Neutrosophy, A New Branch of Philosophy


Abstract:
In this paper is presented a new branch of philosophy, called neutrosophy, which studies the origin, nature, and scope of neutralities, as well as their interactions with different ideational spectra.

The Fundamental Thesis: Any idea <A> is T% true, I% indeterminate, and F% false, where T, I, F are standard or non-standard subsets included in [0, 1].

The Fundamental Theory: Every idea <A> tends to be neutralized, diminished, balanced by <Non-A> ideas (not only <Anti-A>, as Hegel asserted) - as a state of equilibrium.

Neutrosophy is the base of neutrosophic logic, a multiple value logic that generalizes the fuzzy logic, of neutrosophic set that generalizes the fuzzy set, and of neutrosophic probability and neutrosophic statistics, which generalize the classical and imprecise probability and statistics respectively.
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1.1. Foreword.
Because world is full of indeterminacy, a more precise imprecision is required. That's why, in this study, one introduces a new viewpoint in philosophy, which helps to the generalization of classical 'probability theory', 'fuzzy set' and 'fuzzy logic' to <neutrosophic probability>, <neutrosophic set> and <neutrosophic logic> respectively. They are useful in artificial intelligence, neural networks, evolutionary programming, neutrosophic dynamic systems, and quantum mechanics.

Especially in quantum theory there is an uncertainty about the energy and the momentum of particles, and, because the particles in the subatomic world don't have exact positions, we better calculate their neutrosophic probabilities (i.e. involving a percent of incertitude, doubtfulness, indetermination as well - behind the percentages of truth and falsity respectively) of being at some particular points than their classical probabilities.

Besides Mathematics and Philosophy interrelationship, one searches Mathematics in connection with Psychology, Sociology, Economics, and Literature.
This is a foundation study of the NEUTROSOPHIC PHILOSOPHY because, I think, a whole collective of researchers should pass through all philosophical schools/movements/theses/ideas and extract their positive, negative, and neuter features. Philosophy is subject to interpretation. This is a *propédeutique* (Fr.), and a first attempt of such treatise. (An exhaustive (if possible) neutrosophic philosophy should be a synthesis of all-times philosophies inside of a neutrosophic system.)

This article is a collection of concise fragments, short observations, remarks, various citations, aphorisms, some of them in a poetical form. (Main references are listed after several individual fragments.) It also introduces and explores new terms within the framework of avant-garde and experimental philosophical methods under multiple values logics.

The research is a part of a National Science Foundation grant proposal for Interdisciplinary Logical Sciences.

1.2. **Neutrosophy, a New Branch of Philosophy**

   **A) Etymology:**

   **B) Definition:**
   Neutrosophy is a new branch of philosophy, which studies the origin, nature, and scope of neutralities, as well as their interactions with different ideational spectra.

   **C) Characteristics:**
   This mode of thinking:
   - proposes new philosophical theses, principles, laws, methods, formulas, movements;
   - reveals that world is full of indeterminacy;
   - interprets the uninterpretable;
   - regards, from many different angles, old concepts, systems: showing that an idea, which is true in a given referential system, may be false in another one, and vice versa;
   - attempts to make peace in the war of ideas, and to make war in the peaceful ideas;
   - measures the stability of unstable systems, and instability of stable systems.

   **D) Methods of Neutrosophic Study:**
   mathematization (neutrosophic logic, neutrosophic probability and statistics, duality),
   generalization, complementarity, contradiction, paradox, tautology, analogy, reinterpretation,
combination, interference, aphoristic, linguistic, transdisciplinarity.

E) Formalization:
Let's note by \(<A>\) an idea, or proposition, theory, event, concept, entity, by \(<\text{Non-A}>\) what is not \(<A>\), and by \(<\text{Anti-A}>\) the opposite of \(<A>\). Also, \(<\text{Neut-A}>\) means what is neither \(<A>\) nor \(<\text{Anti-A}>\), i.e. neutrality in between the two extremes. And \(<A'>\) a version of \(<A>\).

\(<\text{Non-A}>\) is different from \(<\text{Anti-A}>\).

For example:
If \(<A> = \text{white}\), then \(<\text{Anti-A}> = \text{black}\) (antonym),
but \(<\text{Non-A}> = \text{green, red, blue}, \text{yellow, black, etc. (any color, except white)}\),
while \(<\text{Neut-A}> = \text{green, red, blue, yellow, etc. (any color, except white and black)}\),
and \(<A'> = \text{dark white, etc. (any shade of white)}\).

In a classical way:
\(<\text{Neut-A}> \equiv <\text{Neut-(Anti-A)}>\), i.e. neutralities of \(<A>\) are identical with neutralities of
\(<\text{Anti-A}>\), also \(<\text{Non-A}> \supset \equiv <\text{Anti-A}>\), and \(<\text{Non-A}> \supset \equiv <\text{Neut-A}>\) as well,
\(<A> \cap <\text{Anti-A}> = \emptyset\), \(<A> \cap <\text{Non-A}> = \emptyset\).
\(<A>\), \(<\text{Neut-A}>\), and \(<\text{Anti-A}>\) are disjoint two by two.
\(<\text{Non-A}>\) is the completeness of \(<A>\) with respect to the universal set.

But, since in many cases the borders between notions are vague, imprecise, it is possible
that \(<A>\), \(<\text{Neut-A}>\), \(<\text{Anti-A}>\) (and \(<\text{Non-A}>\) of course) have common parts two by two.

F) Main Principle:
Between an idea \(<A>\) and its opposite \(<\text{Anti-A}>\), there is a continuum-power spectrum of
neutralities \(<\text{Neut-A}>\).

G) Fundamental Thesis:
Any idea \(<A>\) is \(T\)% true, \(I\)% indeterminate, and \(F\)% false, where \(T, I, F \in [0, 1]\).

H) Main Laws:
Let \(<\alpha>\) be an attribute, and \((T, I, F) \subset [0, 1]^3\). Then:
- There is a proposition \(<P>\) and a referential system \(\{R\}\), such that \(<P>\) is \(T\)% \(<\alpha>\), \(I\)%
indeterminate or \(<\text{Neut-}\alpha>\), and \(F\)% \(<\text{Anti-}\alpha>\).
- For any proposition \(<P>\), there is a referential system \(\{R\}\), such that \(<P>\) is \(T\)% \(<\alpha>\),
\(I\)% indeterminate or \(<\text{Neut-}\alpha>\), and \(F\)% \(<\text{Anti-}\alpha>\).
- \(<\alpha>\) is at some degree \(<\text{Anti-}\alpha>\), while \(<\text{Anti-}\alpha>\) is at some degree \(<\alpha>\).

Therefore:
For each proposition \(<P>\) there are referential systems \(\{R_1\}, \{R_2\}, \ldots\), so that \(<P>\)
looks differently in each of them - getting all possible states from \(<P>\) to \(<\text{Non-P}>\) until
\(<\text{Anti-P}>\).
And, as a consequence, for any two propositions \(<M>\) and \(<N>\), there exist two
referential systems \(\{R_M\}\) and \(\{R_N\}\) respectively, such that \(<M>\) and \(<N>\) look the same.
The referential systems are like mirrors of various curvatures reflecting the propositions.

I) Mottos:
- All is possible, the impossible too!
- Nothing is perfect, not even the perfect!

**J) Fundamental Theory:**

Every idea $<A>$ tends to be neutralized, diminished, balanced by $<\text{Non-A}>$ ideas (not only $<\text{Anti-A}>$ as Hegel asserted) - as a state of equilibrium. In between $<A>$ and $<\text{Anti-A}>$ there are infinitely many $<\text{Neut-A}>$ ideas, which may balance $<A>$ without necessarily $<\text{Anti-A}>$ versions.

To neuter an idea one must discover all its three sides: of sense (truth), of nonsense (falsity), and of undecidability (indeterminacy) - then reverse/combine them. Afterwards, the idea will be classified as neutrality.

**K) Delimitation from Other Philosophical Concepts and Theories:**

1. Neutrosophy is based not only on analysis of oppositional propositions, as *dialectic* does, but on analysis of neutralities in between them as well.
2. While *epistemology* studies the limits of knowledge and justification, neutrosophy passes these limits and takes under magnifying glass not only defining features and substantive conditions of an entity $<E>$ - but the whole $<E'>$ derivative spectrum in connection with $<\text{Neut-E}>$.
Epistemology studies philosophical contraries, e.g. $<E>$ versus $<\text{Anti-E}>$, neutrosophy studies $<\text{Neut-E}>$ versus $<E>$ and versus $<\text{Anti-E}>$ which means logic based on neutralities.
3-4. *Neutral monism* asserts that ultimate reality is neither physical nor mental.
Neutrosophy considers a more than pluralistic viewpoint: infinitely many separate and ultimate substances making up the world.
5. *Hermeneutics* is the art or science of interpretation, while neutrosophy also creates new ideas and analyzes a wide range ideational field by balancing instable systems and unbalancing stable systems.
6. *Philosophia Perennis* tells the common truth of contradictory viewpoints, neutrosophy combines with the truth of neutral ones as well.
7. *Fallibilism* attributes uncertainty to every class of beliefs or propositions, while neutrosophy accepts 100% true assertions, and 100% false assertions as well - moreover, checks in what referential systems the percent of uncertainty approaches zero or 100.

**L) Philosophy's Limits:**

The whole philosophy is a *tautologism*: true in virtue of form, because any idea when first launched is proved true by its initiator(s). Therefore, philosophy is empty or uninformative, and *a priori* knowledge.

One can ejaculate: All is true, even the false!

And yet, the whole philosophy is a *nihilism*: because any idea, first proved true, is later proved false by followers. It is a contradiction: false in virtue of form. Therefore, now philosophy is overinformative, and a posteriori knowledge.

Now, one can ejaculate: All is false, even the truth!

All not-yet-contradicted philosophical ideas will be sooner or later contradicted because every philosopher attempts to find a breach in the old systems. Even this new theory
(that I am sure it is not pretty sure!) will be inverted... And, later, others will reinstall it back...

Consequently, philosophy is logically necessary and logically impossible. Agostoni Steuco of Gubbio was right, the differences between philosophers are undifferentiable. Leibniz's expression <true in all possible world> is superfluous, derogatory, for our mind may construct impossible world as well, which become possible in our imagination (F.Smarandache, "Inconsistent Systems of Axioms", 1995).

- In this theory one can prove anything!
- In this theory one can deny anything!

Philosophism = Tautologism + Nihilism.

**M) Classification of Ideas:**

a) easily accepted, quickly forgotten;
b) easily accepted, heavily forgotten;
c) heavily accepted, quickly forgotten;
d) heavily accepted, heavily forgotten.

And various versions in between any two categories.

**N) Evolution of an Idea** \(<A>\) in the world is not cyclic (as Marx said), but discontinuous, knotted, boundless:

\(<\text{Neut-}A>\) = existing ideational background, before arising \(<A>\);
\(<\text{Pre-}A>\) = a pre-idea, a forerunner of \(<A>\);
\(<\text{Pre-}A'>\) = spectrum of \(<\text{Pre-}A>\) versions;
\(<A>\) = the idea itself, which implicitly gives birth to
\(<\text{Non-}A>\) = what is outer \(<A>\);
\(<A'>\) = spectrum of \(<A>\) versions after (miss)interpretations

(miss)understanding by different people, schools, cultures;
\(<A/\text{Neut-}A>\) = spectrum of \(<A>\) derivatives/deviations, because \(<A>\) partially mixes/melts first with neuter ideas;
\(<\text{Anti-}A>\) = the straight opposite of \(<A>\), developed inside of
\(<\text{Non-}A>\);
\(<\text{Anti-}A'>\) = spectrum of \(<\text{Anti-}A>\) versions after

(miss)interpretations (miss)understanding by different people, schools, cultures;
\(<\text{Anti-}A/\text{Neut-}A>\) = spectrum of \(<\text{Anti-}A>\) derivatives/deviations, which means partial \(<\text{Anti-}A>\) and partial
\(<\text{Neut-}A>\) combined in various percentage;
\(<A'/\text{Anti-}A'>\) = spectrum of derivatives/deviations after mixing \(<A>\) and \(<\text{Anti-}A>\) spectra;
\(<\text{Post-}A>\) = after \(<A>\), a post-idea, a conclusiveness;
\(<\text{Post-}A'>\) = spectrum of \(<\text{Post-}A>\) versions;
\(<\text{Neo-}A>\) = \(<A>\) retaken in a new way, at a different level, in new conditions, as in a non-regular curve with inflection points, in evolute and involute periods, in a recurrent mode; the life of \(<A>\) restarts.
Marx's 'spiral' of evolution is replaced by a more complex differential curve with ups-and-downs, with knots - because evolution means cycles of involution too.

This is *dynaphilosophy* = the study of infinite road of an idea.

<N> has a larger sphere (including, besides parts of old <A>, parts of <Neut-A> resulted from previous combinations), more characteristics, is more heterogeneous (after combinations with various <Non-A> ideas). But, <Neo-A>, as a whole in itself, has the tendency to homogenize its content, and then to de-homogenize by mixture with other ideas.

And so on, until the previous <A> gets to a point where it paradoxically incorporates the entire <Non-A>, being indistinct of the whole. And this is the point where the idea dies, can not be distinguished from others. The Whole breaks down, because the motion is characteristic to it, in a plurality of new ideas (some of them containing grains of the original <A>), which begin their life in a similar way. As a multi-national empire. It is not possible to pass from an idea to its opposite without crossing over a spectrum of idea's versions, deviations, or neutral ideas in between.

Thus, in time, <A> gets to mix with <Neut-A> and <Anti-A>.

We wouldn't say that "extremes attract each other", but <A> and <Non-A> (i.e., inner, outer, and neutron of an idea).

Therefore, Hegel was incomplete when he resumed that: a thesis is replaced by another, called anti-thesis; contradiction between thesis and anti-thesis is surpassed and thus solved by a synthesis. So Socrates in the beginning, or Marx and Engels (dialectic materialism).

There is not a triadic scheme:
- thesis, antithesis, synthesis (Hegelians);

or
- assertion, negation, negation of negation (Marxists);

but a pluradic pyramidal scheme, as seen above.

Hegel's and Marx's antithesis <Anti-T> does not simply arise from thesis <T> only. <T> appears on a background of preexistent ideas, and mixes with them in its evolution. <Anti-T> is built on a similar ideational background, not on an empty field, and uses in its construction not only opposite elements to <T>, but elements of <Neut-T> as well, and even elements of <T>.

For, a thesis <T> is replaced not only by an antithesis <Anti-T>, but also by various versions of neutralities <Neut-T>.


Hegel's scheme was purist, theoretic, idealistic. It had to be generalized. From simplism to organicism.

**O) Philosophical Formulas:**

Why are there so many distinct (even contrary) philosophical Schools?

Why, concomitantly with the introduction of a notion <A>, its reverse <Non-A> is resulting?
Now, one presents philosophical formulas just because in the spiritual field it is really difficult to obtain (exact) formulas.

**a) Law of Equilibrium:**
The more \( A \) increases, the more \( \text{Anti-A} \) decreases. One has the following relationship:
\[
\frac{A}{\text{Neut-A}} = k,
\]
where \( k \) is a constant depending on \( A \), and \( \text{Neut-A} \) is a supporting point for balancing the two extremes.

If the supporting point is the neutralities' centroid, then the above formula is simplified to:
\[
\frac{A}{\text{Anti-A}} = k,
\]
where \( k \) is a constant depending on \( A \).

Interesting particular cases:
Industrialization \( \times \) Spiritualization = constant, for any society.
The more industrialized a society is, the less spiritual level its citizens have.
Science \( \times \) Religion = constant.
White \( \times \) Black = constant.
Plus \( \times \) Minus = constant.
Pushing to the limits, in other words calculating in the absolute space, one gets:
Everything \( \times \) Nothing = universal constant,
or \( \infty \times 0 = 0 \) = universal constant.

We are directing towards a mathematization of philosophy, but not in a Platonian sense.

Graph 5. O.a.1:
Materialism \( \times \) Idealism = constant, for any society.

The vertical and horizontal Cartesian axes are asymptotes for the curve \( M \cdot I = k \).
b) Law of Anti-Reflexivity:

<\(A\)> in the mirror of <\(A\)> gradually vanishes itself.
Or <\(A\)> of <\(A\)> may transform into a distorted <\(A\)>.

Examples:
Marriage between relatives gives birth to vapid (often handicapped) descendants.
That's why crossing the species of plants (and sometimes races of animals and humans
as well) we get hybrids with better qualities and/or quantities. Biological theory of
mixing species.
That's why emigration is benign for bringing new blood in a static population.
Nihilism, spread out after Turgeniev's "Parents and children" novel in 1862 as an
absolute negation, denies everything, therefore itself too!
Dadaism of the dadaism vanishes either.

c) Law of Complementarity:

<\(A\)> feels like completing with <Non-\(A\)> in order to form a whole.

Examples:
Persons, who are different, feel like completing each other and associate. (Man with
woman.)
Complementary colors (that, combined in the right intensities, produce white).

d) Law of Inverse Effect:

When trying to convert someone to an idea, belief, or faith by boring repetitions or by
force, he ends up to hating it.

Examples:
The more you ask someone to do something, the less he would.
Doubling the rule, brings to halving.
What's much, it's not good...
(inversely proportional).
When you are sure, don't be!

When pressing someone to do something, he would do a different (but not necessary
the opposite, as Newton's third motion laws' axiom stated) at-various-slopes reaction:
e) **Law of Reverse Identification:**
<Non-A> is a better <A> than <A>.

Example:
Poetry is more philosophical than philosophy.

f) **Law of Joined Disjointedness:**
<A> and <Non-A> have elements in common.

Examples:
There is little distinction between "good" and "bad".
Rational and irrational work together unseparately.
Consciousness and unconsciousness similarly.
"Come, my soul said, let's write poems for my body, for we are One" (Walt Whitman).
Finite is infinite [see the microinfinity].

g) **Law of Identities' Disjointedness:**
The permanent fight between <A> and <A>' (different shades of <A>).

Examples:
The permanent fight between absolute truth and relative truth.
The distinction between crisp false and neutrosophic false (the second one means a combination of falsity, indeterminacy, and truth degrees).

h) **Law of Compensation:**
If <A> now, then <Non-A> later.

Examples:
Any loss / Has its gain
[meaning later it will be better, because you learned from the loss].
There is no success without failure
[patience guys!].

i) **Law of Prescribed Condition:**
One cannot jump out of own limits.
(One spins inside own circle.)

j) **Law of Particular Ideational Gravitation:**
Every idea <A> attracts and rejects other idea <B> with a force directly proportional with the product of their neutrosophic measures and the exponential of their distance.
(By opposition to the modern restatement of Newton's law of gravitation of particles of matter, the distance influences directly - not indirectly - proportional: the more opposite (distanced) ideas, the stronger attraction)
**k) Law of Universal Ideational Gravitation:**

<A> tends towards <Non-A> (not <Anti-A> as Hegel said), and reciprocally. There are forces which act on <A>, directing it towards <Non-A>, until a critical point is attained, and then <A> turns back. <A> and <Non-A> are in a continuous motion, and their frontiers changing accordingly.

Examples:
Perfection leads to imperfection.
Ignorance is pleased.

Particular Case:
Everybody tends to approach his specific level of incompetence!
This is not a joke, but very truly:
X gets a job at level say L1;
if he is good, he's promoted to level L2;
if, in the new position he's good, he's promoted further to L3; and so on... until he's not good anymore, therefore not promoted; thus, he got to his level of incompetence.
<A> tends towards <Non-A>.
Therefore, everybody's ideal is to tend towards what he/she is not able to do.

But the movement is nonlinear.<Non-A> has a large range (power of continuum) of "what is not <A>" (outer <A>) versions, let index them in the set {<Non-A>_{i}}.

(All {<Anti-A>_{i}} versions are included in <Non-A>.)
Hence, infinitely many <Non-A> versions gravitate, as planets around a star, on orbits of <A>. And, between each <Non-A> version and the centroid "star" <A>, there are attraction and rejection forces. They approach each other until arriving to certain minimum critical points: P_{m(i)} for <A>, and Q_{m(i)} for <Non-A>_{i}, and then again they go far from each other until touching certain maximum points: P_{M(i)} for <A>, and Q_{M(i)} for <Non-A>_{i}.
Through differential equations we may calculate the minimum and maximum (spiritual) distances between <A> and <Non-A>_{i}, the Cartesian coordinates of the critical points, and the status quo of each version.
We would say that <A> and a <Non-A>_{i} version meet in an absolute/infinite point. When all <Non-A>_{i} versions fall into <A> we have a catastrophe!

**P) Neutrosophic Studies and Interpretations of Known Theories, Modes, Views, Processes of Reason, Acts, Concepts in Philosophy.**
This section, which is a *neutrosophic epistemology*, has a structure alike Wittgenstein’s tractatus: short (from 1-2 lines to maximum 10-15 lines) independent philosophical
reflections, metaphysical and metaphorical comments – which are separated by blank rows. It is an analytical study, and it is related to multiple-valued logic because in almost each small paragraph one shows that a statement \(<A>\) was proved true by a philosopher \(X\) whereas latter another philosopher \(Y\) proved the opposite statement \(<\text{Anti-}A>\) was true. Therefore, both \(<A>\) and \(<\text{Anti-}A>\) were true. \{Whence one can deduce that both \(<A>\) and \(<\text{Anti-}A>\) could be false.\} Even more, using a neutrosophic interpretation, one could say that other ideas in between \(<A>\) and \(<\text{Anti-}A>\) and related to them, noted by \(<\text{Neut-}A>\), could be true as well. This relates to dialetheism, which says that some contradictions are true, to paraconsistent logic, to intuitionistic logic, till neutrosophic logic (where \(<A>\), \(<\text{Anti-}A>\), and ideas in between them belonging to \(<\text{Neut-}A>\) could all be true or partially true).

Many paradoxes are treated here, and one knows that a paradox is a proposition true and false in the same time – i.e. connected to multiple-valued logic as well, and not many logics approached the paradoxes. Other reflections show that a subject may be characterized by an attribute and its opposite simultaneously (also related to multiple-valued logic in a philosophical way).

To any launched idea there are pro- and contra- reactions, but also neuter (indifference, neutrality) as well. Hegel's <dialectic> [Gr. dialektiké < dia with, legein to speak] doesn't work, it consequently has to be extended to a somehow improper term trialeptic, and even more to a pluralectic because there are various degrees of positive, and of negative, and of indifference as well - all of them interpenetrated. Going to a continuum-power transalectic (\(\infty\)-alectic).

"+" not only asks for "-" for equilibrium, as Hegel said, but for "0" as well as a support point for the thinking lever.

Hegel's self-development of an idea \(<A>\) is not determined on its internal contraries only, but on its neutralities as well - because they all fare and interfere. Self-development of an idea is also determined by external (pro, contra, neuter) factors (Comparative Philosophy, as comparative literature).

Between particular and universal there are \(P\)% particular, \(I\)% indeterminate (neutral), and \(U\)% universal things, with \(P, I, U \subset \| 0, 1^+ \|\).

The atom's structure holds in the history of any idea. The reasoning is based upon the analysis of positive, negative, and neutral propositions. This should be called Quantum Philosophy.

In nuclear fission a free neutron strongly interacts with nuclei and is readily absorbed, then it decays into a proton, an electron, and a 'neutrino' (Enrico Fermi) with a half-time of near 12 minutes.

Neutrosophy equally encompasses a philosophical viewpoint, and mode of reflection, and concept, and method in itself, and action, and movement, and general theory, and process of reasoning.

This approach differs from neutrosophism, which is a point of view that neutrosophy is a fundamental science to study the world from that perspective.
Neutrosophy studies not only an idea's conditions of possibility, but of impossibility as well. And focuses on its historical development (past and present interpretation – by using classical analysis, and future interpretation - by using neutrosophic probability and statistics).

In economics Keynes chose for the concept of "unstable equilibrium" (<The General Theory>), whereas Anghel M. Rugină passed to that of "stable disequilibrium" (<Truth in the Abstract (Analytical) versus Truth in the Concrete (Empirical)>). A self-regulating and self-unregulating mechanism is functioning in each system, moving from equilibrium to dis-equilibrium back and forth. A unstable-made stability, and stable-made instability. Or equilibrium in disequilibrium, and disequilibrium in equilibrium.

We mean, a very dynamic system by rapid small changes, characterized by a derivative. The static system is dead. Leon Walras was right: monopolies reduce the competitions, and thus the progress.

My opinion is that some philosophers grope, stumble. They don't have clear ideas or systems, or even precise directions on a subject. Paroles, paroles... What one asserts today, another will deny tomorrow. Many times they talk too much for saying nothing. Some have points contrary to experience and evidence, others have an inadequate reason. That's why a mathematization (even more, an axiomatization but not in stricto sensu) of all knowledge fields would be required, especially in philosophy (alike Mendeleev's Table of Chemical Elements). The mathematization is required because it is not possible!

Philosophy is semiscientific and semiempiric. It is less scientific than psychology, but more scientific than poetry.

Human is dependent and independent in the same time.

I understand spirit as quality, and material as quantity. Of course, they melt.

I see truth like a body, an object with a form. I see material as a dense/condensed spirit, a viscous idea.

The structure of ideas reflects the structure of objects. And reciprocally.

In the mind-body problem:
The mental phenomenon is of physical nature, and the physical phenomenon of mental as well.
"(...) it feels sometimes the economy was propelled on the symmetry principle, which demands that every new theory always be exactly the reverse of the old one"
[Mark Blaug, <Economics Theory in Retrospective>].

Neohegelians:
Reconciliation of contraries (Bradley), or irreconciliation of contraries (Wahl)?
Both!

Neutrosophy:
- has the aim of unifying field in humanistic (as Einstein tried to find in science);
- explores the differences between:
  - thinkers,
  - philosophical schools, movements, theories, principles and proves they are minimum;
- reveals that no thought school is better than another, and no philosopher is greater than another;
- is an attempt to reconcile reluctant viewpoints with inoffensive others;
- the truth may not be separated from false;
- if the philosopher X enunciated a proposition P, try to contrarily think and to compare with <Neut-P> too.

Ignorantism:
Power countries deliberately ignore the arts, literature, science, culture, traditions of third world countries. More, they even boycott, scorn them...
Third world countries creators and inventors are also handicapped by language, poor living conditions, less technology for doing research.
In histories of arts, literature, science you see only westerners:
- rare exceptions of other people being in there confirm the rule!
A minor poet, for example, who wrote in English or French or German is better known than a genius like Eminescu who wrote in a not-international Romanian language.

Negativity (Heraclitus, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel) passes through diverse phases:
from assertion to a spectrum of partial negativity, and eventually to a higher degree negativity.

Not com-plementarity (used by Bohr and Heisenberg in physics philosophy), but tri-
plementarity (negativity, positivity, and neutrality - corresponding to 0, 1, and 1/2 respectively), even n-plementarity (which means: n disjoint elements together forming a whole), or generalized to \(\infty\)-plementarity (with power of continuum), for there are complex mixed versions of them.
Beyond indefinitely many states between 0 and 1, the midpoint \(\frac{1}{2}\) represents neither negative, nor positive - or represents both of them (which cancel each other).

Hermeneutics of Philosophical Hermeneutics:
If prejudgments can not be eliminated in the judgements, why do we need the science of interpretation?
Arguing with Plekhanov (historical development is not managed at will), one says that it is at some degree managed and at another degree not managed by the will.

Ab'lard's conceptualism, which states that universalia post rem (general is besides things), i.e. general is not in things, is partially true, because general persists in each individual, that's why it is possible to form classes of individuals with similar particular characteristics.

**Philosophy of Philosophy:**
- why do we need philosophy today?
- why don't we need philosophy today?
- what direction is philosophy going to?
- what direction isn't philosophy going to?
One feels that philosophy is for people who have nothing else to do, like puzzles or rebus!

Neutrosophy means/encompasses:
- philosophy seen by a mathematician and poet;
- study of History of Philosophy;
- controversial themes of philosophy
  (to explore the offensiveness and inoffensiveness);
- evolution of an idea from <A> to <Non-A> and then to <Anti-A>;
- how to get patterns where they do not look to be, i.e. to find common characteristics at '+'-, '-'-, and '0' attributes;
- how an idea appears from different viewpoints, from all viewpoints;
- to find the vanishing point of all philosophical ideas.

Neutrosophy can also be seen as:
- new approach to philosophy;
- philosophy of philosophies;
- non-philosophy;
- super-philosophy;
- neophilosophy;
- God and Devil of the philosophy;
- meta-philosophy, macro-philosophy;
- New World Order in philosophy;
- paradox of philosophy and philosophy of the paradox;
- thought of thought;
- showing the philosophy's perfection and imperfection simultaneously;
- paradox within/from paradox: there are infinitely many;
- world's enigma;
- nature's essence;
- enigma of the world;
- any substance ultimately has a neutrosophic attribute;
- life without paradox would be monotonous and boring, linear;
- paradoxist intuition is a high level of awareness;
- postmodernist;
- an algebraic, physical and chemical philosophy;
- consistent with its inconsistence.

Transcendentalism (Emerson especially, and Kant, Hegel, Fichte), which proposes to discover the nature of reality by investigating the process of thought, is combined with pragmatism (Williams James), which first "tries to interpret each notion or theory by tracing its respective practical consequences". We mean to know reality through thought, and thought through reality.

In India's VIII-th - IX-th centuries one promulgated the Non-Duality (Advaita) through the non-differentiation between Individual Being (Atman) and Supreme Being (Brahman). The philosopher Saṅkaracharya (782-814 A.C.) was then considered the savior of Hinduism, just in the moment when the Buddhism and the Jainism were in a severe turmoil and India was in a spiritual crisis. Non-Duality means elimination of ego, in order to blend yourself with the Supreme Being (to reach the happiness).

Or, arriving to the Supreme was done by Prayer (Bhakti) or Cognition (Jnana). It is a part of Saṅkaracharya's huge merit (charya means teacher) the originality of interpreting and synthesizing the Source of Cognition (Vedas, IV th century B.C.), the Epic (with many stories), and the Upanishads (principles of Hindu philosophy) concluding in Non-Duality.

Then Special Duality (Visishta Advaita) follows, which asserts that Individual Being and Supreme Being are different in the beginning, but end to blend themselves (Rāmānujacharya, XI-th century).

And later, to see that the neutrosophic scheme perfectly functions, Duality (Dvaita) ensues, through whom the Individual Being and Supreme Being were differentiated (Madhvacharya, XIII-th - XIV-th centuries).

Thus: Non-Duality converged to Duality.

Know yourself to know the others.
Study the others to understand yourself.

In conclusion, I want to be what I don't want to be: a Philosopher. That's why I am not. (That's why, maybe, am I?)

Control what you can, leave the rest to the luck.
Control what you cannot, free what you control.
We tried to de-formalize the Hilbert's formalization of geometry: by constructing an anti-model, which doesn't respect any of his 20 axioms! (F. Smarandache, <Paradoxist Mathematics>)

Because, by axiomatization, a theory loses its transcendental, myth, beauty, and becomes too arithmeticsized, technical, mechanical.

Or, if a system of axioms is defined in a theory, this should be of infinite (and, even better, of aleph-) cardinality.

Logicism:

Frege's axioms for set theory, to derive the whole arithmetic, were inconsistent (see Bertrand Russell's Paradox).

Look at these

*Inconsistent Systems of Axioms:*

Let \((a_1), (a_2), \ldots, (a_n), (b)\) be \(n+1\) independent axioms, with \(n \geq 1\); and let \((b')\) be another axiom contradictory to \((b)\).

We construct a system of \(n+2\) axioms:

\([I]\) \((a_1), (a_2), \ldots, (a_n), (b), (b')\)

which is inconsistent. But this system may be split into two consistent systems of independent axioms

\([C]\) \((a_1), (a_2), \ldots, (a_n), (b),\)

and

\([C']\) \((a_1), (a_2), \ldots, (a_n), (b').\)

We also consider the partial system of independent axioms

\([P]\) \((a_1), (a_2), \ldots, (a_n).\)

Developing \([P]\), we find many propositions (theorems, lemmas, etc.)

\((p_1), (p_2), \ldots, (p_m),\)

by logical combinations of its axioms.

Developing \([C]\), we find all propositions of \([P]\)

\((p_1), (p_2), \ldots, (p_m),\)

resulted by logical combinations of \((a_1), (a_2), \ldots, (a_n),\)

moreover other propositions

\((r_1), (r_2), \ldots, (r_i),\)

resulted by logical combinations of \((b)\) with any of \((a_1), (a_2), \ldots, (a_n).\)

Similarly for \([C']\), we find the propositions of \([P]\)

\((p_1), (p_2), \ldots, (p_m),\)

moreover other propositions

\((r_1'), (r_2'), \ldots, (r_i'),\)

resulted by logical combinations of \((b')\) with any of \((a_1), (a_2), \ldots, (a_n),\)

where \((r_1')\) is an axiom contradictory to \((r_1)\), and so on.

Now, developing \([I]\), we'll find all the previous resulted propositions:

\((p_1), (p_2), \ldots, (p_m),\)
Therefore, \([I]\) is equivalent to \([C]\) reunited to \([C']\).
From one pair of contradictory propositions \(\{(b), (b')\}\) in its beginning, \([I]\) adds \(t\) more such pairs, where \(t \geq 1\),
\(\{(r_1), (r_1')\}, \ldots, \{(r_t), (r_t')\}\), after a complete step.
The further we go, the more pairs of contradictory propositions are accumulating in \([I]\).

**Contradictory Theory:**
Why do people avoid thinking about a contradictory theory?

As you know, nature is not perfect:
and opposite phenomena occur together,
and opposite ideas are simultaneously asserted and, ironically,
proved that both of them are true! How is that possible? ...
A statement may be true in a referential system, but false in another one. The truth is subjective. The proof is relative.
(In philosophy there is a theory:
that "knowledge is relative to the mind, or things can be known only through their effects on the mind, and consequently there can be no knowledge of reality as it is in itself",
called "the Relativity of Knowledge";
You know?... Sometimes is good to be wrong!

How to reduce to absurd the \textit{reductio ad absurdum} method?

**Continuum Hypothesis** (that the cardinality of the continuum is the smallest non-denumerable cardinal) has been shown to be undecidable, in that both it and its negation are consistent with the standard axioms of set theory.

By contrast to the relativism, which asserts that there is no absolute knowledge, in neutrosophy it is possible to attain in pure science and by convention the absolute truth, \(t=100\), and yet as a matter of rare fact.

**Hermeneutics of Hermeneutics:**
An idea \(<A>\), by interpretation, is generalized, is particularized, is commented, is filtered, eventually distorted to \(<A_1>\) different from \(<A>\), to \(<A_2>\) different from \(<A>\), and so on.
Everybody understands what he wants, according to his level of knowledge, his soul, and his interest.
\(<A>\) is viewed as \(<\text{Non-A}>\) and even \(<\text{Anti-A}>\) at some degree (ill-defined).
But all deformed versions of this idea syncretize in an \(<A>\) way.
Idealists were so formal, empiricists so informal.
Neutrosophy is both.

**Sociological Theory:**
As in the Primitive Society, the modern society is making for MATRIARCHATE -
the woman leads in the industrialized societies.
From an authoritarian PATRIARCHATE in the Slavery and Feudalism towards a more
democratic MATRIARCHATE at present.
The sexuality plays an immense role in the manipulation of men by women, because the
women "have monopoly of the sex" as was justifying to me an American friend kept by
his wife henpecked!
A cyclic social development.
The woman becomes the center of the society's cell, the family.
The sexual pleasure influences different life circles, from the low class people to the
leading spheres. Freud was right...
One uses women in espionage, in influencing politicians' decisions, in attracting
businessmen - by their feminine charms, which obtain faster results than their male
proponents.
The women have more rights than men in western societies (in divorce trials).

**Social Three-Quarters Paradox:**
In a democracy should the nondemocratic ideas be allowed?
  a) If no, i.e. other ideas are not allowed - even those nondemocratic -, then one has not
     a democracy, because the freedom of speech is restricted.
  b) If yes, i.e. the nondemocratic ideas are allowed, then one ends up to a
     nondemocracy (because the non-democratic ideas overthrow the democracy as, for
     example, it happened in Nazi Germany, in totalitarian countries, etc.).

**The Sets' Paradox:**
The notion of "set of all sets", introduced by Georg Cantor, does not exist.
Let all sets be noted by \( \{S_a\}_a \), where \( a \) indexes them.
But the set of all sets is itself another set, say \( T_1 \);
and then one constructs again another "set of <all sets>", but <all sets> are this time \( \{S_a\} \)
and \( T_1 \), and then the "set of all sets" is now \( T_2 \), different from \( T_1 \);
and so on... .
Even the notion of "all sets" can not exactly be defined (like the largest number of an
open interval, which doesn't exist), as one has just seeing above (we can construct a new
set as the "set of all sets") and reunites it to "all sets".

**A Paradoxist Psychological Complex** (with the accent on the first syllable):
A collection of fears stemming from previous unsuccessful experience or from
unconscious feelings that, wanting to do something \( \langle S \rangle \), the result would be \( \langle \text{Anti-S} \rangle \),
which give rise to feelings, attitudes, and ideas pushing the subject towards a deviation of
action \( \langle S \rangle \) eventually towards an \( \langle \text{Anti-S} \rangle \) action.
(From the positive and negative brain's electrical activities.)
For example: A shy boy, attempting to invite a girl to dance, inhabits himself of fear she would turn him down...
How to manage this phobia? To dote and anti-dote!
By transforming it into an opposite one, thinking differently, and being fear in our mind that we would pass our expectancies but we shouldn't.

People who do not try of fear not to be rejected: they lose by not competing!

Auto-suggestion:
If an army leaves for war with anxiety to lose, that army are half-defeated before starting the confrontation.

Paradoxist Psychological Behavior:
How can we explain contrary behaviors of a person: in the same conditions, without any reason, cause?
Because our deep unconsciousness is formed of contraries.

Ceaseless Anxiety:
What you want is, normally, what you don't get. And this is for eternity. Like a chain...
Because, when you get it (if ever), something else will be your next desire. Man can't live without a new hope.

Inverse Desire:
The wish to purposely have bad luck, to suffer, to be pessimistic as stimulating factors for more and better creation or work.
(Appplies to some artists, poets, painters, sculptors, spiritualists.)

My Syndrome:
Is characterized by nose frequently bleeding under stress, fear, restlessness, tiredness, nervousness, prolonged unhappiness. This is the way the organism discharges, thus re-establishing the equilibrium, and it is fortunate because the hemorrhage is not interior which would cause death of patient.
The bleeding is caused by the nervous system, not by physical injury.
If you have any idea of treating it, don't hesitate to contact the author. All opinions are welcome.

All is possible, the impossible too!
Is this an optimistic or pessimistic paradox?
a) It is an optimistic paradox, because shows that all is possible.
b) It is a pessimistic paradox, because shows that the impossible is possible.

Mathematician's Paradox:
Let M be a mathematician who may not be characterized by his mathematical work.
a) To be a mathematician, M should have some mathematical work done, therefore M should be characterized by that work.
b) The reverse judgement: if M may not be characterized by his mathematical work, then M is not a mathematician.

_Divine Three-Quarters Paradox (I):_
Can God commit suicide?
If God cannot, then it appears that there is something God cannot do, therefore God is not omnipotent.
If God can commit suicide, then God dies - because He has to prove it, therefore God is not immortal.

_Divine Three-Quarters Paradox (II):_
Can God be atheist, governed by scientific laws?
If God can be atheist, then God doesn't believe in Himself, therefore why should we believe in Him?
If God cannot, then again He's not omnipotent.

_Divine Three-Quarters Paradox (III):_
Can God do bad things?

a) If He can not, then He is not omnipotent, therefore he is not God.

b) If He can, again He's not God, because He doesn't suppose to do bad things.

Now, even if He only can - without doing it -, means He's thinking to be able to do bad things, thought that again is not compatible with a God.

_Divine Three-Quarters Paradox (IV):_
Can God create a man who is stronger than him?

a) If not, then God is not omnipotent, therefore he is not God.

b) If yes, then God will not be the strongest one and God might be overthrown.

God is egocentric because he didn’t create beings stronger than Him.

_Divine Three-Quarters Paradox (V):_
Can God transform Himself in his opposite, the Devil?

a) If not, then God is not omnipotent, therefore He is not God.

b) If yes, then God will is not God anymore.

[Religion is full of god-ism and evil-ism.]
God and Evil in the same Being. 
Man is a bearer of good and bad simultaneously. Man is enemy to himself. God and Magog!

*Expect the Unexpected:*
If we expect someone to do the unexpected, then:
- is it possible for him to do the unexpected?
- is it possible for him to do the expected?
If he does the unexpected, then that's what we expected.
If he doesn't do the expected, then he did the unexpected.

*The Ultimate Paradox:*
Living is the process of dying.
Reciprocally: Death of one is the process of somebody else's life [an animal eating another one].

Exercises for readers:
If China and Japan are in the Far East, why from USA do we go west to get there?
Are humans inhuman, because they committed genocides?

*The Invisible Paradoxes:*
Our visible world is composed of a totality of invisible particles.
Things with mass result from atoms with quasi-null mass.
Infinity is formed of finite part(icle)s.
Look at these Sorites Paradoxes (associated with Eubulides of Miletus (fourth century B.C.)):
  a) An invisible particle does not form a visible object, nor do two invisible particles, three invisible particles, etc.
  However, at some point, the collection of invisible particles becomes large enough to form a visible object, but there is apparently no definite point where this occurs.
  b) A similar paradox is developed in an opposite direction.
It is always possible to remove an atom from an object in such a way that what is left is still a visible object. However, repeating and repeating this process, at some point, the visible object is decomposed so that the left part becomes invisible, but there is no definite point where this occurs.
Between <A> and <Non-A> there is no clear distinction, no exact frontier. Where does <A> really end and <Non-A> begin? We extend Zadeh's fuzzy set term to fuzzy concept.

*Uncertainty Paradox:*
Large matter, which is under the 'determinist principle', is formed by a totality of elementary particles, which are under Heisenberg's 'indeterminacy principle'.

*Unstable Paradox:*
Stable matter is formed by unstable elementary particles (elementary particles decay when free).
Short Time Living Paradox: Long time living matter is formed by very short time living elementary particles.

Paradoxist Existentialism:
life's value consists in its lack of value;
life's sense consists in its lack of sense.

Semantic Paradox (I):  I AM WHO I AM NOT.
If I am not Socrates, and since I am who I am not, it results that I am Socrates.
If I am Socrates, and since I am who I am not, it results that I am not Socrates.
Generally speaking: "I am X" if and only if "I am not X".

Who am I?
In a similar pattern one constructs the paradoxes:
I AM MYSELF WHEN I AM NOT MYSELF.
I EXIST WHEN I DON'T EXIST.
And, for the most part:
I {verb} WHEN I DON'T {verb}.
(F. Smarandache, "Linguistic Paradoxes")

What is a dogma?
An idea that makes you have no other idea.
How can we get rid of such authoritative tenet? [To un-read and un-study it!]

Semantic Paradox (II):  I DON'T THINK.
This can not be true for, in order to even write this sentence, I needed to think
(otherwise I was writing with mistakes, or was not writing it at all).
Whence "I don't think" is false, which means "I think".

Unsolved Mysteries:
a) Is it true that for each question there is at least an answer?
b) Is any statement the result of a question?
c) Let P(n) be the following assertion:
"If S(n) is true, then S(n+1) is false", where S(n) is a sentence relating on parameter n.
Can we prove by mathematical induction that P(n) is true?
d) "<A> is true if and only if <A> is false".
Is this true or false?
e) How can this assertion "Living without living" be true?
Find a context. Explain.

<A> of <Anti-A>.
Anti-literature of literature.
<Non-A> of <A>.
Language of non-language.

<A> of <Non-A>.
Artistic of the non-artistic.
Tautologies:
I want because I want. (showing will, ambition)
<A> because of <A>.
(F. Smarandache, "Linguistic Tautologies")

Our axiom is to break down all axioms.

Be patient without patience.

The non-existence exists.
The culture exists through its non-existence.
Our culture is our lack of culture.

Style without style.

The rule we apply: it is no rule.

Paradox of the Paradoxes:
Is "This is a paradox" a paradox?
I mean is it true or false?

To speak without speaking. Without words (body language).
To communicate without communicating.
To do the un-do.

To know nothing about everything, and everything about nothing.

I do only what I can't!
If I can't do something, of course "I can do" is false.
And, if I can do, it's also false because I can do only what I am not able to do.

I cannot for I can.

Paradoxal sleep, from a French "Larousse" dictionary (1989), is a phase of the sleep when the dreams occur.
Sleep, sleep, but why paradoxal?
How do the dreams put up with reality?

Is O. J. Simpson's crime trial an example of: justice of injustice, or injustice of justice?
However, his famous release is a victory against the system!

Corrupt the incorruptible!

Everything, which is not paradoxist, is however paradoxist.
This is the Great Universal Paradox.
A superparadox;
(as a superman in a hyperspace).

Facts exist in isolation from other facts (= the analytic philosophy),
and in connection as well with each other (= Whitehead's and Bergson's thoughts).
The neutrosophic philosophy unifies contradictory and noncontradictory ideas in any
human field.

The antagonism doesn't exist.
Or, if the antagonism does exist, this becomes (by neutrosophic view) a non-(or un-)
 antagonism: a normal thought. I don't worry about it as well as Wordsworth.

Platonism is the observable of unobservable, the thought of the non-thought.

The essence of a thing may never be reached. It is a symbol, a pure and abstract and
absolute notion.

An action may be considered G% good (or right) and B% bad (or wrong), where G, B
\subset \lbrack 0, 1^+ \rbrack - the remainder being indeterminacy, not only <good> or only <bad> - with
rare exceptions, if its
consequence is G% happiness (pleasure).
In this case the action is G%-useful (in a semi-utilitarian way).
Utilitarianism shouldn't work with absolute values only!

Verification has a pluri-sense because we have to demonstrate or prove that something
is T% true, and F% false, where T, F \subset \lbrack 0, 1^+ \rbrack and n_{sup} < 2^+, not only T = \{0\} or \{1\}
– which occurs in rare/absolute exceptions, by means of formal rules of reasoning of this
neutrosophic philosophy.

The logical cogitation's structure is discordant.
Scientism and Empiricism are strongly related. They can't run one without other,
because one exists in order to complement the other and to differentiate it from its
opponent.
PLUS doesn't work without MINUS, and both of them supported by ZERO. They all
are cross-penetrating sometimes up to confusion.
The non-understandable is understandable.
If vices wouldn't exist, the virtues will not be seen (T. Mușatescu).
Any new born theory (notion, term, event, phenomenon) automatically generates its non-
theory - not necessarily anti-(notion, term, event, phenomenon). Generally speaking, for any
<A> a <Non-A> (not necessarily <Anti-A>) will exist for compensation.

The neutrosophy is a theory of theories, because at any moment new ideas and
conceptions are appearing and implicitly their negative and neutral senses are
highlighted.
Connections & InterConnections...
The non-important is important, because the first one is second one's shadow that makes it grow its value. The important things would not be so without any unimportant comparison.

The neutrosophic philosophy accepts a priori & a posteriori any philosophical idea, but associates it with adverse and neutral ones, as a *sumnum*. This is to be neutrosophic without being! Its schemes are related to the neutrality of everything.

Spencer's "organicism", which states that social evolution is from simple to complex and from homogeneous to heterogeneous, can be updated to a cyclic movement:
- from simple to complex and back to simple - since any complex thing after a while becomes simple - (but to a superior level), and again to complex (but also to a superior level to the previous one); therefore: from level 1 to level 2, and so on...
- idem from homogeneous to heterogeneous (level 1) and back to homogeneous (level 2), and again to heterogeneous (level 3)... [a *neutrosophic evolutionism*, neither H. Spencer's, nor V. Conta's].

This neutrosophy creates anti-philosophy. And, in its turn, the anti-philosophy creates philosophy. A VICIOUS CIRCLE. Both of them are making history (?) It raises a notion/idea/event/phenomenon <A> to <Non-A>, and vice versa.

Philosophy is a poetical science and a scientific poetry.

There are three main types of humans: not only Nietzsche's "overman" with his will to power, but also the <midman> with his will to mediocrity (yes, people who love to anonymously live every single day, dull), and <underman> with his will to weakness (homeless, tramps, criminals who indulge in laziness, illegalities). Inside of every man there are an <overman>, a <midman>, and an <underman> - varying in terms of moment, space, context. That's why, generally speaking, every man is: O% overman, M% midman, and U% underman, where O, M, U ∈ [0, 1].

While Spencer mechanically supported the flat evolutionism, S. Alexander, C. L. Morgan and later W. P. Montague focused on emergent evolution: the new qualities spontaneously and incalculably emerge. There however is a flatness within spontaneousness.

Lenin's "things' dialectic creates the ideas' dialectic, but not reciprocally" still works vice versa.
Same back and forth dynamics for trialectic (with neuters' attributes), pluralectic, transalectic.

If you learn better a discipline, you'll learn 'less' another one (for you don't have time to deepen the knowledge of the second one). And, if you learn better a discipline, you'll learn 'better' another one (because the more knowledge you have, the more you understand another discipline). N'est-ce pas?

When unemployment $U(t)$ increases, child abuse $CA(t)$ also increases:

$$CA(t) = k \log U(t),$$

where $t$ is the time variable, $k$ is a constant depending on unemployment rate and children's percent in the population.

Philosophy is an ideational puzzle and, alike geometry, it circumscribes and inscribes an idea to and into a class of things.

To think means to be unusual and intriguing and uneasy to others. If X says $<A>$, let's examine all its versions $<A_1>$, then what's $<\text{Neut-A}>$, afterwards focus on $<\text{Anti-A}>$, and don't forget all their derivatives. Let's question any and all. Let's be skeptical versus any "great" thinker.

Go ahead and look for the conflict of theories - grain of wisdom and creativity.

I see the ideas. They are red and blue and white, round and sharp, small and big and middle size. I look through the objects and see the essence.

What could be a philosophical algebra? But a philosophical vector space? And how should we introduce a philosophical norm on it?

Wittgenstein's logical structure of language risks to get out of the main picture when passing from a language $L_1$ to a grammatically very different $L_2$.

Neither interdisciplinarity, nor multidisciplinarity, but the notion to be extended to *infinitdisciplinar*ity (or total-disciplinarity), in order to form a *global discipline* - emerged from every single discipline in order to form an all-comprehensive theory applicable back to its elements, which gave birth to it.

Thomas Kuhn's paradigm is based on scientific and metaphysical beliefs as well.

Schopenhauer was radically pessimistic, what about a laughing philosopher? Would s/he be passed as a joker?

Determinist theory asserts that every fact or event in the universe is determined or caused by previous facts or events. Ok, but what about the 'first' fact or event? Who did cause it? If you are religious, you may answer: God. Then, who caused God?
Is the Supreme Being created by himself? How is that?
Or, maybe there was no 'first' fact or event? Then, how was it possible to get to some point with facts or events in space and time without a beginning?
Determinism flirts with underdeterminism at some degrees.

Every fact or event in the universe is \( d(F)\% \) determined or caused of previous facts or events, \( 0 \leq d(F) \leq 100 \), and the percentage depends on each individual fact or event \( F \). The determinism partially works in this neutrosophy.
The proverb: he, that is born to be hanged, shall never be drowned, doesn't entirely apply. The destiny is also deviated by man himself.

Our mind can not reflect truth accurately (Francis Bacon).
Unfortunately the science too.
What about arts? (No, they are too subjective.)

"Truth is subjectivity" (Jaspers).
Yes, in most of the cases, but according to the previous definition, the truth may be objective too
(as a right limit of the subjectivity, when this is going far away from itself as \( x \mapsto 1 \)).
The independent variable \( x \) swings between 0 and 1.
Subjective = 0, objective = 1, and everything else in between is a mixture of subjective and objective. If the percent of subjectivity in a truth is \( s\% \), then its percent of objectivity is not necessarily \( \leq (100-s)\% \).

The truth is not a stagnant property of ideas, said William James, ideas become true because they are made by events. There are as many truths as concrete successful actions.

"Subjective" is, in its turn, objective too.
Objective is subjective as well.

No assertion is immune revision (W. V. O. Quine).

We extend the solipsism, theory that source of all knowledge of existence is self alone,
to pluripsism, theory that source of all knowledge are all beings, because we get influenced by others' believes, hopes, desires, fears. It's impossible to isolately live, not even hermits or monks stay alone but they at least interfere with nature. They have to - in order to survive.
We may never adequately understand our colleagues' experience (Thomas Nagel's empathic solipsism) or ascriptions of psychological states (Wittgenstein's psychological solipsism),
and yet a small percent of it we do understand, even if we misunderstand but we charge our unconsciousness with fragments of their thought - and later we may partially act in their way without even knowing!
We behave in certain way not only because of what occurs inside of our brain (as mythological solipsism asserts), but mobilized of external events as well.
A mathematization of philosophical (and not only) cognition is demanded.

Sometimes people don't even know why they reacted in the way they did. Something it came from their innermost depths, unconscious, something they were not aware of.

"Impossible de penser que <penser> soit une activité sérieuse" (Fr.) [It's impossible to think that <to think> is a serious activity] (Emile Cioran).

And a sage: There is no philosophy, there are only philosophers. Therefore philosophers without philosophy!
But reciprocally: is there a philosophy without philosophers?

"Any big philosophy ends up into a platitude" (Constantin Noica).

The worth of an action is determined by its conformity to given binding rules (deontology), and equally by its consequences.

The same sentence is true in a reference system, and false in another one. For example: "It rains" can be true today, but false tomorrow; or can be true here, but false there.
Moreover, the sentence is also indeterminate: we don't know if ten years from today it will be raining or not.

Because any attempt to change the political power ends up in embarking another power, "the revolution is impossible" (Bernard-Henry Lévy, André Glucksmann, Jean-Marie Benoist, Philippe Némo who represented the "New Philosophy" French group).

The power of the monarch derives from his powerless people (Juan de Mariana, 16-17th centuries). Because, if they had any power, monarch's position would be in danger.

"It looks like the great systems started to lose their influence, because they vainly slide over the universe" (Țuțea).

Plurality of causes of a single effect (J. S. Mill), is extended to plurality of interwoven causes of a plurality of interwoven effects. It is impossible to separate the causes,

\[
C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n, \text{ where } 0 \leq C_i \leq 1 \text{ for each index } i, \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_i = 1,
\]

they act as a whole, and so the effects,

\[
E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_m, \text{ where } 0 \leq E_j \leq 1 \text{ for each index } j, \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^{m} E_j = 1,
\]
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even more: both, the causes and effects, have the power of continuum.

An analysis and synthesis of the whole philosophy done by the neutrosophy would catch up with a self-analysis and self-synthesis (reflexivity), for the movement is itself a part of philosophy. How should, by consequence, the neutrosophy of the neutrosophy look like?

In cooperative learning the groups of students should be heterogeneous (not homogeneous) with respect to gender, ability, and ethnic or cultural background in order to learn from each other and better interact. Interdependence play un important role, because a student could have to cooperate with another one he might not like.


The more things are changing, the more they stay the same.

All mathematical objects are manifolds (not functions, as Alonzo Church asserted).

The Eleatic School holds that <all is one>, and does not accept change and plurality. We say that <one is all> either, and unchanged and singularity don't work in the real life.

There is no real "ism", because "ism" reduces everything to a conceptualization, the thing-in-itself, a manifold of appearances - while all is mixed and interdependable.

Time is fluid, visible, and material. Like an organism, a being. We are part of it.

Husserl's phenomenological epoch, is commuting not only from natural beliefs to an intellectual reflexion, but backwards as well. It is passing through a neutrality midpoint zero from one extreme to another - besides intermediate multipoints.

Inside the atom protons+electrons+neutrons co\habit.

Theologians have defined the trinitarism as: Father, Son, and Holly Spirit. What about Devil? Therefore, a tetranitarism? But Angels? Thus, plurinitarism?

It is necessary to introduce a measurement for the ideas' field. Let's denote by "IDON" [Latin < idoneus, (cap)able of] the smallest unit to measure an idea.

The idon-ical measurement is directly proportional with the following characteristics of an
idea:
- novelty
- quality
- originality
- density
- continuity
- brightness
- quantity
- analysis
- synthesis
- truth-value,
and inversely proportional with:
- vagueness
- discontinuity
- triviality
- falsity-value.

"From error to paradox it's often not more than a step, but this step is definitive, because, contradicting even the apodictic character of mathematical assertions, it can become itself a knowledge river of future mathematics."
(Al. Froda, <Eroare și paradox în matematică>)

Therefore mathematics is not sufficient to explain everything. Science is actually limited too.

This is the Ultimate Idea:
there is no ultimate idea!
Leucippus's atomism, elaborated by Democritus, asserting that atoms and void are ultimate realities, is itself voided!

Any system or substance has a degree of disorder (measured by the entropy), a degree of order, and a degree of order and disorder in the same time.

What is the sense of emptiness (Gabriel Marcel), but of wholeness? They are opposite, but in my mind both look as perfect spheres. Even the wholeness is vacuumed of sense.
In the pure form they do not exist.

We can treat various themes, that's why neutrosophy is not a specialized philosophy. However it is specialized by its method of research, and by its system. This thinking movement quotes the life.
It is applied in literature, arts, theater, and science as well.

We sometimes love our poetry when we don't love it!
The universe is expanding, the neutrality is expanding – for balancing.
To an event the paradox gives beauty and mister.

World is composed of contradictions.  
Anti-world is composed of contradictions. 
Contradictions are composed of contradictions.

World is of material and psychic natures simultaneously. 
They may not be separated, as the materialist and idealist philosophers tried to do; 
and not only the psychic is the superior result of the material, 
but the reciprocal sentence as well.

Determinism means paradoxist causes.

Truth is relative [V. Conta], false is relative too. Both of them are cor(e)-related to a 
parametric (time, space, motion) system.

Crisis implies a progress. The progress, in its turn, unquestionably leads to crisis. 
One knows the progress if and only if one knows the crisis (a kind of Upside-Down Way: 
"Via Negativa" of St. Thomas Aquinas). 
The development has valleys and hills.

Entities are tight by their differences too.

Paradox is infinite. This is a kind of God for the man.

We can paraphrase Hegel by: 
what is rational is antagonistic, and what is antagonistic is rational, 
and further: 
what is irrational is antagonistic too. 
You can say that 1+1=2 is rational, but not antagonistic. 
However 1+1 may be equal to 3 in another logical system invented by yourself. 
Nothing will exist and last out of neutrosophy.

Neutrosophy is not associated with Fichte's and Schelling's German idealism. For 
example, in the absolutehood, categories such as: 
cause and effect,  
existence and negation, 
may be reversed and mixed. 
There is a neutrality within each neutrality.

The famous pantheism's formula of Spinoza, brought from Giordano Bruno, *Deus, sive Natura* (that is "God, or Nature", identification of God with Nature), is generalized to <A>, or 
<Non-A>, sameness (up to confusion) between attribute <A> and its contrast <Non-A>. 
Synonymity of antonyms,
antonymity of synonyms.

I think, therefore I am a neutrosopher (paraphrasing Descartes's formula of existence: *Cogito ergo sum*).

From Schopenhauer's words "nothing exists without a cause", one merges to the existence of more causes - not only one -, and at least two of them are contradictory to each other.

World as paradox
Schopenhauer said "World is my idea" using <vorstellung> (Germ.) for <idea>, therefore material is immaterial (because 'idea' is 'immaterial').

Some clericalist are atheist on the account they transform the church into a business and the religion into a political propaganda.

"The contradictiousness is a component of individual's personality" (E. Simion).

"Antitheses are the life" (M. Eminescu).

Men are the same, but everybody is different.

"If ever I could have written a quarter of what I saw and felt, with what clarity I should have brought out all the contradictions of our social system" (J. J. Rousseau).

A paradoxical argument:
"Man is by nature good, and that only our institutions have made him bad" (J. J. Rousseau).

In the matter's structure there is always a union between continuous and discontinuous.

Nothing is non-contradictory. All is "+", "-", and "0". Even the exact mathematics. This is a DHARMA for neutrosophy.

Art is a God for our soul.

"Men will always be what women chose to make them" (J. J. Rousseau). Consequently, men will be what they maybe don't want to be!

Learning we become worst (*civilization paradox*): further of ourselves. Rousseau attacked the arts, literature on account of corrupting the ethics and replacing the religion. By modern fashions we don't differentiate each other, but conform in speech, cloths, and attitudes; and we appear what we are not! People are the same, but... different.
His irony against politicians:
"the politicians of the ancient world were always talking about morals and virtue, 
ours speak on nothing else but commerce and money".

His attack against luxury:
"those artists and musicians pursuing luxury are lowering their genius to the mediocre level of their times".
Hence, any progress in arts, literature, and sciences lead to the society's decadence. 
"Man is born free; and anywhere he is in chains" (J. J. Rousseau, <The Social Contract>).

Human being's existence in society is unnatural
(let's look how he is not alike):
he acts how he has to act (not how he feels alike)
he speaks how he has to speak
his personality is destroyed and he became anonymous
his existence is nonexistential
he feels himself foreign  (Heidegger).
Heidegger rejected the science.

I AM NOT IGNORANT THAT I AM IGNORANT, parodying Socrates.

I DO NOT DOUBT THAT I DOUBT.
My authority is not to have any authority at all, for I'm not a dictator.

Nothing from what belongs to us does really belong to us.

We know that we don't know all.

Eternity does not exist. It is a poem.
Eternity is passing...
Eternity is a delusion of the spirit thirsty of absolute.
Not even the absolute inwardly or through oneself exists, but it has been invented by humankind as a goal of not being able to aim at. For judging the ardent.
Nothing is perfect, nothing is permanent.
Any notion is sullied by opposite elements, the contrary's umbrage is imprinted on it.
An object is lighted by its shadow.

Philosophy is a useless futile science. It feeds the blue song of idealists. Every philosopher is an idealist, the materialists too.
Who is keeping both eyes wide open at p-u-r-e notions and concepts?
The science's conventionalism is sometimes exaggerated.
Philosophy is a taciturnity... and a concealment...

Humanity is progressing against humanity, 
until its destruction. Not only a material ruin, 
but people are turned into flesh robots.
How one explains the more mass cultural accent in underdeveloped countries than in rich industrialized ones?

But a hoarfrost of culture still subsists, for example, in the American academic media (Dana Gioia).
The more technology extends, the less culture flourishes. A new event in culture does not differ much from the precedents - culture even repeats, comparatively to the science's exponential growth.

\[
\text{The ratio } \frac{\text{Culture}}{\text{Science}} \rightarrow \zeta, \\
\text{as } t \rightarrow \infty
\]

where \( \zeta \) is a small constant and \( t \) represents the time.
Fortunately, the science influences the culture as well (see futurism, cubism, abstractism, etc.).
There exists a confusion between culture and civilization.
Alfred Weber analyzed the relationship between the growth of knowledge (science, technology) and the culture (soul).

A question: is there a limit to the civilization's advancing behind whose it's not possible to pass?
Science expanded over the culture, strangled it, occupied its place in the society.

To ponder:
- over the particularity of the general,
or the generality of the particular
- over the complexity of simplicity,
or simplicity of the complex
- over the negative side of the positive,
and reciprocally.

Life is neutrosophic: crying today, laughing tomorrow, neither one after tomorrow...
They are so close that life became more neutrosophic, and the neutrosophy more lifer/alive.
People have neutrosophic behaviors:
   friends who change to enemies or to ignorants...
   rich who fall to poverty or to middle class...
Ideas are neutrosophic.

A sentence may be true:
   \textit{a priori} (no matter in what conditions),
or \textit{a posteriori} (depending on certain conditions).
   Also, the same sentence may be true at time \( T_1 \), ignored at time \( T_2 \), and false at time \( T_3 \), or may be true in space \( S_1 \), ignored in space \( S_2 \), and false in space \( S_3 \), and so on…
There is a distinction between Neutrosophic Philosophy and the Philosophy of Neutralities. The first studies the contradictions and neutralities of various philosophical systems, methods, schools, thinkers. The second seeks the neutralities and their implications in the life.

"The paradox invaded all activity's fields, all scientific and artistic disciplines. It is not a marginal phenomenon anymore, but in the heart of the act and the human thought. Outside the paradox we are not able to understand the world. We have to learn to identify the paradox in its stages of an extraordinary diversity, to discover its functional mechanisms for incarcerating and controlling it, and possibly manipulating it in order not to be ourselves manipulated by this. If not long ago the paradox was considered a symptom of a pathological state, in the last decades it is more frequent an opposite facet of paradox: that of a healthy, normal state.
[Solomon Marcus, "Paradoxul", Ed. Albatros, Bucharest, 1984]

Anti-structure doesn't mean chaos.

Logic of the False, or Anti-Mathematics?

There exist (feminine) YN Energy - left channel, and (masculine) YANG Energy - right channel, for psychic or spiritual power. First one is of desires'. Second one is of projects'. Both are of biological nature.

In certain forms of yoga seven chakras coexist in the human body, but they can't be traced out through physical, chemical, anatomical means.

Kundalini Energy (of divine nature) is the universal energy's projection in us. Athman (individual inward) blends with Brahman (collective inward) in Indian philosophy.

Yogic meditation consists of purification of chakras and touch of without-thought status, bringing to Kundalini Energy's increase.

Concreteness of the Abstractness:
An abstract notion is defined by concrete elements, and reciprocally.
The concrete objects have their abstract qualities.

Laromiguière called our senses: machines of making abstractions. Mechanical Philosophy?
Devices of producing presuppositions on running belt (computer programming) - futile philosophy.
A priori thought à la Kant is inlaid to imagination only, a kind of passing to the limit towards infinity. In the kantian space the thought dresses the purity form, going far from reality, idealizing and self-idealizing. Nature's essence doesn't have a homogeneous nor a pure aspect - or that's relying on what acceptance we take the terms.

Mathematics also works with approximations. But exact approximations. And thus the perfection is a notion invented by human: an endeavor, a target never to be touched.

We always want what we don't have. Once we've got it, our interest in it is lost. But we tend toward something else. Human is in a continuous DESIRE, continuous SEEKING, continuous DISSATISFACTION. And these are good, for they bring the progress. So, human is in stress, plugged in.

(In the sport competition an aphorism says that it's easier to conquer a world record than to keep it.)

A cause of all empires' decline (none of them lasted and will never last indefinitely) is the self-content of their leading part in the world, slowing thus down their creative and vigilance engines.

In a universe there are more (concentric or not) universes;
  in a space: more spaces
  in a time: more times
  in a move: more moves
We meet, as such, within a system other systems; and so on...
  subuniverse
  subspace
  subtitle
  submove
  subsystem
And these concentrations pass upward and downward away to the (macro- and micro-) infinite levels.

Nietzsche: "All is chaos",
but the chaos is organized, hair styled on the curlers of an uncombed head.

Truth is hidden in untruth either.

Theory of Happenings and Theory of Unhappenings of phenomena correlate.

Consciousness of unconsciousness.
We do not only support the theory of contraries, vehicled by dualists, but merely generalize it as:
There are only contraries: no phenomenon occurs without its "non" (not necessarily "anti"), without its negation and neutralities. We mean: an event and its non-event are born in the same time.
For each object there exists an anti-object and non-object.
The difference between \(<A>\) and \(<Anti-A>\) are sometimes more pithy: female-male, minus-plus, etc.
or more diluted... but that's another story.

I do philosophy just because I am not a philosopher, and am not interested in philosophy. I waste some time reading and skimming through mind treatises.

Philosophy is useless. It is a headache for individuals without head.
Philosophers are inutile scientists. I am not a philosopher. Am I utile?
If philosophy is inefficacious, let's do philosophy!
The best philosophy is the total lack of philosophy?
Because the non-philosophy is itself a philosophy.
What about pseudo-philosophy?
I didn't even want to become a philosopher in this mercantile society (for I would starve to death). That's why I philosophize... I try not to find a system.

Today's people are very pragmatic, they don't give a penny on my neutrosophic arguments, nor on your anti-neutrosophic ones!
Only for money they are caring...
The number of humanists, and especially their percentage in the population, is dramatically decreasing.

What is the use of the useless theory?

But, the deep face of the world, its inner motion, its pressure and depression are hidden to our senses.
And that's why the world is sometimes what it is not.

That's the crisis of the modern man's crisis!
Neutrosophic nature envelops everything.

It is easy "to write" philosophy. But philosophy shouldn't play for a round game.
It's harder "to discover" philosophy, we mean to find laws applicable to large categories.
The impeccable philosophy would essentially comprise the ideational metabolism of the infinite sphere - to absorb the ray of unbounded archetypes.

Jacques Derida's ideology: the death of all ideologies!

Philosophy is not a unitary theoretical generalized representation of the world (just to intersect with our concepts the A. Comte's positivism).
"Metaphysical sentences are neither true nor false, because they don't assert anything, they don't contain consciousness nor errors" (Rudolf Carnap).

Human is infinite. We oppose to Jaspers's finitude of human. Spirit is its unbounded border.

Experimental law of Murphy: constants aren't, variables won't.

Try to save what can't be saved!

It's easy to forget something important, but it's harder to forget something not important!

Imaginary is more real than the reality.

All is hatred, even the love.

"Knowledge is power" (Francis Bacon), but knowledge brings weakness too (for example a cancerous who knows he's sick).

Knowledge is power in science, research, but may be fear, suffering, even suicide - as in case of the previous patient, for example. Power in a direction signifies weakness in another direction and mediocrity in a third direction. I believe that power and weakness and mediocrity combine up and down.

When you ask yourself: Why do I exist? What is my mission in this stupid world? and you pessimistically think as a Kierkegaard, and especially Schopenhauer, or your heart is vibrating of Chopin's piano grave chords?

Neutrality is the measure unit of all things, paraphrasing Protagoras's famous adage "Pántōn chrémātōn ánthrōpos métron" (Gr.) (Human is all things' measure). Why? Because the contradiction and neutrality are the nature's essence. And examples we may find anywhere.

A philosophical system is a dogma (Francis Bacon). That's why I plead for a philosophical system without system. Not quite analytic philosophy.

Congratulations for your failure!

If you are defeated, fight back.
If you win, fight back either.
Is there a better strategy?

Ah, if I would have a force to change what's unchangeable!
We are permanently moving towards a homogenization of heterogeneous, as Stefan Lupasco would say.
Fixed is the transformation only.

Logos is penetrated by NonLogos.

Attempting to free himself through arts, man enslaves himself to creation.

“Homo homini lupus" (Lat.) (human is wolf for the human), that's why there is a *bellum omnium contra omnes* (Lat.) (the war of everybody versus everybody), as a "natural status" (Hobbes from Plaut).
And Spinoza oppositely with *homo homini deus* (Lat.) (human is God for human), while Feuerbach absolutized to: the God of human is human itself.

Is man a hu(e)-man?

Schleiermacher's personalism proposes that all social problems be solved by evasionism, by intercommunication with God, or by withdrawal in own personal "dimensions".
Therefore, a kind of 'forget about', of solving a problem by properly neglecting it (ignorance).

"It looks like the grand narratives started to loose their influence, because they slide in a sterile manner over the universe" (P. Ţuţea, <Philosophia Perennis>).

Theoretical Categories.
I don't believe there is an absolute beginning of things, nor an absolute ending.
There is no perfect phenomenon, but tending towards a moving goal as in parametrial mathematical analysis.
Nothing perpetual.

Any notion is sullied by untangent notions.

"Know yourself", says a Latin adage.
But it is impossible to penetrate the inner infinity. It is question of psychical and even philosophical approximations.
Many times we feel strangers to ourselves, acting against our thought or senses - as people we would disapprove.

Human being is un organized chaos, endowed with abyssal reason, limited senses, and unbounded irrationalism. All is of continuous and transcendental field. Nor even phenomena are totally derivated ones from others, and there is effect without cause because the irrational has its act empire.
Cantor's set theory solved the infinitude of the finite, and surprisingly the equipotence of unequal sets, in the way that one was finite (segment of line) and another one infinite (the whole line) = paradox's pick!
The real world is messy. Many problems are ill posed. In practice there is ugly mathematics. Clean the awful data to see the beauty of the theorems. Non-mathematicians crinkle into the problems.

In the philosophy of arts and literature: a network of beautiful, well, true is replaced by the voluptuousness for ugly, bad, false... misery of life since Zola, the appetite for scabrous, mould, rot (Baudelaire, Arghezi), injustice of powerful people against the powerless, the wrong promulgated with façade of right, and generally <Non-A> dressed in clothes of <A>.

We do not speak on politics, because "in politics we do not have to tell the truth" (Metternich), nor on history which is the "prostitute of politics" (Nicolae Iorga), but on the nationalism of those who pretend to be cosmopolitan.

Existence of absconded contradictions, therefore of a continuous instability in the moving essence of things and phenomena. Heraclitus's vision of harmony and stability join somehow the absolute, perfect, infinite values liable to a theoretical ideal.

Of course, we can find a harmony in contradictions and a stability in the middle of an instability - dialectically tied.
As well as
- an absolute into absolute
- a perfection into perfection
- and an infinity into infinity
"We enter in the same waves, and we do not. We are, and we are not" (Heraclitus).

"We die and we do not die; human is a mixture of animal and god; all look when fortuitous when necessary" (Petre Țuțea).
Decoding the paradox hidden in the problems' core.
Style means "unity in diversity". "Life can be framed in the form of an instable equilibrium".
With a precise imprecision.

"I know that I don't know" (Socrates).

Philosophy doesn't need philosophers, but thinkers. The thinkers don't need philosophy. Therefore, philosophy doesn't need philosophy!
Is this an anarchy?

Philosophy is neutrosophic, or is not at all.
While Platon, by his dialogues, understands that he doesn't solve anything, Kant believes he solves everything.
None of them is correct.
A vicious circle:
Vasile Pârvan: the ethnical is point of departure, and the universal is point of arrival. *Terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem*.
And again one returns to Petre Țuțea: nation is the ultimate point of universal evolution. [We, personally, don't think so!]

Heidegger: to live absolutely dying every day (in order to get out from anonymity).

The paradox produces anxiety, dizziness (revolving gloomy thoughts), arguing in a circle, twisting your mind around!
A solved paradox loses its mystery and it's a paradox no more.

How can we interpret the biblical expression: "Enthrall me, God, for I to be free" (Imitatio Christi)?

Liberty is a unruly demon from spirit; and dissatisfaction leads to the revolt of the liberty, until it gets to an equilibrium.
While Țuțea has another opinion: "Human's liberty is the divine part of him". *Divina particula auriæ* only?
Equilibrium is in a permanent unstable balance.
And disequilibrium with propensity towards equilibrium.
As the saying goes: Oh, God, give the human what he doesn't have! You zealously need something and, when you get it, it hackneys in your hand.
Plus tends towards minus. Minus tends towards plus. They run each other, as in a vicious circle passing through zero.
Negative and positive.
Heterogeneity is homogenized. Homogeneity is not pure.
There are optimal points that social phenomena are converging towards, and act as curves with asymptotes. More exactly, differential equations would simulate the soul.
Extremes touch each other, said Marx, actually blasphemed philosopher. Without extremes the equilibrium would not exist.

Didn't one vehicle in the Middle Age a theory on the *double truth* (interpreted upon faith: *secundum fidem*, and upon reason: *secundum rationem* respectively)?

Every human is his own slave and master.

The mother nature is reversible and irreversible.

According to Țuțea: Christ is the divined human, and the humanized divine.
He also characterizes Nae Ionescu as: "the metaphysical meditation moved to the daily level, or the raising of daily to the philosophical level"!

Cultured philosophy and in-cultured ideology!

Are really there phenomena without history, things without history?
No, this notion of <history> is incorporated in the essence of essences. Even things without history have their history.

   Learning teaches you what not to learn either.
Intelligence has prejudices, prejudices have a grain of intelligence too.

   Imitation has an original character. And, in its turn, originality is often imitative.
These are not simple puzzles, escapades.
"God is creator, man is imitator" (Țuțea), and not only, because man created God in his (imagination) mind.

   "Idiot's function is positive, for without him we would understand neither the geniality nor the normality" (Țuțea).

   Neutrosophy became as a religion, a contemporary myth.
Trans-spiritual. Trans-sensorial.
Contradictory and neutral laws, factors, principles, functions.

The fantastic results from the real's side, as an excrescence. Afterwards, the inverse cycle follows: when the real (scientific/technical conception) is inspired from imaginary.

   Nicolae Iorga considered the idealist factors have determined those materialist in the human society's evolution.
Conversely it is still right.

   "I thought the truth is universal, continuous, eternal" (Mircea Eliade, <Oceanografie>).
Of course, it is not.

   "One can solace the man who suffers because of happiness" (M. Eliade, <Oceanografie>).
And one can solace a man who rejoices at trouble.

   Man's endeavor to impossible, infinity, absolute passes through possible, finite, relative.
One explains <A> through <Non-A>. Which means: <A> is what it is not.

   Goethe-ian principle of bi-polarity:
idol and devil, interior powers of the human being that are in a permanent dispute.
Mephistopheles & Faust.
   While we plead for a pluri-polarity among various combinations of idol and devil in our soul and mind.

   Pure philosophical concepts are not to be found. This is a dialectic of metaphysics, and similarly a metaphysics of dialectic.
Is there a necessity of happening and a happening of necessity? We mean a
determinism of in-determinism and in-determinism of determinism?
Is there an internal term of the essence of things which implies the appearance of an
external term to them?
[Necessity = internal term; happening = external term.]

A continuous discontinuity, and a discontinuous continuity in the process of evolution.
However the set of isolated points is of null measure.

Nothing belongs to us in this world. Only our original ideas (if any!), transmitted to
posterity, may bear our mind prints:
  a) spiritual ideas (such as theories, theorems, formulas, concepts);
  b) material ideas (embodied in art canvas, sculptures,
architectures, machines, tools).
Creativity and inventiveness belong to us.

Philosophy will be neutrosophic, or will not be at all!  
_Sine die._
It is normal when a philosopher asserts something, another one
(to become conspicuous, to distinguish from the first) denies him, otherwise the second
would be a simple imitator, an epigone.

And not only in philosophy. Therefore, two opposite ideas/concepts/systems were set up.
Look how easy it is to develop the paradox.
Thus, it is normal to be abnormal! (Eugène Ionesco)

The death of neutrosophic philosophy would signify the death of whole philosophy,
and of humankind too. (The philosophy of philosophy will reveal it.) Because how
would this look like to have all people thinking in chorus in unison all over the world?
Wouldn't it be a totalitarism?
The genius of philosophy shows this may not be absolute, perfect,
finite.

There are two types of _totalitarism:_
a) _unconditioned_ - of one's own will;
for example, the today's third world country people imitating/following the western
ideology, politics, culture, behavior, etc.
b) _conditioned_ - by military, ideological, economical imposed forces (in dictatorships,
for example see Arthur Koesler, _<Le zéro et l'infini>_).
Always in the world will be a totalitarism at some degree.
Individual is going with the crowd, without even realizing it (societal totalitarism against
individual) - like a sheep with bent head in the herd.
Also, there is an ideational oppression of classics floating in the air, and the permanent
revolt of contemporaneous.

And totalitarism at transversal levels as well: linguistic (dominant, so called
"international", languages), politic (solidarity with the most powerful), economic,
ideological, cultural, even scientific.
Gabriel Marcel wrote "Les hommes contre l'humain", speaking on brain-washing (in French: le lavage du cerveau), and on tabula rasa. Mass-media partially does this.

Social disease, created by mass media's political manipulation:
Give citizens the impression/disillusion they are free, and they'd feel they are - even if they are not.
Give citizens the impression they live in a democratic society, they'd feel they do - even if they do not.
And absolute free society may not exist. Countries differ by their degree of undemocracy.

Remain with your real world - which exists, but I remain with my idealist world - which doesn't exist.
One exists through non-existence better. At the beginning it was the end. A realm passes. A realm comes. And, at the end, the beginning starts.
Let's present the actual phenomena as they are not.
The nonrepresentable represents something.
Let's define the human through a non-definition.
Rational being is full of irrational elements.
Man is a philosophical animal (but depraved, said Rousseau).
(Let's grade the degradation.)

Dante was Florentine (but not Smarandache)!
I am a model of unmodeled artist. An anti-Goethe and non-Faust.
A sacerdotal sinner, a wicked saint.

The heroes hide cowardly secrets. The poltroons have heroic facets.

Spirit and matter.
Spirit is an emanation of the matter, said the materialists.
Matter is an emanation of the spirit, said the idealists. The truth is somewhere in the middle. It is neutral.
Is the spirit material, and the matter spiritual?
Both, spirit and matter, have ambi-(even pluri-)valent characteristics.

Philosophy is an alive graveyard of dead ideas.

Soul is a kind of anti-body / anti-organism / non-body that isochronizes with the body through a unity of contraries and neutralities. Soul is a part of the body, body is a form of the soul.
Soul is the I and the non-I.
God is immortal.
But "God is dead", uttered Nietzsche. That's why I believe in God.

How did Eugène Ionesco ejaculate in one of his dramas: "The king is dead. Long live the king!"

Perfection is imperfect.
This is a theoretical notion only, not touched in practice.

"The paradox is the limit up to where our mind can go, besides of whom the nothingness shows up" (Țuțea, "321 memorable words").

Life is a source of joy and anger (completing Nietzsche, the poet). Life is utile to the death. Life is inutile. Death is inutile too. Then what?
We study the weakness of Nietzschian superman, his will of powerless.

Happiness is the headquarter of the future unhappiness.
The sin is the headquarter of further honesty.
Order is the headquarter of disorder.
Passion fights against passion.
Taste and disgust... to cut the Gordian knot.

Philosophy started when it didn't even start, and will end when it will never end. This has been done when it was not done, and it was not done when it was really done.

Where goes a road which doesn't go anywhere?
(Paul Claudel: "Where goes a road which doesn't go to the church?")

The paradox is a therapeutical method in science. Not speaking of arts and poetry, which hunt after it (see, for example, the Paradoxist Literary Movement set up in 1980's). However, the science glowers at it!
James F. Peterman considered the whole philosophy as a therapy.

"Where are those who are not anymore?" (Nichifor Crainic).

What was I when I was not? What was I before being?

My personal life became public (by printing my diary), my private life not private anymore.

"Poets' work can stay one near another, philosophers' not" (Schopenhauer).

The absurd is natural, so the un-natural.
[See the lack of sense of the sense.]

I write philosophy to denounce it, or to prove the sickness of philosophy (?)

How will the universe and humankind look like after one million years? (This is not a science-fiction/fantastic question, but a more scientific problem.) In what direction will them converge?

My purpose is the infirmity of purpose! Inward purpose is not a purpose. Outward purpose is not a purpose either.

Any creed delivers an anti-cred. <To have no creed at all> is also a creed, isn't it?

How to release the pain from the pain? But the soul from the soul, and the body from the body? I want to be a measurer of the truth, to renounce to renunciation and get inspired by the myths' charm.

Philosophy-poetry:
   an inspired non-inspiration
   a voluntary involuntariness
We need to artistically express the inexpressible. And catch the non-artistic in an artistic form.

Atheism's role in faith's development. Schleiermacher nominates by "God" the existence we relate on, going up to a religion without a personal God.

Inward infinity of finite objects.

Beyond philosophy there is a philosophy. Beyond arts there are arts. Beyond religion there is a religion. The matter is of neutrosophic essence.

Philosophical poverty: "We live together, but die alone" (Țuțea).

Man is the blossoming of the nature's neutrosophy.

Theology and science merge in philosophy.

From the animal psychology to the animal philosophy.

We always do things done by others.
Today's society creates underhumans, not superhumans (Nietzsche's übermensch), because man is lost, small, unimportant, forgotten in the huge amalgam of information, news at every second, scientific and cultural forces... He doesn't face up with these accelerated dynamics.

The most complicated things are those easy. The most uncommon ones are those common. But we don't see them because we are superficial and don't have time to think deeper (collapsed by the aggressive day). All is based and raised on contradictions and neutralities. World is unitary in its variations and differentiations (Lossky, "World as an organic whole").

As in Ramayana epic, the neutrosophy adopts a skeptic attitude simultaneously rejecting and contradicting the famous philosophical theses. In other words: a LOKAYATA in contemporaries, or a CARVAKA. And not disagreement in disagreement's behalf, but for generalization. Didn't Voltaire say: "The laws in arts are made to encroach upon"?

When the human being will understand what is not understandable?

Who made God? Doesn't He, really, commit mistakes? Doesn't He have His own God to hold Him responsible for His creation? Or is he a dictator?!

"Tie two birds together. They will not be able to fly, even though they now have four wings." (Jalaludin Rumi) [<The Way of Sufi>, by Idries Shah]

Always what you don't have it's formidable, while what you have you get bored of it.

Man must live in accordance with the natural world around him (Pueblo Indian philosophy). While genius should not!

_Credo quia absurdum_ (Lat.) [I believe for it is absurd], credited to Tertulianus. Therefore, I believe because it is unbelievable!

The idea of Kierkegaard's eternal alternative: who emerges the man's impossibility to select or intercede among contraries. A dialectic of neutrosophic states of ethical consciousness.

Normally the human rights are promulgated by those who do not respect them - according to the curious principle that making noise they pass unobserved.

It is the question of PHANTASÍA KATALEPTIKÉ (Gr.) [comprehensive representation] only by the contradiction law of component units. _Philosophia perennis & paradoxae_ (Lat.).
Do you still think at me when you don't think at me?

One reveals the non-real reality of philosophy. And the real non-reality as well.

As part of the general theory of efficient action (Kotarbiński's praxiology) the intermediaries' and extremes' roles must be caused.

Philosophy shows the human spirit's formation.
"Because a philosopher writes with a knowledge of what his predecessors have thought, his own work is at once a criticism of earlier thought and a creative contribution at the growing edge of philosophy" (Samuel Enoch Stumpf, <A History of Philosophy>).

"I am constrained to confess that there is nothing in what I formerly believe to be true which I cannot somehow doubt" (Descartes).

Theologian Thomas Aquinas agreed the universal is found in particular things (in re) and, according to our experience, it is abstracted from particular things (post rem).

God is the supreme nature. The divine reality inside trivial, and reciprocally. He is the supreme neutrosopher of all times. He is the absolute, the nothingness, the nonbeing, <A>, <Neut-A>, and <Anti-A> simultaneously.

Double Truth of Ockham:
- a kind of truth is the product of human reason,
- the other one is a matter of faith.

Seneca: "People love and hate their vices in the same time".
To love our enemies, to hate our friends? How unexpected we are!

How curious!
We strangely and peculiarly behave.

Platon said the soul is fighting between reason and passion.
Creator of the classic tragedy Pierre Corneille's characters are unwound between their ideal and their passion (<Le Cid>), but their ideal wins.
While Jean Racine's characters are destroyed by their passions (<Iphigénie>, <Phèdre>).

In our being there are an "I" and a "Non-I" that dispute the priority. It is that interior dissection which split our existence in two dual pieces.

"The scientific philosophy doesn't exist" (Nae Ionescu).
Philosophy is the road towards neutrality, the exercise on the border between being and nonbeing, an ideational reaction of the essential contradiction in the confrontation of YES with NO and thousands of intermediary positions in between.
Nae Ionescu tells the art work framed in a historical moment does not correspond in another moment.

Governmental investments do not bankrupt, even if they bankrupt [because the government refinances them from people's tax money!].

I can't afford not to afford thinking. My philosophy is to contradict the philosophy. And, thus, to deliver an Anti-Philosophy which, after a while, becomes philosophy. I study others' opinions for I run counter to them. My ideology means the death of other ideologies. I study Kant for not following him (because, if I don't study him and I know nothing on his <Criticism of Pure Reason>, I may accidentally rediscover his theory, but I would like to imitate nobody).

The neutrality constitutes the dominant note of existence, such as mystery in the center of the speculative and metaphoric philosophical system of Lucian Blaga. Its inner tension dilates it. To reveal this is to form the future growth's stimuli. This is regarded as an irrationalism of the rationalism, and reciprocally.

The Paradoxism studies the paradoxes and their use in different fields. An axiomatic system of the paradoxism couldn't be other than... contradictory. Theory of the sense and of the nonsense. Form of the in-form. See also the Paraconsistent Logic (Newton C. Da Costa, in the journal <Modern Logic>).

Paradox is metaphysically, unconsciously, occultly perceived... and resembled to the hell! Absolute, abyss, perfect are only a few notions not touched by others than paradoxist senses. They are isomorphic.

For any kind of opinion there are a counter-opinion and a neuter-opinion; for Kant there is a counter-Kant and neuter-Kant, for Moses ben Maimonides a counter- and neuter-Moses_ben_Maimonides, for Augustine's philosophy a counter- and neuter-Augustine's_philosophy. Existence and counter-existence and neuter-existence.

Since philosophy was born - due to its mosaic of counter-set ideas, systems which clash, rival Schools - the neutrosophy also came to life. But people didn't realize it. Neutrosophy exists in the history of each field of the cognition. Displacement towards neutrality - this is the motto of evolution.

Cognition rises from neutrality to neutrality.
Politics is dictated by mean interests (Machiavelli). The Arabic philosopher Ibn-Haldun defines history as a repetition in a regular and alterant mode of the cycles of climbing and decline of civilizations.

You don't need to be a philosopher in order to become a philosopher.

Manichaean dualist religious doctrine of eternal fight between good and bad (or light and obscurity), originated by the Persian prophet Mani (Manichaeus) in the third century A.D., combining Zoroastrian + Gnostic and other elements, is among the first forms of pre-neutrality expression.

"You become what you are in the context of what others did from you" (Sartre). Hence, you are what you are not.

A method "to make/produce philosophy":
- pass a strong basic idea <A> through all known philosophical systems, thinking schools, and compare it with their opinions, concepts;
- extract the <PRO-A>, <CONTRA-A>, and <NEUTER-A> sentences, comment and argue with them.
Everything put in a form of short sections (analytic philosophy), systematically concatenated on themes, notions, categories. And, of course, using an adequate meta-language.

I am asking if the form may exist outside of matter? Aristotle denied it. But the thoughts, the ideas... do they have some form?

There are philosophers who contradict themselves: like me, for example. Only that I am not a philosopher(!)

Every phenomenon, action of ours, however much positive, has negative parts. And, however worst, has good parts.

To win, we need first to lose.

People should speak philosophy. They already speak philosophy - but don't realize it!
- people eat philosophy
- people drink philosophy every day

Philosophy should be a dream of contemporary citizen. However, their philosophy is not to do any philosophy at all. Their thought is not to think.

A famous poem of Tennyson:
"Theirs not to make reply
"Theirs not to reason why
"Theirs but to do and die.

Criminals are transformed in heroes.
Sinners in saints. This is the contemporary world!
While innocents and obedient become victims (the poorest) of the society...

Exterior world is real, but dependent on our consciousness, therefore not real!

The lack of existence of the non-existentialism.
The lack of absurd of the absurdism.

Was the American Pragmatism (Charles S. Peirce, William James, John Dewey) another kind of the(r)orism?
At Peirce we see thought [= theory] and action [= practice], then an alloyage.

Any idea is tested by its neutrosophic effects.

Philosophy is a speculation, starting from an easy idea, which gets bolder, extended, and applied to available systems...
as a skeleton covered with an aesthetic skin, which forms a body.
And such, the philosophy is not a speculation anymore.
The philosophy is still and is not.

The spirit is transcendent. The spirit is also material.

If a philosopher <F> one day asserted an idea <A>, in the future another philosopher <G> will neutralize him supporting/motivating the idea <Non-A>.
This is a way to do philosophy, or a philosophical career for some ones.

As an attacker, there is no doubt that you need to defend your attack from the opponents' resistance.
As a defender, it is not doubt that you need to attack the attackers?
The best defense is the attack - says a proverb.

You better like my poems when you criticize them.

The cure is worse than the problem it supposes to treat.

Simone de Beauvoir exists even when she doesn't exist [by her literary work].

Western culture is progressing in a wrong direction, towards European man's crisis (Husserl, <Phenomenology>).
Wittgenstein: "the results of philosophy are the uncovering of one or another piece of plain nonsense".
Interpretation of misinterpretation?

Human gets to identify with God, on the way of soul's liberation and of status of detachment from the world (abgeschlidenheit) [Meister Eckhart, <Die Deutsche Werke>]. But human gets to identify with Devil as well, by revealing the misery of soul and private life.

Essence is God (essential est Deus), essence is Devil (essential est Diabolus) either. Both, God and Devil, are necessary to keep an equilibrium. God and Devil identify because they are abstract, symbolic, infinite, fuzzy even neutrosophic notions. And, especially, because there is no pure "positive" or "negative" action. Each action is a percentile combination of "+" and "-" and "0" attributes. God, also, commits errors; (the Bible is full of crimes, incests, and sins). Devil, in his turn, does beneficial work (because this is like a vaccine, which helps our mind to produce immunity to Bad Behavior "disease" by causing the formation of spiritual "antibodies", which we would call "antispirits", produced by our brain). From vice we again rise, on a long staircase, to virtue. From virtue we decline back to vice (the opposites attract) - passing through neuter, because monotony is against our biological rhythm. And the cycle is habitually rotated. There is no God neither a Devil, but a mixture of them - they neutralize themselves at some degree: a "devilish god" and a "godly devil", we would call Him/It DevGod.

To most of the questions:
- there is no exact right answer
- there is no exact wrong answer, or
- every answer is right
- every answer is wrong, because it is an interpolation of them.

A formal system, interesting enough to formulate its own consistency, can prove its own consistency if and only if the system is inconsistent (Gödel's Second Incompleteness Theorem).

Cultural events occur 'synchronically' in many countries, but 'protochronically' as well. The first adverb includes a quantity of universal, the second a quantity of particular.

How can we melt abstractness with concreteness?
Paradoxist Determinism:
The lack of cause is, still, a cause.

This is a Definitive Judgement:
there is no definitive judgement.

Le Roi le veut. Let's cite the masters:
Platon: *panta chorei* (all is moving);
Diogene Laertius: *rhein ta hola* (all is passing);
Aristotle: *panta rhei,ouden menei* (all is passing, nothing is remaining).
Therefore, a today's affirmative sentence will be infirm tomorrow.

I have decided not to decide anything anymore.

World continuously changes, and ideas alike. But, after a while, this arrives in the same position.

We can easily get from an extreme to the other.

The paradox is immanent to the consciousness (Schuppe), whence the whole neutrosophy is an immanent philosophy (because the paradox is a part of neutrosophy).

Lotze studied the distinction among reality, truth, value. He initiated the axiology, the philosophy of the culture, the anthropological philosophy. Let's analogously introduce:
the NEUTROSOLOGY (philosophical significance of the neutrality *in lato sensu*),
the NEUTROSOLOGY OF THE CULTURE,
the NEUTROSOPHIC ANTHROPOLOGY.
And so on: neutrosology of the values, histories, sciences, arts.

Philosophy reflects the existent from the non-existent.

Heraclitus found consensus of opposite propensities and tensions, as that of bow and lyre. People can't imagine how in-harmony-with-itself is the discord!

I thank God he told me he doesn't exist.
This is my *Te Deum laudatum*!

Wouldn't it be possible to set up in the calendar a religious holiday for atheists?

We should realize that sometimes the beautiness is ugliness, and ugliness is beautiness - paraphrasing Gertrude Stein.

There is a unity between the scientific and artistic languages, and this is not Neurath's *physicism,*
but an accommodation of variability.

Just because the man is mortal, he wants to become immortal (by his creation in arts, science, history). What would happen if all men were immortal?

Every man bears inside a supra-man (positive energy), an infra-man (negative energy), and null-man (no energy side):
- himself projected outside of himself
- himself projected inside of himself
They are sporadically activated.

"Man is a upsurge towards it's-not-possible" (Ion Ornescu, <Poems from Prisons>).

Causes and effects are antagonistic.

There are no dynamics without antagonisms.
To the neutrology the to-(and for-)itself inner movement is characteristic.

Behaviorism initiated by J. Watson can't be linear. There also exists an inward behaviorism of the being (esse), in a continuous disequilibrium with being's outward image reflected by F. C. Tolman (and, especially G. H. Mead by his "social behaviorism" concept). Uniting the previous inward and outward with neut-ward notions, we find a Neutrosophic Behaviorism.

Human demeanor functions upon the laws of differential equations with partial derivatives with respect to more or less adverse-to-each-other parameters. Hence: nonlinear.
Nature's essence, beginning with the atom, consists in the fight and agreement of its components. Their convergence passes through divergence.

I decide not to decide anything.

"The beginning and ending are to be found on the same circle" (Heraclitus).

How infinitely big can be the infinity?
We never could imagine in our mind how infinity would look like in the daily life! Question which fascinated us...
To go, to go, and never to get to an end? Or, if you ever find an end, how is it? A hundred miles high wall... and thick? A precipice, a chasm? Or the universe is circular, and we indefinitely turn and turn around? The universe, as a sphere or closed surface, has no beginning, no ending.
Nor the small infinity neither the big infinity we perceive other than in an abstract theoretical mode.
The theory of transcendental infinity of Cantor contains the paradox's beauty. Two unequal sets may have, however, the same one-to-one correspondence among their points. This was the great surprise which disturbed his rival mathematician Kronecker. But no one can pull out the charm and ineffable from the science world (and from the new truths which, as part of old reference systems, deny the superannuated classicized assertions).

Dictatorship:
even if you don't want, you have to!

May we construct a non-philosophical philosophy?

Any positive has its negative and null side effects.
Pace of mind does not exist. The systems' war grinds and reborn our neurons.

How to dispute an indisputable subject!

Formation is just the tension between contraries. It resorts to a kind of a catastrophic law, a fight (polemos) (Radu Enescu, <Eminescu, the Chimerical Universe>).

Man has to be prepared to adapt, and to face controversial situations. Man should be strong enough to afford the unaffordable.
"It is much better for people not to have accomplished all they want; it is the sickness which gives sense and worth to the health; evil of good; starvation of saturation; fatigue of leisure" (Heraclitus).

John Dewey considers intelligence itself as a habit by which the man adjusts its relation to environment. It's a permanent circuit:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{ENVIRONMENT} & \xrightarrow{\text{stimuli}} & \text{MAN} \\
\text{space} & \text{thought} & \\
\text{time} & \text{feelings} & \\
\text{beings} & \text{sensations} & \\
\text{conjecture} & \text{predictions} & \\
\end{array}
\]

which stops when man dies (and even long after).

"Marx has often protested that he was not a Marxist", writes Samuel Enoch Stumpf in his <Socrates to Sartre> history of philosophy, 1988.
The neutrality knows a process of unbounded self-development towards an absolute (Hegelian) spirit.

According to Marx and Engels, everything (and the neutrality included) "is in a ceaseless state of movement and change".

The philosopher is not capable of discovering unique form of information (Wittgenstein).

But no use and (ab)use of neutrosophy in order to "draw false inferences, or ask spurious questions, or make nonsensical assumptions" (A. J. Ayer, especially referring to the analytic philosophy).

Neutrosophy is not only "unitary and fight of contradictions" (V. I. Lenin), but their transcendence in our every day's life; neutrosophic space, time, existence. This is a generalization and relativization of ambiguities as well as philosophical controversies.

Non-philosophy makes philosophy. Most philosophical problems arisen from puzzlement (L. Wittgenstein, Gilbert Ryle).

Pleasure and suffering, both, were studied by Heidegger and Sartre.

Sometimes an analytic method may be synthetic, while a synthetical method may be analytic. W. V. O. Quine argued that "a boundary between analytic and synthetic statements simply has not been drawn". Every notion has the shape of a neutrosophic sphere: t% of the points/elements are surely in (inward), f% of the points are surely out (outward), and i% of the points are indeterminate (neutward), where t+i+f \leq 300°.

The paradox has many functions, besides its <classical> "para" (against) "doxa" (opinion) (Gr.) feature. There is a plethora of oppugnancies inside of it. But, don't let the paradox bewitch you!

Any dogma gives birth to an anti-dogma. <Not to have any dogma at all> is also a kind of dogma, isn't it? The anti-dogma comes back again as a dogma itself.

Body and mind are brought together (and studied by Gilbert Ryle).

\textit{Neutrosophic Existentialism}: Life is, now, machinized. Machine is, now, humanized by science's sensorial improvements.
This is a nonexistential existence. 
Human is dehumanized! What is its alienation?

Anti-Tautology: 
Existence is, therefore, what doesn't exist...

A person is governed by his neutrosophic senses. I was surprised that people didn't grasp it! 
They all shunned it, suffering from night blindness. 
Without variations in opinions there would be no evolution.

There are many modes of neutrosophies, of course. Like in Husserl's phenomenology, 
we need somewhat to stay back from the realm of experienced neutrosophies (in a detachment act) in order to understand and enable to master our life's opponents and neutralities.

This is a philosophical system without system, or based on non-system.

According to Kierkegaard the anxiety involves an antipathetic sympathy and sympathetic antipathy.

Physic joy may lead to a psychic bitterness. 
Spiritual victory is conquered through bodily damage.

"Human existence" (Heidegger's Dasein), by its nonsense and absurdity, leads to Non-Existence? (Somehow: self-destruction?)

Any evolution ends by closing the cycle (demise)!

Generally, the point of maximum extreme on the evolution's curve of any phenomenon is identical to a previous point to the phenomenon's origin. Circular infinity coincides to zero.

The existent, in its apogee boiling, passes to non-existent. \(<E>\) is transformed in \(<\text{Non- E}>\) (not necessarily \(<\text{Anti-A}>\)), which is transformed in \(<F>\), which is transformed in \(<\text{Non-F}>\).

The victim loves his executioner. 
The loser like his prejudicist. 
The thrall adores his landlord. 
The dog licks the whip which beats him.

How can we bring ourselves into agreement with somebody else's disagreement? 
What about studying the informal formalists, or the formal in-formalists?

Explanatory force of agent's no-reason-for-his-action, or of agent's reason for his nonaction?
"A philosopher when he pretends to be a philosopher, he's not a philosopher. Philosophical ideas normally spring forth spontaneously, otherwise if you try to color 'em - they look stridently." (O. Paler, <The Ten Commandments of 'Wisdom'>)

Assimilate what is too little (rarity is precious),
Dis-assimilate what is too much (a Romanian proverb says: what is a lot, it's not worth).

**Negative definition.**
We introduce a concept <C> to the students by explaining them what <C> is not. We, thus, teach what <Anti-C>, the opposite of <C>, is all about to make them understand <C>. This method is common in science when <Anti-C> is easier to define or better known.
In a similar way we may introduce a concept <C> teaching the students what is <Non-C>.

Analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating opposite and neutral subject matter leads to neutrosophy.
Inter-(trans-)disciplinarity bases more on integrating theories from apparently intangible disciplines.
A such Centre Internationale de Recherches et Études Transdisciplinaires was set up in Paris, chaired by Basarab Nicolescu.

In regard to J. Piaget's & B. Inhelder's theory of cognitive development that individuals construct knowledge by interacting with their environment, we support the idea that a person's intellect is influenced by contradictory phenomena, facts, events on a background of neutral ones. The more different they are, the better experience of life and mental growth. Social interaction encounters pro-action and anti-action and neuter-action. [<La Psychologie de l'Enfant>]

Theories are elaborated from facts, but facts from theory too. If the university variant of relativism is the assertion that "there is no objective criterion to decide between true and false, good and bad, the farm hand variant alleges that all is a power game" (H. R. Patapievici, <The Relativism and the Politics / A Waisting Scoundrelism>).

"I find myself traveling towards my destiny in the belly of a paradox" (Thomas Merton, Trappist monk).

One changes from a common thing to a bizarre thing, then from a curiosity back to normal.

The "absolute value" (Platon, Aristotle) is displaced to a "relative value". The pure ideas are generally impure.
In the sacred Hindu text "Bhagavad-Gita", found in the "Mahābhārata", one of the ancient Sanskrit epics, Lord Krishna lays the complete knowledge of life to his pupil Arjuna:
He who in action sees inaction and in inaction sees action is wise among men.  
(Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, <Bhagavad-Gida: A New Translation and Commentary with Sanskrit Text>)

Ultimate order means chaos.

Maieutic Neutrosophy:  
to get to the true by contradictory and neutral debates, conversations.

Miguel de Unamuno: When two folks Juan and Pedro talk, there are six folks who actually talk:
- the real Juan, with the real Pedro;
- the Juan's image as seen by Pedro, with the Pedro's image as seen by Juan;
- the Juan's image as seen by himself, with the Pedro's image as seen by himself.
Actually, there are more:
- the Juan's images as seen by various people around, with the Pedro's images as seen by various people around.
How many dialogues are taken place?
But in a group of n folks, when everybody talks?

We know without knowing.

In biology which one, the fixist theory or evolutionist theory of beings, is true?

In the modern diplomacy "saving time and energy is not possible without the replacement of real communication by a code, through formalization. (...) For the rest, the code remains almighty. You are <important> and null in the same time. More than yourself, you are as much as your badge - the little cardboard which marks your place at the debate table - allows you to be."  (Andrei Pleșu, <Some Eastern Neuroses>)

If you seriously speak, you are laughing at me.
If you don't really speak seriously, you even more laughing at me!

To build a philosophy without any philosophical support (from the scratch)? Would it be a "naive" philosophy?
Philosophy without philosophy?
Paraphrasing Husserl: to judge only by comparison with the antinomies, and not according to any other trivial phenomena.

A neutrosophic phenomenology is based on intentional consciousness oriented towards the life's ups and downs and linear events. This is a branch of Husserl's Phenomenological Epoché.
We can easily get from an extreme to another, but sometimes hardly between two close states.

The fear of ourselves... We don't know who and why we are...

"every YES must to lean upon a NO (otherwise what Archimedes' lever would lean upon??)" (Ion Rotaru).

Philosophy is not solid. Idea gives birth to non-idea (not necessarily anti-idea), otherwise the previous would become an indoctrination. New spirit builds on the old spirit by destroying it. Another conventional logic replaces the superannuated logic. Any assertion is a limitation, that's why a non-assertion comes regularly out: for pushing the limits.

Contemporary Neutrosophic Moral issues. There are arguments for, neuter, and against: abortion, euthanasia, homosexuality, pornography, reverse discrimination, death penalty, business ethics, sexual equality, legal use of drugs, economic justice.

The paradox is a mystery! Gabriel Marcel's "What am I" particular human question has two complementary answers within paradoxism:

a) I am what I am not, and
b) I am not what I am.

We think these tell you everything. Period!

Sometimes:

a) It's possible to capture the impossible and
b) It's impossible to capture the possible.

Ein Buch für Alle und Keinen (Germ.) (a book for everybody and for nobody, Nietzsche), subtitle to "Also sprach Zarathustra".

If you do something, it's wrong. If you don't do, it's wrong either. In conclusion:

What should you do? and/or
What shouldn't you do?

Man is infinite in his interior, and finite in his exterior. How is it possible that a finite entity include an infinite one?
The benefaction of the neutrosophy emerges from its philosophy of life and writing: it's normal to have bad and good in life, it is even better than only bad or only good (which mean monotony, whence death of mind and action).

Your happiness is inside of yourself (from Buddhism). Thus, God is inside of man. Your sadness too. But man is inside of God as well. And yet man and God do not coincide.

Philosophy had to govern the state in the Athens democracy (Karl Popper), while in the modern "democracy" of Hegelian inspiration the philosophy became the most slave of the fishy demagogues.

"All is a continuous metamorphosis, and so its contrary" (Chuang Tzu in his taoism - School of the Way).

There is an <A> beyond <A>. Example: There is a reality beyond reality; which one? reality from our imagination. Neutrosophy doesn't consent in any way to the domination of some spiritual doctrines - although, in its turn, this becomes intrinsically established as another doctrine(!)... for and, at the same time, against all the doctrines, but keeping a neutral side.. Whence, neutrosophy will later act versus neutrosophy, giving birth to post-neutrosophy.

*Labelism.*

Trivial ideas of big guys are taken more important than clever ones of anonymous individuals. Everybody's judged upon his place in the society. People have labels stuck on their forehead. Great ideas of poor persons, or from poor countries, are intentionally ignored. Big guys' mistakes are hushed up. It is not the spiritual work which counts the most, but the author's position (faculty of a "famous" university, his/her book or paper published by an "important" publishing house or journal, connection network, scientific or artistic mafia, arrangements, snoring awards). Traffic of influence!

The crowd is manipulated by mass-media, which became the strongest force in the society. People's consciousness is stolen.

Daily citizen, in accordance with illuminist Rousseau, bears <mask>. Due to the sophisticated technology, he can't look inwardly, he swims through the world passing besides himself. Only spirit man is brave enough of his inward retrieval (La Rochefoucault), enduring that "luxury humiliation". Technologized man who is doesn't answer what he feels, thinks, or is true; but what's good for him to answer (in order to keep his social position/job or be promoted, or in foresight of rewards). He's robotized. He's dis-humanized. He's false...
The individual is surpassed by universal.

From experimental psychology to *experimental philosophy*.

"Geometry is exaggeration, philosophy is exaggeration, and so poetry. Everything which has sense is exaggeration.

(...) Ontologically, the bad and idealization, as spirit necessity, are exaggerations.

(...) Greeks' <measure> was excessive as the *hybrid* which broke it. Their serenity was a fickle equilibrium, of contrary excesses. Without a dose of exaggeration there is not knowledge, nor action as well. Neither science, nor justice. And not even common sense." (Alexandru Paleologu, *The Common Sense as Paradox*)

Plato: essence precedes existence, which is easily explicable for objects. You first think you need an apparatus - and what characteristics to have -, and second you build it. Following Plato, what now exists, was necessary (produced by natural laws).

Anthropological question: Thus, human being could be predicted from the origin of the solar system?

Sartre: existence precedes essence, which is available for beings. Say the horse, first exists, and then we study its characteristics, which are general for all individual of the same specimen.

Who is true? (Both of them!)

Who is wrong? (Both of them either!)

Then, which one came first, the egg or the hen (?)

There is a cycle: existence ↔ essence ↔ existence ↔ ... 

In our opinion none of "existence" or "essence" is first.

"Whatever can go right, won't!"

Nietzsche: God is dead.

Dostoievsky: If God did not exist, everything would be permitted.

Connections and adversities among ego and *superego* and *underego*.

*Daimon* is a form to illustrate the pulling off of the mobility from immobility (Gabriel Liiceanu).

Man is free in society, but governed by its laws. Therefore, man is not free, but limited. There is no absolute freedom.

"Humanity can't live just by logic. It also needs poetry." (M. Gandhi)

Epistemology:

How to know all what we know?
Spiritual pathology:
the philosophy is my life's disease.

Immaterial matter? Is that an absurdity?
Hobbes wrote about immaterial substances as being something meaningless.

We are not us; we live through friendship's, profession's, language's, and epoch's elements. (C. Noica, <Book of Wisdom>)

Hobbies.
Ordinary people became the slaves of objects (luxury car, house), of passions (sex, trip).
Masters: slaves of ideas.

When you want to make connections, you even tie opposite cases;
and when you don't want, you even separate identical things.

Be adaptable to inadaptability.

Change the change.

The happiness of the artist persists in his unhappiness.

The greatest moral lessons are thought by immoralists
(because they were landed into the trouble, and are experienced).

Hermeneutics of Foucault, hermeneutics of previous hermeneutics, until anti-hermeneutics...
Wanting to support too much, you might deny!
From homo religious to homo neutrosophus.

A pluri-philosophy means opponent and similar ideas cross-referenced in the whole cognition.

There are neither a definite end nor an ultimate purpose.
The theologians ignore the happening's role, and so the vitalists.

Researchers in the Chaos Theory are in progress to discover order inside of chaos of the nonlinear differential equations.

Existence hasn't sense, and yet has a sense.

Will and non-will, goal and non-goal, sense and non-sense all act together, we being conscious and unconscious of them.

Heraclitus: All is changing.
Parmenides: Nothing is changing.
Who is right?
   Heraclitus: Individual is essential.
   Parmenides: Universal is essential.
Who is right?
   Heraclitus: pluralist.
   Parmenides: monist.
Who is right?
(Both of them in each case!
And, simultaneously, both of them made mistakes.)
Every reference system reflects a sentence in a different light.

Empedocles explains how *Filia* and *Neikos* (Love and Hatred, attraction and abhorrence) function together.

Prothagoras was the first to say that in all things there are contrary reasons.

Gorgias's definition of rhetoric: "the art to transform the worst thesis into the best thesis" (or *Ton eto logon kretto poeiein*).

Ephemeral is eternal only.

By virtue of contrary principles things are made themselves conspicuous (Anaxagoras): light through darkness, darkness through light, etc.

All is necessity and happening in the same time.

Man's attitudes in the presence of evil or suffering are:
- primitive passivity: to bear, tolerate it;
- magic reaction: to do magic rituals for driving away the bad spirits hidden in objects and beings;
- resignation: to stay pessimistic, because the evil is irreparable;
- suffering utilization: to turn suffering to joy, because suffering is necessary and can't be eliminated from our life;
- activist solution: to accept the suffering and to condemn the evil (Tudor Vianu); (Müller-Lyer, <Soziologie der Leiden>).

But what are the man's attitudes in the presence of good or joy?
- ecstasy;
- arrogance;
- indolence;
- decline.
This is the close circuit of man's attitudes in the presence of ",", "0", and "+".

Idealism and Realism.
Schopenhauer asserts that "world is my representation", which is distorted by the plurality of various imaginations.
Contradictory and alike representations at different individuals.
Running counter Fichte's transcendental idealism (who, in his turn, ran counter Kant's metaphysical determinism), Schopenhauer concludes that beyond the veil of the world there is an absolute reality.

A text on a Chinese Funeral Pillar:
"Detour of non-boundary, statement of non-statement, settlement of those who can't settle were our tortures".

Eliade reveals an "irrecogniscible God", who is present without being made known, an echo of the Buddhist paradox of presence-absence grounded by Nāgārjuna. While Hegel (according to H. Küng) shows a "God who sacrifices himself".

Kant: man must be regarded first as purpose, and then as means. While others said the purpose excuses the means!

That, who said he never lied in his life, is a liar.

X writes on a piece of paper, and put it in an envelope addressed to Y, "today I'm writing you no letter anymore". Is that an antithesis?

Unfortunately, word puzzles are substitutes of philosophy, especially in the language philosophy. Should a such thinker be named word theorist or terrorist?

And, yet, I love Frege.

Content is not a form of the form, but it tends to become a form. And reversely.

The spirit couldn't even breathe without opposition and neutralities, would wither itself as a plant...

1.3. Neutrosophic Transdisciplinarity.

A) Definition:

Neutrosophic Transdisciplinarity means to find common features to uncommon entities: i.e., for vague, imprecise, not-clear-boundary entity <A> one has: <A> ∩ <Non-A> ≠ ∅ or even more <A> ∩ <Anti-A> ≠ ∅.

B) Multi-Structure and Multi-Space:

B1) Multi-Concentric-Structure:
Let S₁ and S₂ be two distinct structures, induced by the ensemble of laws L, which verify the ensembles of axioms A₁ and A₂ respectively, such that A₁ is strictly included in A₂. One says that the set M, endowed with the properties:

a) M has an S₁-structure;
b) there is a proper subset $P$ (different from the empty set $\emptyset$, from the unitary element, from the idempotent element if any with respect to $S_2$, and from the whole set $M$) of the initial set $M$, which has an $S_2$-structure;

c) $M$ doesn't have an $S_2$-structure; is called a 2-concentric-structure.

We can generalize it to an $n$-concentric-structure, for $n \geq 2$ (even infinite-concentric-structure).

(By default, 1-concentric structure on a set $M$ means only one structure on $M$ and on its proper subsets.)

An $n$-concentric-structure on a set $S$ means a weak structure $\{w(0)\}$ on $S$
such that there exists a chain of proper subsets
$P(n-1) < P(n-2) < \ldots < P(2) < P(1) < S$,
where '<' means 'included in',
whose corresponding structures verify the inverse chain
$\{w(n-1)\} > \{w(n-2)\} > \ldots > \{w(2)\} > \{w(1)\} > \{w(0)\}$,
where '>' signifies 'strictly stronger' (i.e., structure satisfying more axioms).

For example:
Say a groupoid $D$, which contains a proper subset $S$ which is a semigroup, which
in its turn contains a proper subset $M$ which is a monoid, which contains a proper subset $NG$ which is a
non-commutative group, which contains a proper subset $CG$ which is a commutative group, where $D$
does include $S$, which includes $M$, which includes $NG$, which includes $CG$.
[This is a 5-concentric-structure.]

B2) Multi-Space:
Let $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_n$ be distinct two by two structures on respectively the
sets $M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_n$, where $n \geq 2$ ($n$ may even be infinite).
The structures $S_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, may not necessarily be distinct two by two; each structure $S_i$ may also be
$n_i$-concentric, $n_i \geq 1$.
And the sets $M_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, may not necessarily be disjoint,
also some sets $M_i$ may be equal to or included in other sets $M_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.
We define the Multi-Space $M$ as a union of the previous sets:
$M = M_1 \cup M_2 \cup \ldots \cup M_n$, hence we have $n$ (different) structures on $M$.
A multi-space is a space with many structures that may overlap,
or some structures include others, or the structures may interact and
influence each other as in our everyday life.

For example we can construct a geometric multi-space formed by the union of
three distinct subspaces: an Euclidean space, a Hyperbolic one, and an Elliptic one.

As particular cases when all $M_i$ sets have the same type of structure, we can define the Multi-Group (or n-group; for example; bigroup, tri-group, etc., when all sets $M_i$ are groups), Multi-Ring (or n-ring, for example biring, tri-ring, etc. when all sets $M_i$ are rings), Multi-Field (n-field), Multi-Lattice (n-lattice), Multi-Algebra (n-algebra), Multi-Module (n-module), and so on - which may be generalized to Infinite-Structure-Space (when all sets have the same type of structure), etc.

{F. Smarandache, "Mixed Non-Euclidean Geometries", 1969.}

Let's introduce new terms:
C) Psychomathematics:
A discipline which studies psychological processes in connection with mathematics.
D) **Mathematical Modeling of Psychological Processes:**

a) Improvement of Weber's and Fechner's Laws on sensations and stimuli.

According to the neutrosophic theory, between an <idea> (=spiritual) and an <object> (=material) there are infinitely many states. Then, how can we mix an <idea> with an <object> and obtain something in between: s% spiritual and m% material? [kind of chemical alloy].

Or, as Boethius, a founder of scholasticism, urged to "join faith to reason" in order to reconcile the Christian judgment with the rational judgment.

For example <mind> and <body> co-exist. Gustav Theodor Fechner, who inaugurated the experimental psychology, obsessed with this problem, advanced the theory that every object is both mental and physical (psychophysics).

Fechner's Law, \( S = k \cdot \log R \), with \( S \) the sensation, \( R \) the stimulus, and \( k \) a constant, which is derived from Weber's Law, \( \Delta R / R = k \), with \( \Delta R \) the increment of stimulus just detectable, should be improved, because the function \( \log R \) is indefinitely increasing as \( R \to \infty \), to

\[
S(R) = k \cdot \ln R / \ln R_{M}, \text{ for } R \in [R_{m}, R_{M}],
\]
and

\[ S(R) = 0, \text{ for } R \in [0, R_m) \cup (R_M, \infty), \]

where \( k \) is a positive constant depending on three parameters: individual being, type of sensation, and the kind of stimulus, and \( R_m, R_M \) represent the minimum and maximum stimulus magnitude respectively perceptible by the subject, the second one bringing about the death of sensation.

Fechner's "functional relation", as well as later psychologists' power law \( R = k \cdot S^n \), with \( n \) depending on the kind of stimulus, were upper unbounded, while the beings are surely limited in perception.

\[ S: [0, \infty) \mapsto \{0\} \cup [S_m, S_M], \]

with \( S_m, S_M \) the minimum and maximum perceptible sensation respectively.

Of course \( R_m > 1, S(R_m) = S_m, \) and \( S(R_M) = S_M = k. \)

\( \ln \), increasing faster, replaces \( \log \) because the sensation is more rapidly increasing at the beginning, and later going on much slower.

At \( R = R_M, S \) attains its maximum, beyond whom it becomes flat again, falling to zero. The beings have a low and high threshold respectively, a range where they may feel a sensation.

Graph of Fechner's Law Improvement:
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For example in acoustics: a sound is not heard at the beginning and, if it constantly keeps enlarging its intensity, at a given moment we hear it, and for a while its loudness increases in our ears, until the number of decibels - getting bigger than our possibility of hearing - breaks our eardrums... We would not hear anything anymore, our sensation died...

Now, if at a given moment \( t_0 \) the stimulus \( R \) remains constant equal to \( R_0 \) (between the conscious limits of the being, for a long period of time \( t \)), and the sensation \( S(R_0) = c, \) then we get the following formulas:
In the case when the stimulus in not physically or physiologically damaging the individual being: 
\[ S_{dc}(t) = \frac{c}{g^{162}} \log_{1/e}(t + 1/e) = -\frac{c}{g^{152}} \ln(t + 1/e) , \] 
for \( 0 \leq t \leq \exp(-Sm/c) - 1/e \), and 0 otherwise; which is a decreasing function.

In the case when the stimulus is hurting the individual being: 
\[ S_{inc}(t) = \frac{c}{g^{152}} \ln(t + e) , \] 
for \( 0 \leq t \leq \exp(Sm/c) - e \), and 0 otherwise; which is an increasing function until the sensation reaches its upper bound; where \( c \), as a constant, depends on individual being, type of sensation, and kind of stimulus.

Examples: i) If a prisoner feels a constant smell in his closed room for days and days, isolated from the exterior, and he doesn't go outside to change the environment, he starts to feel it less and less and after a critical moment he becomes inured to the smell and do not feel it anymore - thus the sensation disappears under the low perceptible limit. ii) If a water drop licks constantly, at the same interval of time, with the same intensity, on the head of a prisoner tied to a pillar, the prisoner after a while will feel the water drop heavier and heavier, will mentally get ill and out of his mind, and will even physically die - therefore again disappears the sensation, but above the high limit. See how one can kill someone with a... water drop! iii) If one permanently plays the same song for days and days to a person enclosed in a room without any other noise from outside, that person will be driven crazy, even psychologically die, and the sensation will disappear.

Weber's Law can be improved to 
\[ \frac{R}{\ln R} = k, \] 
where \( k \) is a constant depending on individual being, type of sensation, and kind of stimulus, due to the fact that the relative threshold \( \Delta R \) increases slower with respect to \( R \).

Let's propose a
b) Synonymity Test, similar to, and an extension of, the antonym test in psychology, would be a verbal test where the subject must supply as many as possible synonyms of a given word within a as short as possible period of time. How to measure it? The spectrum of supplied synonyms (s), within the measured period of time (t), shows the subject's level of linguistic neutrosophy: s/t.

c) An Illusion:
Suppose you travel to a third world country, for example Romania. You arrive in the capital city of Bucharest, late in the night, and want to exchange a $100 bill to the country's currencies, which are called “lei”. All exchange offices are closed. A local citizen approaches and proposes you to exchange your bill. He is a thief.
You give him the $100 bill, he gives you the equivalent in the country’s currency, i.e. 25,000 lei. But the laws of the country do not allow exchange on the street, and both of you know it.

The thief cries “police!”, and gives you the dollars back with one hand, while with the other hand takes back his lei, and runs out vanishing behind a building. The thief has cheated you.

Taken by surprise, you don’t realize what had happened, and looking in your hand expecting to see back a $100 bill, actually you see a $1 bill… in your mind, in the very first seconds, it appears the illusion that the $100 bill changed, under your eyes, into a $1 bill!

E) Psychoneutrosophy:

Psychology of neutral thought, action, behavior, sensation, perception, etc. This is a hybrid field deriving from psychology, philosophy, economics, theology, etc. For example, to find the psychological causes and effects of individuals supporting neutral ideologies (neither capitalists, nor communists), politics (not in the left, not in the right), etc.

F) Socioneutrosophy:

Sociology of neutralities. For example the sociological phenomena and reasons which determine a country or group of people or class to remain neuter in a military, political, ideological, cultural, artistic, scientific, economical, etc. international or internal war (dispute).

G) Econoneutrosophy:

Economics of non-profit organizations, groups, such as: churches, philanthropic associations, charities, emigrating foundations, artistic or scientific societies, etc. How they function, how they survive, who benefits and who loses, why are they necessary, how they improve, how they interact with for-profit companies.

H) New Types of Philosophies:

a) Object Philosophy: a building through its architecture, a flower, a bird flying, etc. any object are all ideas, or inspire ideas - which are not necessarily to be written down on the paper because they would lose their naturalness and their essence would be distorted. The philosophy should consequently have a universal language, not clung to a specific language (how to translate, for example, Heidegger's dassein, and why to entangle in a notion, syntagme, or word?!).

b) Concrete Philosophy: a drawing, a painting, a canvas, any two-dimensional picture are all ideas and inspire ideas.

c) Sonorous Philosophy: a symphony melody, the jazz music, a sound, any noise are all ideas, or inspire ideas - because they directly work with our unconsciousness.
d) Fuzzy Philosophy: there is only a fuzzy border between <A> and <Non-A> and, in consequence, elements which belong (with a certain probability) to both of them, even to <A> and <Anti-A>. Like the clouds in the sky. An element \( e \) belongs 70% to <A> and 30% to <Non-A>. Or, more organic, \( e \) belongs 70% to <A>, 20% to <Neut-A> and 10% to <Anti-A> for example. The di-chotomy between <A> and <Non-A> may be substituted with trichotomy (<A>, <Neut-A>, <Anti-A>) according to our three-ory, and by generalization in a similar way, with plurichotomy onward to transchotomy [i-chotomy] (continuum-power shades among <A>, <Neut-A>, and <Anti-A>). And, when the probability is involved, fuzzy-chotomy, or more: neutro-chotomy.

e) Applied Philosophy: philosophical knowledge (such as: proverbs, aphorisms, maxims, fables, stories) used in our every day's life.

f) Experimental Philosophy: philosophical checking and studying of strange, bizarre ideas.

g) Futurist Philosophy: ideas created by machines, robots, computers using artificial intelligence; this is the philosophy of tomorrow.

h) Nonphilosophy: To make philosophy by not doing any philosophy at all! Like a mutism. Everything may mean philosophy: a graffiti (having no words, no letters), any scientific sign or expression displayed on the page... A poem is a philosophical system. A physics law, a chemical formula, a mathematical equation too. For example, a blank page also means an idea, a natural phenomenon as well. Due to the fact that they all make you reflect, meditate, think. This nonphilosophy becomes, paradoxically, a new kind a philosophy!

I) New Types of Philosophical Movements:

a) Revisionism: to review all the philosophical systems, ideas, phenomena, schools, thinkers and rewrite the philosophy as a cumulus of sumnum bonum.

b) Inspirationalism: to look to antecedents for clues and contemporaries for inspiration to get your own research methods and original system.

c) Recurrentism: any idea comes from a previous idea and determines another idea, like an infinite recurrent sequence.
d) Sophisticalism: the more unintelligible, ambiguous, unsolved, abstract, general... the better!
[This is the style of some people...]

e) Rejectivism: a unconscious (and, at some degree, becoming mixed with conscious) will to a priori-ly repel somebody else's system, and totally or partially replace it with yours own.

f) Paradoxism: any philosophical idea is true and false in the same time.
Law of the paradoxism:
   Nothing is non-contradictory.
   Nature's essence is antonymic.

J) Logical and Combinatory Modeling in Experimental Literature:

a) An Avant-garde Literary Movement, the Paradoxis (which uses mathematical paradoxes in artistic creations):
the study of paradoxes as a discipline apart and their use in other fields.

   - Basic Thesis of Paradoxism:
     everything has a meaning and a non-meaning in a harmony each other.

   - Essence of Paradoxism:
     a) sense has a non-sense, and reciprocity
     b) non-sense has a sense.

   - Delimitation from Other Avant-gardes:
     - paradoxism has a significance, while dadaism, lettrism, the absurd movement do not;
     - paradoxism especially reveals the contradictions, the anti-nomies, the anti-theses, the anti-phrases, antagonism, non-conformism, in other words the paradoxes of anything (in literature, art, science), while futurism, cubism, abstractism and all other avant-gardes do not focus on them.

   - Directions for Paradoxism:
     - use science methods (especially algorithms) for generating (and also studying) contradictory literary and artistic works;
     - create contradictory literary and artistic works in scientific spaces (using scientific: symbols, meta-language, matrices, theorems, lemmas, etc.).
b) New Types of 'Mathematical' Poetry with Fixed Form
(using paradoxes and tautologies):
- Paradoxist Distich = a two-line poem such that the second one
  contradicts the first, but together they form a unitary meaning
  defining (or making connection with) the title.
- Tautological Distich = an apparently redundant two-line poem,
  but together the redundant lines give a deeper meaning to the
  whole poem defining (or making connection with) the title.
- Dualist Distich
- Paradoxist Tertian
- Tautological Tertian
- Paradoxist Quatrain
- Tautological Quatrain
- Fractal Poem.

c) New Types of Short Story:
- Syllogistic Short Story
- Circular Short Story
(F.Smarandache, "Infinite Tale", 1997)

d) New Types of Drama:
- Neutrosophic Drama
- Sophistic Drama
- Combinatory Drama = a drama whose scenes are permuted and
  combined in so many ways producing over a billion of billions of
  different dramas! (F.Smarandache, "Upside-Down World", 1993)

  Similar definitions for other types of poems, of short
  stories, and of dramas.
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