

The “Information as Absolute” conception: the consciousness

Sergey V. Shevchenko¹ and Vladimir V. Tokarevsky²

¹*Institute of Physics of NAS of Ukraine, ret.* ²*Professor ret., Pr. Nauki, 46, Kiev-28, Ukraine*

Abstract in the paper one of utmost fundamental in philosophy and science phenomenon/notion “Consciousness” is considered in framework of the “The Information as Absolute” conception.

Key words consciousness, Matter, neuroscience, the “Information as Absolute”, consciousness theories

1 An introduction

[A quote from a thread on the Research Gate net] “...*Again, consciousness is the ability to experiment in abstract way on oneself.*

All so-called consciousness’s traits are derivatives or consequences of this definition above...”

- that isn’t a definition of the phenomenon/notion “Consciousness”, that is next one of the Consciousness’s properties. Though that isn’t an unique misleading at the phenomenon “Consciousness’s” definitions and argumentation of the definitions that exist in rather numerous publications, Web discussions, etc. And though the number and nomenclature of corresponding approaches at the definitions are rather large and wide, that doesn’t change something in that the result is as it exists a few thousands of years already: how many [and in this case indeed very many] doctrines/schools/ religions/etc. exist, so many the different definitions exist.

What is quite evident next manifestation of well known rule: in practically any case there is only one true/correct inference/description..., and practically infinite number of erroneous ones.

This situation in the “Consciousness problem” naturally follows from the fact that in the mainstream philosophy simultaneously there exist two main equally legitimate doctrines, Materialism and Idealism, which are based on the their fundamental primary postulates “All/everything is Matter, and Being is the beings of material objects” and “All/everything is Idea/Spirit/..., and Being is the beings of emanations/revelations/shades...of Idea/Spirit...”.

This situation in the mainstream philosophy exists a few thousand years already, in spite of that it evidently is a next manifestation of the rule above: if there exist more then one doctrine that differently explain the same, in this case fundamental, objective facts, then in such case either only one doctrine is true, or both are false.

However from this fact one true inference well certainly follows: in the mainstream philosophy and so further in the mainstream science, both these utmost fundamental in the mainstream philosophy phenomena/notions, i.e. “Matter” and “Consciousness”, are fundamentally transcendent, so undefined and uncertain; and so the attempts to define both

phenomena, and other phenomena/notions that directly relate these utmost fundamental ones, remaining in the mainstream are simply meaningless. The definitions” above that “Matter is all/everything” and “Idea/Spirit... is all/everything ” are meaningless evidently, they by any means make in any extent the problem – what these, in fact omnipotent, Essences are and why they are omnipotent?. More about what the mainstream philosophy is, and what should be the indeed philosophy, though, see Annex to this paper.

Correspondingly existent conceptions that “solve” the “consciousness problem” postulate that either Universe, including Matter, is completely conscious as an conscious emanation of “Idea...”, or there exist only material Consciousness, and so, again, the conscious Matter and conscious whole Universe. These postulates in all existent mainstream conceptions of the consciousness always exist, either directly, if authors of the conceptions claim that they are, for example, materialists; or implicitly, when the authors claim that their conceptions of the consciousness aren’t in accordance with some philosophical doctrine, however in fact these conceptions obligatorily are always based on one or other doctrine.

The next result of this situation is again rather natural: since both fundamental phenomena/notions are uncertain, that allows to some people to assign to the both them any attributes, abilities, etc.; and further to create sometimes rather complex logical constructions that, though be based on principally uncertain initial premises and as a rule seemed as something rather fantastic, are claimed as “explaining scientifically” the observed properties of the consciousness [and of Matter correspondingly, also, though, but that isn’t a main subject of this paper].

Besides, the consciousness problem seems as rather interesting for many people; when, at that, the problem, unlike to many other scientific problems, where subjects for studies are rather far from the everyday practice and so the theories, concepts, models, etc., are some sophisticated logical and mathematical systems, seems as rather simple and understandable, because of practically everybody knows, or, more correctly, “consciously” selects, her/himself in Nature and so think that they can understand the explanations well enough.

That above seems turned out to be the reason of that the number of basing on quite different initial assumptions conceptions of the consciousness is rather large; and, in spite of that, because of the situation in the mainstream philosophy and science above, in many cases these assumptions and so further the conceptions, are sometimes evidently rather strange, many of the conceptions are considered as “officially scientific” and they are animatedly discussed in scientific press and the media.

A more concrete analysis of these concepts so has a rather small sense; besides of, possibly, some historical interest; for this case rather representative surveys [though by the reason above these “mainstream” survey are analytical ones essentially limitedly] are given in a few encyclopedias, for example in [1], and here only some concrete points in the existent conceptions are considered below. However for that is necessary to make a few basic for further consideration tentative remarks.

2 The phenomena/notions “Matter” and “Consciousness” in the “The Information as Absolute” conception

The rational, i.e. that have sense to be further rationally elaborated, definitions of the fundamental phenomena/notions “Matter” and “Consciousness” that constitute our Universe, can be [and are] obtained only in “The Information as Absolute” conception [2]. Including,

first of all, only in this conception it becomes be clear enough that Matter and Consciousness are fundamentally different and so Universe is at least two-component system.

In the informational conception it is rigorously proven, that there is/are nothing else then some informational patterns/systems of the patterns, which are elements of the absolutely fundamental and absolutely infinite “Information” Set/System, where all elements, because of all they have the same, i.e. informational, nature, can, in principle, mutually interact by some ways; and our Universe is only some infinitesimal sub-Set/sub-System, which, in principle, can interact/ can be impacted by something other in her absolutely infinite environment.

It seems as evident that at the impacts in systems of the interacting elements [the patterns/systems] must change the elements by some way/to some extent; however this effect depends on the strength of interactions; what, in turn, depends on to what extent the elements are “informatically” strong, active and accessible in the Set; so in some cases some patterns/systems can be rather stable at interactions.

Matter. An example of such stable in the Set system, as that seems rather convincingly follows from observed experimental data [for example Matter, as the system, practically didn’t changed in observable soon 14 billions of years], is the informational system “Matter”.

This system is stable by at least three main, seems sufficient in this case, reasons. The first one is in that Matter is rigorously logically organized closed system, where exchange by information between material objects is possible practically only inside the system, what is provided by that the material objects use only rather poor simple language with rigorously defined “notions”. This language is very specific, and so the both, the Matter’s objects “don’t understand” what other Set’s elements “say” on their languages, and the other elements don’t understand what information circulates in Matter. The next important condition, that makes the system Matter and material objects be stable, is in that in this case at informational exchange only true [completely consistent inside Matter] information, which is fundamentally valid in the scope of close complete set of the Matter’s basic set of rules/links/constants, is used.

Besides, it should be noted in this case also that any changing, including at any exchange by information in any informational patterns/systems, and, of course, at a creation of a new information[al patterns/systems], of any information *is possible only if at the changing some portion of absolutely fundamental* Quantity “Energy” is spent.* That is absolutely fundamental Rule that acts on whole “Information” Set, since it follows from the absolutely fundamental fact that the absolutely fundamental phenomenon “Change is logically self-inconsistent, and Energy is necessary to overcome this inconsistency.

The informational system “Matter” was created by spending at Beginning of a huge quantity of energy; it seems rather probably mostly at creating utmost fundamental primary material structures [fundamental particles], and so further, and at least till now, they have rather large quantities of energy. Correspondingly to change them is necessary to spend large energy also; that is the third main factor that provides the stability of Matter.

Because of the energy conservation law [this law acts in Matter because of the rules/links, which determine the informational exchange in Matter, are reversible; more see [3]], Matter contains till now seems practically the same energy as that it obtained at Creation.

* here and further the attribute “absolutely fundamental” relates to basic phenomena/notions that exist and act in whole “Information” Set/System and mostly are elements of the “Logos” set that determinates how any information must “be made”; when “fundamental” relates to phenomena/notions that are fundamental in the sub-Sets/sub-Systems “Matter”, “Consciousness”, “Universe”.

Besides the law above, there exists the next specific and important Matter's property: in Matter, as that follows from existent experimental data, the energy exchange at interactions of all/every material objects is simple, rigorously determined, and is fundamentally universal at all/every interactions.

Finally, note in this section that from existent experimental data follows also that, though Matter as a logical system is rather simple, and the set of fundamental laws/links/constants is rather small, nonetheless this set turned out to be sufficient to create practically infinite diversity of existent material objects.

Consciousness. [quote from [1]]

"The Oxford Living Dictionary defines consciousness as "The state of being aware of and responsive to one's surroundings.", "A person's awareness or perception of something." and "The fact of awareness by the mind of itself and the world".

In the reality Consciousness is not some state of something, including a state of a person when (s)he have awareness or perception; and isn't, of course, a fact.

In the reality a consciousness is a non-material informational system, "a computer+program", that is organized and operates in accordance with a set of [fundamentally other than Matter's] logical rules /links/constants, and so she exists as essentially closed autonomic system in the Set. In this point a consciousness, including the existent on Earth consciousnesses, is similar to Matter, however fundamentally differs from it by at least two basic hallmarks.

Consciousness is:

(i) – able to obtain and to analyze information about the external for her elements in the Set; which is obtained when she interacts/[and so always exchange by some information and energy with] with the elements. However, unlike informational exchange in Matter, she makes that essentially logically/*abstractly*, i.e. not by direct reproducing of concrete real objects/processes, but by simulation, when the simulation of the objects/processes runs outside and without direct interaction with them. For that consciousness uses her own analytical tools/utilities, and her other, than Matter's one, spacetime for placing of the simulations' information; and

(ii) – a self-aware, i.e. selects logically/*abstractly* herself from her environment in the "Information" Set [even when doesn't know that she is an element of the Set, though].

That is fundamentally possible in the system "Consciousness" in principle, again because of that all/ everything what exist have the same informational nature; however, what fundamentally differs a consciousness from Matter in this case, besides the points above, is that consciousness isn't rigorously closed system and so can exchange by information with a large number of types of the Set's elements/systems; i.e. the consciousness's spacetime has common regions with spacetimes of such elements/systems in the Set, including with material objects.

3 On the phenomena/notions “consciousness” and “conscious”

Matter is, of course, some “computer+program” also, though; where the informational exchange between material patterns/systems doesn’t differ *principally* from the informational exchange, including at a data processing, in a consciousness. In both cases at interactions there are some communicating objects, which send to each other some messages, understand the messages, and react on the obtained information. Including, for example, every material object has formally the “self-awareness” since quite selectively, “individually by self”, interacts with other objects.

However the informational exchange in Matter is rigorously determined, and at this informational exchange some other information [other informational patterns/systems], besides that is in limits that are permitted by Matter’s basic laws/links/constants, cannot be created logically, fundamentally. I.e. at informational exchange in Matter there is no necessity to have completely the consciousness’s abilities above; here is enough to have only limited “logical self-awareness and analysis” and no necessity in an abstraction. Everything in Matter is/are, by this attribute, only some “unconscious” automata, when Matter as a whole is a huge “computer” [more correctly a huge automaton, though] where the automata, i.e. particles, bodies, stars, etc. are united in the system by universal informational law - fundamental Nature force “Gravity”, and operate be governing by the program, which never changes.

Nonetheless, formally the communication in material and conscious systems doesn’t differ principally; and so for a consciousness the Nature laws and material objects/processes are observed as quite logical and rational. For example action of the Newton gravity law verbally is as that masses say each other “come here”, understand the messages, and execute the asks.

That creates an, till now rather popular, as that follows from a rather large corresponding publications, illusion of that whole Matter is conscious. However, again, from above follows that this illusion is an illusion only by a convention, which establishes a using of the notion “conscious” only to processes in a consciousness. So, because of the nuances above, this convention, which is rather rational because of the consciousness is indeed fundamental autonomic system that fundamentally differs from Matter, requires corresponding underpinning and clearing.

For that we can adopt that roughly that there exist three basic “conscious levels” at, again, nothing else then some informational exchange/processing of information at interactions of the Set’s elements, including of material and non-material objects in our Universe. Two most different levels are:

- “**unconscious**”, what happens at existence and interactions of rigorously logically organized, basing on a fixed set of basic rules/links/constants informational patterns and systems of such patterns, including of material objects; and

- “**completely conscious**” or “**meta-conscious**”, which is highest, “verbal”, level of being conscious, what happens when some pattern /system not only processes some information, but at that this pattern/system knows that (s)he does that, and is able at the processing to estimate value, verisimilitude, etc. of the information, including when the obtained information is vague, i.e. isn’t rigorously defined/is uncertain, and is able to choose different versions of the responds. That is fundamentally, logically, impossible in unconscious patters/systems in the Set, including Matter.

Note, that in the cases above the notions “unconscious” and “meta-conscious” are applicable to both, to informational patterns/systems, and to corresponding processing of information

Besides the two levels above there exist the third level, which relates to informational systems that have a consciousness, i.e. have the properties (i) and (ii) above. The unique known such systems are living beings on Earth, which all have some consciousnesses. These consciousnesses, first of all, have qualitatively different abilities at all stages of processing information and so can process information limitedly, and “not meta-consciously”; having ability to react on external information practically only in scope of rigorously defined, first of all rigidly written in some material the beings’ structures, set of responds. However only practically, not completely; and that differs this level of informational processing from unconscious one.

This level, though, has two different sub-levels.

The first sub-level of “the third level of not meta-conscious” data processing relates so to rather simple consciousnesses that have limited sensorial, and, what is more important, analytical, tools at obtaining and at processing information about the environment; and about own states as well, though.

Examples on Earth are the simplest bioforms, i.e. viruses, bacteria, few-cells organisms, which exist, interact with the environment and react on the interactions practically automatically, rather similarly to how that material objects do.

Nonetheless these interactions are rather specific because of, very probably, some “conscious” actions of *something* that possibly created the life on Earth and after the creations always acts in the beings by some way: the beings above have some shells that allow to reduce hostile environment’s impacts to acceptable for them level in many cases, and, what is more important, reactions of these beings on the environment can be “unnatural”, “non-material”, when results of the beings’ interactions can be non-optimal for a purely material interacting system.

For example, the resulting state of a being’s interactions with the environment can differ from “natural” state, which is a state with minimum potential energy of the system’s corresponding chemical substances. By such a way, for example, a bacteria colony expands in the environment just specifically, when the energy that the bacteria obtain in a new place is larger then energy that is necessary to be spent by the bacteria to make the expansion.

Thus, in spite of that chemical substances, say, a substance “a bacterium” and some set of organic molecules that are copies of this substance can be made be practically identical, they are fundamentally different; or, by another words, every living being has some non-material set of rules that “is written” somewhere outside Matter, which allows the beings to behave “non-materially”/[“non-naturally”]; though limitedly, see above. Thus the living beings, even in simplest forms, are fundamentally non-material, and data processing in the informational systems “living beings” isn’t a full analogue of data processing at interactions of informational patterns/systems “material objects”.

Nonetheless such behavior in this case is rigorously limited in all directions, at recognizing of impacts, choosing of versions of corresponding responses and in nomenclature of the responses/[reactions]. So eventually, because of simplicity of these beings, their behavior often doesn’t differ formally from behaviors of purely material objects; and corresponding data processing; though it is not “unconscious”, but is not “meta-conscious” also. Corresponding sub-level can be defined/[be called] as, let, “**proto-conscious**”, because of the processing is determined essentially by something that is non-material. This something,

taking into account the observable fact that this something seems rather probably is common for all living beings, including humans, is, though rudiment, nonetheless a consciousnesses. And what is fundamentally essential and effective in this case: the result of the living beings behavior with informational exchange on the proto-conscious level is well known – the cell and Life on Earth are immortal in spite of often aggressive environment. As in the [unconscious/meta-conscious] case above, the notion “proto-conscious” can be applied to corresponding living beings and to the process of processing of information.

The other type of “not meta-conscious” data processing, on the contrary to the proto-conscious processing above, when such processing is caused/determined by very poor analytical abilities of simplest bioforms, take place in more developed consciousnesses’ versions. Though it is caused also by limitation of a consciousness’s abilities, however it exists even at the meta-conscious processing, the utmost relevant example in this case is operating of the version “homo sapiens sapiens consciousness”.

In this case it seems as rational to conjecture that a result of any “non-material” analytical data processing in the consciousness doesn’t appear in consciousness magically, “at once and from nowhere”. Consciousness is some informational system/program, which, though is rather labile, but is a limited closed complex system also; where the analytical “meta-conscious” processes aren’t unique, in this system a number of other processes run, including, for example, processes that control and provide the integrity and stability of the system’ parts (“functional modules”) operating, aimed at the normal operating of consciousness as a whole.

Besides it seem as rather rational to conjecture, that the consciousness’s “hardware” is made, like as that is in Matter, from some basic primary logical elements, which are, first of all, “informatically strong” [and so simple] enough to be stable in the environment. Since these elements are simple logical constrictions, they can operate in accordance with only a limited set of some rules/links/constants. Thus the informational [and not only analytical] processing rather probably runs in the consciousness always as some chains of elementary logical operations of these elements, either at operating that provides the consciousness’s existence, for example at processing data of proto-conscious sensors of the body’s state, or at the analytical work. As that takes place, for example, in computers, where concrete software at concrete data processing uses some concrete rules/links/constants that differ from the rules/links/constants that determine the computer’s hardware operation, however eventually this processing is reduced to flipping of the hardware’s material elementary logical gates “and”, “or”, “not”, [nand , nor, xor, xnor].

This, which seems could be named rather pertinently “**sub-conscious**”, processing level isn’t controlled “meta-consciously” at every elementary steps, and so isn’t “meta-conscious”; though takes place, unlike to the proto-conscious processing, in “meta-conscious ” system. On the other hand, again, really it appears like the proto-conscious processing, i.e. because of eventually limited abilities and rates of data processing in the consciousness’s modules. However the elementary processing isn’t, of course, completely independent, and, in spite of that these operations in such [meta-conscious] consciousnesses are mostly executed “unconsciously”, this processing is “globally” controlled meta-consciously, and the results of the processing eventually appear on the meta-conscious verbal level.

However besides the case above, when the notion “sub-conscious” is applied to intermediate data processing aimed at obtaining a rational meta-consciously result or correction/adjusting of some body’s organ work, with a rather non-zero probability in every consciousness always at least one more parallel data processing runs, which isn’t controlled meta-consciously. This process[ing], which is one of most importance, is governed not by meta-conscious “program shell”, but by the “BIOS” [more see sec.5 below] utilities

“*striving to be alive*” and “*striving to develop*”, which in background mode activate and control data processing aimed at further development of current consciousness’s version. This processing runs on the sub-conscious level also. Note that the notion “sub-conscious” thus seems as is applicable only to the informational processing.

Besides, note also here, that it seems as possible to use notion/term “conscious” instead of “meta-conscious”, if that doesn’t lead to some ambiguity in concrete cases, having, however, in mind the nuances above.

Memory. Besides the points above at any/every conscious processing of information there exists [though again because of that operations abilities, at least of consciousnesses on Earth, are limited on all processing levels] the important and obligatory attribute of the processing: a memory.

To obtain a new version of an information’s state is necessary to remember the former versions, initial and auxiliary data about considered topic, event, etc., versions of possible reactions on the adopted final information etc. In addition really, because of that any real consciously data processing system has limited abilities, any processing passes as a sequence of steps, where some intermediate results must be stored to make a next step, again etc.

Thus really at the processing of information two main types of corresponding memory are used. The first type is the long term /["hard"] memory, when the storage devices can be both, some external purely material devices, e.g., a book, a computer’s hard disk, etc., and some structure in consciousness, that isn’t non-material.

The second type of memory is used constantly at every processing, independently on the content of processed information, serving for permanent storage of intermediate results of the processing, that are necessary only at work of some “active processing” modules of the processing system. Informational content in such memory constantly changes and isn’t necessary be remembered for a long time, so this type can be called “short term memory”.

A rather relevant in this case example is a computer, which contain all the modules above: the active processor, hard disk, as a long term memory, and the short term memory, which is in computers the random access memory (RAM). Such scheme seems as is utmost optimal at data processing, when the abilities of the processing system are limited; and, in spite of numerous attempts in a number of tens of last years to invent in cybernetics something that would be principally different from this scheme seems rather naturally till now have no corresponding results.

4 A few notes to existent consciousness conceptions.

From the above follows a number of consequences that relate to existent consciousness conceptions.

First of all any conception that is based on the conjecture that consciousness is some product of some material processes aren’t valid principally. Matter fundamentally cannot be conscious, just therefore it is stable. And, besides, rather probably this Matter’s attribute is realized in this informational system non-accidentally.

That is true for any material systems, either cosmological or biological. It seems rather strange things would happen in Matter if a star could think, say, that some other stars live better then it, and attempt to correct this situation. Quite equally if some cells, say, in a human, or even associations of the cells, including in, say, the human’s neuro-system, could make meta-conscious inferences as a result of some “neural correlations”, “coherences”,

“quantum entanglement”, etc.; and further act in accordance with the inferences besides those actions that are prescribed for these cells and are rigidly written materially in the practically completely material body and brain, then evidently rather strange things would happen with humans.

It seems as rather evident, that all, though indeed very complex, neural systems of living beings, including humans, are governed by some center, which has for that necessary instruments. That is because of the neurosystems are built, exist and react on obtaining information be basing on stable proto-conscious structures, where only the necessary concrete specific “proto-consciously understandable” information, from the environment and from the center, can be processed in accordance with rigorously determined algorithms, and no any information else.

Any consciousness is fundamentally non-material, but on Earth, by some till now for sure unknown reasons, seems there exist, at least as only observable by humans, possibly more correctly observable by humans’ consciousnesses, consciousnesses of only living beings, which are, nonetheless, constituted from material chemical substances. Thus some of the defined in the mainstream the main consciousness problems, e.g., “the hard problem of consciousness”, and “the mind-body problem” indeed exist and posed rather adequately to the reality. However in framework of the mainstream philosophy and science these problems have no solutions, because of in the mainstream on one hand fundamentally there are no rational criteria in philosophy, and on the other hand, in science it is possible to observe and experimentally to study by instruments only material structures.

Correspondingly, though hypotheses about some at least partially non-material consciousnesses that operate somewhere outside Matter aren’t unusual in the mainstream, for example well known Jung’s concept of some “collective unconscious”, which exists somewhere outside Matter, they remain be only some suggestions, which have no further elaboration and development. The reason of this situation is rather evident – to develop such hypotheses is necessary to answer on the questions: “somewhere outside Matter” – that is where? Why and in what state this “collective unconscious” exist in this somewhere? can in this somewhere exist something else besides this “unconscious”, etc. Though, of course, the first question is – what is this “collective unconscious” at all?

Correspondingly the Jung’s and his followers’ hypotheses, more correctly some guesses, because of the reasons above, though, remain be some exotics in the mainstream, when most of “hypotheses” and even “theories”, which are claimed as “more scientific”, are “materialistic”, in spite of that all of them are nothing else then some fantastic constructions based on quite non-grounded premises. Thereby “official” scientific, “near scientific”, and “simply” media, are filled by “theories” that deduce the phenomenon “Consciousness” postulating existence of [mostly material] “Panpsychism”, “multiverses”, “self-organization of neural cells”, “memes”, by unknown reasons and ways “integrated information; etc.

At that in most cases “grounding” of such “theories” are claims that they are some manifestations of the quantum mechanics effects; mostly because of the quantum entanglement. However, besides that these claims quite naturally, because of that is impossible, aren’t accompanied by any concrete rational thoughts – what in the consciousness’s existence and operation, and how/by what reasons, is that could be related to quantum mechanics, the quantum mechanics is the theory that is developed aimed at adequate description of objects and processes on Matter only, is adequate to Matter only; when the development of this theory became be possible only because of Matter is rather simple rigorously organized informational system, where, first of all, the energy exchange is simple and fundamentally universal for every material object and every interaction/process. Correspondingly “material” quantum mechanics doesn’t relate by any means to the non-material phenomenon “Consciousness”, and that is principally correct, despite of that many

things in QM, including the entanglement, even in application to material objects/processes remain be obscure in physics..

All these questions became be clear, at least sufficiently for further rational elaboration, in the “The Information as Absolute” conception only. Consciousnesses, including the “homo sapiens sapiens” version, are fundamentally non-material informational systems that exist and operate in the Set mostly outside Matter and Matter’s spacetime, including that happens when a consciousness doesn’t reside on some material matrix. So existence of some “collective” consciousness phenomena outside Matter seems as rather possible; this “Jung’s collective unconscious” can be anything that is possible at the sub-conscious communications between existent on Earth consciousnesses, and seems as not impossible with some consciousnesses of dead humans, etc. And, rather possibly, not only; the Set “Information” is absolutely infinite and in the Set absolutely infinite “number” of other, conscious and unconscious patterns/systems can exist and operate.

Note also about rather numerous publications, where in the reality some listings of the consciousnesses’ properties are claimed as definitions of the phenomenon “consciousness”, an example is in the beginning of this paper. In some cases indeed, some things can be rationally defined by definitions of their properties; an example is mathematics, where that is standard practice, when some new mathematical object is defined by postulating of its properties as a system of axioms.

However that doesn’t work when is necessary to define rationally non-abstract, really and objectively independently on humans existent phenomena, and claims that consciousness is something that has “sensation”, “attention”, “qualia”, etc. by any means don’t answer on the questions what this something is, and by what reason this something has just the listed properties.

5 Consciousness on Earth

Till now for humans really only conscious objects on Earth are known; at that, as that is pointed above, these objects are some living beings only. From this fact seems rather evidently follows, that the phenomena “Life” and “Consciousness” are essentially linked.

Further from the consideration above here quite naturally follows seems as rather plausible hypothesis, which was formed in the “The Information as Absolute” conception in 2007 year [4]; see also [2] and [5]; that for consciousnesses, though they are fundamentally non-material, it is necessary to be “settled” in/on the living, though in many traits practically material, beings, because of for consciousnesses is necessary to have stable residences for their stable existence in rather unstable informational environment in the Set; and material matrixes in living beings are just such stable residences..

And, besides, thus the appearance of Life on Earth, which [appearance] is practically improbable as a result of any processes in any material system, with rather non-zero probability isn’t, in the reality, accidental. Life on Earth appeared as the result of deliberate “conscious”, rather probably “proto-conscious”, action of some non-material the Set’s system “Consciousness”, which, possibly existed even before appearance of Earth; and which, using some non-material forces [existence of such forces evidently follows, for example, from the evident fact that non-material consciousness well governs by practically material body], had composed from some sets of material atoms some material structures, on which this system could be fixed/reside. The first biostructures were rather simple, and so only simplest and utmost fundamental “BIOS” operational modules of the system could reside.

However further these material structures developed, governing by resided consciousness versions, in more complex versions, where more and more operational modules could be and were “connected up”; now seems utmost developed functionally version is the version “homo sapiens sapiens” consciousness.

Seems by the reasons above (Sec. 3) it seems as reasonable to conjecture [2], [5] that the consciousness/[es] that inhabitate materially on Earth consist of, in first approximation, rather probably, from a few main functional modules [though in different states of development, of course] that are similar to classic computers modules:

- “BIOS”, i.e. short and well isolated from the environment in the Set “resident program”, which rather possibly can exist in the Set autonomously, that governs on primary level by the consciousness’s operation, including contains for that a number of “utilities”, at least
 - “self-awareness”,
 - some “templates”, which contain information how some chemical compounds of H, C,N, O and a few other atoms must be constructed to be some residence for more sophisticated then the BIOS version the consciousness’s versions,
 - “striving to be alive”,
 - “striving to develop” [to have more and more ability, first of all of analytical, and the ability to access safely to more information in the Set], correspondingly, besides, rather probably the consciousness’s property “curiosity” is a BIOS utility also.

-“processor”, i.e. some module that process entering information about the external environment and internal processes in the consciousness herself;

-[rather small] “random access memory” [which is the “short term memory” in psychology], which is necessary at the processing information.

The modules above are organized and operate [at least practically] completely basing on the laws/links/constants that differ principally from the laws/links/constants that determinate existence and processes in Matter, i.e. these modules mostly operate in the Set outside Matter and Matter’s spacetime.

-“hard disk” [“long term memory” in psychology], where intermediate results of data processing, when the memory of the processor and RAM isn’t sufficient, and final results of processing are stored.

Besides there exist/work some “auxiliary modules”, that supports the consciousness operating:

-“power tuner”, which transforms “material”, seems practically only EM [“chemical”], energy that practically material human’s body obtains chemically processing obtained food, into some energy form, which has no analogues in Matter and is “edible” for the non-material modules above;

“signals coders” that assign/transform into “understandable for the non-material modules” marks [practically only] EM signals that come from different practically material body’s sensors; and, reversibly, transform non-material information of the non-material modules, when this information is used, for example, to govern by the practically material body, which seems as is governed eventually by purely material electric signals that propagate in practically material the body’s neural system.

The “proto-conscious” modules “hard disk” and “signal coders” are “semi-material” and, though their functions rather probably are “materially” written as some rigid algorithms in the practically material in the rest brain, they constantly exchange by changing non-material

information with the non-material processor and, possibly, RAM. As well the power tuner is some “semi-material” module also.

That above here relates to some structural and functional traits of the consciousness, and every consciousness, including simplest bioforms, contains practically all listed functional modules, differently developed, of course. Just therefore seems as rather convincingly observed fact [2], [5], as the trend in the living beings development “more and more out Matter” exits, the consciousness’s last utmost developed “homo sapiens sapiens” version is the result of long chain of sequential upgrades as selections, seems utmost probably by existent consciousnesses resident [BIOS?] utilities, “mutations”. Further a next mutated version after death of her host material residence, some time conserves the mutations outside material matrix, and after she sets in other residence, she modifies the new “house” aimed at providing of new material base for new functions.

By another words, the consciousness is immortal, and every human is a few billions years old; and it seems as rather natural to conjecture that the trend above didn’t finished in the existent homo-two-sapiens version; and now humans’ consciousnesses in a background sub-conscious level continue to seek for next mutations that could upgrade existent version into, say, “homo (?) sapiens sapiens sapiens” one.

6 In conclusion

That above is rather short and compressed introduction in the consciousness problem, and so a standard conclusion with repetition of main inferences and corresponding discussion would be too long; so in this section we only very briefly touch a few other points that relate to this problem.

“Is Universe conscious?” problem. This problem is posed to some extent uncertainly, for example answers on the question “is a human conscious?” can be different and depending on the condition/convention – what conscious level is considered. If that is the proto-consciousness level, then a human is conscious practically as a whole; though the body is composed of unconscious atoms, but the atoms are combined in molecules, which practically all are proto-conscious. If this question relates only to meta-conscious level, then only consciousness in human is conscious, when all the rest in humans isn’t conscious.

That above seems as is clear enough; and the answer, in fact in this case can be reduced to formulation of a convention that would establish how the question above should be answered, for example, “human is conscious”, provided that this answer is accompanied by corresponding explanation.

However, relating to this section’s problem, an answer is essentially more complex, for that it is necessary to know – what is Universe and what is Matter in Universe? Till now to answer on the last questions there isn’t sufficient information. The unconscious, comparing with at least human’s consciousnesses, Matter can be, for example, some analogue of human body, i.e. a body of some Super-consciousness, for example of rather possible Universe Creator, which uses it also as a stable residence in the Set, and so some structures in Matter can be at least proto-conscious; and Universe is meta-conscious in practically complete accordance with human. Or, reversibly, just human was created “in the image and likeness of” Creator, and if not so literally, but at least as some Creator’s project.

However for such answer could be indeed a grounded answer, humans don’t have sufficient information. There is no data from which an existence of a Creator could follow at all, including, for example, in observed Space seems there is no, at least observable by using

existent EM instruments, some Matter's structures that by some attributes could be selected as being structurally different in whole Matter, unlike human, whose body is well structured. On the other and, though Matter isn't, according to observations, structured in the 3D space, and seems in time also [though if the "cosmological space expansion" indeed exists, the last can be incorrect] but it is quite evidently very thoroughly structured logically.

As that was already pointed here above, in spite of that it is rather simple and is based on a rather limited set of the laws/links/constants, where seems only 4 fundamental totally universal in whole Matter Nature forces [Strong, EM, Weak, and Gravity] act. However these forces have different relative strengths and different actions' strengths dependently on spatial distances, and such simple logical system is sufficient to that Matter is structured on particles, atoms, molecules bodies, etc. At that, though every next "generation" is composed from the former ones, it drastically differs from a simple sum of the former structures, including in Matter it was possible to create material by origin structures, which non-material consciousness could use as material residence.

Besides, the system of basic Matter's laws/links/constants has at least one more rather non-trivial property: laws in this system are logically reversible, when if in some closed system interactions between elements proceeds as exchange by reversible information, then this exchange doesn't accompanied by losing energy outside the system (see references on Fredkin and Toffoly works in [2], [3]). Just therefore in Matter the energy conservation law acts, and the stored in Matter energy remains be practically constant in all time after Beginning.

From the list of Matter's traits above seems as rather evidently follows, that even Matter hasn't some level of consciousness, however it with a rather nonzero probability could be created by something, which was, and possibly is till now, meta-conscious.

At least such hypothesis, in spite of that it is a dogma of practically any religion, seems as much more grounded then a numerous existent now "scientific" versions of Beginning, where Matter (moreover, Universe; though in most cases of the "scientific hypotheses" the authors seems don't understand that these phenomena/notions are different) appeared as a "Big Bang" in some "spacetime point with extreme density and temperature" as a "quantum mechanical fluctuation" ["because of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle"] with thus "accidental" releasing of extreme energy. The fact that such hypotheses are fantastic, seems as evident: they don't contain any physical basis, or even rational conjectures, that by some way could answer on the evidently arising in this case many questions, at least – what was "fluctuating"? with what probability at such fluctuations practically unbelievable portion of energy could be released?; etc.

"To solve" these problem a number of hypotheses postulate existence of our universe as some one of others in a "multiverse"; what, of course, doesn't solve anything, moreover only makes the problems above to be infinitely more, because of, e.g., "multiverses" in such hypotheses contain infinite numbers of universes; and to create a multiverse is necessary to have and to spend unbelievably infinite energy. Some hypotheses "solve" the Beginning problem, as that universe is a "fluctuation from a predecessor, a mother universe"; probably authors don't think at that, that so again the problem "what has fluctuated to create the mother?" appears, etc.

Number of meaningless premises that "ground" the scientific hypotheses is too large for be commented in detail in this paper, but what seems as worthwhile to mention especially and what relates to all "scientific" hypotheses, is that it seems as quite natural to suggest that at any "energy fluctuation" the resulted "Big Bang" remnants would be unbelievably chaotic systems of some things chaotic also. From what seems that a probability of appearance from the Big Bang's Chaos of so rigorously logically constructed system, as Matter is, seems even

lesser than the probability of fantastic energy release that could be sufficient for creating of Matter at fantastic QM fluctuation.

This section's problem is rather important, though, because the next, and seems indeed fundamentally actual for humans, problem is as: now the "homo sapiens sapiens" consciousness version is utmost developed on Earth; but is that the final version or not? And if not, what seems as rather probable (see [2], [5]), then in what direction and by what changes her upgrade will proceed?" Or, by other words, what is the place and perspectives for some the Set's informational system "human's consciousness" in the Set and in the sub-Set "our Universe"?

Answers on these questions evidently depend on answers on questions – so what is the origin of this consciousness? Including – had the informational structure the "on Earth consciousness" formed and existed in the Set completely independently on Creator and simply uses a few billions of years already an opportunity to obtain stable residence and the energy source in this Matter and is, if Matter was created consciously, some parasite? Or she is created by Creator, either consciously or is some accidental consequence of some Creator's Consciousness's operation on un-controlled meta-consciously [if Creator existing seems obligatory] sub/proto-conscious levels?

And, if the on Earth consciousness is deliberately created by Creator, then with what aim that was done? Again here can be a lot of variants. For example it could be that Earth is some nursery, where future Creators must study something necessary for good existence in the Set "rules of behavior"; though Creator seems in this case could make the development of the consciousness much more certain, when the real development on Earth is seemed, at least on first glance, a chain of trials and errors at choosing of correct next step, when a next accidental mutations appear. However as the result of such development on Earth now a vast diversity of living beings stably exists, i.e., simplest forms, plants, animals, etc., where, as a rule, the beings on a lower state of consciousness development are food for the higher level beings.

That seems as not too rational in the nursery case above, and a version of an accidental parasite seems as more probable. However not with probability be equal to 1, of course, any other versions cannot be excluded. An example seems follows from the mentioned above fact that in the life hierarchy on Earth lower level beings are mostly foods for the higher level ones; but that isn't only point here. The simplest forms make the extremely important work, they transform "crude material" EM energy into forms that are consumable by the highest forms. Just that makes be possible a next step, when the highest living beings special structures "brains" transform the energy of consumed food into forms that are consumable by these beings' consciousnesses non-material functional modules.

Since here is a possibility that these, utmost "easy of digestion", brains' products aren't completely consumed by the consciousnesses, and so some part can be loosing in the Set, So it cannot be excluded, that the Life on Earth is some farm that produces some delicacy food for the conscious beings that are on highest level of development then the beings on Earth. Such version seems as rather fantastic, of course, however there exists rather widely known allegation "Gods live till some humans believe in their existence".

Etc., however in any case, if a Creator exists, it seems as that in this case the problem "what at that should be the human's consciousness's existence/behavior/development at possible interactions with Creator?" becomes be actual.

Some versions of answers now only religions offer; which aren't scientific, though; since that are dogmas that don't change thousands of years, which were developed by humans who didn't understand what Matter and consciousness are; and, of course, didn't know what is

Information Set. Correspondingly practically all utmost developed religions' answers can be reduced to establishing humans' consciousnesses' states that guarantee that the consciousnesses, since are "meta-conscious", and so potentially can be harmful for God "viruses", by any means must not have the hostile to God intentions, either when they operate using the body, or when turn out to be outside in the Set after the body's death [5].

Correspondingly in this case rather possibly is worthwhile to make a next time the step at rational study of humans' consciousness relations with the environment, as that happened a couple thousands of years ago, when religions became be mothers of more rational science, philosophy, and further when from philosophy the number of other sciences arose. Now seems is the time when the "God problem" becomes be a philosophical, and possibly, further scientific, problem.

Returning to this section's problem, so note that the answer on the question "is Universe conscious?" differs from the question "is the human conscious?" practically only in one point. In the last case the answer is "yes", and only the problem of a convention remains – how this answer should be concretized – is the human "conscious as a whole", or it is necessary to point all nuances above; when the section's problem implicitly contains the answer - is there some conscious Creator of Universe, which, if exists, is, of course, a functional part of it or not? Besides, from the existence of the life and consciousness on Earth seems follows with a rather non-zero probability that in Matter there can be a vast number of other places, where at list protein life and conscious creations can exist, etc. However in any case all conscious beings, including possible Creator, since all are nothing else then some informational logically organized structures, with rather probably are constructed in main features analogously to the human's consciousness.

Here is a next nuance, though: material objects and Matter as a whole are very likely as even not proto-conscious; so it seems we cannot exclude the conjecture [5] that Matter is some very stable storage energy device, which accumulated at Beginning a huge portion of some "impulse" of energy, and now this energy is long time constantly consuming by small portions providing the operation of conscious being in Universe, including possibly possible Creator and for sure the living beings on Earth.

The problem "consciousness and language". Consciousness is the informational system, when any information in any system of informational patterns/systems can exist only if the notions that are used at informational exchange inside a system are "understandable" by members of the system. I.e. every notion is presented as a singled infopattern, "symbol", relating to which the members have inward information what this symbol means and what a member should do if obtained a symbol/"word".

These sets/systems of the symbols, are quite specific in concrete systems of the informational patterns/systems, including, for example, a system of patterns can use some set of symbols, when the patterns themselves can be some specific informational sub-systems also, and these sub-systems can use sets the symbols that are essentially different from the hosts' sets.

However the basic schemata of the sets are the same, and so to any stets of the symbols one common name can be applied: "language"; which, seems, can be a next element of the "Logos" set; and so in every system of interacting, i.e. principally exchanging only by some information, elements some language is used principally obligatorily.

The languages can be differently "rich", i.e. contain different numbers of words and corresponding notions/interpretations of the words, however that isn't principal at the communications. An example: the language in a computer is rather poor, and is reduced

practically to some set of rules of Boolean algebra (see above), nonetheless using of this poor “material” language allows to present practically completely any “meta-conscious” information, that is contained, for example, in any picture of any painter; in any novel of any writer, in any scientific theory, etc.

However to construct by using this language more complex notions, in the computer is necessary to execute a number of “elementary” operations, which occupy the most part of the computer’s work, and the “verbal” information for the computer is some minority, but for meta-conscious reader a minority is the computer’s elementary operations’ information.

By the reasons of maximally economic realization, and because of rather probably the lesser “informatively” basic elements are in some system, then the more stable this system is in the Set, it seems as rather reasonable to conjecture that data processing in the Earth consciousnesses also mostly is executed basing on some simple logical elements and correspondingly with using a poor languages on the sub-conscious levels, when meta-conscious analysis of verbal information occupies rather small time in this consciousness’s data processing.

“Consciousness and free will” problem. This problem seems appears only on the meta-conscious level, and so seems is actual, for humans only; so here we consider only such case.

From the “The Information as Absolute” conception rigorously follows that, in spite of that the “Information” Set is absolutely infinite and exists always [since absolutely fundamentally, logically, cannot have some Beginning and End], and in spite of that in the Set there exist absolutely all possible and “impossible” informational patterns/systems, where, for example, our Universe is only absolutely infinitesimal informational structure,

the Set is *simultaneously dynamic and static* System. The “static” connotes that in the Set everything had happened already and always, i.e. “at every time moment in the absolutely infinite time interval” “before now”, “now”, and will be had happened already “in the absolutely infinite time interval” “in future”. The “dynamic” connotes that simultaneously in the Set all dynamical systems already and always were changing/evolving/developing “before now”, are and will be doing that “now” and “in the absolutely infinite time interval” “in future”.

Thus every dynamical system that exists/changes lesser then absolutely infinite time interval, for example our Universe, in the absolutely infinite time of the Set’s existence repeats absolutely infinite number of times its/her/his evolution, and makes that, what is a next rigorous consequence from the conception, always in complete accordance with one fixed scenario.

Including every human lives in concrete life in every concrete realization of concrete evolution from the absolutely infinite “number” of Universe’s evolutions, i.e. lives absolutely infinite “number” of times, including in recent time in given actual evolution, and does that only in absolutely complete accordance with the fixed her/his own scenario.

By another words the notion “free will” is principally non-applicable in the reality. However here is the objective nuance, that relates to this notion and to few allied notions, i.e. the notions “choice”, “contingency”/“randomness”] and “probability”.

The last phenomena/notions, in spite of that all in the Set had happened completely yet “absolutely infinite time interval” ago and so all/everything is absolutely completely determined, really exist, because of, first of all, that the absolutely fundamental phenomenon/notion, the “Logos” set’s element “Change” is logically self-inconsistent.

Thus to overcome this inconsistency is necessary to pay by two points: firstly to change [and so to create, of course] something, as that pointed above here, is necessary to spend some portion of seems utmost indeed weird Logos's element "Energy". However that is insufficient, and, besides, at any change of something the state of this something in any case will be fundamentally obligatorily uncertain on some level/scale. Correspondingly concrete values of the state's parameters of changing objects/systems are always randomly distributed in accordance with some probability. In simple systems, as, for example, in Matter, these points are bounded – the more energy is spent, the lesser will be some an uncertainty; as that the QM Uncertainty principle states.

So, for example, on one hand, though all QM processes are principally random, every "collapse of Ψ -function" at every concrete quantum interaction in Matter happens completely deterministically in complete accordance with Matter's evolution scenario, but from another hand these collapses in an real ensemble of identical particles in identical conditions really, objectively, and absolutely necessarily are randomly distributed in accordance with QM. Analogously humans' actions/behaviors and their results in ensembles of humans in similar situations with random outcomes are different, what creates some illusion of the "free will"; in both cases above the random diversity of outcomes is absolutely determined.

However here is an once more nuance also: generally speaking the notions "random" and "probability" are practically equally applicable for humans in both cases, when some events/processes are objectively random, and when they are determined, however, if a human hasn't complete information about something, concrete results of changes of this something for him are seemed as accidental and having different probabilities. An example: if a coin flies in air, for anybody events by what size the coin will fall on, say, a palm, are random with a probability, say, $\frac{1}{2}$; when the coin has fallen, those who see the coin know that it lies on one size with probability 1, however for those who don't see the coin, it lies on some size again with probability $\frac{1}{2}$.

So, since humans don't know their scenarios, if they in some living situations think that make some free choices, when in the reality the choices are fundamentally determined, this subjective illusion has some objective sense.

References

- [1] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Consciousness>
- [2] S. V. Shevchenko and V. V. Tokarevsky, The Information as Absolute, (2008-2017) <http://viXra.org/abs/1402.0173> , DOI 10.5281/zenodo.268904
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260930711_the_Information_as_Absolute]
- [3] S. V. Shevchenko and V. V. Tokarevsky, The Informational conception and basic physics, (2008-2015) <http://viXra.org/abs/1503.0077> , DOI 10.5281/zenodo.16494
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273777630_The_Informational_Conception_and_Basic_Physics]
- [4] S. V. Shevchenko and V. V. Tokarevsky, The Information and the Matter, [arXiv:physics/0703043](http://arXiv.org/abs/physics/0703043) [physics.gen-ph] (2007)
- [5] S. V. Shevchenko and V. V. Tokarevsky, "The Information as Absolute" conception: Marxism and "now"(2017). <http://vixra.org/abs/1712.0437> , DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1116209
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321757886_The_Information_as_Absolute_conception_Marxism_and_now]

Annex

Briefly about philosophy

[two comments in Research Gate net discussion

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Who_is_the_most_relevant_philosopher_of_the_20th_century_worldwide]

[quote from some comment in the thread]“...Some believe that after Plato or who they read to him the era of philosophers has ended...”

- that is indeed practically totally so.

Philosophy started as a science indeed in ancient times, as the first and inevitably necessary step: “formulating of the main fundamental problems in humans’ knowledge”; and that was indeed very important step, in mathematics they say that if a problem is correctly formulated, that is a half of its solution.

What, in turn, required to define clearly enough – what of the observed notions/phenomena are utmost fundamental, and in what relations these phenomena co-exist?

First of all – what is the external to humans World? How this World and humans were created? What is place of humans in the World? What should be relations between humans and possibly with possible the World’s Creator?

These questions were formulated and answered in first approximations long before the philosophy appeared in religious systems [World and humans are created by Creator(s), i.e. God(s); rules/laws for relations between humans are established by Creator(s), for example, “Ten Commandants” in Abraham religion, though all these rules/laws, excluding the first (I’m the Lord...) one, existed in practically all religions long before these religions appeared, and exist now]. Philosophy as a science appeared when some people, who weren’t satisfied by religions dogmas, attempted to seek for more rational answers on the fundamental problems above.

Thus a number of philosophical doctrines appeared, which were and are rather different on East and West. When the first practically remained be linked with Eastern religions [which, though, are much lesser dogmatic comparing with Western religions, for example, with the Abraham ones, and so are “more philosophical”], Western philosophy, first of all in ancient Greece, turned out to be more rational, and seems in those time in the philosophy two main philosophical doctrines, i.e. “Materialism” and “Idealism” were rather clearly formed/differentiated.

As well as in Greece the notion “philosophy” appeared/applied for a science that consists of 3 main branches “Physics”, “Logics”, and “Ethics”.

Physics studied, first of all “Metaphysical” problems, again first of all, the ontology of utmost fundamental notions/phenomena, attempting to answer on the questions What are “Matter”, “Space”, “Time”, etc.? Logics studied relations in cause-effect material and social systems, Ethics studied relations between humans in societies.

And just in the ancient times practically all philosophical indeed scientific results were obtained. The indeed Great philosopher Pythagoras put forward the fundamental, and essentially adequate to the objective reality idea that the external material World, i.e. the system “Matter” is some system that is built from numbers. The indeed Great philosopher Zeno discovered and proved the fact, that continuous changes are fundamentally impossible, and so predicted the quantum mechanics. The indeed Great philosopher Aristotle discovered and developed main rules in logics, and moreover, his great intuition resulted in that he started to study the fundamental problem – what is the phenomenon “Information”?, and discovered the categories.

In Ethics the democracy system was developed, including systems of state laws; and the democratic system in ancient Greece only in some minorities differs from the systems in Western [now practically in all countries on Earth] countries now. As well as now the state laws systems in most of countries only in inessential minorities differs from, for example, Roman law.

However to develop philosophy more it was, and it is till now, necessary to define rationally – what are the fundamental notions/phenomena “Matter” and “Consciousness”?

That turned out to be impossible in the philosophy, and, as that was mentioned above, it consists of two opposite doctrines, where the fundamental in the doctrines notions/phenomena above remain be totally uncertain, moreover, transcendent and omnipotent. All what the doctrines “know” and postulate about Matter and Consciousness are: [in Materialism] “There is nothing besides Matter and Being is a being of Matter”, and [in Idealism] “There is nothing besides Consciousness/[“Idea”, “Spirit”, etc] and Being is a being of Consciousness/[“Idea”, “Spirit”, etc]”.

For both these assertion there are no any grounds, and so both they are principally non-provable and non-disprovable, just therefore both opposite philosophical systems well co-exist thousands of years, and only next and next sub-doctrines in both doctrines appear, basing again on next non-provable and non-disprovable postulates; from which [the sub-doctrines] cannot follow something besides again non-provable and non-disprovable, and so senseless, scholastic exercises.

Correspondingly the existent “mainstream” philosophy now is nothing more then a community of some people, who claim themselves “intellectuals”, which time to time produce next and next mostly in fact senseless publications, which contain usually a sets of numerous words and no one concrete rationally grounded thought that would relate to indeed philosophical problems in Metaphysics;

and essentially senseless that relate to Ethics and Logics. Nonetheless there are a huge number of “brilliant minds” in ontology of Matter, Space, Time, etc., etc., etc.

Including among names that are mentioned in this thread, seems some contribution in science were made only those, who continued/s to developed the Aristotle ideas in Logics and Information [for example Peirce. Russell, Wittgenstein], though professionals in mathematics and linguistic rather probably have in these scientific domains more concrete and more grounded results.

Indeed philosophy is possible only in the Shevchenko and Tokarevsky “The Information as Absolute” conception

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260930711_the_Information_as_Absolute DOI 10.5281/zenodo.268904

, where it is rigorously proven, that there isn't and cannot be fundamentally, nothing else than some informational patterns/systems of the patterns that are elements of the absolutely fundamental and absolutely infinite "Information" Set.

From the conception follows, including, that main constituents of the informational system "our Universe", i.e. "Matter" and [at least a system of humans' consciousnesses, though here can be any of "idealistic" mighty "Consciousnesses" (/ "Ideas", "Spirits", etc.)] "Consciousness" are some informational systems also.

At that, in spite of that the notion/phenomenon "Information" is absolutely fundamental, it isn't transcendent and so is cognizable; thus indeed philosophy obtains indeed fundamental subject for study – the phenomena "Information" and "Information" Set.

The "simply fundamental" phenomena/systems "Matter" and "Consciousness" become be rationally studyable also, including in the relation to the one of the main philosophical problem "what was the first, Matter or Consciousness? "; from the conception follow rational and correct definitions of a number of absolutely fundamental notions/phenomena, as, say, "Space", "Time", "Energy", etc.

In the conception it is shown, that Matter and Consciousness are fundamentally different informational systems, including human's consciousness is fundamentally non-material, and so has some inherent purposes that are different from "purposes" of material human's body. From what follows, that seems more naturally for humans would be to behave aimed at just the consciousness's purpose, and the problems, which appear in this case should be the main subject for study in the philosophical branch "Ethics" [more see, for example,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321757886_The_Information_as_Absolute_conception_Marxism_and_now DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1116209], etc.

Dear Hein,

Thanks for the rational understanding of my post and, possibly of the "The Information as Absolute" conception at all; so the rest text here can be unnecessary; though it possible can be useful for some other readers. And sorry for so long my reaction on your comment.

But since you wrote nothing else, I add to the SS post above a few remarks about "recognition" and "epistemology"; keeping in mind that you are quite right, when link the problem of "recognition" and the ontological problems "what is Matter" and "what is Consciousness"; without clearing these problems a possibility of solving of the problem "what is the recognition" is absent, firstly is necessary to answer on the question "what studies of what"?",

and only as a next step the answer on "when and why the first "what" adequately to the objective reality at least sometimes decodes some laws and links in the second "what"?" can appear.

However in this case a next time the common questions appear "what is the "objective reality"?" "Does this "objective reality" exist at all?"; and if that is so – then "what is the "existence" in this case?", including "where this existence exists?"

Again, all the questions above become be essentially clear even in the initial 2007-2017 version of the conception.

First of all there is no problem of “existence”: in the conception it is proven that all what exist, can exist and “cannot exist” is/are some informational patterns/systems of the patterns, which exist because they cannot be non-existent, since any information cannot be non-existent logically, that is the main property of the so absolutely fundamental phenomenon “Information”.

As well there is no problem – where every information exists: because of the property above for existence of information there is no any necessity in existence of something else, information exists in information, every informational pattern is always existent element of the always existent absolutely fundamental and absolutely infinite “Information” Set.

Thus the observable by humans systems “Matter” [a system of material objects and [sub]-systems of the objects] and “Consciousness” [a system of at least humans’ consciousnesses, which are rather complex informational structures] are some informational systems also, and, since exist as something observable, they exist absolutely really.

Both systems, in principal contrast to the mainstream philosophy aren’t transcendent, because the notion/phenomenon “Information”, in spite of that it is absolutely fundamental, isn’t transcendent and so is cognizable. Thus a few existent and already known now properties of Information is enough for the seems as with large probability correct inference that these systems are fundamentally different.

Further the question “what studies what” obtains rather clear answer: some self-aware informational structure “human’s consciousness”, which is capable to obtain information about something and is capable to analyze this information, obtains and analyze information about external Matter [and about internal states in human’s body and the consciousness herself also, though] and thus studies the External.

At that if something in the External is/are some informational patterns/structures/systems, that are composed of some sub-patterns/sub-structures/sub-systems and between these components are united in some systems basing on some stable laws and links,

then there is nothing impossible and even surprising in that the consciousness sometimes correctly decode these laws and links, creating models, theories, etc. From this follows, including, that at the cognition and further at the recognition there are no fundamental “philosophical” problems, these problems exist in the mainstream philosophy completely because of the transcendence of the mainstream notions/phenomena “Matter” and “Consciousness”. In the reality these problems are purely technical and any science can solve them having no any “philosophical” problems, moreover, concrete scientists can do that in every concrete case much more efficiently then professional philosophers, since they much better the philosophers know – what are the scientific researches.

I.e. the branch “Epistemology” that exists now in the mainstream philosophy, in the reality is superfluous.

Again [as in the first SS post above], the indeed philosophy should be based on the “The Information as Absolute” conception and, since in this conception all ontological problems now become be subjects for study for “usual” sciences, the main subject for study in the indeed philosophy remains practically only Ethics, which must discover and optimize, first of all, the relations of humans’ consciousnesses with the other informational objects/systems in the Set at rather possibly quite natural continuation of existent on Earth already a few billions of years the consciousness’s way “from a stone into a God”.