

(1) Total Negation

Hegel's dialectic holds that the development of things is realized through the continuous transformation and unity of 'thesis', 'antithesis', and 'synthesis'. The 'unity of opposites' is the essence of dialectics. According to the logic of dialectics itself, dialectics denies that it itself is the most fundamental theoretical method. Because, according to dialectics, we can obtain its opposite (antithesis): non-dialectics. In other words, dialectics is not the most fundamental theoretical method.

A Hegelian-style rebuttal might argue that dialectics aims to embrace and transcend contradictions. In this case, the 'synthesis' could be a higher-level understanding that combines both dialectical and non-dialectical modes of thought. However, such a rebuttal has already admitted that there is a non-dialectical method; it has already admitted that the 'synthesis' is a theory of a higher level than itself.

Any theory established on the foundation of dialectical logic will face a problem: how to explain dialectical logic. That is, it must both use dialectical logic to establish the theory itself, and use this theory to explain dialectical logic. If such a theory cannot do this, then this also shows that such a theory is not a fundamental theory. If a theory established with dialectical logic is, in turn, used to explain dialectical logic, it in fact returns to using dialectical logic to explain itself, which is 'dialectics negates itself', and gives rise to 'non-dialectics'. And for this reason, it is said that any theory established on the foundation of dialectical logic is not a fundamental theory.

In the subsection "Formal Logic," we have already explained that 'negation' is the motive force of the world of isolation. For a thing A, as a thing of isolation, to negate it is to exert a motive force on it, and the result of this motive force action is the generation of a negated A. Negation is not only the destruction of the original form, but also the reshaping of its possibilities; therefore, it exhibits motive force action. A negated A is also a manifestation of A; it is a reverse manifestation. This is dialectical logic, and this is also a no form united transformation.

Negation is not a simple elimination, but a reverse manifestation; that is, through negation as a motive force, the being of the negated is revealed. For example, non-A, as the negation of A, although in form it is the exclusion of A, in essence it still depends on the being of A; they are mutually dependent. Non-A is a mirror-like manifestation of A; it clarifies the characteristics of A through opposition.

Note, from the perspective of no form united transformation, the negation of A must be the total negation of A. If it is not, then the negated A cannot totally negate A, and thus cannot fully manifest A. Therefore, it would not be an effective dialectical logic. The total negation of A is not necessarily B, but it must be non-A. The thesis and antithesis must be the total negation of each other. That is, the being of the thesis depends entirely on the exclusion of the antithesis, and the being of the antithesis depends entirely on the exclusion of the thesis. The meaning of 'non-A fully manifests A' is that A can be fully obtained through the exclusion of non-A. That is, by excluding A, one obtains non-A, and by excluding non-A, one obtains A: negating A yields non-A, and negating non-A yields A. Only total negation is the most determinate.

Therefore, dialectical logic has a limited scope of application. Its two opposing sides, thesis and

antithesis, must be such that one is the total negation of the other; otherwise, it is not a complete dialectical logic. This also shows that dialectical logic is a special case of no form united transformation. This reveals a characteristic of dialectical logic: the thesis and antithesis can be mutually transformed and mutually manifested. Dialectical logic, as a special case of no form united transformation, has its essence in the realization of the mutual manifestation and mutual transformation of the thesis and antithesis through total negation. This logic plays an important role in revealing the relationship between formal opposition and unity.

So, how does the negation in dialectical logic achieve total negation? This negation must have a standard (or rule); it must be a total negation according to this standard. That is to say, such a standard must enable a thing to generate two opposing sides. For instance, if we want to fold a piece of paper, we need to draw a line on the paper and fold it along this line as the standard. Such a standard makes the two folded parts have total negativity. Such a standard defines the boundary and determinacy of the negation, ensuring its completeness and precision.

Therefore, the 'total negation' of dialectical logic needs to satisfy three conditions:

- 1) Both opposing sides must follow this standard of negation (consistency).
- 2) The two opposing sides can be mutually defined through the relationship of negation (determinacy).
- 3) One of the opposing sides must be able to be completely transformed into the other (completeness).

From the perspective of no form action theory, 'total negation' in fact contains the collaboration of the three no form actions:

- 1) Isolation action: The setting of the standard separates the two opposing sides, making them independent parts.
- 2) Manifestation action: The standard makes the relationship of negation explicit, giving 'opposition' its determinacy, so that one side can manifest the other.
- 3) Motive force action: The execution of the negation; this motive force drives the thing to be completely transformed from one opposing side to the other.

No form action theory emphasizes the transformation among the different no form actions, not necessarily the conflict and unity between two opposing sides. In no form united transformation, isolation action, motive force action, and manifestation action are not necessarily in a relationship of the unity of opposites, but rather a more dynamic process of interaction. This transformation transcends the simple logic of thesis-antithesis-synthesis and instead emphasizes multidimensional, multi-modal mutual interaction. Therefore, no form action theory can provide a more fundamental theoretical framework than dialectical logic. It can not only explain the unity of opposites, but also explain the complex transformational relationships among different forms, thereby avoiding the dilemma of the self-negation of dialectical logic.

Dialectical logic lacks a direct connection with 'no form'; it is not directly established on the foundation of no form. Furthermore, the negation that serves as the motive force in dialectical logic is a motive force of the world of isolation (although Hegel's dialectic emphasizes the

dynamism and transformative nature of the concept); it is not a real motive force. This limits its ability to provide a truly fundamental explanation for the interconnection of things. The scope of application of dialectical logic is limited; it cannot be universally applied to all things and phenomena. If dialectical logic is blindly used to explain things that are beyond its explanatory scope, it will inevitably lead to erroneous conclusions. Because it may misinterpret the essence of things, or force a connection where none exists.

The legitimate scope of dialectical logic refers to the situation where 'the two opposing sides, thesis and antithesis, must be such that one is the total negation of the other'. Only in this situation can the transformation among the 'thesis, antithesis, and synthesis' of dialectical logic be logically consistent and meaningful—that is, conform to the rules of no form united transformation. As long as dialectical logic is confined within its legitimate scope, it can play its proper role, because dialectical logic is a special case of no form united transformation.

Not only that, the transformation of the two opposing sides requires negation as a motive force, and for negation to be transformed into one side, its opposite is required. Therefore, the transformation of dialectical logic is also a no form integrated transformation.

(2) The Relationship Between Formal Logic and Dialectical Logic.

The difference between formal logic and dialectical logic lies in the way they maintain identity. Formal logic maintains identity by not destroying identity, which it achieves through the use of the three fundamental laws. Dialectical logic first breaks identity through the motive force of 'negation' to obtain its opposite (that is, the no form united transformation constituted by the transformation of A into non-A), and then unifies A and non-A. This is the re-establishment of identity on a higher level, thereby maintaining identity. In fact, the ways in which these two logics maintain identity are opposite. This clearly reveals the core difference between the two logical systems. In this way, we have fundamentally clarified the relationship between formal logic and dialectical logic.

The Static Nature of Formal Logic: The framework of no form action theory shows the limitation of formal logic—it excels in the 'closed system' of static concepts. Formal logic is adept at handling the static characteristics of things, focusing on clear and precise inference and induction on an already determined foundation. Its strength lies in maintaining consistency within fixed categories, but it has difficulty considering change or development.

In contrast, dialectical logic thrives on contradiction. It is not afraid to break 'identity' in order to drive the evolution of concepts towards a richer and more complex direction. Dialectical logic focuses on the dynamic development and internal contradictions of things, and is able to reveal and handle the change, development, and transformation of things. When faced with dynamic and contradictory things, dialectical logic shows a stronger adaptability.

There is no right or wrong in these two ways of maintaining 'identity'; both are reasonable. Both are 'effective methods', and they each have their own advantages, disadvantages, and domains of effective application. Although the two are in opposition, they are also complementary. By emphasizing how they maintain 'identity' in different ways, it shows that they are different expressions based on the same fundamental principle. This provides a deeper understanding of when each logic is most effective, and shows their respective advantages and intrinsic limitations.

Their unification under 'no form action theory' reveals that seemingly different logics can be unified and understood through no form action theory as a unified 'foundation', from which their unique characteristics and relationships can be better understood. 'No form action theory' provides a 'deeper ontological foundation' that 'supports' and 'integrates' these two methodologies!

Formal logic and dialectical logic can be fused together. A and non-A in dialectical logic are similar to the law of the excluded middle in formal logic. As was discussed in the subsection "Formal Logic," negation in formal logic relies on dialectical logic for its explanation. And in the reasoning of formal logic, dialectical logic also appears. For instance, in mathematics, the negation of rational numbers generates irrational numbers, and rational numbers and irrational numbers are unified into real numbers. The results of formal logical reasoning can serve as the foundation for dialectical logic. Conversely, dialectical logic can expand knowledge for the thinking of formal logic, breaking through the boundaries of form through motive force. By embracing contradiction, it leads to a transformation towards new forms of expression. This reveals the creative and generative power of dialectical logic. It does not 'discard' formal logic, but rather utilizes its inherent 'tension' to transcend existing knowledge and create new formal structures.

Therefore, formal logic and dialectical logic are not completely opposed or mutually exclusive, but are complementary. Both formal logic and dialectical logic are logics of isolation. They are effective both in the world of isolation and for isolated things in non-isolated worlds. They constitute the two aspects of isolation logic: one is maintenance, and the other is expansion.

(3) The Three Fundamental Laws of Dialectical Logic

We see that dialectical logic also uses something similar to the law of the excluded middle in formal logic (A and non-A). Corresponding to the three fundamental laws of formal logic (the law of identity, the law of non-contradiction, and the law of the excluded middle), dialectical logic should also have three fundamental laws: the law of unity, the law of negation, and the law of dichotomy.

1) Law of Unity corresponds to the law of identity. It emphasizes the unification of two opposing sides within the same thing. The law of identity in formal logic emphasizes that a thing is itself, that is, a thing maintains its own consistency. The law of unity in dialectical logic, on the other hand, emphasizes the unity between two opposing sides. It is concerned not only with the stability of a thing, but more so with how the internal contradiction of a thing achieves unity between its two opposing sides. The law of unity is not merely a formal identity, but is realized through the dialectical development of the two opposing sides.

The law of identity and the law of unity are different. The expression of the law of identity is 'A is A', and this expression does not cause A to have any differentiation. The law of unity is different; unity is the unification of A and non-A into the same thing B, and B has differentiation. This is also the difference between identity and unity.

2) Law of Negation corresponds to the law of non-contradiction. It emphasizes the negation of a self to obtain its opposite (obtaining non-A through A). The law of non-contradiction in formal logic states that a proposition cannot be both true and false at the same time; it requires that the two opposing sides must be mutually exclusive. Its requirement is: if it is A, it cannot be non-A; if

it is non-A, it cannot be A. It emphasizes the choice of isolation. Whereas in dialectical logic, the law of negation emphasizes the interrelation between the opposing sides; through negation, things can be mutually transformed. The law of negation in dialectical logic does not exclude the opposing side, but rather completes the transformation between the opposing sides through negation. Its requirement is: to negate A is non-A; to negate non-A is A. Both can exist. It emphasizes the mutual transformation of motive force.

3) Law of Dichotomy corresponds to the law of the excluded middle. It emphasizes that for a thing 'a', there exists a 'non-a', and there is no intermediate state. It emphasizes the state of a thing's existence. The law of the excluded middle in formal logic states that for a certain proposition, there is always a definite value (true or false), and there can be no intermediate state between the truth and falsity of the proposition. In dialectical logic, the law of dichotomy embodies the being of the opposition of things—for a thing A, there must exist a non-A (that is, A and non-A), and no intermediate state is allowed between them. This opposition and division of the law of dichotomy does not have to be static; it can be realized in continuous transformation and development.

This framework precisely formalizes dialectical logic, making it more rigorous and less susceptible to vague interpretation.

The law of unity unifies the two opposing sides into the same thing (identity is a characteristic of manifestation); therefore, it is of manifestation. The law of negation transforms through negation; therefore, it is of motive force. The law of dichotomy distinguishes between the positive and negative sides; therefore, it is of isolation.

Now let us see if these three laws constitute a no form integrated transformation:

1) The law of unity requires the law of negation and the law of dichotomy in order to realize unity in opposition.

The law of negation obtains non-A through A, but this does not mean that no intermediate state exists between A and non-A. Therefore, after the law of dichotomy has excluded intermediate states, one can obtain non-A through A, and obtain A through non-A. In this way, A and non-A are unified into the two indivisible aspects of the same thing.

2) The law of negation requires the law of dichotomy and the law of unity in order to drive the dynamic transformation of the two opposing sides.

The law of unity unifies A and non-A within the same thing. Then, A and non-A constitute the entirety of this thing, and no intermediate state exists between A and non-A. Therefore, negating A can only be transformed into non-A (or vice versa).

3) The law of dichotomy requires the law of negation and the law of unity in order to maintain the clarity of the boundary between the two opposing sides and the completeness of the unity of opposites.

The law of unity unifies A and non-A within the same thing. Then, A and non-A constitute the entirety of this thing. Through the law of negation, A can yield non-A (or vice versa), and there is only A and non-A, with no intermediate state. Thus, the law of dichotomy is obtained.

We see that each of these three laws depends on the other two. This shows that they constitute a no form integrated transformation. The law of negation provides the connection between the two opposing sides; the law of unity guarantees the overall unity of the dichotomous relationship; and the law of dichotomy provides the clear boundary between the two opposing sides. Each law not only requires the support of the other two, but they are also mutually dependent, forming an indivisible whole.

The no form integrated transformation constituted by the law of negation, the law of unity, and the law of dichotomy in fact completely defines the various elements of dialectical logic, the relationships among these elements, and the specific operation of dialectical logic. The specific operation of dialectical logic is as follows: one side negates itself to form its opposite (this is the law of negation and the law of dichotomy). Then, based on the law of negation and the law of dichotomy, this can be transformed into the law of unity, and the two opposing sides can be unified into the same thing.

(4) Negation of the Negation

This can also be examined from another perspective. One side negates itself to form its opposite. This opposition (let us call it the state of opposition AA) and its unity are also an opposition. Then, by negating AA, one transitions to unity, thereby achieving unity. Therefore, the 'opposition of the opposition' reveals a deeper logic: the negation of a self is the logical starting point for generating opposition, while the negation of the opposition is the bridge to unity.

In other words, in this line of thought, we do not presuppose that the two opposing sides can be unified. Instead, we have purely applied the principle of negation, and the principle that opposition and unity are also an opposition, which enables the two opposing sides to naturally achieve unity through logical inference. This is, in fact, to say that the law of negation and the law of dichotomy can be transformed into the law of unity. That is, for a thing A, as long as a non-A exists (according to the law of dichotomy), and as long as A and non-A can be mutually transformed (according to the law of negation), then A and non-A can be unified into a single thing B.

This shows that the no form integrated transformation constituted by the law of negation, the law of unity, and the law of dichotomy is the substance of dialectical logic. This also tells us that the unity realized in the dialectical process is not a predetermined result, nor is it a desire for unity on the part of the two opposing sides, but rather the result of the transformation of the law of negation and the law of dichotomy within the logical system. This is different from those interpretations that see dialectical logic as necessarily developing towards some predetermined end (such as Hegel's Absolute Idea). The 'end point' is not a predetermined state or result, but the continuous and dynamic process of the transformation itself. Dialectical logic is a logical structure that generates opposition (AA) through negation, and realizes unity by negating the opposition, thereby constituting an internally logically self-consistent system. However, this perspective does not show the entirety of dialectical logic, as it only shows a part of the no form integrated transformation: that the law of negation and the law of dichotomy can be transformed into the law of unity.

One side negates itself to form its opposite. This opposition (AA) and its unity are also an

opposition. Then, by negating AA, one transitions to unity, thereby achieving unity. In this way, a double negation appears; this is the negation of the negation. The thing B, which is the unification of A and non-A, we call the unity of A and non-A. B can exist in a different thing B'; we call B' the unified object (this will be discussed in the later subsection "exploring philosophy with mathematics").

Through the 'negation of the negation', a chain of negation and unity can be obtained. For example, by negating 'a', one obtains 'non-a', which are then unified into 'b'. Then, one can continue to obtain different levels: (a, non-a), (b, non-b), (c, non-c), ... ad infinitum. In fact, any isolated thing or concept can be infinitely negated and unified. However, such an unlimited process of negation and unification may lose meaning and direction; there needs to be some standard as a limitation. In other words, each level in the continuous process of negation and unification must follow the same standard.

For example, the process of the extension of the number system:

Natural Numbers: 1, 2, 3, ... originally arose for counting.

Integers: ..., -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, ... introduced negative numbers and 0 to represent debt and nothingness.

Rational Numbers: Introduced fractions, numbers that can be expressed as the ratio of two integers, e.g., $1/2$, $-3/4$, to represent parts and proportions.

Real Numbers: Include both rational and irrational numbers, such as $\sqrt{2}$, π .

Complex Numbers: Numbers of the form $a + bi$, where i is the imaginary unit satisfying $i^2 = -1$, used to solve equations that have no solution in the real number field.

Such an extension process is extending the concept of 'number', and the standard to be followed is the 'properties of numbers', and nothing else. In fact, an object is also a non-number. If one were to unify complex numbers and objects, then the meaning of extending numbers would be lost. Moreover, the number system can be extended from complex numbers to quaternions, but quaternions no longer satisfy the commutative law, which makes their properties and applications very different from real and complex numbers. Quaternions are more often regarded as a mathematical tool rather than an extension of the number system itself. Therefore, even when extending according to the same standard, it may not be possible to extend infinitely. Thus, for real things, due to the constraints of specific conditions, it may not be possible to extend infinitely.

Therefore, we call this dialectical logic, which embodies isolation action and is conducted within the isolated conceptual domain, isolation dialectical logic. (Hereafter, unless otherwise specified, 'dialectical logic' will refer to isolation dialectical logic). This foreshadows the existence of: manifestation dialectical logic and motive force dialectical logic.

For the thesis (A), antithesis (non-A), and synthesis, let us look at Hegel's negation of the negation: the first negation is the negation of A; the second negation is the negation of non-A, and through this second negation, a higher-stage synthesis is formed.

My negation of the negation: The first negation is the negation of A; the second negation is the

negation of the state of opposition itself between A and non-A. This means that this is a way of transcending the binary opposition. It achieves a new state through a more fundamental negation, a state that is no longer A or non-A, but transcends this opposition.

Therefore, my understanding of the negation of the negation is logically self-consistent. In contrast, Hegel's understanding is more of an empirical summary of the process of historical or intellectual development, lacking a basis in a priori logical necessity.

The 'negation of the negation' in isolation dialectical logic discards the ambiguity of philosophical terminology and directly divides the two negations into two self-consistent steps at different levels of logical deduction. This is a structured and rule-based analysis of 'negation' and 'unity' from a logical perspective, possessing a clear logic. This clear division of the two negations is not explicitly mentioned in Hegel's system. Hegel did not provide a clear mechanism to explain how the negation of the negation leads to synthesis; he only said that this is a logical necessity. He often relied on metaphors and a certain logical necessity to suggest the direction of progress, rather than outlining any logically generative mechanism that could be rigorously tested. He saw the 'unity of opposites' more as a result of historical and conceptual development, rather than a result generated by the natural process of logical deduction.

Therefore, the 'negation of the negation' approach of isolation dialectical logic can be directly transformed into logical expressions or algorithmic operations. It is applicable to a broader range of fields because it remains open to specific content and is not limited to being historical or developmental. It can be widely used in philosophy, science, or social analysis. From an operational perspective, achieving the transition between opposition and unity through clear steps is more suitable as a universal methodology. In summary, isolation dialectical logic, through its structural reconstruction of the 'negation of the negation', elevates it from a description of philosophical history to a scientific analytical method with precise operational steps and broad applicability.

(5) The Motive Force of Negation and Real Motive Force

Isolation dialectical logic is still a formal logic. Like traditional formal logic, it is also a logic of the world of isolation, and the negation that serves as its motive force is also a motive force of the world of isolation. Negation is also a motive force on the logical level, serving as a motive force in both isolation dialectical logic and formal logic. This motive force, as a basic motive force, is a formalized motive force. Negation, as a motive force of form, drives the transformation of the two opposing sides, but this is still an abstraction of motive force from the perspective of the world of isolation. What actually drives the transformation of the two opposing sides is the real motive force.

The real motive force drives the transformation between the two opposing sides, but it requires negativity to ensure the directionality and clarity of the transformation. Logic provides a formal structural framework for understanding reality. Negation on the abstract level acts on the logical structure, but conversely, the motive force in the real world also embodies negation as a motive force, because there is also isolation action in the real world, and it must also follow the laws of the world of isolation. Therefore, it is said that where there is isolation, there must be dialectical logic. This, in theory, clarifies the universality of dialectical logic in the real world through the

isolation action of no form action theory.

The reason why real motive force is expressed in the form of 'negation' is that for real motive force to be manifested, isolation is necessarily required (this is no form united transformation), and the isolated independence of a thing will necessarily cause this thing to have an opposite. For instance, to make an object move, there must be an action and a reaction.

In fact, this embodies that motive force itself can also be divided into: the motive force of isolation (negation), the motive force of motive force (motive force itself), and the motive force of manifestation (expressed as change). They are a no form trinity. There is the motive force of isolation in real motive force, and the motive force of isolation cannot be separated from the real motive force.

For example, the existence of a person comes from nothingness. The existence of this person and nothingness are in opposition. From the perspective of isolation, we say that this motive force is negation. But in reality, the generation of this person is the act of human reproduction; it is not that a person will actually be generated just because there is a motive force of negation. This is speaking from the perspective of reality. However, from the perspective of the world of isolation, the being of a person comes from nothingness; this is a motive force of negation.

On the real level, this motive force is embodied as a concrete causal process, but at the same time, it embodies the logical characteristic of negation. For example:

- 1) Growth is a negation: from seed to tree, what is negated is the static state of the seed.
- 2) Motion is a negation: from rest to motion, what is negated is the initial state of rest.
- 3) Transformation is a negation: from one form to another, what is negated is the integrity of the original form.

The essence of these real processes is precisely the projection of negation into the concrete world. The motive force in reality, although it is a concrete act or process, from the perspective of isolation action, is expressed as a negation of the current state.

The laws of dialectical logic are a structural foundation for the laws of reality. The laws of logic (such as the law of negation, the law of unity, and the law of dichotomy) have universality in the world of isolation, and this universality extends to the real world:

- 1) Negation: All transformation requires the negation of the current state.
- 2) Unity: All opposition is ultimately unified within a whole.
- 3) Dichotomy: All opposition can be clearly distinguished (in terms of isolation action).

Therefore, the motive force, transformation, and forms of being in the real world must all follow these fundamental laws. This provides a theoretical framework for understanding opposition and transformation in reality. Logical laws can be used to abstract the universal structure of the real world.

Clarifying the distinction and relationship between the motive force as negation and the real motive force can provide guiding principles for our correct use of isolation dialectical logic in

reality. Isolation dialectical logic emphasizes the mutual revelation, mutual transformation, and necessary unity of the two opposing sides.

1) The most important point is: one must clearly determine the isolated thing in reality; that is, one must clarify what is being negated. A thing without a clear boundary of isolation may be influenced by other things, and such a thing does not necessarily have a definite opposite. Dialectical logic cannot be applied to such things. For example, in the transformation of a plant from a seed to a seedling, we cannot say that 'the seed is negated', because burning the seed is also a negation of it (this is a change from a state of being to a state of nothingness). Therefore, to be precise, in the transformation from seed to seedling, it is actually the static state of the seed that is negated. Through an external force, a change is generated, and it is transformed into the dynamic state of vitality of the seedling. Therefore, accurately defining the isolation of a thing and clarifying the object of negation is important. The isolation in reality is not always absolutely clear; the isolation boundaries of many things will change due to the influence of the environment or external forces. Dialectical logic is not applicable in all situations; it can only be effective when the oppositional relationship and the content of negation of a thing are clear in terms of isolation.

2) One must distinguish under what standard the two opposing sides are in opposition. If it is not an opposition under the same standard, then it is not a correct opposition. Because if the two opposites have different standards, then negating one side does not determinately yield the other. For instance, positive and negative are a correct opposition; they are on the same straight line and in opposite directions. Negating one side determinately yields the other.

3) Avoid absolutizing or isolating the motive force as negation

The law of negation is logical; it is an abstraction of the real motive force, not the real motive force itself. To mistakenly absolutize the law of negation may lead to overlooking the complexity and diversity of reality. For example, in social change, if one only focuses on the logical 'negation' and ignores the actual conditions, it may lead to radicalism or impractical actions. In philosophical discussions, if one only analyzes motive force from the perspective of dialectical logic, one may overlook the real motive force and manifestation.

4) Reveal the direction of the real motive force through the law of 'negation'

Although the motive force as negation is not the real motive force, it can help us understand the directionality and developmental trend of the real motive force. By analyzing the internal contradictions and oppositions of things, one can predict the changes that the real motive force may bring about, and thus make preparations in advance in practice. For example, in technological development, analyzing the limitations of existing technology (the motive force as negation) can predict the direction of innovation. In social reform, analyzing the problems of the old system (the motive force as negation) can reveal the necessity and potential paths of reform.

By standardizing dialectical logic, it is made to possess universality, precision, and validity, just like formal logic. And, by distinguishing the difference between the real motive force and the motive force as negation, we can clearly know how to apply dialectical logic and prevent it from being confused with the real motive force. In this way, dialectical logic can play its role in the areas where it should.

(6) The Application of Isolation Dialectical Logic in No Form Action Theory

(6.1) The Characteristics of the Three No Form Actions

The previous subsections have already discussed the characteristics of the three no form actions: isolation action has the characteristics of independence (viewing isolation action from the perspective of motive force action) and distinction (viewing isolation action from the perspective of manifestation action); motive force action has the characteristics of change (viewing motive force action from the perspective of manifestation action) and generation (viewing motive force action from the perspective of isolation action); and manifestation action has the characteristics of Immediacy (viewing manifestation action from the perspective of motive force action) and identity (viewing manifestation action from the perspective of isolation action).

1) Independence means a stable, self-contained entity. The stability of independence is expressed as the limitation of generation; that is, it has the ability to maintain its own identity. At the same time, it also has the 'power' to separate from other things in isolation; that is, it has the 'power' to negate that it is other things. Whereas generation means change and appearance, emphasizing 'separation' in motive force.

From the law of negation of dialectical logic, it can be seen that by negating one side of A and non-A, the other can be obtained. However, this does not require A and non-A to be in absolute isolation (that is, absolute independence and distinction. For example, for the number 1, it is isolated from all other numbers; this is called absolute isolation). Rather, it is to say that it is sufficient that A and non-A can be mutually isolated; this is relative isolation (this will be seen in the later subsection "Isolation Logic: The Unity of Formal Logic and Dialectical Logic").

2) Identity means a lack of difference; whereas distinction means difference.

3) Immediacy has the meaning of stillness; Immediacy means the present. If Immediacy were to undergo change, it would be transformed into the past, and would no longer be Immediacy. Note, the stillness here is not a relative stillness in terms of motion. Whereas change means the generation of difference over time.

Viewing from the perspective of isolation dialectical logic:

1) Independence and generation are mutually opposed: Independence is expressed as stability, which conflicts with the dynamism of generation. Independence represents 'maintaining the status quo', while generation represents 'changing the status quo'. This opposition embodies the internal tension of motive force: on the one hand, it tries to maintain stability, while on the other, it continuously drives change.

2) Identity and distinction are mutually opposed: Identity is viewing manifestation action from the perspective of isolation action, attempting to achieve a description of unity through isolation (for example, A is X, B is X; different things are the same X, and X is itself). Whereas distinction is viewing isolation action from the perspective of manifestation action, attempting to reveal the differences of things through manifestation. The two form an opposition in their emphasis on fusion and separation.

As discussed in the subsection "Formal Logic": 'A is A' (embodying identity) and 'A is not A' (e.g.,

'A is B' embodying difference) are contradictory. From this perspective, identity and distinction are also in opposition.

3) Immediacy and change are mutually opposed: Immediacy is viewing manifestation action from the perspective of motive force action. The dynamism of Immediacy is embodied in its ability to bring things together to become the same thing and manifest it, and it emphasizes the instantaneousness and stillness of manifestation. Change is viewing motive force action from the perspective of manifestation action. The dynamism of change is embodied in the causality of motive force, and it emphasizes that manifestation displays dynamism through time. In their description of manifestation, one focuses on the instant, the other on the process of change, forming an opposition.

Why is this so? Independence is viewing isolation action from the perspective of motive force action; whereas generation is viewing motive force action from the perspective of isolation action. Identity is viewing manifestation action from the perspective of isolation action; whereas distinction is viewing isolation action from the perspective of manifestation action. Immediacy is viewing manifestation action from the perspective of motive force action; whereas change is viewing motive force action from the perspective of manifestation action. We see that the two opposing sides are both viewing the other from the opposite perspective. This forms a standard of opposition, which is why they are mutually opposed.

However, the two opposing sides also possess a dialectical unity:

1) Independence and Generation: Independence provides the prerequisite for generation, and generation is the unfolding or negation of independence.

As opposites, independence and generation are unified in 'cause'. We say that cause 'a' generates result 'b'; 'a' is the cause of 'b'. Then 'a', as the cause, isolates 'b', and 'a' and 'b' each possess independence relative to the other. A cause must be distinguished from its result; otherwise, it cannot be a cause. As a cause, it must both be independent of the result and establish a connection with the result through generation. Cause is the combination of dynamic generation and static isolation, emphasizing the generative relationship between things.

2) Identity and Distinction: Identity can only achieve clarity through distinction, and distinction only has meaning within identity.

As opposites, identity and distinction are unified in 'ground'. For instance, if 'a is b', then 'b' is the ground of 'a'. Here, 'a' is both unified in the identity of 'b' (this is viewing manifestation from the perspective of isolation: different things are unified in the same 'b'), and is also distinguished from 'b' (this is viewing isolation from the perspective of manifestation: 'b' and 'a' are distinguishable). Ground is the logical and substantiating foundation of things, emphasizing the logical connection between things.

Hegel, in his *Shorter Logic*, argued that identity and difference are unified in ground (Hegel, 1830). I, however, have not used 'difference' but rather 'distinction'. The difference between 'difference' and 'distinction' is that distinction has the characteristic of manifestation, and identity also has the characteristic of manifestation, whereas 'difference' is merely descriptive. This is because both 'viewing manifestation action from the perspective of isolation action' and 'viewing isolation

action from the perspective of manifestation action' have the nature of manifestation. Therefore, I believe it is more appropriate to use 'distinction'.

3) Immediacy and Change: Immediacy is the instantaneous embodiment of change, while change is the continuation or unfolding of Immediacy.

As opposites, Immediacy and change are unified in 'opening'. Because Immediacy is the continuous alternating change of Presence and Absence. Presence is the continuous manifestation of things that are absent. This is, in fact, a continuous opening; it is a continuous manifestation. Change causes things to go from nothing to something, from appearance to disappearance. This generation and perishing is, in essence, a process of opening. Therefore, 'opening' contains both the comprehensively grasping manifestation of Immediacy and the generativity of change; the two achieve a unity of opposites in opening. 'Opening' not only combines the manifestation of Immediacy with the dynamism of change, but also reveals the essential connection between manifestation and generation. Opening is the alternation of manifestation and generation, emphasizing the process of dynamic manifestation.

This, in fact, very clearly brings about an unfold-manifestation of the meaning of these six concepts and their deep-seated relationship. We see that the three concepts of cause, ground, and opening were already obtained in the subsection "viewing no form from the perspective of form" through the method of limits. We have also, in the oppositional analysis of the characteristics of no form action using dialectical logic, connected them with these three concepts. This connection has allowed us to establish a link between these two frameworks (the framework of the limit method and the framework of dialectical logical analysis). This convergence is an important advantage of no form action theory, demonstrating its internal consistency and the interconnection of its core concepts.

To fully reveal the deeper, more complex relationships among these concepts, relying solely on traditional methods of conceptual analysis will face enormous difficulties and limitations. In the subsection "exploring philosophy with mathematics," a more powerful tool for exploration will be presented.

(6.2) The Self, Being-for-itself, and Self-limitation

We can also view manifestation action from the perspective of manifestation action. In the later subsection "The Self," it will be discussed that self-consciousness is consciousness manifesting consciousness; that is, viewing manifestation action from the perspective of manifestation action. Therefore, viewing manifestation action from the perspective of manifestation action is the self.

Thus, we can deduce: viewing motive force action from the perspective of motive force action is being-for-itself, and viewing isolation action from the perspective of isolation action is self-limitation.

Viewing manifestation action from the perspective of manifestation action is the manifestation action within manifestation action. The same applies to viewing motive force action from the perspective of motive force action and viewing isolation action from the perspective of isolation action.

1) Viewing manifestation action from the perspective of manifestation action: The Self

'Viewing manifestation action from the perspective of manifestation action' can be understood as the manifestation or understanding of manifestation action by itself. This is consistent with the characteristics of 'manifestation action' which emphasize Immediacy and identity. The self emphasizes the identity and Immediacy of its intrinsic completeness. It is regarded as being, in essence, self-transparent.

2) Viewing motive force action from the perspective of motive force action: Being-for-itself

The characteristics of motive force action are change and generation. Viewing motive force action from the perspective of motive force action can be understood as the self-driving and self-creating of motive force action. This is consistent with the philosophical meaning of 'being-for-itself'. 'Being-for-itself' means the intrinsic, self-directed activity of something, which achieves self-generation and development through its own motive force. Therefore, 'viewing motive force action from the perspective of motive force action is being-for-itself' can be understood as a self-driving nature of motive force; that is, motive force achieves self-generation without relying on external factors. It is regarded as being, in essence, free and self-directed. It is not pushed or pulled by external forces. Being-for-itself emphasizes the generation and change of intrinsic drive.

3) Viewing isolation action from the perspective of isolation action: Self-limitation

The characteristics of isolation action include independence and distinction. Viewing isolation action from the perspective of isolation action can be understood as a thing determining its own boundaries and essence through self-distinction and self-limitation. This shows that isolation action is not only a separation from external things, but also a confirmation of its own internal boundaries. This internal confirmation is precisely 'self-limitation'. Self-limitation emphasizes the independent and distinguished nature of intrinsic determinacy. It is regarded as being, in essence, its own ground.

These three are not merely characteristics of human consciousness; non-conscious things also have these three characteristics, just not as prominently. Because, for humans, we can directly know these three through our own consciousness. But for non-conscious things, we need to know them indirectly through exploration and external phenomena. For example:

1) An ant colony is a system with the characteristic of self-organization, which is, in fact, a kind of being-for-itself. Ant colonies, through simple individual interactions and local rules, produce complex, efficient, and highly adaptive collective behaviors without any central control. The motive force behavior of each individual drives the motive force behavior of the entire colony. From a local motive force, a global motive force is obtained; this is viewing motive force action from the perspective of motive force action. This being-for-itself has too many complex forms within it, so the being-for-itself is not so obvious.

2) The self-assembly of nanomaterials is a system with the characteristic of self-limitation. The self-assembly process of some nanomaterials is designed to be self-limiting. For example, in Atomic Layer Deposition (ALD) technology, the growth of a thin film proceeds layer by layer, and the growth of each layer is limited by the surface chemical properties of the preceding layer, ensuring precise control over the film's thickness. The example of nanomaterials effectively shows that 'self-limitation' is not confined to conscious self-restraint or intention. It can also be

expressed as a property of a physical system driven by intrinsic constraints and self-regulating mechanisms. This internal, local limitation leads to the global limitation of the nanomaterial; this is viewing isolation action from the perspective of isolation action.

3) In the two examples above, we can vaguely see an inconspicuous 'self'. Even in non-conscious systems, a certain primitive principle of 'self' exists. Although it is not a complete 'self' in the human sense, these systems, through their 'being-for-itself' and 'self-limitation' attributes, are able to exhibit a primitive form of self-organization, self-restraint, or self-preservation. Then this system, as a whole that can autonomously maintain and operate, exhibits a primitive self.

Extending 'the self', 'being-for-itself', and 'self-limitation' to non-conscious phenomena significantly strengthens the claim of universality for 'no form action theory'. This shows that these concepts are not merely confined to human consciousness but are manifested in many aspects. Their universality will be seen more clearly in the subsection "exploring philosophy with mathematics".

However, this is not reductionism; it is not reducing the self to some attributes of 'being-for-itself' and 'self-limitation'. Because these three constitute a no form integrated transformation:

1) The transformation of the Self into Being-for-itself requires Self-limitation:

The self needs to carry out its activities of being-for-itself within the scope of its own limitations. That is, self-limitation provides the conditions of possibility for being-for-itself.

2) The transformation of the Self into Self-limitation requires Being-for-itself:

For the self to determine its own boundaries and principles, or to enrich, strengthen, and shape itself, it needs to be achieved through its own behavioral activities.

3) The transformation of Being-for-itself into the Self requires Self-limitation:

The self shaping itself through its own actions needs to be done on the basis of the conditions it possesses.

4) The transformation of Being-for-itself into Self-limitation requires the Self:

The purpose of this transformation from pure agency (being-for-itself) to the establishment of rules and boundaries (self-limitation) is to better define and protect the subject that is the 'self'. The self is their subject.

5) The transformation of Self-limitation into the Self requires Being-for-itself:

To strengthen and shape the self, the self must have a process or 'action'. In this process, the limitations (strengthening and shaping) become the content of the self. The formation and shaping of the self are not static, but are continuously adjusted and expanded through the process of action and behavior.

6) The transformation of Self-limitation into Being-for-itself requires the Self:

When a system with boundaries (self-limitation) begins to act (being-for-itself), this action is identified as the action of the subject that is the 'self', not a subject-less motion.

As we have discussed earlier, independence is to affirm A itself while negating the other (non-A). A and non-A each affirm themselves, yet mutually negate each other; this expresses their respective independence. This is an independent being established with an external frame of reference. However, we can think further: when a unity B internally contains the pair of opposites A and non-A, which both affirm themselves and mutually negate each other, we find that this internal dialectical relationship alone has already established the independence of B itself. B no longer needs an external non-B to define itself; its identity and boundary are self-maintained by its internal tension.

B is obtained by negating the opposition AA between A and non-A. B affirms itself and negates AA. B determines its own independence in this way. However, we find that B includes this state of opposition AA. That is to say, B's negation of AA is, in fact, a negation of itself. This self-driving and self-evolving ability of B is, in fact, being-for-itself. And because of the mutual constraint of its internal opposing sides, it establishes its own boundaries and rules; this is self-limitation.

In fact, the no form integrated transformation constituted by A, non-A, and negation forms a unity. It is precisely because these three constitute a no form integrated transformation that this unity possesses identity. This identity can be expressed as: A and non-A are both B; they belong to the same B. For example, negative numbers and non-negative numbers are both real numbers.

(6.3) The Internal Opposition of the Characteristics of the Three No Form Actions

The characteristics of the three no form actions:

1) Isolation action:

Characteristics of independence (viewing isolation action from the perspective of motive force action) and distinction (viewing isolation action from the perspective of manifestation action).

We see that independence possesses motive force action and isolation action; distinction possesses manifestation action and isolation action.

2) Motive force action:

Characteristics of change (viewing motive force action from the perspective of manifestation action) and generation (viewing motive force action from the perspective of isolation action).

We see that change possesses manifestation action and motive force action; generation possesses isolation action and motive force action.

3) Manifestation action:

Characteristics of Immediacy (viewing manifestation action from the perspective of motive force action) and identity (viewing manifestation action from the perspective of isolation action).

We see that Immediacy possesses motive force action and manifestation action; identity possesses isolation action and manifestation action.

In this way, each characteristic of each no form action possesses a dual no form action. This approach expands no form action from the one-dimensional isolation action, motive force action, and manifestation action into a two-dimensional no form action. That is, it expands from a

one-dimensional framework to a two-dimensional framework. For example, independence has the two dimensions of motive force action and isolation action.

At the same time, we also see the opposition among these characteristics of no form action:

- 1) Independence and generation are mutually opposed, but they both possess motive force action and isolation action, and thus both lack manifestation action.
- 2) Identity and distinction are mutually opposed, but they both possess isolation action and manifestation action, and thus both lack motive force action.
- 3) Immediacy and change are mutually opposed, but they both possess motive force action and manifestation action, and thus both lack isolation action.

Therefore, to maintain the absolute identity of no form:

- 1) Independence and generation, due to their lack of manifestation action, need to acquire manifestation action.
- 2) Identity and distinction, due to their lack of motive force action, need to acquire motive force action.
- 3) Immediacy and change, due to their lack of isolation action, need to acquire isolation action.

And since the six characteristics of no form action form three pairs of opposites, they can be used to obtain the two internal opposites for each characteristic of each no form action.

1) Independence

For independence, we see that manifestation action can be obtained from identity and distinction, and also from Immediacy and change, because they all contain manifestation action. And independence is viewing isolation action from the perspective of motive force action, while distinction is viewing isolation action from the perspective of manifestation action. Therefore, both independence and distinction are dominated by isolation action. Identity also possesses isolation action. These three can be correlated on the basis of isolation action and can be regarded as different aspects of isolation action. And because identity and distinction are in opposition and are indivisible, the choice is made to associate independence with 'identity and distinction'. Independence is to affirm oneself to obtain identity (a self is itself), and at the same time to negate other things to have distinguishability ('a self is not another'). Therefore, we have obtained two opposites: affirmation and negation.

Analyzing from an experiential perspective: independence is the ability to maintain one's own identity, which is, in fact, self-'affirmation'. Independence also has the 'power' to negate that it is other things, to avoid the interference of external things; this is, in fact, the ability of 'negation' of the other. Then, according to dialectical logic, the two opposing aspects of affirmation and negation are unified in independence. These two aspects not only coexist but also act together, forming the independence of a thing.

Independence obtains from identity the manifestation of an affirming self that possesses identity (a self is itself). Independence obtains from distinction the manifestation of a negating self that possesses distinguishability (a self is not another). Independence acquires the joint action of both

aspects, identity and distinction, to realize manifestation action, thereby maintaining the identity of no form.

2) Generation

By the same logic, generation can be associated with 'Immediacy and change'. Immediacy is to create on the dimension of 'the now'. The past is history; the future has not yet happened. And change necessarily implies the destruction of the old state and the appearance of a new state. Therefore, we have obtained two opposites: creation and destruction.

Analyzing from an experiential perspective: to generate a thing is to create a new thing and at the same time destroy another old thing. Because this is a real motive force action, the cause that generates the thing will certainly disappear and be transformed into the result. For example, when a person pushes an object, this pushing force, as the cause, is transformed into a change in the object's state of motion. If the cause did not disappear (the thing where the cause resides would undergo a change, and this change would indicate the disappearance of the cause), then the result would appear abruptly, and we would never know there was a cause. Creation and destruction are in opposition. Then, according to dialectical logic, the two opposing aspects of creation and destruction are unified in generation.

To analyze further: a cause can have a carrier; the cause and the carrier of the cause are not the same thing. The cause is transformed into the result. The disappearance of the cause does not mean that the carrier of the cause will disappear. For instance, when a person pushes an object and generates a change in motion, the pushing force used by the person, as the cause, disappears, but the person, as the carrier of this pushing force, does not disappear. This distinction is crucial for understanding the difference between the cause of an action and the agent of that action.

However, in a world of isolation (such as the isolated world of language), creating an object (or concept) 'a' does not mean destroying the object 'b' that was transformed into 'a'. But this is speaking from the perspective of the entire world of isolation. From the perspective of 'a', 'b' has been transformed into 'a'; 'b' is a part of 'a', which is equivalent to destroying 'b' (the meaning of 'destroy' here has changed). For example, if we create a concept 'a' through 'b', then 'a is b', and 'b' becomes an attribute of 'a'.

Generation obtains from Immediacy the action of manifesting new things. Generation obtains from change the manifestation action of changing old things.

Generation acquires the joint action of both aspects, Immediacy and change, to realize manifestation action, thereby maintaining the identity of no form.

3) Identity

By the same logic, identity can be associated with 'Immediacy and change'. Immediacy is direct. Change gives rise to an indirect causal relationship (because the result must be supported by the cause, it is indirect). Therefore, we have obtained two opposites: direct and indirect.

Analyzing from an experiential perspective: identity is the identity of a self with itself. This is both directness and indirectness. The directness refers to 'a self with itself', with no intermediate steps.

The indirectness refers to the fact that although it is already itself, it still needs to be manifested and supported through the form of 'a self is itself' (the 'self' relative to 'a self is itself' is also a kind of change), so it is indirect. Therefore, direct and indirect are in opposition. Then, according to dialectical logic, the two opposing aspects of direct and indirect are unified in identity.

To analyze further: identity is direct. This means that it itself is direct. However, the expression of identity is indirect; these are two different concepts. That identity is indirect is spoken from the perspective of viewing motive force action from the perspective of manifestation action (this is the 'change' characteristic of motive force action). This is already to say that identity is expressed indirectly through causality. Because when we view 'motive force action' from the perspective of 'manifestation action', we see its causality and mediacy. Whereas identity itself is direct; this is viewing manifestation action from the perspective of motive force action (Immediacy). Immediacy is still; it is a direct manifestation. The reason two opposites can be derived is because the directions are opposite.

Identity obtains from Immediacy the motive force to comprehensively grasp various things. Identity obtains from change the causality of motive force.

Identity acquires the joint action of both aspects, Immediacy and change, to realize motive force action, thereby maintaining the identity of no form.

4) Distinction

By the same logic, distinction can be associated with 'independence and generation'. Only an independent thing can have its own attributes, and thus it is possible for it to have the same attributes as another, that is, homogeneity. When a thing is generated, a difference between cause and result appears. Therefore, we have obtained two opposites: homogeneity and difference.

Analyzing from an experiential perspective: to distinguish different things is to find the difference between them. At the same time, this difference is measured according to a certain standard, which means that they all have a common attribute. They are different with respect to this same attribute. Then, this standard is homogeneous for the things to be distinguished. For instance, if two people have different personalities, we must first acknowledge that both of them have the attribute of 'personality'. Difference and homogeneity are in opposition. Then, according to dialectical logic, the two opposing aspects of difference and homogeneity are unified in distinction.

To analyze further: for the real world (that is, the world that has the three real no form actions), the difference between things is obtained through generation. A direct difference is generated between cause and result. As soon as a thing 'a' is generated, a difference is generated between its cause 'b' and 'a'. And many differences are generated indirectly. For example, two celestial bodies have different masses. How is this difference manifested in the real world? Gravity is a way of expressing this difference; a planet with less gravity will orbit a star with greater gravity. That is to say, difference is expressed through generation. Moreover, all differences are expressed through some standard; gravity is a standard. There is also a standard for the difference between cause and result: if there were no difference between cause and result, then the cause would not change at all. This standard is the change of the cause. In its essence, the cause and the result are

different entities. The very fact that the cause changes or is transformed into the result becomes the 'standard' for identifying their difference and their causal relationship. As discussed earlier, the difference in the essential attributes between things also requires a common attribute as a standard. 'Distinction' is not just a passive act of noticing a difference, but can be an active process facilitated and constructed by the motive force of 'generation'.

In the isolated world of language, difference is also obtained through generation. If we are to compare the differences between things, we must necessarily generate a common attribute standard to make the comparison. Therefore, no matter what kind of difference, a standard needs to be generated to obtain it.

Distinction obtains from independence the motive force that independent things have to become independent things, thereby making it possible for them to have their own attributes. Distinction obtains motive force from generation, thereby enabling it to obtain the standard for expressing the differences between things.

Distinction acquires the joint action of both aspects, independence and generation, to realize motive force action, thereby maintaining the identity of no form.

5) Immediacy

By the same logic, Immediacy can be associated with 'identity and distinction'. To manifest things on the dimension of 'the now' means that these things are all present, which shows that they possess identity, thus enabling various manifested things to be brought together under the same dimension. Things that are not present are absent. That is, when things exhibit distinguishability, they can no longer be unified on the dimension of 'the now' (just as when an actor leaves the stage, they no longer have an identity with that stage; they no longer belong to that stage). Therefore, we have obtained two opposites: Presence and Absence.

Analyzing from an experiential perspective:

Immediacy is about the present moment; it is the core of what constitutes 'directness'. In the context of no form action theory, presence is the direct manifestation of things. When something manifests, it is immediately present.

However, Immediacy also implies a form of absence. The concept of the present moment itself implies a past that is no longer present and a future that is not yet present. This absence in the temporal context is crucial for understanding Immediacy. Furthermore, the manifestation of a specific object implies the absence of other potential objects. This absence provides the background against which presence stands out.

Dialectical Unity: Presence and absence are not merely mutually exclusive; they exist in a dynamic interaction. Immediacy arises from the oppositional relationship in 'the now' between that which is present and that which is absent (the past, the future). This tension gives Immediacy its unique characteristic. Then, according to dialectical logic, the two opposing aspects of presence and absence are unified in Immediacy.

Immediacy obtains from identity its isolation action of being itself (identity). Immediacy obtains from distinction its isolation action of distinguishing between presence and absence.

Immediacy acquires the joint action of both aspects, identity and distinction, to realize isolation action, thereby maintaining the identity of no form.

6) Change

By the same logic, change can be associated with 'independence and generation'. The generation of a thing means that this thing has become an independent thing; that is, it has appeared as an independent thing. As a real motive force action, the cause that generates a thing must certainly disappear and be transformed into the result. For instance, when a person pushes an object, this pushing force, as the cause, is transformed into a change in the object's state of motion. If the cause did not disappear, then the result would appear abruptly, and we would never know there was a cause. Therefore, we have obtained two opposites: appearance and disappearance.

Analyzing from an experiential perspective: when a thing has undergone a change, something must have disappeared, and a new thing must have appeared. Therefore, disappearance and appearance are in opposition. Then, according to dialectical logic, the two opposing aspects of disappearance and appearance are unified in change.

Change obtains from independence the isolation action that a new thing possesses. Change obtains from generation the isolation action between cause and result.

Change acquires the joint action of both aspects, independence and generation, to realize isolation action, thereby maintaining the identity of no form.

(7) Summary

Starting from the three no form actions, we have, through the negative mode of isolation dialectical logic (for example, viewing motive force action from the perspective of isolation action is generation, and viewing isolation action from the perspective of motive force action is independence; since these two perspectives are opposite, it is thus obtained that generation and independence are in opposition), deduced three pairs of opposites among the characteristics of no form action. Furthermore, we have then deduced the two opposites for each characteristic. The above has been strictly deduced in accordance with isolation dialectical logic. This shows that isolation dialectical logic can be used as strictly and effectively as traditional formal logic.

Through the deduction of no form action and isolation dialectical logic, a deepening from one-dimensional no form action to two-dimensional no form action has been realized. The original one-dimensional no form actions (isolation, motive force, manifestation) have, through a two-dimensional structure (where each characteristic possesses two no form actions), formed a more complex structure. This two-dimensional structure not only brings about an unfold-manifestation of the synergy among the no form actions, but also reveals their internal contradiction and unity.

This deductive process still embodies the core role of the absolute identity of no form. By revealing the lack of certain actions in the opposition, it is shown that the absolute identity of no form is not necessarily static, but can be realized in a dynamic balance of opposition and completion. This dynamic balance embodies the intrinsic unity and self-regulating ability of no form action. This method of deduction, starting from the most basic no form actions, has laid a systematic foundation for no form action theory.

Although we have conducted a detailed and in-depth analysis and discussion of these mutually opposing concepts using the method of conceptual analysis, there is always a sense of ambiguity, a feeling that something has not been clearly articulated. And there should be even more complex relationships among these concepts, which are difficult to grasp using the method of conceptual analysis. This is an inherent flaw of conceptual analysis, and this is also the main method on which traditional philosophy has relied.

However, this will become a thing of the past. The work that no form action theory has done so far is laying the foundation for philosophy to be studied through a method of rigorous deduction. The next subsection, "exploring philosophy with mathematics," will take philosophy to a higher level, and philosophy will be presented with a brand new appearance.

References

Hegel, G. W. F. (1830). *Encyclopaedia Logic*. Translated by T. F. Geraets, W. A. Suchting, and H. S. Harris, Hackett Publishing, 1991.