

“The Information as Absolute” conception: Marxism and “now”

Sergey V. Shevchenko¹ and Vladimir V. Tokarevsky²

¹Institute of Physics of NAS of Ukraine, Pr. Nauki, 46, Kiev-28, Ukraine, Scientific explorer *,
ret.

²Professor ret., Pr. Nauki, 46, Kiev-28, Ukraine

Abstract In this paper the some problems of relevance of Marxism in applications to recent societies are considered in framework of the “The Information as Absolute” conception.

1 Introduction

The problem of relevance of Marxism in recent societies is rather popular and is considered in many publications and discussions. In this paper this problem is considered in framework of the new philosophical “The Information as Absolute” conception. Since, in spite of that the discussions are numerous, the main tenets of Marxism and often versions of its critiques are rather well known, here we mainly refer to a rather popular discussion on the Research Gate, where a number of points are presented rather professionally [1]; and use some information from Wiki [2].

At the beginning a few comments to some relevant citations:

[Malek, A. [1]] “... Marxism is a socio-economic and political worldview or inquiry based on a materialist interpretation of historical development ...The enhanced “consciousness” from other “sapiens” to man; lies in the dialectical mode of thought that could only arise with the higher capability for communication, abstraction, introspection, and reflection etc., and that could only manifest itself in the highest developed form of matter - the thinking brain of man.

This higher level of “consciousness” is gained through increasing positive knowledge of the material world and of man himself; that provide man with progressively increasing “freedom of the will” to act and to “change” himself and the world (for a harmonious co-existence of man and Nature) as Karl Marx asserted!”

This is how Frederick Engels put it: "Hegel was the first to state correctly the relation between freedom and necessity. To him, freedom is the appreciation of necessity. “Necessity is blind only in so far as it is not understood”.

Freedom does not consist in the dream of independence of natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work towards definite ends. This holds good in relation both to the laws of external nature and those which govern the bodily and mental existence of men themselves – two classes of laws which we can separate from each other at most only in thought, but not in reality.

Freedom of the will therefore means nothing but the capacity to make decision with real knowledge of the subject. Therefore the freer a man’s judgement is in relation to a definite question, with so much the greater necessity is the content of this judgement determined; while the uncertainty, founded on ignorance, which seems to make an arbitrary choice among many different and conflicting possible decisions, shows by this precisely that it is not free, that it is controlled by the very object it

* sshev2g@gmail.com

should itself control. Freedom therefore consists in the control over ourselves and over external nature which is founded on knowledge of natural necessity; it is therefore necessarily a product of historical development. The first men who separated themselves from the animal kingdom were in all essentials as unfree as the animals themselves, but each step forward in civilization was a step towards freedom." (Anti-Duhring, p-127)

- that is indeed so, however, the Marxism is more than an interpretation, it is **the theory** that is based on adequate to the practice and to the reality, in some historical periods however, postulates; first of all on the main Marxism "fundamental law": "***In all/every humans' societies the material social Being determinates the social [and most of individual] Consciousness***".

Thus

[James, I. O. [1]] "...that man is a social animal with physical needs. These physical needs can, however, only be satisfied when man develops or produces the means to satisfy these needs... These means of producing the satisfaction to his need for a house is called **Forces or Means of Production**... It means that whenever man uses any one set of means of production, it leads him to a new need or needs. This process is the dialectic process of the history of man in his various stages of development of the means of production.

•The use of any given means of production.. involves certain social relationships
What does this mean?

It means that:

- These social relationships or Institutions or Practices are called **Productive Relations**.
- These social relationships or productive relations depend on the stage of evolution of the forces of production or means of production....
- ...that man is a social animal with physical needs.
- For Karl Mar ...that man is a social animal with physical needs... the ideal society will have no economic classes, no wages, no money, no private property and no exploitation."

All that above again is indeed adequate to the reality practically in all cases till now, including indeed

- the slave system replaced the social relations in first human sapiens sapiens's [tribal] societies, [as to official Marxism, as elements on the "dialectic helix" - "primitive communism", which will return in the post-capitalistic future as the "scientific communism"], the slave system was replaced by feudalism, feudalism was replaced by capitalism.

As well as the Marx's analysis of the capitalism remains be adequate till now, including in that one of the main differences of the capitalism from all social states/modes before is that at capitalism the financial capital dominates and the common earlier formula "commodity-money-commodity" at capitalism is principally replaced by the formula "money-commodity-money".

The further development of the science "economics" practically

[if we don't pay attention on some ideological points, that are in all new economic doctrines, including ritual "critique of Marxism" in these theories; that is, first of all, since as Marx and Engels wrote in "The German Ideology" "*ideologists are humans that made as the resource for their good life development of illusions of peculiar class about the class itself* [translated from Russian]]

only adapts inessentially the Productive Relations at permanent changes of the Means of production, considering concrete capitalistic problems in concrete historical situations in more detail.

However, Marxism attempts to go farther than capitalism. It postulates also that just “iron” material economical laws inevitably lead to replacing of capitalism by some next, post-capitalistic, societies [“ideal society” in the citation above]; which were named before Marx in a number of “utopian”, in contrast to “scientific” Marxism’s doctrine, philosophical and religious doctrines, as “socialism” and “communism”. A rather complete set of such societies are considered [and critiqued in framework of Marxism] in “*Manifesto of the Communist Party*” [3]

And, what historically turned out to be very important, in XX century the number of attempts to implement Marxism into humans’ practice and to build some versions of socialisms and a communism were made.

Practically all these attempts failed [when “socialisms” in a couple of non-capitalistic countries now is rather far away from its “theoretical” image just in the economics], at that the more orthodoxly the leaders in “socialistic countries” followed to Marx, the more evident the difference between theory and the reality was revealed.

The attempts failed, first of all, just in the economics: Marxism claims that the “dialectic resolution” of the “main inherent contradiction in capitalism” between “social method of production” and “private methods of the consumption” [which results in uncontrolled production, crises of production, etc.], is the “socialistic/[communistic]” transformation of the Productive Relations correspondingly, i.e. when both, the production and consumption become be only social.

Besides that, the chaotic capitalistic production in new society with solved this “production/consumption” contradiction must be replaced by planned production.

Both these factors, as that Marx claimed [*Critique of the Gotha Program*], will result in that “wealth will flow in a dull stream” and so the “*Great Principle*” of communism “*From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs*” will be realized.

In the reality the “real socialism” with established planned economics and harmonized in accordance with the theory Productive Relations lost the economic competition with capitalism. As well as it turned out to be impossible to build a society that indeed “has no economic classes, no wages, no money, no private property and no exploitation.”

Thus, since in the reality **Marxism is indeed very effective and correct theory of pre-socialist, including capitalistic, societies**, when it is applied as a theory of/at building of some concrete societies, it turns out to be no more than only some instruction “How to build capitalism”; and Authorities an Executives in the former socialistic countries executed this instruction, when they have lead their countries and nations through most of mentioned in Marxism stages of humans’ societies [in the USSR practically literally, from primitive military communism through further, in fact, slavery and feudalism,], and ended in capitalism.

2 Reasons of the failure of the communistic experiment

The main reasons of the inevitable failure of the attempts to apply of the Marxist theory on the practice two: (i) this theory is principally materialistic, and (ii) Marxism is only some branch of one of the main traditional philosophical doctrines “Materialism”.

Both the main traditional doctrines in the philosophy, every of which climes itself as the science that studies utmost fundamental laws that govern by Nature and societies, i.e. “Materialism” and “Idealism”, in the reality aren’t sciences, because of the utmost fundamental notions/phenomena, on which these doctrines are based, i.e. “Matter” and “Consciousness/Idea/Spirit, etc.” aren’t, and cannot be principally, properly defined in every

of the doctrines; both they are some transcendental omnipotent Essences that form the “Being”, as that is, without any rational grounds, postulated in corresponding doctrines: “the Being is the being of Matter” and “the Being is the being of Consciousness/Idea...”.

Including, for example, the Marx’s and Engels’s statements below are eventually nothing more than bare ungrounded declarations, which could have some concrete sense only provided that the main notions above are properly defined.

The well known Lenin’s definition of “Matter”: [translated from Russian]

“Matter is a philosophical category that services for designation of the objective reality, which is given us in feelings and exists independently on them”

doesn’t change anything in this case and, for example, can be equally a definition of “Idea” simply by replacing the word “Matter” by word “Idea”, which any objective idealist will completely agree with. Moreover, in this case such definition of the undefined transcendent [and so the definition remains be senseless] in Idealism notion/phenomenon “Idea” would be even “more correct”, since the Lenin’s definition not only is senseless since simply replaces the undefined transcendent in Materialism notion/“philosophical category”/phenomenon “Matter” by equally undefined transcendent notion/phenomenon “objective reality”. That contradicts also with the main materialistic postulate that the answer on the one of main questions in philosophy “What was the first, Matter or Consciousness?” is that the first was Matter, when Consciousness is secondary: it is evident that a philosophical category “Matter” could not appear before the consciousness’s product “philosophy”.

Both fundamental the “Being postulates” above, and so practically every substantive consequence from the postulates, cannot be proven/disproved in framework of every of the doctrines; just therefore the endless struggle of Materialism and Idealism continues seems at least a few thousands years already; when the opponents, i.e. true believers of the doctrines, including Marxists, because of principal absence of rational arguments, exchange only by in fact senseless bare declarations; sometimes rather emotional.

That doesn’t connote, of course, that everything in the traditional philosophy is senseless, in some cases the philosophy rather adequately describes the objective reality, albeit makes that only as some phenomenological constructions; something like to phenomenological “phlogiston theory” in physics, which, though it was unknown what this phlogiston is, nonetheless pretty adequately described a lot of heat effects and events. In such cases usually these adequate descriptions are used in both main philosophical doctrines.

The essential here examples are below.

Dialectic

Seems utmost known common for both doctrines and adequate to the reality is the philosophical branch “Dialectic”, which is based on a few postulates/ “dialectical laws” [2]

- (1) Everything is transient and finite, existing in the medium of time.
- (2) Everything is composed of contradictions (opposing forces).
- (3) Gradual changes lead to crises, turning points when one force overcomes its opponent force (quantitative change leads to qualitative change).
- (4) Change is “helical” (periodic without returning to the same position), not circular (negation of the negation)”

Including

“...According to Hegel, "dialectic" is the method by which human history unfolds; that is to say, history progresses as a dialectical process...”

- as that the materialistic Marxism claims also; the difference is practically only “ideological”:

(Marx)... “My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, i.e. the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea', he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea'. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought...” Marx, Karl. "Afterword (Second German Ed.)". Capital. 1: 14; cited in [2].

(Engels)... Probably the same gentlemen who up to now have decried the transformation of quantity into quality as mysticism and incomprehensible transcendentalism will now declare that it is indeed something quite self-evident, trivial, and commonplace, which they have long employed, and so they have been taught nothing new. But to have formulated for the first time in its universally valid form a general law of development of Nature, society, and thought, will always remain an act of historic importance...” Engels, Frederick, (1883) "Dialectics of Nature:"II. Dialectics"; cited in [2].

The “three main laws of the dialectic” [(1)- (3) above] are on one hand indeed adequate to the reality, however all are purely phenomenological, since doesn't follow from something more common, including, first of all, from principally obligatorily necessary some definitions of the notions/phenomena “Matter” and “Consciousness”. Just therefore they are important [and, again, indeed rational] parts in both opposite doctrines, the difference is only in equally “true” opposite interpretations [though that is an evident nonsense] at applications of the laws in the practice.

In the reality all these laws have rational explanations what they describe/ “govern by” in practice, which [explanations] are, correspondingly, outside the traditional philosophy, and that is possible *only* on framework of the “The Information as Absolute” conception [4], where it is rigorously proven that all what exists is/are some informational patterns/systems of the patterns that are members of the absolutely fundamental and absolutely infinite “Information” Set. Including “Matter” and “Consciousness”, where at least humans' consciousnesses exist and operate, are some informational systems that exist and evolve/develop in the Set. Thus the correct definition of the “Being” is “*Being is a being of information*”

At that the absolutely fundamental notion/phenomenon “Information” isn't transcendental, Information is a product of actions of a number of the absolutely fundamental Rules/Possibilities/Quantities/Actions/[etc.], which are members of corresponding set [in the conception] “Logos”, which [members of Logos], if applied to something, make this something be understandable, i.e. be some “information”.

Besides in the conception it is shown that the systems of material objects “Matter” and the system of [at least] humans' consciousnesses “Consciousness” *are fundamentally different systems*, including both exist and evolve/develop/operate in different spacetimes in the absolutely infinite spacetime of the Set.

More about the conception see [4], for further consideration here, besides the notions/phenomena “Matter” and “Consciousness” is necessary to use a few other Logos' members: the absolutely fundamental [the “Action”] “Change” and [the “Quantity”] “Energy”.

The absolutely fundamental notion/phenomenon “Change” is logically self-inconsistent: at any change of something this something is simultaneously in former, recent, and future states, when they are different by definition; this fact was well shown by Zeno in his aporias. To overcome this self-inconsistence it becomes be fundamentally necessary to pay by two things: (i) – to apply some quantity of absolutely fundamental “Quantity” “Energy”; and (ii)

– nonetheless, if the energy value isn't infinite, then on some level of the changes they become be uncertain.

Both known systems, Matter and Consciousness are dynamical systems, i.e. that indeed uninterruptedly [but not continuously because of (ii)] change their states, so “everything is transient” simply because of at the Beginning in some fixed system “pre-Matter” a huge portion of energy was pumped. As the result Matter appeared as a system of some automata, which (a) - is based on some set of laws and links between automata, which [the laws and the links] are, in turn, based [and the automata use at informational exchange] on exclusively true information, and (b) – all changes in Matter in depth are reversible. Thus Matter is very stable system, which practically don't lose its energy in outer the Set's space, when, because of the energy conservation [so corresponding law], at that all automata uninterruptedly and practically eternally interact; so Matter indeed is constantly “transient”.

The elements of the system “Consciousness”, i.e. humans' consciousnesses, are some self-aware systems that operate with uncertain and false information, thus to exist in the Set for them is necessary to have some stable residence, in this case that is practically purely material human's body. Besides, in this case the operations are non-reversible and so proceed with energy losses, correspondingly humans must constantly obtain some energy, what they do at consuming foods. And, till they have some external energy resource, they are constantly changing, “transient”, also, producing, for example next and next thoughts.

The law “Everything is composed of contradictions (opposing forces)” is just a consequence of the self-inconsistence of the “Change”, which [the self-inconsistence] reveals itself concretely in every concrete case, always as a resistance and corresponding opposite actions for something that attempts to change state of concrete object.

The 3-th law “Gradual changes lead to crises...” is the consequence of the fact that in both main systems, in spite of, for example, a rather small number of basic laws and links in Matter, Matter's elements can form practically infinite number of comparatively stable different systems [nuclei, atoms, molecules, bodies, etc.], which, nonetheless, are stable in only concrete limits. Thus, if some change of some object/system exceeds a limit, it transforms into some other object/system or is broken. For example the transformation of the H₂O substances as ice – water – steam at the temperature gradual changing, what was “mysterious” for Hegel, is rather trivial phase transitions in physics.

Thus the dialectic laws above are, in certain sense, trivial and practically useless at studying of Matter and in biological sciences. However the application of these laws at analysis of essentially non-material objects, i.e. of uniquely known now human's consciousness and human's societies, when the analysis is possible till now practically only on a phenomenological level, remains be actual; but keeping in mind at that, that the laws act at concrete changes in concrete, e.g., social, systems non-fatally, the resulting “crises” can be predicted and made dependent on possible conscious actions.

Historical materialism

“Historical materialism” is another example, when materialistic dialectical doctrine turns out to be adequate to the objective reality; and well describes and explains how the humans' societies develop; till, however, the adequacy of the main postulate of this doctrine about the primacy of the material social Being is hold; what was and is till now so seems in all history of the humanity.

However this postulate becomes be invalid outside its region of applicability. Moreover, its application in such cases leads to wrong interpretation of existent situations, and the dialectical laws act indeed objectively independently on humans, i.e., blindly and fatally. As that was, including, in 1917 year in Russia, when the historical conditions made objective prerequisites to finish long permanent Russian bourgeois revolution; however Russian

bourgeoisie turned out to be incapable to make that, and the group of fanatically believing in truth and power of discovered by Marx laws of the “historical materialism” people attempted to make the communistic revolution and further to build a communistic society.

This attempt ended in a few 1990-th years by the transformation of the ”real socialism” into capitalism. That was inevitable, just because of that Marxism is fundamentally materialistic doctrine/theory; when the difference of humans from material objects and Matter at all, and from other living beings on Earth as well, is in that the humans aren’t some “only animals”; **and this difference is fundamental.**

Nonetheless in the case when the humans’ behavior has the practically one purpose: a satisfactory of clear instinctive needs of the practically material human’s body: better food, better male/female, more safety and comfort; including domination in societies to provide utmost effective satisfactory of the needs above, the behavior becomes be understandable, and, again, Marxism, including the historical materialism, which analyses just this case, which, in turn, indeed really existed in all humans’ history and exists in the societies till now, turns out to be adequate and effective theory.

3 Some objective peculiarities of recent state of humans’ society development

Recent humanity, though remaining be controlled by the materialistic purposes, differs from the humanity of XIX century, when the Marxism was developed in a few essential points, first of all in that:

(i) - XXI-st century proceeds when the capitalistic relations practically totally dominate in practically all countries on Earth soon two tens of years already; and correspondingly the social/economical relations in the countries are, in main traits, in accordance with Marxism. A number of some economical theories that appeared after Marx are, mainly, in the accordance also; however they only concretize and fit some inessential principally economic relations in/to changing concrete situations in countries/World economics.

However it seems rather probable, that this situation is hold now mostly as some inertia. The XXI -st century essentially differs from “classic Marxian” capitalism, when humans thought that Earth provides infinite resources for infinite commodity production [in both, capitalistic and [according to Marx] communistic mode of production]. It turns out to be that Earth is rather small planet and the resources are limited. Besides, the action of this fact is very essentially strengthened by the demography – the quantity of humans increased sharply in last even decades following the increasing, because of the technological revolution, of the commodities and food production, as that happens always when the population of any other species grows, if the environment allows that;

(ii) the demographics growth follows from the sharp production growth above, and, even when now more and more part in the production and in states gross national products are “services” that don’t require mostly essential consumption of the resources, this process resulted in [at least] a couple of concomitant points:

(ii.1) the increasing of the labor productivity results in that the more and more quantities of the commodities are produced by lesser and lesser quantities of humans, and

(ii.2) - what is quite natural since humans, including their consciousnesses, are some informational systems, the very important part of the later technological development is the development of the means that process information. That substantively strengthens the point (ii.1) above, since more and more technological operations in “Means of Production” can be executed by robots that replace humans, which, at that, don’t take part in “Productive Relations” and don’t form “classes”.

The both points above can lead to [at least] main ways of the social relations development:

(1) - if the society remains be governed by material needs, then a most part of humanity becomes be superfluous; moreover, hazardous, since creates unacceptable load on the environment; if all people on Earth will consume the resources as that is in the developed countries, that will result in progressive exhausting of the resources, what by any way eventually will lead to a reducing of the homos' population.

At that the development of means of killing, including biological, allows now to reduce very effectively the quantity of humans to an acceptable value.

Besides, the development of IT allows to a rather limited groups of humans to control practically totally the "computerized" society now and possibly reduced societies in future. Even now the massive computerization [including everyday gadgets] and web-control creates so many possibilities for, e.g., to monitor anybody, which Kaltenbrunner and Beria could only dream about.

Possible scenarios of the way above are rather sad; and, since they are purely materialistic, they can be in some traits in accordance with Marxism, including when the built society "*will have no economic classes, no wages, no money, no private property and no exploitation*" since the main "working force", i.e., robots, don't create classes that have some social interests, and they also don't buy the commodities.

There can be seems a very big number of such societies, including some remakes of Herbert Wells fantastic novels. The human's consciousness is so developed already now, that at executing of the blunt body's commands she is capable to invent too many rather sophisticated versions of "materialistic" societies; so considering of this problem is outside this paper.

(2) - the humans and the society understand that the material, i.e., the material body's, needs, are some rudiments of the animals that were humans' ancestors, for which the satisfactory of the organisms' needs was critically necessary for species to exist at all, because of life of any such living being was/is practically totally dependent on the environment, first of all accessibility of food.

Thus all of the beings' actions were aimed at "providing conditions for existence", when rudimentary primitive consciousnesses of non-homos even don't produce some abstract thoughts, for example "what I am and what is the purpose of my existence?". As well as even for first humans such thoughts were completely non-actual and practically superfluous, first of all for them it was necessary to remain being alive, for what it was necessary to execute just what the material, fundamentally non-sentient, automaton "human's body" dictates.

The claim that "earlier philosophers only explained World, when the real purpose of humans is to transform it" appeared rationally seems only in XIX century, including in Marxism; when the safety and satisfaction of main needs of the species "homo sapiens sapiens" in some countries was provided practically on sufficient level. However, when be considered in framework of the historical materialism, the post-capitalistic transformation of World and social relations is reduced eventually aimed at providing of primitive Marxism's "*Great Principle*" above.

Though "scientific communism" includes the "non-material" socialistic and communistic ideas/principles that the new society should be based on the "real" "Freedom", "Equality" and "Brotherhood", all these principles cannot be realized till the main "historical materialism's" postulate about the primacy of the material aims comparing with the "ideal",

i.e. purely consciously formulated, aims is hold. The reason is simple and evident: the practically material body, which formulates material aims and forces the consciousness to determinate the human's actions/behavior aimed at satisfaction of these aims, simply doesn't understand what these essentially abstract ideas are; and so fundamentally cannot to form corresponding tasks for the consciousness.

Though indeed, these principles are, to certain extent, written in chemical chains [seems mostly in brains] as instincts of most of at least mammals, however that relates only to concrete separated groups [flock, herd, pride, etc.] that are united mostly by cognate links. All other animals, including if they belong to the same species but to other groups, are enemies for concrete groups that conquer for, e.g., food resources; and even can eat members of other groups of the same species.

All that is quite natural in pre-homo animals societies, first of all the principal individual inequality [hierarchical in the groups or in force outside the groups] at the access to food, male/female and comfort, since that provides better conditions for the better, i.e. more adapted in the environment, members of the groups at species reproduction.

On the next stage of the consciousness development, i.e. in humans' societies, the principles "Freedom", "Equality" and "Brotherhood" become be applied essentially "outside the body", even in "materialistic" societies, when the brutal inequality "a slave – slaver's owner" was replaced by feudal one; and further feudal hereditary and so "unfair" inequality was replaced in capitalism, albeit the "full realization" of the principles were claimed as aims of all bourgeois revolutions, in fact, not by "full" but by only "more fair" capitalistic economical inequality.

The socialistic and communistic ideas, including a realization of the three principles above maximally, are in essential contradiction with the material needs and can be introduced into, [and that really and essentially indeed was introduced in the "countries with real socialism"] a society **only by using administrative coercion**. That becomes be necessary in any case, since these principles contradict with material "natural aims" of human's body. In the indeed scientifically organized post-capitalistic, let "socialistic/communistic", society the opposite to Marxism main law must act: "**Consciousness determinates the material social and individual Being**", and the real politics at implementation of the principles above should be based on the primacy of adequate to the reality non-material purposes; in other, i.e. which is in accordance with the historical materialism, case a next repetition of, e.g., the USSR society way, will happen.

What are these purposes? The answer(s) on this question isn't known till now and in the objective reality just this problem, with the corresponding concomitant problems – how these properties can/should be realized in an optimal processes of the humans' society development, is the main problem of indeed fundamental science, first of all of the [indeed] philosophy.

4 Some problems that relate to post-capitalistic aims

This philosophy should be based on the basic inferences of indeed philosophical "The Information as Absolute" conception, and seems should take into account a number of corresponding points.

Consciousness development

First of all what should be taken into account is the seems evident experimental fact that Life on Earth developed and develops as appearing of a next and next species that have more and more developed consciousness, up to the consciousness of homo sapiens sapiens; and this trend "more and more out Matter" now directly relates to humans also. It seems as rather

rational to suggest that this trend wasn't accidental, that was the result of telic work of some non-material informational pattern/[an "essence"] for which to exist and operate stably in the Set is necessary to have a stable residence, on Earth that are practically material and so essentially stable organisms of living beings. Outside a stable base this essence can exist stably in the Set only in very truncated state, let, using the computer terminology, in a "BIOS" state.

This essence had, and has now evidently [that follows from the evident fact that non-material human's consciousness effectively governs by practically material human's body], a very weak, but non-zero, capability to impact on material informational patterns/[objects], thus the consciousness in BIOS state could have composed a few billions years ago on Earth first biological structures, and further step by step controlled the changes in the living beings aimed at to provide more and more capability for herself of her operation's functions in the Set.

The utmost developed this essence's version is now the human's consciousness, which, seems is now something like a computer, which consists of the practically purely material "power supply", i.e. the human's body, "hard disk" [the long term memory], i.e. the brain; and practically non-material modules "processor" and "random access memory" [short term memory].

To make the conclusion that the human's consciousness is a final version of the essence above now there is no any rational prerequisites, though most of religions postulate that. It seems as rather probable that the trend of the consciousness's development "more and more out Matter and farther and farther in the Set" has a continuation. Correspondingly rather probably every consciousness always continues to work in a "background mode" aimed at developing of her possibilities to interact with other, besides Matter, informational systems in the Set, upgrading both, her hard and soft wares, what will result, rather probably, in the qualitative transformations of the "homo existent sapiens sapiens" version into, say, "homo existent sapiens sapiens sapiens" one.

Some problems

In this state this development critically differs from the background operation of the pre-human's consciousness versions at least in a couple of points.

When the software, which is responsible for the development of earlier versions, were/are primitive and was practically totally busy by solving material problems at providing of survival of species, human's consciousness can, in principle, spent an essential time analyzing non-material problems, including that arise at own development. However in all existed and existent humans' societies, where the main law of the historical materialism worked and works very effectively, the situation remains be like in the case of any other living being: practically all the consciousness's activity is spent on satisfactory of the body's needs.

That seems as rather irrational now, when objectively the technology can provide for humans already the possibility to have more and more free time for thinking outside material problems, comparing even with the societies a number of decades ago, this fact can create, simultaneously, objectively worsening of life's conditions for large part of people. In the reality the robotization isn't some danger for most of people, that is objective prerequisite for more effective, at least in the background mode, consciousness development.

Here appears, however, the problem that should be solved: since the consciousness cannot stop to obtain and analyze the obtained information, then what corresponding information should be formed by humans' activity?

The next objective and additional, comparing with the pre-homo species, prerequisite for enhanced consciousness development that appears in the homo-SS version, relates to the “hardware”. It seems that some stable residence in the Set for a consciousness is obligatorily necessary, for example seems as rational to suggest that Matter is a stable residence for the possible Super Consciousness, i.e. of Creator of our Universe. [Though it is possible also that Matter, which is very stable in the Set and, because of it is based on reversible logic and so practically doesn’t lose the energy outside, is some effective storage for energy, some Creator’s battery that practically doesn’t discharge].

When in the “pre-versions” the consciousness improved the material hardware by using only own very weak forces, the human’s consciousness can consciously to apply material forces at modification of, for example, the brain [for example like to the computers development, when single-core processors are replaced by multy-core ones] using, for example, genetic engineering.

Here appear, however, a lot of problems, besides those that directly relate to the hardware upgrade, which are mostly ethical and are so direct and utmost important subjects for study for the indeed philosophy, for which the eternal and fundamental “Good and Evil” problem becomes be the main philosophical problem.

This problem is very complex since there is no either an absolute “Good” or an absolute “Evil”, results of development of every situation are always some mixes of these phenomena. Since both they are applicable only to systems of conscious self-aware objects, that have mostly different aims, the optimal results in concrete cases should be as some compromises, which take into account values of the aims and costs of their achievements; a huge number of other parameters.

In this concrete case some points that seems should be elaborated are:

The objective problem of the resources: it seems evident that to provide the existence even existent now number of people it will be necessary to limit social and individual consumption of the recourses; what is possible only by using methods that are outside purely economical ones.

The “homo-SSS” problem: it seems evident that possible transformation of the homo-SS consciousness into homo-SSS version will not happen at once, that will be rather gradual process and for a long time both versions will co-exist. What should be relations of both versions? Till now in the chain of homo “erectus” – “habilem” – “sapiens sapiens”” all versions operated in practically the same ecological niche and every next version completely annihilated its ancestor.

This process in the transformation “SS - SSS” seems can be changed by at least two reasons. First of all the ecological niche of the versions are essentially different, both versions could operate mostly in different the Set’s spaces; and, what is seems as more important, the main operation of the “SSS” and “SS” homos, if the SS homos understand what the notion/phenomenon “consciousness” is and what is the natural trend of the consciousness development, will not attempt to conquer with the SSSs for material recourses and his/her consciousness will be busy not by blunt material problems, but by something what is more interesting and useful. Besides, the homo-SSS’s production will be mostly non-material, what fundamentally differs from, say, the main results of humans’ activity now. In the non-material World the primitive material conservation laws practically don’t act, and, for example, if somebody gave to other somebody something material, (s)he loses this something, however, when (s)he gives some thought, nothing happen with her/his property, information can be cloned practically infinitely.

Returning for a moment to the Marxism, note also that the freedom isn't, of course, "the appreciation of necessity", the phenomena "freedom" and "necessity" are simply opposite and are always in a contradiction, when this contradiction cannot in most cases to be "dialectically resolved" by an "appreciation". A prisoner in a jail well appreciates that he isn't free, but this appreciation only in very few cases leads to freedom at some successful jailbreaks. Correspondingly more freedom have those, who have objectively more possibilities and lesser limitations in her/his actions; what indeed happens at the development of science and technology, but indeed qualitative, principal, change in the system "freedom/necessity" for humans appears only after the consciousness will make a next step in her development.

However there can appear another problem, if our Universe has the Creator, and so humans are only some microflora in some Great Organism. In this case increasing of the consciousness's functions can turn out to be, at least potentially, harmful for this Organism, and, if it has some antivirus soft/ immune system, then any consequences are possible if the microflora will be too active. It can be not accidental that such case is taken into account practically in all main religions, where it is stated, for example, that "on heaven" only those people have the access, who for sure cannot to make something wrong to God, and for what the religions point rather simple receipts: humans must have engrossing fear of God [Judaism, Islam], and engrossing love and fear of God [Christianity]. In Buddhism, as the obligatory condition for anybody who goes out the material limits, is that this human must totally annihilate any her/his desires at all.

Thus the problem is – there is or not some other way to go outside material limits besides that are defined by religions? Or indeed, maximum what is possible, is the case when a perfect consciousness occurs in an Eden, which seems as like some quarantine module of an antivirus program?

Now we can practically only formulate a few of possible problems at the, seems indeed natural, consciousness development above; when the number of these problems is very large; this paper by no means, of course, pretend on some, even tentative solution of even some of them. However seems humans can hope that the history will continue in future in natural way, and eventually will result in appearance, at least of basing on Earth, the next human's version; and can hope, remembering that every human's consciousness started to develop billions years ago, so every human has the age of billion years, that she/he will, rather possibly, live in other versions in future.

In other case humans will remain to satisfy mostly the growing needs of material bodies, when being, as that Cicero said 2000 years ago "And who isn't a slave? One is in slavery to lust, the other to greed, the third to vanity, and all to fear. When there is nothing worse than slavery, which is voluntary"...

References

- [1] https://www.researchgate.net/post/Is_Marxism_relevant_in_the_21st_century?view=5a2c466ef7b67e656438e08c
- [2] Marx, K and Engels, F "Manifesto of the Communist Party" (1948) <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf>
- [3] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialectic>]
- [4] Shvchenko, S. and Tokarevsky, V. "The Information as Absolute" (2007-2017) https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315825362_The_Information_as_Absolute_conception_a_couple_of_applications_in_philosophy DOI 10.5281/zenodo.49570 https://zenodo.org/record/495701/files/AAPHIL_04_17_ER_key_w.pdf