To explain consciousness, merely focusing on consciousness itself is not enough to reveal its essence. Consciousness can perceive matter, time, and space; experience beauty, pain, and colors; follow logic; and participate in science and morality. Therefore, a complete theory of consciousness must also be able to uniformly explain these things. Otherwise, it is impossible to clarify why consciousness can reflect the world. This requirement for unity transcends scientific reductionism, pointing towards a higher dimension of metaphysics. That is to say, only on a higher dimension above the concept of consciousness can consciousness be explained; without transcending consciousness, consciousness cannot be explained. So, how can such a theory that can unify this world be established?

(1) Introducing the two-dimensional theory

Let us re-examine Aristotle's relative dualism. His dualism is somewhat different from Descartes'. Descartes' dualism absolutely separates the two Ontological Primitives; it is an actual separation. In contrast, Aristotle's dualism is a logical separation of form and matter, while in reality they are mixed together. If we discard the concepts of relative form and matter, retain the concepts of pure form and pure matter, and view pure form and pure matter like the x-axis and y-axis in plane geometry, it becomes a two-dimensional theory. Then, any thing can be explained using pure form and pure matter, as everything is their combination, including attributes.

By replacing form and matter with pure form and pure matter, then pure form and pure matter become uncorrelated. In this way, Aristotle's dualism is expressed in a simpler and clearer manner. By viewing pure form and pure matter as two independent dimensions, rather than two mutually dependent principles, one avoids the relativity of form and matter being mutually transformable, while also preserving the characteristic that everything is a combination of pure form and pure matter. Thus, we can use form to characterize substantiality. As long as a thing has form, it has substantiality, and this includes things like attributes. This way, the shortcomings of his theory can be avoided. At the same time, it also avoids the predicament caused by absolute dualism's division of the world into two absolutely different aspects. This is because the two-dimensional theory does not divide the world into two absolutely different aspects, but rather identifies two different dimensions within the world, thus avoiding the predicament of absolute dualism.

However, Aristotle did not clarify what pure matter is. If the relativity that allows form and matter to be mutually transformable is removed, his theory can no longer unfold or develop. If pure matter is called no form, and pure form is called form, then it becomes the no form action theory that I have created. No form action theory is a two-dimensional theory composed of these two dimensions: no form and form. No form has three actions: motive force, isolation, and manifestation. The combination of no form with different forms generates these three actions. With these three actions, things can undergo change, be presented, and become individual entities. Change requires motive force action; the ability to be presented is manifestation; and the ability to become a single individual is achieved through isolation.

Indeed, if a thing has no form, studying it is certainly difficult. This is also the reason why, since ancient Greece, people have basically only studied form and not no form. Since it is no form, and there is no way to express it in language, how can it be studied? However, the fact that we have no way to express no form does not mean there is no way to study it. As long as we identify the actions that no form generates, we can still study no form. This solves the problem for Aristotle's theory, making it possible to study the world through no form action theory even 'in the absence of the mutual transformability of form and matter'. For more than two thousand years, people have studied form for too long and have neglected no form for too long. It is time to open the door to the study of no form.

(2) Why it is necessary to identify two different dimensions to characterize the world.

This is just like the x-axis and y-axis in plane geometry. According to the principle of linear spaces in mathematics, one must find a set of elements for a linear space such that any element in that space can be linearly represented by them, and none of these chosen elements can be linearly represented by the others. In other words, these elements are not linearly correlated. These elements are then the basis elements of this linear space—that is, the dimensions of the space. In the case of plane geometry, the basis elements are the two elements: the x-axis and the y-axis. Intuitively speaking, the x-axis and y-axis are uncorrelated, and thus any point in the plane can be represented using an x-coordinate and a y-coordinate.

This is the reason why I must identify two uncorrelated dimensions in this world. No form does not have any form, so how could it represent form? Likewise, within form, one cannot find anything of no form; all that is found is form. This means they have no similarity whatsoever. Therefore, form and no form can only combine with each other; they cannot represent each other.

This is unlike consciousness and the physical world, where consciousness can reflect the laws and forms of the physical world. For example, when we see a cup, the shape of the cup is generated within our consciousness—this is a strong correlation. Humans can also create forms in consciousness and use these forms to transform the physical world. Because consciousness and the physical world share certain identical forms, viewed in this way, dividing the world into matter and consciousness is incorrect. The forms in consciousness can reflect the laws of the physical world; the correlation between them is too strong. Therefore, this is an unreasonable division.

Form and no form, however, perfectly meet the conditions for being the dimensions of this world. They are the most fundamental, and, they are indeed uncorrelated. Thus, all things are composed of no form and form.

No form action theory posits "form" and "no form" as its two dimensions, providing the possibility of applying mathematics to philosophy. This application will be seen in a later section, "exploring philosophy with mathematics".

Why does no form action theory choose the two dimensions of "form" and "no form," rather than a single- or multi-dimensional theory?

(2.1) A single dimension cannot explain the diversity of the world. Any idea of developing a philosophy starting from a single concept is impossible. How can a single concept possibly develop into a concept that is different from itself? Hegel attempted to unfold his dialectical philosophy from the single concept of "being," proposing that "nothingness" was contained within it, and that the two were ultimately unified as "becoming" (Hegel, 1817, pp.82-83). However, "being" cannot independently derive "nothingness"; the two are more akin to coexisting companions. Philosophies of a single dimension, due to their lack of comprehensiveness, find it difficult to construct a complete metaphysics. Kant, in his Critique of Pure Reason, pointed out that metaphysics must achieve a transcendental synthetic unity through sensibility and understanding in order to transcend the limitations of a single principle (Kant, 1781, B139, p.153).

(2.2) As for theories with more than two dimensions, I do not deny their potential existence. Perhaps such theories exist, but first, we must properly establish the two-dimensional theory of no form action theory. No form action theory will be a very complex theory, let alone one with more than two dimensions. Therefore, let us first focus on the simplest task at hand.

However, from a formal mathematical perspective, any finite multidimensional theory can be dimensionally

reduced to a two-dimensional theory. Let us assume a three-dimensional theory with dimensions: a, b, and c. Since a, b, and c are the three dimensions, they must all be simultaneously correlated (or combined) to represent any given thing (just as in three-dimensional space, three coordinates are needed to represent the position of a point). Otherwise, it would not be a single three-dimensional theory, but potentially several different theories—for example, one theory composed of a and b, and another composed of b and c.

Since a, b, and c are mutually correlated, we can:

1) Express their correlation mathematically as: $a \cdot b = c$, $a \cdot c = b$, and $b \cdot c = a$. Due to the fundamental and universal nature of a, b, and c as dimensions, we can assume this operation possesses the commutative property (e.g., $a \cdot b = b \cdot a = c$) and the associative property (e.g., $(a \cdot b) \cdot c = a \cdot (b \cdot c)$).

2) For the operation $a \cdot a$, we consider it as performing no net action, as it does not involve correlation with the other two dimensions. We denote $a \cdot a$ as 'e', that is, $a \cdot a = e$, where e represents the identity element (no action). Similarly, $b \cdot b = e$, $c \cdot c = e$, and $e \cdot e = e$.

3) For $e \cdot a$ (or $a \cdot e$), we consider that no action is performed on 'a', and therefore, $e \cdot a$ (or $a \cdot e$) = a. Similarly, $e \cdot b$ (or $b \cdot e$) = b, and $e \cdot c$ (or $c \cdot e$) = c.

Thus, mathematically, the set V = {a, b, c, e} forms a group: the Klein four-group, with 'e' as the identity element. This group can be generated by the direct product of the binary cyclic group $Z_2 = \{0, 1\}$, which is $Z_2 \times Z_2$. In this manner, the three-dimensional theory is dimensionally reduced to a two-dimensional theory.

For multidimensional theories with a dimensionality greater than 3, we can arbitrarily divide its multiple dimensions into three classes, repeat the procedure above, and ultimately reduce it dimensionally to a two-dimensional theory.

(3) So, how can form and no form be defined?

Form and no form cannot be directly defined. For if they could be defined, a problem would arise: if A were used to define them, then A would need to be defined, and then B would be used to define A, leading to an infinite regress. However, for humanity, besides logical reasoning, there is also intuitive manifestation. We can perceive form intuitively—for instance, the structure of an object, the speed of its motion, and so on.

Intuitive manifestation is, in fact, the manifestation action of no form action theory. And when we define things, we are forming concepts; a concept is a single, formed thing, which is the isolation action of no form action theory. And when we actually do things, that practice is the motive force action. No single method can completely explain the world; it must be explained through the combined application of these three no form actions.

We perceive form through intuitive manifestation; from this, we can deduce that 'that which contains no form is no form.' This deduction is the motive force action. Finally, we isolate the concept of 'that which has no form' (which is no form), and this is the isolation action. Therefore, to understand a thing, it must be explained through the combined application of the three no form actions. One of the methods of no form action theory is to connect the three no form actions: manifestation, motive force, and isolation.

In other words, the two-dimensional framework of form and no form is only a hypothesis; it can also be called an axiom. The establishment of a branch of mathematics begins with mathematical axioms. On the basis of these axioms, a logically consistent mathematical system is built through deduction, and this system is then applied to specific problems. Such a process is precisely what demonstrates the reasonableness of these axioms.

Establishing mathematical axioms is isolation action (c), building a mathematical structure through deduction is motive force action (b), and thereby, the reasonableness of the axioms is manifested, which is manifestation action (a). This process is a union of the three no form actions: (c) requires (b) in order to manifest reasonableness (a). This process is, in fact, a form of reasoning called 'identity reasoning' (this is a type of reasoning different from traditional formal logic, which will be discussed later). This kind of reasoning will be used frequently.

We take the two-dimensional framework of form and no form as an axiom. Through constructing the entire theoretical framework, explaining phenomena, and applying it to specific cases, we manifest the reasonableness of this two-dimensional framework. When the limitations of this two-dimensional framework are discovered, we will have then determined the scope of its reasonableness and will know the extent of its reasonableness. Before its limitations are discovered, it can continue to be developed.

A theory must start with basic assumptions of intuition (why must it do so? This question will be explored in a later section). In the process of explaining the world, it continually brings about an unfold-manifestation of itself. This mode of thinking is, in fact, the natural mode of human thought. Most philosophical theories, in essence, also do this. For example, Aristotle's metaphysics begins with intuitive assumptions about form and matter, explains phenomena such as motion and causality, and simultaneously brings about an unfold-manifestation of its theoretical coherence (Aristotle, Metaphysics, Book VII, 1029a).

So, what is philosophy? The standard for judging the value of a philosophical theory is the degree of its reasonableness. The value of a philosophy is determined by its applicability and its scope of application. The greater the scope a theory can explain, and the deeper its level of explanation, the stronger its truthfulness. Philosophy is the study of reasonableness, and this reasonableness is oriented towards the reasonableness of concepts. It focuses more on conceptual clarity, logical consistency, and a profound understanding of phenomena. The core theories of philosophy cannot be scientifically proven (which is not to say they cannot be scientifically falsified); otherwise, philosophy could not be called a theory that is above science. Philosophy, as a discipline whose standard is reasonableness, is distinctly different from science. Scientific conclusions must be based on the standard of empirical verification and need to be confirmed in reality. The value of a philosophy, in contrast, is judged primarily by the degree of reasonableness it can offer.

Therefore, to determine whether no form action theory is a reasonable theory and to gauge the degree of reasonableness it can offer, one must begin with the two-dimensional framework of form and no form (isolation action). Then, through the process of constructing the entire theoretical framework, explaining phenomena, and engaging in concrete application (motive force action), the theory must continuously manifest itself (manifestation action).

(4) The existence of no form

Nothingness means that there are no things at all; it is obtained by negating all forms. But why is negating all forms Nothingness? This is just a default idea; Nothingness cannot be deduced by negating all forms. This is not logically feasible. Since this is the case, we can assume the existence of a thing of no form, and then verify its reasonableness through continuous deduction.

No form simply means that there exists a thing that has no form whatsoever. It can be obtained in the manner of a limit. As the form of a concrete thing (for example, a stone) is continuously reduced, it finally becomes no form. And we cannot logically deduce that no form is Nothingness. No form is simply without form, but it is still a being that cannot be negated. Thus, we can treat it as an object, and through the three actions of no form (isolation

action, motive force action, and manifestation action), we can effectively use it.

The combination of no form and form generates three no form actions: manifestation action, motive force action, and isolation action. No form cannot be equated with nothingness. No form is simply without form; it cannot be expressed as an existence with form. However, this does not mean it does not exist. No form and non-existence are not the same concept. That no form can generate action does not mean it is formal; these are two different concepts.

No form is a type of being, but not a directly perceptible or knowable being. It only serves to facilitate the existence of form, but it itself does not possess form. Only that which has no form can act upon all things that have form. The action generated by no form is a no form action; it only exerts a no form action on form, but it does not change the form itself. Let us examine the three no form actions:

1) Motive force drives other things; it itself is not driven.

2) Manifestation manifests other things; it itself is not manifested.

3) Isolation isolates other things; it itself is not isolated.

To elaborate further:

1) If a thing X appears, there must be a motive force that causes its generation. But does motive force itself require a motive force? If so, then motive force 'a' would need motive force 'b', and 'b' would need 'c', leading to an infinite regress. Therefore, motive force itself does not need a motive force. Motive force only causes form to undergo change; it does not change the form itself.

2) If a thing X appears, it must be capable of manifestation; otherwise, we could not detect its existence. And what difference would there be then between it and non-existence? Similarly, manifestation manifests form; it itself does not need to be manifested by another thing. Manifestation only manifests form; it does not change the form itself.

3) If a thing X appears, it must be distinguishable from other things to be called a thing. This distinction is the effect caused by isolation. Isolation, too, isolates form; it itself does not need to be isolated by another thing. Isolation only isolates form; it does not change the form itself.

Therefore, we conclude that no form manifests as three different actions only because it combines with different forms. Therefore, the three no form actions contain both no form and form. Viewed from the perspective of motive force action, no form is motive force; viewed from the perspective of manifestation action, no form is manifestation; viewed from the perspective of isolation action, no form is isolation.

Thus, there are three types of no form: motive force, manifestation, and isolation. These three types of no form are merely the result of viewing from different perspectives; in reality, they are the same, as no form is without differentiation. However, the three no form actions are different. For instance, motive force causing an object to undergo change is motive force action; the shape of an object being manifested in consciousness is manifestation action; and isolating two different things is isolation action. It is important to note: the three types of no form are different from the three no form actions.

In summary, no form is its own cause; it does not require any other thing to be its cause. If no form had a cause, then its cause would necessarily be a form for it. That is, if some thing caused no form, then this thing would become the causal form of no form. For example, a mother is the cause of her son's generation. We can therefore

say that 'the son has a mother' is a type of form. In that case, the son cannot be no form. Therefore, if no form had a cause, it would possess a form, which contradicts the definition of no form.

No form is ubiquitous; it exists not only in theory, but also in reality, in thought, in consciousness, in language, and so on. It influences the world through the three no form actions. This viewpoint will permeate the entirety of no form action theory, and its reasonableness will be manifested throughout the development of the theory. For example:

After intuition, through reflection, one comes to know that such a thing as no form action exists. When we see a single thing, it becomes necessary for us to reflect that there must exist an action that makes the appearance of a single thing possible, and this is isolation action. When we see things changing, it becomes necessary for us to reflect that there must exist an action that causes things to change, and this is motive force action. When an image of a thing is presented in our consciousness, it becomes necessary for us to reflect that there must exist an action that enables things to be manifested, and this is manifestation action. This reasoning process is also explained by the union of the three no form actions: intuition is manifestation, reflection is motive force, and finally, an action is isolated.

Within the framework of this two-dimensional theory of form and no form, it becomes possible to penetrate the spiritual world and the material world (or the world of consciousness and the physical world) and unify them, thereby resolving their apparent opposition. Thus, it becomes possible to clearly and reasonably explain consciousness, mind, and matter, and in this way, one can see a unity in essence.

Have you noticed that in explaining no form action theory itself, one is actually using no form action theory?

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

References

Hegel, G. W. F. (1817). Science of Logic. Translated by A. V. Miller (1969). Humanities Press.

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

Aristotle. (n.d.). Metaphysics. Translated by W. D. Ross, Oxford University Press.