

APPENDIX #1B  
TO PART TWO “THE LIFE” OF  
PHILOSOPHY OF PURE REASON  
SUB SPECIE AETERNITATIS.”

A SHORT INQUIRY INTO  
LACONICAL CYNICISM, FOCUSING  
ON ITS ATTITUDE  
TOWARDS PROBLEMS OF  
MORALITY.

## Preface.

### Okay or not Okay, that is the question!

Here, it will be useful to outline some basic conceptions of Laconical Cynicism for the benefit of readers who may be interested in becoming more familiar with the most pitiless method of reasoning. It is best to begin by considering such a proposition as: the Whole does not have sentiments. It is neither good nor evil; it is just apathetic. In agreement with Spinoza I truly think that our "knowledge of good or evil is nothing else than the emotion of pleasure or pain, in so far as we are conscious of it."<sup>1</sup> It follows from this purely subjective assertion "that the necessity may now have arisen of again making up our minds with regard to the reversing and fundamental shifting of values, owing to a new self-consciousness and acuteness in man - is it not possible that we may be standing on the threshold of a period which to begin with, would be distinguished negatively as *ultra-moral..?*"<sup>2</sup> Cynicism states that the objective truth for the plurality of limitlessnesses is not pure truth of one's becoming the One.

As a Cynical metaphysician among philosophers but not a philosopher among Cynics -- I am assuming that a mythical "evil" in the reality of Nonpredicative definition is a defect of the One; also I presume that the attempts to "exchange the glory of the incorruptible God for an image in the form of corruptible man" led to the complete collapse of the theory of Historical Materialism. Indeed, both Marx and Engels were spurred by the desire to create *the* perfect society and because of that they identified evil with private property<sup>3</sup> and tried to exorcise it: they conjectured that a human state without private property is indeed this ideal Kingdom - the Proletarian Dictatorship - Kingdom of God without God, or, to be more correct, Kingdom where people (but not a man as the One!) take God's throne; human nature rejects the equality of others' rights.

At the same time, Descartes' problematic understanding of *infinitum* played a bad joke on them. The *infinitum*, in spite of Descartes, exists not in the space of the universe, as he thought, but it is in the loop(s) of change(s) of substance. The world around us is *finite* but changes in it are really *infinite* (I assume that "vacuum" is neither space nor NON-EXISTENCE)! No things move in the vacuum of this universe, but the space of things changes because things change and these changes are not connected with the NOWHERE of a vacuum<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> BIB:(22.55),[p.149]

<sup>2</sup> BIB:(19.36),[p.46]

<sup>3</sup> "For according to the axiom of the wise Locke, *where there is no property, there is no injury.*" BIB:(20.45),[Rousseau J., 'Inequality Among Men', p.306]

<sup>4</sup> According to Cynicism, in the simple case of two similarly oriented cartesian reference frames, moving along their common

Marx and Engels created their "broken cistern" -- an artificial limit for *the* limitlessnesses: their theory of Historical Materialism stands between me, a Laconical Cynic, in whom physicists brought out the beast, and the dazzling sun of the magnificently clear absolute knowledge of Pure Reason.

**Thesis I.** Can I apply what I see in a part to the Whole? But what can I use as a basis for a conception of morality? Or, if morality is whole<sup>5</sup>, what are the parts of it and what connects them to the whole Nonpredicative definition? How can I use the universal idea of Nonpredicative definition for this purpose?

Most of the previous analyses started from the assumption that only a human being should be the subject of research into morality. This conjecture cannot be sufficient because in this case I have to exclude too many parts of substance from the inquiry and, what is more, I have to reject their natural right to have morality. Indeed, haven't I proven that the mind is the *immanent* quality of substance in general, and is not an exclusive quality of human beings? Didn't I presuppose that "Ego sum, ergo cogito"? From that conclusion, I will use the term a 'live part of substance' in my speculations, not as pertaining to Homo Sapiens particularly, but to any ordinary living form of substance<sup>6</sup> as to 'one'. I, as a fighting Cynic, suppose that man is not just "the measure of things" but I think that one<sup>7</sup>, at least, constantly strives to be.

At the same time, I insist that only the living parts of substance that are united into a society have morality. But what is

---

(x,x') axis, the transformation equations cannot be put in the form:

$$x'=x-vt \quad y'=y \quad z'=z \quad t'=t$$

where x,y,z and x',y',z' are the space coordinates of a given part of substance, and v is the speed of one system relative to the other because these equations are not sufficient for describing a thing's nature that causes it to change the way of motion of a given part of substance without any rationally explainable external/internal cause.

<sup>5</sup> All qualitative descriptions of a part of substance which can be called moral predicates have their opposites: justice and injustice, love and hate, decency and meanness, etc. The sum of them always is **NOTHING** -- "for instance, says, "Summum ius summa iniuria", which means that if abstract justice is driven to the extreme, it overturns into injustice (BIB:(8.10),[p.130]."

<sup>6</sup> "I was astonished that he did not state.. that 'Pig is the measure of all things' or 'Baboon' or some yet more out-of-the way creature with the power of perception. That would have made a most imposing and disdainful opening." BIB:(19.54),[161c]

<sup>7</sup> "My good people, young and old! You sit here orating; you drag in gods, whose existence or nonexistence I exclude from all discussion, written or spoken; you keep on saying whatever is likely to be acceptable to the mob, telling them that it would be a shocking thing if no man were wiser than any cow in a field; but of proof or necessity a word." BIB:(19.54),[162e]

meant by the term "society" in general? And which parts of substance can constitute a society? The meaning of the term "society" presupposes that a sufficient and necessary definition must be found. As a matter of fact, no theory offers satisfactory answers to these questions. Can, for instance, a few stones, "beautiful in their smoothness and transparency and colour"<sup>8</sup>, constitute a society? It appears that if a stone has the same "endeavor to become the One" as a man has, the difference between a Homo Sapiens and a stone, which allows one but not the other to be a part of society, **must** be discovered. The following notes are intended to show in outline form just what factors have to be considered.

**Thesis II.** Laconical Cynicism assumes that life is a product of the contradiction between a striving toward Life, or SOMETHING, to become the Best; and immediate DEATH after becoming the Whole.

All my previous speculations started from the assumption that Nonpredicative definition of the Whole shows that changes to one part, in effect, change all other parts of it as well as the Force of Interaction among them. Hence, if a part of substance from a set of parts of substance of the Given would like to continue its existence and strives to become the Whole, it will not allow other parts of the set to suppress its "natural right to become the Whole" or, what is called "a program *maximum*". It is reasonable to expect that all other parts of substance from the set have an "equal right" to this -- in spite to Nietzsche, who would have advised a man like myself to go to an insane asylum voluntarily, where I did in fact go!

As a matter of fact, the following contradiction -- all parts of the Whole have an "equal right" to become the One (by virtue of uniting with good parts of substance) and an "equal right" does not allow other parts of substance to appropriate these positive parts of Nature, which are limited in quantity -- is the cause of motion for any part of substance and can be called "egoism", which is a part of the Nonpredicative definition of morality, and is called a "Moduse of Ethic of society". This Moduse is, in fact, the main cause for a Superman's (Superwoman's, Superit's) "Will to Power." According to rules which were formulated in "The Manifesto of Laconical Cynicism", I have to find at least one other(opposite!) part of the Whole definition.

To explore this question, let us first consider the following thought: how can life fight for its own existence and how can life prolong it? My theory is as old and banal as possible<sup>9</sup>: it has to unite itself with the parts of a substance with a positive quality

---

<sup>8</sup> BIB:(19.50),[110e]

<sup>9</sup> "V. It is in vain to talk of the interest of the community, without understanding what is the interest of the individual. A thing is said to promote the interest, or to be for the interest, of an individual, when it tends to add to the sum total of his pleasure: or, what comes to the same thing, to diminish the sum total of his pain." BIB:(1.90),[p.3]

("a program *maximum*"<sup>10</sup>) and has to avoid the parts of a substance with bad quality ("a program *minimum*"<sup>11</sup>, or in Nietzsche's words: "self-preservation is only one of the indirect and most frequent results thereof"<sup>12</sup>).

**Thesis III.** I will call any process uniting the Given part of substance with any other part of substance "labor" or "work"<sup>13</sup>. Indeed, according to Kepler's Law of Gravity, any unity of the Given part of substance with another part of substance changes the meaning of the pair of Moduses of Inertia of the Given and, consequently, the diameter of its *orisphere*. I think that "labor" is somehow proportional to the changes diameter of the *orisphere* of the Given part of substance. This conjecture frees my calculation from a search for "an edge" of any part of substance<sup>14</sup>.

**Thesis IV.** I already presupposed that the Reality rests(is apathetic) and does not have any quality such as, for instance, perfection or imperfection. Kepler's Law of Gravity limits each Moduse of Inertia of mass for each Moduse of Inertia of space; in other words, for every constant Moduse of Mass of the Given part of substance, only one constant radius of *orisphere* must exist, or changes of this radius of *orisphere* are the cause for changes in the Force of interaction of the Given living part of substance with all others. As a result, the Given part of the substance has to increase or decrease a number of its Pair of Moduses of Inertia into the Set T.

Any decrease in the number of the Pair of Moduses of Inertia of the Given part means enlarging the quantity of other parts of substance with which the Given should interact and compete for positive parts of substance<sup>15</sup>. An increase in the number of a Pair of Moduses of Inertia means an increase in quantity of parts of substance into the Given part of substance, each of which strives to become the Best, which leads to "a cancer"<sup>16</sup> and DEATH; but it can decrease the Force of Interaction at large if the Given unites itself with Relict Parts of substance. Surely, to be a set of parts

---

<sup>10</sup> the becoming a(the Supreme) Monad;

<sup>11</sup> the becoming a 'thing-in-itself';

<sup>12</sup> BIB:(19.36),[p.20]

<sup>13</sup> Therefore, Marx's "labour's realization is its objectification" (BIB:(18.56),['*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*',p.71]) finds its Cynical interpretation: one works for the sake of parts' of substance *orispheres* change -- 'to exist' means 'to work'.

<sup>14</sup> For instance, put your hand on a table, and try to define where your hand finishes and where the desk begins! Without any doubt, all six axioms of separation are useless here! BIB:(1)

<sup>15</sup> "All things are said to grow which gain enlargement through another thing by contact and assimilation..." BIB:(1.10), [1014<sup>β</sup>,20]

<sup>16</sup> Definition 29.

of substance, each of which fights for its own interests<sup>17</sup>, leads to an endless suppression and manifestation of their tendencies (one is one's own worst enemy), so that any mistake can be fatal because for any living part of substance all its parts, such as "memorable", "receptionable" and "motionable", work in unity by virtue of changing their Meanings of Inertia, where any changes in one part shall be accepted by another as an order-feedback<sup>18</sup>, which is a cause for motion. Thus, a living part of the Whole, which is defeated by 'cancer' cannot adequately coordinate its motion according to its will: "program minimum" or "maximum".

Therefore, forced into a brutal concurrence<sup>19</sup> with all other parts of substance, the Given has to risk increasing its own Moduses of Inertia mass and space, or just keep what it has as it is, trying to continue its existence as SOMETHING. With this in mind an attempt will be made to state that the Given part of substance has to support its condition as long and as close to the condition of Thing-in-itself as it can. So, changes in interaction with the universe inside such parts of substance of the Given as "memorable", "motionable" and "receptionable" demand the neutralization of these changes, because they change the Meaning of Inertia of the Given part of substance<sup>20</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> "The human body is composed of many individuals(of different nature), each one of which is also composed of many parts."BIB:(22.55),[p.53]

<sup>18</sup> "The parts composing the human body do not appertain to the essence of that body save in so far as they reciprocally communicate their motion in a certain ratio, and not in so far as they may be considered as individuals without relation to the human body."BIB:(22.55),[p.59]

<sup>19</sup> "...things do come to be in a way out of what is not, namely by virtue of concurrence." BIB:(20.01),[191<sup>β</sup>,15]

<sup>20</sup> For instance, the phenomenon of 'depression' is caused to exist by this circumstance: a Given union must keep the Meanings of Inertia of its part unequal, and these parts have to keep their Meanings of Inertia bigger than they are needed by the Given as by a thing-in-itself. Indeed, the Given's aim is to provide for all its parts a chance to prolong their existence. Therefore, if one wishes to move according to one's pragmatic necessity one must have a 'supply' of good parts of substance within the Given (that is called 'fat') and/or have its parts' Meanings of Inertia on a level which is higher than that is required by the Given for sleep; next, this level/fat exists only inasmuch as it can be used by the Given for the instantaneous decreasing/increasing of the Given's Meaning of Inertia. To illustrate, if a person is suddenly awakened from sleep, one's heart begins to beat faster because one's blood must transport good parts to all one's body parts, which parts are supposed to react to this interruption according to one's necessity. Starting from this as the base it emanates that all parts of the Given demand one's action; otherwise their activity cause one's permanent 'soreness from inside' -- 'depression': these parts of the Given have to be either in rest or they must act. Based upon this examination Cynicism infers that sleep is a very

All these contradictions were the stimuli for the beginning of the evolution of living parts of substance. Positively, if the Given part of substance tries to save itself as a Thing-in-itself, it has only to make itself free from extra mass and space. One may ask: "what quality does this extra substance have<sup>21</sup>?" One variant of the answer is widely known: there are plenty of restrooms around in which to leave it<sup>22</sup>!

Another variant was used by Nature for the purpose of reproducing and prolonging its own Life(existence): this extra part of substance has the same quality(ies) its predecessor had. And, consequently, it gave an impulse for the appearance of another part of the Nonpredicative definition of morality among predecessors-parents and their heirs<sup>23</sup>. The striving of a living part of

---

complicated condition of balance among parts of the Given association. This idea is supported by the fact that the best medicine against depression, that may be caused to exist by a limitation of any kind, is activity(BIB:(4.35)) -- "Then ask to know of that infinite Reality./ ...It is only when a man has realized eternal Truth that he declares it... And only he struggles to achieve self-control who finds joy in it... The Infinite is the source of joy. There is no joy in the finite. Only in the Infinite is there joy. Where one sees nothing but the One, hears nothing but the One, knows nothing but the One -- there is Infinite. Where one sees another, hears another, knows another -- there is finite. The Infinite is immortal, the finite is mortal./ In what does Infinite rest?.. How shall the Infinite rest anywhere but in itself?" BIB:(24.45),[*Chandogya*, p.73]

<sup>21</sup> "How is it possible for unintelligent bits of matter to produce intelligence? How is it possible for the intelligent bits of matter in our brains to produce the intelligent behavior that we all engage in?.. Unintelligent bits of matter can produce intelligence because of their *organization*. The unintelligent bits of matter are organized in certain dynamic ways, and it is the dynamic organization that is constitutive of the intelligence." BIB:(22.32),[p.32]

<sup>22</sup> "The human body needs for its preservation many other bodies from which it is, so to speak, regenerated.[p.52]

Lemma IV. If from a body or individual which is composed of several bodies certain ones are removed, and at the same time the same number of bodies of the same nature succeed to their place, the individual will retain its nature as before without any change of its form.

Lemma VII. Moreover, the individual thus composed retains its nature whether as a whole it be moved or remain at rest, whether it be moved in this or that direction, provided that each part retains its motion and communicates it as before to the other parts." BIB:(22.55),[p.50-51]

<sup>23</sup> There is not a Dedekind cut between predecessors-parents and their heirs: predicates(sense-data) can follow from one's loop of changes(Cantor set) to another. So, once again, the virtue of substance is another sort than knowledge: it is not teachable. This appears to be that a *a priori* knowledge is a *a priori* sense-data(the

substance to save<sup>24</sup> its limitlessness in a new living part of substance forces it to take care of its own continuation. This can be called "altruism". Finally, "altruism" and "egoism" can be recognized as the only parts of morality as whole<sup>25</sup>, or the "Moduses of Ethics" for a society of living parts of the One. Truly, without its opposite, "egoism" can be viewed, for instance by Nietzsche, as the only Moduse. Thus, the separation of any parts of Nonpredicative definition is impossible<sup>26</sup>! Indeed, **NOTHING** and Substance, as **SOMETHING**, are the parts of any Whole definition, where two parts of morality must exist; where both of them have the same cause to exist; where one part cannot exist without another; where the existence of one part must come from the existence of its opposite!

**Thesis V.** The next step was taken by Nature when it found that it could exchange sense-data<sup>27</sup> among living parts of substance from such parts of substance as "memory". If the parts of substance can reproduce themselves and continue to exist in a new living part of substance, they also could impart to offspring their abilities (which are unstable sense-data) to extract positive parts of substance from Nature and to escape the negative in Nature in their own offspring.

After that, why not accumulate in a descendant of the Given one the skills from several living parts of substance? An optimal way to do this was determined by Nonpredicative definition: at least two opposite parts of Nonpredicative definition must exist. The following consideration confirms this point: Nature chooses two parts of substance as a basis for breeding. Among other things, this combination gives a descendant more chances to compete for positive parts of substance, because it can accumulate a sum of skills for how to become the Whole, which have been accumulated simultaneously, from two parts of substance. Thus, any living part

---

sum of one's *a priori* opinions) which are given to one by one's predecessor. BIB:(19.50),[87c]

<sup>24</sup> "Because to the mortal creature, generation is a sort of eternity and immortality, and if, as has been already admitted, love is of the everlasting possession of the good, all men will necessary desire mortality together with good: whence it must follow that love is of immortality. ...for here again, and on the same principle too, the mortal nature is seeking as far as is possible to be everlasting and immortal: and this is only to be attained by generation, because generation always leaves behind a new and different existence in the place of the old." BIB:(19.64),[206e-207a]

<sup>25</sup> "Altruism" and "egoism" in different proportions represent themselves in all other moral items which are caused to exist by the interaction between parts of society.

<sup>26</sup> the "...metaphysicians mistake is the belief in antitheses of values." BIB:(19.36),[p.7]

<sup>27</sup> BIB:(18.70),[p.48-52]

of substance is born with the virtue<sup>28</sup> that it must somehow become the Best-Whole, but not with "pure knowledge" itself! One does not "recollect the things of which we had knowledge of previously"<sup>29</sup> but one creates the knowledge in the process of living; there the connection predecessor-descendant is one of boundlessness!

The successful breeding of two living parts of substance gives a new factor to morality, which can be called "love", where "love" consists, practically, of two components: "egoism" and "altruism" in different proportions, where "love" is a balance of forces between the opposites. A living part of substance chooses and breeds with another living part of substance, in sum with which one may almost be SOMETHING in NON-EXISTENCE<sup>30</sup>.

Now, let me look more suspiciously at the idea of "love" -- if I am going to fail, I should do it in Cynical style. It is a Cynical necessity in the study of morality to put in the forefront the idea that if one cannot live without global, or cosmic love for all living parts of substance of this particular species the question arises: "What does this *utopian-hysterical* love mean? Is this the desire to see and to make all people happy? Can one be ultimately happy only when one becomes the One?" And an even more comprehensive generalization must be made: "Does one have the desire to exorcise evil from this world, to reach such an aim as the Best without its bad parts: without other minds?"

It is better for one to become a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal than to provoke human beings to think that an abstract, global, absolute and therefore absurd and vulgar universal love exists. For example, many philosophers have followed St. Augustine's thought: "All natures, then, are good simply because they exist"<sup>31</sup> and have tried to find the pure good where it did not exist at all! Definitely, this unfounded and foolish idea has brought more tears into this world than any other: men have tried constantly to force others to feel this total love for each other without a right understanding and use of the definition of love. I think that the attempt to force another to have such feelings as love for a neighbor is a striving to create an ideal environment for oneself<sup>32</sup>.

---

<sup>28</sup> "...we must... inquire into the qualities of something the nature of which we do not yet know. Among the things existing in the soul, of what sort is virtue, that it should be teachable or not?" BIB:(19.50),[86e-87c]

<sup>29</sup> BIB:(19.50),[76b]

<sup>30</sup> "For love is the desire of the whole, and the pursuit of the whole is called love." BIB:(19.64),[p.484;193]

<sup>31</sup> BIB:St Augustin, "City of God", Book 12, Ch.5; or, what is the same "...peace would be the first law of nature." BIB:(18.67),[p.2]

<sup>32</sup> 16."...Don't listen to these false prophets when they prophesy to you, telling you with futile hopes. They do not speak for me!

17. They keep saying to these rebels who despise me. "Don't worry! All is well"; and to those who live the way they want to, "The Lord has said you shall have peace!" Jeremiah 23, BIB:(2.02)

The love of one to others -- the basis and central point of any philosophy -- is the love of one to oneself, contemplated as

It is well to bear in mind that Nietzsche's *nihilism* has its roots in his complete disillusionment with all attempts to force men to become kind. So, *the* real "love" exists within a family exclusively and only 'family values' have true importance for one.

Next, protecting the name of Cynicism, I have to say that it is a necessity to see that even if Paul said that "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"<sup>33</sup>, he explained later: "10. Love worketh no ill neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law."<sup>34</sup> But this law of ten commandments is the Golden Rule -- the Categorical Imperative, and it is the Law without human feelings<sup>35</sup>. The law of the ten commandments is the Whole definition which of necessity must lead to one's DEATH if one tries to fulfill it.

**Thesis VI.**

13. For My people have

committed

two evils. They have forsaken Me, the fountain of living waters, to hew for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.

Jeremiah, Chapter 2

I might as well be hanged for a sheep as for a lamb and, consequently, I have to ask: what is evil in this universe? Can we define it? Yes, we can (at least, I think that the method of Laconical Cynics can)!

We do not have to go far. Let us look for an easy experiment - a well-known thing, which has already been the subject of many contemplative experiments, and let us examine it in a way in which it has not been investigated before. As a good all-purpose example, let us take Newton's apple. Initially the aim of this thought-experiment is to challenge the Cynical conception of Ether. Here is how it goes:

To begin undermining the foundation of hitherto existing opinions about Ether, suppose that this apple is a whole object -- the One-Best-Absolute, or Nonpredicative definition. Now, let us cut a part of it, which part can have any size in comparison with the volume of another part of the whole apple. Truly, it does not matter, how big the part of the apple that was cut away is! It is still a piece of the same whole apple. All that has been done can be interpreted as breaking off the connection between these two parts of the whole apple. But both parts of the whole apple are still existing things. If we put the already cut portion of the

---

the highest objective truth, as the highest being of one: faith in one's ability to be the Best is therefore the faith in the eternity and truth of one's own nature.

<sup>33</sup> The Epistle of Paul to Romans, Chapter 13

<sup>34</sup> The Epistle of Paul to Romans, Chapter 13

<sup>35</sup> "In God there is no sort of wrong whatsoever; he is supremely just, and the thing most like him is the man who has become as just as it lies in human nature to be. And it is here that we see whether a man is truly able, or truly a weakling and nonentity; for it is the realisation of this that is genuine wisdom and goodness." BIB:(19.54),[176c]

apple in its former place on another part of Newton's whole apple, we will have the volume of the whole apple, and if at the same time we think that the former associative connection between these two parts has not been cut<sup>36</sup>, we will have a brand new Newton's apple. In view of all above, if this associative connection can be called the Force of Interaction, which is proportional to a part of Newton's whole apple which was cut and does not exist right now, but existed before and will exist one day, in sum of which this fruit was, is and will be **NOTHING**, we can guess that the whole Newton's apple exists because a part of it does not. This mysterious part which does not exist is called Ether.

If we add this ethereal part, which does not exist, to Newton's apple, it will not have existed. I can imply that an influence of this ethereal part of Newton's apple - the Force of Interaction - is that evil. So, if good and evil are in the sum of the volume of this absolute Newton's apple, they are in sum **NOTHING**, even if they are not equal to each other in volume. On the strength of all preceding arguments I imply that the evil in this universe **becomes** as long as and because this universe **becomes**; for this distinction between good and evil is found only in what is split in two -- i.e., in that which evil itself is<sup>37</sup>; it stops existing only when the universe stops doing the same<sup>38</sup>.

John Calvin expressed this thought: "Every descendant, therefore, from the impure source, is born infected with the cognation of sin; and even before we behold the light of life, we are in the sight of God defiled and polluted."<sup>39</sup>

In the meantime, we have the *Golden Section* rule: the stability of this universe is reached if the good has the same proportion to the evil as the Whole has to those of its parts which have the Meaning of Inertia, or, in other words, Substance, as **SOMETHING**, is kind insofar as a proportionally bigger part of it exists as **SOMETHING**<sup>40</sup>.

**Thesis VII.** In the process of cruel evolution, a living part of substance became more and more complicated, and found more and more parts of substance with positive qualities. At the same time, it studied how to use other parts of substance for the extraction of "necessary" parts of substance for its own good.

Since living parts of substance were taught by Nature how to reproduce themselves, they suddenly received a *Choice*: to cannibalize their own heirs and parts of substance of the same species, or to make an agreement with them and together destroy all other living parts of substance of the same species who are

---

<sup>36</sup> "And now, if we suppose that all things have the power of communion with one another -- what will follow?" BIB:(19.66),[252d]

<sup>37</sup> BIB:(8.10),[p.9]

<sup>38</sup> So, nobody can love others where "love worketh no ill to his neighbour..." (BIB:(2),[Paul to the Romans, Ch.13:10]) because "there is none righteous, no, not one..."

<sup>39</sup> BIB:(3.70),[p.43]

<sup>40</sup> for the Yang condition of substance

contenders in the fight for good parts of the Whole or cooperate with them.

Thus, there are two different reasons for a living part of substance to unite into a society<sup>41</sup>:

- the purpose of reproduction,
- a division of labor in a person's egoistical attempt to survive<sup>42</sup>: to create an ideal environment<sup>43</sup> -- the extensive way of evolution.

The division of labor, a key characteristic of any society of living forms of substance, is a method of interaction with parts of substance in which each living part of substance specializes in some phase of the extraction of positive parts of substance for its own good together with other living forms of substance.

It may be inferred that the necessity of unkind concurrence was the cause for dividing all living parts of substance into spheres of consumption. Now any living part of substance may be specialized to deal with only strictly determined positive parts of substance.

Well, as a matter of fact a man looks for the optimal way in the process of evolution: one constantly tries to realize his "program *maximum*" and "program *minimum*"<sup>44</sup>.

I.Kant expressed the optimal way to realize this for a man, who is a part of society: "Act as if the maxim of thy act were to become by thy will a universal law of nature."<sup>45</sup>

V.Pareto expressed the same thing for economics: "An allocation of resources in the economy was optimal if there existed no other productively feasible allocation which made all individuals in the economy at least as well-off, and at least one

---

<sup>41</sup> But Locke thought that "to avoid this state of war... is one great reason of men's putting themselves into society..." BIB:(20.45),[J. Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, p.249]

<sup>42</sup> "We must bear in mind... that man's relation to himself only becomes objective and real for him through his relation to the other man... Every self-estrangement of man from himself and from nature appears in the relation in which he places himself and nature to men other than and differentiated from himself." BIB:(18.56),[p.79]

<sup>43</sup> There is another way of evolution -- intensive -- to change oneself: it means that one can make oneself as simple as possible; there non-being is the simplest condition of Nature.

<sup>44</sup> "Political power, then, I take to be the right of making laws with penalties of death, and consequently all less penalties, for the regulating and preserving of property, and of employing the force of the community, in the execution of such laws... From this *two distinct rights*, the one of *punishing* the crime for *restraint*, and preventing the like offence... the other of taking reparation, which belongs to the injured party..." BIB:(20.45),[Locke J., *Second Treatise of Government*, [p.243-244]

<sup>45</sup> If the maxim of anyone's act is the 'becoming' the One and the universal law of nature -- the striving to 'be' the One -- is equally in and for any part of substance it should mean that all particles and even their existence contradicts to the aim and existence of others.

strictly better off, than they were initially"<sup>46</sup>, (where "at least as well-off" is the "program minimum" and "at least one strictly better off" is the "program maximum" -- the becoming the Best -- for a man).

It is reasonable to expect that in the reality of Nonpredicative definition, where the Force of Interaction exists, this condition of the intermediate cannot be reached till this Force exists. This supposition limits the ability of living parts of substance to avoid participation in the competition for parts of substance with good quality. The maxim of the Given living parts of substance is: "The strongest will survive!", as long as one is the strongest.

**Thesis VIII.** Cynicism that is related to Communism by the bond of blood accepts Marx's: "...the whole of human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production and every relation of servitude is but a modification of this relation."<sup>47</sup>

It has been proven many times that one of the main aspect in the relation of an individual to another individual in the process of production is somehow connected with man's relation to commodities, which circulate in society as ultimate results of the extraction of positive parts of substance from others. Consequently, the main term, which must be defined, is the term "alienation".

According to the method of Laconical Cynicism which does not divide living parts of substance from others, the definition of the term "alienation" is: *Good parts of substance, which were extracted from others by the Given living part of substance, become commodities: can be changed by the Given for another good part of substance, which belongs to and was produced by another living part of substance, and these commodities become alienated from the Given which(who) had extracted(produced) them from Nature*<sup>48</sup>.

Thus, even if the Given part produces good parts of substance from Nature, other living parts of the Whole are also parts of Nature, aren't they? And why cannot one living part of substance extract a few good parts of substance from another one? In the context of private property, it is very simple to consider that it

---

<sup>46</sup> BIB:(26)

<sup>47</sup> BIB:(18.55) But Cynicism states that there are no such origins which can be called 'the general laws of economics: 'the general laws of economics' are simply the manifestation of the virtue of concurrence presence; an *ethnos* does not pass over from one given stage of historical development to another because any *ethnos* is not *one among others*, but is the *association* of many -- people change themselves and these modifications to be reflected as the historical changes of an *ethnos*' superstructure and its economic foundation. In this sense it can be concluded that 'economic life offers us a phenomenon analogous to the history of evolution in other branches of biology.' BIB:(18.56),[p.300-301]

<sup>48</sup> BIB:(18.56),['*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*', p.72]

is easier to take a big piece of substance as private property<sup>49</sup> and extract good parts of substance from it quietly, than to beat unlucky neighbors from morning till evening every day on the head with a cudgel in the attempt to extract the good parts of the One directly from them. Therefore, due to the fact that everything is limited, one may give an unsuccessful neighbor the chance to extract positive parts of substance from one's private property, for which this fruitless neighbor must give a part of the positive parts of substance that have been produced. Particular emphasis must be given to the fact that the institution of private property is not a bad way to achieve this! Now, it is presumed that groups of living parts of substance or, to say it in the laconical manner, people, who are exploited by owners of private property, nevertheless try to defend and restore their "natural right". They try to expropriate the exploiters.

Thus, men themselves are what they are, not only because the society in which they are born and bred is what it is but also inasmuch as they are alliances of parts of substance and their behavior manifests these unions' striving to become the Whole<sup>50</sup>; the community is a mere collection of individuals who are logically prior to it and are not a real being; any society-alliance cannot and, simultaneously, can be regarded as the one in the many because any alliance can be conjectured as an union of many and it must be observed as one among many<sup>51</sup>. Due to one's striving toward one's 'self-realization' -- one's *autarky* -- one must always endeavor to destroy the community of other minds.

**Thesis IX.** "Territoriality is always socially constructed."<sup>52</sup> Indeed, because a man exists on the surface of a constant negative curvative he has to have some social relations with his neighbor, even if these relations are summarized in the act of cannibalism. A Cynic, who thinks that when in Rome, act as Cynics always do, I can make the hypothetical suggestion that it was solely the increase in the population of human beings that resulted in the limitation of

---

<sup>49</sup> "The first person who, having enclosed a plot of land, took it into his head to say this is mine and found people simple enough to believe him, was the true founder of civil society... Man's first sentiment was that of his own existence; his first concern was that of his preservation. The products of the earth provided him with all the help he needed; instinct led him to make use of them... He learned to surmount nature's obstacles; combat other animals when necessary, fight for his subsistence even with men, or compensate for what he had to yield to those stronger than himself...[p.302] From the cultivation of land, there necessarily followed the division of land; and from property once recognized, the first rules of justice[p.308]." BIB:(20.45),["Rousseau J., *Inequality Among Men*]

<sup>50</sup> "5.For they that are after the flesh to mind the things of the flesh; but they that after the Spirit the things of the Spirit." BIB:(2), Paul, 'To the Romans'.

<sup>51</sup> at least, up to the time that one will become a Monad -- the One.

<sup>52</sup> BIB:(36),[p.24]

space for each individual and, in consequence, the viewing of land as private property, and, as a result, the change from the hunting-gathering method of extraction of positive parts of substance from Nature to the agricultural: limitlessness changes through limitations.

Now, it may be repeated that the existence of private property has converted human labor into a commodity. A man can exchange his labor for money, which process has called to life the *phenomena* of distribution of different kinds of commodities such as the good parts of the Whole, labor and money<sup>53</sup>. In fact, many people extract good parts of the Whole from others in the process of distribution of positive parts of substance and labor in exchange for money. There is nothing amazing in the fact that a few people, who somehow extract good parts of substance from other people, try to protect their ability to do this as long as they wish by suppressing any attempt to displace them. These groups (which have private property and/or extract good from others) increase the quantity of evil for all others, but they compensate for this increase by decreasing the quantity of evil for themselves. The quantity of evil does not depend on the distribution of it among parts of substance within the closed volume of a society. This quantity is more or less stable for any "broken cistern". The quantity of evil in any closed volume can be changed if somehow a few good parts of substance suddenly appear within this volume: for example, as a result of the extraction of good parts of Whole by this state from another one. Usually this event is called a "war": the best solution for all the problems of any society is a "good war"!

**Thesis X.** Karl Marx and company were influenced by German classical philosophy, which was established on the old conception that good must be and shall be victorious over evil -- for any philosophy its "essence consists precisely in making one-sided and abstract determination valid in their isolation, each on its own account, in accord with the individual's interest of the moment and his particular situation". This conception was a primitive theistic one, because it was built on the presupposition that the good predominated in this universe from the beginning of time and was suddenly corrupted by someone. And, the exorcism of private property was proclaimed to be the right method for the complete termination of all incarnations of evil.

A "Proletarian Revolution - Solution of the contradictions. The proletarian seizes the public power, and by means of this transforms the socialized means of production, slipping from the hands of the bourgeoisie, into public property. By this act, the proletariat frees the means of production from the character of capital they have thus far borne, and gives their socialized character complete freedom to work itself out. The development of production makes the existence of different classes of society

---

<sup>53</sup> Anything which serves as a medium of exchange and is generally acceptable for this purpose, or as a unit of value in terms of which the price of everything is stated, is money. BIB:The McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Modern Economics.

thenceforth an anachronism. In proportion as anarchy in social production vanishes, the political authority of the state dies out. Man at last becomes the master of his own form of social organization, becomes at the same time the lord over Nature, his own master - free.

"The possibility of securing for every member of society, by means of socialized production, an existence not only fully sufficient materially, and becoming day to day more full, but an existence guaranteeing to all the free development and exercise of their physical and mental faculties - this possibility is now for the first time here, but *it is here*.

"With the seizing of the means of production by society, production of commodities is done away with, and, simultaneously, the mastery of the product over the producer. Anarchy in social production is replaced by systematic, definite organization. The struggle for individual existence disappears."<sup>54</sup>

Is this naïve<sup>55</sup>? No, it is not! Cynicism is supposed to stick in the throat of all who perpetually desire to have their Ideal exist regardless of cost and, consequently, it must encourage anyone to make one's Absolute exist!

**Thesis XI.** The basis of the contradiction of morality for a living part of substance has been found. The attempt to unite oneself with a good part of substance is an attempt to change the universe -- to make it free from contradictions.

As a matter of fact any society is ruled by some elite, where this "ruling group sets down laws for its own advantage; a democracy sets down democratic laws; a tyranny, tyrannic laws; and the others do the same."<sup>56</sup>

For instance, the case of the Soviet Union provides evidence in favor of the conjecture that everywhere the extraction of good from living parts of substance will exist, independently from the existence of private property: the right to have private property of a piece of substance was changed to the right to distribute good parts of substance, for which a distributor can take a quantity of good parts of substance proportional to one's place in the system of distribution. The construction of a human society like this according to the original theory of the Social Contract was not strictly the result of an agreement, which is consciously concluded between people, but, in effect, through good or evil it brought the same result as the theory of the Social Contract<sup>57</sup>: it limits

---

<sup>54</sup> BIB:(18.45)

<sup>55</sup> "There must be a unity which is subserves, and a whole, taken in which it is a struggle no longer[p.137]. There is no pain on the whole, and in the Absolute our whole nature must find satisfaction[p.139]." BIB:(3.55)

<sup>56</sup> BIB:(19.52),[338e]

<sup>57</sup> "Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will; and in a body we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole... What man loses by the social contract is his natural freedom and an unlimited right to everything that tempts him and that he can get; what he

everybody who strives to realize his "program maximum" and can help others to complete their "program minimum"; this, actually, can be summarized as a "neutral program" -- *Golden Section* rule -- for society, or the Bible's Golden Rule, or the Categorical Imperative. Indeed, society is stable insofar as the proportion of people who have already realized their "program minimum" to the number of people who strive to realize their "program maximum", is closer to the proportion of the whole population of the state to people who have realized their "program minimum"; or, in other words, the state satisfies all its members to the degree that a proportionally bigger part of them have realized their "program minimum" as the program of "self-preservation"<sup>58</sup>. This is called the *Golden Section* rule for human society and the passionate activity of an *ethnos* increases if the number of people who realized their program of "self-preservation" becomes smaller than the number that satisfies the *Golden Section* rule and vice versa.

During different stages of the history of human society we can see how elites have used different methods to suppress all other living parts of the Whole; and all great revolutions always have had the purpose to at least limit the elite's right or at maximum to exchange the elite for a new one with, usually, the high-minded purpose of creating some rules which can satisfy the *Golden Section* rule.

As an example, society in the USSR was almost ideal, and any attempts by any members of it to change it were limited, as different productively feasible allocations were limited, that in effect did not give a range of choice between different modes of allocation, which could have made all individuals in the economy not only at least as well-off, but at least strictly better off, than they were initially. The Soviet Union supported (theoretically) an equal level of good for all of its members by decreasing of the necessary level of good for each of its members (Aristotle's Principle -- the presence of opposites is the principle -- was not recalled and lost from memory<sup>59</sup>). But the attempt was done by Communists to make the quantity of people, who completed their program of "self-preservation", equal to the number of all the

---

gains is civil freedom and the proprietorship of everything he possesses." BIB:(20.45),["Rousseau J., *On the Social Contract*, p.282]

<sup>58</sup> or, the same, they are apathetic: "...by the fundamental law of nature, man being to be preserved as much as possible... for where there is an authority, a power on earth, from which relief can be had by *appeal*, there the continuance of the *state of war* is excluded, and the controversy is decided by that power."

BIB:(20.45),[Locke J., *Second Treatise of Government*, p.248-249]

<sup>59</sup> Lenin made a methodological mistake: "the condition for the knowledge of processes of the world in their 'self-movement,' in their spontaneous development in their real life, is the knowledge of them as a unity of opposites. Development is the 'struggle' of opposites." BIB:(17.20),[p.277-78] Everything is correct but Lenin did not realize that the unity of opposites does not have any quality it is **NOTHING**.

USSR's members: this was the mistake. An important point is that the destruction of private property follows upon the almost complete absence of contradictions in economics: it is a paradox but society is unable to solve the contradiction within the sphere of the distribution of good and evil if it does not have contradictions in economics; if **SOMETHING** exists it contains contradiction in itself. So, the termination and/or restriction of people's<sup>60</sup> right to act according to their egoistical interests follows upon the decrease of an *ethnos*' creativity -- if it satisfies the *Gold Section* rule it must strive to be undisturbed -- to not exist; if the quantity of people (who are forced to be apathetic) is equal to the whole population, a society is compelled to satisfy the *Gold Section* rule<sup>61</sup>.

Therefore only the violation of all society's rules is a sufficient proviso for the development of society and finally for the complete demolition of society<sup>62</sup>.

### **Thesis XII.**

The King is dead! Long live the King!

Human society is not a subject for experiments. Indeed, how can we repeat this event or any other? Next, the presupposition that nothing invariable exists in the *Yang* condition of the Whole means that neither territory, as form, nor population, as main sort of matter, is stable. The attempt to divide a society into classes also is unsuccessful due to the fact that any member of any class has a bigger or smaller opportunity to change from one's class to another (where the division into classes can be done according to the relation of a particular living part of substance to the extraction of positive parts of substance from living parts of substance).

The history of the worldwide trade market also offers proof in favor of the conjecture that any artificial attempt to create a territorial "broken cistern" of any kind in effect leads to absolute collapse.

There are two models for the functioning of the state: first, it is the form of suppression of one part of society under another for its own good; second, it is the form of suppression of all

---

<sup>60</sup> who are the carriers of the passionate character;

<sup>61</sup> When a society does not contain contradictions within itself, which cannot be eradicated by means of the society's members' change because they are so limited, it cannot offer effective and fruitful responses to the challenges caused by the contradiction between members of this society and others.

<sup>62</sup> But Locke asserted that "the liberty of man, in society, is to be under no legislative power, but that established, by consent, in the common-wealth; under the domination of any will, or restraint of any law, but what legislative shall enact, according to the trust put in it.." BIB:(20.45) Locke, *Second Treatise of Government, Of Slavery* p.249-250] And a Cynic should judge this judgment if and until there are many who can force one to see them: but the immanent virtue of men is the striving to become *the only* singularity -- violate others' natural rights to do the same.

parts of society under themselves for the sake of equal distribution of evil among all members of society<sup>63</sup>.

The origin of Cynicism cannot be clearly understood in isolation from this statement: democracy is the only system of and the only system for a Laconical Cynic that is always driven to extremes, the system for which one lives and for which one dies; and democracy is the only system in which one lives and dies; so, democracy is enemy number one for any Laconical Cynic, who strives to create the environment which is suitable for oneself. For fighting Dogs of Pure Reason, as for *herding animal* creatures -- carriers of the most inhuman morality -- "...the democratic movement is the inheritance of the Christian movement"<sup>64</sup>. It alone can give them a chance to build their own "broken cistern", and democracy gives another a chance to break it.

**Nor God, nor czar or hero brings a redemption!  
Long live the system which is established on the feeling of total  
distrust in a human being's nature - Democracy!  
It must be destroyed!**

---

<sup>63</sup> "...just action is intermediate between acting unjustly and being justly treated; for one is to have too much and the other to have too little. Justice is a kind of mean, but not in the same way as the other excellencies, but because it relates to an intermediate amount, while injustice relates to the extreme."  
BIB: (1.10), [1133<sup>β</sup>, 30]

<sup>64</sup> BIB: (19.36), [p.127]