

(1) absolute identity:

No form does not contain any form, and thus has no distinguishability. Therefore, no form possesses the characteristic of identity; this is an intrinsic identity. No form is an undifferentiated 'One'; it is absolute identity.

From the perspective of isolation, the three actions of no form—isolation action, motive force action, and manifestation action—are indeed distinguishable; they are different. However, the no form that lies behind them as their common foundation is the same; it is identical. The three no form actions are all ultimately founded upon the same no form. This suggests to us that the three no form actions, on the ground of the absolute identity of no form, are rendered mutually dependent and indivisible.

This is because no form is an undifferentiated 'One', and any single action (due to its combination with a specific form) introduces a certain determinacy and one-sidedness, thereby disrupting the complete integrity of the identity of no form. Therefore, the absence of any one no form action prevents the absolute identity of no form from being embodied. To fully embody this identity, the three actions must unite; together, in their unity, they constitute the complete expression of this identity. This is using the unity of the three actions to maintain the identity of no form. In other words, the three no form actions are complementary; only by coming together can they form a whole.

This gives the three no form actions a united character, which is expressed in two aspects:

1) Dynamic union: For a no form action 'a' to be transformed into its complementary no form action 'b' (one of the other two actions), a third no form action 'c' must participate in this transformation in order to embody the absolute identity of no form. Throughout the entire transformation process, the three actions are unified into a whole to maintain this identity. Furthermore, a no form action can only be transformed into its complementary no form action.

In other words, any transformation must take place among the three no form actions in order to embody the absolute identity of no form. This identity provides the basis for the transformation, and any transformation process must maintain this identity.

This transformation is spoken of from the perspective of motive force action; it is the motive force relationship among the three actions. The principle of this transformation can be more clearly understood from its mathematical structure (see the subsection: exploring philosophy with mathematics).

2) Static union: The same thing must possess these three no form actions; that is, these three no form actions can be distinguished within this thing. This distinguishable united relationship is the isolation relationship among the three actions.

This relationship of identity can be understood from the perspective of no form manifestation (the characteristic of identity is a characteristic of manifestation action). Therefore, this relationship of identity constitutes the manifestation relationship among the three actions.

(2) Further elaboration:

1) The motive force relationship means that the three no form actions are mutually transformable. In this way, the different actions can be connected through the "motive force relationship."

2) The isolation relationship means that a thing (even no form itself) can be isolated into three different actions: isolation action, motive force action, and manifestation action. The perspectives of these three no form actions can be applied to a single thing. The isolation relationship allows the three no form actions, despite having the same origin, to exhibit differences in their action and expression. This shows that no form can present itself in different ways.

3) The manifestation relationship means that the three no form actions are identical in their origin; they are all no form.

The manifestation relationship maintains the intrinsic identity of no form itself; the motive force relationship maintains identity through change; and the isolation relationship maintains identity through separation. It is precisely these relationships that enrich the connotation of the "absolute identity" of no form, giving no form not only an intrinsic identity but also an external diversity. This embodies the essence of the three no form actions being both independent of and interconnected with each other.

No form is absolute identity without any form. It is precisely because of this "absolute identity" of no form that the three seemingly different actions can be mutually transformed and united. This "identity" is the most core principle of no form action theory. It is like a main thread running through the entire theory, binding it tightly together, making it a unified organism rather than a collection of fragmented viewpoints. This tells us that no matter how diverse and complex the phenomena are, there is a unified principle at work behind them. It provides a way to understand the unity of the world that transcends the diversity of appearances.

Not only that, but since no form possesses the most fundamental foundational nature, its identity is also the most fundamental principle. Therefore, with this absolute identity as a principle, a complete framework for reasoning can be constructed, a framework that transcends the reasoning of formal logic. Several later subsections will explore this issue.

(3) The Identity of Manifestation

Viewed from the perspective of motive force, manifestation is Immediacy. Viewed from the perspective of isolation, manifestation is identity. From the perspective of isolation, the isolation in manifestation is the weakest and simplest. This isolation of manifestation is the distinguished isolation of a thing from itself; it is an isolation without difference, which is precisely the identity of a thing with itself. To perceive identity through Immediacy is to perceive the thing's self through Immediacy, which means that the thing is identical with its self. Immediacy is to be directly manifested, without needing to reflect the underlying cause or ground.

Manifestation can 'simplify' isolation action into identity, and 'simplify' motive force action into Immediacy. Only this simplification can achieve manifestation without needing to reflect the underlying cause and ground. Manifestation action is like a filter; it filters out the complexity of isolation action and motive force action, leaving only the most essential information, enabling us

to perceive and understand the world in the simplest, most direct way. This is also why manifestation action plays such a crucial role in the cognitive process. This also reflects what was said earlier: "viewing form directly from the perspective of manifestation is essence," because what no form manifests is form.

Here a question arises: why is the characteristic of isolation in manifestation action the identity of a thing with itself? Why is it not the absolute identity of no form? No form has no distinguishability, and therefore it possesses this absolute identity. And because of this, its absolute identity cannot be directly manifested. Since there is no distinguishability, isolation action is necessary in order to manifest this intrinsic identity. Therefore, it is said that the identity of a thing with itself is the manifestation of the absolute identity of no form. This both embodies the absolute identity of no form (because it is the identity of a self with itself) and possesses distinguishability (because 'self' is already an isolated concept). This is the relationship between the absolute identity of no form and the identity of a thing with itself. This also shows that it is reasonable for the identity of a thing with itself to be the characteristic of isolation in manifestation.

In Kant's philosophy, a unified object is perceived through Immediacy from the manifold of material (Kant, 1781). This unity is precisely the unification into an identity. Only an object that possesses identity can be manifested. Immediacy (motive force) is the direct manifestation of content, while identity (isolation) ensures that this content is 'this one' and not 'another', and that it is 'self-identical'.

References

Kant, I. (1781). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by N. K. Smith, Macmillan, 1929.