als Sonderdruck aus
»Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung« Band
VIII herausgegeben von Edmund Husserl

© Max Niemeyer Verlag Tübingen 1967
Alle Rechte Vorbehalten - Printed in Germany
Druck: Gutmann & Co., Heilbronn
Einband von Heinr. Koch, Tübingen
Digitalisiert in Deutschland 2002 vom Schwarzkommando

EDMUND HUSSERL

in Verehrung und Freundschaft zugeeignet

Todtnauberg i. Bad. Schwarzwald zum 8. April 1926

WAS HEISST DENKEN?

VON

MARTIN HEIDEGGER

-

19

MAX NIEMEYER VERLAG TÜBINGEN Martin Heidegger: DIE FRAGE NACH DER TECHNIK Vortrag, gehalten am 18. November 1953 im Auditorium Maximum der Technischen Hochschule München, in der Reihe « Die Künste im technischen Zeitalter », veranstaltet von der Bayerischen Akademie der Schönen Künste unter Leitung des Präsidenten Emil Preetorius, im Druck erschienen in Band III des Jahrbuches der Akademie (Redaktion: Clemens Graf Podewils), R. Oldenbourg München 1954, S. 70 ff. <http://www.bard.edu/library/arendt/pdfs/Heidegger-Frage.pdf>

Gilles Deleuze Difference and Repetition Translated by Paul Patton COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS Columbia University Press, Translated by

Paul Patton Columbia University Press New York

English translation copyright © 1994 The Athlone Press, Difference et Repetition © 1968,

Presses Universitaires de France. The publishers wish to express their appreciation of assistance given by

the government of France through the French Ministry of Culture in the

preparation of this translation.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data Deleuze, Gilles. [Difference et repetition. English] Difference and repetition/Gilles Deleuze : translated by Paul Patton. p. cm. Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 0-231-08158-8 1. Difference (Philosophy) 2. Repetition (Philosophy) . 3. Philosophy, French-20th century. I. Title. B2430.D453D4513 1993 93 & 41815 111-dc20 CIP

Printed in Great Britain on acid-free paper.

A Thousand Plateaus

A THOUSAND

PLATEAUS

Capitalism and

Schizophrenia

Gilles Deleuze

Felix Guattari

Translation and Foreword by Brian Massumi

University of Minnesota Press

Minneapolis

London

The University of Minnesota Press gratefully acknowledges translation assistance provided for this book by the French Ministry of Culture and by the National Endowment for the Humanities, an independent federal agency.

Copyright © 1987 by the University of Minnesota Press

Published by the University of Minnesota Press

111 Third Avenue South, Suite 290, Minneapolis, M 55401-2520

<http://www.upress.umn.edu>

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

Eleventh printing 205

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Deleuze, Gilles.

[Mille plateaux. English]

A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia/Gilles

Deleuze, Felix Guattari; translation and foreword by Brian

Massumi.

p. cm.

Translation of: Mille plateaux, v. 2 of Capitalisme et schizophrénie.

A companion volume to Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and

. ISBN 0-8166-1402-4 schizophrenia.

Originally published as Mille Plateaux, volume 2 of Capitalisme et Schizophrénie © 1980 by Les Éditions de Minuit, Paris.

Photo of Sylvano Bussotti, Five Pieces for Piano for David Tudor,

über die spezielle und die
allgemeine Relativitätstheorie

(Gemeinverständlich)

Von

A. EINSTEIN

Fünfte Auflage

(10.— 14. Tausend)

Mit 3 Figuren

Verlag von Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn in Braunschweig

1920

Herausgeber dieses Heftes:

Prof. Dr. Karl Scheel, Berlin. Copyright, 1920, by Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, Germany.

Jürgen Habermas Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns Band I Handlungsrationalität und gesellschaftliche

Rationalisierung Suhrkamp Verlag Zweite Auflage 1982 © Suhrkamp Verlag Frankfurt am Main 1982 Alle Rechte

vorbehalten Druck: Mühlberger, Augsburg Printed in Germany CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Habermas, Jürgen: Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns | Jürgen Habermas. - Frankfurt am Main : Suhrkamp ISBN 3-

518-07591-8 ISBN 3-518-07583-7 Bd. 1. Handlungsrationalität und gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung. - 1982. Die fröhliche

Wissenschaft Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche 1844— 1872, 1876— 1882, 1888— 1889, 1890— 1892, 1893— 1894, 1895— 1896, 1897— 1898, 1899— 1900, 1901— 1902, 1903— 1904, 1905— 1906, 1907— 1908, 1909— 1910, 1911— 1912, 1913— 1914, 1915— 1916, 1917— 1918, 1919— 1920, 1921— 1922, 1923— 1924, 1925— 1926, 1927— 1928, 1929— 1930, 1931— 1932, 1933— 1934, 1935— 1936, 1937— 1938, 1939— 1940, 1941— 1942, 1943— 1944, 1945— 1946, 1947— 1948, 1949— 1950, 1951— 1952, 1953— 1954, 1955— 1956, 1957— 1958, 1959— 1960, 1961— 1962, 1963— 1964, 1965— 1966, 1967— 1968, 1969— 1970, 1971— 1972, 1973— 1974, 1975— 1976, 1977— 1978, 1979— 1980, 1981— 1982, 1983— 1984, 1985— 1986, 1987— 1988, 1989— 1990, 1991— 1992, 1993— 1994, 1995— 1996, 1997— 1998, 1999— 2000, 2001— 2002, 2003— 2004, 2005— 2006, 2007— 2008, 2009— 2010, 2011— 2012, 2013— 2014, 2015— 2016, 2017— 2018, 2019— 2020, 2021— 2022, 2023— 2024, 2025— 2026, 2027— 2028, 2029— 2030, 2031— 2032, 2033— 2034, 2035— 2036, 2037— 2038, 2039— 2040, 2041— 2042, 2043— 2044, 2045— 2046, 2047— 2048, 2049— 2050, 2051— 2052, 2053— 2054, 2055— 2056, 2057— 2058, 2059— 2060, 2061— 2062, 2063— 2064, 2065— 2066, 2067— 2068, 2069— 2070, 2071— 2072, 2073— 2074, 2075— 2076, 2077— 2078, 2079— 2080, 2081— 2082, 2083— 2084, 2085— 2086, 2087— 2088, 2089— 2090, 2091— 2092, 2093— 2094, 2095— 2096, 2097— 2098, 2099— 2100, 2101— 2102, 2103— 2104, 2105— 2106, 2107— 2108, 2109— 2110, 2111— 2112, 2113— 2114, 2115— 2116, 2117— 2118, 2119— 2120, 2121— 2122, 2123— 2124, 2125— 2126, 2127— 2128, 2129— 2130, 2131— 2132, 2133— 2134, 2135— 2136, 2137— 2138, 2139— 2140, 2141— 2142, 2143— 2144, 2145— 2146, 2147— 2148, 2149— 2150, 2151— 2152, 2153— 2154, 2155— 2156, 2157— 2158, 2159— 2160, 2161— 2162, 2163— 2164, 2165— 2166, 2167— 2168, 2169— 2170, 2171— 2172, 2173— 2174, 2175— 2176, 2177— 2178, 2179— 2180, 2181— 2182, 2183— 2184, 2185— 2186, 2187— 2188, 2189— 2190, 2191— 2192, 2193— 2194, 2195— 2196, 2197— 2198, 2199— 2200, 2201— 2202, 2203— 2204, 2205— 2206, 2207— 2208, 2209— 2210, 2211— 2212, 2213— 2214, 2215— 2216, 2217— 2218, 2219— 2220, 2221— 2222, 2223— 2224, 2225— 2226, 2227— 2228, 2229— 2230, 2231— 2232, 2233— 2234, 2235— 2236, 2237— 2238, 2239— 2240, 2241— 2242, 2243— 2244, 2245— 2246, 2247— 2248, 2249— 2250, 2251— 2252, 2253— 2254, 2255— 2256, 2257— 2258, 2259— 2260, 2261— 2262, 2263— 2264, 2265— 2266, 2267— 2268, 2269— 2270, 2271— 2272, 2273— 2274, 2275— 2276, 2277— 2278, 2279— 2280, 2281— 2282, 2283— 2284, 2285— 2286, 2287— 2288, 2289— 2290, 2291— 2292, 2293— 2294, 2295— 2296, 2297— 2298, 2299— 2300, 2301— 2302, 2303— 2304, 2305— 2306, 2307— 2308, 2309— 2310, 2311— 2312, 2313— 2314, 2315— 2316, 2317— 2318, 2319— 2320, 2321— 2322, 2323— 2324, 2325— 2326, 2327— 2328, 2329— 2330, 2331— 2332, 2333— 2334, 2335— 2336, 2337— 2338, 2339— 2340, 2341— 2342, 2343— 2344, 2345— 2346, 2347— 2348, 2349— 2350, 2351— 2352, 2353— 2354, 2355— 2356, 2357— 2358, 2359— 2360, 2361— 2362, 2363— 2364, 2365— 2366, 2367— 2368, 2369— 2370, 2371— 2372, 2373— 2374, 2375— 2376, 2377— 2378, 2379— 2380, 2381— 2382, 2383— 2384, 2385— 2386, 2387— 2388, 2389— 2390, 2391— 2392, 2393— 2394, 2395— 2396, 2397— 2398, 2399— 2400, 2401— 2402, 2403— 2404, 2405— 2406, 2407— 2408, 2409— 2410, 2411— 2412, 2413— 2414, 2415— 2416, 2417— 2418, 2419— 2420, 2421— 2422, 2423— 2424, 2425— 2426, 2427— 2428, 2429— 2430, 2431— 2432, 2433— 2434, 2435— 2436, 2437— 2438, 2439— 2440, 2441— 2442, 2443— 2444, 2445— 2446, 2447— 2448, 2449— 2450, 2451— 2452, 2453— 2454, 2455— 2456, 2457— 2458, 2459— 2460, 2461— 2462, 2463— 2464, 2465— 2466, 2467— 2468, 2469— 2470, 2471— 2472, 2473— 2474, 2475— 2476, 2477— 2478, 2479— 2480, 2481— 2482, 2483— 2484, 2485— 2486, 2487— 2488, 2489— 2490, 2491— 2492, 2493— 2494, 2495— 2496, 2497— 2498, 2499— 2500, 2501— 2502, 2503— 2504, 2505— 2506, 2507— 2508, 2509— 2510, 2511— 2512, 2513— 2514, 2515— 2516, 2517— 2518, 2519— 2520, 2521— 2522, 2523— 2524, 2525— 2526, 2527— 2528, 2529— 2530, 2531— 2532, 2533— 2534, 2535— 2536, 2537— 2538, 2539— 2540, 2541— 2542, 2543— 2544, 2545— 2546, 2547— 2548, 2549— 2550, 2551— 2552, 2553— 2554, 2555— 2556, 2557— 2558, 2559— 2560, 2561— 2562, 2563— 2564, 2565— 2566, 2567— 2568, 2569— 2570, 2571— 2572, 2573— 2574, 2575— 2576, 2577— 2578, 2579— 2580, 2581— 2582, 2583— 2584, 2585— 2586, 2587— 2588, 2589— 2590, 2591— 2592, 2593— 2594, 2595— 2596, 2597— 2598, 2599— 2600, 2601— 2602, 2603— 2604, 2605— 2606, 2607— 2608, 2609— 2610, 2611— 2612, 2613— 2614, 2615— 2616, 2617— 2618, 2619— 2620, 2621— 2622, 2623— 2624, 2625— 2626, 2627— 2628, 2629— 2630, 2631— 2632, 2633— 2634, 2635— 2636, 2637— 2638, 2639— 2640, 2641— 2642, 2643— 2644, 2645— 2646, 2647— 2648, 2649— 2650, 2651— 2652, 2653— 2654, 2655— 2656, 2657— 2658, 2659— 2660, 2661— 2662, 2663— 2664, 2665— 2666, 2667— 2668, 2669— 2670, 2671— 2672, 2673— 2674, 2675— 2676, 2677— 2678, 2679— 2680, 2681— 2682, 2683— 2684, 2685— 2686, 2687— 2688, 2689— 2690, 2691— 2692, 2693— 2694, 2695— 2696, 2697— 2698, 2699— 2700, 2701— 2702, 2703— 2704, 2705— 2706, 2707— 2708, 2709— 2710, 2711— 2712, 2713— 2714, 2715— 2716, 2717— 2718, 2719— 2720, 2721— 2722, 2723— 2724, 2725— 2726, 2727— 2728, 2729— 2730, 2731— 2732, 2733— 2734, 2735— 2736, 2737— 2738, 2739— 2740, 2741— 2742, 2743— 2744, 2745— 2746, 2747— 2748, 2749— 2750, 2751— 2752, 2753— 2754, 2755— 2756, 2757— 2758, 2759— 2760, 2761— 2762, 2763— 2764, 2765— 2766, 2767— 2768, 2769— 2770, 2771— 2772, 2773— 2774, 2775— 2776, 2777— 2778, 2779— 2780, 2781— 2782, 2783— 2784, 2785— 2786, 2787— 2788, 2789— 2790, 2791— 2792, 2793— 2794, 2795— 2796, 2797— 2798, 2799— 2800, 2801— 2802, 2803— 2804, 2805— 2806, 2807— 2808, 2809— 2810, 2811— 2812, 2813— 2814, 2815— 2816, 2817— 2818, 2819— 2820, 2821— 2822, 2823— 2824, 2825— 2826, 2827— 2828, 2829— 2830, 2831— 2832, 2833— 2834, 2835— 2836, 2837— 2838, 2839— 2840, 2841— 2842, 2843— 2844, 2845— 2846, 2847— 2848, 2849— 2850, 2851— 2852, 2853— 2854, 2855— 2856, 2857— 2858, 2859— 2860, 2861— 2862, 2863— 2864, 2865— 2866, 2867— 2868, 2869— 2870, 2871— 2872, 2873— 2874, 2875— 2876, 2877— 2878, 2879— 2880, 2881— 2882, 2883— 2884, 2885— 2886, 2887— 2888, 2889— 2890, 2891— 2892, 2893— 2894, 2895— 2896, 2897— 2898, 2899— 2900, 2901— 2902, 2903— 2904, 2905— 2906, 2907— 2908, 2909— 2910, 2911— 2912, 2913— 2914, 2915— 2916, 2917— 2918, 2919— 2920, 2921— 2922, 2923— 2924, 2925— 2926, 2927— 2928, 2929— 2930, 2931— 2932, 2933— 2934, 2935— 2936, 2937— 2938, 2939— 2940, 2941— 2942, 2943— 2944, 2945— 2946, 2947— 2948, 2949— 2950, 2951— 2952, 2953— 2954, 2955— 2956, 2957— 2958, 2959— 2960, 2961— 2962, 2963— 2964, 2965— 2966, 2967— 2968, 2969— 2970, 2971— 2972, 2973— 2974, 2975— 2976, 2977— 2978, 2979— 2980, 2981— 2982, 2983— 2984, 2985— 2986, 2987— 2988, 2989— 2990, 2991— 2992, 2993— 2994, 2995— 2996, 2997— 2998, 2999— 3000, 3001— 3002, 3003— 3004, 3005— 3006, 3007— 3008, 3009— 3010, 3011— 3012, 3013— 3014, 3015— 3016, 3017— 3018, 3019— 3020, 3021— 3022, 3023— 3024, 3025— 3026, 3027— 3028, 3029— 3030, 3031— 3032, 3033— 3034, 3035— 3036, 3037— 3038, 3039— 3040, 3041— 3042, 3043— 3044, 3045— 3046, 3047— 3048, 3049— 3050, 3051— 3052, 3053— 3054, 3055— 3056, 3057— 3058, 3059— 3060, 3061— 3062, 3063— 3064, 3065— 3066, 3067— 3068, 3069— 3070, 3071— 3072, 3073— 3074, 3075— 3076, 3077— 3078, 3079— 3080, 3081— 3082, 3083— 3084, 3085— 3086, 3087— 3088, 3089— 3090, 3091— 3092, 3093— 3094, 3095— 3096, 3097— 3098, 3099— 3100, 3101— 3102, 3103— 3104, 3105— 3106, 3107— 3108, 3109— 3110, 3111— 3112, 3113— 3114, 3115— 3116, 3117— 3118, 3119— 3120, 3121— 3122, 3123— 3124, 3125— 3126, 3127— 3128, 3129— 3130, 3131— 3132, 3133— 3134, 3135— 3136, 3137— 3138, 3139— 3140, 3141— 3142, 3143— 3144, 3145— 3146, 3147— 3148, 3149— 3150, 3151— 3152, 3153— 3154, 3155— 3156, 3157— 3158, 3159— 3160, 3161— 3162, 3163— 3164, 3165— 3166, 3167— 3168, 3169— 3170, 3171— 3172, 3173— 3174, 3175— 3176, 3177— 3178, 3179— 3180, 3181— 3182, 3183— 3184, 3185— 3186, 3187— 3188, 3189— 3190, 3191— 3192, 3193— 3194, 3195— 3196, 3197— 3198, 3199— 3200, 3201— 3202, 3203— 3204, 3205— 3206, 3207— 3208, 3209— 3210, 3211— 3212, 3213— 3214, 3215— 3216, 3217— 3218, 3219— 3220, 3221— 3222, 3223— 3224, 3225— 3226, 3227— 3228, 3229— 3230, 3231— 3232, 3233— 3234, 3235— 3236, 3237— 3238, 3239— 3240, 3241— 3242, 3243— 3244, 3245— 3246, 3247— 3248, 3249— 3250, 3251— 3252, 3253— 3254, 3255— 3256, 3257— 3258, 3259— 3260, 3261— 3262, 3263— 3264, 3265— 3266, 3267— 3268, 3269— 3270, 3271— 3272, 3273— 3274, 3275— 3276, 3277— 3278, 3279— 3280, 3281— 3282, 3283— 3284, 3285— 3286, 3287— 3288, 3289— 3290, 3291— 3292, 3293— 3294, 3295— 3296, 3297— 3298, 3299— 3300, 3301— 3302, 3303— 3304, 3305— 3306, 3307— 3308, 3309— 3310, 3311— 3312, 3313— 3314, 3315— 3316, 3317— 3318, 3319— 3320, 3321— 3322, 3323— 3324, 3325— 3326, 3327— 3328, 3329— 3330, 3331— 3332, 3333— 3334, 3335— 3336, 3337— 3338, 3339— 3340, 3341— 3342, 3343— 3344, 3345— 3346, 3347— 3348, 3349— 3350, 3351— 3352, 3353— 3354, 3355— 3356, 3357— 3358, 3359— 3360, 3361— 3362, 3363— 3364, 3365— 3366, 3367— 3368, 3369— 3370, 3371— 3372, 3373— 3374, 3375— 3376, 3377— 3378, 3379— 3380, 3381— 3382, 3383— 3384, 3385— 3386, 3387— 3388, 3389— 3390, 3391— 3392, 3393— 3394, 3395— 3396, 3397— 3398, 3399— 3400, 3401— 3402, 3403— 3404, 3405— 3406, 3407— 3408, 3409— 3410, 3411— 3412, 3413— 3414, 3415— 3416, 3417— 3418, 3419— 3420, 3421— 3422, 3423— 3424, 3425— 3426, 3427— 3428, 3429— 3430, 3431— 3432, 3433— 3434, 3435— 3436, 3437— 3438, 3439— 3440, 3441— 3442, 3443— 3444, 3445— 3446, 3447— 3448, 3449— 3450, 3451— 3452, 3453— 3454, 3455— 3456, 3457— 3458, 3459— 3460, 3461— 3462, 3463— 3464, 3465— 3466, 3467— 3468, 3469— 3470, 3471— 3472, 3473— 3474, 3475— 3476, 3477— 3478, 3479— 3480, 3481— 3482, 3483— 3484, 3485— 3486, 3487— 3488, 3489— 3490, 3491— 3492, 3493— 3494, 3495— 3496, 3497— 3498, 3499— 3500, 3501— 3502, 3503— 3504, 3505— 3506, 3507— 3508, 3509— 3510, 3511— 3512, 3513— 3514, 3515— 3516, 3517— 3518, 3519— 3520, 3521— 3522, 3523— 3524, 3525— 3526, 3527— 3528, 3529— 3530, 3531— 3532, 3533— 3534, 3535— 3536, 3537— 3538, 3539— 3540, 3541— 3542, 3543— 3544, 3545— 3546, 3547— 3548, 3549— 3550, 3551— 3552, 3553— 3554, 3555— 3556, 3557— 3558, 3559— 3560, 3561— 3562, 3563— 3564, 3565— 3566, 3567— 3568, 3569— 3570, 3571— 3572, 3573— 3574, 3575— 3576, 3577— 3578, 3579— 3580, 3581— 3582, 3583— 3584, 3585— 3586, 3587— 3588, 3589— 3590, 3591— 3592, 3593— 3594, 3595— 3596, 3597— 3598, 3599— 3600, 3601— 3602, 3603— 3604, 3605— 3606, 3607— 3608, 3609— 3610, 3611— 3612, 3613— 3614, 3615— 3616, 3617— 3618, 3619— 3620, 3621— 3622, 3623— 3624, 3625— 3626, 3627— 3628, 3629— 3630, 3631— 3632, 3633— 3634, 3635— 3636, 3637— 3638, 3639— 3640, 3641— 3642, 3643— 3644, 3645— 3646, 3647— 3648, 3649— 3650, 3651— 3652, 3653— 3654, 3655— 3656, 3657— 3658, 3659— 3660, 3661— 3662, 3663— 3664, 3665— 3666, 3667— 3668, 3669— 3670, 3671— 3672, 3673— 3674, 3675— 3676, 3677— 3678, 3679— 3680, 3681— 3682, 3683— 3684, 3685— 3686, 3687— 3688, 3689— 3690, 3691— 3692, 3693— 3694, 3695— 3696, 3697— 3698, 3699— 3700, 3701— 3702, 3703— 3704, 3705— 3706, 3707— 3708, 3709— 3710, 3711— 3712, 3713— 3714, 3715— 3716, 3717— 3718, 3719— 3720, 3721— 3722, 3723— 3724, 3725— 3726, 3727— 3728, 3729— 3730, 3731— 3732, 3733— 3734, 3735— 3736, 3737— 3738, 3739— 3740, 3741— 3742, 3743— 3744, 3745— 3746, 3747— 3748, 3749— 3750, 3751— 3752, 3753— 3754, 3755— 3756, 3757— 3758, 3759— 3760, 3761— 3762, 3763— 3764, 3765— 3766, 3767— 3768, 3769— 3770, 3771— 3772, 3773— 3774, 3775— 3776, 3777— 3778, 3779— 3780, 3781— 3782, 3783— 3784, 3785— 3786, 3787— 3788, 3789— 3790, 3791— 3792, 3793— 3794, 3795— 3796, 3797— 3798, 3799— 3800, 3801— 3802, 3803— 3804, 3805— 3806, 3807— 3808, 3809— 3810, 3811