Introduction

This work explores the constitution of human consciousness and mind in Paul C Mocombe's theory of phenomenological structuralism. The work concludes that consciousness is an emergent fifth force of the multiverse that is embodied to constitute the I, transcendental ego, of the human mind through practical activity and conflict.

Background of the Problem

Consciousness here refers to subjective awareness of phenomenal experiences (ideology, language, self, feelings, choice, control of voluntary behavior, thoughts, etc.) of internal and external worlds. The academic literature “describes three possibilities regarding the origin and place of consciousness in the universe: (A) as an emergent property of complex brain neuronal computation, (B) as spiritual quality of the universe, distinct from purely physical actions, and (C) as composed of discrete ‘proto-conscious’ events acting in accordance with physical laws not yet fully understood” [1-13]. The latter position, (C), represents the ORCH-OR (“orchestrated objective reduction”) theory of [13], which includes aspects of (A) and (B), and posits that “consciousness consists of discrete moments, each an ‘orchestrated’ quantum-computational process terminated by an action [objective reduction or OR,] rooted in quantum aspects of the fine structure of space-time geometry, this being coupled to brain neuronal processes via microtubules”. In this view, the understanding is that a proto-conscious experience existed in the early universe, panpsychism, and as a result of emergent structures of the brain it (proto-conscious experience, psychion) became embodied and evolved as a result of quantum neuronal computations of “brains” [14-20]. In this article, the understanding is that what accounts for the unity of experience is the psychion, subatomic particle, of an emergent psychonic/panpsychic subatomic field of the multiverse that has phenomenal properties, which gets embodied as neuronal particles of the aggregated brain, which experiences a material resource framework as an “I,” mind, whose neuronal phenomenal properties following matter disaggregation either returns back to the field or collapses in other worlds where the same matter exists/entangled [21-29]. This Mocombeian materialization of consciousness and mind is captured in [30] theory of phenomenological structuralism.

Theory and Method

Paul C Mocombe’s (2016, 2017, 2018, 2019) structurationist sociology, phenomenological structuralism, which attempts to resolve the structure/agency problematic of the social sciences, builds on the ORCH-OR theory and panpsychism of Hameroff and Penrose, while holding on to the multiverse hypothesis of quantum mechanics and Haitian ontology/epistemology, which the authors reject, the former, because it is not “a more down-to-earth viewpoint” [13]. For Mocombe (2016, 2017, 2018), quantum superposition, entanglement, and evidence in Haitian Vodou of spirit possession, which represent ancestors from a parallel world, Vilokan, of the earth’s of which we ought to pattern our behaviors and structures, are grounding proofs for the acceptance of the multiple worlds hypothesis of quantum mechanics within an M-theory interpretation of the constitution of the multiverse.

Within the latter hypothesis, the understanding is that “each possibility in a superposition evolves to form its own universe, resulting in an infinite multitude of coexisting ‘parallel’ worlds.
The stream of consciousness of the observer is supposed somehow to ‘split’, so that there is one in each of the worlds—at least in those worlds for which the observer remains alive and conscious. Each instance of the observer’s consciousness experiences a separate independent world and is not directly aware of any of the other worlds” [13]. It is within these multiple worlds, which are materially real, hypothesis that Mocombe constitutes the notion of consciousness in the universe according to his theory of phenomenological structuralism. For Mocombe, the material world is real and objective, and the informational content of consciousness is epiphenomenal content recycled/entangled/superimposed throughout the multiverse after matter aggregation and experience [31].

Consciousness is an emergent fifth force of nature, a quantum material substance/energy, psychion, the phenomenal property of which is recycled/entangled/superimposed throughout the multiverse and becomes embodied via the microtubules of brains. It is manifested in simultaneous, entangled, superimposed, and interconnecting material resource frameworks as embodied praxis or practical consciousness, which in-turn becomes the neuronal phenomenal properties of material (subatomic particle energy, psychion) consciousness, mind, that is recycled/entangled/superimposed throughout the multiverses via (self-aware or not) practical activity and the phenomenal properties of subatomic particles of a psychonic/panpsychic field, which goes on to produce aggregated matter with consciousness and a mind [32].

In other words, Paul C Mocombe’s (2018, 2019) structurationist theory of phenomenological structuralism, in keeping with the logic of structurationist sociology, assumes practical activity and consciousness, i.e., practical consciousness, to be the basis for understanding human behavior and consciousness in the world/multiverse. For Mocombe, this consciousness is neither an emergent illusion of the brain or one that comes from a simulation of species-Beings with “higher consciousness” than our human form, nor a God, which animates our species-being with its essence that is our human soul/consciousness [33]. The positions, a simulation/virtual reality, emergent property of the mechanical brain, or the essence of God, presupposes the existence of consciousness as fundamental to the multiverse prior to its embodiment as the “I,” the Cartesian thinking subject, mind, of the human actor.

In Mocombe’s theory of phenomenological structuralism, consciousness, like the other forces of the multiverse, is presupposed as a proto-evolutionary force with a subatomic field whose particles become embodied via microtubules of brains. In other words, consciousness is an emergent fifth force of nature, a psychion of a psychonic/panpsychic subatomic field, which evolves via experience of the macro-world as embodied aggregated neuronal energy in microtubules of brains, recycled/entangled/superimposed throughout the multiverses. Hence, it is not solely an emergent property of the mechanical brain; a simulation (virtual reality) wherein sentient beings with consciousness are the pawns in the conscious scenarios of a species-being with higher-consciousness; nor is it a product of a God, in the Christian sense, animating it in its consciousness [34]. Even if the latter two (which makes up the virtual reality hypothesis in some physic circles) were the case, neither would deny the fact that we are able to know the laws of the “material” simulation by which we become conscious or have consciousness, which appears to be fundamental prior to time and space of the macro-worlds.

Thus, I disagree with this virtual reality hypothesis of the multiverse. For me, the multiverse is real and objective, and consciousness is not fundamental to it. Instead, consciousness is, like time and space, an emergent property of the macro-world, which evolves as a force of nature akin to the evolution of gravity. In other words, it becomes an emergent force of nature, which is recycled/entangled/superimposed throughout the multiverse, after the constitution of the macro-world: consciousness is the product of neuronal energies, psychion, of a psychonic/panpsychic subatomic field, the phenomenal properties of which aggregate as matter, via the other forces of nature, and manifests itself in the multiverse as embodied practical activity, i.e., practical consciousness, of species, whose consciousness, once disaggregated as matter in one universe, either collapses unto other versions of itself that exists in other multiverses, or is recycled into the psychonic/panpsychic subatomic field as particles with phenomenal properties, i.e., qualia [35]. So the phenomenal properties, qualia, of subatomic particles is the binding elements that give unity to consciousness in the brains of sentient beings, which experience this unity as neuronal phenomenal experience of an “I,” mind, in order to experience and exist in a material resource framework.

Hence, for me the multiverse is objective and real. There is no God in the multiverse (even if there was one, who created us as part of a simulation (virtual world) that is the multiverse, it would not matter or prevent us from understanding the rules and laws explaining the emergence and role of consciousness in the simulation), just consciousness, emanating from a psychonic or pan-psychic subatomic field, becoming and being in simultaneously existing present/past/future layered worlds, which are entangled and superimposed. The initial superverse, which created the multiverse is a product of quantum fluctuation of dark matter and energy, which funneled or exploded to create multiverses via the first four forces of nature, with consciousness being a later (evolutionary/emergent) force that emerged following species formation (matter aggregation) and death. That is, the superverse creates layered multiverses each interconnected via subatomic particles, which aggregated, via the initial four forces of nature, to form macro-worlds [36].

Over time sentient beings experiencing these objective worlds emerged, and the phenomenal properties of their subatomic particles were/are recycled upon matter disaggregation to constitute a psychonic/panpsychic field of the superverse, which would make consciousness an emergent (evolutionary) fifth force of nature endowing future sentient beings with consciousness, a fifth (evolutionary) force of nature. This consciousness is a neuronal energy field, which is not destroyed when matter is disaggregated; instead, it is either recycled into the psychonic/panpsychic subatomic field of the superverse, or entangled and superimposed in to its counterparts where the disaggregated matter
still exists in its aggregated forms in the multiverse. In the human
ethos of the macro-world, the psychonic/pan-psychic subatomic
field that is consciousness becomes God, which is associated with
attributes that we embody or must embody in order to reproduce
our being in material resource frameworks. Generally speaking,
consciousnesses, actions (practical consciousness), learning, [37]
and development within Mocombe’s phenomenological structural
ontology are the product of the embodiment of the phenomenal
properties of recycled/entangled/superimposed subatomic
neuronal energies/chemicals, psychion, of the multiverse
objectified in the space-time of multiverses via the aggregated body
and the microtubules of the brain.

Once objectified and embodied the phenomenal properties
of the neuronal energies/chemicals encounter the space-time of
physical worlds via a transcendent subject of consciences
(the aggregation of a universal-self superimposed and entangled
across the multiple worlds of the multiverse) and the drives and
sensibilities of the aggregated body and brain in reified structures
of signification, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and
communicative discourse defined and determined by other beings
that control the resources (economics), and modes of distributing
them, of a material world required for physical survival in space-
time. So, in my view, contrary to Daniel Dennett, this transcendent
subject, mind, of consciousnesses is not an emergent illusion of the
brain [38]. It (the mind/transcendental subject of consciousnesses)
is, following the constitution of macro-worlds throughout the
multiverse, an emergent material substance superimposed/
entangled/recycled via a psychonic/panpsychic subatomic field
that enables us (as both first and third person perspectives) to
experience the material resource framework.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Hence, once objectified and embodied the phenomenal
properties, qualia, of the neuronal energies/chemicals encounter the
space-time of physical worlds via a transcendental subject of
consciousnesses (the aggregation of a universal-self superimposed
and entangled across the multiple worlds of the multiverse) and
the drives and sensibilities of the aggregated body and brain in
reified structures of signification, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse defined and determined by other beings that control the resources (economics), and modes of distributing them, of a material world required for physical survival in space-time [39].

The Heideggerian (mental) stances/analytics, “ready-to-hand,”
“unready-to-hand,” and “present-at-hand,” which emerge as a result of conflict between the embodied transcendental ego vis-à-vis its different systems, 1) the sensibilities and (chemical, biological, and physiological) drives of the aggregated body and brain, 2) drives/impulses of embodied residual memories or phenomenal properties of past/present/future recycled/entangled/superimposed subatomic/chemical particles, 3) the actions produced via the body in relation to the indeterminacy/deferment of meaning of linguistic and symbolic signifiers as they appear to individuated consciousnesses in ego-centered communicative discourse, 4) and the dialectical and differentiating effects, i.e., structural
reproduction and differentiation, of the structures of signification,
social class language game, of those who control the economic
materials (and their distribution, i.e., mode of production) of a
world are the origins of practical consciousnesses. All four types
of actions, the drives and sensibilities of the body and brain, drives
or phenomenal properties of embodied recycled/entangled/
superimposed past consciousnesses, structural reproduction/
differentiation stemming from the mode of production, and
deferential actions arising from the deferment of meaning in ego-
centered communicative discourse via the present-at-hand stance/
analytic, exist in the material world with the social class language
game, i.e., the physical, mental, emotional, ideological, etc., [40] 5) powers of those who control the material resource framework as the causative agent for individual behaviors.

In other words, our (mental) stances in consciousness vis-à-vis the conflict between the (chemical, biological, and physiological)
drives and sensibilities of the body and brain, (societal) structural
reproduction and differentiation, drives of embodied past/present/
future consciousnesses of recycled/entangled/superimposed
subatomic/chemical particles, and deferential actions arising as a
result of the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative
discourse determines the practical consciousness we want to
recursively (re) organize and reproduce in the material world. The
power and power positions of those who control (via the mode
of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and
communicative discourse) the resources (and their distribution,
i.e., mode of production) of a material resource framework, and
the threat it poses to the ontological security of an actor, in the end
determines what actions and identities are allowed to organize
and reproduce in the material world without the individual actor/
agent facing marginalization or death. It is Being’s (mental/
cognitive) stance/analytics, “ready-to-hand,” “unready-to-hand,”
and “present-at-hand,” in consciousness vis-à-vis the conflict, or
lack thereof, between the (chemical, biological, and physiological)
drives and sensibilities of the aggregated body and brain, drives/
impulses (phenomenal properties) of residual past/present/
future consciousnesses of recycled/entangled/superimposed
subatomic particles, alternative practices which arise as a result of
phenomenological meditation and deferment of meaning,
along with the differentiating logic or class divisions of the social
relations of production, which produces the variability of actions
and practices in cultures, social structures, or social systems.

All four types of actions are always present and manifested in a
social structure to some degree contingent upon the will and desires
of the economic social class that controls the material resource
framework through its body (practical consciousness), language/
symbols, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and social relations
of production. They choose, amidst the class division of the social
relations of production, what other meaning constitutions and
practices can manifest themselves in the material world without
facing alienation, marginalization, domination, or death. Hence,
our embodied we never experience the things-in-themselves
of the world culturally and historically in consciousness. We
experience them structurally or relationally, the structure of the
conjunction of the mode of production, its language, ideology,
ideological apparatuses, etc., and our (mental/cognitive) stances/analyses, ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, present-at-hand, vis-à-vis these things as they appear to and in consciousness determine our practical consciousness or behaviors [41].

We initially know, experience, and utilize the things of and in consciousness in the preontological ready-to-hand mode, which is structural and relational. That is, our bodies encounter, know, experience, and utilize the things of the world in consciousness, intersubjectively, via their representation as objects of knowledge, truth, usage, and experience enframed and defined in the relational logic and practices or language game (Wittgenstein’s term) of the institutions or ideological apparatuses of the other beings-of-the-material-resource framework whose historicity comes before our own and gets reified in as the actions of their bodies, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, mode of production, and communicative discourse. This is the predefined phenomenal structural, i.e., ontological, world we and our bodies are thrown-in in coming to be-in-the-world. How an embodied-hermeneutically-structured Being as such solipsistically view, experience, understand, act, and utilize the predefined objects of knowledge, truth, and experienced defined by others and their conditions of possibilities in consciousness in order to formulate their practical consciousness is albeit in determinate.

Martin Heidegger in Being in Time is accurate, however, in suggesting that three stances or modes of encounter (Analytic of Dasein), “presence-at-hand,” “readiness-to-hand,” and “un-readiness-to-hand,” characterizes our views of the things of consciousness represented intersubjectively via bodies, language, ideology, and communicative discourse, and subsequently determine our practical consciousness or social agency. In “ready-to-hand,” which is the preontological mode of human existence thrown in the world, we accept and use the things in consciousness with no conscious experience of them, i.e., without thinking about them or giving them any meaning or signification outside of their intended usage. Heidegger’s example is that of using a hammer in hammering. We use a hammer without thinking about it or giving it any other condition of possibility outside of its intended usage as defined by those whose historicity presupposes our own. In “present-at-hand,” which, according to Heidegger, is the stance of science, we objectify the things of consciousness and attempt to determine and reify their meanings, usage, and conditions of possibilities as the nature of reality as such.

Hence the hammer is intended for hammering by those who created it as a thing solely meant as such. The “unready-to-hand” outlook is assumed when something goes wrong in our usage of a thing of consciousness as defined and determined by those who adopt a “present-at-hand” view. As in the case of the hammer, the unready-to-hand view is assumed when the hammer breaks and we must objectify it, by then assuming a present-at-hand position, and think about it in order to either reconstitute it as a hammer, or give it another condition of possibility. Any other condition of possibility that we give the hammer outside of its initial condition of possibility which presupposed our historicity becomes relational, defined in relation to any of its other conditions of possibilities it may have been given by others we exist in the world with who either ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, or present-at-hand attempts to maintain the social class language game of power. In the ready-to-hand stance the latter unconsciously practices and attempts to reproduce the social class language game of power by discriminating against and marginalizing any other conditions of possibilities of their social class language as determined by those in ideological power positions.

They may move to the unready-to-hand stance in response to those who they encounter that attempts, present-at-hand, to alter the nature of the dominant social class language game they recursively reorganize and reproduce as outlined by those in power positions who are present-at-hand of the dominant social class language game. In either case, not all beings achieve the present-at-hand stance. The latter is the stance of science and ideologies, which are tautologies when they profess that their stances represent the nature of reality as such, and those in power positions, who choose, among a plethora of alternative present-at-hand social class language games, what alternative practical consciousnesses outside of their social class language game that are allowed to manifest in the material world. Hence, as outlined above, phenomenological structuralism posits human consciousness to be the by-product or evolution of subatomic particles unfolding with increasing levels of abstraction within a material resource framework enframed by the mode of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse of bodies (who control the material resource framework) recursively reorganizing and reproducing the ideals of the latter factors as their practical consciousness.

Thus, in phenomenological structuralism the understanding is that the structure of reality determines language (via its generative grammar) and how we ought to live in the world. However, the language, and its usage, i.e., social class language game, of those who control the material resource frameworks of the world conceals that relationship via their mode of production, ideologies, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse, which is evolutionary. In other words, like the Wittgensteinian position of the Tractatus, Mocombe’s theory of phenomenological structuralism assumes that there is a uniform (grammatical) structure to language determined by the logical-empirical structure of quantum and physical reality. The grammatical structure of linguistic utterances attempts to capture the subjects and objects of that reality and how we ought to live in it with them. In being-in-the-world with others, this logical-grammatical structure, however, is concealed by the developmental knowledge, and its usage (practical activity), of those who control the material resource framework of the world via the stage of development of their language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, social relations of production, and communicative discourse.

Be that as it may, the latter comes to constitute an evolutionary social class language game whose linguistic systemicity and usage comes to determine our conception of reality, and the classes, categories, and forms of life we belong to and interact in and with, which depending on its stage of development and relation to the True nature of reality as such, is either accepted or constantly deferred.
by those in its speech community who are marginalized or not represented in its evolutionarily developed linguistic system. The latter process under the guise “language game,” language as a tool, is what Wittgenstein captures in his second treatise on language as developed in the Philosophical Investigations. That is, the classes and categories identified and created by the dominant social class language game of a material resource framework constitute reified classes, categories, and forms of life, “language games,” whose meanings and praxes as defined by the dominant social class language game are either accepted or deferred by those classified in them. So, in Mocombe’s theory of phenomenological structuralism, Wittgenstein’s two theories of language and meaning must be read as one philosophy as opposed to two, one supported by analytical philosophy and the other by postmodernism/post-structuralism.

We have a plethora of language games (classes, forms of life, and categories) in the world, which structures our language, because of the ability to defer meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse and the developmental stage of the human mind and body vis-à-vis the actual structure of reality. The language of science, like its predecessor religion, attempts to capture the logical-empirical structure of (quantum and physical) reality, and how we ought to live within it, amidst the utterances and practical consciousnesses of the masses given their abilities to defer meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse and the classes, categories, and forms of life they are classed in/with by the dominant social class language game. Hence in the end, consciousness (praxis) and subject constitution is a product of conflict, or lack thereof, and an individual’s (mental/cognitive) stance, i.e., analytics, vis-à-vis three structures of signification and the ability to defer meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse stemming from the social class language game (i.e., language, symbols, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse) of those who control the mode of production of a material resource framework.

It is the ready-to-hand drives of the body and brain, ready-to-hand and present-at-hand manifestation of past/present/future recycled/entangled/superimposed residual consciousnesses/subatomic particles, the present-at-hand phenomenological meditation and deferment of meaning that occurs in embodied consciousness via language, ideology, and communicative discourse as reflected in diverse individual practices, within the ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, and present-at-hand differentiating logic or class divisions of the social relations of production, which produces the variability of actions and practices in cultures, social structures, or social systems. All four types of actions, the (chemical, biological, and physiological) drives/impulses of the body and residual past/present/future consciousnesses of subatomic particles, structural reproduction/differentiation, and actions resulting from the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse, are always present and manifested in a social structure (which is the reified ideology via ideological apparatuses, their social class language game, of those who control a material resource framework) to some degree contingent upon the will and desires of the economic social class that controls the material resource framework through the actions of their bodies (practical consciousness), language, symbols, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and social relations of production. They choose, amidst the evolutionary class division of the social relations of production, “the structure of the conjuncture,” (Marshall Sahlins’s term) what other meaning constitutions and practices can manifest themselves without the Beings of that practice facing alienation, marginalization, domination, or death.

The individual being is initially constituted as superimposed, entangled, recycled, and embodied subatomic particles of multiple worlds of the multiverse, which have their own predetermined form of understanding and cognition, phenomenal properties, based on previous or simultaneous/entangled/superimposed experiences as aggregated matter (this is akin to what the Greek philosopher Plato refers to when he posits knowledge as recollection of the Soul). Again, the individual’s actions are not necessarily determined by the embodiment and interconnecting drives of these recycled/entangled/superimposed subatomic particles. It is conflict and an individual’s stance, ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, and present-at-hand, when the subatomic particles become aggregated matter or embodied, which determines whether or not they become aware, present-at-hand, of the subatomic particle drives and choose to recursively reorganize and reproduce the content of the drives as their practical consciousness.

This desire to reproduce the cognition and understanding of the (chemical, biological, and physiological) drives (frequency) of the recycled/entangled/superimposed subatomic particles, however, may be limited by the structuring structure of the aggregated body and brain of the individual subject. That is to say, the second origins and basis of an individual’s actions are the structuring drives and desires for food, clothing, shelter, social interaction, and sex, of the aggregated body and brain, which the subatomic particles constitute and embody. In other words, the aggregated body and brain is preprogrammed with its own (biological) forms of sensibility, understanding, and cognition, structuring structure, by which its experiences being-in-the-world as aggregated embodied subatomic particles. These bodily forms of sensibility, understanding, and cognition, such as the drive and desire for food, clothing, shelter, social interaction, linguistic communication, and sex, are tied to the material embodiment and survival of the embodied individual actor, and may or may not supersede or conflict with the desire and drive of an individual to recursively (re)organize and reproduce the structuring structure of the superimposed, entangled, and recycled (phenomenal properties of) subatomic particles.

If these two initial structuring structures are in conflict, the individual moves from the ready-to-hand to the unready-to-hand stance or analytics where they may begin to reflect upon and question their being-in-the-world prior to acting. Hence just as in the case of the structuring structure of the subatomic particles it is an individual being’s analytics vis-à-vis the drives of its body and brain in relation to the impulses of the subatomic particles, which determines whether or not they become driven by the desire (actions/praxis) to solely fulfill the material needs of their body and brain at the expense of the drives/desires of the subatomic
particles or the social class language game of the material resource framework they find their existence unfolding in. The social class language game, and its differentiating effects, an individual find their existence unfolding in is the third structuring structure, which attempts to determine the actions of individual beings as they experience being-in-the-world as embodied subatomic particles.

The aggregated individual finds themselves objectified and unfolding within a material resource framework controlled by the actions of other bodies, which presuppose their existence, via the evolutionary actions of their bodies (practical consciousness), language, communicative discourse, ideology, and ideological apparatuses stemming from how they satisfy the desires of their bodies and subatomic particle drives (means and mode of production). What is aggregated as a social class language game by those in power positions via and within its mode of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse attempts to interpellated and subjectify other beings to its interpretive frame of satisfying their bodily needs, fulfilling the impulses of their subatomic particles, and organizing a material resource framework at the expense of all others, and becomes a third form of structuring individual action based on the mode of production and how it differentiates individual actors.

That is to say, an individual's interpellation, subjectification, and differentiation within the social class language game that presupposes their being-in-a-world attempts to determine their actions or practical consciousness via the reified language, ideology, etc., of the social class language game, the meaning of which can be deferred via the communicative discourse of the individual actors. Hence, the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse of the language and ideology of a social class language game is the final means of determining an individual's action or practical consciousness outside of, and in relation to, its stance, i.e., analytics, vis-à-vis the drives of subatomic particles, drives and desires of the body and brain, and structural reproduction and differentiation. Whereas the practical consciousness of the transcendental ego stemming from the impulses/frequencies of embodied subatomic particles are indeterminant as with its neuronal processes involved with the constitution of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse (Albeit physicists are in the process of exploring the nature, origins, and final states of subatomic particles, and neuroscientists are attempting to understand the role of neuronal activities in developing the transcendental ego and whether or not it continues to exist after death).

The form of the understandings and sensibilities of the body and brain are determinant as with structural reproduction and differentiation of the mode of production and physiological mapping of the brain and body, and therefore can be mapped out by neuroscientists, biologists, and sociologists to determine the nature, origins, and directions of societal constitution and an individual actor's practical consciousness unfolding. The interaction of all four elements or processes in relation to the stance of the transcendental ego of the individual actor is the basis for human action, praxis/practical consciousness and mind in a world. However, in the end, consequently, the majority of practical consciousness will be a product of an individual actor's embodiment and the structural reproduction and differentiation of a social class language game given 1) the determinant nature of embodiment, form of understanding and sensibility of the body and brain amidst, paradoxically, the indeterminacy of impulses of embodied subatomic particles and the neuronal processes involved in ego-centered communicative discourse; and 2) the consolidation of power of those who control the material resource framework wherein a society, the social class language game, is ensconced and the threat that power (consolidated and constituted via the actions of bodies, mode of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse) poses to the ontological security of an aggregated individual actor who chooses (or not) either ready-to-hand or present-at-hand to recursively reorganize and reproduce the ideals of the society as their practical consciousness.

It should be mentioned that in response to this latter process, those in power positions who internalize the ideals of the social structure and recursively (re) organize and reproduce them as their practical consciousness are in the unready-to-hand stance when they encounter alternative forms of being-in-the-world within their social class language game. They dialectically attempt to reconcile the practical consciousness of their social class language game with the reified practical consciousness of those who have deferred their meanings for alternative forms of being-in-the-world within their social class language. They can either accept, marginalize, or seek to eradicate the deferred or decentered subject or their practices. Future research must continue to find evidence for the superversive, multiverse, and the subatomic particle, psychion, and its field, which is consciousness.
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