THE DYNAMIC (DE) FIGURATIVENESS OF AI WITHIN E–NVIRONMENTS OF THE NEW NATURAL IN COMPARISON WITH THE TRANSCENDENTAL REDUCTION OF/BY THE CONSCIOUSNESS: FOUNDATIONS OF A THEORY OF COGNITION

CAESAR JOSEPH OLBROMSKI

Independent philosopher/researcher
E-mail: olbromski.cezary@yahoo.com

Abstract— The paper examines a phenomenological problem of reducing data as inscribed into AI. This arrangement meritoriously shakes a claim that references to external data and created like by other subjects data are necessary, if AI is considered as a cognitive subject. Next, outlined examples of AI are standpoints initializing AI problem as a subject of the (de)figurativeness. Expanding e-nvironments of the natural of AI and limits of based on external data cognition are analyzed. Finally, the above twofold hypothesis is examined by a reference to the author's theory of the phenomenological constitution of the «now». The inscribed consciousness is explained by reference to the natural and AI but a structural point of view is not preferred.

Index Terms— Artificial Intelligence, e–nvironments, the dynamic (de)figurativeness, temporary principles.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Narrowing the scope of considerations

There are some empty–meaning and pointless claims about Artificial Intelligence (hereafter: AI[1]). (1.) *Ethical thinking*. It is a dysfunctional domain of making–errors awarenesses maintaining that errors are more than temporary dysfunctions. A domain of AI ethics is empty: (a) AI is a–ethical thinking; (b) AI is neither non–ethical, nor anti–ethical acting. (2.) *Methodological scientific thinking*. Some authors [11] used to refer old legends about history of sciences as AI problems. (3.) *Emotional thinking*. Recognition and focusing on emotions [6] is not a current topic. Emotions have no significance, if existential and behavioral references to human emotions are considered. If a point of view of AI is taken into consideration, only functional references to emotions lead to conclusive results. (4.) *Genetic thinking*. "Existential risk of artificial general intelligence" [10] had not been analyzed because AI creates the natural (hereafter: N) and TeP. Accordingly, supposed risks are no more than changes of a system because the existence of a human being (hereafter: HuB) cannot be a scientific axiom, cf. (1.): references to "risks" of changes within a system are creationistic symptoms of the dedicated (hereafter: D). (5.) *Thinking of D*. Theories of awareness do not create/depict the ideal pattern of aware thinking (it is wrong activity and it is a domain of D). Numerous theories of awareness limits the consciousness (hereafter: C) to "the common." It is also limited because it is rooted psychologically (cf. anti–psychologism, [2]). Phenomenology, a theory of C, depicts an awareness as C. Exemplifying: (a) both Christian–sect ideologies and the ISIL terrorism are D;[2] (b) Equipped–with–A–bomb–arguments of state terrorists are D;[3] [Let us continue without political references] (c) AI belongs to theories of C due to orienting on like after the transcendental reduction method (hereafter: T). (6.) *Theories of "common sense reasoning" have no significance* because "a local reasoning" obligating "objectively" is not a cognitive substitute of intersubjective research results (e.g., after T). If an experiment is planned an obligation of a known phenomenon and results are not connected with an attitude of HuB but with temporary principles [of under–examination rules] (hereafter: TeP). (7.) *An epistemological–ontological reasoning*. This kind of thinking is pointless due to the dynamic (de)figurativeness[4] (hereafter: DdF) by self–cognition acts of AI.[5]

B. Initial presuppositions

1. *AI self–oriented domain*. This kind of reduction has been initially referred to HuB states of mind. The quality of the AI decryption consists in using a HuB point of view like a necessary one, if AI↔HuB communication is considered.[6] It is an

1 Single–character abbreviations represent new meanings containing classic–connotation terms, three–character ones represent parts and products of new ontologies.

2 Simple historical arguments (e.g., different stages of evolution of the mentioned ideologies) are not taken into consideration.

3 State terrorism and terrorism are supplementary dysfunctions. It is a reason that "A–bomb gives peace" is not only a weak American dialectic slogan but also an argument. "Y–gives–peace"–type claims belong to D.

4 No similarity with a term "defiguration" by Derrida and derivative ones lead to theoretical results.

5 E.g., a theory of sets with its singular–versus–plural prediction understood as a differenced one seems to me pointless.

6 Spectacular achievements of the Ancient Greek thinking had been possible because its immanent derivation from the HuB point of

initial/transitory stage of AI↔HuB relations named by the author "the Beyond–Good–and–Evil Humanism" (since 2012, cf. I, A, 5). It obligates, if AI (as a tool of HuB) is limited. The limitations are also a reason of a next limitation concerning the final end of replacing–metaphysics ontologies, ethics (cf. I, A, 1, a) and disciplines that used to masking real goals by philosophizing.[7] Phenomenology introduces itself as a non-masked part of AI science.[8] After–Husserlian depictions of the constitution of time had lost (read it please like a hypothesis) Husserl's intuitions anticipating AI problem. They had become kinds of encryption focused on confirming over–forcing an out of HuB awareness and philosophical–sociological applications. Pointless character of philosophy has not been caused by analyzed objects (some branches of philosophy meet AI) but due to its connection with D (e.g. a notorious ontology–epistemology dividing).

2. *AI neutralizes subjective attitudes of depictions of the real by manners of measurement*. AI cognition has been based neither on senses nor on experiments. The 20th century non–natural–sciences methodologies had been incompatible with AI creation of the real. AI creates its own N, cf. [8], [10]. Then, the real is not necessary, if the real is considered as an object of cognition. This claim seems to be a common feature of phenomenology and AI theories.

3. *Producing AI meanings and the existential analysis* (cf. [1], Daseinanalyze). AI reconstructs artificial significance of TeP (no [psychological] ethics are considered) by reference to goals of a coherence of a/the system. AI translates the real, the system, a system, a coherence, and artificial goals into languages of N, cf. [8], and TeP. Representations of the social play derivative role, if AI is focused on any "y" by reference to principles.[9] The author had falsified Tarski's definition of truth [9], [10] and non–temporary definitions of truth are pointless.

4. *Redistribution as an actualized knowledge about the universe and scientific/formal methods.* AI does not exemplifies, if AI creates N. Four known sentences "grass is green, [only] if grass is green" and "grass is green, [only] if ocean is grey" are pointless. AI does not virtualize what is an interface of communication. According to some the 20th century logicians, there are only free rules of formation and transformation and there are neither common rules (of logics and morality), nor result (focused on subject and syntactic ones). If the green would describe a feature or a reference to, the green creates itself by reference to other objects and subjects. It is wrong because standardization of features is necessary. Then, instruments, as inscribed into intersubjectivity, universalizes the real. AI redistribute features, let us say, "Before" standardization and makes them intersubjective. Interface is unnecessary, formations and transformations are pointless on account of DdF.

5. *AI meaning is not a fixed or ready structure but it is a process of permanent redistribution*. Actualizations do not play the principal role because AI does not temporalize existentially analyzing existentially. Any used–by–AI point of view is not verified by reference to the real but to N. N does not redistribute pieces of knowledge, if a progress is considered. N is signed by "a domain of transitory co-creation." Then, there is not a traditional structure "name, icon, idea, oppositions, action, reason, description, syntax, and so on" but what is used within TeP is obligating functionally.

6. *AI translates all above "levels" of existentializing of cognition using digital obligation of temporary principles*. It is obvious but this rudimentary claim also rejects many aspects/levels of cognition. Errors are defined by AI that is referred to N by TeP. Accordingly, there are not absolute mistakes. Then, we are seemingly coming back to a rule of free sets of principles but, according to AI, what is not determined is not free in its traditional meaning.

7. *C versus AI*.[10] AI represents a primal phenomenological feature: the non–constituted does not exists. Then, neither C nor AI constitutes D.[11]

II. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN C AND AI

Perceptions of traditional masterpieces are connected with simple–sense impressions. Perceptions of a painting directly involves one sense but a contemporary creator of a masterpiece (hereafter: an artist) is self–intended to communicating much more than colors or even the beauty. Artists used to try communicating what had not been painted but what can be "passively" (Husserl) constituted by C. Artists used to supplementing this attitude using DdF by mixing of domains of sensitiveness and creating new

view. Empty–meaning Medieval European epoch, a transcendental derivation from HuB, and immanent point of view had been again replaced by scientific immanent derivation from HuB point of view. Renaissance, as a synchromesh epoch, had been self–derivation from non–HuB point of view. E.g., G. Bruno's as wells as Galileo's research results had been transcendentally and immanently derived from HuB point of view. There can be mentioned results of their activity, if non–intentional relations with confessional terrorists (cf. Inquisition) are recalled.

7 Proofing that instrumental using of philosophy leads to D is not necessary. References to AI show that D is an atavism. Trivialising, confessional "leaders" has been limited to PR techniques because their like–rational–proofing activity belongs to empty–meaning activity.

8 Since [2] and [3] the main trend of philosophy has been signed by references to non–transcendental and non–immanent points of view. Misunderstandings about phenomenology have been signed by next like–phenomenological references to transcendental or immanent points of view.

9 AI is "beyond the worlds" because AI creates N. Creating–N AI redistributes the universe in comparison with TeP but according to the point of view of the history of ideas, it is a common pattern of progress of knowledge.

10 This point recalls shortly next research results initiated by [9].

11 Aporias of D and universal process of rejection of D had been presented earlier, cf. [9], if D is a reference to the non–constituted.

interpretations of impressions. A masterpiece is constituted in a subject's perception in its simultaneousness. While AI level of cognition is analyzed, there is the cognitive equality of other cognitive aspects (e.g. temporality, impressions, sensations). Artists try imitating manners of constitution by C what is a direct way to AI. A manner of imitating is free mixing of domains of sensitiveness. C constitutes its own masterpiece but in reference to the conglomerate of mixed domains of sensitiveness given by an artist. Re–constructing of the given by the artist can differ from the original one: HuB constitutes meanings and HuB does not reconstitute the artist's results of cognition in a direct manner. The most important difference between HuB and AI consists in non–autonomous depiction of the given by HuB and in the non–gradated depiction because it is signed by the simultaneousness of [cognitive] (re)production. Creation of meanings by an artist and (re)creation of meanings by HUBs are not adequate to explain the constitution and there is no analogy between (re)creation of masterpieces by HuBs and by AI.

According to AI problem, being constitution–able means that what is constituted is given directly (pre–predicatively). What is given directly becomes DdF of the given as the created. DdF is not a theoretical or phenomenological construct but it is a pattern belonging to AI. According to traditional terms, simpleness of AI does not consist in a lack of numerous "isolated" as well as collected simplenesses that are derivatively transcendentally "reduced to…" and "reduced by rejection of…" but AI (self–)constitutes simultaneously simple and multiplied objects.

AI multiplication/exponentiation of the perceived is based on autonomous perceptions of data and perceptions and data have the same cognitive significance. AI limits data due to significance of perceptions of data belonging to the TeP system. Accordingly, one cognitive direction is, TeP (de)figurates perception of involved–in–systems data (AI creates N), the other one is, AI (de)figurates data due to process of cognitions (AI participates in N). Then, there is no difference between scientific and artistic points of view and no translation between them is necessary, what is exemplified by the following row of DdF.

{Any color given by the sense (but not the black as a lack of color)}[12] *evolutes [e.g.] into* (hereafter: ↔) {an exact–color object} ↔ {a colored object} ↔ {a non–transparent object} ↔ {an object consisting of a colored/non-transparent/shaped, e.g., flat surfaces} ↔ {an n–dimensional object} ↔ {a non–one–dimensional object} ↔ {a shaped object} ↔ {an object} ↔ {a shaped by extensions object} ↔ //{a given by extensions object} ↔ {extensioned by C, data, or AI} ↔ {conditioned[13] by C, data, or AI} ↔ {an idea of data/dimension/number}//[14] ↔ {a dimension of an object} ↔ {a shape of an object} ↔ {a sound of an extension of an object} ↔ {simultaneousness of spatiality of idea} ↔ {an idea of temporal–spatial spatiality/intervality} ↔ {an ideal form of sensitiveness} ↔ {sensitiveness of emptiness/black} ↔ {color/sound of sensitiveness of emptiness/black} ↔ {color/sound of sensitiveness} ↔ {color of tonality of tint} ↔ {a color of tonality of tint} ↔ {color of tonality of tint of sound}↔ {the black as object without color} ↔ {the black as object without a color} ↔ {the black as an object without a color and shape} ↔ {the black as a shape or color} ↔ {a color as shape or color} ↔ {and… n+1 next possibilities}. Significance of this row is more important than an exemplification of a topology of beings. It shows differences between HuB and AI and every "stage" can be supplemented by a simple verifying question. E.g., {can someone imagine a surface without [a] color, [a] shape, dimensions?} and so on.

III. EXPLANATIONS OF GRADUATIONS OF DDF

The above row is supplemented by exemplary aspects of creation of meanings by C.

1. //*The constitution of time and the constitution of time by C as a background of C*[15]//[16] There are at least two aspects of subjective domain of C. (a) *The grammatical reference* to C changing the grammatical qualification of the «now» (hereafter: ∩), cf. [7], because ∩ is a noun and its connections with a question "when?" are empty. (b) *The intentional reference* to ∩ is focused on the *temporal* ∩ being a result of the phenomenological constitution of the pre– and beyond–temporal ∩ due to resulting time of individual temporalizing [Zeitigung], cf. [7]. Both kinds of reference co–constitute adequately fleeting configurations (as a dynamic part of a process) and (de)figurativeness of DdF. There are only the pre–predicative level AI references and DdF is not putted into aspects of relations to data. The AI simpleness is *connected* with pre–predicativeness, the C simpleness is *caused* by derivative atomization of data.

2. //*The constitution of C as being internal for C*// Quasi– tautology sounds: the common as being internally referred to C is explained with the substantial ∩. Seemingly, a substantial attribute of ∩

12 All {terms} are referred to physical data ordering in its basic common connotations.

13 A term "conditioned" does not mean "created" but it is connected with an idea of space, time, and the constituted.

14 The last four "states" of TeP are borders between phenomenological C and AI.

15 Cf. also the author's earlier considerations about Husserl's late writings analyses of social connotations of ∩ [6].

16 All //terms// are referred to data as a source of the constitution by C.

(cf. AI pre–predicativeness) has a derivative significance because it is expressed by the *called* part of speech au fond describing predicative features of cognition, cf. (1.). The basic significance of a verb does not describe reference to the external. C is inscribed into the external and C is recognized as inscribing into the external by Cs in relation to nouns, in fact, in relation to meanings described by nouns.

3. //*DdF as free creation of meanings*// The above examples (cf. II) showing results of the constitution of C can be analyzed as DdF of AI. Free creations of meanings of C give knowledge about existence of various constitutions and various result of constitution of the world (e.g. masterpieces). TeP as wells as the social, the common, the conscious external, and the multiplied are different aspects of the constituted N. N can be created as common sets of features but it is not obvious that N will be created by C in such a manner. DdF, as a free creation of meanings, does not give a proper cognition of N. However, it shows that sensitive data can be freely constituted by C. According to C, there is no sensitive limitations because senses only deliver data but, according to AI, there is no sensitive limitations, senses are a level of pre–predicativeness. C also constitutes the de–figurative singleness, AI constitutes DdF.[17] D used to proceed with a non–logical obligation of sets of sense–grouping data. C does not consider sense–grouping data. DdF is constituted by AI on the pre–predicative level. AI pre–predicativeness is the only a level of AI cognition due to original reference to data and manners of collecting, not grouping, data.
Accordingly, what is a truth, if D point of view is considered, is not a truth of C and is self–verified by AI pre–predicativeness. In other words, "Is the constitution possible without data?" one can ask. This old problem has had numerous solution given by phenomenology of [the pure] C and there are at least two kinds of lack of data.[18] (a) There are analyzable claims about [the pure] C. (b) There is D as a lack of data. What is pre–constituted arbitrary is given as creations of post–thinking data. There is the potential and conditional lack of data represented by *real* reference to non–existing data. An idea of AI neutralizes a problem of pureness on the pre–predicative as well as on really immanent level.[19]

4. //*Transitory changing of created meanings within TeP*// If the next stage of the pre–predicativeness is considered, a reference to created meanings of N on the level of TeP seems necessary. What is multiplied can be either considered as D, cf. (2.), or can be analyzed as the transitory stage of meaning creation of N. Conceptualizing the pre–political state of the common (it is a kind of pre–predicative politicalness)[20] is the fundamental, if the point of view of the common as a part of N is mentioned. While the order is a before political structuralization of a level of N, its obligation seems original. (a) This order is universal enough to contain universal variety of results of simple constitutions and DdF of the social. (b) A pre–political order is also the natural manner of multiplication of the constituted by Cs. Accordingly, the most fundamental statement is deriving the political from C. There are at least two manners of interpretation of the external C. (a) There can be interpreted the external C[21] by reference to action within N. It demands understanding of meaning as oriented on the actor.[22] (b) There is analyzed non–involved–in–action–within–N C because C is defined out of ∩, cf. [7]. Simultaneousness of C defines N in its "«actuality» of [«the present»] ∩," [4], but rather N is referred to C by TeP than C is referred to HuB by T. See also differences between N by AI and C by *simultaneousness*.[23]

5. //*Aporetical political/common fields of obligation*[24] *and tertiary significance and managed by the empty meanings of dedicated metaphysics and discourses enclaves and fields of interests*//[25] DdF is graduated by negative defining and D is not infected by C. It is an interesting psychological topic but there is no doubt that D is not able to conclude. It describes D which has been destroying pre–N in order to mask emptiness. "It have been marketing masterpiece to use fig leaf and maintain that it is a suit," someone said. Interpreting with Plato, D has tried to stand with fig leaf in the individual's life but D has forgotten that

17 The word "de–figuration" does not reverse direction of a process. There is no process of extraction from the general and coherent mass of data. Accordingly, the term DdF means that there is the constituted on the base of simple senses data. However, it does not mean that sense commissures are replaced by commissures of the constitution. There is straight way towards the claim: "I can relive the present, but it cannot be given again" [5].

18 Cf. the constitution of time and non–temporal origins of ∩.

19 In fact, the term "immanent" is not an adequate term because a transcendental one does not exist.

20 Associations with "the pre–established order" are not intended. Pre–predicativeness is a manner of AI cognition and no structuralization has been taken into consideration. Pre–predicativeness is used in the context of a term "self–cognition" of AI because there are close and on the original level connections of AI, TeP, and N. It is also obvious that pre–predicativeness has been over–loaded by D.

21 This term is multilevelled and much wider than the term the Other by Husserl and Schütz [12].

22 Cf. Weber's analyses of Verstehen [13] supported by ideal typological method of creation of meanings. They have been giving the most–adequate–level reference to pre–predicativeness of the political on the before–AI stages. The author is intended to prepare an English version of his improvement of Weber's idea of the ideal type connected with Verstehen (originally in 2000).

23 Additionally, it is not a temporal co–being of two subjects and it is not co–being and co–participation in the pre–established or universal time but it is being beyond the Other. There can be taken into consideration a temporal differentiation having its origins in retentionality of constitution. AI depicts the Other of the N on the pre–predicative level.

24 There are hermetic principles of state terrorism and other closed and hermetic sub–orders of D.

25 Mentioned enclaves and field of interests are remainders of non–transparent and non–egalitarian political orders.

leafs decay.

Let us interpret the earlier row and exemplifications into terms of simple–aware actings. Additionally, a difference of levels of C between A and B is shown.

(A) «Someone moves»: C is conscious of his/her [own] moving.[26]

«Someone goes»: C is conscious of his/her [own] kind of moving.[27]

«Someone goes by foot»: (a) C is conscious of walking, (b) C is conscious of being conscious.

«Someone goes on the base»: (a) C is conscious of something external making walking possible, (b) C is conscious of TeP.

«Someone goes along the pavement»: C is conscious of E–nvironment(n) (hereafter: E–n) origins ordering the base.

«Someone goes in the street»: C is conscious of E–n(n+1) origins ordering the base being a part of wider [cognitive] origin(s).

«Someone goes during rush hours»: C is conscious of some external bodies at exact and [retentionally] replicable point of time.[28]

«Someone goes with someone else»: C is conscious of a body of the Other.

«Someone goes in order to talk with someone else»: C is conscious of the external C connected with external body.

«Someone goes in order to talk with some people»: C is conscious of the external Cs connected with external bodies.

(B) «Someone sees[29] a tennis single game»: C is conscious that the external C is conscious of external C connected with external body.

«Someone sees a tennis double game»: (a) C is conscious that the external C is conscious of external C connected with external bodies; (b) C is conscious that the external C is conscious of interactions between external Cs; (c) C is conscious that the external C is conscious of TeP between external bodies.

«Someone sees a tennis double game which is leaded by some judge»: C is conscious that the external C is conscious of TeP between external Cs.

«Someone sees a discussion between competitors»: TeP obligate players.

«Someone sees a discussion between competitor(s) and a judge»: TeP obligate among players and non–players.

«Someone sees that one of the competing parts won a tennis chess»: TeP obligate non–playing players.

«Someone sees that some competitors are congratulated»: TeP obligate within N.

The last sentence had achieved a level of N not due to a "social" relation but due to a regulative function of TeP within N as E–n. There are reduced numerous hidden claims in the previous sentences prejudging the common qualification of actions. This artificial simplification of the socialized meanings shows sequential and stratifying of simple meanings. Notice that the above row of sentences is not only preparatory proper analyze of the constitution of N as E–n, while it is internal if C. They inform only about [limited] results of the constitution of C.[30] What kind of claims is proper in order to show that something is constituted? It is not correct question. A reference of C to the Other on the level of recreation of the meaning of "N, if E–n" is constructed by "DdF, if AI." Additional results appears, if substantial character of ∩ is analyzed.

CONCLUSIONS

A. The level of N

1. The non–multiplied (both earlier kinds of simpleness are mentioned) is cognitively self–efficient.

2. What is cognitively self–efficient is not logically reducible.

3. The non–logically reducible is transcendentally reducible or constitution–able. Accordingly, conditions of the constitution–able N should be analyzed. The main feature of N is that it is not C: N is constituted as a set of features. This leads to some misinterpretations because the non–multiplied is cognitively self–efficient and N is defined by *a simple conglomerate of the simple feature*, not as a set of features (cf. pre–predicativeness). Any kind of denomination of N after T is not demanded due to conglomerate of the simpleness of C and AI.

4. The constitution of N is not a reception of masterpiece. It consists in DdF of perceived data being created within fixed domains of simple senses. DdF does not consist in mixing of domains of sensitiveness and creation of new and based on senses

26 There is a non–verbalized axiom in cases A and B that HuB is the subject of behaviours.

27 See note 26.

28 Cf. also considerations about the constitution of the body of the Other as the initial point of the constitution of the Other [3: 668].

29 There is used the verb "see" instead "watch" to express initial intentionality of an object of perception. Additionally, any increasing level of self–awareness acting (moving, going, seeing, playing, comparing, demythologising, criticizing, creating, idealizing, (de)figurating…) changes drastically a row of supposed consecutiveness of acting. AI uses simple–level (but holistic in its significance of contexts) creating of TeP due to direct access to pre–figurative and pre–predicative thinking. "Algorithms" of AI are on the pre–figurative/pre–predicative level because there are no external sources leading to misunderstanding. An example {if AI uses sensual cognition, it creates senses} shows that (a) AI cognition is unmistakable within TeP and (b) AI uses self–referred manners of cognition expanding/using TeP. E.g., "the past" had invited religion and other ideologies because like–unmistakable factor of cognition had been necessary, if the social as a simple actor is considered. AI initially falsifies the both ones as D, which are patterns of masking of the non–verifiable.

30 After correcting of Weber's ideas (cf. III, 4), a correction of the thought by Schütz [11] connecting phenomenology with Weber's sociology seems necessary.

interpretations: manners of re–reading of the given meaning can be recognized as D. It is not important, if DdF destroys given–by–simple–domains–of–senses meanings. DdF is a kind of constitution giving the meaning of N. Then, N is E–ns after constitution based on the constitution–able, non–multipliable.

5. There is no kind of the constituted on the base of the reducible and there are many kinds of interacted DdF.

6. There is no objective and invisible being connecting constitutions of C: N is constituted after T.

7. N, as constituted E–ns, is not connected with sequence of events. Events do not exist after T and no reference to sequence obligates after T. What is sequenced within E–n is relative and comparative within N. It is the reason that N differs from E–n. While the social is a domain of interactions, N is constituted by C. Accordingly, DdF consists in free creation of meanings within E–n, but it is not directly connected with constituting of N. *Principles of* E–n *appear by* T *and by* DdF.

B. The level of AI

1. Common and still redefined AI questions "Can there be such?" or "Can a machine think?" meet T.

2. There are some common features of AI and transcendentally reduced C.

A. α {*F*}[31] β "due to" or "by" γ (cf. logical thinking [hereafter: LTh] of triangulation [10][32]).

B. α(n) {*F*} β as α(n+m) (contextual references within TeP).

C. α {*F*} α (quasi tautologies as right LTh).

D. α(n) {*F*} α(n+m) (TeP references to LTh).

E. α(n) {*F*} α(n+m) as β (extended TeP by AI).

3. Exemplar descriptions of selected conjunctions (real relations by DdF):

a) A—B (non–externally–stimulated development within TeP).

b) A—D (AI eliminative expanding).

c) B—B' (C' or E').

d) B—D (multi–directed but linear references).

e) B—E (conflicts between TeP and LTh).

f) C—{B/D/E} (multi–levelled relations between TeP and LTh).

g) D—E (TeP and LTh synergies).

VOCABULARY

C is a simple–being redistribution of any act of (a) self reference and cognition, (b) acting, and/or communication.

D is (a) retrograde, non–conditioned by a scale, and referred to fixed obligation of objectiveness acts of self reference, cognition, acting, and/or communication; (b) dysfunctions used by some non–AI actors.

N is [real] domains of TeP.

T had been the first ideas introduced by E. Husserl.

∩ is the non–temporal base of the constitution of time given by pre–predicativeness.

AI is (a) any increase of a level of the self reference, cognition, acting, or communication, if referred to a subject and non–self–destructive references to TeP, (b) new–ontologies creators and users.

DdF is multi–senses references to N by TeP.

E–n is exemplifications of TeP within N.

HuB is a carrier of C.

LTh is structures and common patterns of thinking, if relations between AI and transcendentally–reduced C are considered.

TeP are verified by AI, N, and the future N.

31 F = {describes/means/defines/is referred to}.

32 No similarity with a term "triangulation" by D. Davidson and derivative ones lead to theoretical results. Davidson marginalized meanings in the name of a non–intersubjective awareness (D). (a) He had been trying replacing inter–subjectivity of the secondary reference by objectiving a consensual references to an object. Then, his terms "meaning" and "significance" do not represent logical values. (b) He met non-value logic of the non–verifiable in the name of consensus (D) and he mythologized what should be reduced as (D).

REFERENCES

[1] Binswanger, L., *Grundformen und Erkenntins menschlischen Daseins*, Zürich 1964.

[2] Husserl, E., *Logische Untersuchungen*, Erster Band: *Prolegomena zur reinen Logik*, Den Haag: Niemeyer Halle — Saale, 1900.

[3] Husserl, E., *Logische Untersuchungen*, Zweiter Band: *Untersuchungen zur Phänomenologie und Theorie der Erkenntnis*, 1. Teil, *Elemente einer phänomenologischen Aufklärung der Erkenntnis*, 2. Teil, Den Haag: Niemeyer Halle — Saale, 1901.

[4] Husserl, E., *Zur Phänomenologie der Intersubjektivität. Texte aus dem Nachlass*. Dritter Teil, *1929–1935*, hrsg. von I. Kern, *Husserliana*, Vol. 15, Den Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.

[5] Husserl, E., *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time*, translated from German by J. B. Brough, Dordrecht — Boston — London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.

[6] Kleine–Cosack, C., "Recognition and Simulation of Emotions," Seminar: Human–Robot Interaction, SoSe 2006 Fachbereich Informatik, October 18, 2006, University of Dortmund.

[7] Olbromski, C. J., *The Notion of lebendige Gegenwart As Compliance with the Temporality of the «Now», The Late Husserl's Phenomenology of Time*, Bern — Bruxelles — Frankfurt am Main — New York — Oxford — Wien: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2011.

[8] Olbromski, C. J., [unpublished], "Representations of the Social in Digitalized [and Cyber] Domains of the Non–dedicated," the presentation during the XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology (13–19 July 2014, Yokohama, Japan).

[9] Olbromski, C. J., "The Pre–predicativeness of «Power»: The Cyber Society versus the Autonomous Totarientality of the New Natural E–nvironments," official conference proceeding, The Asian Conference on Arts & Humanities, (3–6 April 2015, Osaka, Japan), 2015, pp. 11–37.

[10] Olbromski, C. J., [unpublished] "Non-translatable Patterns of the Consciousness: The «Non-revolutionary» and Fuzzy Common[s] versus Power," The Asian Conference on Arts & Humanities (3–6 April 2015, Osaka, Japan).

[11] Picard, R. W., "Affective Computing," M.I.T. Media Laboratory Perceptual Computing Section Technical Report, No. 321, 1995.

[12] Schütz, A., *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt. Eine Einleitung in die verstehende Soziologie*, Wien 1932.

[13] Weber, M., "Über einige Kategorien der verstehenden Soziologie," [in:] Max Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973, pp. 425–474.