

Unified theory: Metaphilosophy

Csaba Varga

1. (New life-feeling, new life-knowledge)

The 'new' life-feeling': there is no valid present. However we are approaching to a glad, mental-spiritual state: a new *universal status-* and *consciousness state* will be created. Substantially, not only the sparkling new-capitalism is self-destructive, but the many dim souls are also eating their hearts out. It can not be anymore gloosed over, veiled that the inner-outer world observed and experienced at the beginning of the new millenium is a dead end, a mistake and so it can not be continued. Not only partially, but as a whole as well.

This new axioma requires no further special explanation, although the post-modern philosophy has far not finished the philosophical destruction of dogmas, illusions and lies up till now. The brutal mock-arrangements of the law-level individual and collective existence is unsustainable, too. Behind the mediatized scenes decomposition is progressing. The global deconstruction is *finally questioning* the current world structure at macro-, mezo and micro level as well. The overall –and fulsome – emptiness has pushed in the bottommost level of the everyday life, so the individual, wearing away in the depressive living circumstances, may even less avoid the confrontation with the real truth.

Beacuse of the nervous and rough intervention of the degregating states and the reactions according thereto, the membrane of the mock-safety of the individual is totally weakening. And the seemingly stable personal and collective self-deception are becoming transparent and noticeable. The often esthetical, *total obscureness and inextricability* covers the personal and collective consciousness as a grey veil.

The criticism, which was unimaginable a few decades ago, is now becoming *sharper and more accurate* and it is expanding in each directions and the content of the sure quasi-information and the attitude connecting thereto are annihilating. So the knowledge, up till now, is not a soft duvet anymore, with which we can cover to protect ourselves. The fears, disorders and the no ways out, pressed in the unconsciousness and the wailings, caused thereby are *breaking out*. It can be hardly argued that the daily, simplified, wringed application of the old-present knowledges serves the concealment and extinction of the truth.

At the level of the old understanding of existence it is visible that the individual is not simply the captive of its inner-outer world, because the outer world –as a caterpillar tractor – presses it into the reality. So it is not a mere virtual prison experience, but the experience of being pressed in the prison's floor. There is no way to break away from the reality and it is impossible to rise above the prison. There is hardly any inner will and outer chance to exist as an acting witness integrated in the real Self and/or Absolutum in the real world. According to the new existence-sensation and existence-interpretation the virtual prison, the pressure weighing the prison, the burning into the prison floor are only *negativ-appearances*, fear-projections, false knowledges of existence. At least the created prison wall can be of paper as well and it is possible that the break out is not depending on the weight of the caterpillar.

The bad assumption and the real stamping on are very good signs. What has been invisible or what has been visible till now only for a few, it is becoming visible. The disclosure is not a primitive criticism, not a theoretical fist shaking, but it is rather an understanding-centered *new conception* and knowledge of life. The new thinking is authentic, because the new knowledge of life and the new life feeling is behind it.

So, here is the new and complex state, or more carefully: the looming of the new situation. So, here is the new state of consciousness or more carefully: the chance of the new state of consciousness. They are mutually but not equally influencing eachother. Newer and newer life feelings may open up like the door of hope. For the defenceless people, there are opportunities to make good use of the new knowledges of life. Without the new knowledge and state of consciounsess the people and the communities of the era are struggling on unprecedented outer dangers and inner mistakes.¹ But the useful and useless struggles may change into personal and collective *floodgate*: they may raise us higher, into new channels and into new rivers. There are gaps on the wall of the seemingly close and ice-covered present, which may quickly expand into *new skies*.

2. (New knowledge, new science)

¹ There is nothing new in these. Inter alia the admonition of Trinitarian Saint John have not lost anything from their actuality. (Trinitarian Saint John: Burning Godworship, edited by the Kármelita holy order, 1991.) It is not accidental that the Koran is speaking about Nafse Ammarah, the *Ego prompting to evil*.

The science – as institutionalized and systematized thinking form – is necessarily agespecific, as well. It's not originated from eternity and it will not last for ever. Science is the actual projection of the collective state of consciousness of the industrial capitalism and capitalism. It is simultaneously progressing and goose-stepping; it is simultaneously new thinking and thinking dead-end. It is simultaneously a collection of many genius recognitions and non-the less many wrong hypotheses. The industrialized science manufacturing will always remain the captive of the *agespirit*. That is why the present and later personal and collective intellectual traumas – rightly – will always force everybody to rethink the hardened dogmas of the agespirit (and the science connected thereto). The former century of the 90s showed the passionate fight of the reductionistic and the holistic scientific approaches. However, at that time there were already many – e.g. Michio Kaku theoretical physicist - who suggested the synthesis of the two views in a higher dimension. [15] For a long time the question will be: which is this optimal higher level and when and how the results of the synthesis will be accepted.

Meanwhile, the science expressing the thinking and serial limits of the industrial society's self-development, however, has reached the next step, exceeding the following science-development and the old science. *Self-development*? Are we beforehand of a new and again unexpected paradigm shift² of science? The general clinical picture of science shall not cover that inside and aside the professional science there always have been unbound intellectual endeavors, which were not influenced by the era. Every great philosopher partially or completely *exceeded* the actual science. This also belongs to the natural history of science-industry.

The petrified dogmas of science are again crumbling with odd intensity. If there has ever been an unexpected change of paradigm with the speed of light, then now it is that and it will be more. The change of paradigm of the Millenium are interweaving with the re-expansion of cognition method and procedures. The postmodern era rightly and still many times perfunctorily questioned the great theories, meanwhile it has already become clear that the lack of the old/new type of great or integrated theories is overwhelmingly set back the pragmatistical search and developments, as well. If one of the axiomas was that the modern-postmodern era, starting with the enlightenment, got into the self-destroying breakdown, then the other axioma is that the thinking model of this first and last euroatlantic world model also reached its *final point*. Let's rejoice: this is a *tremendous succes*.

One of the main trend of the new science (if it would be, could be): the joint science, or in other words metatheory, or its new metaphysical theory: the metaphilosophy. So in the postnormal era of the development of science, the born of metaphilosophy, looking for the final answers, is expected. So metatheory is the *common top theory of sciences* (1), *teologies* (2) and *sciences of art* (3), in other words: a minimum onto-teology.

Theory-formation is unification at its every level, so simultaneously the hierarchical and horizontal theory system of the basic theories (a), top theories (b), and the higher integrated theories (c). But it is not or not only transdisciplinary, not or not only unified great theory, not or not only new metaphysics, not or not only normal and post-normal science. These are all-together and are over them, as well. It is not only the philosophy of Europe and North America, it is also *post-colonistic* theory as well, the *unification opportunity* of the thinking of East and West, North and South; an unprecedented opportunity.

It is interested in receiving all scientific (and also metaphysical) results up till now and setting high value on it. So it is not interested in not recognizing one or more results, or judging it for forgetting. The new science is receptive, since it becomes able to integrate by receiving. It does not originally start from – presumed - new truths, it is 'only' opening doors, researching, it does not slow down at the dogmas of the mind, making possible to search for new path of the mind, does not fear from the agespirit, does not look down on anybody and anything, it does not fear from the impossible, does not hate neither the old nor the new dead ends, it is progressing without any feelings to each directions and dimensions.

The metatheory is a new type of unified cognition theory, as well. However, the practising science sometimes keeps it unscientific, or does not understand the higher scientific level, but the old-new cognition set is *greater and more fully*, than the now accepted epistemological palette of the rational science of the industrial society. Metatheory may use at least 9 to 10 cognition opportunity and at the same time *can control* with eachother: the pre-science (1), the (traditional or normal) science (2), art (3), the postnormal science (4), scientific cognition over the (normal) science (post-science) (5), the personal experience of God, or (in a narrow sense) experience of the cosmic intelligence (6), the individual and collective faith (7), the artificial intelligence (8), or the metatheory itself (9). And the list is waiting for continuation.

Everybody takes or may take possession of methods as many as he wants or accepts; but does not judge what is out of its methodical horizon or thinking practice. I repeat: if science may risk or possess only hypothesis today, it may rejoice that it can *mutually control* the new assumptions by methods, criticizing eachother. This is a new method in itself. That is why that today theoretical physics, theoretical biology, the theory of consciousness

² Thomas S. Kuhn: The structure of Science Revolutions (Gondolat, Budapest, 1984); Original publication: Kuhn, Thomas S., 1962, 1970: The structure of Science Revolutions; Ziauddin Sardar: Thomas Kuhn and the Science Wars (Alexandra, 2003) Original publication: Sardar, Ziauddin: Postmodern Encounters: Thomas Kuhn the Science Wars. (Icon Bokks Ltd.)

and philosophy are the four branches of the same 'intellectual bush'. This recognition brings *cardinal new results* in all four branches of science.

Neither of the listed cognition methods have – and will not have - the possession of the guaranteed understanding method of the truth. In the last millenniums all cognition methods, science as well, produced many false, unfounded statements, while it came to many such cognitions, which offers a long-valid hypothesis. Let's observe our civilization's knowledge state without prejudices, because this is the condition of the *progress* of science (and not only of science).

Where could we get to? It is yet unpredictable. This is still incomprehensible. It is almost hopeless, but *it is very good in this way*.

3. (New Natural science or before a new science?)

First of all, the postmodern science or the postnormal science faces its questioning and question-dealing viewpoint in the *natural science*. It is time to sum up what the new science or one or more opinion leader scientific teams handle as known or/and new truth-hypothesis in the beginning of the new millennium. It cannot be held over anymore that the surviving normal natural science and liberal arts have to face continually with the following hypothesis, while reaching coherent conclusions:

1. *Matter is different in its type, content and form at the different levels of reality.* The greatest knowledge revolution of the modern physics was brought by the multiple exploration of the subatomic level, so today the atom is regarded as an intelligent being. The behavior of matter differs on the micro (subatomic) and macro (universal) level from that which is perceptible and explainable at the middle- and rough level. According to one of the recent hypotheses, we can talk about matter, in the classical sense, only as an actual consciousness-density or thought-concentration event. The theoretical physical ideas, having quantum theoretical origin, - e.g. the super string or the twistor theory [22] – has been discussing these new, tentatively not confirmed recognitions for a long. The latest astrophysical theories are presuming parallel, rotary and twisted universes and it is quite possible that our universe is only a tiny bubble in a much bigger and more complex multiverse.

2. *After the Four-dimensional space-time theory, the theory of higher dimensions.* The three-dimensional (height, width, depth) description of everyday life was firstly completed with time, as fourth dimension. Meanwhile the Kaluza-Klein-theory denominated light, as the *fourth dimension of space* beside the third dimension of space. It explained that light is the vibration of a newer dimension. Since then some leader physicists accepted that there are further *dimensions (n-number, more than ten or twenty)* over the four or five space-time dimensions. What's more mathematics worked out the topology and geometry of n-dimensional spaces, however, science remains still in the frame of the higher order physical worldview of Einstein and Newton. For the planned experiential confirmation of the hyperspace - if the calculations are right - a thousand billion times more energy is needed, than that the particle accelerators are now able to produce.

3. *The concept of the matter is widening, transforming, and becoming almost infinite and mysterious.* The concept of matter (if we can even talk about the concept of the classical physical matter for a long) is not only and not primarily physical matter, but *it has a spiritual nature*, as well. Matter is essentially a thought-realization or a momentum of consciousness. The connecting net is very tight between matter and consciousness, but the creator- and the sustaining vital source is consciousness itself. (The information physics, physics of consciousness and physics of holography, etc. are talking about this – among others.) So first of all we had to cognize that there are at least three basic components of existents (beside matter there is *energy* and *information*), then secondarily it became more obvious, that beside the previous three there are on the one hand the *mind* and on the other hand *consciousness*, which is the real secret. (This assumption does not preclude that in a few decades we will come across with a newer secret.)

4. *There exist not only one, but more or n-kind of matters.* If we hold the old concept of matter, then we can say, in this language, that there are more or many types of matter (antimatter, dark matter, etc.). From the beginning human thinking has always assumed non-perceptible, other type of matters than the physical one, e.g. the ether. In this sense thought and consciousness may also be regarded as matter, but there are/can be non-matter form or post-matters, too. The new, unified natural science of the now beginning century is expected to basically expand and transform our concept about the nature of matter. The traditional science does not have yet the measuring system, has no observational opportunity, has no perceptive means and has no such state of consciousness that it could grasp the new forms of matter and the non-matter.

5. *It is a stronger assumption that there are more universes and more spacetimes.* Firstly, the physics of space-time seemingly decided the dispute of Newton and Einstein. According to that, in the physical space there are not only one universal coordinate or reference system, but many local reference systems, because, according to Einstein, in the four dimensional bended space-time all features of long-range gravitation are exclusively originated from the local curvature of space-time. The next answer can be so-so. Later the new hypothesis on the one hand presumed that there are many, interconnected universes and spacetimes and on the other hand it was confirmed, that in the human mind-consciousness there are more spacetime dimensions, too.

However, the theory of transformation or tranzit between inner and outer space-time dimensions have not yet been realised. Then how far do we see in the space-time infinity?

6. *The new hypothesis of biological life.* The solution of the secret of life is still waited for itself, but the (often simplified) theory of natural selection, in the possession of the new knowledge, cannot be maintained or at least it is seriously arguable. The different avenues of chemical evolution cannot explain how the information code of the DNA have to be explained if we deny the existence of a creative intelligence. The theory of unsimplifyable complexity is justifiable. The origin of the genetical information cannot be explained either by coincidence, or by the initial 'empty' cell, or by selection, or by the theory of self-organization. So the only rational, post-rational solution is the theory of the *intelligent* creation of life (and now we leave it open what kind of intelligence), which of course accepts all protectable-defensible statements of theory of evolution.

7. *The final truth is (according to the recent knowledge) that there is no matter 'only' thought exist.* Justified scientific suggestion that the reality level and reality net, defined as matter by us, is maybe an appearance, an illusion, not material. Inside 'matter' we find the quantum vacuum or emptiness, consisting of or filled with observer dependent postmaterial phenomenons. If there exists only thought or information, then we should rethink the theory, accepted very widely, that we should exclude science from the interpretation of supernatural phenomenons, or we raise further enormous high walls between science and teology. All these do not mean that we have come into the final truth. However, we can step on the next level.

8. *If we generalize the recognition of the existence of different kinds of matter and space-time, then we can draft the theory of more reality/consciousness.* This reality concept is opened and not a closed theory: every momentum is an opportunity – each one is a chance, progress at the beginning and after it has happend, as well. So, man creates itself and its circumstences as a *reality-producing 'machine'*. We are continuously producing knowledge-, consciousness- and physical and social realities, which, however, are *continously producing us* as physical- (genetical), mental, spiritual and consciuosness, what is more social reality – which is also a possible hypothesis. The question, of course, cannot be avoided that *who/what is the producer* and where are the producing orders and technologies from. If the interactive production takes place as logical process in a logical space, then the dilemma is e.g. that who/what is the logical space and logical DNA-ordering system.

9. *The new recognition: all is mind and consciousness.* In the last decades, science had gradually got to recognize the mind and/or the consciousness as cardinal momentum in the creation and existence of matter. The thinking of the present and the near future does not understand yet consciousness, and the relation and transformational system between consciousness-mind-matter. The question is not only that what functional and substantial role do the non-coding elements play in the DNA, but that also, which is already seriously assumable, that there may be a second, simultan, non-material, clearly virtual DNA, too. The assumption is justifiable that the transformational system is a multilevel, multidimensional *living holographic* system. [9].

10. *There are more than one consciousness, level of consciousness and states of consciousness.* In the history of the human civilization, it is an ancient knowledge that over the individual state of consciousness there are further *levels of consciousness and states of consciousness*: pure consciousness, cosmic consciousness, God consciousness and unity consciousness. However, it is still a secret that what kinds of states of consciousness are there over ('above') unity consciousness. According to our hypothesis, we could also *social and collective states of consciousness and qualities* can be distinguished in the same way. One of the possible assumptions is that the collective levels of consciousness are paralel with the individual ones and then there are tense, pure, cosmic, God and unity type of collective consciuosnesses. So, psychology is talking about personal and collective unconscious dimensions not by chance. (One of the possible new universal programs has to answer that how can mankind transform the present lower state of consciousness to higher collective states of consciousness.)

11. *The developing and self-developing center of the (physical) matter is the mind, the creative center of post-matter is consciousness.* According to the new concepts, the cosmic, multidimensional wave function includes every possible states of the world, however, the general theory of the universe cannot be drafted until we are only looking for physical and chemical interactions. Likely, we should presume such multidimensional, physical, biological, mental, conscious and logical complex space-time systems, having metatheoretical origin, where we are able to recognise that from the point of view man (as observer) the mind is the organizing and the back and forth turning 'center' of the physical and chemical dimensions, while consciousness, as the home of the Self, is the organizing and the back and forth turning 'center' of the expanded dimensions beyond matter.

12. *Most of the supernatural phenomenons are higher-level natural phenomenons.* The continuous progress of science and its rising to higher levels of understanding (e.g. recognition of the interaction between matter and mind) resulted in that it can be ascertained about more and more, earlier supernatural phenomenons that: (1) they are also a *natural phenomenons*, only until now we could not understand them, or we could not justify them tentatively – maybe theoretically; or (2) they are also natural phenomenons, which can not be interpreted in the frame of normal science, so it is more proper to qualify them as *post-natural phenomenons*.

13. *There is non-matter, as well; there is a transcendental 'something', which may have material characteristic or material from of existence, or expectedly it has no material nature in any senses.* Today and tomorow, we cannot make the hypothesis probable that finally every trancendent phenomenon can be regard as a

physical-material one. At the same time, it is the problem of God and/or Absolutum. If consciousness, just like matter and post-matter, is in everything and is surrounding everything and is over everything, then the Divinity or the final Absolute 'substance' is also a similar 'something' (silence, emptiness, nameless, etc.). However, this is utterly non-material in its nature, even if try to further expand the category of matter. So, independent of what philosophical view we are taking, we have to recognize the existence of non-matter and non-matter dimensions, while on the other hand we always get back to the fact that non-matter is the creative source, the self-changing/self-forming power.

14. *The real substance is the knowledge and knowledge is more decisive than consciousness.* In millennial cultures and in the recent post-physical researches, too, one of the most pronounced hypotheses is to place consciousness and its role into the centre. However, there can be another idea, too, which consider to find the creative, forming and transforming power in *knowledge*, and describes the individual and collective consciousness and its operation 'only' as a (holographic) changing-mechanism between knowledge and matter. Independent of this, the information/knowledge/intellect, similar to consciousness, is a multi-level and multi-dimensional system and net: containing the *low*, *middle* and *high* knowledge levels, which could be interpreted also as the category of physical, pure, cosmic, divine and unified knowledge. (An open question is that the divine and/or the absolute is a knowledge, post-knowledge or anything else, independent of the fact that this 'knowledge' manifests itself as light, voice, emptiness or in any other from.)

15. *The social reality is the same as the physical-chemical and the non physical-chemical matter.* In social science it is an elementary recognition that there are *many social realities*. However, it is not clear *how and by who* was the collective reality of the physical-institutional social reality created. Social realities come to existence by collective consciousnesses and states of consciousness, or by the common *consciousness and contents and forms of knowledge*.³ On our planet, the human (local, national, continental) communities always form such second nature, community existence and operating forms, state and social institutions, collective mental and identity states, and conceptions of knowledge and operating system rules, that the content, form, system and processing thereof are primarily dependent of the *timeless-spaceless and spacetime bound* social consciousnesses. So, society is not primarily a structure, an institution and not a communicational structure; the society, first of all, – according to the traditional points of view, as well – is a complex virtual reality. Society is typically the same as the physical, five or more dimensional, hyperspace. If we do not accept the direct projection of the physical and social realities to each other, nevertheless, the initial subatomic content/form of the society is similar to the subatomic 'reality' of matter.

16. *Before the theory of unity.* First of all, the combined theory of theoretical physics, theoretical biology, theoretical sociology and philosophy, etc may be the arranging, arrangement creating *theory-summation*: this is metatheory and partly metaphilosophy. The new knowledge-construction may be nominated as metatheory, if we build a 'theory-pyramid' from the aspect of normal science-, art- and religion theory. The theory of unity may be regard as metaphilosophy, new knowledge and state of knowledge, if the new reality/consciousness is recognizable thereby/therewith over the theory summation, which is not part of the three or four dimensional reality, but which may be interpreted as an actually and symbolically alive, moving, contracting-expanding sphere-model. So to interpret this theory summation as a mental process (knowledge concentration and knowledge alloy) is just one possibility, since on the other hand it is simultaneously reality- and consciousness cognition and – creation.

17. *New genesis theory, hypothesis of the new higher order existence.* Many of them are not interested in the new genesis power and not in the new thinking, but in the consequence thereof, the earth's civilization and its operability, namely the new *action-theory*. Now we are experiencing the *ancient truth*: until there is no new knowledge, new knowledge quality, new world-perspective, new past/present and future vision, till then there is no humanity-concept, no new universal-local world plan, there is no other world practice. Provided that we still consider some evolution development-paradigm as valid, because at the same time we can also suppose that humanity carries out overall paradigm-changes under the effect of some crisis or catacism drama. On the other hand only the intervention of 'outer' and 'inner' genesis-source, intelligent, consciousness-quality, not influenced by the self-development/self-destroying of humanity, may help. Temporarily, we are maintaining this *minimal three opportunities*.

18. *Etc. (N-number of thesis can be drafted)* This theory, which can be expanded to almost 20 or 50 elements, is drafting the initial thesis of the unified theory of the reinterpreted hypothesis. This is called the collective unit-thought, unit-state of the metaconsciousness and the metareality. The new knowledge is expected and hoped to replace the classical knowledge gradually. Is the knowledge expense and knowledge change only the question of *time*? If we dig into the new spacetime 'reality' of physics and biology or more accurately into

³ The classical writing is also about this: Berger, Peter L. and Luckmann, Thomas, 1966: The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. (Doubleday et Company, Garden City. New York) In Hungarian: Berger, Peter L. – Luckmann, Thomas: A valóság társadalmi felépítése. Tudásszociológiai értekezés. (Jószöveg Műhely Kiadó, 1998)

quantum physics and quantum biology, it can not be doubted that the time is now ripe for knowledge-change and knowledge-expansion because of the multilevel and multidimensional spacetime.

So what are we *stating* (and not stating)? If matter is thought, and thought is able to create, then the question is: who and what is thought? Is it matter, energy, information or knowledge? Is it more or less? We do not know better concept than what offered by the linguistic-conscious form of metaknowledge, which is not only written on and in matter as empty information, and not just stored as a dead digital signal, but it is a *living reality and consciousness*, at the same time. It is self-developing supra-substance, expanding collective intelligence, developable by us. It is the Essence. It is God and it is beyond God: the Absolutum, which is not the same as God, we suppose.

Whether we know or not, we are *continuously creating and destroying*: our own body, what is more, the outer reality, the material universe and the collective conscious realities. Whether we know or not, we created the surrounding world, or it was created for us and together with us. If this is true, what is following from this? For what and how much new knowledge, new knowledge-quality, new creative-source do we have?

Post script: If new scientific hypotheses are recently drafted monthly and annually then we do not have any reason to suppose that after 10 or 20 years later we will consider the Bran-theory or the quantum-jump theory as the simple dogmas of the old knowledge. The knowledge creation is not a finite process, not a closable sequence of events: after 50-100 years later we will possess a 'new' knowledge *far-exceeding* the present theoretical nucleus of the new multithesis.

4. (Assumptions of the new logic and logical space)

What is visible of the top reality and top consciousness on the otherwise invisible highest level? The point of the paradox is that the *One is and is not*: there is infinity, which is not, and there is. Or: there is silent and it is not. This is still not voice, not light, not anti-matter, not thought, not word. It is not space and not time. Then let's assume that the self-interacting One produces the spirit, or the voice and the word, which is transformed into the inwardly infinite matter and multidimensional spacetime by holographic consciousness. All together: the Whole. Which is: reality and consciousness together. If these are together: this is the complete logical space, the logical spacetime. First of all take a look at the world's *basic structure and co* in the three dimensional structure.

First level: the One (Absolutum, or what is beyond this); *Second level*: the spirit (wisdom, which is more than knowledge); *Third level*: the man (man and the world consciousness created by man); *Forth level*: nature (matter and post-matter). And we can nominate the fifth level, as well, because inside matter we again find the spirit and the One. However, this does not mean that there is no God, spirit, consciousness and matter at *every level*.

If we want to observe and cognize the Whole, then we are proceeding to discover where there is the thought of nothingness, and at the same time there is the Whole among the infinities. This infinity and the definite or concrete are together the Whole. Many times there is no base, no scientific dogma and neither the religious symbols are directing us. What we are now philosophically undertaking is a *travel and anti-travel beyond the spiritual travel*. The new science of physics and biology gives us guidance only at the beginning of the travel. However, there is no and there can not be consent between physicists about the alternative answers of the questions. Temporarily hypotheses interfere with hypotheses and the majority always refuses the new hypotheses. The new philosophy, however, is able to *pass* this limits, dogmas, but physics may only appreciate these limited passes, if it also does some newer quantum jumps. However, one science cannot present everything about the Whole, which is true for philosophy as well, so the Whole interweaves with Nothingness again. Why might be it a problem?

So the theory of Wholeness is necessarily a philosophy and post-philosophy and possibly *metaphilosophy*, as we have already mentioned. This includes all the philosophies of the different levels separately, and the unified philosophy of all levels with the secrets of the changes and rises between the levels. The philosophical theory/non-theory of nothingness/wholeness. It is a new view from the new reality or new state of consciousness. For the observer the new perspective necessarily also a new observation, reading, modelling and drafting. In reality and symbolically: first of all, reading sentences from the invisible 'wall' of nothingness/wholeness and then the writing down of sentences with a consciousness-pen. Since we do not undertake this, temporarily we can not do anything else and any better than we also offer knowledge-hypotheses, not denying that the Observer is still derogates the one, being Observed (the One, the Nothing, the Intellect, the Consciousness or Matter). If we can understand and go through it, it is a shivering feeling and consciousness. Just imagine: *'levitating' as nothingness and thinking in nothing*. Mere, it would be an unknown feeling or experience, if we would somehow think as something in nothing.

The logical 'chain' and 'structure'. The *Voice* is the *original and first manifestation* of the One (or e.g. the Absolutum), but this time it may be lightless and voiceless. This necessarily overtakes the n-dimensional voice, existing in space-time. We can nominate the Voice as information or pre-matter, anti-matter. From each voice there will be a light-quantum, because the voice vibration shines in the dark. Voices are embodied in

words, which become *geometrical/mathematical forms* by writing. The multidimensional system of the voices/words/concepts is philosophy, or wisdom. Or in another way, the logical space. Philosophy is the world's final, linear and non-linear reason and without reason, which is the *creator and the nomination of creation* of the multicoherent, many dimensional system of voices, lights, words, concepts. This intellect is the component of the universe and the infinite consciousness, too, as one of its consequences: matter. Cause and effect, reasonless and consequenceless, at the same time.

The vibrating voice expresses the spaceless and timeless world, and later produces the physical world, which we experience as three-dimensional space. The voice/light created the universes of voice and light and the multicoherent multiuniverses. Further more, the known individual and collective consciousnesses, are also consisted of voice- and light vibrations, according to many sources. All voice and voice-group is a spacetime of frequencies. The voice (or light) existed sooner than the conscious man or the three-dimensional matter. The man's body/intellect is also consisted of voices and energy nodes and these vibrating-shining voices have self-creative ability. Each voice, independent of in what language it is told or sung, immediately suits and remains forever in the multidimensional spacetime. Necessarily, even if it does not form a matter, or does not concentrate in a micro, mezo or macro sized bran.

If each light, voice is a spacetime vibration, then each letter is a *geometrically embodied sound vibration*. There is a very tight coherence between the sound vibration and the letter-form of the voice. The letter not only expresses, but bespeaks the features of voice, catchable in spacetime. If each letter is a twisted, rotating spacetime quantum, then every concepts (as high level vibrations) are multidimensional space vibrations. It is also assumable that each voice, each word, each sentence, each letter and each philosophy exist in each time and each space, independent of we are aware of it or not. Behind matter and its interactions, consisting the world experienced by us, there are *non-matters and non-material interactions*, as well. This is the intellect and philosophy, which to our mind creates the concept of matter with the help of the conscious processes. But without matter there is no man and mind, which is able to turn into intellect and philosophy.

This new, unified theory of wholeness introduces three other hypothesis levels: 1. before, behind and after the unified theory of physics and the unified theory of consciousness is the unified theory of philosophy, which is a theory of light, voice, word and concept, at the same time. It is high ranked knowledge theory, or: *new philosophy*. 2. Between the unified metaphilosophy, as the creator and the theory of creation, and the unified theory of physics, as the theory of created world, the intermediating and transforming theory is the *unified theory of consciousness*. The theory of consciousness is not just intermediating, but embracing, and a clasping tank for the liquid of knowledge. 3. the unified theory of philosophy, consciousness, physics and biology is a unified theory of logic, at the same time.

The One may mostly be called as Absolutum, and the 'vibration' of the Absolut, or its manifestation is: *God*. So God is not the same as the Absolute and especially not the same as what is beyond it.⁴ From the interactions of the Voice the spaceless-timeless *spirit* is generated, which is the 'super ego' of consciousness, and from which consciousness produces all existences.

Consciousness is inspiring the transformational change and operation. So consciousness is existing and operating at every level (in every dimensions, at every spacetime level). However, the main point is that it makes the changes/transformations between the levels. If we describe consciousness as observer, the process of observation and the result of observation or observed, this may be true only at the lowest level. This looks like only from the point of view of the Observer. Consciousness is unfolding through the observation 'window', but at higher level it is already the *creation, the process of creation and the result of creation*. The main point of creation is: the holographic transformation. Back and forth changing.

So the expanded theory of physics is not only a theory of consciousness, but firstly and after all it is a theory of philosophy and the multiple system and non-system, logic theory, *theory of the logical space (or spacetime)* of the above mentioned minimum three components (in real and symbolically multicentered and infinitely expanding sphere of many shells). However, neither physics, nor any other partial-theory, nor the normal sciences are able and suitable for this. On the one hand: together the top-theory cannot be other than the *theory of the Whole*, the metatheory. On the other hand: it is a top-theory, a unified philosophy over the theory. However, the philosophy of the Whole is not only the nomination, description of something, but it is the creation/non-creation itself – the existence, and history thereof.

The theory of the Whole is describeable by the theoretical language of physics, mathematics, consciousness or philosophy, however, in the pyramid system of languages; at the higher levels necessarily a new language is required, because this is the highest level of existence or form of existence. We can say: new

⁴ This concept is very close to the opinion of Sankara, the hindu philosopher, who distinguishes between higher and lower brahmas. According to him, the lower brahman is Isvara, the personal God, the creator of world, the higher brahman is the Whole's basic principal without features. So the Absolutum has two forms: the saguna, the brahma having features, and the nirguna, the brahma having no features. (see at e.g.: Klaus K., Klostermaier, 1998: A Short Introduction to Hinduism, Onworld Publications, Emland; in hungarian: K.K. Klostermaier: Bevezetés a hinduizmusba, Akkord Könyvkiadó, 2001) pp. 143.)

linguistical transformation is needed between the One, Consciousness and Matter. We are standing behind and before the new language; in the next ages we will try to reveal the new (or rather the very old?) language. In the lack of the new language, we use the prefix of 'meta' for each concepts (e.g. metareality, metaman, metaknowledge, etc.), because this is the only way we can separate the old concepts from the new categories. But this is not new, since Abraham H. Maslow had already used the concept of *metaman*, *metahuman*.⁵

5. (Let us Observe: who and what is the Whole?)

The first answer sounds in the following way: it is *voice, letter, sentence, philosophy, logic* (etc.) together. And the *material and non material world*, formed of voices and words. Whole: *matter and consciousness, space and time, man and God, philosophy and Absolutum* together. As one. In one system and without a system. Do not bother with its complexity, the unsimplifiable complexity is characteristic thereof.

The mental-conscious barrier on the way leading to the correct solution of the secret is bypassable now (after many millenium). Physicists have been researching and promising to create the *unified theory of physics* for a long. They want to form it from the four fundamental forces or interactions (electromagnetic, gravitation, strong and weak nuclear force) and from the theory of time. However, till they approach the problem from this way, there will be no chance to create the Theory of Everything or the Unified Theory of the Whole. Theoretical physics has come off to that point that there is no real physical matter, no autonom matter, matter is the shell, outer cover thereof, which is not matter or at least not the classical matter. The new question of the turn of the millenium is the *unified theory of physics and consciousness*. The best of physicist are today not only consciousness physicists, or consciousness researchers, but they try to apply this new theory in physical/chemical hypothesises, as well. Up till now, they thought that the separate, basic components of the universe are matter, space and time and after this a wider dimension has been arisen: in the universe consciousness is also primarily just like matter, or space and time. So it become clear again that consciousness (contrary to mind) is not the result of material processes. However, how long shall the overall thought system of reality/consciousness or the whole new theoretical system be expanded to produce and fit the unified theory? To solve the scientific secret, we had to go on, since the real problem was that the soul and clothes of the secret, or the name and *form of the problem* were also a barrier.

In the last decades, some physicists, those who went quite far, started to presume that there were more than one universe, at micro and macro levels, as well. Physicist are not saying today, so we have to state instead of them, that there are more or n-kind of matter, so it is not enough to create a theoretical description of only *one type of matter*. (We have assumed it for a long, since we used the word ether and dark matter to express that we are not able to justify or we are not aware thereof.) Theoretical physicist and biologists started to say a few years ago that their researches have led to that matter or/and life actually is different than that the shyer and the more cautious ones are calling *mind* instead of consciousness. Man is not only differing from other living beings that it has consciousness, because the difference is mainly in the *states of consciousness*, since, according to our recent knowledge, only man is possessing reflexive consiouness. So the main cause of the universal natural scientific and thinking crisis is that we cannot observe the non-matter and nor the 'nothingness' over matter with the classical natural scientific methods. Physics is not (and not only) a natural science any more, or the *better understood nature* is not mere material, but it is a more complex and more varied matter. From here there is no further way.

In the inner side of matter, at the subatomic level, or in the assumed paralel universes it has no sense to talk about traditional matter or rational matter vision. The useable recognitions, concepts, from the quantumspace till the twister, or till the brans, partly introduce us in a higher type of physical theory and partly lead us out from the material structures and dimensions.

In the beginning of the Study, we have already briefly summarized: those, who started from physics or biology, may put down in their agenda the question of consciousness and matter together, and they cannot do anything else than to recognize the *primacy of consciousness* and at this point the truth of all high level ancient cultures will be scientifically justified. So it is a natural scientific and metaphilosophical question that instead of the unified theory of physics a unified theory of physics/mind/consciousness shall be created. More and more branches of the theory of physics are going to become part of the theory of consciousness and of course the theory of consciousness is part of the theory of physics in many ways, as well. Those, who Started from the philosophy, or more specific from the theory of society, can also do nothing more than acknowledging the world's (reality/consciousness) basic and *substantial mental-conscious nature*, in other words there is no philosophy without simultaneous natural and supernatural consciousness or theory of religion. So it is a very important question that phylosophy, which was always a unifying and the philosophy of unity, has to be able to

⁵ Maslow, A. H., 1969: Different meanings of transcendenty (Journal of Transpersonal Psychology, 1969. spring). In hungarian: A.H. Maslow – R. Assagioli – K. Wilber: Bevezetés a transzperszonális pszichológiába (Ursus Libris Kiadó, 2006) 55., 60. o. Under metaman he meant that man become god or god natured.

move on to the new theory of reality/consciousness. On the basis of the theory of physics and consciousness, it is possible to construct the *unified theory and/or metaphilosophy*.

Before the turn of the millenium, the theory of philosophy was often restricted to the *theory of society* and was primarily observing only the physical/institutional, or more specifically the *political/economic constructions* of the society. Instead of the deconstructive theory of philosophy, an ontoteology or in other words a new *unified theory of philosophy/theology* is unavoidably required. Is it arguable? Hardly. The new unified theory, the theory of the whole, and the new natural- and social sciences are more and more become philosophical and consciousness theories, or at the same time logic theories, however, this redefined philosophy and logic *not (or not always)* is the same as the leading theoretical efforts of the XX. Century philosophies. So philosophy and logic are assumed in a wider-higher sense in this unified mental space.

But *how can* the new physical/conscious and the new philosophical/theological theory *meet*? There are still two solutions: the new theory 1. could be only *philosophical theory, or clearly a new philosophy*. 2. or it could be only metatheory, which is essentially a scientific theory of the whole, which is necessarily a new science, as well. All are of *high rank* on their own.

How can this hypothesis be 'justified'?

6. (The new phenomenons of science and the new interactions)

So theoretical physics has already drafted that the simultaneously micro-mezo-macro levels of the universes are bound together by four interactions (electromagnetic, strong and weak nuclear forces and gravitation) in the three or fourdimensional spacetime. This question is already productive in itself, independent of the fact that when they will be accepted. In the mean time however another important question was left unanswered: what kind of forces and interactions bound together *society and economy*. It is very interesting, that in liberal arts, or more closely, in social sciences the establishment of unified theory has not yet been put down in the agenda. Of course, the most interesting theoretical assumption is that *what kind of energies and inner and outer interactions 'wire together'* and make able the individual (as physical, mental, intellectual, communal and spiritual being) and its communities (family, friends, local world, nation, Europe, etc.) to exist permanently and sustainably. If we start from the assumption that the physical universe is finally and basically made of super strings, brans, or multidimensional, multicoherent, twisted, spinning-twirling vibration-nets, then all planets, all living beings and all created worlds of the universe is the same. Or not?

Nevertheless, in the development of the (post-normal) science some new phenomenons are observed:

- New phenomenon: theoretical physics transforms into philosophical physics – into the philosophy of physics (physics/philosophy: are One)
- New phenomenon: theoretical biology transforms into philosophical biology – into the philosophy of biology (biology/philosophy: are One)
- New phenomenon: theoretical philosophy transforms into physical/biological philosophy (physics/biology/philosophy: are One)
- New phenomenon: physics (biology, etc.), philosophy (ontology, etc.) transform into theological physics, biology, philosophy (teology/ physics/ biology/ philosophy: are One)
- New phenomenon: physics, biology, philosophy, theology transform into (back and forth) to the ancient knowledges and the knowledges of the day after tomorrow (all knowledges, science, wisdom: are One)
- The same is true for e.g. psychology, sociology, metaphysics, etc.)

The discovery and understanding of the new phenomena will last for a long. I would like to take one *example*: Sri Ramana Maharsi in the conversation called *Intellectual Instruction*⁸ makes a brief comment that in the human body between the two nipples, under the chest, above the venter there are *six, different coloured organs*, which are not equal to the physical organs nor to chakras. One of them, which is similar to the bud of water-lily, is called '*heart*' (*hridajam*) and the psychical terminal nerves (*nadi*) are running together here and this is the basis of the vital power (*prana*), of the mind and of the light of {consciousness}.⁹ This *second 'heart'* is actually Self-reality (*Atman*). It will be very hard to interpret such a 'phenomenon', 'organ', even with the help of a unified theory, which describes in its framework cultures and sciences, as well.

The prior example showed us the system and the main node of the multilevel and multidimensional interactions. Now, take a look at how (while still operating in the three and fourdimensional space) the integrated table of *parallel interactions* may look out try to simplify not the physical or biological, but e.g. *the economical and social interactions* into four-four interactions.

The metasystem of interactions (first version)

⁸ Sri Ramana Maharsi All writings (Filosz Kiadó, Budapest, 2006) pp.80

⁹ the same pp.80.

	First interaction	Second interaction	Third interaction	Fourth interaction
physics	Electromagnetism	Strong interaction	Weak interaction	gravitation
society	Civil resources	Economic-state resources	Cohesive resources	Intellectual-cultural resources
economy	Interactions between man and the first and second nature	Material-market and technological resources	Social resources	Information and knowledge resources
man	Physical-biological resources	Communal (economic and social) resources	Mental and spiritual resources	Intellectual resources

The table is far not *complete and accurate*: the moral resources are left out from the society; or today more and more are revealing the spiritual resources in economy; or there can be technological resources among the human resources. The science of physics has visibly come off the point that it could only unify the four interactions if it steps out from the three+one spacetime dimensions and tries to unify in *hyperspace*. The result is that the unification would not be successful without adding the *mind or/and consciousness*. Or we can say that the inner and outer reality could be simplified to the interaction of matter-consciousness. However, more interesting is that it is – seemingly - unimaginable to unify the social, economical or human resources without adding *higher dimensions*. This is again the consciousness, but the collective consciousness, the consciousness dimensions and consciousness vectors thereof. So if we would like to unify all factors, all levels, all interactions in metaphilosophy or in the wholeness theory, then we have to emphasize the role of *personal and collective consciousnesses*.

So we are again at the point: matter and consciousness together. So in philosophy we cannot turn back to the dominant concepts of the last half-century (neomarxism, structuralism, postmodern, etc.). At the same time, the new metaphilosophy, based on the matter-consciousness interactions, may *learn more* than expected from the theology of the world religions or from the ancient e.g. greek philosophy or from the Hegel tradition. The reality and the 'reality' and concept of consciousness are models and their relation is also *theoretical construction*. However, there is a new theoretical model of reality and consciousness and this opens the way to metaphilosophy. To the new balance and new unification of construction and deconstruction. So, the question of cosmological constants are not only risen in physics, but the question of *theoretical constants* are also risen in philosophy, which simultaneously mean the *criticism* of the humanity's - power centered and power-ideology bounded - philosophical variable and the sustaining of the continuously *rethought wisdom-constants*, which however have been existing for milleniums.

All knowledge models – all visible – are *not necessarily* false. *New knowledge horizons* are opening.

7. (Model-freedom and consciousness-alternatives)

Every statements, every words, every concepts are: *models*. Representations, symbols, visions. Knowledge is: a *thought-model*. Matter is a model, brain is a model, mind is a model, consciousness is a model, life is a model, God is a model. I/we are models. Understanding the models is a model again. The *unified model* is also a model. But *which* one is it? In the frame of the new thinking we are free to model the model-alternatives. Let's begin with e.g. the more important *consciousness-models*.

Model A:. There are only matter and only material representations (e.g. mind). All the others are only the illusive games of the mind. Only the experiencable exist. The supernatural 'experience' is also the fairy-tale of mind.

Model B:. there is no difference. Brain and mind/consciousness is the same. In the three-dimensional (+time) space it is brain, in the hyperspace (in minimum five dimensions), however it is consciousness. And over the material and mental-conscious representations there is nothing.

Model C: there is only vibrating mind (maybe consciousness). The consciousness is self-interacting physical vibration. The brain is not able for conscious-wilful activity, because the brain without consciousness is only a developed matter-model, however this consciousness do not get out from the physical universe. This mind-model is definiable only in the three-dimensional world.

Model D: there is only (metaphysical) consciousness. Matter and all models of matter are the – non physical-material natured - self-creation of consciousness. Consciousness is the inner-outer fluctuation of an unknown material/non-material 'field'.

Types of mind and/or consciousness models

Model A : there is no consciousness, only matter and mind
--

Model B: there is no difference. Brain and mind/consciousness is the same; unity.
Model C: there is only vibrating (physical) mind or consciousness.
Model D: there is only (metaphysical) consciousness
Model E: Consciousness: Observation.
Model F: Consciousness: creation 1.
Model G: Consciousness: creation 2.
Model H: Consciousness: not creative, only creation-organizing.
Model I: Consciousness: knowledge (1): information.
Model J: Consciousness: knowledge (2): wisdom.
Model K: Virtual (non-material, or post-material) reality
Model L: Consciousness: overflow of God
Model M: God and/or Absolutum.
Model N: Unrecognizable, nameless
Model O: Integrated models

Model E: Consciousness: Observation. In three steps: observer, the process of observation and the object of observation. This only assumes the 'observer', which could be a (personal) consciousness, or collective (impersonal) consciousness. This model follows that the Observer is able to 'only' observe.

Model F: Consciousness: Creation (1). Consciousness is more than observation, the main point of consciousness is creation. The common result of the creator, the process of creation and the creation. The creator is 'only' a personal consciousness.

Model G: Consciousness: creation (2). Consciousness is more than observation, the main point of consciousness is creation. The common result of the (collective) creator, the process of creation and the creation. However, the creator is a collective, high rank consciousness.

Model H: Consciousness: not creator, only creation-organizer. Consciousness is the autonom creator activity of the Observer or/and the creator. 'Only' the creation' process. In other words, transmission between the non-created and the created: transformation.

Model I: Consciousness: knowledge (1): information. There is no matter, no consciousness. Everything is information. Information is able alone for self-motion, which is not creation, but it is 'only' the self-organization of information. The information-unification and information-change between information is: life.

Model J: Consciousness: knowledge (2): Wisdom. The main point of consciousness: the intellect. Which is 'only' knowledge in the three+one dimension. This is the spread of wisdom and the self-application of spread wisdom. In one conscious person, as well.

Model K: Virtual consciousness: virtual (non material, or post-material) reality.

Model L: Consciousness: overflow of God. The representation of the n-dimensional God-model in the three + one-dimensional spacetime.

Model M: Substance of God. It is not the manifestation of God, because it is only the self-unbracing of consciousness, but it is God or/and Absolutum itself.

Model N: Unrecognizable, unnomlatable.

Model O: Integrated model(s). Integrated models of two or more actors could be set up from the listed (and not listed) models. It could simultaneously be Model L, Model H, Model B, dependent of in which spacetime or in which super spacetime dimension it is existing. In on place it is waking consciousness, elsewhere it is pure consciousness, or information, or knowledge, or some transformation, or the logical space of knowledge/consciousness, or the Absolutum or its manifestation, or these *all together*.

On the one hand, it is depending on from *which level of consciousness* does the consciousness-model Observer observe: from the three+one dimensional, from normal waking consciousness, or higher (pure, transcendental, cosmic, God, etc.) state of consciousness. On the other hand it is depending on *which stage* (physical, intellectual, divine, etc. reality/consciousness) of the wisdom/consciousness/reality structure do we observe. It could not be argueable that the lower rank models (from Model A to Model D or Model F) can only refer to the physical/biological levels. Independent of recognizing or not the existence of any God, all higher rank consciousness-models necessarily require at least the acceptance of the opportunity of *supernatural realities*. This situation does not disturb the division of labour: scientist, dealing with normal sciences, may research the lower rank reality/consciousness plane, while the philosophers, theologians – the representatives of post normal and post science – may observe or experience the *higher reality/consciousness levels*.

Ken Wilber was drafting a *ten-level consciousness-structure* in his early writings (e.g. The spectrum of consciousness¹⁰) [35,36]. According to him, the basic structures of consciousness look like this and there are Sri Aurobindo's concepts in the brackets: sensory-physical, phantasmical-emotional (under physical consciousness),

¹⁰ Wilber, Ken – Engler, Jack – Brown, Daniel, 1986: Transformations of Consciousness: Conventional and Perspectives on Development (Shambala)

mapper mind (vital-emotional), rule/role-mind (sensing mind), formal-reflective (thinking mind), visionlogic (higher mind), occult (enlightened mind), subtle (intuitive mind), causal (super mind), final (supermind). This consciousness structure is detailed and imposing, but neither Wilber, nor Aurobindo *separate* the mind and consciousness, what is more Sri Aurobindo – in our opinion causeless – calls the real level of consciousness as mind. The consciousness-model, drafted by us also runs into this error, but only for the purpose that the system of consciousness will not be close and for that the alternatives of traditional science will not be regard as void. (However, the Model 'A', 'B' and maybe 'C' are surely not consciousness-models.)

The philosophical wholeness theory can not do anything else, than, on the one hand, it has to observe from each consciousness-level and on the other hand the consciousness-models have to be examined at every level. This opportunity could be denied its necessity could only be *accepted*.

8. (Unified philosophy and its process-structure)

Can we introduce metaphilosophy as multilevel, multidimensional concentrated content-form? The whole image, or the whole theory (the 'reality/consciousness' and its nomination) can be described as unified philosophy in a two-three dimensional table, in matrix and mostly in sphere-model. *A note:* instead of a moving-spinning sphere-model here is a 'simple' table:

The structure of the unified metaphilosophy (table instead of spherestructure)

Number of stages	Name of stages	Level of consciousness
One (1.0)	Absolutum	Absolutum consciousness (what is perceivable: unity consciousness)
One/one (1.1)	God, Creator (Infinite, silence, etc.)	God consciousness
One-two (1.2)	Self-creation, self-overflow (the first act of creation)	Manifestation of God consciousness
Two (2.0)	Voices (created voice, infinite light, empty space)	Speaking of Manifested God consciousness
Two-one(2.1)	Vibration/lights (self-motion and continuous manifestation of the created light)	Vibration of transcendental consciousness or light-consciousness
Three (3.0)	Words (coherent vibrations of voices, voice-brans, charged space, the creatures of absolute consciousness, etc.)	Preparation of intellectual consciousness
Three-one(3.1)	Sentences (words, word-brans)	Intellectual consciousness
Four (4.0)	Philosophy (sentence-brans, sentence spacetime gropus)	Knowledge and/or experience of knowledge
Four-one (4.1)	Logic ('structure' of sentence spacetime-groups, logical spaces, or logical self-creating processes)	Timeless, spaceless manifestation of Intellectual consciousness
Five (5.0)	Multidimensional space/time (manifestation of philosophy-logic)	Metaphysical consciousness and experience
Five-one (5.1)	Paralell universal spaces, paralell timespaces	Cosmic consciousness and its expanse
Six (6.0)	Nature, three-dimensional matter (width, height, depth) and the development of spacetime.	Physical consciousness and self-organization
Seven (7.0)	Highly organized matter/body (man at a high level)	High rank of organization of physical body and consciousness
Seven-one (7.1)	Brain, mind	Representation of matter
Eight (8.0)	Second nature (environment, created by man)	Transformation, self-development of nature
Nine (9.0)	Community, society	Social consciousness and its interactions
Ten (10.0)	Human self-consciousness in the (three+one dimensional) world of earth	Personal Human self-consciousness
Eleven (11.0)	Man as transcendental being	Personal cosmic consciousness
Twelve (12.0)	Complete man, conscious-man, human-god	Personal God consciousness
Thirteen (13.0)	Coming home of man, and becoming superhuman thereof	Unity consciousness

The top-category: the One. Almost all philosophical and theological writings are talking about the One (about non-duplicature), however its top-being, infinite being is very difficult to 'press' into a well defined concept. Worthy of evocation how well A.N. Whitehead interprete the philosophical concept of the *One*, because he clearly recognizes that this is the *final category and the concept of creating power*: the terminus 'One' does not mean the 'integer one', which is a complex special concept, but the general concept which is the base for the

indefinite 'one', the definite 'the', the demonstrative 'this' or 'that' or the relative pronouns 'which', 'what' or 'as'.¹¹ He adds that the final concept is 'the creation of the new collectivity.'

The One: is the Absolutum, which is however *not* God. Liptay Lothar analyzes the conception of Sankara: 'The personal God, the enormous Isvara of hindus is also the son of this glamour and the mediator thereof. The absolutum is without any definiteness, the Brahman does not equal to it, only forms the final, transcendent aspect thereof, as for everything else, as well.¹² (Of course, there are many conceptions which consider Absolutum *equal* to God.)

However, this is only a philosophical-logical One. This is not the theory of non-duality. The problem is that the One (Absolutum and/or God) could not be cognised in the normal waking state of consciousness. The Absolutum and God become the only reality in God- or in Unity consciousness. (This is why the classical and the modern philosophy¹³ may go thereto, as A.N. Whitehead. [34]) Metaphilosophy and the metaphilosophy-state of consciousness can get thereto where only the highest rank of wisdoms¹⁴ are able to see: there is nothing, there is no God, there is only the real Self, which may be translated as Absolute and what may be said God for the simpler souls. This might not weaken our attention, because in unity consciousness there is no need for 'some sort of bhāvanāra (on the contemplation of a personalized god or divinity inspired with deep emotions and religious feelings).¹⁵

There is no opportunity for integrated analysis of all conceptions under more sciences and more religion-philosophy. Nevertheless, in the previous table we observed the creation, self-motion, self-development from upward to downward. According to this the complex world structure, in other words the *unified logical space or reality/consciousness structure*, is constructable. If someone would like to keep the known limits and competencies of science, that has to take some levels in brackets from the top and bottom of the table.

Unified logical metaspace (table, instead of sphere structure)

Number of stages	Name of stages	States of consciousness	Level of changes
First level	Absolutum (one infinity, God, etc.) or the absolutum, the manifestation thereof is God	Superconscious – or only this consciousness, or the absolut consciousness	+ the manifestation of Absolutum into Intellect
Second level	Mentality (duplication of One, wisdom, knowledge, information)	Knowledge, being also superconscious, or the condensation, concentration of knowledge and the consciousness itself	+ self-motion and self-development of intellect
Third level	Consciousness (the first two levels do the creation with the help of consciousness, started from the voice to information)	Consciousness – knowledge makes the consciousness move; consciousness is a holographic forming-creating power	+ Absolutum and the change of intellect into information, matter, nature
Fourth level	Nature (physical, biological reality, the created world)	Natural, cosmic consciousness – or at subatomic level it is a higher state of consciousness	+ the change of matter into man (unifying with the consciousness)
Fifth level and the first level backwards	Man (Man, experiencing the first four reality/consciousness levels, makes itself able to go backward from the fifth level, possibly, to the first level)	Waking consciousnesses, transcendental consciousness, Cosmic consciousness, God-consciousness, Unity-consciousness	+ change of first nature into second nature
Backwards: second level	Second nature (second nature created by man, or the three + one dimensional civilizational self-creation)	Natural consciousness mixed with human consciousness – higher state of consciousness at the subatomic level	+ the constructed change of nature into community
Third level	Community, society, so the	Community and social	+ change of community into

¹¹ Whitehead, Alfred North: Process and Reality (Typotex Kiadó, 2001) pp-36.

¹² Liptay Lothar, 2006: The Absolutum, www.evilagonline.hu (Stratégiaikutató Intézet – the written version of the lecture of Absolutum (04.21.2006.) which started disputes.)

¹³ The starting point of Jacques Derrida is also the same, he is considering or describe religion 'in the frame of good sense'. (Derrida, J.: Faith and knowledge (Brambauer, Pécs, 2006) Original edition: Foi et savoir, Les deux sources de la 'religion' aux limites de la simple raison, Jacques Derrida and Gianni Vattimo, *La religion*, Paris, Seuil, 1996, 9-86.

¹⁴ It is due to the liver that we consider always and everywhere presenting, all-pervading real Self of self light, the reality as non-existing, meanwhile we consider the individual soul (jiva), world (jagat) and God (para), which are always and everywhere consequently considered as non-existing, as existing.' All writings of Sri Ramana Maharsi (Filosz, 2006) pp 78.

¹⁵ pp. 84.

backwards	consciousness of humanity and the institutationalism thereof (cooperation of man and nature, and man and man)	consciousness, or the practise of the ability of self creation of man	knowledge, intellect
Fourth level backwards	Collective intellect (all information and knowledge, developed by man and humanity)	Consciousness of collective knowledge (intellectual consciousness)	+ transformation of collective knowledge into divine knowledge
Fifth level backwards	Common god-consciousness of the individual and people, or the consciousness of Absolutum	Super-religious common (divine) super-conscious level of humanity	+ summary of the individual divine consciousness and Absolutum

This diagram-model demonstrates that it is more or less useless in this form. The Fifth and sixth level could be well illustrated only in a sphere-structure. (Even so, the relations are obvious)

The world structure is the manifestation of the logical space. So what is this *logical space*? On the one hand, building from the universal meta-knowledge, on the other hand inspired from the collective consciousness and unconsciousness, behind and above the conscious level, we *may be able* to process or address the image of the logical system (at least the apposite symbol, then the concrete behind the symbol). If someone is asking now, what sort of logical space we are going to draw, firstly – for lack of a better - we will answer that we do not or not really know this. But then, carefully we continue that with concentrated inner-outer attention, with some previous recognition and with metatheoretical thinking, maybe, we can nominate the *unknown spacefield*. The new logical map, evaporating continuously from our prior logic. The (meta)logical (meta)space.

We are also not sure of that the concept of logical space, declared in the title, is guaranteed appropriate. However, according to our opinion that this is the best for aspect base, meanwhile we are getting signs from the simultaneously personal and collective consciousness and unconsciousness that the logical metaspace is *not only a symbol*, but *existing reality*, since it covers different logical spaces, dissimilar logical space types in more dimensions.

Contrary to many nature researchers, we are considering the logical system as not primarily physical or mathematical space, but primarily as a philosophical (or intellectual) space, or a more wider, *conscious space*, which basic plane or projection is the physical or biological space, as well. This logical space is simultaneously our logical space and all other dimensions, which are pointing beyond our inner logic, what is more it is seemingly an independent logical space of us. All these, no matter how abstract or complex they are, finally we *have to draft* the complex concept of the logical space.

The creation of *logical space* has been our inner program for decades. The logical space is *simultaneously* theoretical space and the structure of new science, is *simultaneously* knowledge and conscious space, is *simultaneously* personal space and collective space and is *simultaneously* reality and non-reality, meanwhile it is *simultaneously* space and spacless, *simultaneously* mathematical and philosophical space, *simultaneously* the new world image and its symbol. It is *simultaneously* silence, noise and voice, is *simultaneously* light, shadow and lightless, is *simultaneously* nothing and everything, is *simultaneously* abstract and concrete, *simultaneously* empty and full to overflow. Space is simultaneously physical, biological, social, intellectual and transcendental space. It is simultaneously complex material and structural divine-space (sacred space). This space is the (real and symbolical) nucleus and (self-observer-self-creative) expanse of metatheory, it is structurally a three or more dimensional space (ladder- and 'sphere'-model), what is more it is a twisted logical spacetime. We do not think that this complicated collective-space, this spacetime dimension-system can be described by one branch of science or from one aspect.

This many-countless logical space or individual space dimension, this integrated conceptual spacetime dimension-system is the metaspace. Or more precisely: the *logical metaspace*. Between the spaces, times, spacetimes, listed and not listed among the concepts, there are different relations, different systems, so the logical spaces show not only simply accidental set and mean not only serious cause and effect connection-net. The linguistic-conceptual spaces simultaneously form themselves and collectively close and open structure and this structure may be hierarchical or not hierarchical, it can be a simple two dimensional village main street and an incredibly complicated logical hyperspace. Hypothetically, it can be everything inside and outside, meanwhile the space-cohesion, the power keeping balance do not cease. This is simultaneously deterministic and non-deterministic conceptual-mental spacenet. The logical space cannot be expressed by any bias and nothing can explain to accept any spacevision itself as an exclusive one. Motion and motionless: One.

In each logical space there are and there can be many-countless components – we are considering *each one* as a spacetime-element. In abstract sense: all logical components are independent spaces, or spacetimes. However, it is not consequent therefrom that each spacetime elements are the same type, meanwhile they can be necessarily the same or equal logical space-building 'cubes'. The theoretical secret is of course that what kind of passages or impenetrabilities are between the logical spaces ('doors', 'path', 'walls', 'wormholes', or 'gaps', maybe 'bridges').

The logical metaspace, or metalogical space, or new logical space is still unknown, or is *not known appropriately*. It is not sure that it is equal to any recent logical space/spacetime hypothesis. It is not consequent from this, that others earlier, earlier in time or parallel to us, just now do not form the same or similar *meta-logical metaspace*. It is of no importance if one or many logical metaspace births, because none of the space-conceptions may differ from one another, if it is really thinking in unified metaspace, at the same time, each individual/person – partly as autonomous metaspace – creates a unique logical space. Because the logical space is simultaneously *creative and created* at all levels. The logical metaspace is necessarily unknown, because on the one hand there is not any linguistic expression or concept-set for that, we would like to talk about. On the other hand – just for this reason – we can hardly nominate what we would like to talk about. Neither in the case when we consider the logical space as *symbolical concept*.

There are many other reasons for the intellectual and factual dim. In the logical space, namely, there are simultaneously yes and no, and as a surprise there are joint yes/no positions, as well. Of course, the conceptual space is simultaneously time, and the space is not only four dimensional with the three or time, but n-number, so infinite dimensional (fractal, vector, etc.). Ludwig Wittgenstein – as the continuation of the logic of Aristotle – thought that each statements have to define the reality for *yes and no*. In our opinion, the logic, simplifying to yes and no, is valid only in the three dimensions of the physical reality of the logical space. The era of yes-no logic is over now and the basic logical status of the logical space is the *unified yes/no* again or now firstly.

In the last 100 years, the change of science has forced apart the logic, thinking in yes and no. Von Neumann introduced the third logical status, the possible. Then the post-copenhagen aspect brought two new positions, the *indefinite* (the unjustifiable) and the *meaningless* (which may be unjustifiable for ever?) So, for the third part of the XX. century the first step of *quantumlogic* had developed: (1) interpretable (yes, true, it is), (2) the non-interpretable (no, false, it is not), (3) interpretable/non-interpretable (yes/no, maybe), (4) non-interpretable (indefinite, noise, etc.). Under this, the new science may think in another way about the reality and consciousness, and about the different levels and dimensions thereof. The base and substance of logical metaspace (the unmanifestability itself) is the interpretable and non-interpretable logic. Which is already or yet uninterpreted, that *cannot be identified* with the non-interpretable by no means, what is more in the logical metaspace the indefinable for ever is theoretically impossible.

The science of logic has no limit anymore and there is only experimentally justifiable science. This is why, *there is no* separate science, separate religion, separate art or separate artificial intelligence anymore. In the new logical metaspace, accepted by us, we have to *exceed* the first state of quantumlogic. The logical system of the future: the *conceptual-linguistic sphere-space*, in which all logical status have n-number of logical positions, meanwhile the stable *truthes* are discoverable in the inner-outer top-points of the logical spherespace.

9. (The sphere-model of metaphilosophy)

The new science started then and with that, when it slightly turned out that the observer, the recognizer is not neutral. But the fright and solitude became final at this time, because from this time not only ourselves, personal consciousness-unconsciousness, but the new science is also finally unrecognizable and unjustifiable – under the logic of the statements, up till now. After long struggle and short triumphal, science is still there, where it was before chronology and *where it seperated* from other thinking forms, especially from theology. The euroatlantic science, which has successfully recognized many things, faced with the fact that the secure objectivity is lost again and so the recognizing process became unknown, as well. The turn of the Millenium: *the death* of science – and at the same time its never seen *horizon*?

Either we go deep into the quantumreality, or we take a look at the consciousness-unconsciousness, there is nothing objective seizable. The first and last shalter is the construction of the *logical metaspace*, where however are 'only' logical arguments instead of experimentally justified facts. Meanwhile natural science seems to remember: there is no reality, the reality is 'only' logical space. The logical space is a complex space: information space, conscious space, etc. It brings the totality of despair that the logical metaspace is also not objective, since it is the *part-element of our personality*. This is the point when it is very easy to be taken in the yes-no based logic of Aristotle: if classical science cannot be continued, then *do not continue* it (this no, is the non-interpretable). If instead of the old science there is a need for new science, then *let us make* it (which is interpretable, true, etc.), but in the interest thereof, we have to reject the no-yes logic. In the spirit of this – and this is a program already – let us unify classical science with the new science, in that way that we form a new, integrated logical metaspace. Let us start everything from the beginning and continue in the end, as we were really creators.

The greatest challenge is always that whether we are aware of some simple concepts and suspect the relations between them. If you guess the proper words and understand approximately their contents or suddenly – as you were enlightened – you get know them in a minute, collected them in system. We can openly state that we have been strongly feeling for decades that the searched knowledge is recognizable since the beginning, only the *linguistic-conceptual set* and the enlighting *recognition series* are lacking. We assume also that our

consciousness is joining (not only touching each other) with the universal transcendental consciousness, however we cannot automatically or necessarily raise these information to the level of waking consciousness.

We are not writing about ourselves, because we would like to raise our importance. Simply we *are the recognition itself*: we are continuing recognition with each other, or in other words there is no recognition without us. Theoretical physics has stated, not accidentally, for a hundred year that there is no *reality independent of the observer*. Or the so-called reality always flashes that actual image which is generated by the 'penetration' of the observer. Of course the problem is that we, as observers, do not know ourselves, as well, and we can get know the important things about us by what sort of form/soul we give for the outer world through our observation. So *the adventure is perfect*: first of all neither the inner ourselves, nor the outer world could not be declared, on the other side the relation between we and that something over ourselves (reality, consciousness, etc.) back and forth shows the reality-sight.

Neither state is good: it is not good, if we consider ourselves empty, as there would not be any thought or knowledge in us; as the same time it is also not so good, if the well known, routinely used thesis schemes and thought dogmas fill us. One is the state of an empty tube with a hole; the other is the state of an overflowed tube. To draft the logical space we have to clean ourselves. There is no other task than cleaning us of the learned schemes and dogmas – but how long? We are not talking clearly, maybe we do not have to clean, but we should push backwards the old schemes from the front of the consciousness and to create an open and free space for the new words, new sentences, new assumptions rising from the depth of consciousness. For this, of course, we have to understand that at different levels of the logical space, me/we are (and at the same time we are not) the logical space, simultaneously receptive, constructing and projecting space.

However, what we were at the moment of space creation, we would not be in the end of space construction. This means that what sort of logical space we considered ourselves, we create a different logical space in each intellectual creation. There is difference between the two spaces. If the new space is born, then because thereof we are transforming into *another space*. This process, of course, takes place in the state of the waking consciousness. So, necessarily we have to assume that in the unconsciousness we have already been, or this space has ever been possible for us. On the other hand we can not forget that the logical space, meaning /not meaning ourselves is flowing as a sponge, waving through into the common and infinite outer spaces, from which we are getting or asking for information impulses continuously or actually. So, thirdly – in an ideal case – we have to get in higher states of consciousness, where the existing and changing logical space-myself become visible-seizable, because the putting into sentences of sight brings the continuous birth and existence of logical space therewith.

This is the first intellectual creation of us, which we want to write as we were a sacral king (and at the same time as the last created being) who creates an *intellectual country or town*. This country: is ourselves, or we as logical space; but we create this country, new 'empire', or ourselves in the creation, however the space of the new intellectual creation (I repeat: as it were a real region, country, or town) is also logical space. At the same time this study and we, as well, are all the concentrate of the infinite universal-sacral space, what is more the ready creation - after its birth – is necessarily separated from us, becomes independent logical space, and so affecting it builds further the cosmic-transcendental space. In a book, each studies are independent logical spaces and in the book's inner world it exists as independent element. These different spaces simultaneously join and separate from each other, so it is a question how we interpret the dependence and independence thereof, and how we define the passage between the logical space levels and the space elements.

Let us face the – *old and new – dilemmas of the era*: is it possible to unify science and religion (what is more art as, well), or properly science theory, religion theory and art theory; or otherwise may the unification of different theory resources in common logical space result in metaphilosophy? We do not bother with the question and it does not irritate us that most of the sciences, originated from the European enlightenment, recently rejects all such themes and aspect systems, which is over the research of empirical reality. It is the sovereign right of everybody that how much and how he limits the logical space of him and his creations and what kind of knowledge domain he selects. It is a possibility to keep in a sort of vector-reality of science, it is possible to insist on other vector-realities of theology, and it is possible to be at home in the third kind of vector-reality of art. However, just leave if someone would like to exist alone in all vector reality and in all reality-infinity above and behind of vector-reality. Our task is to help nominating the metaspace, making it accessible, and uncovering as created and creating simultaneously.

In our opinion, this multidimensional and multivectorial logical space is the only possibility to exceed the state of knowledge and consciousness, perceived with pain and complaint in the last two thousand years. So it is absolutely understandable that we make much of the many thousand years old sacral ancient knowledges, B.C, the sciences which had begun before Christ and has reached a very high level for today and the theology of different religions, going back high in the past. These are three enormous intellectual rivers, which we let now flow in the only knowledge-ocean, and let undertake to search the common ocean. Anyway, it is *totally the same* what concept do we use for the joint and unified waters: those who come from science, call it new science or post-science, those who come from religions, call it new metaphysics or post-metaphysics, those who come from

the world of art, call it art-theory or post-philosophy of art. There is free option. We keep at the specific metatheory or at the wider metaphilosophy.

We wrote the last sentence as a *message for the world*, as we experienced it. This means attention-decrease and lack of concentration. So we switch off the concentration and we leave the attention to be spread. We contract and release, we vegetate on the lower level of the space and we switch off in the waking state of consciousness; we are in the logical space and there is logical space inside us, as well. The space-collective is silently pulsing within/without us. If we do not do anything conscious/wilful, the logical space is existing/not existing in a self-relative way.

The *system image* of the logical metaspace-theory, drafted by us, can be summarized. We plan and imagine such a *sphere model* for the description of the logical metaspace, where the exterior shell is not an edge surface, but the *infinity* and where the center is a point, which also spreads *infinity* inward.

This sphere is *simultaneously reality, simultaneously state of consciousness* and simultaneously symbol from two aspects, as well. If we look at this sphere from outside then we can see the *exterior reality/consciousness*. If we look at it from inside then we can perceive the *interior reality/consciousness* of man. The sphere, as geometrical body, can be structured. It means that the inner *levels* of the sphere, the *sphere slices* and the *vectors* inside the sphere can be separated. This sphere is of course not a simple standing, motionless, empty body, but a *moving-spinning space-group*, in its whole and interior unities. The sphere is a real logical metaspace, twisted meta-spacetime, where motion and change can be demonstrate with the help of the sphere-symbol.

On the one hand, this sphere structure is One-Sphere, on the other hand, it is many Spheres. If we look at the structure, the sphere-matrix, from outside, we can see the *five levels*.

(1) the human, (2) the natural, (3) the second 'natural', (4) the intellectual, (5) the divine reality and the consciousness. We can call the first as human, the second as physical and biological, the third as communal, social, the fourth as wisdom and knowledge, the fifth as divine and super-divine reality/consciousness.

If we look at the matrix from inside then there are beside each other: the personal physical-biological, spiritual, intellectual, social and divine reality/consciousness of the individual, which can be grouped into *five levels, five qualities*:

(1) personal physical-biological body, (2) personal soul, the interpersonal body, (3) personal communal-social (4) personal knowledge (5) personal divine and Super-divine reality/consciousness. Organized and displayed in the logical space, it is Complete and observing the components of the Whole as Whole it is unified in nature.

The sphere model, visioned by me, is very similar to that of Leo Schaya who regards it as the principal or ideal form of the cosmos. 'It is clearly spiritual, super-structure form: the prototype of the «World of Genesis» (Olam ha beria), which we can also call as: «the Sphere, in which there is everywhere center and it has no perimeter anywhere.», because there live Shekina alone, the infinite Omnipresence.'¹⁶ Then it continues: '...meanwhile in the field of principal Forms each point, which gather around the center, are simultaneously and secretly the Center itself: however there is only one center, in this center, however, in this sphere each point is a spiritual Archetype, immanent Aspect of God...' The sphere-model is simultaneously a geometrical sphere, superform sphere, a spiritual sphere.

From this, it is also following that if we observe the Whole as physical reality, the non-physical (or conscious) reality has to be seen in it, as well. If we are researching the Whole as intellectual or/and conscious reality, then the non-intellectual (material) reality has to be seen, as well in it. If we reveal the Whole as social reality, we also have to come off to the social non-material quality, to the social and super-social consciousness. So this not two, but *multidimensional matrix excludes* the basic mistakes. There are astounding conclusions: the philosophical work (as thought, personal and/or collective conscious product) is simultaneously physical reality and non-physical consciousness-quality; it is secondary that natural science is still not able to justify the physical-material (chemical-genetical) bearers of the thought. Or: if thought remains physical (matter, vibration, energy, code, etc), then we can reconstruct each personal or collective thoughts.

So what is the mental-logical *starting point*? What does Unity (advaita) in our case mean? What is That? What is the Unity of Is/Isn't? What is the common reality/consciousness? Our answer is that there are simultaneously reality and consciousness, which we do not give a common name, but we call it *reality/consciousness*. Two is One, uniform reality/consciousness, which is continuously transforming from one to the other. The passage between them is described by the holographic change, which is true only if there is physical-biological matter and there is non-physical, non-biological matter, or there is non-material consciousness. This does not exclude logically that matter is not matter inside and consciousness is not a material type of matter inside. This means logically that matter may transform into consciousness and vice versa. So, contrary to some physicists, we state that there is not only one-way holographic-change (from matter into

¹⁶ Leo Schaya: The man and the Absolutum according to Kabbalah (Arcticus Kiadó, 2002) pp 43. Originally: Leo Schaya, 1958: L'Homme et l'Absolu selon la Kabbale (Buchet/Chastel)

consciousness/intellect/God), but there is backwards, from God/intellect/consciousness into matter, which we can call genesis as well. In the logical space, there is no other possibility than creation, however, creation is not contrary to evolution, taking place at the lower level of the logical space.

So the problem is that only God, only (the absolut) consciousness or the proper (divine) man is able for this? So in the logical metaspace the point of man is seizable in that it has either a divine or similar opportunity – or it has at least potentially.

The prior answer series *can be an error*, as well, what is more, for different reasons: e.g. there is no reality, no consciousness, no reality/consciousness – there is something totally other thing. Or there is neither this other. Logically, there can be at least so much errors, or there are logically at least so much truths. The logical space is simultaneously true and not true, so the logical space is not closed space.

The answers, given to the real questions are, on the one hand, secrets, mysteries, miracles, on the other hand, they are mechanisms, processes, formulas, words. The observer cannot feel other than drafting the answers exceeds his normal ability, meanwhile behind the seemingly evident answers there are not yes/no realities and states of consciousness.

So, here are the questions, *firstly about the vertical structure*: Why do we assume the *four basic levels*? *What sort of relation-net* is between the four basic levels? *What are the passages* between the basic levels? *What sort of ability, preparedness* is necessary for passing the passages? Secondary, about the *horizontal structure*: Which has *priority* among the parallel spheres/sphere-layers? What kind of *relation-system* is between the parallel existing realities/levels? What kind of passes, passages are *existing or not existing*? How can man *get about or pass*, what does he win with it?

Some sample questions of the *basic dilemmas*: 1. the sphere-model is good or bad analogy, proper symbol or not. 2. if the logical space is not proper, then it is suggesting only stock phrases or neither of that. 3. If we cannot secede from the yes/no thinking, we cannot live to see anything? 4. If the sphere model is a good/perfect model, then such reality/consciousness will reveal which has been unknown or not understood (which has been undefined) yet. 5. If the undefined part became defined, then how can we control it.

In the face of all dilemmas, I *suggest* the sphere-model *to be accepted*. So we come off to that we have set as an aim: the drafting of a unified metaphilosophical theory. This is however not an empty logical frame, but it gives an *interpretation-frame* for the answering of all questions.

If, e.g. we would like to build up the complex DNA-model, then according to the sphere-model, there should be physical and post-physical, information or intellectual and conscious and/or transcendental levels, vectors of the DNA. The researches firstly decoded the physical coding elements of the DNA (the protein-coding genes), and the researches are now reached at the post-genetical level¹⁷ (fractal natured not coding elements, containing 'plan') thereof, because it is more likely that in the DNA, primarily, not the physical level is the important, but the *informational level*¹⁸, which we do not far understand according to our hypothesis. And the sphere-model gives out the 'white-spot', since science is still not researching it, however, it is likely that each DNA have a non-physical (intellectual or transcendental) pair, which may be discovered and justified decades later. The logical space *makes it* already *recognizable* now!

10. (The hypothesis of World and Consciousness Structure)

The logical metaspace is *intellectual-space and knowledge-space and consciousness space*, as well. So the sphere model, looking from outside, is the exterior world beyond the physical body, personality, consciousness of the man. The sphere-model has vertically and horizontally five-layers (which can be 4 or 6), as well. This five layers are: the sacral-reality/consciousness, the knowledge-reality/consciousness, the nature-reality/consciousness, the man, the individual reality/consciousness and the social-reality/consciousness. So the logical metaspace, planned by us, has four-level, looking from outside, it is simultaneously reality and consciousness. It is an old dilemma how the original old and possible today-tomorrow world structure should look like and how many stages or stairs should it have according to the metatheory. Finally, we decided that it should not contain of more than five levels or five sphere-stages, however, in all layers we determine lower and upper levels. So, e.g. we decomposed the nature-reality/consciousness into natural and the layer marking the second nature, since in the civilization of the Earth the man created the second natural reality/consciousness beside the original nature and at the expense of the original nature. Similarly, we display the sacral reality/-consciousness as two-layers, the lower level is the reality/consciousness of monotheism, and the superdivine level is denoted by the widest concept of Absolutum.

World structure 1. The levels of the exterior world

¹⁷ the new science (postgenetics) was born in Budapest, where the International Postgenetics Society was established www.junkdna.com/postgenetics

¹⁸ example for the new science, pointing beyond postgenetics: P.P. Gariaev, 1997: *Volnovoj Geneticskijj Kod* (Insztitut Problem Uprablenija RAN)

Number		(Meta)consciousness	(Meta)reality
1.	5.	Upper level: <i>Absolutum consciousness</i> Lower level: <i>God consciousness</i>	Upper level: <i>Absolutum</i> Lower level: <i>God</i>
2.	4.	Upper level: <i>wisdom consciousness</i> Lower level: <i>knowledge consciousness</i>	Upper level: <i>collective intellect, collective wisdom</i> Lower level: <i>knowledge</i>
3.	3.	Upper level: <i>consciousness of second nature and environment</i> Lower level: <i>consciousness of nature</i>	Upper level: <i>second nature (built nature and environment)</i> Lower level: <i>(first) nature</i>
4.	2.	Upper level: <i>personal consciousness</i> Lower level: <i>human unconsciousness</i>	Upper level: <i>personality</i> Lower level: <i>instinct-man</i>
5.	1.	Upper level: <i>social consciousness and unconsciousness</i> Lower level: <i>communal consciousness and unconsciousness</i>	Upper level: <i>global, continental, national, local society</i> Lower level: <i>community (family, tribe, etc)</i>

The external world is actually ten layered, but the meaning-differences are between the five basic-layers. If we observe this external reality *from above downward*, then this is not other than the way of creation, in which the Absolutum, with the help of God, firstly created the wisdom and knowledge, then with the help of them it finished the creation by establishing nature and human-community. The table strongly pictures that what is created at every level, is also two different qualities, on the one hand it is consciousness, on the other hand it is the change of consciousness-quality into material reality. If we observe this exterior world overhand, then this is not other than the system of being created, in the frame of which the intelligent, thinking being, the man, who created its own community and society was created from the lifeless matter and for this it tried to understand its wisdom and widen the knowledge.

In the end of the XX. century the human thinking is still embodying two poles. One group is still only rational matter-centered, experimentally justifiable, and sees a material world and determines the task of science in searching material-natural world. The other group – primarily continuing the traditions of religions – is observing the intellectual and sacral consciousness (or mainly). In the metaspace, created by us, both groups' *complete thinking spectrum* can be found: the material thinking covers the two lower levels of the outer world, meanwhile the intellect and/or god-centered thinking covers the two upper levels. The material-principled thinking is also indicated by that the outer world regards only the right side, the metaphilosophy as reality in the drafted system image of the table.

In the logical sphere this five basic levels are not only experiencable vertically and horizontally, but this five basic levels are representing more poles in the interior of the sphere and on the surface of the sphere. So the sphere has not only lower, upper and middle poles, but in the same form, it has western, eastern and middle poles. This is necessary, because the more basicpole-level inside the whole sphere has the same nature and form as the whole logical sphere. In other words, at every level and every pole the complete sphere can be found, only other elements are dominant and determinative. The logical metaspace is a very complex structure, which can be imagined that the sphere itself is the infinite sized bran, symbolizing the many universes, in which the five levels and the many poles are all brans and there are infinite number brans in each.

If we position in one or multiple center of the sphere, in the logical space – under the mentioned model – then we can see, understand and so we can releave the inner world and its structure. We immediately note that this inner world also contains of two logical scopes, the *metareality and metaconsciousness* since man is also natural and social body and intellectual and transcendent body. In this sphere model the impersonal absolutum or among others the personal wisdom – told by old aspect – is objected reality, meanwhile we can talk about not only personal god consciousness, but personal absolutum consciousness or beside the personal knowledge consciousness about the personal wisdom consciousness. The logical metaspace offers for all thinking system an independent place and by organizing them into a system, it determines the relations between them.

The metasphere structure, as inner world, can be described in a similar way, or can be shown geometrically.

World Structure 2. the levels of the interior world (world inside the man)

number		(meta)consciousness	(meta)reality
1.	5.	Upper level: <i>personal Absolutum consciousness</i> Lower level: <i>personal God-consciousness</i>	Upper level: <i>impersonal Absolutum</i> Lower level: <i>personal God</i>
2.	4.	Upper level: <i>personal wisdom consciousness</i> Lower level: <i>personal knowledge consciousness</i>	Upper level: <i>personal wisdom</i> Lower level: <i>personal knowledge</i>

3.	3.	Upper level: <i>personal cosmic consciousness</i> Lower level: <i>personal body-consciousness</i>	Upper level: <i>personal brain, mind</i> Lower level: <i>personal physical-biological body</i>
4.	2.	Upper level: <i>personal (self)consciousness</i> Lower level: <i>human unconsciousness</i>	Upper level: <i>personality (ego, me)</i> Lower level: <i>personal instinct, emotions</i>
5.	1.	Upper level: <i>personal social consciousness</i> Lower level: <i>personal mental-consciousness</i>	Upper level: <i>personal communal soul (ancient soul, collective soul)</i> Lower level: <i>personal soul</i>

The interior world – similar to the exterior world – distinguishes five basic layers, which are the mirror-realities and mirror-consciousness of the exterior world's basic layers and it is true vice versa, so in this logical metaspace there is continuous synchronicity and asynchronicity between the outer and inner world. The secret is the same here, as well: what sort of passages are between the two worlds and which passage and how does the individual use? All perceiver and observer may decide under its philosophy that from which position of the system he observes the uniform outer and inner world (layer, factor, dimension). And according to this all philosophy (see objective idealism, subjective idealism, objective materialism, subjective materialism, etc.) have grounds, but the logical system spectacularly certifies that none of them is the whole and each aspect-system see only the limited number dimensions or layers from the logical space.

In this special structured, odd shaped logical sphere-model there are simultaneously *various stairs* (or using another metaphor: round). One is connecting the outer and inner infinity, the other makes the transport possible between the upper and lower layers. The structure is not only symbolizing what was the way of creation and evolution, but it also symbolizes what continuous inner vibration, fluctuation, waving or stairs-walking it has to fulfill. The logical sphere space is necessarily timespace, as well, it is multityped timespace, because the spherelayers and spherepoles express different time-structure. The chronology of the Earth is interpretable only at the two lower levels of the outer world. In the logical metaspace, exceeding the rules of geometry, the world structure and the human complex and also structured reality/consciousness thereof are thematically definable.

So the sphere-model simultaneously introduces and symbolizes the logical space and the metatheory and the structure and net of the metaphilosophy.

Post script: Muzsnai László, a nowadays already unknown philosopher/theologist tried to draft metatheory, unifying the inner and outer world structure –more than 60 years ago.¹⁹ Some summarizing citation: 'The basic and the topwisdom can be sum up in a system. For the modern wisdoms: for Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, Kant was it one of the most secret desires. This wisdom, which has to be formed, will be depicted by the top pyramid, built on a square basis.'²⁰ According to this experiment the western science-conception has failed. Because beside the traditional Aristotle logic and metaphysics there is possible to be another more universal, more peculiar and more general logic and metaphysics.' 'By this, we tried to conciliate Aristotle's realism with nominalism, and the modern realism with idealism. We tried further to set down the substance-relation of the initial principal of the human and divine ego.' 'By this, we tried to conciliate naturalism with spiritualism, the humanism with divinism, and the objectivism with subjectivism. The common logical structure of human and divine ego and the fine conciliate philosophy with theology.'

Today we would not draft the aims in the same way and we would not appreciate the done work and it is possible that we would not change the sphere-model into top pyramid-model, built on square basis. However, the intellectual way of Muzsnai Zoltán (and others) can be continued. The new science, the new philosophy, the new metaphysics and of course the new logic *is more possible, today*.

11. (In the end, some sentence about the personal story)

Maybe there is something special about it that the contour of the new typed thinking and philosophy: metatheory and metaphilosophy was born in Middle-Europe, in Hungary, in the intellectually most limited era (from the 50s till the end of the 90s).²¹

We are now at that point, where we *had to start*. In the middle or in the end of the 60s, but there and then we had failed. Maybe the opportunity itself is assumable later and only logically. In the new millenium, however we have the chance for the first time that we can draft the theoretical (and post-theoretical) system²², at the same time systemlessness, or unified wholeness theory, space theory, which we have been looking for for 40-

¹⁹ Muzsnai László, 1943: Hungarian metaphysics and logic. (Budapest) If the auther had not been hungarian, or at least he had written his book in hungarian, he would be a world-famous philosopher at that time or since then. He was ahead of his time.

²⁰ the same pp24.

²¹ Metatheory, metaphilosophy, 2005, edited: Varga Csaba (Stratégia kutató Intézet, 2006)

²² new thinking? New paradigm? New knowledge? New consciousness quality?

50 years long.²³ Sometimes we put into brackets the thinking- and enlightenment researches because of other tasks, mainly local mock-tasks. Personally we have been experienced for 40 years, so this is why we know it, that our own mind and consciousness – without influencing it – is operating in such way that it would like to put together the whole. Or it is continuously building hierarchical and/or net logical system and always concentrate on the top principals, top concepts.

Why is it or may be successful only *from now*?

1. For decades we had not said publicly, but we were aware of that *we cannot (or just partially want to) periodically identify* with the *agespirit*, which started in the XX century and is *still existing*, especially with the middle-european and hungarian actual intellectual establishment. This did not cause exterior scandal, but we had to live the scandal inside.

2. Under the limited intellectual glass bell, however there were *vestigial, partial blooming*, or at least grew some *new and provokating intellectual shoots* – as compared to the low horizon of the era. We celebrated it, but the general lack of knowledge remained. The seemingly most accidental event-series was that we had not get a permanent labour relation and we would not have been let into such role, where we could have subverted the actual intellectual – ideological quasi-saint – clima. However this intervening-changing experiment *could have deteriorated or blinded* us, as well. (the upper ones did not protect us, but rejection made us protected.) The home local rootlessness and groundlessness was the precondition of the appearance of the require of root creation and of the experiment of new ground building, which in a paradox way caused in the same way – consequence natured - *new rootlessness and groundlessness* emotionally-mentally.

Go further: 3. the second part of the XX century was a beautiful ear: the socialist party state was run down in the orgy of the ideological constructions, which however – partially in the collective consciousness, partially in the common knowledge – started *wide deconstructions*. (Maybe the half-global soviet empire had got by earlier the deconstructive intellectual state of post-modernism than the society of the developed North?) Because of the prior and then existing aspect system's self-destructive and self-destroying state, it was not too exciting, attractive for us, or causing intellectual noise the questioning of the *political or intellectual great stories*. We have experienced that Hngary sometimes dip head over ears into the invalidations of self-giving up and into the rejection of the limited acting opportunities, as well ('we can do nothing'). We (ourselves) were questioned, for a long we were questioned hopelessly. But this was a beneficial paradox, because we not only questioned the era, but ourselves as well.

4. So the meticulous and systematized publication of the deconstructions seemed quite boring, but emotionally it was tension reducer. So seemingly there was only one normal alternative: *to turn back*. Yesterday and today, as well, turn back on the present hen-house, on the intellectual dogmas and at the same time try to jump *in front of the future*- so elegante, isn't it. The silly future vision was the periodical present vision, because it wanted to mask the not existing false present state into future and true, which also seemed false and impossible ('the existing socialism making into anthropoid', then 'accomplishment of the democracy and freedom of the change of 1989'). The future researcher *quantum jump* has become a second alternative, so this attitude was typical for us, as well. We thought there is no other way than *constructing utopia*.

5. The key momentum and changing momentum, at the same time, was necessarily the following: not only the local, but many *leader half-global, power-centered thinking-horizon* of the 70s and 80s and the rejection of *thinking method* and the *realization of rejection*. Later the 90s had not brought changes: instead of the statecapitalist state the capitalist state was established and instead of the socialist democracy we vainly wated for the *participative democracy*. The bankruptcy of present offered us the alternatives of future on tray.

Periodically, either like a bolt from the blue, or in the frame of intellectual evolution running in spiral realized in us that we are *often not thinking in that way than the others*. Not in the way, what the preferred *agespirit(s) are dictating*. Not that way, what most science after european enlightenment thought right. Not in that way as many professional scientist did; here the eminent scientist often was slured with the politically managed quasi-scientist. Not that way as almost everyone accepted²⁴ the ruling dogmas. This realized gradually in us, or

²³ we are consciously using 1st person plural instead of 1st person singular. With this we would like to keep distance from ourselves and make the personal character more secondary. We try to shift off anything which refer to our importance. (And finally, according to the quantumpsychology the individual is always consists of more person-personality, so the plural is not only reasonable, but may be compulsory, as well.

²⁴ Note: From this it does not follow automatically or perforce, that the thinking, represented by us, is better or true. This is only the registration of the situation.

we can also say that the recognition *went into our heart*²⁵ that we have to deal with the convictions²⁷ – 'built on connections'²⁶ – rooted in our heart and consciousness and not with the rational study of the knowledge-thinking.

The starting point of the attitude, chosen by us, was the *realization of the lack of logical space* and so the substance of our future vision cannot be other than the *continuous searching* of the integrated logical space. But, Hungary's knowledge and collective consciousness history was and is full of with autonom (humiliated many times) philosophers, who meanwhile inspired us virtually or/and personally. The political-ideological system, strengthening the intellectual limits tried to cripple all enemies not directly physically, but mentally-spiritually or existentially or conserve in an unstable state. Those who survived, they got *hidden freedom*. Then they had to be careful not to cripple mentally-spiritually in the throw away of the hungarian and eastern-european change of system. Finally we were not burnt into the lovely, but often bulldozed, riven, offended era. We remained as an acting witness.

The hidden freedom is pushing through as *public theories* from the dimness. The knowledge could and cannot be taken away anymore after which we had to rise in the new state of consciousness. So *this is the way and reason* of the birth of metaphilosophy.

Important literature

1. Brain and consciousness, 2002, edited: Vizi E., Szilveszter, - Altrichter, Ferenc, - Nyíri, Kristóf, - Pléh, Csaba (BIP)
2. Revolution of consciousness, conservation of Grof, Stanislaw, László, Ervin and Russel, Peter (Új Paradigma, 1999)
3. From perceiving to language, 2004, edited Pléh, Csaba, - Kampis, György, - Csányi, Vilmos (Gondolat,
4. Behe, Michael, 1996: Darwin's Black Box, Free Press (publisher)
5. Berger, Peter L. - Luckmann, Thomas, 1998: Social structure of reality. knowledgesocial dissertation. (Jószöveg Műhely Kiadó)
6. Capra, Fritjof, 1996: The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems (New York: Anchor Books)
7. Capra, Fritjof, 2004: The Hidden Connections (Anchor Books/Doubleday)
8. Cousins, E. ed., 1985, World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of the Religious Quest, 1-25 vols, (Crossroad, New York,)
9. Dienes, István, 2007: The living hologram; a new approach to the Theory of Everything, the basis of a new physics (Stratégia Kutató Intézet, Megjelenik: 2008-ban)
10. Frank, Szemjon L., 2005: Intellectual basis of Society (Kairosz)
11. Green, Brian, 2003: The Elegant Universum (Norton, W.W. & Company)
12. Green, Brian, 2004: The Fabric of the Cosmos (Knopf Publishing)
13. Grof, Stanislaw, 2000: Psychology of the Future (State University of New York Press)
14. Hawking, Stephen W, , 2003: The Theory of Everything (New Millennium Press); In Hungarian: S. W. Hawking: A mindenség elmélete (Kossuth, Budapest, 2005)
15. Jäger, Willigis, 2000: Hullámaiban a tenger (Editio M Kiadói kft. 2001)
16. Kaku, Michio, 1995: Hyperspace (Anchor Books)
17. Kaku, Michio, 2004: Parallel Worlds (Hardcover)
18. Kaku, Michio, 1998: Visions (Anchor Books)
19. Kiss, Endre, 2005: Hungary and globalization (Kodolányi)
20. Lewis, L. E., 2004: Our superstring Universe (iUniverse.com)
21. Liptay, Lothar, 2005: Odyssey of Absolutum in the buddhism (Kalligram, Pozsony)
22. Penrose, Roger, - Shimony, Abney, - Cartwright, Nancy - Hawking, Stephen, 1997: The Large, the Small and the Human Mind; (In Hungarian: A nagy, a kicsi és az emberi elme, Akkord Kiadó, 2003)
23. Penrose, Roger, 2006: The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe
24. Philosophy of Mind, 2002, Chalmers, David J. (Oxford University Press)
25. Pléh, Csaba, 1998: Introduction to recognition-science (Typotex, Budapest)
26. Popper, Karl, 1998: Body and mind (Typotex, Budapest),
27. Ratzsch, Del, 1999: Science & Its Limits: The Natural Sciences in Christian Perspective (Intervarsity Press; In Hungarian: Del Ratzsch: Miből lesz a tudomány? (Harmat, Budapest, 2002)
28. Ricoeur, Paul – LaCocque, Andre, 1998: Penser la Bible (Éditions de Seuil); In Hungarian: P. Ricoeur . A. LaCocque: Bibliai gondolkodás (Európa, 2003)
29. Sadar, Ziauddin: Thomas Kuhn and the Science Wars (Icon Books, Ltd.); In Hungarian: Ziauddin Sardar: Thomas Kuhn és a tudomány-háborúk (Alexandra, Pécs, 2003)

²⁵ Georges Vajda: Researches of philosophy and Kabbalah in the middle-age jew thinking, Logos Kiadó, 2000, pp 44. 15. Original edition: Georges Vajda, 1962: Recherches sur la philosophie et la Kabbale dans la pensée juive du Moyen Age (Mouton&Co, Paris-La Haye)

²⁷ such conviction is: the unified philosophical-theological model, or the conception of absolutum exceeding the concept of God, or the consciousness- and knowledge centered future vision

²⁶ the same

30. Science and The Primacy of Consciousness, editor: Richard L. Amoroso, etc.(Noetic Press, 2000)
31. Szász, Ilma, 1997: Shadow of the living light (Köröspatak, Budapest)
32. Schuon, Frithjof, 2005: Transcendent unity of religions (Kvintesszencia Kiadó)
33. Varga, Csaba, 2004: Before new theory horizons (Tertia, Budapest)
34. Walsh, Roger (Foreword), Wilber, Ken, 2005: A Sociable God: Toward a New Understanding of Religion (Shambala)
35. Whitehead, Alfred North, 1929: Progress and reality (Gifford lectures), In Hungarian: Whitehead, Alfred North: Folyamat és valóság (Typotex Kiadó, 2001)
36. Wilber, Ken: A Brief History of Everything (Shambala); In Hungarian: Ken Wilber: A Működő Szellem rövid története, Európa, Budapest, 2003)
37. Wilber, Ken, 2000: A History of Everything (Shambala);
38. Wilson, Robert Anton, 1999: Quantum Psychology; In Hungarian: Kvantum pszichológia (Mandala-Véda, Budakeszi, 2002)
39. Wolfram, Stephen, 2002: A New Kind of Science (Wolfram Media, Inc.)
40. World, Kenneth, 2004: The Quantum World (Harvard University Press)