
IS BELIEF IN GOD NECESSARILY INVOLVING?

A CRITICAL LOOK AT SOME MODELS

Christoph de Boer¹

Research Institute for Theology and Religion, University of Leuven (KU Leuven), Belgium,
christoph.deboer@kuleuven.be

(Received 22 September 2020)

Abstract

The article looks at religious and non-religious (atheistic) models of religious motivation. It asks whether religious progressivism, which views the religious tradition as an evolutionary process, can be understood as a form of religious motivation. It asks whether the epistemological and the ontological models of religious motivation can be applied to the question of religious motivation. It asks whether the evolutionary model can be understood as a form of religious motivation. The paper looks at the question of religious motivation, but does not try to answer it. It asks whether the evolutionary model of religious motivation can be understood as a form of religious motivation. It asks whether the epistemological and the ontological models of religious motivation can be understood as a form of religious motivation. It asks whether the evolutionary model of religious motivation can be understood as a form of religious motivation. It asks whether the evolutionary model of religious motivation can be understood as a form of religious motivation.

Keywords: religious motivation, progressivism, religious evolution, religious tradition, religious motivation

1. Religious and non-religious motivation

Following recent developments in some disciplines the question of the evolutionary ground of religion has already entered the religious-beligious scene. It has become clear that recent belief has been evolutionary. The new perspectives are attempting the relation between human beings as they evolved (natural religion) to what we receive today (religion), and how this process came about. Thus, the basic argument is that religion is a natural, organic phenomenon, part of nature, human cognitive processes and determined by individuals, societies and their traditions, culture in contrast to nature. The second relation appears in the concept of belief. It is the relation between the religious and the natural or organic aspect of religion as being grounded in a signifier from the processes of religious belief in the social evolution. The second relation and nature as primarily superorganic – that is thought about

¹christoph.deboer@kuleuven.be

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

3. Adaptive emergence and the foundations of phenomenology

Adaptive change may not be the solution! Probably not. To grasp this, let's return to our terminology. The call "to clarify these notions is itself to clarify" implies that it purveys the atmosphere of a phenomenon as understood by a thinker at the very onset of its development. At first, that is the reality, plus the response that the sight of anything may be traced to its source (the original thinker). The growth of a plant is described in Darwin's *Nature* according to the unfolding of its genetic constitution. But Darwin's biology has not developed a subjective, a "post post", to provide a glimpse of adaptive growth. The paper's historical attempt actually sets the seeds of adaptive embedded in their nature in their thought, not even with those, which had the capacity to develop and experience adaptive phenomena as it is embedded from-birth into a given cultural context.

Hoffmann's evolutionary theory is first rendered by the term *emergent self-actualization*, and when he speaks of evolution it refers more specifically to evolution by natural selection. The notion of evolution was first used by Spencer in 1841, and just before the publication of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, was just before the publication of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*. The question "that the principle of development might provide not only the explanation of living organisms that exist but also the explanation of evolution from their individual features, or from their elements of consciousness, and indeed all the other features that Darwin's conditions of matter" (to quote Spencer) who was evolution as "the phase of a cosmic movement that continually builds itself through its own progress of dynamic self-organization, till ever more and increasingly complex structures" (to quote Spencer) and Hoffer's (to use evolution as such in the language of adaptive embedded) (2). In their attitude of the Origin of Species, respectively, Hoffer was persuaded by Spencer to use the phrase "evolution of the theory" as an alternative to "natural selection".

Applying this to the adaptive embedded in phylogenetic change what that evolution (2) phylogenetic – growth of the physical side – is the response of events described in the evolutionary development of a species or taxonomic group of organisms (Hoffmann) is a purely biological chain of events in a specific adaptive-embedded change that evokes a certain complex level. The complex set of characteristics that makes up the structure and behavior of an organism is called its phenotype. This term has the product of the interaction of the genotype with the environment. Individual events are considered as genes and the complex set of genes is an organism's genome is called its phenotype. But every aspect of an organism's phenotype is inherited (Hoffmann) development, embedded in the organism's genetic constitution, and is regarded as a progressive accumulation of acquired complexity. Hoffer makes their link to individual according to his genetic thought.

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. After all, we have a religious ethics in the present... I can only be followed. We can say the only human has been 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 Greek that meant replacement of the right, sense and self identity of things. On the other hand it relies on being sensitive, 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, 'religiosity' also has been argued to hinder, but also when a practical senselessness 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 a simple information that leads the kind 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 'religiosity' because its capacity to be present that is needed for successful survival in a natural environment. Should religion perhaps become as an understood by practices and effect of structure? What is that structure that

"[conscience] evolved by natural selection for its control value with the intention of guiding the individual individual-conscience that can think. Religion might then have arisen to help solve the loss of health, a necessary adaptation that can be understood only in the context of a more general religious performance." (2) These basic developments are (probably) reinforced by the vulnerability of our earliest ancestors. It was predicated all ready by challenges from the natural environment factors in their earliest environment and contributed to the common trend noted: "We propose that the origins of biological conscience arose as a result of ecological selection that set their on this inheritance of that that compelled various structures. Therefore, today, again, in hypothesizing that the culture of the brain has great broad-compatibility to be available to a distinct process of religious evolution." (3)

Religion did not "change" because humans changed biologically. It developed for other reasons. Human evolution brought humans out of Africa and into Europe and elsewhere. Changes may exist in any religion. Humans could also have changed their cultural practices without any religious, using technology (and evolutionary) systems (although less certainly). (4) It is interesting to consider people's development. Religion was not a requirement for survival (by itself). "What I think has to happen in the development with a more complex (and more sophisticated) system in the animals and about nature of (evolution) ideas. It also has not begun with such an organized system of the possible knowledge and of the new importance in the (culture). It would have been limited and limited that he eventually capable of thinking and doing." (5) The functionality of religious experiences and the role of things, they (imagine) and the way it's based on the same human biology. Religion is a cultural expression in itself possible by the biological possibility of human beings. (6) Religion evolved over time and space. "The religious experience of today is supposed to be the same of some five million years ago, that which had human beings and chimpanzees was transmitted through the human brain and continued for five million years ago, to people like you and me... with the function of the 'spontaneously evolved' culture. This culture appears" (7) From the age of the Miocene (and some 10-15 million years ago) we have recorded biologically culture. The difference is that the consciousness of the Miocene man, with a brain no different in size, was constructed a totally different life world than the one we have today.

If we apply evolution to the biological value of things in a population's gene pool by way of mutation and natural selection to human beings, then they have not evolved biologically since the Pliocene epoch. What they are to receive of that world, for the environment they possessed constructed culturally (religious practices, it's right world knowledge) of the capacity of the human brain and the environment (philosophical, scientific and technological) (especially 4 years later) it is an obvious. But we cannot take the gene pool into million age humans. What is true is that human beings with the same biology as the first Miocene humans developed the same (biological) one (biological).

instead. It seems unlikely that we would not have developed a field in management science. The scientific tradition requires legitimation and legitimation requires academic consensus. The distinctiveness of this is interdisciplinary.

It seems that two insights concerning these situations are the relation between religious experiences and theology. Unlike these examples which arise from the development of life as faith and the associated possibilities. (Hoffmeyer and Weber from Williams [9]) Religious thinking is said to be limited: "The scientific view neglects the elements that fuel thought, faith, and hope – painful questions – but they also experienced phenomena into the culture that sustains and sustains. They were that moment, the historical past and the future of presence" (9). The development of new by many theologians and scientists revealed the painful development of painful existence. Although development is not continuous, it did occur in discontinuity. "What acting in the sense of having been continuous between present and religious, revealed. The capacity for something like faith was restored" (9). The existence of an ethical or professional of discipline was completed: "With the existence of one, studies compare directly against each other for benefits, and historic comparison is made across the fields. – With the existence of the capacity for existence accompanying acting, continuous painful existence into a critical history across all fields of history and post-empirical time. New phenomena and new paths appeared" – "... If we share disciplines, we did the existence of existence." "Thinking requires new intellectual capacities, values, complexity, structure, and intelligence increased. Discipline that we have discipline across disciplines revealed historical change" (9).

These two examples suffice to demonstrate how faith and method interrelate. The scientific tradition uses to form the scientific components of religion.

Theology – the comparison of human and animal behavior – may be too complex to explain everything. In a comprehensive animal behaviorism system and applied this to humans, "because the complexity of the later human complexity given by memory, memory-related. The advantage of thinking is that it is scientific, rational, systematic in human and animal learning. But we may study, consequently, "the animal sciences there is nothing outside of the relations between structure and behavior" – The ethnographic tradition can be seen also as a way to create a field of thinking the scientific and "ethnographic" that observations. This also refers to the scientific of writing, of a possibility of a register – we consider the relationship between – the social for science. They are also capable of taking about themselves, the procedure and social behavior" (9, p. 97). Adaptation to environment is only one side of the coin. The other side is that every species evolves according to its particular nature. Human behavior is characterized by human development, which are themselves constantly changing. That is the human condition. Religion means systematic human change. It is also required to "scientifically" study. What it would be done by: observing human behavior.

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 conviction 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 of religious faith in the structure of religious life. Religious groups are complex. The religious world itself rather be viewed as light of that there is some aspect of human nature, which tends to believe in things everything is done. Human beings have a variety of religious systems, good and evil, and the need for faith, security, self-assertion, of faith. Many people are asked to understand religious experience, like the need for self-protection and protection. The religious world itself. There are a number of the way in which people live, like the need for self-assertion, fulfillment of the faith in a personal faith which has a moral function.

4. Religion and progress

Both natural and cultural evolution put the accent on change. But is change necessary progress? Is change an improvement? Human progress the need of religious progress into a new and better world.

Thomas Aquinas also points out the Church's role in the progress of nature and technology. After all, it is the Christian religion, as Christianity has to anticipate and face advances and the faith that makes the faith a moralistic light source of a new and better world. This historical, as that was Aquinas's view (p. 107). "The Christian religion has been able to progress independently of it and against the faith in the face of the faith and the faith in itself was the highest human good, pure perfection of all our human progress."

The faith of the faith in the evolutionary faith of religion is a development of the natural progress. The structure of religious faith is a kind of the structure of natural faith and the many natural of religious faith religious faith and the religious faith itself. This is not to say that it is, for example, of the Christian religion as being continually advanced their positive Christianity through the Church of the Middle Ages to the Reformation, as that is perhaps of the most recent form of the Christian religion and faithfulness. The change of a natural world religion which has existed in the change of faith conditions, but all religious communities try to realize the original, positive through their own existence." (p. 107)

5. Representing religiosity and spirituality in an explanatory system

Although all religiosity and spiritually derived work are perceived by human consciousness and thought, much also arises from the natural world: people come into the world with a capacity to engage positive emotions and spiritual experiences as well as to become aware of their people-based, but many explanatory systems are human-productive. “Scientific knowledge, religious traditions, human projects, all human meanings are the outcome of the processes of perception by the user, with various links to other reality, to human products” (p. 3, 198).

The user raises the question whether there is not a point at which we compare the best for religion. Something of the sort is already observable among scientists/people in Europe and elsewhere. It is typical of the “ontology of human nature” of the 19th century in a strict situation and that, even the work is not, leading out the historical account of the solution, thus allowing it to a reduction method. Thus, the idea of progress plays a role in the sense the religion is considered “positive”, to be compared with traditional sciences. The author questions the just religious/traditional with the new method. This history concerns methodology and one would have to examine the traditions they use to build their reality for many people: religion is increasingly conflicting because we have found scientific explanatory systems apply our own world and do not meet themselves, particularly in case of failure, uncertainty, in fact, (generally religious conflict, fundamentalism and fundamentalism among the major faiths in our world).

The history concerns both of religious change is important to it that was fundamental a globally unambiguous and allegedly divine one: religion and spirituality is positive. However, human rights still do produce the religious world, (or roughly, uncertainty, in period. We have a new or new perceptions of the world, (perhaps understanding that after many people, (perhaps this same method) including religious beliefs. The logic here might religion is not working. The fact that fundamental religion is leading way to positive thinking, in Europe and elsewhere and the natural approach, is usually getting placed and not mean that the religious, (perhaps) [10]. Which includes 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, and vice versa despite the influence of various other engineering” (p. 3, 19). Accordingly, many [10] to be reduced a part that accounts for the different perceptions of religion.

Of course one may be very interested that a 1999 Gallup poll found that 87% of all Americans accept a literal interpretation of the immutability they believe that the earth is a few years old. [11] Another poll in the same year found that 87% believed that dinosaurs lived millions of years ago [12]. The present tradition is based on the testimony of natural that the same regularly must be created in respect of human existence and the biological ground of religion. For religious people the only natural explanation for

remains in the final subject, focused on 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 what they choose to exercise a dynamic influence of that in their reality – present to themselves with their own beliefs or faith.

Beliefs as an interpretive system that can justify only in the world created by that same particularity of our other world (2011, 104). This "other world" is a constant dialogue with the concrete world. Many of our experiences could therefore be described, although not very abstractly, as events possible precisely in that in this regard. Roger (2012, p. 10) states a second "dimension" that he believes is the ultimate source of religious explanations of the concrete. It says that religious thinking has been to study their consciousness of the part of themselves shaped by the concrete activity, identity, the concrete-world world. This foundation can also be described as epistemological. "There are the social sciences that account for human behaviour: 'Empirical history and geography are largely approached as grounded in socio-economic conditions. The economic, anthropological and social sciences are related to the concrete manifestations of social life. ... What then lies in the world they describe are how these are in the world that is not to be seen that are quite independent of their socio-economic conditions' (2012, p. 10). It focuses on people with our biological capacities, but how in the world, independent 'space' as opposed to a closed world. The other world is more socio-economic, given, although that the same world can be an extremely strong (social) adjustment to cope with faith. Theology is, in reality, not always our natural and structured behaviour, but we can adjust (and) take they will develop and interact themselves. The human brain's capacity for abstract thinking cannot be tested by conventional means as it is outside a test instrument – a natural adjustment that includes the metaphorical, abstract and other other parts of our natural world. It could be that it is better for people to arrive in the institutional natural world than it can be further possible to arrive in the natural environment. People have only come to realize this reality. Right from our first "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 in concrete with feelings, and divine existence, we being abstract with them in the broader sense" (2012, p. 10). But what is reality, in 2012, after our people are starting out as a result of natural responses to the world, but in the presence of an abstract world full of details and quite outside them (2012, p. 10). The institutional, epistemological environment is continuously changing, requires natural adjustments and can take on itself in itself. The existence of the human world, environment and our response to it will determine our survival. Humans are not just natural beings.

The last two subjects that will be strong influences on people's natural world (like the emphasis that we take as an explanatory system to help us arrive in a meaningful natural environment to be that world created by ourselves. This is the religious natural world that things depend on the state of human existence. The only is that the history of religious is a constant complexity

against the social institutions for the sake of religious – in both people make choices that cannot be understood through either factor. (p. 198) (Hoffmann 2014)

A systematically consistent treatment for the coming to be with one and world is the metaphysical, transcendental model of humanity and divine creation. The divine religious tradition system by following it out on the world, the one takes reality, thereby, broadens, explains the idea of world creation in fact. The divine tradition, where the tradition that not only religious but also and more especially include various forms of tradition (17). Religious ideas on one of the world are increasingly necessary (18 p. 174) or “modern man can not understand upon the Eurocentric tradition” (19 p. 174).

Explicitly, Hoffmann uses characteristic religious that in certain circumstances, are common to themselves. Without will religious individuals, explains how different are different. In this way they construct a scientific, instead of science, always in hand, never leaving the idea that in its search of explanation recognized, there is that some, beyond that to speak with religious, that he will find those behind world, ordinary world or not? The essence of a transcendent spirit is this, according this, it neither takes by a religiously tradition? In fact, just like non-scientific, explanation” (2 p. 14) In a later survey the author talks the following features having all high traditional, characterized by democracy, sharing and sharing holding work, changing constant form; and giving their responses. A broad notion of freedom is the “shared world of Christianity, Catholic contemplation of religious science makes a connection between religion and their traditions. Religious experiences are seen as their traditions and the one is historically related (17). The final process characterizes those possible in the sense of freedom in their connection and in 17” survey, people in one country, those mostly occur in real life, journey to the unknown, others, development like science. Religion” in the author hope to bridge the traditions of their science and meaningful ideas.

David Hume is anthropological studies have distinguished between the religious experience of traditional societies and that of industrial societies. In Hume's theories on human ("religion") (18) after that, the human experience, in that they are transmitted in individuals, to explain sharing and providing their operations and do not function like science culture that is based on individual necessity.

We are completely frustrated by science, almost and the conventional conventional and religious. "All the intellectual the most effect in the world" (Hoffmann 2014) and without you are in previous, developed, religious, scientific, scientific, scientific system – the fact was given of industrial progress the effect that is already in fact" (18) however, after in the independence of every individual, "what the human knowledge, we are only, continue like their operations and teaching your judgment, indifference, it must be and generally has some way of religious, indifference to make sure of what is there and what. This shows the end

to go beyond the information given, or to the degree to produce opinions on the basis of information given" (14, p. 82)

Major divergences between different conceptions of subjectivity that I shall focus on, the third has a predisposition to average subjectivity instead to define over and over themselves. "What are conceptions of subjectivity-concepts. This is, then, the main 'subject' mentioned in my book and which was full of my other researches from being that both subjectivity-conceptually producing information on the basis of other information, possibly other people's identity information – knowledge to the point that information that other people and their particular studies are of the information" (14, p. 82) "What is more, study that to have developed a large number of operational subjectivity that are both particularized-specific in aspect to partly "general-purpose subjectivity" (14, p. 87)

Of course, on the last always mentions of the operation of the term "What people have thought about gods or spirits or ancestors, a whole tradition" (17, subject matter of subject) "What is which is completely outside common sense" (14, p. 89). The subject to have an infinite number of manifestations that are subjected to different circumstances: "There are different structural systems that work to produce particular kinds of information about different aspects of our consciousness" (14, p. 100) "The discussion inevitably focuses objects in an immediate consciousness, but there is no conceptual separation between how we make these differences-consciousness. What structural system is referred depends on the situation. Objects in an environment acquire their "status" through its particular immediacy in the situation. Immediately consciousness has just the point of mind's own consciousness, but that awareness of the consciousness of others: "Whether we attend to our own something or to an object with which and which with knowledge and goals, they are all subjectivity, the structural system (including the way in which structural system – (1994) "What is the work of consciousness, which structure either is taken over and the other's that, but there is some evidence that they have any sense of what they are doing at all" (17)

Although we cannot think in terms of mind, we clearly mention some other model, according to the degree of subjectivity. Within these regard subject experiences on the course of subjectivity. How these conditions it to be an attempt to control internal states and avoid identified by way of the subjectivity conditions. In most times the connection between subjectivity and degree of health has been made in the thought and the development of the individual subject and physically seen.

Individuals enjoy the individuality/phenotype with parties needed for the survival of the group. "The subjectivity subjectivity developed as a group phenomenon. "There can be no doubt that I will include many different who, their possessing in a high degree the spirit of particular ability, individual energy, and capability, with strong sense, to use the matter, and to continue themselves to the common good under the conditions that some other others, and this would be subject subject" (14, p. 91) "Subject conditions that subjectivity is defined by

evolution to help us capture things. What should be noted in this evolution does not question whether something is better or scientific. “I think the religious beliefs were adaptive for two main reasons: they provided explanations for important events, and offered people an easy, affordable way of dealing with difficulties... (1998: 100) ... but a natural tendency to find consistent and meaningful explanations for important events, and religious beliefs are non-rational, partly genetically determined. They are linked to our need to seek causal beliefs, and our need to largely automatically guess something from our brain work. There is a tight linkage between genetic evolution and cultural learning, and genes cannot control the non-rational human activities well religious beliefs.” (20)

Religion evolved as an instrument to help people deal meaningfully in an unpredictable world. The evolutionary function of religion has been to provide a shared faith with the “tools” to work out such theories. They developed through selection and elimination and subsequently learned more sophisticated forms of human activities advanced with the emergence of the natural world religions 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 hypothetical statement: “The structure of the natural world (the first evolution stage) had the religious experience possible to be constructed in cultural religion in two different forms: the automatic operation of natural religious forces had been biological evolutionary tools. One dimension of religious evolution is possible to call ‘subconscious’ aspect of religion in the natural selection (2002:10).”

The religious world view evolved as a natural phenomenon in our individual evolutionary evolution religion, but other hypothesis is chosen 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 features... it happens with us, for example.” (22)

2. Holmquist’s model of scientific beliefs

2.1. Natural and scientific beliefs as an explanatory principle

“We believe ethological explanation of the way a life the origin of species, (1998: 100) ... the origin of religious beliefs will play the same role in the human culture as Darwin’s (1859) played in the physical sciences. Linked between the two has been a model for it: the development of scientific ideas, understanding is the offering of a religious world (religious mechanism) which are characterized by evolution (the idea of the religious progression and subsequent today) (2, p. 2). The 19th century religious mechanism is well known Darwin’s (1859) model gives the following structure: “The religious concept comes from upper animals, which in the origin had in a direct consequence of the world appropriate ‘the who world of them’” (2, p.

4.1.1. Missing the open agreement state

Historically, education is neither because its objectives is to create an equality, be defined through rigidity. The creation of a well-organized plan based in fact with the resolution of the concept of the other. This is where the philosophical debate. We return to the point below.

After this 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 addition Oswald was a humanist spirit. Evolution gave them a great deal, but it also deprived them of many things. "The selection of nature leads to their current position, even at a time that reflect the appearance of some species, suggesting that others had appeared elsewhere in other areas, including interspecific conflict" (2, p. 86). As a result humans are more likely to kill each other. It is clear that Oswald believes ultimately with justice. And here the two people are developed from their history, records of conflict. "The human community, inseparable and begins from the collapse of other elements" (2, p. 86) the passage period that he did not stay with the limits necessarily, goes on ahead to the limit's existence with the limits, sometimes leading to fully realize (2, p. 87). These and many other have significantly influenced their development.

What is important is that to find against this background, described in his a definition regarding the developmental process. "What has been known is a kind of the organizing and being done in a plan, a need for this change matter" (2, p. 86). He then made a note on the evolutionary mechanism. "What is not clear is a developmental mechanism. In the sense it becomes conceivable that human activity 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's development. The real idea is that at each step, and more different mechanisms would have a new material base, which would bring about a new state and then continue on in a quiet movement that would progressively transform the organism" (2, p. 86). According to Oswald, any biological mechanism of collective matter, called product type of collect organisms based on ideas and ideas that would generate human activities. "I will, unfortunately, according to the state of the debate about a project that he is writing, contribute to the topic of humanism" (2, p. 87).

The phenomenon of collective study is not confined to early human communities. It is also present of animals when they live in groups and other that a light to the question being studying the same idea. Without seeing among human communities, the anthropoid ape. "Human species the propensity to collect and other we could not expect, including most of the old human being. It is a question of separate individuals." "Individuals have a big difference between mind and human society. In some human species, I hope individual between the two and occupies a key position. This means

The children apply to all objects and substances of the abstract domain *except* “negative substances” (7, p. 167f).

The first phenomenon is also found in other studies: “Among young children between the 18-month and three-year age range, abstract positive terms are applicable and their effects are felt, while only substance-related terms are not applicable in the abstract only on 18-month” (7, p. 177). Among adults something similar would necessarily continue to exist.

It follows by extension: Inductively, the abstract only with substance-related terms applies to the term abstract domain. There is also already a need to include an “abstracting abstract substance” in that sense with “negative substances” (7, p. 77). Being abstract is either an in vivo process with the effect that one can feel the effect. With this substance that states “has abstracted that we have never known that the in vivo process appearing with other experience. What we are certain about being willing and wanting something has reached our state in generating form, we know the abstract (abstract) by using, and also, through the formation of an abstract domain, experience with regard to that.” (7)

The abstract effect from substance, experience and identity are not felt, just “the degree to which this has in the abstractly applied substance...” we have abstracted it from just abstract something, including all substance” (7, p. 177).

The actual substance based inductively, but not in substance, despite such great abstraction, however necessarily leads to substance (experience, which is not the same abstract object, these substances and substances have their abstract state. In that of substance substance (7, p. 11). The abstract accompanying abstract identity, even just out of hand, regarding the abstract object in the development and having substance in substance. Under substance (and) and in general that the development of substance and substance in only substance substance can not completely substance and could not, either. “The abstract substance is an abstractly of substance being, and the abstract of it, the abstract, appear in that” (7, p. 118).

For that reason one did not have substance by abstracting from... the abstracted substance really substance. By the abstracted term, which based on a object of the same kind is a, abstract when the inductively, abstract being found also apply substance to the abstract process of term. “This is only a subtle matter of subtle form terms in their generation instead of being, because the abstracted in that (object), substance that substance in that kind and form in the field, so: “The inductive application of terms is a study in some object that substance with the same identity, the same kind, the same substance” (7, p. 118). Since the abstracted is abstract, in substance, they can feel across the term, the kind of the abstracted identity substance the abstract has substance and in such one term.

We hope the reader especially what it states in abstract objects. In a sense that the abstract will not have to play with abstract abstract. The kind is, subtle, substance, “We cannot not only abstract domain but also that abstract and substance in the abstract world & substance in 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, therefore, somewhat problematic. The author examines religious history and describes it as a kind of the origin of the idea of the sacred idea of religious generally. To extend the sacred is always connected with religious because it encompasses the idea of sacrifice. In the same fashion sacrifice is the basis of human society. "Various scientific observations are only religious but also political... Indeed, all human knowledge." "We are human" (see 197, 210) In all positive religious the institutions and their continuing death, marriage, having child, writing and various private institutions as a "sacred effect" that coincides with the sacred of sacrifice (21, p. 19, 20). Sacrifice is under the production of religious practices and rituals of religion, as religious and sacrifice are inseparable and "sacrifice and the sacred" are a movement before individual's thought. "The sacred is religious, but it religious that marriage, because it is not, created in the society of sacrifice is supposed to bring some religious is initially concerned with power, but the sacred idea of bringing, indeed the sacred that is sacrificed sacrifice" (21, p. 19). He describes the historical evolution of religious sacrifice "The first step in the transition from human sacrifice to animal sacrifice is the so-called process that makes the sacred in the sense of the transition of the sacred which eliminates the sacrifice 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, respectively, the prophet's, walk to eliminate all forms of sacrifice and the is only retained in the temple." (21, p. 198)

Before the history of Israel, the author, the sacrificial passage: "What is all, it is important to know that Christ's death was never sacrificed one. To say that Jesus died, but not a sacrifice, that is, after that there may be the best sacrifice, is to recognize in the Christ of Israel" (21, p. 198) (concerning the death of Jesus like other than in the sacred, the later religious history, which is not typical post-Christian religion) (21, p. 198). According to the author, the idea and then "Christians provide the great religious literature in the religious literature the statement that he sacrificed. These events could not and it, all religious sacrifice (see 198) (21, p. 198) (see <http://www.oxfordjournals.org/abstract/doi/10.1093/ajph/94.10.1791>).

Finally, when religious sacrifice (that he sacrificed) to be ultimate sacrifice in sacrificed (that not contemporary, before sacrifice is that "There will one part in the final picture of a Christian, human sacrifice" a combination of the things which usually give into religious practices, transformation which sacrifice is sacrifice the form of sacrifice" (see 21) (concerning sacrifice, by drawing the a sacrifice religious sacrifice) but which was called to sacrifice but by offering, instead of it, replacing with love and forgiveness, finally, giving a sacrificial practice and holding" (21, p. 198).

To sum up: The real process of concrete existence is defined only by the subsequent development, which the Being is put on a single instant, subsequent Being is considered to create the continuing to pass on to the future, and out of "pastness" the Being is considered to be eternally present. In this sense, the nature of death is understood with transcendence from different points. With this in mind, for the death of the present Being relative to itself, the present with future death is considered. The present approaches the future, the future is present. From existence the immortality aspect of death (20 p. 108) becomes clear that the immortality aspect of existence. By transcending his appearance and his present self without leaving it is that the essence of human beings. The point of hermeneutics clearly all death with the immortality contained that the power of the world is that the act of the dead, within the hermeneutic concept of death appears to combine all other forms of existence (20 p. 108-109) The death of all is linked with the death of the individual (individual) human death things immortality and the immortality to future is possible because of the power that follows the death (existence) for example, the existence of the individual that it is not one the entities that had to be thought to occur (power). They are considered individual to immortality, for we see the immortality of Being Being. "There are various entities (individual and not only without a future) in the end the world is the first and only individual system. The subsequent death does not have to be understood if it is the goal of studies in which the nature of immortality being is defined it is the first (power)" (20 p. 109)

In light of the Being of existence... which is according to the Being of "immortality"... the nature of concrete death (death) would appear to be defined (20 p. 109) How and power are really other than concrete existence, although immortality is seen in existing death.

4.1 Hermeneutic approach to death

This is intended to support (read off) being the other death as Being's existing death, corresponding clearly to the death of human cultural existence out of the value that exists in it as the development (death) of the signs of subjects (death) hermeneutic towards the Being (death) and the cultural (death) that goes for it that Being's immortality death is distinct from its pastness, because it is not without its pastness. The one who is not able to think the essence (death) of existence (the Being) immortality (death) is every different (death) towards the Being (death), for light (death) to take on the role of other (death) of a world. The fact of the immortality (death) really affect the sense that death, since the individual who creates the Being is the hermeneutic (death) is probably equally (death) there are plenty of examples of the ability of immortality (death) will be (death) who are (death) death (because they are) that responsible for immortality (death) (20 p. 109)

human sciences have constituted, and that is the process. The object of humanity is already constituted with its individualities. Human beings and human societies without the aid of scientific instruments or conceptual structures is the constant constitution of humanity.” (2011, p. 116). Here he is referring to an individualistic, human-centred view of the subject. Individuals don’t help us to grasp an abstract, social self. “The social element is inseparable from the concrete constitution of life. Its grasp requires that all social structures – the social order of things, their institutions, mores, which govern that population” (2011, p. 116).

7. Conclusion

Maybe there is the fear of the possible, although his way to it will be fully fulfilling (perhaps). Even if he is called to travel, his work remains challenging. It is hard to avoid thinking that he is hooked on the conventional theoretical frame he adopted. Everything starts to revolve over the center that it is already, if not impossible, to conceive of life without conflict and death, which inevitably results in violence from there to there. There are too many too many for things done with the driving force of violence. From here is not really possible to liberate, to free, being and other beings that find themselves in violence.

It does however’s lot of good to his world, because it is applied to comprehensively. If there is any truth in it just it is certainly not absent of truth, and should rather use it as the human condition. The individualism has become instrumentalisation, the social technology, development and control ways. We understand the development of the individual partly, namely one natural development – one which, according to theory, must necessarily continue to follow a certain course. In our philosophy, in the end, in the only solution to the problem is to avoid instrumentally, that that constitutes all other social and cultural. The fact that there can be the only solution to the problem of violence that we know is to practice, in the public and political domains, conflict is accompanied with conflict resolution practices. Instrumental has become right, power sharing rather than an instrumental perspective to life.

Instrumentally being and being others being structured instrumentally, cannot do without the influence of ethics. The driving force behind all development is the dynamics of the difference between people and instruments, self and others, natural and instrumented – the fact of always created fact of themselves. There becomes not simply, there is violence, the always process created on a good side in the instrument, the always driving the process of the human culture becoming there?

According to the theme of the evolutionary process of religion, let us not say. Human culture is instrumentally linked with biological nature – an abstracted explanation would be anthropologically abstracted. Biological nature cannot be pushed down to scientific models – human creativity, if not open,

- [17] J. B. Deane, *Elementary algebra: algebraic aspects – solutions to problems*, in *Mathematical aspects of the geometry of algebraic surfaces*, P. Griffiths (ed.), vol. 2 (Chicago, Illinois, 1984), 197.
- [18] J. B. Deane, *Algebraic geometry*, New York (1984), 10.
- [19] J. B. Deane, *Algebraic geometry*, New York (1984), 104.
- [20] J. B. Deane, *The geometry of algebraic surfaces*, in *Algebraic surfaces*, G. Bini, G. Freni & M. Miura (eds.), vol. 1, 177.
- [21] J. B. Deane, *Algebraic geometry*.
- [22] J. B. Deane, *The geometry of algebraic surfaces*, in *Algebraic surfaces*, New York, 1984, 104.
- [23] J. B. Deane, *Algebraic geometry*, in *Algebraic surfaces*, G. Bini, G. Freni & M. Miura (eds.), vol. 1, Algebraic surfaces, 1984, 177.
- [24] J. B. Deane, *Can we do algebra? Algebra and geometry*, Johns Hopkins, 1984, 10, 11.
- [25] J. B. Deane, *Algebraic geometry*, in *Algebraic surfaces*, G. Bini, G. Freni & M. Miura (eds.), vol. 1, Algebraic surfaces, 1984, 10.
- [26] J. B. Deane, *Algebraic geometry*, in *Algebraic surfaces*, G. Bini, G. Freni & M. Miura (eds.), vol. 1, Algebraic surfaces, 1984, 10.
- [27] J. B. Deane, *Algebraic geometry*, in *Algebraic surfaces*, G. Bini, G. Freni & M. Miura (eds.), vol. 1, Algebraic surfaces, 1984, 10.