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(extract)
Meaning from within (The laws of its form)

An approach towards an identity of meaning cannot be completed successfully based simply on social systems. Social systems are products of meaning and meaning producers in the form of semantics: but the individuality and the functioning of a psychic system is a necessary environment for the formation of every level of systems of meaning, social and individual.

Social systems prepare the semantics for life’s conduits. In general, such grounds are supposed to be universal: but gradually society is sliding from a supposed unity of that universality to a unity of the functioning of singularities. The continual changes of order in society, from hierarchical to functional, have brought the view that “…the basic semantic terms used to describe either society or time underwent a radical change during the second half of 18th century”

It is curious to observe that the same individuality of psychic system plays a role in the formation of different levels of system and functions as an element of a system or its environment; in the cybernetics of self-referential orders, for autopoiesis, it plays a role as information and communication, as contributor to the maintenance of social systems, as a partially declined subject interfering in another potential system and, overall, as a phenomenological unity in its completeness of the spectrum from consciousness to the absence of consciousness.

Social systems and communication can realize the transmission of meaning, but only partially. The world of meaning is bigger than the world of articulated or socially signified meaning. Meaning is the fundamental source of communication and information. But communication at
a high level remains a system that reproduces by means of communication and that gives probability to complete communication by endless coding, as Husserl has dreamed.

The “I” system or any social system, uses “the other” in every level of communication as its environment; and it uses a principle that environments are constituted with secondary importance at every level of meaning. Paradoxically this is often true even for a body regarding its own mind. “In other words the theoretical approach used here proposes to abandon such guiding principles as humankind, the human species, the norms of rational life style, or the tools of the intellectual history of human life and replaces them by a differentiation between system and environment.”

Distinction and differentiation are the basis of the orientation of meaning. The relationship with the system environment is the relevance between one’s own difference and the distinctive orientation in meaning via intentionality in what is probable between improbability, for meaning selection and decision making. All this happens in the context of laws in the world of meaning. This means that we are mentally made and directed not of any special matter than social semantics, improved and proved in our experience of life. “We love and suffer regarding to cultural imperatives genesis of a particular discourse!”

Systems, including the individuality of a psychic system, are able to combine their autonomy which is based on specific functions. They operate simultaneously as closed and open systems. Self reference of the individuality of the psychic system is the basis for every kind system formation and operation. Self reference operates at different levels in the systems, and is connected in function by systems in that dedicated manner which makes this reference valuable for the systems, and vice versa: - valuable for its self with reference to expectations. With adaption of functional differentiation persons can no longer be completely located into one single subsystem of society, and society does not covers this happening. The delusion of expectations brings new requirements of meaning, something which changes latencies and beliefs. The integration of self reference between its orientation and social perspectives opens a new insight into discourse analyses. “A shift occurs in the pivotal point from which complexes of meaning direct actions, so that as long as the conceptual resources are reach enough…”.
A special role is known to love and intimacy for transpire of new meaning: Love composes a symbolic code for the improbable. Love and intimacy are forms of transcendence within individual systems. Intimacy prepares conditions for an expanding code. Conditions to copy the code rather to change it are those normally inherited by society for communication. Love supersedes such conditions. It enriches and deliberate self reference.

Self reference is a constituent engine of every act of meaning in the context of life. Meaning appears formal in content as well as in the forms it comes from. Signs, thoughts and other communication media work to create meaning and transcend it. But once that meaning is created, it sustains and increases in meaningful ways, by reflexivity and intuition, beyond communication media structures or signs. But, yes, always with relevance to social meaning.

Findings:

1. The individual’s psychic system or self-referencing becomes meaning.
2. The process of meaning and the world of meaning become meaning.
3. The difference between self and other environments (self or not self-referential) is given in the form of meaning.
4. The difference between self and the totality of the world is given in the form of meaning.

Environments are given in the form of meaning, which virtually means that boundaries are confined internally and externally as meaning. All this structure is virtual and formal. We accept that meaning is a formal construction from within and from outside. We can relate to the laws of form in order to analyze characteristics of meaning with a significant intensification of orderliness:

**Characteristics of meaning:**

1. Meaning has an element of unrest within it.
2. Meaning forces itself to change.
3. Meaning can be seen also as a process, as flux, or motion.

4. Meaning use its differences for connective information processing to other differences, which always leads to meaning.

5. Meaning figures out potentialities and expectations, thus making time and space a reality of meaning.


7. Meaning is indicated by signs but in itself is an indicator and performer for that force which is called significance.

“The meaning specific strategy of absorbing and processing its own stability seems to reside in the use of the difference for connective information processing”

This includes the use of itself as difference from the world.

Meaning is the continual actualization of potentialities. But these potentialities are those which meaning can grasp. Potentialities are selected and formed by meaning, given in the form of meaning. The content of meaning is in form not in essence. Essence is historical. So we can treat meaning as a form and detect its laws by the theory of form.

Referring to Spencer Brown’s theory of forms, we can treat meaning as a form for form formation, always in meaning relation forms, for the processing of meaning, a vibrant phenomenon.

Forms of meaning are educated by social semantics (forms of interpretation of acts and forms). A semantic is a demonstration, an expression, a display, an abstracted conclusion from some experiences, taken for granted without verification in every case once its use has been agreed.

“An expression (demonstration) rests in a finite number of steps”.

We need to confine its application (function) to any given level of consideration. Because meaning can be meaning only as the difference between what is actual in any moment and a horizon of possibilities, every actualization also leads to virtualization of potentialities that
could be connected up with it, and except at the moment of happening, every other use in the form of rule or repetition means a loss of adequacy with its initial position compared, or reality. Meaning appears unstable, even in the moment of its conception. Its actuality must arise from its own instability, and this is called the transpiring of meaning. Temporal displacement of meaning is the displacement of forms of meaning in the processing of them. The processing of meaning is possible by distinction and indication. Distinction is form of differentiation within self reference. Indication is a call to point out, to point to a difference. The processing of meaning through distinction and indication can be taken as a Form coming out from forms’ motion. Forms of meaning are parts of the space shaped by the sides of distinctions. This is the visualization of meaning; but, in its space, meaning appears shaky and unstable. Signals or indications come within the sphere of meaning as intent. (Something is intended; an aim or purpose, in a state of one's mind, at the time one carries out an action or reflection or...) The use of the signal of a certain limited length makes the boundary of its use. The use cannot be unlimited, because this makes the structure impossible. Structure takes its form from the limitation in form of its boundaries. Behind these boundaries other uses are not allowed. Perhaps behind this zone, is the sphere of negation. The space within the boundaries is the content of meaning (meaning width, or space). There is also meaning' dimension, which shows how much the same meaning is spread across society. Many people may share the same opinion.
The space of meaning within the same individuality psychic system is the space of its meaning within it. This inner content is a form which is distinct from other forms of meaning into other individualities of psychic systems. For all these forms we try to have, and of course we have (partially), signs for communication, as equivalent marks for meaning.

The signs and semantics work for name arrangements, expressions, values of expressions, and expressions of the same value, which by sameness give instinctions (semantics), and so on: the arrangements determining the occurrences of new meanings.

**Processes are employed here as substantial, but they are formal:**

1. Condensation--to rejection as negation.
2. Confirmation- as equivalence (sameness) of any expression.
3. Cancellation –as negated possibilities.
4. Compensation- as gaining for what is cancelled.
5. The result- form of pure statistical happening of the sameness: shifts order.

This means that order is created by statistical happenings of the same observable fact, the same condensation and rejection, the same thinking directed to acting, to gain some compensation for what we have canceled as the possibility of a happening, in the initial agreement.

Condensation is associated with expansion of awareness: it means of the same form of thinking. The expansion of awareness comes as an expansion of a rule -“*Forms of reference must grow to accommodate rules*”\(^7\). This expansion creates a social dimension of meaning, by creating norms, rules, which in space is the same form of thinking, called equivalence thinking.

**A rule saves the convention of an attention (thought).**

This saving in itself is the saving of a condition of meaning (it is how meaning becomes sustainable and universal).
The saving of meaning is the saving of accessibility to the world of meaning. (This accessibility is connected with accessibility in belongings and relations, in systems which are either self referential or non- self referential).

The accessibility to the world of meaning makes possible the autopoietic reproduction of horizons of meaning, self reference and consciousness: but this is not the final purpose of meaning. Meaning thrives for meaning, and this is the essence of its nature, freeing itself from itself, with another itself.

All these processes suppose accounts and calculations within a system of meaning or a self referential system; it is not simply a processing of signs, but process of spatiality via virtual occurrence, in calculated forms for calculation of new forms, for form-forming.

Calculation is a procedure by which, as a consequence of steps, a structure (form of meaning) is changed to another.

The conventions to which we refer to calculate our positions of meaning are called calculus. (Noema-noesis relationship, by Husserl’ theory, while Dilthey goes on with theory of reflexivity, rejecting any ready cliché existence in consciousness…and Luhmann goes on with self reference theory and reflexivity in adapting to complexity, always of meaning reference).

The initial calculus (reference) can be considered like a belief or like an authentic sign or semantic we use to understand the world. Initial forms serve as initial shape for form-forming, which we take via learning. These semantics prepared and ordered by society equip us with the calculus of order for ordering. Semantics are algebraic forms of description of the world in words. They are assumed true, whilst not meaning they need to be proved as true in every folder of human experience. Their proof is supposed in the initial proof, the conditions of which are forgotten, form of which are inherited.

It is possible to distinguish the elements of meaning by proceeding in mathematical steps. It goes from number to order. But can also go from order to number (as a negative experience), from what is common to what is individual, from what is calculable, to what is to be cancelled...because seems incalculable...or unfamiliar.
So calculus of indication that are simply singular, not yet universalized by language (are not universal forms of meaning but very specific) are indications for a new order, not simply aberration or abnormality as we might easily think.

Order supposes a degree of numbers of the same calculus which can correspond to a majority contrary to the minor opposite meaning for the same calculus. So, there, the line of what is good or bad, negating or positing (negation or positive) is a question of resonance: the specific calculus to a degree of numbers resonance, can turn in order. (This question of degree in numbers comes in the form of principles and values when order comes in view.) Taken as essential by holders, an outlook brings into view its simply formal and statistical structure.

So, the forms of expression (language happening for meaning) suppose a quantity or number behind them of the same possible expression (communication), without which expression cannot happen.

Here language, communication, emerges as a force (numerically represented). The depth of space of meaning can bring it into significance, via language, or can keep it in insignificance, via time, by the pressure of what is signified as a reality of other calculus in a higher degree or lesser degree numbers resonated or, if not so, kept by power.

We come to the conclusion that language and communication cannot cover the whole space of meaning. Certain propositions arise from this conclusion:

1. Meaning can stay without signs.
2. Meaning is partially expressed by signs.
3. Meaning can be contained or denied by a sign(container).
4. The depth (dimension) of meaning is the calculus resonance of meaning in numerical form (social resonance).
5. Meaning’ resonance is the social dimension of meaning.
6. The social dimension of meaning is temporal and historical.
7. Reference to past meaning is to refer its past social dimension.
8. There is no meaning outside meaning, outside reference to a social dimension.
9. The unexpressed meaning is a construction not successful for communication; potentiality it may indicate a new optional order.
10. Order is what is included systematically, by exclusion.
11. The repetition of what is included does not mean that the excluded world has no information.
12. On the contrary it is supposed that at the system level, in social systems, this is the only information.
13. Semantics cannot prove the failure of what is excluded, except in the form of sanction.
14. Sanctioning cannot explain the premises of excluded happenings.

From order comes dominance, and from dominance a positive order is sustained. Agreement is expression of such order in conventions (semantics). Coming as an initial social phenomenon, conventions work for distinction and the ordering of values.

**Consequences from conventions:**

1. The subject is not simply a calculus machine.
2. That is because there is space in every self-referential subject for another calculus.
3. Out of what is dominant and universal comes the calculus which is also calculus elsewhere.

Every one of us is equipped with a rational coefficient (calculus out of calculus); and for every reasonable act (resonant or universal expression or calculus or common meaning) there is an individual ratio.

The semantic (algebraic) consideration in the form of a calculus of indications is a guide to further distinctions between expressions. Expression is the market state of the integral (connection). When expression does not mark states it is disintegrated (disconnected). When expression is disintegrated, communication and understanding become a problem.
Expression of a state resulting on states of their unknown indicators may be called consequential. The process of applying meaning for such state: Consequential expressions.

How can consequential expressions integrate with one another?

**Theorem of the second order**

Meaning has a complex structure. Variables of it manifest themselves sometimes in common forms, sometimes in unique forms. The space of meaning can indentified as a deep space or a shallow one. Depth or shallowness are not questions of essence, but become like that because of the depth or shallow of their space, the space of meaning, which is simply social resonance.

We consider cases in which a variable of meaning is generated in space deeper than the space of variable origin. This is the spread of meaning (space deep, space shallow), so that a meaning is acceptable not by the nature of its variable, but by its extent.

The shallow space is a deviance or second intended order, whereas the deep spread of meaning is its first order. The first order can lose contact with the second order via semantics and law and power.

Conflict of language with meaning, into expression, can be seen as a conflict of order keeping boundaries between the first and second order.

**Re entering of two orders**

Since we accept values and conventions via meaning, we agree that consequences are acceptable also.

These consequences are primary arithmetic for a new order calculus, other thinking, other ordering, other order.
"All we need to show is that follows from them". It follows from what we accept as principles and convections. Repetitions of deviances coming from agreed constraints cannot be within the same system of reference and premises of analysis, or, to express it differently, with the same logic reference (meaning reference) by which we describe them. They come from another orientation, another premise and system of logic references.

The marked state of deviation (variable) of meaning needs a new expression to be followed. But our expressions are more or less statements about grounds of meaning on which we have chosen to reside. To be able to follow such an expression depends on the relevance of what is assumed can be expressed by meaning (communication).

When we cannot express such a value, we try to discount it in expression or to cover it with a tautological value. The ignoring of a variable meaning is not simply the loss of a variable, but potentially the defeat to develop meaning in more than a variable, a potential space denied.

“Irrelevance of variables other than one we have fixed precisely, it may not at first be obvious that we can ignore the possible values of the other variables, but the supposition is in fact justified in all instances ....”

Turning back to “tautologies” they are defined as:

1. “Needless repetition of the same sense in different words; redundancy. An instance of such repetition: -

2. Logic. An empty or vacuous statement composed of simpler statements in a fashion that makes it logically true whether the simpler statements are factually true or false; for example, the statement.

3. It seems that communication is possible only with the help of tautologies which cover those empty representations of meaning in the point of implication". Communication is possible with tautologies. They work as logical covers for those variables of meaning we want do detach from the lack of freedom of expression or any reason else. It is scary to think that the most aberrant expression can work one day as tautology.
The Bridge

The space of meaning is opaque (dense) and transparent. Opacity or transparency of meaning is determined by the possibility of connectivity for communication. The space within (subject space) is opaque. The fact that the variable of this space oscillates to its meaning, by trying to make it transparent, assigns the transmitting tendency of meaning, for meaning-to-meaning connectivity. Connectivity requires conditions for happening.

“The principles of transmission as a self-transmission ask for certain conditions.” 11. These conditions for meaning transmitting are not simply individual, except when formally so. The question of a bridge is the question of initial structures. Initial structure of meaning cannot be out of existent structures. This bridge connects individual with social meaning. Every act of meaning connection is a set up on communication. The transmission of meaning is a space transmission in the form of application (proposal). Opacity of meaning, “un-transmission”, is a space carried within self reference, which calls for applications.

The blocked chunks of this space in different degree of its density can have implications for the health of carrier, or meaning system (self reference of individual psychic system). The carrier itself is a condition (element) for other systems of order of meaning. The carrier has a twofold function: individual and social. The disorder of carrier it is an indication. It reveals the implication by order.
Completeness of meaning

Meaning enclose its initials. Initials of meaning convened, carry no variables. These initials or primitives are the primary or the initial agreement contents of no variables, since they express the real moment of convention. But this is how it is socially. Initials in the individuals’ life live as beliefs or forms of truths in which a self-referential system (psychic system) believes, is principally oriented. Otherwise they may be called premises for further meaning proceeding.

Any applied consequence must indicate an arrangement derived from a set-up (convention). Consequences must represent properties of a totality. Consequences cannot be seen as a substance of nonentity. Consequences are part of completeness. Completeness is not only what is approved, but also what results, positively or negatively, from what is approved.

Conditions of completeness, demonstrability of meaning, when variables hold the same positive value, make the space of positivity (Positive Law or meaning). Meaning requires conditions to complete itself, to make sense, to be part of order.

Except deviation there are also variables with live simply in memory, with no correspondence in occurring reality of meaning, they represent a convention that does not work anymore. Their life is simply in language, as a memory, without response to actuality. This is language with no connotation, as we may find connotation, meaning, with no correspondence in language. The completeness of meaning is not possible other than in the form of self-references. But here the problem of continuity of meaning emerges in the form of contingency to the “other” for meaning continuity, which implies individual self-reference with communication and social system arrangement.

Independence

The sphere of meaning (self-reference) intends independence. Independence happens when no opposed demonstration (representation) can happen by “the other” for the same space of meaning.
We may say that independence of meaning is a pure totality or completeness, an ideal sphere of being, where the meaning system is free from meaning: it turns it in being (between thinking and being there is no contradiction; they are unified, so there is no determination as a weight of mind).

This is a perfect reality: the force of meaning appears free from any resistance to any other meaning forces. (This means that no consequence is discernible).

If one variable determines the only change allowed, it follows from the convention of intention that: no expression other than that of form (initial) can be put into or taken out of any space of meaning. Separately from the possibility of expression, examination reveals no way of eliminating any distinct variable (distinct space of meaning).

But this is ideal (at one moment in time) a possible expression, since the system references of meaning are always in discordance with empirical experience. The world of meaning is bigger than the world meant or language.

M (meaning) is what is intended (meant): but M* is what really is in the world of the happening of meaning, experience. We see, in such cases, that the theorems of representation (and every piece of metaphysics) no longer hold true, since the value of M is not provable in every case, where M is the initial system of meaning.

**Indeterminacy**

The rule of expression (concealment, or disguise, is the antonym of this term) is the rule of dominance “*a guiding principle by which we can still find our way.*”

We are denied by semantics (meanings) of referring in our deviation, in our iniquity or negative decline; we prove a denied procedure outlined in referring to our weakness. We cannot find a procedure to confirm a demonstration of any such exceptions (each is a unique case).

Our form of meaning finds no response in the meaning form as it is determined. “... *The excursion to the infinite procedure has denied us our former access to a complete knowledge of*
where we are in the form. Hence it was necessary to extract, before departing, the rule of demonstration, for this now becomes, with the rules of dominance, a guiding principle by which, we can still find our way.”

As we can grasp now, our form of thinking takes part in a quoting of being, which is a partial social system quotation in our thinking, whose picture as a completeness we cannot see: but the communication (social system) cannot see ours, and it must be “a third eye” to see the completeness happening, if possible.

Crisis can be seen as a loss of connectivity with what happens in reality of meaning. Meanwhile self reference requires continuity From here derives a necessity for envisaging form in language, to bring into the world the imaginary states, information and communication. Imaginary states are chunks of meaning in the enquiry into expression. Behind this unspoken ordered meaning is a physical tension (a force) which asks for significance (expression).

**Imaginary state**

The world represented by semantics does not guarantee a connection with every case of individual experience. We have lost the connection with cases of every experience in the space of meaning, since we use codes. We represent states envisaged. But we are in a state of pregnancy of new images by our surprising experience of relations.

The existing form of representation (what we know) must allow the imaginary forms to be envisaged. But also it must allow them to have a solution representing an imaginary state, not hitherto envisaged as a form. This creates the motion of thinking to strive for language.

Language appears with a delay to visualizing forms of meaning. We envisage meaning despite this the fact. This envisaging happens in the space of self reference. The allocation of new forms of self reference, outside communication, is considered “time” by a focus of forms for form formation or significance, in suspense.
In the concept of imminent meaning, this is pure new space, carried internally, yet not signified.

This time delay, or latency, is the core of psychic system continuation and social system maintenance.

This is the indicator from which we take our meaning and beliefs as essentially routed, and we liberate our self from this “mistake” only by taking new beliefs and meanings as essential; and this is the displacement of the metaphysical (understanding), through reduction. However, what is reduced is not any historical mistake; it is simply awareness. The loss of awareness comes as an abbreviation of difference (distance) between self-reference (awareness) and its environments. So all the distance of thinking to being can be seen as the mirror of such distance, which is a complex image. However, because of the nature of the mirror, it is complex, but not the same as distance.

Coming back to the earlier idea, we envisage, not in space but in “time”. Regarding laws of form, it “is being possible to enter a state of time without leaving the state of space in which one really lodged” 14

It seems that “space” of meaning is considered what socially signifies, or what the rule of determinacy decides. There are other perceptions about this idea, such as: - to be means to signify, to take part in spatiality; to be, independently of order reference, is one element of completeness. But now it is not the moment to analyze these contrasts. (Since logic is a determined system for determination, the opposite confession cannot be true, except as its unlimited ideal extension).

**Frequency**

Semantics (or order) represent an unquantifiable number of experiences. Each experience is not possible to connect in statistical steps with what is defined as language or norms or expression. Communication, in any case, transmits non-stop chunks of meaning experienced individually, by repeating and replicating thousands of times, as Derrida says: it is the element of language around chunks of meaning.
We consider the speed at which the representation of values travels, making space for meaning, with the frequency of meaning spreading. This rule can be the same for deviant meaning, otherwise known as negativity.

**Re-entering**

It seems that thinking oscillates along two lines: semantically socially accepted and negation-effected (results from selection).

A demonstration (semantic) rests in finite numbers of logical steps which represent a finite number of experiences. It is not infinite in form and origin: we need to confine its application to any given level of reflection.

It does not matter how many experiences disagree with it as long as a semantic is completed (it is consummated, works in use). Self-reference via conscience meets the same problem with beliefs, which means the problem exists from inside as well as outside, as a form of vice versa.

The re-entering of semantics is governed by the rule of dominance. By re-entering the same rule (we educate ourselves internally), we enforce such rule. This is how order maintains itself.

The role of semantics as representation holds for the value uniquely to be determined and applied in every case. But the opposite situation happening makes the value of indeterminacy possible. We are not equipped with knowledge of the premises of indeterminacy. We do not know what we don’t know......Here we can make a supposition, but we don’t know until it becomes a fact. How is indeterminacy determined by its own premises?

Here meaning envisaged in time comes in stages, but cannot yet perform, except as a negation.

The sphere of meaning becomes necessary to correlate with meaning, but because of different premises and orientation it becomes difficult to configure the form as a continuity of logic. The degree of indeterminacy does not exclude our expression. We go on with what is determined, until we find our self in an “out” position. The degree of determinacy in which the expressions are equal is another characteristic of meaning expressed. “Equations of expressions with no re-
entry and thus with no un-resolvable indeterminacy, will be called equations of the first degree”

15. This can happen in mathematics; but its reality is in motion.

The source of meaning and the space of expression

The source of meaning is under the pressure from the space of expression; and space of expression under the force of meaning. These two forces appear unified as one in the awareness or self-reference and communication. The space of expression is that which is supposed communicative, as a possible narrative...

In ideal conditions of relationship of a system of meaning with expression we can observe:

1. The space of expression is constant;

2. There is no re-entry fluctuation through the tunnel of meaning from negative cases;

3. The frequency is determined by the speed of its transmitting through space-re-entry.
Velocity: (speed)

Transmission of an indication has a value of speed which becomes its velocity. “We must also give it a direction.”

It is obvious that at a moment or another of our interpretation of meaning, we are obligated to analyze it as a force with its qualities. A transmission of indication (a signal) makes possible the structure in a change of meaning, for a new meaning, for adaptation to a situation.

Real and imaginary value

A value represented being indeterminable in space may be called an imaginary value, in relation to form.

Nevertheless, as we see above, it is real in relation to time; and it can, in relation with itself, become determinate in space, and thus real in form. This means that existing in time doesn’t prevent meaning from taking its form. To put this in another way, meaning can stay without
expression and in a certain space, without language. It stays within us as a proportion of one space to another, always virtual, and where space is the world within which our self reference resides.

**Memory function**

The present value may depend on its past value. The reality of values is also a virtual reality. Values are temporary, and conventional. This is the reason that their historicity and continuity reside in memory. As a consequence, when past values indicate the unmarked state (unarticulated meaning), the marked state suffers by insignificance, because its expression is replaced with fossils of language memory.

**Subversion**

One can suppose that it is possible to repress meaning, to suspend it for a time while it is being formed in a way it can be imagined.

This can be possible from the outside to the inside, from form to conception, from significance to non-significance, as an echo of transmitting.

“We call such a partial destruction of the distinctive properties of constants: a subversion.”

This can happen to use an indication of a marked state by reliable memory, by an expression in which the memory is apparently lost. This shows also that between meaning and significance there is a force to force relationship. What is signified works as a contingent to what is tending to come into a state of significance.

The new significance is part of a new order. “New order” always means a different access to the reality of meaning, a new access to all kinds of reality. Accessibility is the purpose of meaning. “Determining” means a new accessibility.
Time in finite expressions

Time cannot exist outside memory. Memory is the store of applications. Calculus is ordered there.

The degree of necessity of an adapted (calculated) measure is the extent of its application. This measure of time, as we have introduced it here, can be seen to cover (envelop), without inconsistency, all representative forms hitherto considered, which must be continuous without discrepancy.

Testing the concept of time is, whether it leads to the same answer, whether it leads to the same memory or to dominant states (dominant states are semantics absorbed for the current states of interpretation), reacting as a testing process with costs to memory.

Memory role

1. Expansion of it (a version of memory to memory).
2. Considering a finite expression- memory is made by finite elements (and boundaries).
3. Memory envisages forms without representing them as infinite.
4. Supposing a finite memory of the other, too.
5. Finite expression- it is stable, and in one condition.
6. Duration is proportional to the degree of extension.
7. Endless extension of the echelon (level) allows endless memory of either condition.

Concept of time

The concept of time is a key by which “the contracted and expanded forms are made patent to one another.” This means that novelty and convention do not have a radical conjunction, even though it may seem so.
Wave is:

The extent of expression from where is emitted;
When expression represents a part of a larger expression;
A direct connection;
A re-naming, or re-indicating, by direct connection.

Subversion happens:

In non-literal (truthful) parts which represent the same boundary.
In the non-linear part of any expression: a marker(or semantic).
Where a marker needs to be a cross (means: a space irritated by limitation).
Where a modular function is an anti-vibrator (determinate) function.

What’s under the marker?
We suppose that there is a kind of tracing of meaning in a structure of thinking which is “bound” from a marker or fringes of thinking…selection and limitation, in a quantity of length, by escaping implication and structuring formations, and so on...

The value of marker led from the marker by a lead (guide). Leading to the lead-marker makes the parts of meaning structure, deliberating a form from a single construction into significance of it.

The whole account of our deliberations is an account of how it may appear, in the light of various states of mind, which we put upon ourselves.

By the canon of expanding reference, we see that an account may be continued endlessly......But usually we stop in a degree of it to join another course... These stops in extensions are limitations. Limitations are conditions for structure formation.

**Re-entry into the form**

*"The conception of form lies in the desire to distinguish"* 19. The calculus of indication is a way of regarding a form. We can see the calculus by the form and see the form in the independent calculus, unhindered by the intervention of laws. They work as initials, not yet of consequences. (This is state of a pure meaning).

**The finite nature of expression**

Any given expression is either communication or a system level and shall be finite. This makes it possible to determine its value.

It follows that any given expression can be reached from any other given equivalent expression in a finite number of steps (transmitted worlds are limited).

In semantics, each idea-meaning represents an unknown number of representatives of the same design. We don’t know how many of them carry a semantic in the form of an ordered
structure, an application, when reality has gone in other directions as a third dimension, outside standard representation.

Every variable is expressed by a finite expression. It is evident that, by an unlimited number of steps from a given expression, we can reach this expression which is not equivalent to initial one. So: $M/M'$

Semantics (the same as an algebraic equation) represent in an immaterial number of experiences (it is not possible to count in arithmetic steps the changes in the world of meaning).

**Sign**

The sign is marked from the outside and inside (identity).

Each repetition of a sign is a re-entering. The re-entering of a sign cannot be distinguished from initial sign.

So each re-entering of a sign is = sign, or form.

Marked from inside the sign it is the value of the space it stands for.
Signs repeated are always the same signs, the values of meaning which are spread (space of meaning framed) are not the same. Value increases with the expansion of the sign’s use, also with semantics (forms). With a simple example: you can make many kinds of bread with the same form, or sign.

Sign is something from outside, too, and is used for something from inside.

Since the same sign indicates both sides of the reference (circumference), it cannot be distinguished in respect of value — that is its nature.

Meaning remains mutual — it is not transmitted. We communicate communication. We communicate what is a sign capable of communication.

A sign in use (of the original sign), or a circle in use, of an original circle, cannot distinguish different values.

Sign = Sign. There are no distinctions in the same sign.

“S” comes from outside for inside, in the same way that semantics are educated in general.

In each of re-marked insides we have a formatting space in the frame of the Sign (a circle in our case).

S=S=1S

The marked space is S x n, where “n” is the number of people (subjects), and is to be considered as the spread of the sign. The spread of the sign in use means the spread of form.

Form dimension: meaning dimension. We match a specific form of meaning not only with its specificity, but with its spread. Spread gives the meaning of “security”, for a form of meaning, until abundance makes meaning bored.
Space

A sign, or frame, or form for formation, for design of meaning, may be deleted without loss or gain to the space which it occupies.

Forms of meaning are the same as forms of bread, as we explained. This means that forms of space envisaged can stand without signs...Signs are simply the clothing for a body...

Increase space of meaning signified is the expansion of form or significance. Increase of significance is an increase in the same mode of operation, the same order, or law.

The value of a circumference of the space outside must be therefore the value of the mark, because a mark, a sign, now distinguishes this space.
An observer, since he distinguishes the space he marks (he occupies) is also a mark.

1. An observer is a mark.
2. A mark is used to mark a space.
3. An observer is a space.
4. A mark, a distinction, shapes space by cliché of a mark as a distinction.
5. There is always space for the meaning.
6. By cliché of mark as a distinction.
7. This turns its real spatiality into virtuosity specially orientated, or into the space of meaning.
8. The space of meaning turns the subject into a force orientated to force.
9. Being is a force within forces.
10. Individual being is a force in a social being force.

We see now at first distinction the mark: and the observers are not only interchangeable, but in form are identical.

Distinction exists as a form of closure (conclusion).

The primary form of communication is not description but injunction. This is a very important result.

In this respect it is comparable to practical forms such as cookery (recipes). Initially, a sign appears as a command.

Mathematically described, thinking says nothing.

The essence of meaning is force; it has nothing of the function of signs per se.

Signs take meaning in the context of meaning.

We estimate our force orientation via signs (clichés), having either negative or positive values.
An observer is not included in the observation of an event as an act of happening; we can see it out of the meaning happening.

Alienation of our meaning comes as a happening meaning to another self-referential system and enforced use toward us...

One who observes both sides must understand that there is no meaning to meaning per se, but an erratic force of constraints between them. This speaks for a formal content of meaning, not really essential as we understand it.

The essence of meaning does not reside in principles, but in determinacy. It is this which ensures the autopoiesis of conscience in the form of accessibility’s freedom. But here we may discuss also the unknown opportunities ignored by such accessibility...

It is curious that attending semantics in our experience of life we discover more than once their partiality nature, temporality function or disability operation to prove our experienced meaning. This means an insufficient explanation of forms to forms. But we usually escape the discussion of premises, because of those premises: we take them to be true.

We attend to rules and semantics without proving in each instance their honesty. It is by a quota of accumulation of these by prior use that we start to reflect, over any special event (experience).

“In all mathematics it becomes apparent at some stage that we have for some time been following a rule without being conscious of the fact. This might be described as the use of the covert convention. A recognizable aspect of the advancement of the conciseness of what we are doing, where by the covert becomes overt. Mathematic is in this respect psychedelic.”

What we discuss in this paper is the question: - Can we be equipped with adequate systems of calculation in order for us not be destroyed by meaning? And yet this question leads on to other questions: - Are we prepared for “the truth”? And: - Is the system of meaning a relative system?
We are customized to a form of meaning, we continue the logic of initials and instructions, even when try to find new meanings. A small escape means such a huge distance in logic. It is ridiculous how strongly meaning fits us.

“It is deliberate to inform the reader that, in the system of calculation we are building, we are not departing from the basic methods of other systems. Thus what we arrive at, in the end, will serve to elucidate them, as well as to fit them with their true origin... So rules...merely summarize the commands and instructions that will be relevant to new kind of calculations we are about to undertake.” 21

If it does not fit in with rules and commands, this can be thought of as a weakness regarding order, and as information regarding a new class of happening, which demands a new orientation. Here essentials become inessential, become forms of meaning in themselves. The question raised is: - Can we see with others’ premises? Can we see with the eyes and horizons of others? If yes, why is this still difficult? And is it, really?!

**Calculus of indications:**

Distinguished by its first distinction the calculus of indication requires a use for its application.

We find an application form for indicative forms, via distinctive variations of it:

- Entrances(doors) can be open or shut
- switches can be on or off
- lines can be clear or blocked....

in a language structure in which structures can be true or false:

and all this involves horizons(meaning) of our self-reference.

From whichever directional light we may come, the calculus will have “a useful or an informative application”: the calculus has been built up, in the treatise of a series of forms and departures.
Undertaking the development of the calculus in this direction is to make a journey for a second time.

“In interpreting a calculus, what we do is match the values or states or the elements in what is to become its interpretation”. 22

An interpretation is properly matched if each element in it is associated with a particular element in the calculus; and elements in each case have similar distinctions between them.

The calculus and interpretation are distinct entities but inseparable in consciences. Factually their difference is made clear by the plurality of ways in which a given application can be applied.

Forming a procedure of meaning is schematized like this: -

- calculus to applications
- application to matching of elements
- matching of elements for difference
- application to calculus difference
- extensions of calculus
- re-formulation of application
- the distinction between calculus and interpretation is crucial.

What is true and false in logic:

In logic what is “not true” means the same as “false”; and what is “not false” means the same as “true”.

We have a choice to associate marked states (of meaning) with truth or untruth determined by logic.
An immaterial process from the point of view of our logical calculation which we might do helps us to make possible the latter arrangement from the point of view of our interpenetration.

Variables of values go in different states as true or untrue. A confirmation of a form has exactly the same form as that displayed by the rule of logical control.

The representative choice is the representative of implications.

The condensing of a number of representative forms into a Form, and the ability to proceed where required, going beyond re-calculation, through a routed concept show:

- Semantics stand for the possible truth values
- The essential calculuses are these to which values are related
- In examination of this, we see two sources of power:
  - Both sources are invariable to the standard sentential calculus:
    - Contingent
    - Inspection (answer)

Contingency and inspection are always concerned with the fact that indication is or is not:

1. Familiar with the form
2. Extensive or consequential with the form

With time, concepts or initial forms become redundant. Reality of meaning asks for new meaning. New meaning is in contradiction of form-structure to the old meaning. This appears as crisis in language by creating a kind of language inflation. This inflation tries to protect communication in a degree length but works in a moment time opposite.

Inflation

1. Words are sometimes like inflation in an economy: - they make the best to escape the rupturing of meaning.
2. Expressions are detached at the point of implication.
3. They join with each other at the point of equivalence, for communication.
4. To keep equivalence, we keep inflation when we are not able to conduct new meaning.

But if this inflation is a tautology which can be implied by another tautology, so that, in such case, the sign of insinuation can always be replaced by a sign of the equivocal, this implicational logic in fact degenerates into an equivalence logic, in respect of the course of the semantics which we take \textit{a priori} as “true”, because it is with such logic that we are most intimately concerned. The degeneration of such a situation is the decline of self reference capability in re-interpreting itself. We are stuck in traditional thinking, making a gap with our being.

We are skilled in knowing instructions given to us socially. In the absence of new instructions we assume the premises of an argument to be related by inherited conventional logic. This artificial conjunction is the result of latencies, which work on us; and we take them as grounds for our being, or as essentials.

A universal argument in syllogism form is the method which will determine the conclusion from the premises alone.

A universal argument, in syllogism form, forms the conclusion.
Chapter II

The semantically pregnant mind

Being careful in our observing forms of meaning, we see that there are only physical relationships within meaning. They are entirely visual, but not in any proper spoken form, so that in verbalizing these forms, we must encode them in a form suitable for ordinary speech. Thus, although the meaning form of an expression is clear, “the verbalized form is obscure”.23

The main difficulty in translating from the meaning to the verbal form comes from the fact that in meaning we are free to mark in three dimensional form, whereas in speech we can mark only the one dimension of time.

We have already distinguished between expression and proof.

In a proof we are dealing with terms which are outside of the calculus (semantics), and thus not amenable to its instruction.

We succeeded only at the cost of making another calculus, inside of which the original calculus is cradled, and outside of which we shall again see forms which are amenable to proof but not yet expressible.

The validity of a proof thus rests not in our common motivation by a set of instructions, but in a common experience of a state of dealings and relationships.

It seems open to question why we regard the proof of our formation with the same degree of certainty as the display of the consequence.

We gain experience of living via a representative process.
By particular argument and continuing forwards and backwards in units of experience, and through this experience, we become quite certain.

In our own minds, of the validity of using this certainty is to substantiate a proof (a new experience). But since procedures of a proof are not themselves codified in a calculus (although they may eventually become so), our certainty at this stage must be deemed, at least, to be intuitive.

Conditions for an experience as a proof: -

1. We can achieve an expression simply by following instructions.
2. Although we may be unfamiliar with the system in which the instructions are ordered, we go on through, intending to be familiar, but we keep our sense of matching up to it.
3. In providing such research, we have not yet already codified the structure of the proof in the form of thought.
4. We must at least be familiar with, or experienced in, whatever it is we take to be the ground of a piece of evidence.
5. Otherwise we shall not see it as a proof. We escape from it or cancel it.

Relationship between forms of thinking and life experience

We have to consider the boundary dividing the state of proof from the states of thinking. We add support to the proposition that the degree of certainty of proof is equal to that of forms of thinking to which we have adapted.

Remembered forms occur inside the calculus, whilst proof remains outside.
The boundary between them is a shared boundary.
Thus consequences can be seen to bear a fitting relationship to each other (in terms of form).
A form can be seen by implication as a proof.
A form of thinking rests as distinct from the pragmatic, for the initial computation we employ. We do not have to hypothesize them.
We should also note that this relationship to prove form is for the purposes only of making meaning.

**(Normative Logic)**

Proof makes apparent what exists latently.  
This is meaning in primary interests.  
There is a large number of wrong ways before coming across a right way.  
Even the analogy of seeking something cannot be quite correct in this framework.  
What we find is eventually something that is known.  

The idea of performing a search can be unhelpful, or even positively obstructive, since searching is in general organized to find something which can be previously hidden and is thus not open to view.  

The discovery a proof process is:  

*Something more subtle than search;*  
*We must come to see the relevance;*  
*In respect that whatever statement it is that we wish to justify;*  
*Of some facts in full view;*  
*Of which therefore we are constantly aware.*  

The technique of trying to “find” something which we already can see may more easily escape our efforts.

**(Forming process:**

Introduce distinctions between things, following a course of argument;  
Understand it;  
Understanding is experience of what is understood;
We understand in a wider context what we have understood;
We do not fully understand something, until we are able to contain it in a more general understanding;
We can follow it by proving our forms. It happens in the sense that we see its evidence...

This puts our understanding of it in the wider context in which it may rest.

**Following and understanding**

Following and understanding are not representing and proving.

The failure to follow may be from the fact that we don’t have an understanding of what was presented to us.

We do not follow it because we may have a shorter way or different way; yet we don’t know how to communicate it.

Following must be associated with a particularity principle.

A principle demands accuracy.

“...following must be associated particularly with doctrine and doctrine demands an adherence to a particular way of saying or doing something. Understanding has to do with the fact that what is ever said or done, can be always said or done a different way and yet all ways remain the same.”  

**Completeness:**

The idea of completeness cannot apply to a calculus as a whole, but only to a representation of one determination of it by another. What is questioned in fact is the completeness of an alternative form of expression.
The idea of completeness condenses with that of consistency. The most primitive example of completeness, in its pure form, is to be found in expression.

**Results:**

No self-referential system can be constructed within which all the forms of experiences are included.

“A set of rules to say that one must not do something is not an explanation of why one must not, and nor does the fact that if we allow the inference, it may mislead us to an improper conclusion, meet with the high degree of understanding required of all explanatory accounts of this book.”

Now the distinction between existing and not existing is not applied like the distinction between true and not true. If a statement S is true, than its complementary statement \( \neg S \) is not necessarily false. But if a thing exists, than its complementary is not necessarily non-existent.”

No statement is to be taken existentially.

Every statement has an end of degeneration.

**Rules:**

Never make an existential interpretation, unless the argument demands it.

Avoiding existence we avoid pitfalls in its train.

During the course of solving a problem do we ever need to make an existential interpretation?

No representation as a universal is possible.

*Do semantics include everything? This is a question which must be answered with “No”. Semantics are socially created, and they include specific experiences generalized as norms.*
“Only very gradually, and only to the degree required by changes in social structure was the meaning constitutive relevance of the social dimension revealed constructive relevance to be the semantic interpretation of the human individual as the guiding thread, via e-detour in characterizing humans that then had to be retained yet leveled out.”

These semantics, norms and rules we use as references. In a point connection with them, in their historical life, they work within us as premises, forms, directions.

The world of meaning comes from initials, or premises.

If we know the premises and direction of meaning we can configure the meaning derived from “the others”.

The world of meaning extends in time and space.

Semantics cannot cover all meaning in time.

The space of meaning in time is the pregnancy content by semantics (boundaries).
Only by binary schematization does meaning emerge and become complex and beyond words.

Meaning can be calculated from a number of logical steps.

The positive world of meaning is finite.

The negative world of meaning is finite, too.

Only a “foolish” can live in completeness, because he is not derived from premises.

Regarding Pierce, every world is infinite since the countable steps (the number of them) are possibly infinitely dividable.

The nature of semantics is finite, because it comes from selections and limitations and so on, by a number of calculated logical steps. This is true not only for the positive world of meaning, but also for discourse (negativity). This makes spirit, in a way, a calculable construction.

Without a line of demarcation such as “yes” and “no”, or “0” and “1”, or “good” and “bad”, meaning cannot exist. The world out logic appears complete, continual and not contradictory. What is excluded makes the division with from what is included. What is excluded summons up what is included. What is excluded is not permitted. What is not permitted is forbidden. What happens in the sphere of negativity is the slide to exclusion with the result that what is included cannot cover all expectations. The world of semantics declines into the change of physical reality. This is a hurtful process: a lot of new meaning stays still in time (waits); and other meaning dies or operates in expression as a relic. Action stays pending. The state of being declines in social space.

The capacities of man to keep meaning in time (in a virtual space without the application to place it), in a degree, creates disorder. Disorder has its tendency, via social accumulation and resonation to make again order. The health of a self reference calls for social resonance in every action of its rational operation. Operations without such answer are associated with discourse and risk, which helps for the creation of new thoughts and the decline of olds. The process of spatiality from the virtual state of meaning to expression is a self-controlled process. Order is always a sphere of accessibility, and this makes meaning a boundary of ownership for the right
of an access. Spatiality of meaning seems a violent process in the sphere of intentions, and this is so as long as we use “the other” as our environment without having such empathy to live in its world as our own. But we also often do not live our world as ours, for the same reason.

An existential crisis is a moment at which an individual questions the fundamentals of his or her life: whether his or her life has any meaning, purpose or value. “The human being is essentially spirit. But what is spirit? Spirit is to be a self. But what is the self? In short, the self is a synthesis of the infinite and the finite, of the temporal and the eternal, of freedom and necessity. The self is the conscious unity of these factors, which relates to itself, whose task is to become itself. This, of course, can only be done in relationship to God, who holds the synthesis together.”

It consists in ascribing infinite value to the trivial and temporal. Here the self is lost by being altogether reduced to the finite. Finitude's despair allows itself to be, so to speak, cheated of itself by "the others."

Deformed will is disease.
We become a meaning-orientated system. Surpassing our bodies (our organism) to achieve such an orientation by a system of meaning, via self-reference, makes us force-orientated thanks to meaning systems. Signs and semantics in use for the occurrence of meaning and thoughts are often the shapes or the contours of the content of meaning.

The virtual form of scanning and designing reality by forms of meaning, for the leading back to reality of meaning, by observation, self description and representation, gives us the impact of feelings without orientation, which may be positive or negative, depending on expectations.

There is no substance in meaning, except for a virtual field, which attracts the force of our organism, taking its orientation virtually from it. This is the process required for significance and access to the reality of meaning and its environments. This access is the condition for autopoiesis.

Autopoiesis incorporates all levels of our reproduction: - the organism, psychic system, participation in social systems (the persona) and communication, as extended by the
environments, outside the body, for connection and reproductively of our internal environments of meaning.

We live as self-referential systems, somewhere in such interdependence; and the center of our meaning system can be somewhere else: a lover, a carrier dream, a book, etc ... Center is somewhere in the inter-relation of meaning systems.

Freud did not develop psychoanalysis simply in “essential” terms or historicity. He tried to give a genuine figure of force of consciousness, and consequences with its significances in the form of reports of the mind with the known and unknown. This advantage of his work will make it relevant for a long time.

Freud has used in a wide range the concept of force, for different psychic events. We may be reminded here of terminology such as: compulsion, condensation, drive, drive derivation, force, repression, psychosexual energy, repulsion, etc. (www.chalquist.com).

Heidegger’s and Husserl’s analysis of being and thinking are based mostly in concepts of pure “essence” and description of their functionality. Their perfect theoretical systems explain the displacement of “essences” from a historical space to the real one.

Differently from them, Derrida investigates the concept of the Sign in relation with meaning, as a counteracting force within the psychic world, for getting out of time, free of access, behind the reality of pure meaning.

He reconstructs the conflict in the form of life of the signs in signification, and meaning as a force of the signs of life in way to express itself. For him signs are partially and temporarily the resources of orientation. The insistence of a kind of significance longer than that of social functioning, gives signification to a violent force against new expression. “...it is certain that the question of the sign is itself, more or less, or in any event something other, than of sign of the times... to dream of reducing it to a sign of the times, is to dream of violence”. 27 The force of new meaning in conflict with the pressure of old signs, beyond their adequacy, is nothing more than a process of conflict, between meaning and language, covered by the pressure of power.
The violent character of this dream is proved more than once in reality of being, individually or socially. This demonstrates that communication (because signs in themselves are not capable) is a process of force relating to force in resulting significance, in order.

The pressure of meaning on language makes signs lose their initial competence through time, and asks for new forms of representational meaning.

Analyzing the structuralism’s dream for a sign of times, Derrida considers it as a “meaning of imagination, affectivity, fashion... as a vision of taking language as the origin of history and writing as the origin of state.”  

He gives attention to meaning as a force of orientation.

The reality of language is and always has been pushed out by the reality of meaning, increasing connectivity and relations in humankind: “confronted by possibility of speech and always already through it, finally extended to the dimension of world culture - a surprise incomparable to any other”  

Here the idea of the processing of meaning as an element of binding a world culture and orientation for global organization turns the function of language from hierarchical ordering origin, into the functional enterprise of meaning.

Meaning makes language a structure adaptive to meaning. “The simple signification nature of language appears rather uncertain, partitive or inessential” The overcoming of the anxiety of language regarding meaning was attempted by structuralism: but that did not succeed.

The character of language
For Derrida structure in communication is the formal unity of form and meaning. Meaning works as a structuring form-force, in communication. Meaning is not force per se. Meaning simply conduct. Behind language and norms is a physical system order. Behind language and meaning is a force for autopoiesis.

Questions raised about sign are:

1. What is sign?
2. What it may signify from within it?
3. What is attention given to force? To indication?
4. What is the tension of force itself?
5. What is the relation of form and force?
6. How does force of discourse make a detour, to the force of course?

Analyzing the power of meaning and its form and attending to the laws of form, Derrida makes a definition: “form fascinates when one no longer understands force from within itself. This is to create discourse as the condition of work, not only separation from what existing” and he adds that “certain defeat of force within the movement of diminished order” 31 Reflection comes always about in a constituted structure and observation:

Structure consists:

In Form

In Relation
In Configuration

With an interdependency and always concrete totality, structure of perspective appears as:

1. Interrogative (questioning);
2. Totalitarian (very interesting!! He finds violence in determinacy).

This antinomy appears as a characteristic of meaning (thinking).

The force separated from totality, the curious force of questioning, is in relation with totalitarian force; the questioning force is the weakness force. Derrida appreciate weakness:

**Force of weakness:**

- separates,
- disintegrates,
- emancipates.

**Force in totalitarian form, determinacy:**

- attaches,
- dominates,
- conserves

These two sides (antinomian) make possible both panorama and panoragrama (the whole range of positive and negative values).

The process appears as:

1. Schematization and spatiality (virtualized);
2. The field diverse from its forces;
3. Even if it exists as totality, the totality of form of meaning, for what is in the question is always meaning;
4. This question requires: Meaning to be re-thought as a form;
5. Structure is the form unity of form and meaning;
6. Behind the language and norms is a physical ordered system.

Derrida puts forward a hypothesis for a project of the conceptualization of totality:

He analyses a drama of horizons of self-perspective and self-totality: he researches an exceptionally classical early (historical) way of conceptualizing:

1. The neutralization of meaning;
2. Force of meaning, a space which is forbidden;
3. Content is the living energy of meaning;
4. This force must neutralize itself or signify otherwise that its effects are uncontrollable.

Trying to abstract and picture the harms of meaning to “essentials” Derrida describes as “..somewhat like the architecture of uninhabited or deserted city, reduced to its skeleton, by some catastrophe of nature or art.. a city haunted by meaning and culture.”

Meaning is pictured like a fire, and notions and structures of thinking like burned skeletons.

Structures of meaning have the same problems as language, which means that even meaning is a formal content which is not essential and can be reformulated:

**The character of meaning:**

1. Liability (unstable)
2. Soliciting (shaking)
3. Shaking of the whole to put Being into motion (soliciting).
The significance of Form and unburdening of meaning drives towards a mute anxiety, beneath the language, and to the individual itself.

The unity of form and significance is deliberately due to a difference. Here must be examined a community of intentions, a bringing to the surface an enigma of values, traditions, openings to reflection and suspicion about the individual psychic system.

His sensation is that making language one with meaning is not expression but creation (re-ordering in every moment of structure displayed by speech).

Here preposition gains “unanimous acceptance” by a highly equivocal notion of form and expression. Imagination is a synthesis, between meaning and factual, the common route between universal and particular...To obscure the origin of structural frameworks and empathy between form and content this makes possible transcendence and access to its unity. The same rule works in communication.

The process of meaning is made possible by Imagination.

“Imagination is freedom that reveals itself only in its works, not in nature, nor out of ours.” 33

**Characteristics of imagination:**

1. Imagination schematizes without concept.
2. Imagination is a fundamental activity of mind.
3. Metaphoric expression is everything in the language of imagination.
4. Invisible interior of the metaphoric freedom is an envisaging procedure.
5. Conversation experience reunites the blind origin of the work in process.
6. Conversation designates the interiority of a breaking, discourse (signified by meaning).
7. Departure to “neither a non-place nor another world” of meaning.
8. Worlds can indicate an experience though metaphor, whose genealogy itself deserves our efforts.
9. This process is a creation of a universe to be added to the universe.

10. Origin is possible and conceivable only in disguise.

11. Thought is confused by pure language.

12. Language is confused by experience itself.

13. Pure language requires existence.

14. Meaning pushes towards the world in a way similar to power towards action.

15. “Nothing” stated is potentially a condition for a re-start.

A particular concept: “Nothing”

Only pure absence, the absence of everything - in which all presence is announced – can inspire new meaning.

Nothing itself is determined by disappearing.

Disappearing means also you are not involved with anything.

“There is no intuition for a thing involved” 34 This means that this position of nothingness seen by an observer brings up the observation in creation.

The reality of meaning is a condition for new meaning and speech.

“Creation is absolutely freedom of speech. A freedom of response which acknowledges as its only horizon the world and history and the speech which can only say: being has always already began” 35.

“There consciousness to having something to say as the consciousness of nothing: this is not the poorest but the most reaches moment …” 36

Speech

Writing and talking are two forms of signs ‘ use of language. Writing has made possible the ordering and codifying of experiences: but speech is the most important factor for change.
Speech is the active energy of meaning in communication with other systems of meaning. “By energizing speech, inscription has as its essential objective and, indeed takes this fatal risqué, the emancipation of meaning...as concerns any actual field of the perception... from the natural predicament in which everything refers to disposition of a contingent situation.”  

**Writing**

“If the play of meaning can overflow the signification (signalization), which is always enveloped within the regional limits of nature, life and soul, this overflows in the moment of attempt to write.”  

**Reconciliation (understanding)**

The will to write re-awakens the determination of the will: freedom, breaking with the domain of empirical history, a break whose aim is reunion with the hidden essence of empirical, with pure history...the will to write is freedom and duty. To be affected is to be finite.

**Rigor**

Heidegger differentiates writing from speech, because the latter cannot “be conceived on the rigor of its essence” on the basis of its “character as a sign”. Behind a state of meaning is a mental universe. Effort exists in relationship with the internal historicity and relationship to the subject.

1. **Historicism is:**
   - Biographism
   - Psychologism

2. **The spiral of Meaning:**
Before becoming unitary it makes itself alternative;
Articulation is a unifying operation;
Initial accord;
Separation;
Reunification that files a second separation, symmetrical to the first;
Final conjunction;
The destination is a return to the point of departure;
After a circuit in the form of a crossed ring, the crossed ring is singular;
Return in the commonest devices;
Distancing;
Separation;
Inconsistency;
Test of fidelity;
The ring has becoming an ascending spiral;
Violent elevations.

“*The movement toward the highest*”, the expression of Pierre Gorneille. The complex accounts for the unity, the totality of the complex of moments, and points must traverse, with a formula which occurs and changes!! “*forced to commit an act of violence*”.

In the world of the written form:

1. Language is one with meaning;
2. Form belongs to the content of work;
3. The work is not expression, but creation.
Self-reference: meaning from outside to inside; the functioning of an individual psychic system.

Understanding meaning as a structured force which strives for significance is deeply concerned with a minimum of autonomy agreed for the individuality of a psychic system. The boundaries of this autonomy are relative and overlapped by those of social systems. This does not prevent the existence of the functionality of the two systems, psychically and socially, even though they are both located in and operate in the mind.

The world of meaning is the world of the maintenance of boundaries between psychical and social systems, between the universal and the individual. They cannot merge together and grow up as systems without each other’s sustenance.

Until the 18th century, a social system was interpreted as a container of members of the same society, on the basis of sameness of language and economy. Such an approach had its relevance for the time: society was rigidly ordered; and the authority of the state was the basis for the conduct of relationships. Hegel and Marx didn’t reflect on the individuality of a human being. Their statement was concerned mostly with the ideal to produce universality, to supply people’s mind with principles of metaphysic.
Humboldt and Hegel integrated this ideal in theory of Bildung: - “The ultimate task of our existence is: to give as great as possible a content to the concept of humanity in our person, both during our life time and beyond it, through the traces left behind by our life’s work, this task can be fulfilled only by linking our ego with the world for the most universal, vivid and freest reciprocal action”.

This ideal sought to conceptualize the relationship between the individual and society not as a contracting profit, but as a continual augmented relationship. Humans were first determined as a special class of animal with socially related properties, then as the center of the universe. Later this concept was modified by modern thinking into that of individuals living in the world.

The characteristics of the relationship of individuals to the world in the context of their autonomies are:

1. Fact and social dimension are differentiated by the internal endlessness of each individual according to individual consciousness;
2. This reflection posits the “I” and the World as both matching and endless;
3. The “I” and the World are mediated by negation (an inverse formulation);
4. The “I” loses internally something that the object World cannot accomplish;
5. The World produces alienation;
6. To endure its “I”, “I” requires another “I” in reflection: - A “You.”;
7. The “I” is a formulation in social semantics, but “I” requires its specifics to transcend its selfhood in relation to another “I”;
8. All this process cannot be covered by ontological schemata; it is a life process, for autopoiesis, requiring a displacement in the processing of meaning.

Meaning initially was identified with language and signs. The historical idea of identifying consciousness or meaning with signs leaves no room to make a difference between the structure of signs and the reality to which they refer. Society was intended to be produced by language. Meaning and signs are two different categories of reality.

1. The immanent world of meaning prevents one from defining meaning as a sign;
2. One must carefully distinguish between the structure of reference and the structure of signs;
3. The function of a sign always requires reference to something specific;
4. This something specific requires excluding of self reference (for communication);

5. Communication requires the asymetrization of a basic, recursive self reference, regarding signs, for building communication.

“In other words there is neither a sign for the world nor a sign that indicates itself, but both of this, universality and self-reference are indispensable properties of meaning. This is why meaning is the foundational matter: a sign must have meaning to be able to fulfill its function, but meaning is not a sign. Meaning forms a context in which all signs are determined; it is the condition sine qua non of their asymetrization. But taken as a sign, meaning would be able to stand only as a sign for itself, thus a sign for non-fulfillment of a sign’s function.”

The change made in the theory of social systems by putting the self-reference concept at the center of system theory, for both individual and social systems, has open a new perspective in understanding the psychic system and its operation via self-reference. Self-reference becomes the creator of the world which has created it.

Basic pre-suppositions of this theory are:

1. The individual psychic system operates as a unified and autonomous subject.
2. What is social is a derivative sphere of inter-subjectivity.
3. Communication comes from interaction between subjects.
4. Communication transmits mental contents between separate consciousnesses.

5. Language is a corresponding matter of such contents.

Psychic and social systems treat each other as necessary environments. They scan reality in the form of self-reference. The observation and interpretation is always in self-referential form, but significance gives the sense of communication. This is made possible by personality. “It is the peculiarly psychiatric conception of personality as a reactive system which is in some sense stable or typologically defined for a long period of time.”

The centered concept in the use of self-reference relates to a higher degree of complexity of reality which is represented in the form of meaning. For orientation to this complexity the ontological concept of consciousness is transforming in that of self reference, which assumes a higher degree of agility to the world of meaning, without denying “consciousness” but considering it as horizons of experience within which self-reference finds elements for its operation for autopoiesis.

Conditions for self reference (consciousness) are:

1. Psychic and social systems have evolved together;

2. At any one moment in time one kind of system is the necessary environment of another (intermediated by persona);
3. Persons cannot emerge and continue to exist without social systems;
4. A social system cannot function without persons;
5. Both systems are ordered according to this co-evolution in the common achievement employed by psychic as well as social systems;
6. We call this achievement «meaning»;
7. This achievement called meaning appears as the capacity to solve and interpret autopoiesis;
9. Schemata of thinking are derived by a binary method of social semantics, prepared by systems;
10. A deviation of meaning takes meaning, as a deviation, in contrast to those semantics.

Social and psychic systems interfere by communication. Communication cannot transcend meaning totally. The dream of transcendence of all meaning has no sense, since communication is for the displacement of boundaries, which are bound by meaning: that means the continuity of consciousness, not its termination. Something internally always remains hidden. This is because social semantics prepare standards of communication which require the repetition of such standards. The ideal of
all meaning ‘transcending’ is analyzed and dreamed of by Husserl. But this principal or ideal form of unity of meaning is the end of meaning.

“Something is always hidden on us a support for what communication cannot permit to us until the hidden is exposed supported by a structure which we don’t know, we cannot calculate, but gives us the chance to be based on other latencies or hidden event into the way of impossible through the possible.” 44

Luhmann obscures the process of expression, because for him it is conditioned socially. He observes it connected to the changes of latencies, something difficult to observe and measure. In fact, if all meaning transcends, this is the end of communication. It is also the end of social systems. And this supposes some hidden meaning. But also it does not happen on purpose. It expresses the limitations of “pure knowledge”, if we may use this term. Social systems are still needed to support consciousness.

It is obvious that psychic and social systems develop their personality by supporting each other environmentally. Their divisions are simply methodological.

1. It is almost impossible to divide one element of personality from another (social and individual) in the individuality of the psychic system.

2. Elements appear psychically indispensible, universal and particular.
3. This indispensability is called in modern science “self-reference”.

4. Self-reference includes the common and individual specifics of a system (in our case: self-reference).

5. The mode of operating and connectivity are two basic conditions of every system evolution - of psychic systems also.

6. Unified individuality cannot solve once and for ever the problems of complexity and contingency.

7. Temporality of meaning must be understood as immanent quality of meaning.

8. Temporality ensures the adaptability of self within society. Self reference serves for it.

Heidegger has determined being as a self-directional one, with temporal skills “Both blinking close and the estimating and measurement of distances within that which has been deserved and is present at hand within the world, are grounded in making present belonging to the unity of that temporality in which directionality becomes possible.” 45. This self-directional quality with attribution of temporality is almost the same as the concept of self-reference, except for the fact that last one is used for every level of system formation by the action of a personality.
Culture is a sphere of personality: but the last one is not simply the culture it owns. Personality is a specific functionality, a signification, in social structures. “There is an important relation between culture and personality. On the one hand there can be little doubt that distinctive personality types may have a profound influence on the thought and action of community as a whole.”

For Luhmann culture is not a normative content. It does not guarantee the adequate continuity of semantics of systems. Its orientation is freer than that of social systems. Systems are orientated to the environment structurally, not just occasionally. They keep distance and use boundaries to keep their difference. It is this difference which constitutes self-reference orientation and vice versa. “Culture is not necessarily a normative content for meanings; perhaps it is possible to distinguish appropriate from inappropriate contributions or even correct from incorrect uses of themes in theme-related communication.”

“The social cannot be entirely reduced to individual consciousness. It neither penetrates its complexity to the consciousness nor can it be interpreted as the adding-up of the conscious contents of different individuals. This is how temporal differences in different people’s states of information are relevant; and how communication is socially possible. The experience of non-reductability of the social helps constitute and keep the social.”

It is nothing more than the experience of self-reference to the social. The social creates, increases and finds ways to reduce complexity in the form of
systems, while individuality of a psychic system in the form of consciousness by self reference.

1. Meaning is a general form of self-referential adaptation to complexity.

2. Meaning cannot be characterized by specific contents (to the exclusion of the others).

3. Each interpretation signals a limitation of compatibility.

4. Meaning comes as a piece of self-evidence to the world of meaning.

5. Meaning is consequently in form, not in content.

Meaning is partially structured by thoughts and partially expressed by language. Of course, words, thoughts, concepts and signs are used for transmitting meaning, oriented or directed by self-reference: but once this is made possible, the forms of meaning can work in reflexive way, without always employing such an appearance for structures; or they can immerge intuitively. “In language there are only differences. Even more important: a difference generally implies positive terms between which the difference is set up; but in language there are only differences without positive terms.”

What guarantees recognition is meaning, not pure language. Signs are inert contents outside the life of meaning.
1. Words and names cannot guarantee recognition.

2. Concepts could only contribute to relating doubtful cases or usages to actualize meanings.

3. Symbolic generalizations already arise when one deals with concrete objects or events.

4. Symbolic generalization serves to keep re-accessibility open: indications, type ideas, and notions that encompass heterogeneities.

5. This media generalizing does not come into play before there is a demand for aggregation on a higher level.

6. These media can be integrated in a meaningful world only with the help of language.

7. The concept of the symbolic generalization of self-reference replaces the concept of the sign. (The concept of sign has until now dominated the theoretical tradition).

11. Meaning becomes a reference to something that exists independently of language.

15. Its content with reference to language, too, activates signs via indications.

12. Language itself cannot be understood as a mere concatenation of signs.

13. The function of language is not only or even primarily to refer to something that is given.
14. Language is also not just a means of communication.

15. Language functions in psychic systems without communication.

16. The true function of language is in generalizing meaning with the help of symbols.

17. Contradictory signs, rather than designating something else, are themselves what they perform.

18. Controversially, the function of signs ensures communication.

Language is a coded system for communication and yet it is not equal with communication. In its function as a medium of communication “which from the view point of evolution, seems to have been its original function, – its language bound to coding, and thus to acoustic or optical signs of meaning. In this sense generalization of meaning is an instrument for managing the difference in degree to complexity between environment and system”.  

We must differentiate:

- The structure of language differs from the structure of thinking.
- The structure of thinking differs from the structure of meaning.
- The structure of meaning differs from the structure of feelings.
- Mood is the underlying state of the functioning of such structures, like the effect of feelings.

As a universal form of meaning the reasonability of expression appears asymmetrical with rationality. Its meaning as pure reasonability works as
an indicator of rationality. “Tomorrow is Monday”: this phrase means that tomorrow is the first day of week; but for one who thinks that tomorrow is Monday it may signify a number of duties and directions in the form of the rationalization of the day. So the dimension of fact is bigger than the schema of its expression, which is a simplified version of the dimension of fact. The same expression may indicate endless possibilities of interpretation concerning the dimension of fact and its impact on the world of meaning.

Meaning is a general form of self-referential adaptation to complexity. The content of meaning cannot result in the exclusion of other contents. Meaning comes like a self-evidence of our being, to the world of meaning, for what we suppose to be self-referentially meaningful for us. We care
about what it means for us. We are self-directed, self-orientated.

“Concernfull Being in the world is directional, self-directive.”

Meaning emerges as a category, without differentiation. Meaning changes by meaning only. The state of meaning is also shakable internally. Meaning operates with self-directness in the form of self-reference. In the self-referential mode, closure is the form of broadening possible environmental contacts. Closure is to ensure information and continuity by its openness to the world. The closure of meaning works for constituting new elements of meaning, more capable to determine the complexity of the environment where it operates. The fact of openness in the form of closure does not contradict the openness of systems.

For each level of system meaning, individual or social, environments appear more complex than the system.

There is no point-for-point correspondence between a system and an environment created by a system.

There is always a degree of complexity which can be managed by a system, with its limitations.

Complexity forces us to make a selection; and a selection means a decision.

Selection reduces complexity but also increases it indirectly.

Every limitation prepares the conditions for new relationships requiring expansion.
The intensification of complexity between systems requires balances.

Formally each complexity is incrementally calculable. If we want to make measurements of the state of a complexity, we start with number of elements, relationships at stake, and see the effects of relationships among them in the form of a determinacy of structure. There is a difference in the degree of complexity given. This difference is quantifiable depending on our differences. Only complexity can reduce complexity - this is how the formula operates. Loss of complexity comes from simplifying by better organization. Complexity is a measure for indeterminacy or lack of information. “Given to abstract concept of boundary the concept of difference between system and environment, one can decide whether boundary belongs to the system or to the environment. Viewed logically the difference is something third.”

This “third” something serves as an indicator to adaptation or a negation of what are supposed values. It is the promoter for the sustenance or shaking of meaning. Here a primacy is given to a decision on a subject. It means that if the nominal level life (autopoiesis) is ensured, that the meaning state is dependent on choices of self-reference.

The requirements for a reduction of complexity are:

1. Formulating the difference.
2. Determining structure complexity.
3. Selecting by orientation.
4. Differentiating between two complexities, as the real principle determining a selection.
5. Making the selection.
6. Going ahead to re-emerge with the qualities of self-reference.

**Information**

Self reference occurs exclusively in the domain of consciousness which we suppose as the only autopoietic system.

Self reference supposes its difference in every selection by treating world as its object. "The difference between subject and object thereby would become the premise of all further information processing."\(^{53}\)

1. Difference between utterance, behavior and information remains the basic process for the process of meaning.
2. This difference formed as a Sign can be used as a basis for communication between the alter and the ego.
3. Both can, by the same use of signs, be re-inforced in the apprehension that they mean the same thing.
4. Language works here as a dissemination of media, behind the sphere of perception, for communication.
5. The difference between a system and its environment is relevant in constituting every element of meaning in this process.

**Understanding**

We have characterized as understanding the specific form of the observing of observation suited to the social dimension. Understanding requires observation with the help of the system-environment difference. It requires that one interprets the system in a form to be understood as a system that is meaningfully orientated to its own environment. Meaningful orientation always implies a world. Understanding of this world cannot avoid re-encountering itself in the environment of the system to be understood. The understanding system sees itself as the alter ego’s alter.

Understanding makes the behavior of others more accessible, easier to observe and easier to anticipate. It helps to produce adequate determinacy. The difference between meaning and the world is formed for this process of the continual self-determination of meaning as the difference between order and noise. Order and noise are necessary for each other. They bring in the difference, which remains basic for operation. Order makes sense, in contrast to disorder.

Order is a constant required correlation for a system’s existence, elements and relations of a structure which make possible self-reference of an
individuality for autopoiesis. Order is not a sacred system; it changes also
with the accumulation of new elements of observation, reflection and
representation.

Characteristics of order:

1. Order is formally constant correlation.

2. Order does not express a construction of unchangeable
   fundamentals.

3. Order is a foundation of some certain level directed by norms.

4. Order does not exhaust the limits of knowledge.

5. Social order is temporary and historically blind.

6. A "social order" is a relatively stable system of institutions,
   patterns of interactions and customs, capable of continually
   reproducing at least those conditions essential for its own
   existence.

7. The concept order refers to all those facts of society which remain
   relatively constant over time.
These conditions could include property, exchange and power relations, but also cultural forms, communication relations and ideological systems of values. 54.

Communication

Communication makes possible the existence of order. It feeds order via operations and increasing connectivity. The primary function of communication is the maintenance of boundaries for its autopoiesis: but also the expansion of boundaries is another function, because expanding is one of the systems conditional on further existence. Even though it is made possible by consciousness, communication is different from it. It supposes that the boundary maintenance of communication differs the from boundary maintenance of consciousness, even though they intersect. For consciousness, even communication, can only be conducted consciously; and this is invested in further possible consciousness. However, for communication itself this is not so. “Communication is only possible as an event that transcends the closure of consciousness; as the synthesis of more than the content of just one consciousness. One, or at least I can become aware of this, and one can also communicate about it without being sure in one’s own consciousness whether that succeeds.” 55.
Thoughts come in reference to communication, even when not communicating. This is because communication is supposed internally as a legitimized world which pre-supposes being. Thoughts intend their life in relation to, and adaptation with, being. Adaptive function of thought as a binary schematic used to order between thinking and being relationships works within us intrinsically. “A positive valuing of being then requires a negative valuing of any deviant thinking and a readjustment of thinking in the sense of adaption to being.”

Communication is not simply expression. Communication must be understood as a rule as a process. Above all this means that the self-referential operation must comply with the characteristics of belonging to a specific process, must be communication in a communicative process, observation in a process of observation (the observation of observation) and an application of power in a process of applying power (the application of power to the powerful). In this sense reflexivity increases and intensifies the features that typify process. This form of communication is based (still) in considering the primacy of signs to expression.

Communication and understanding
1. Communication is a process differentiated by information, utterance and understanding. So communication can be seen as an intersection between information, utterance and understanding. Husserl’s attention does not derive from signs, but from expressions: it is what conscience performs within itself for itself. He has an ideality which is inadequate to seize communicative reality. He sees communication as less important than expression.

a. For Husserl:

2. Communication is unity of actions of speech, proclamation, utterance.

3. Communication is a unity derived from information.

4. Consciousness has a life which is independent from communication.

5. Conscience is sufficiently self-motivated.

6. He believes in a transcendental subject, and sees the difference of utterance as information.

For Luhmann consciousness does not always motivate itself towards communicative action. Thinking is compulsory. «The difference between information and the act of utterance already establishes far-reaching possibilities for analysis, because both require meaningful interpretation the communicator (« alter ») gets caught in a dilemma». 57
As far as information is concerned the « alter » must view himself as part of the world of meaning in which information is true or false, is relevant, repays utterance, and can be understood. But as someone who utters it, he must have the freedom to speak: and here the tautology helps to go forward if there is no freedom. In one respect he must interpret himself as part of what can be known about the world, for the information refers back to him (otherwise he could not apply it). In another sense he controls himself as a self-referential system. Dieter Henrich calls this the « distance between his being as a subject and his belonging to the world » and views this distance as justifying the need for unified interpretations of life. 58

The process of communication is not a passive one. It is a process of signification; and when logic cannot work, then power interferes. “An individual who enters an understanding oriented communication can freely examine whether that individual can acknowledge its grounds as universally binding. But will the individual do so? And if alter eludes this, should ego nevertheless accept for ego’s self what ego believes alter should accept for alters’ self. In other words, who should be the first to get involved in the general, perhaps by disarmament? And if individual must decide this individually, could anyone reasonably, except himself, to begin with the general?“ 59

The problems of adaptation often appear to be problems of neurosis. The tension between information, expression and understanding is implied within the freedom for access and acting for access. Conscience via self-
reference gives primacy to ego, which is the form in which self-awareness makes its self-reference. Although consciousness is the basis of every level system in existence via the functioning of self-referencing, there are distinctions between the social and the individual in the environmental use of system maintenance, in which, as far as subject is concerned, for the self-reference of an individual psychic system, we observe:

1. Problems of causality are secondary to the problems of self-reference.
2. All information processing shifts not from identities but from differences.
3. Communication as constituting and reproducing autopoiesis is distinct from action as the constituted element.
4. The relationship of human beings to social systems is one of inter-penetration.

Oversimplified premises by working from within – such as linear causality, according to which social order forms the individual through its agents of socialization, the fact (which is beyond doubt) that human beings distinguish themselves according to the social circumstances in which they grow up, the differences that can be established to stimulate welfare–state manipulations that seek to compensate for them - all these above serve as controlled premises for that relationship between the consciousness and
social systems, in which both lives are inter-conditioned. It is a process of inter-penetrations via a psychic system to bodily behavior for control boundaries of meaning. The concept impinges on several system references; it overlays positively or negatively valued effects; and it comprises conforming and deviant, pathological, neurotic and healthy behavior. Socialization in this sense is no occurrence structured by the standards of what is successful (which at worst could fail). A theory that binds the concept of socialization to the creation of the adaptive behavioral that conforms to the expectation cannot explain the emergence of opposite behavioral patterns: and it is helpless before discoveries such as, for example, that adaptation can have neurotic consequences or that adaptation and neurosis reinforce each other.

**Expectations**

Expectations are forms to which an individually psychic system exposes itself, in relation to its environment. The environment’s expectation is put forward as consciousness, with the social structure as communication. This twofold form of conscious operation is the alienation of the human being as persona. The form of expectation is psychically orientated to socially orientated. For psychic system expectations there are ties sustaining reality; and that reality used as its reference. Expectations are grounds used internally for terminable episodes of self-reference. Episodes of meaning
are not structured in a definite way. They are often found in a way by which consciousness perturbs and relates to complex structures of meaning, sometime controversial for the same object. Expectations ask for fulfillment, but often they can fail, or are only partially completed. Expectations are dependent on “the other”. Disappointment always relates to other expectations by calculating other possibilities. The impossibility of expecting anything is the end of information. Information, expectation and expression give meaning to one’s world via intention and motivation for acting and accessing. Meaning, in itself, is an act of logic.

We have accepted:

The autonomy of subject;
Interaction between subjects;
Transmission of mental contents;
Limitation of meaning by self-reference;
Opacity and transparency of complexity;
Supporting construction built in the form of a system;
Meaning becomes: - time, event, element, relation, contingency, action, communication, self reference, etc.

Latency
The world of all meaning, at different levels of systems, is based on latency. Latency or beliefs are temporal, but lived as essentials. The change of latency is a condition for distinguishable grounds of self-reference and its functionality.

There are forms of latency:

1. Pure factual latency, in the sense of ignorance or lack of consideration;
2. Factual latency which rests on the impossibility of knowing or communicating;
3. Structural functional latency, a latency that functions to protect structure.

“If structures require the protection of latency, this does not mean that consciousness or communication is impossible, only that consciousness or communication could destroyed structures or trigger considerable restructuring, and that this prospect preserves latency, and thus block consciousness or communication.”

Knowledge and ignorance live in unity with latent contents.

Latency has a function for the system to bring manifested latent structures into a nexus of order and thus to transcend the object’s possibilities of self observation. Conciseness can undermine social latencies when it forces
communication. Communication can sabotage psychic latencies especially in the form of communication about communication of a person who is defined as seeking to protect and conceal personal latencies. Thus psychic and social systems endanger each other simply in that their latency needs do not agree, and their operative processes are not identical.

With the adaptation of the functional differentiations individual persons can no longer be definitely located in one single sub-system of society, but rather must be regarded *a priori* as socially displaced.

A greater differentiation – system-environment occurs, whereby the ego becomes the focal point of all their inner experiences; and the environment loses most of its contours. It is not whimsy to see how ignorant and uneducated people achieve adaptivity faster by making their own world.

"It is all too often forgotten that the ancient symbol for the presence of the world is a fool, and that foolishness, being a divine state, it’s not a condition to be either proud or ashamed of. Unfortunately we find systems of education today which have departed so far from the plain truth, that they teach us to be proud of what we know and ashamed of ignorance. This is doubly corrupt. It is corrupt not only because it is in itself a mortal sin, but also to teach pride in knowledge is to put up an effective barrier against any advance.”

61
Remarks

Classic epistemology is characterized by the intention to avoid self-references, considering them mere tautology.

Self-referentially systems can not emerge and live exclusively. Also they cannot exist with arbitrary environments.

Self-reference requires order out of noise. Any possible event would obtain an ordering value.

Self-reference can occur only as a mode of dealing with a non-illogical structured environment.

Self-reference has the ability to establish a relationship within itself and to differentiate these relationships from relationships with their environments. All this above constitutes a meaning structure which demands its meaningful existence and continuity.

Meaning systems are completely congested to the extent that only meaning can refer to meaning and that only meaning can change meaning. Besides the psycho logic worked out from the view point that psychic systems seek to avoid cognitive inconsistencies, one can also imagine a logic of
communication that must take care that the unity of communication does not come into contradiction with itself.

Identity of meaning is meaning in itself. It cannot be completely transcended, or signify, in form of sign, because its life is based in such opacity or in the insignificance of a part of it. In this it is like an iceberg, whose appearance does not reveal what is below. Logically, in mathematical form, all meaning is made from countable steps. It depends on one’s point of view about what we will call world of meaning: - all that which is obvious, or that which is not obvious, and requires space or complete meaning. Phenomenological meaning is one system; and the fringes are moveable and fluid, taking account of pressure from within and from outside, for significance.

Society has been organized in the base of intersection of universality. Now this intersection is going to be replaced by the unity of singularities. Sign is going to be determined by meaning, and life of signs is in question by signs of life. Aberration intends to become norm.

Double Contingency

Structure, Conflict
Double contingency comes into view as structures’ conflict (with continuation) of meaning. In reality the concept of structure makes a crack with the necessity of continuation of meaning. This makes meaning’s structure a inconsistency. A form which must continue and stays there as a structure or form for forming but does not coincides with evident experience. The continuity of meaning is the continuity of autopoiesis (the ordered reality). How continuity of meaning and continuity of life relates, this is the main question of meaning science and therapy of meaning.

Positioned as a problem, double contingency is a necessary phenomena for mental change and social continuity. Personally it comes as the contradiction of meaning within distinction-indication and difference keeping, all in meaning happening. The continuity of meaning is ground in the settings of semantics and trusts, in the form of knowledge and experience inherited, always in reference with the form of social system as long as it exists.

The continuity of life is self reproduction, where reproduction of meaning is the continuity of mental conditions for life advance.

Continuity as autopoiesis in itself is a process as physical as abstract. The reality of meaning ends always in physical effects, but its form is virtual.
In the classical period, the concept of consciousness was thought in the form of a system, but recently was seen by a new optic from Luhmann, and consciousness is more similar with a stream.

“In this context, I am also interested in relating the conceptual angle of our theoretical labor to the classical controversies for or against systems theory in the sixties. This should show us what changes occur in discussions conducted in terms of ideology critique or the politics of ideas when one formulates higher standards of conceptual precision.”  

The question of double contingency is concerned with the question that how is social order made possible. The social order as a concept is concerned with conscious as a presumed ordered structure, or system. The form of consciousness’ processing is twofold: relation and intention (expectation). This makes the basic grounds for double contingency, because between relations and expectations there are gaps.

“The first issue concerns "double contingency.... 1 Historically speaking, one ought to know that the reformulation of an old question lies hidden behind the strange expression "double contingency." This old question is simply "How is social order possible?" ...For it asks not just "What is the case?" but also "How is this possible?" How is it possible at all that there should be such things as cognition, aesthetic judgment, or, in our case, social order? In addition to the Kantian triad of cognition, rational praxis,
and aesthetic judgment, we now also have the question "How is social order possible?" \(^{32}\)

The agreement for an established social contract, has prepared the conditions for a sustained order and enlightenment about it (semantics). A system of norms and values oriented, which of course couldn’t be established out of a framed consciousness, brought civilization, but both with it the change from classical concept of humanities to that one of double contingency.

One actor overwhelms all others. Over time, a modicum of reason helps to civilize this structure of domination somewhat. \(^{33}\)

The problems came out by the contradiction of behavior with social values and trusts and the necessity for a new explicating of irregular events was helped by the the concept of double contingency. This gave to the picture of consciousness a dimension of continuity, as a never-ending structure on move.

The concept of double contingency attempts to recover this problem at a different conceptual level. That is to say, it was intended as an explanation of how common values and the symbolic encoding of social behavior come about, and how cultural anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists are able to isolate specific aspects and work on them according to different methods. \(^{34}\)
Parson developed mainly a theory of action. He coupled systems and their functionality on the bases of acting. He almost separated expectations (time) from acting (space), meaning from behavior. Luhmann tries to integrate both aspects in his system theory by establishing the system theory by meaning where expectations, motives and acting make a unified individual structure in each individuality of psychic system, in the form of consciousness and in its continuity, one fold of which plays an everyday role in social system as a function or as a reference or both and the other encoding and striving for encoding new experience as information. This double continuity, individual and social, makes the antinomy of the same process which is called meaning.

On the one hand, there is "contingency" in the sense of "being dependent on" or, as one says colloquially, "contingent on." On the other hand, there is "contingency" in the sense of the possibility that things could be different, which is to say, as the negation of impossibility as well as necessity.

Under such circumstances, the question arises of how a course of action can be found in which expectations and the corresponding achievements can be established as complementary and not simply be pulled apart as separate elements.

Later, this model was also applied to conflicts.
The ideal of Luhmann, to aggregate action with expectation in a continuous as uninterrupted chain, even thou expresses an ultimate stipulation of being, is far from the reality. Being cannot exists without such fault, or partially incompatibility. System emerges and keep difference as well as from continuity to noncontinuity. This idea (to coincide point to point) presumes that human being is not the environment of system but its purpose. But if this happens, there is no system anymore as well as consciousness. The difference of an individuality it is based in difference of expectations and acting, not only as a structure, but also as time to space. It is this discordance between meaning or expectation and acting, as a negation, a base for widening the bandwidth and the horizons of meaning, as social dimension and self reference of the individuals, as far as there are in some way individuals. This makes also possible through a delay (mechanism) or latency the existence of different ranges of systems as well as systems as a concept....the Parsonian claim is that they have a "shared symbolic system" or world orientation in common. However, it is apparently not working when conflict is involved, except if one wants to claim that what the two opponents have in common is a positive/ negative disposition vis-à-vis the same value - that is to say, in our model, getting through or being caught. This reformulation of the model in terms of a theory of conflict indicates that we need a more abstract solution than the one along the lines of a common value orientation that was suggested by Parsons in keeping with Durkheimian sociology. 36
Parson observed and mentioned the distinction between culture and social systems and he placed culture in a hierarchically higher position to the social systems. This means that social systems and consciousness are not possible without cultural life and common values accepted and discussed by cultural instance. **For Parsons, even language belongs to values and norms.** Language is understood as a sort of normative code that determines what kind of speaking is possible if one wants to be understood, and what kind of speaking is invalid.  

For this reason: language, culture, values, and norms are tied very closely together according to this view. But they all cannot consume ones experience and encoding necessity. Luhmann rises a question: how does someone slide from norms and common values to the situation of double contingency and negativity? **As soon as one gives an answer to this question, it becomes apparent that the emergence of common values or of common uncontested positions happens in all likelihood only as a second step.** In the beginning, one does not even know yet what values one actually has. But, after solving the problem of double contingency operationally for some time - that is, after forming complementary expectations and enacting suitable actions and action sequences - one may perhaps find oneself capable of formulating the consensus that has, as it were, revealed itself during the course of the process.  

Here some physical time is a necessary constituent for the consensual approach and
structure. Luhmann considered double contingency and he designed it as an asymmetrical process between semantics and life experience, knowledge and practice, meaning and acting. According to him all values serve for temporal structures. **If I am correct, then a specific temporality or temporal structure replaces the idea of a value consensus as the premise or answer to the question of how social order is possible.** Thus, the asymmetry that is so obvious in this model is not first of all a hierarchical but a temporal one. In other words, it is not the case that there is a higher level of values which is more or less intact and which serves as the motivator. Moreover, it is not the case, as it is in the objective hierarchical model, that these values can be modified in detail depending on the way in which one communicates or feuds with one another. 39 This gives to every judgment a temporal value and makes a break in the conception of consciousness as a sustained system of the rigid principles. This confession is a potential to smooth and surpass every meaning’ determination or identity as an ontological reference.

Another question that Luhmann rises is if double contingency possibly will or will not create conflict in the variation of states of systems. This question is special because it means the flexibility and tolerance of systems as well as consciousness capabilities. The same behavior may be interpreted: accepted or rejected, according to subjective interpretation. This is a
freedom of consciousness in regard with system. But all these terms are insufficient to explain double contingency yet:

All this is based on a model that starts off with self-reference and circularity, since double contingency is circular: "If you do what I want, I will do what you want!" But who is responsible for breaking this circle? Who creates asymmetries? The answer is: time and he who acts first. It is difficult to know who has merits, those who sacrifice everything, even life in the name of values, or the breakers. As we see, the process is twofold. But from the experience of life, no one is completely perfect or mistaken, but both sides exists in contrast to each other and take being like this, in a positive and negative reasoning.

No one can rely on having access to a position that meets with everyone's acceptance.

The basic idea is that, in some way, a split between variation and selection occurs, and this process stimulates the emergence and change of structures.

Following the explanation of the horizon of social dimension or semantics and values, the question of structure of thinking becomes evident. Continuity of thinking and its sustaining are simultaneously working as a structure on move not only forwarding for social dimension but also internally in each individual’s mind …a minimal notion of persistence
and permanence came to mind. This is due in part to the tradition that usually designates systems and other states of affairs with the help of the concept of relation. There are elements and there are relations, and the latter are, in a sense, constant across time. Of course, they may change. However, one speaks of a relation only if one is dealing not with.42

A general design of structure of thinking in move according to Luhmann is:

1. On the one hand, there is this connection between concepts of structure and relation and thus a moment of constancy.
2. On the other hand, another cognitive or analytic moment is added on.
3. Structures work as conditions of cognition. (Regardless of who is the subject of this cognition.)
4. It is necessary to recognize what it is all about and one's ability to identify the type of something. (Recognize and identify)
5. The relative permanence of relations, and totality as the condition of cognition. (Relativity of meaning which comes from all over changes of meaning).
6. Some progress, in the form of additional developments occurred.
7. The first concerns the coordination of structure and expectation. (The primacy of consciousness).
8. This issue pertains specifically to psychic and-social systems and thus not to the general concept of structure as such. (Here we observe that the change is twofold, for self reference and for social systems)
9. Apparently, there is a structure within the system that is not a mere representation of environmental differences but includes generalizations instead. This is the core, which keeps historical
attribution of values and latency in individuals and social systems, or law, in the level of every range of meaning, law.

**Expectation:**

A great role in the structure of thinking and motivating for action plays expectation. Here a continual condition are believes and insights. Luhmann considers expectations as structures which release systems from the domination by their environment.

This is an important point that ought to be kept in mind. If structures are coupled with expectations, the perspective of the future will receive preferential treatment in the entire theory. The system itself was already its own past (or whatever else you want to call it). All this is connected to the concept of expectation. Abstracting from this concept of expectation, however, is not so easy. It is most worthwhile to think about how this might be accomplished. ..the so-called subjectivity of structures that are defined merely by expectations. 43

In this surroundings, "subjective" merely means "relative to the system," and system is possible only by a radicalized viewpoint. Order is created by system, either as its own internal order or as the ordering of its environment. Being is constructed in relation to the system. Structure and process so are as decoupled and coupled in a intersystem of communication.

**The concept of operation**

The shift from system’ concept to continuity of meaning as a system in processing forward is realized with the concept of *a strictly operational*
We have mentioned that quality of systems is based in mode of operation and range of its connectivity. Operation is the live of every system. **Systems always consist of operations and continue to exist as long as they are able to actualize new operations.** Systems exist only in the present of their real operation, which is to say, only when communication takes place or, in the case of psychic systems, only when attention is activated.  

Structures are real only when they are utilized. Regarding time or unutilized thoughts perhaps art only is a kind of system which tries to bring something in view from unutilized thoughts and events in time.

**We no longer have at our disposal a higher level which, like a world of ideas or an ontological invariant, has a stability all of its own, existing above the actual occurrences, as it were.** So operation is the only way which realizes communication.

**Operation and communication**

Operation is itself the only reality of communication and reflection. Questions are derived from this assertion, like:

1. How one operation connects to another?
2. How we meet with the meaning of a structure?
3. How does an operation find the next appropriate operation?
4. How does next operation produce itself, starting from a given point of departure?
5. How becomes relevant something between real and not yet real in processes of thoughts? How connects the past with the future?
6. Is reality of a structure and its durability an existential mode? Or reality of a structure lies in its being utilized (used)?
7. Is real the division between structure and process?

It is quite obvious that structures and processes do not exist separable. Here we may inquire which one has the primacy: do systems generate processes or vice versa? **Systems are generated through the type of operation by means of which they realize themselves.** … one has a clearer picture of the unity of the system as related to the corresponding operation, which in our case is communication.  

Systems are composed of two sides: **events and processes**, on the one hand, and **structures**, on the other. Structures represent the recursive interconnectedness of operations, used and for this reason become system.

Recurrents can symbolize by functioning as **recourse to the past or anticipation of the future** - are handled as the constitutive elements of the identity of a single operation.  

**PREORIENTATION**

How do a sentence, a command, a request, an assertion, or a statement come about in specific situations if not through a pre-orientation towards what has taken place before and what can be connected to it **afterwards**? Structures work as the general demonstration for the unbroken activation of recursive orientations within a system. That is to say, structures themselves would be something that is fluid from moment to moment and which serves merely to furnish the continuation of the operation of the system with information and order.

Questions here move toward view:
1. How the same structure can be set up and work repeatedly?
2. Is memory a kind of structure in our disposal so that we can use it again for operational purposes?
3. Is writing a sort of limitation of a system's chances for forgetting?
4. Is memory as good at remembering as it is at forgetting?
5. Who decides for forgetting: society or individual?

One of the advantages of an operation-related concept of structure is, as it were, the equal validation of recollection and forgetting, depending on operational necessities.\(^{48}\)

**Recursiveness**

It would be necessary to know in more detail how recursiveness build ups.

We takes out from memory something we carry from our past as relevant, and aim at a sort of future without using the past circumstances and without knowing the future situations?

Here a structure of questions comes in focus:

1. What kind of some process of selection intervene here?
2. Do we necessary already established identities or this is an ontological habit?
3. What we need from the past, to be able to identify?
4. To what purpose we take into account the past for the future?

All these question can be reduced in one question: under what logical and emotional conditions meaning condenses itself? ... adopting a formulation that for Spencer Brown has an entirely different purpose, I call this "condensation." In a certain sense, meaning contexts are condensed through their repetition. That is to say, they are reduced to forms that can be marked and designated while omitting almost everything that was plausible in the situations of their invention and earlier uses. 49

A second phase of operation is confirmation. This division is formal because usually condensation, operation and confirmation, for the reason of difference keeping, live un inseparable life.

Condensation – operation – confirmation

(No unified formula)

Can condensation and confirmation be synthesized to one concept? Or is the production of structure, of identities, and of reusability a two-step process of specifying and generalizing, of reducing and expanding, for which there can be no unified formula? 50

There are different ways of encoding experience according to language, culture, groups. A standard formula for the ways of meaning crystallization seems almost impossible. Meaning takes relevance in relation to meaning. So in all this relative area, the only approach remains meaning to meaning, which means relative to relative assessment. This nature of meaning does not annihilate the tension of meaning as a force for determination... that there is a complex tension between condensation
and confirmation. One can then imagine that structures become somewhat indefinable through the sequence of their repeated uses.  

Purpose and structure

Regarding Luhmann the purpose for which something can be used is not really clear or wholly defined. This means that “essentials” are taken like this scientifically a priory in the best case, because their background of human relations is historical (transitory). This is the reason that one cannot simply hand it over to someone else with the simple instruction "This is how it is done!" In other words, if the experience of use is brought into the form of an instruction, one reduces it to words that are used by the instructed person as well as to the assumption of a rigid identity for which the actual context is completely irrelevant.

For this reason structure is always also an instrument of cognition. Knowing in what situation and in what system one is acting. If so, then one is asking about the structure. This can be easily integrated in operational structure as observation. Observation is another operation between operations, inseparable.

Distinctions, and identities as decisive for the identification of an object. The role of observer.

Observer is a system of operation as every system. If the issue concerns how to find out what past experience is relevant in what way for what kind of future, the system is observing itself in the very moment when it operates, regardless of how reduced the means of this self-observation may be. Observation, self observation and operation are in each other's
pocket processes. The degree of their participation depends on the
determination and the state of system.

The system itself recognizes its structures in its operation and in its
commitment to certain preset meanings that can be reused. 54

Observer identifies systems from the perspective of structures, and this is
always made in relation to observer’s structure and his side of perspective.
Observer is subjective in regard with system.

An observer of a system that generates and develops its own structures
does not understand the system if he does not know how the system
itself conducts its observations. He may well see other structures behind
this, and he may postulate and recognize latent structures. 55

Latency
Latency or belief, or delay, is the core of the system.

Latency has to effect also the mode of observation and the structures of the
system, which in turn is itself being observed by other’s with other latency
as core of their systems. Thus, the cognitive aspect - namely, the observer
relativity of the concept of structure - is not lost, but it becomes more
complicated to the degree that one has to decide who exactly is this
observer who constructs structures. In addition, it becomes more compli-
cated to the degree that one recognizes that, without the structure, there
would be no move from one operation to the next.
Conflict and anomalies

... communication engenders a bifurcation between "yes" and "no" as soon as one has understood it, then you will recognize that, in the operations themselves, conflict and consensus are constantly reproduced as a duality and as alternatives.

We prescribe that it has to describe society primarily in terms only of consensus or of conflict.

For Max Weber, the problem is essentially addressed in terms of value relations, which is to say, a plurality of values, and the idea that there are different modes of ordering life, such as religion, love, the economy, or politics. Each of these modes posits an a priori value that offers it orientation. Conflict between individuals arises when one has to decide whether, say, reasons of state are more important than love. 56

Here the concept of love works as a possible encoding and processing to the system or against, but independently of it, the attraction and processing of meaning in lovers works in the sphere of continuity, to the system or potentially to another as discontinuity.

This point was picked up by Robert Merton when he proposed that structures in social systems, especially in societies, have to absorb value contradictions.17 There are latent structures that have the effect of "anomies," as Merton puts it. (I would speak of paradoxes and antinomies.)

Merton provided important reflections on this issue. He came to the conclusion that apparently there are different possibilities of reacting to this state of affairs, and the choice of one of these possibilities is itself in need of sociological explanation.
This is only one example to show that the conflict-consensus dichotomy did not simply remain in place as a crude alternative.  

Luhmann advanced his point of view considering conflicts systems. In my point of view, conflicts are not systems because of not freely processing in operation. They restrain systems relationship in the processing, with an obligation of newly forming processing, in purpose to continue internally without barrier. But in a very general view, conflict is part of the system as anticipatory component.

The key statement for this purpose is my claim that conflicts themselves are systems. Conflicts are systems because one creates a situation that limits the bandwidth of variation concerning the other, if one treats him as an opponent and acts in a correspondingly aggressive, defensive, or protective way in his presence.

"no" as an answer to repeated interpretive offers, is a motive that produces a system, which is to say, a motive that organizes connectivity.

Conflict-connectivity

For Luhmann moral perspectives serve to generalize conflicts. The formula is that conflicts are an excellent principle of system formation, and that systems theory can deal as well with conflict as with cooperation. Conflicts are highly integrated systems.

Integration
The concept of conflict leads to the concept of integration. The integration works as the limitation of the degrees of freedom that components have, and sees the conflict as a strong integrative engine for the sameness for communication.

Components are integrated to the degree that the options, states, and qualities that a system can have are reduced. 59

He explains system with an integrative tendency, and after regaining new and additional options they introduce in the conflict again.

There is rampant growth in the system because it is too integrated. The subsequent analyses would have to deal with the question of how conflicts arise and how the problem of negation or rejection in communication is prevented from immediately turning into conflict. After all, every "no" immediately suggests the question "Why do you say this?"

The control of conflict concerns the social structure. However, in these explanations, an intermediary step is usually missing namely, the question of how it was possible at all that things could get to such a point - that is to say, how a conflict can become so dynamic that it no longer manages to rein itself in.60

What keeps the sustaining of meaning, except opinion, semantics, culture is law as empowered power. Behind law it is power. Another idea that belongs in this context is that it is possible to conceive of the law as an institution for the domestication of conflicts. (In Social Systems, I spoke of immune systems.) That is to say, the law really encourages conflicts. That is to say, the possibility of saying "no" is strengthened by the legal structure, and usually this suffices to nip a potential conflict in the bud.
In the reverse case, when conflicts do happen, the law can lead to a peaceful decision. ⁶¹

Trying to make an architecture theory and both with it a design of its structure in abstract terms, with different levels of resources and elements as well as arguments about, Luhmann gives these conceptual tools by a design of system plan of meaning as much as one could do in the époque’s context. He makes clear the ambiguity of System concept and offers some new brightness in system’s theory.

This singles out the following questions at every point in time:

1- What are the different options?
2- What is connected to the decision in favor of this concept as opposed to another one?
3- Where is there an exit point?
4- Where does one have the freedom to choose something else in order to see what else needs to be changed if one revises a certain decision?

In this tradition, humanism is nothing but ontology applied to the human being. ⁶²

Conclusion:

One of the most important conclusions regarding meaning is that Order is not a mental rigidly reality. I recognize that nothing can force us to claim that there is something constant behind the fluid realities of the everyday and all the actions or operations, and that this constant element has to be recognized in order for real understanding to happen. We say
that the observer himself constructs a structure. In the very moment when he observes, he takes certain things, distinctions, and identities as decisive for the identification of an object. Ibid.\textsuperscript{63}

This confession does not mean that distinctions and identifications as well as objects are unexcitable. Simply means that variability is phenomena of a system in the form of the subjectivity in relation with something common which we call system in social terms and consciousness in those individuals.
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Abstrakt
Ky studim modest ka për qëllim të sjellë një kuptim të asaj se si kuptimi është krijuar zyrtarisht nga brenda; dhe se si kjo është bërë e mundur nga jashtë, duke kondicionuar sociale. Vetë-referenca funksionalitetin e sistemit psikike individuale e bën këtë realitet të jetë e mundur.

Si rezultat i vjen nga epoke të Regjistrohu me atë të Kuptimit, vetë-referencë e individualitetit të sistemit psikike vjen në pikë qendrore për një vëzhgues. Praktikisht vetë-referencë në ditët e sotme u bë kyç për formimin e sistemeve sociale.

Ne supozojmë referencë vetë të një individualitetit të një sistemi psikike të jetë një sistem autopoietic, me njëkohësi në funksionimit të sistemit social, gjë që e bën një qenie njerëzore një person. Kjo referencë dyfishtë është
thelbi i mirëkuptimit, si përparësia e Kuptimit ka zhvendosur për t'u bërë përparësia e Regjistrohu, një ngjarje e cila e bën gjuha një të mesme të transmetimit të kuptimit.

Hipoteza se një mendje e rëndë është një mendje semantike shtatzënë është një ekuacion logjik, është një nga të cilat do të paraqesin këtu dhe të cilat ne do të përpiqemi për të verifikuar. Kjo shtatzënisë, të trashëguara nga semantikë dhe forma të reja të domethënies së bashku, është arsyja për transformimin e kuptimit dhe të shpërnguljes së strukturës së saj riprodhuar me drejtimin e vetë. E gjithë kjo është një proces i informacionit, të kuptuarit dhe përshtatjen, ku folurit duket si sfera e shprehjes apo lirinë e kuptimit.

Në fund të fundit i këtij hulumtimi është që kuptimi është formal në përmbajtje dhe jo thelbësore si ne me të vërtetë besojmë. Gjuha dhe linjat e të menduarit janë formularët për formimin e formave të kuptimit të cilat më vonë mund të ketë një jetë të tyre, pa ta dhe shfaqen edhe në kohë pa to. Bota e kuptimit nuk duket identike me shenja ose semantikë. E gjithë kjo e bën të thotë një fenomen shakable dhe historike me skajet kohore. Ajo që është me të vërtetë thelbësor për të kuptuarit e kuptimit është se duket si një forcë për rëndësi, me implikime në botën e kuptimit për lirinë e qasjes në kuptimin dhe mjediset e saj fizike.

Identiteti i kuptimit është shuma e kuptimit social dhe individual, të dyja plotësuar nga hapat countable e logjikës. Për këtë arsy, kuptimi është si fenomenologjik si dukuri shoqërore. Pjesë e kuptimit të jetuar në kohë, nga
hapësira sociale apo komunikim, pa transpiring: por të gjitha chunks
djaktore mund të numërohen, dhe kështu që ata janë shumë të kufizuara.
Kuptimi është një strukturë, shpesh rrjedhin nga lokalet të cilat ne nuk do
të shqetësojë për të verifikuar. Uniteti i lënë pas dore të tillë krijojn se
shtyrja ku të gjitha sistemet e kuptimit të bazuar në, sociale dhe
individuale. Kjo vonesë është quajtur latente. Zhduka e latencies vjen nga
konceptues i kuptimeve të reja nga përvojat e jetës.

Behind çfarëdo interpretimi një mund të sigurojë, ajo është një, realitet fizik
urdhëruar. Nuk ka kuptim për të është e vlefshme një kohë të pacaktuar.
Rënia e ndërgjegjes duhet të pranohet si një tregues i një rendi të ri. Bota
rinovohet në çdo moment