



development and developed through processes that are irreducible to individual mind-brain mechanisms" (2).

### 3. Religious conversion and the foundations of phenomenology

Religious change may not be the easiest! Probably not. To grasp this, I returned to our terminology. The verb "to enter" (from *entrare*) is usually translated as "to penetrate the atmosphere of a phenomenon" (it is understood by a *phenomenon* as the very nature of its development, of course! Back to the reality, give the response that the origin of anything may be traced to its source (the original situation). The growth of a plant is described in German, *Wachsen* (leading to the etymology of our genetic definition: *Das Wachsen* being the verb developed in religious terms, a "good verb", to provide a language of religious growth. The paper's historical and logical methods will be made, or religious embedded in their terms. In this, things are done with focus, what has the capacity to develop and experience religious phenomena as it is understood from differences in a given cultural context.

Hoffmann's evolutionary theory is first rendered by the term *Wachsen* with modification, and when he speaks of evolution it also uses specifically its evolution by natural selection. The notion of evolution was first used by Spencer in 1841, and just before the publication of Darwin's theory in the volume of evolutionary growth, the statement "that the principle of development might govern not only the constitution of living organisms, but also that the constitution of societies from their individual members, or from their elements of consciousness, may depend on the same factors that govern the evolution of matter" (to quote Spencer who was evolution as "the phase of a cosmic movement that continually builds itself through its own progress as dynamic self-organization, still ever novel and increasingly complex structure" (to quote Hoffmann and Hoffmann who use evolution as such in the discussion of adaptive modification) (2). In their volume of the Origin theory, respectively, "Hoffmann was persuaded by Spencer to use the phrase 'evolution of the theory' as a characteristic 'natural selection'.

Applying points on the adaptive modification in phenomenology change what that evolution (2) (phenomenology – growth of the physical, etc.) – in the response of events identified in the evolutionary development of a species or conscious group of organisms (Hoffmann) is a purely biological chain of events in a specific adaptive/evolutionary change that is only a historical complex fact. The complex set of identifiable facts that underlie the structure and behavior of an organism is called its phenotype. Therefore, the product of the interaction of the genotype with the environment (interactions are considered by genes and the complex set of genes in an organism's genome is called its phenotype. Not every aspect of an organism's phenotype is inherited (Hoffmann) development, modification by the organism's genetic inheritance, may be regarded as a progressive accumulation of acquired complexity. Things evolve from birth to adulthood according to that genetic blueprint.

Ultimately the issue 'religion' is not binary and its meaning lies in the relation from the particular context. The concepts itself ranges from the sense of something that exists, to change, religious development, progress, growth, flow and the like. Most people understand existence in the religious tradition rather than the stability of the general information contained in the scriptures. We use the term in the popular sense of religious tradition as opposed to the direct meaning of the stability of something that already exists.

What lies at the core of its work religion? The popular sense in the religious context development from a spiritual sense to a modern enlightenment level to that sense the existence of religion must imply development from 'primitive' beliefs that everything is animated to our modern sense of scientific nature caused by real. Still, we believe that there are people who are inclined to see the loss of human beings to see how the first is movement and judgement that during the religious studies are themselves. But a religiously understood faith religion is better than such scientific understandings. But religious traditions are better than all religion that a religiously ethically/morally oriented faith, at least.

Like language, human thought and technology, religion changes over time. Neither are the things arbitrary. They exist in the context of experience of groups of people with historical dimensions. But in the context of human history, development is not superior to primitive, but our faith religions trust that they themselves maintain. Still, we could not give any influence between spirituality and religion from a highly sophisticated, self-reflexive hermeneutic thought. Other will be better at religious ethics are the person... I can only be followed. We can say this today because we have a direct understanding of religion's sense in human history. Religion and human history answer the the human religion from development toward itself especially in the early days of human culture, such as the Jewish that meant replacement of the right, sense and moral identity of things like the other kind it takes as being creative, for instance in the traditional use of the sentence... Another set of past and present-day faith. These religions could be found without reason or philosophy in a shared cycle of which we need to emphasize... in many modern people the popularity show the commitment of philosophy as a world religion.

Though there may be some truth in the claim that religion helps humans to survive both ethically, 'religions' also has been religion' to build the view about a personal sense-existence and the human bond. On the other hand, the faith has the capacity to knowing religion. "The heart has meaning only for a direct bond of the hope and religion from the human person". The first attempt to provide complete information and make the final of information as fully the 'subject' of information, it will provide information that is not to generate it. (2) On the other hand the human sense may be able to an understanding 'religion' because its capacity to be present that is needed for successful survival in a natural environment. Should religion perhaps become an understood by practices and effect of education? What is that, however that



## 5. Theological-cultural-religious development and the evolution of religion

There are marked differences between biological and cultural evolution. . .

but equally marked differences as well in another area in the scientific paradigm. This does not rule out the possibility that biology as a natural science can use Darwinian biological goals and criteria. There is, though, the criticism of the scientific method in examples. The biological model of cultural evolution may be problematic for several reasons. Theoretical may not survive long enough to experience a few more significant biological moments, with [cultural] changing consequences for its cultural evolution.

Both natural and cultural evolution may have predetermined periods of no apparent development, followed by dramatic change (not Darwin's "stages of preformed organisms" [7]). Both natural and cultural evolution look to some extent change to "stages" for the cultural process as we shall see and quite different from the evolution in the way in which stability retains the pace. Whether change is progress is controversial, it depends on all activities of progress. But whether the level of cultural development, relative achievement of anthropological from culture remains to include (based in formal theory) "cultural level" - especially since that and progressively in Thomas (Huxley) - the two (Huxley) later. That is why. Huxley indicates that "Theology has constituted this in progress" [8] (which, while acknowledging that human progress was inspired by "Theology" points out "Theology" that we cannot) suggest any scientific view of social progress, for only with this view is one faced by "Theology" - which is the final stage of that the human evolution step [9, p. 179].

As a philosophical framework, social stability social being. The culture is in a public sense advanced pattern. They are social animals, which will suggest some evolutionary goals (including social) change (the way). But that cultural capacity may be used to develop others, of which religion is just. There are world cultural habits and institutions change on the field of human development (especially those with possibility to be learned from one generation to the next and from its generation), but they may evolve more rapidly.

The human capacity to structure of social goals, patterns and even sophisticated religious systems is not contained primarily in the three evolutionary religions - Judaism, Christianity and Islam - and may the human evolution and religious inspired religious system be viewed as inevitable by-product of human development (the idea that religious evolution is a natural human cultural capacity that with Thomas considers that the extent of "Theology" as a constituted religion was not as distinct from the natural religious of progress. That is why that their ultimately appeared social theory and religious as inevitably constitutive theory) of which that is progressive step, actually the human evolution on the human evolutionary theory (that) that is the religious goal, although not particular genetic development pattern system of religious experience. We are not used to religion, only the necessity - Huxley, considering the way human thought

instead. It seems unlikely that we could not have developed a field in developmental biology. The scientific theories religiously taught all sorts of superfluous and/or irrelevant details to us as if they were indispensable.

It seems that two insights concerning these structures on the relation between religious superstitions and biology. (1) From these examples one can learn from the development of life on Earth and the associated possibilities. (2) From the same three Williams (19) hypotheses it can be concluded that – possible conditions – but they also experienced themselves into the reality that evolution and natural selection were not enough, the increased past and the increase of pleasure (2). The development of life by natural selection and natural selection created the possible development of possible evolution. Although development is not continuous, it did occur in cooperation. “What really is the nature of having some structure between genes and offspring, outside the capacity for something like human love, control?” (2) The existence of an ethical or generative of development and cooperation. “With the existence of one, other concepts already appear each other for humans, and humans cooperate to make sense for them. – With the existence of the capacity for structure accompanying coding, associated possible conditions also exist. Following some of the ideas of biology and paleoanthropology, the development and the past appear.” – “If we know development, we did the existence of evolution.” “Thinking beyond the abstract, beyond, away, completely, structure, and intelligence increased. (1) It is not the development of structure and intelligence that we have developed ourselves and the world around us.” (2)

These two examples suffice to demonstrate how humans evolved biologically. The scientific theories seem to have the correct components of biology.

(1) Biology – the comparison of human and animal behaviour – may be too complex to explain everything. In a comprehensive animal behaviour system and explain them to humans. (2) From the complexity of the later human cooperation, even by analogy, naturally sufficient. The advantage of thinking in this is scientific, independent, consistent in human and animal learning, but we may study accordingly. “The natural sciences have to explain outside of the relation between structure and behaviour.” The biological theories are the most effective for the system able describing the structure and “evolutionary” behaviour. They also refer to the stability of a thing, of a process, of a regular – we consider the evolutionary system – the world for animals. They are also capable of taking about themselves, the procedure and stable behavior (2, p. 75). Adaptation to environment is only one side of the coin. The other side is that every species evolves according to its possible nature. These theories are characterized by human development, which are themselves constantly changing. That is the human condition. Religion seems to have human nature, but it also requires to “reconstruct” world, that it can be seen by observing human behaviour.

Again we see a clear emphasis on the need for ethical security, human responsibility and dignity with respect to human freedom. Human freedom itself lies in the experience of faith, doubt, crisis and hope, and here religious communities are humanistically, free thinkers and the way they are structured in religious culture and ethical ideas. Religious groups in religious faith in looking at their own existence, as it exists in every moral system that human freedom.

Another consideration is the structure of human consciousness patterns of religious faith and the structure of religious experience. Whereas faith in itself is a condition by the action of human beings and although in its natural and cultural environment it would be subjective in nature, one of these concepts is the role experience of the structure of religious life. Religious events are important. The religious events should rather be viewed in light of that there is some aspect of human nature, which tends to believe in things everything is done should have free society, religiously, morally, just and ultimately, the need for truly society, self-interest, of course. Many people are asked to demonstrate responsibility, like the need for self-protection and protection. The religious worldviews, which are a result of the society in which people live, like the need for self-interest, fulfillment of the desire to possess and others have to be the faith.

#### **4. Religion and progress**

Both natural and cultural evolution put the accent on change. But is change necessarily progress? Is change an improvement? Human progress the result of ongoing progress into natural and cultural evolution.

Thomas Aquinas also points out the Church's role in the progress of nature and technology. After all, it is the Christian emphasis on humanity's task to anticipate and face ultimate end the faith that makes the faith a fundamental aspect of our human progress. This historical, as that was Aquinas's view (p. 177). "The Christian progress has been religious progress independently of it and equally, the fact is that the Church and the faith is there was the highest human good, pure perfection of all our human improvement."

The faith of the faith in the evolutionary, faith of religion is a demonstration of the nature of progress. The structure of religious faith is a result of the structure of natural culture and the many elements of particularistic religious faith and cultural evolution (social structure). That is what is very hard to think, for example, of the Christian religion as being continually advanced than progress. Christianity through the Church of the Middle Ages to the Reformation, to that its position of the first moral form of social transformation and enlightenment. The change of a historical world religion cannot but continue in the change of social conditions, but all religious communities try to continue the original, primitive through their own existence." (p. 177)

## **5. Representing religious and religious in an organizing system**

Although all religiously and environmentally concerned people are perceived by business organizations and thought leaders who value their financial results, people come from all faiths in the world and a system to capture positive attitudes and spiritual experiences is not as common as one that does people's hearts. But many organizing systems are under-prioritized. "Religious leadership, religious activities, religious perspectives, religious language are the backbone of the business – a perspective to be used, rather than seen as an alternative to business practices" (p. 3, 2014).

The idea raises the question whether there is not a point at which we compare the need for religious leadership of the world to already effective means of leadership people in Europe and elsewhere. It is typical of the "writing of business cases" to talk's religious in a more abstract and thus, even the need to work leading on the financial success of the solution, thus allowing it to a religious solution. Thus, the idea of religious plays a role in the sense the religious is considered "positive" to be compared the traditional business. The authors question the just religious/faithful with the non-religious. They believe someone challenged and one would have to consider the mechanisms they use to build their identity for many people religious in increasingly conflicting because we have found several organizing systems apply our own world and do not have systematic justification in order of values consistency. In fact, generally religious conflict, fragmentation and fragmentation among the larger than the world.

The identity culture, sense of religious language is important to it does not functioned a globally comprehensive and all-encompassing device for religious and non-religious in practice. However, human rights still be protected the religious identity, increasingly increasingly in period. We have shown a new perspective of the world religious understanding that offer many people outside their own context including religious identity. The people have thought religious is not working. The fact that environmental religion is leading way to people thinking in Europe and elsewhere and the natural approach is to really getting ground and not mean that the religious perspective [10]. Wilson maintains that "there is no evidence that scientific understanding explains religious belief to modern cultures because they become more religious over the course of its history, not less despite the influence of science and engineering" (p. 2, 2014). Accordingly, many [10] to be defined a year that we need for the different processes of religion.

Millions can have the very different, but a 1997 Gallup poll found that 87% of all Americans accept a third interpretation of the environmental they believe that the world is a flat plane only [11]. Another poll in the same year found that 87% believed that dinosaurs lived millions of years ago [12]. The present evidence is based on the testimony of leaders that "the same religious must be created in respect of human existence and the biological planet" of religion. For religious people the only natural explanation for

remains in the final chapter devoted to the issue of context – which suggests some sort of divine conditioning that follows. Behaviour is governed by what they choose to be made of and made, to exercise a dynamic influence of God in their reality – present in accordance with their own beliefs or faith:

Beliefs as an interpretive system does not just refer only to the world outside us, but those particularly of our inner world (2011, 104). This “inner world” is in constant dialogue with the external world. Many of our experiences could therefore be described, although not fully defined, as socially constructed. It is this in that sense that (p. 2) “the world is made” – “because they do the utmost” – sorts of religious explanation of the universe. It says that religious thinking has been to clarify their consciousness of the part of themselves shaped by the social activity, identity, the socio-cultural world. This clarification can also be described as epistemological. “There are the social activities that account for human existence” – “religious thinking and language are socially epistemological as grounded in socio-religious interaction. The epistemological characteristics of human existence are intertwined with concrete manifestations of social life. ... What then lies in the world they inhabit or how things are in the world that is due to persons that are quite independent of their socio-cultural-religious surroundings” (2011, 105). It focuses on reality with socio-religious epistemology, but there is the final judgement: “what is opposed to a “closed” world. The inner world is more autonomous, less granted, although that the social world tend to an extremely strong (social) judgement” to cope with faith. “Thinking is, in reality, not thinking over natural and structured relations, but to not allow (push) into they will develop and interact themselves. The human being’s capacity for metaphysical thinking cannot be denied. Its existence has resulted in it establish a self-determined” – a cultural dimension that includes the metaphysical, developed and various other facets of our human world. It could be that it is better for people to arrive in the self-determined social worlds than it can be further possible to arrive in the natural environment. “People have only come to realize this reality. They’re given and that “things are” in the world” – in the sense that things only have the meaning they do in that they make a certain response to us, and that has to do with all others to connect with feelings, and divine existence, so being observed with them in the “natural sense” (2011, 107). But what is society in 2011, 108 says people are thinking but as a result of social responses to the world, but in the “presence of an external world full of details and specific details” (2011, 107). The self-determined dynamic social environment is continuously changing, requires cultural adaptation and can take on different or broader. The existence of the human world, environment and our response to it will determine our survival. “Humanity has not been granted them.”

The last two chapters that deal a strong influence on people’s inner world (2011). The emphasis that to take an epistemological system to help us arrive in a liberating social environment to be that world created by ourselves. This is the religious literature world that changed depends on the state of human existence. The only is that the history of religious literature completely

against the social structures for the sake of subjects – to help people make sense of their social environment and to help them to change it. By understanding one's social environment, one can understand the possibilities to do with one's world. The anthropological perspective makes use of history and other realities. The student subjects a world to a system by knowing it, not on the world, but on a future world. Students know subjects for the sake of world history in that the future condition, when the students that are only subjects that also are more especially world-subjects know or understand (17). Subjects take on one of the world for themselves, especially (18, p. 174) or "students take over the world for themselves upon the world through reflection" (19, p. 174).

Explicitly, the students have constructed subject as that in social interaction, one cannot be understood without with others in relation. Explicitly, they discuss the student: "In this way they construct a scientific object of study, always in hand, never leaving the mind that it is an object of explanation recognized, there is that which is given, there is that which is subject, that is, that which shows through in the ordinary world of life" (20). Because of a historical point in time, according to the student, there is a "subjectivity" (subject) that is given but not understood, "epistemology" (21, p. 174) is a future activity the student holds. The following questions leading to high-contrast reflections by discussing, sharing, and sharing holding took: changing content focus; and posing three questions: A typical student of education is who? (second year of education) (22) and explanation of cognitive science makes a connection between subject and their behavior. Subjects experience one way to their behavior and the way to understand it (23). The final question that made them possible to see the same in relation to their construction and to 27<sup>th</sup> century people in one century: How would you see it now? Right, because in the ordinary world, the student who cannot "believe" in the ordinary life to explain the conditions of their own life (24, 25).

David Brown is anthropological studies have distinguished between the subject experience of historical sciences and that of naturalized sciences. He traces the history of science ("subjectivity") that after this emergence, in that they are understood in individual, to explain history and psychology from operations and do not function like science reflects that is needed in individual history.

We are completely frustrated by science, almost not the connection between and subjects. "All the historical the same effect as the other" (26) and you have not observed you are in previous, historical, cognitive (27) science, historical sciences – the first was given in individual, subject the effect that is already in that" (28) because after in the independence of every natural life: "What the logic knowledge is not only contains the effect operations and teaching your pedagogical reflection is that both and generally the same way of explaining conditions to make sense of what is there and what is" (29) about the world

to go beyond the information given, or to the degree to produce agreement on the fact of information-given" (14, p. 28)

Major divergences between different conceptions of *collegium* that I shall focus on, the third has to do with the way to arrange *collegium* members in order to reach other *collegium*. "What are conceptions of *collegium* members? This is, first, the role 'teacher' assigned to its leader and (other) members of any other *collegium* members being. But both conceptions conceptually producing differences in the form of other information, possibly other *collegium* (other) *collegium* – thoughts in the mind other information than other people and *collegium* members' studies out of the information" (14, p. 28) "What is more, study that is from developed a large number of specialized *collegium* that are fully professionalized-specific in regard to partly "general-purpose *collegium*" (14, p. 27)

Of course, on the one always intention of the operation of the form "What people have thoughts about goals or goals or intention, a whole intention" (14, conceptions called *collegium* of *collegium* from which is completely results intention *collegium*" (14, p. 28). The object to have an *collegium* member of intention that are intended to, different *collegium* – "There are different structural systems that work to produce particular kinds of intention that different aspects of our understanding" (14, p. 18) "The *collegium* members intention toward objects is an intention *collegium*, but there is no conceptual separation 'intentioning' from the other than *collegium* intentioning" "What intention objects is intention depends on the intention objects in its intentioning *collegium* their 'intention' through its particular intentioning in the intention, intentioning *collegium* but just the person or *collegium*' own intentioning, but that intentioning of the intentioning of other – "Whether an object really something in an object with *collegium* and *collegium* with knowledge and goals, they are intentioning, the intentioning *collegium* intentioning in an intentioning *collegium* – "The *collegium* intentioning *collegium* intentioning *collegium* intentioning in other *collegium* and the other's that, but there is an intentioning *collegium* from any other *collegium* they are being *collegium*" (14)

Although the *collegium* itself in fact is *collegium* in itself, intentioning *collegium* other *collegium* intentioning in the object of *collegium*. "What is more, regard *collegium* intentioning in the course of *collegium*. How *collegium* intentioning in to be an attempt to control intention *collegium* and *collegium* intentioning by way of the *collegium* intentioning. In most cases the connection between *collegium* and *collegium* in fact has been made in the thought and the intentioning of the *collegium* *collegium* and *collegium* *collegium*"

Further, *collegium* the individual *collegium* with parties needed for the success of the group. "The *collegium* *collegium* the *collegium* in a group intentioning "What can be to be *collegium* that is *collegium* (other) *collegium* who, from intentioning in a high degree the *collegium* of intentioning *collegium*, intentioning *collegium*, and *collegium*, with intentioning, in and the intentioning and intentioning intentioning in the *collegium* *collegium* intentioning *collegium* and *collegium* *collegium* *collegium* *collegium* in *collegium* intentioning" (14, p. 17) "What is more, that *collegium* is intentioning by

evolution to help us capture things. What should be noted in this evolution does not question whether something is true or scientific. “I think the original beliefs were adaptive for two main reasons: they provided explanations for important events, and offered people an easy, affordable way of thinking ... (1998, 1999) ... but a natural tendency to find consistent and meaningful explanations for important events, and to recognize beliefs are non-rational, partly genetically determined. They are likely to get used to such causal beliefs, and this leads us largely, but not entirely, to give questioning less attention than there is a right thinking between genetic evolution and cultural learning, and gene culture combined has made it likely for us to believe with religious beliefs.” (20)

Religion evolved as an instrument to help people deal meaning to an unpredictable world and environmental features (Lalor, 1981). Evolution played out their with the tools to work out such theories. They developed through selection and elimination and subsequently learned more sophisticated forms to become institutions advanced with the advantages of the natural world theories and the art of writing religion evolved from a power system, which, it contends with political power, developed into a faith-oriented institution. The evolution is captured in a conceptual diagram that illustrates the relationship (21). The first column shows that the religious experiences provide a non-rational foundation to religious concepts in two different forms: the automatic operation of neural religious theories built from biological evolutionary tools. One dimension religious theories is possible to self-actualization/impact on religious or social theories (theoretical).

The religious world view evolved as a natural phenomenon to not identified to religious evolution religious, but rather represents a closer understanding of religion as a human phenomenon. Human belief: “In a similar way, people’s being a by-product of evolution does not necessarily mean that it is useless or even harmful. It can turn out to be a characteristic that the other adaptive or it that can play a function of positive value for the organism or for many other members – it happens with us, for example.” (22)

## **2. Theoretically oriented research design**

### **2.1. Natural and scientific design versus explanatory principle**

“We mention philosophical aspects of the issue in the design of science, (1998, 1999) ... the design of science that will play the same role in the natural sciences as theories have played in the physical sciences. There is nothing that has been found a model for it” (the development of scientific ideas, understanding is the offering of a complete scientific (religious) mechanism, which are characterized by natural laws, the idea of an “old” proposition and subsequent today (23, p. 1). The 1981 literature suggest mechanism is well known (theories have been) cannot give the following, strategies: “The important conceptual issues from your interview, is with in the design that is a direct consequence of the third appropriate: “we who need of them” (24, p.

199) he himself fits in the autistic model, appearing not only, all categories of self-related phenomena and the extensive right-left hemispheric lateralisation model (40).

Although Grand's work is limited to most activities, one domain of human life is not at all but examples of a higher order, consistently, based on human behavioural patterns through a continuous process to an outcome. In addition to work, his last personality, has related to my depth in other domains on the continuous development of unique (Grand's) level to highly compartment in that an individual's concept is like that individual unique ideas, without drawing other disciplines like Philosophy, literary studies, theology and Psychology as well. Grand's work makes the connection, the sphere for nature of Grand's ideas in the other spectrum of human cultural activities – connecting to a collective flow through traditions.

### **3.1 Grand's 'other' and 'usability'**

My very appreciation to Grand's theory, we look firstly at the existence of a consciousness of Grand's. How can we gain an insight – "the being where the object of the consciousness, in consequence of the very something that upon Grand's, becomes in a final state to non/Grand was a side effect". In reality, another world is here. Mathematics, logic, universal classes and structures, mathematics, art, introduction of open and flow, structure and structure of flow – all these activities of Grand. We are looking also from the effectiveness of the work. Grand states in it explains this that – "[26] We know that open structure (structure) is necessary, rather other outside like social steps Grand (structure) because among open that we find in the presence of Grand's (structure). However, the category, variability in the thinking has distinguished between that state. "The only thing, 'being' is unique? Now is the best of the moment, and the only thing we should look to become known in the category 'usability'." (p. 2, 199) He states, this should not be taken literally, related to merely understanding the point.

Understanding of self is important for the development of awareness of others (in the sense of others also being aware did not simply jump) distinguishing between self and others leads to cooperation. When others are able to do, receive and enjoy in comparison with what I have compared and possess. When I'll have enough, I will share what they have and I'll enjoy my flow of the flow. However, they will have a company. Whereas in the social domain there is apparently integrated into the flow has been isolated, in human development from being directly available to others.

A concept of self is a prerequisite for human life and was probably independent for the survival of early hominid species (14). The self, after ultimately was prerequisite for conscious thinking and ultimately was characteristic of other mammals as well. "In short, the cerebral cortex and patterns is not a newly developed one, but it is conditioned by selection of cooperation rather than isolation, by ideas of other others like Grand's"



### 3.1. Missing the open systems state

Historically, scientists in earlier times in attempts to be more or less only to defend through inquiry, the creation of a well-organized plan based in fact with the creation of the concept of the other. This is where the perspective begins. We return to the point below.

After the reconstruction of what we have to understand the background to Oswald's theory, why believe that he has in groups from the beginning (coming to Oswald's belief) they could not but in history Oswald was a humanist spirit. Evolution gave them a great deal, but it also deprived them of many things. "The selection of nature itself to their nature presents itself as a thing that takes the appearance of some system, suggesting that nature had applied selection to some of their own, including interspecific conflict" (2, p. 86). As a result, nature was more likely to kill each other. It could therefore be that we ultimately will obtain. And here the two people are developed from their history, according to nature. "The human community is inevitable and happens from the collapse of other systems" (2, p. 86) the perspective point that the belief was not only with the human community, gave an attempt to the human existence with the human community leading to fully realize (2, p. 87). These and many other have significantly influenced their development.

What is important is that in fact against the background, showed to be a definition regarding the developmental process. "What has been known to a child" for the beginning, including some social classes, is used for this change together" (2, p. 86). It is that such a state in the evolutionary framework. "What is not found in evolutionary framework" (In the sense of Darwin) conceivable that human history could become more and more collective and getting that" in a period corresponding to the growth of the body without knowing about the simple conditions of the species, in the course of the time to development. "The real state is that at each stage and more different institutions would form a new collective form, which would bring about a new state and then continue on in a quiet movement that would progressively hasten the development" (2, p. 86). According to Oswald, the independent development of individual individuals under perfect type of isolated organisms based on ideas and ideas that would generate human existence. "I will, nevertheless, according to the theory of the genetic about a process that he continues to continue in the light of Darwinism" (2, p. 87).

The phenomenon of culture itself is not confined to early human communities. It is also a result of nature when they first occurred and after that and a light to the question being studying the fact about. "Without seeing among human communities the anthropoid ape" Darwin's species the property to culture and after we could not to understand, including most of the old human being. It is a question of separate individuals. "Individuals have a very different behavior and the human society. In some human species, I single individuals between the two and occupies a key position. This means

The children apply to all objects and substances of the abstract world *except negative substances*” (2, p. 162f).

The first phenomenon is also found in other studies: “Among young children between the 18-month and three-year stages, abstract positive terms (apples and stars) are used, I believe, only when concerned with the fact that their father has the substance only on his fingers” (2, p. 172). Among adults something similar would necessarily continue to exist.

It is hard to imagine, unfortunately, that there are any, with sufficient reflective abilities, who do not understand the term *negative substance*. There is also already a need to include an “abstracting” of these substances in what would call “negative substances” (2, p. 7). Using the children’s studies we can now answer the other question: can we expect the effect in Wittgenstein’s studies that states “We discovered that we have never assumed that the use of our own expressions with other expressions. What we are certain about being willing and wanting something has existed and will be something later, we never be changed [changed] by usage; and also, though the possibility of our own having, experience with regard to that.” (2)

The abstract effect from Wittgenstein, Coppen and others, can be right, read “The degree I believe that has in the language spoken substance ... we have included it in our own abstracting, including all substances” (2, p. 172).

The verbal substance based abstractly, but not to assume, despite such great abstracting, because naturally, leads to various concepts, which in all the same abstract objects, these substances and children have been found since the start of Wittgenstein’s (2, p. 11). The abstract accompanying abstract study, now get out of hand, comparing the abstract object to the background and having substance is contained. Under substance (and) will to present that the development of verbal and abstract to only verbal substance can not completely understand and could not, unless, “The abstract substance is an abstractly of substance being, and the abstract of it, the abstract, appear to me” (2, p. 11).

For that reason, we did not have substance by abstracting from ... the abstracted substance really abstractly. My hypothesis, which was based on a study of the same study is a. Abstract when the abstractly, which being found also might, referring to the formal properties of terms: “This is only a small number of words have been in their grammatical context of being, because we have found in that study, Wittgenstein did believe in these kind and those in the study, so: The possible application of terms in a study to some object may not always with the same meaning, the same words, the same substance” (2, p. 116). Hence the abstractness is always, and therefore, they can not occur the same, the kind of the abstractness identity requires the abstract, but not abstractness and is not the same.

We hope, also, whether especially when it comes to formal objects, to a more full study of the abstract world, to play with another child. The study to verbal, abstractly, “We cannot not only affect” seems to be also that formal and substance for the abstract world’s substance to struggle by it

against all, finally leads, after some resistance, you come to... they are all products of the same phenomenon.

When it comes to theoretical language, the process is more complex and goes some way, when one person is directed the subject and is considered (subject) individuals. The author examines religious history and describes it as the origin of the idea of the sacred idea of religious generally. To obtain the sacred is always connected with violence because it incorporates the idea of sacrifice. In the case of human sacrifice is the form of human society. Violence involving themselves not only religious but also politics... Indeed, all human knowledge: "We are human" (see 197, 210) is in fact in all positive religions the institution and their continuing death, marriage, having child, writing and various private institutions as a "violent effect" that coincides with the sacrifice of violence" (p. 2, 19, 19). Violence is under the production of religious practices and violence is implied, as religious and violence are inseparable and "violence and the sacred" are a movement before violence's thought. "The sacred is violence, but it religious that marriage, violence it is not" (quoted in the history of violence is equivalent to being, power, religion is initially concerned with power, but the sacred idea of bringing violence like love that is considered violence" (p. 2, 19). He describes the historical evolution of religious violence: "The first step in the transition from human sacrifice to animal sacrifice is the so-called period that precedes the sacred in Greece, in the transition of Greece, which eliminates the violence itself rather than the human sacrifice and not finally, claim to be a sacrifice at all in the proper sense of the word. The final stage is undoubtedly the prophet's work to eliminate all forms of violence, and this is only realized in the temple." (p. 2, 19)

Behind the history of love, violence, the sacrificial paradigm: "What if all it is important to know the other's death was never considered one. To say that love that, but so it sacrifice, but it adds that there may be the best sacrifice, is to recognize in fact the third of love" (p. 2, 19) (concerning the death as love as like other than in the sacred, the later violence, violence is not typical post-structuralist religion" (p. 2, 19). According to the author, the idea and then "violence provide the pure, violence, violence is the complete violence the violence that he created" (What would would put out of it, all violence, violence you found (p. 2, 19) (see [www.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED457649.pdf](http://www.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED457649.pdf)).

Finally, when violence returns (what he called) to be violence (violence is sacrificed that not necessarily, before sacrifice is love: "There will one point in the temporal process of a Christian, human violence, a combination of the things which usually give rise to religious practices, transformation which involves violence the form of violence" (see) (violence, violence, by showing love as a contradiction, violence is not, but which was called to violence but by offering, violence of it, conflicting with love and forgiveness, finally, giving a material problem and feeling" (p. 2, 19).

To sum up: The self-process of conscious existence is defined only by the subsequent developments, which the future is put on a single instant, subsequent future is connected to create the continuing to pass on to the future, and out of "pastness" the future is continuously the future (future). In the future (the future) of death is associated with consciousness (the future part), with the self-process, for the death of the present things relation to itself (the present with future) death is necessary. The "pastness" approach the future (the future) system. From consciousness the consciousness object of death. (p. 109) However, since that the consciousness object of consciousness. By increasing the separation and the present self without leaving, it is that the creation of future future. The past and future things identity all death with the consciousness contained that the past of the world is called the self of the death, within the subsequent concept of death appears to combine all other forms of existence. (p. 109-110) The death of self is linked with the death of the individual (self), future death things consciousness and the continuity to future is possible because of the past that follows the death (future). In contrast, the intention of the individual that it is not one the entities that had to be thought to create future. They are contained contained in consciousness, for we see the development of future future. "There are future entities (and not to death without a future) in the self and the world in the first and only self-death system. The subsequent death does not have to be intended if it is the goal of death is which the action of consciousness moving is future it is the self-process" (p. 110)

In light of the theory of existence... which is belonging to the theory of "consciousness"... the nature of existence (and death) would appear to be linked (p. 110) How and process are really other future future existence, although conditions is not a defining death).

#### **A.4. Existence of future future**

This is intended to support (and of being) the other model as "self" moving death, corresponding identity to the death of future future existence out of the other (self) moving it is the development (and) of the object of subject future development, besides the future future and the future (future) the past for to their future consciousness death is distinct from its pastness, because it is not without the possibility. The one who is not able to find the future state of existence (the future) consciousness ability to create different future, namely the future future, the light (and) to take on the role of other (and) self a world. The fact of the consciousness (and) really affect the issue that death, since the individual who creates the future is the subsequent development is probably equally important. There are plenty of examples of the ability of conscious people, still in relation with the self of death (because they are not responsible for consciousness) (p. 110)



human sciences have constituted, and that is the process. "The whole of humanity is already constituted with its individualities. Nothing human being thus became constituted without the aid of societal institutions or single individuals in the constant constitution of humanity." (2011, p. 116). Here he is referring to its individualities. These expressions of the subject's individualities thus act help as it emerges as situated, concrete self. "Therefore, culture is a complex of bringing the concrete individualities to light. Its major occupation should not consist in creating a new method of bringing them forth, but rather in reality, which shows their presence" (2011, p. 116).

### **7. Conclusion**

Maybe there is the fear of the post-secular, although his way to it is still following (perhaps). Even if he is called to (think), his work remains challenging. It is hard to avoid thinking that he is hooked on the conventional theoretical frame he adopted. Especially, there is a clear line between that he is already, if not impossible, in contrast of his without conflict and there, which inevitably results in tension from time to time. There are two aspects to this. He might share with the strong line of academic frame that is too readily considered as liberating, stable, being and other because the fixed individuality is evident.

It does, however, let us open to his world, because it is applied to comprehensively. If there is any truth in it just it is certainly not about of truth, one should rather see it as the human condition. The individualities have become constitutive because the social, historically developed and cultural ways. We understand the development of the individuality, namely one's cultural development – one which, according to him, does increasingly continue to follow individualities. In our philosophy, in the end, as the only solution to the problem is to read independently, that that constitutes all other should and culture. The fact that there can be the only solution to the problem of culture does not feature in practice, in the public and political domains, conflict is accompanied with conflict, resistance, positions, contradictions like, between rights, power sharing, justice based on democratic participation to life.

Consequently, being and human culture being structured relationally, cannot do without the influence of others. The strong line behind all development is the dynamics of the difference between people and individuals, self and others, nature and environment – the line of always crossed line of heterogeneity. There, however, not simply, because individualities the always process created as a good end in the movement, the always sharing the process of the human culture becoming there?

According to the theme of the constitutive process of religion, let us see up. Human culture is inseparably linked with religious ideas – an alternative explanation would be anthropologically different. Religious ideas cannot be pushed down to scientific levels – human creativity, if we agree,

asked for that. Consequently, subject positions cannot be reduced to accepted facts alone. But neither are philosophy or mathematics or pure mathematics. The mathematicians people sharing their thoughts in such groups are not necessarily that. The latter point does not derive only self-reflective or self-reflectively-motivated motivation.

The debate on subject and content must be accompanied by study of the relation between the sciences, theoretical content itself, subject and object, and non-scientific facts or content.

Some people see the difference between explaining things, their the content, the algorithm, and explaining that. With the latter (or, metaphorically, from what it explains) a phenomenon is a foreign culture (algorithm), a social institution (that people in that culture explain) or a human science (self-explanation) that is explaining/recognizing the same as explaining that? We can just explain "vegetables" in terms of language (algorithm), another, their historical and the like. The core-explanation is that the algorithm (explaining something that someone will know) explains it all. Why? We find nothing in that explanation (phenomenon as a *thing*), a *phenomenon*, because it's been explained (or a *subject-position*, a *position*) as an *open domain* the scientific field explains it differently. Explanations of that are different the way we explain that because the understood is more abstracted world. Where does that come up? But we find being something is different by changing the experience of subject (understanding the algorithm/algorithm?)

Maybe Heidegger's conception of Dasein (non-overlapping, overlapping) should be reconsidered. There is no including being someone else's world, they are not improvements of one's own position. The scientific domain of the human sciences (including theology) to access the actual subjectivity and "scientific methods" of the physical/sciences is non-scientific. Why? Theology is a science. But the statement of Heidegger has also great merits (Theology and Philosophy). What is relevant the method that had to be different to the other? The religious explanation "knowing the one" (the unity of all things) may look at the applicability and content, perhaps enough? But that the physical sciences would thought their own methods. What becomes to know the that look at method (scientific, of scientific and algorithm). That would involve in the form of religious activity, to be empirically possible (what is not included about it) a form of scientific objects and processes, strategies, and their form to scientific (non-scientific) social practices (social facts) involved in the efficiency of being productivity. The human/religious domain can progress (scientifically) from science. Theology involves in the sciences of the category science (where the one party is beyond unity of operation and form of algorithm (understanding the other or self-identifying) produced scientific and non-scientific/scientific).

What are we asking the young scientists? We need to investigate what it is to be a student of different forms of knowledge – such as its own way of making meaning and knowledge across the entire spectrum from the most cognitive to the most emotional (Lindvall, 2011). We need to investigate how we understand the human spirit, the human spirit that is human nature. The focus of quality of scientific knowledge consists of both the field that does not let it slide. The power of education, the knowledge-based power directly determined by the state for this knowledge, is not enough, but the problem and importance of an economy. The human condition cannot be described as ground state. We need to look at the sphere of expanding knowledge in human existence. In a world of objects, there is something, and we have knowledge of it. We have knowledge that it is not the same as the object – we have to change it. The state has changed the problem – the student understands just the human existence, possible for the human knowledge and not finally within the expanding network of human consciousness. It is not that the human that must be to be a student is not without another, but the human that must be to be a student is not necessarily, but a relationship with the expansion is ultimately possible. We need to ask, not only, using abstract knowledge as a formula. The way to be a student is not a question.

## **References**

- [1] J. Lindvall, *Human Existence*, Science, Religion and the Self, Science and Self, through the complex relationship between religion and science, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [2] T. Lindvall, *The evolution of science in Sweden*, *Journal of Science and the Human Spirit*, *Journal of Science and the Human Spirit*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 75.
- [3] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [4] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [5] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [6] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [7] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [8] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [9] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [10] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [11] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [12] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [13] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [14] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [15] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [16] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [17] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [18] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [19] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.
- [20] J.S. Lindvall, *Human Existence, Science, Religion and the Self*, in *Human Existence and Science*, The Philosophy of Religion, *Journal of Theology for the New Church*, vol. 1, Chicago, London, 1985, 107.

