

CLARIFICATIONS  $\chi$   
TO APPENDIX #10A

CONCERNING PURE LIE ABOUT  
PURE TRUTH AND PURE TRUTH ABOUT  
PURE LIE:  
ARITHMETIC AND DIALECTIC OF  
LANGUAGE;  
LANGUAGE OF ARITHMETIC  
AND  
DIALECTIC.

"Now many errors consist of this alone, that we do not apply names rightly to things."

Spinoza. "Ethics"<sup>1</sup>

Clarification 24. One can say that one sees not the grape but the potential wine because there is no grape that 'is' -- the grape must always change its condition of substance; one is capable to state that one observes not the wine that 'is' but the former grape that had become the wine because it has changed its condition of the Reality; one cannot deny the existence of SOMETHING (grape and/or wine) if others are able to persuade one to admit the existence of the grape and the wine but one and others must notice that there is not 'this' grape and/or wine -- SOMETHING is always becoming. Therefore, one's faculty of affirming and denying what is true or false concerns only SOMETHING's ability to become NOTHING and/or the change of SOMETHING's condition of substance but does not concern the possibility that SOMETHING becomes or not becomes. It only looks like one is stating 'this' and not 'this' about the

---

<sup>1</sup> BIB:(22.55),[p.74]. "What peculiar privilege has this little agitation of the brain which we call 'thought', that we must thus make it the model of the whole universe?" BIB:(11.00),[p.19] Cynicism assumes that Nature does not impose proper words upon one, but one imposes them upon nature, for one finds them convenient for the reason that the only true objective reality is the internal harmony of the world -- the becoming Best. BIB:(20.01),[p.29;p.125] So, the objective for Cynicism is that which is generally regarded as valid, that which is accepted by the majority of men, or by all if and till they are many; that is to say, Cynicism intents to destroy the possibility of and for one to possess *the* objective truth and, paradoxically, it urges that anyone may suggest that one maintain *the* truth. For, when one says whatever it might be, another one may simply 'prefer to say' something else, they will not always be arguing about words, about what terminology is to be preferred, but of their own pragmatic interests. Thus, there is, indeed, only simple substance that cannot be touched and put into words -- Absolute. It makes itself manifest: it what is thought mystical (BIB:(24.15),[6.522]); "the absolute maximum is beyond our comprehension yet intelligible, able to be named whilst remaining ineffable[p.14]. Every affirmation puts, so to speak, in God something of the thing it signifies; but He is as much all things as He is something; therefore, all affirmations are inappropriate. If, therefore, affirmative names are used, they can only apply to Him in relation to creatures[p.55]..." BIB:(19.37) Therefore, "...the mystical is the concrete unity of just those determinations that count as true for the understanding only in their separation and opposition... everything rational can equally be called "mystical"; but this only amounts to saying that it transcends the understanding. It does not at all imply that what is so spoken of must be considered inaccessible to thinking and incomprehensible." BIB:(8.10),[p.133]

same thing at the same time because there is no moment of time 'right now'.

Clarification 25. Laconical Cynicism asserts that Pure Truth is becoming **NOTHING** -- becoming 'is' is Pure Truth<sup>2</sup>; where Pure Lie is the Reality of being **NOTHING** -- being 'is' is Pure Lie<sup>3</sup>; there is not a gap in the continuity of interaction among particles in time and there is no such a condition as the 'being the One': when one has uttered 'this' about **SOMETHING** and **NOTHING** they have already gone.

Clarification 26. The assertion:

$$a = a$$

is wrong because  $a - a = 0$  does not make any sense --  $a$  may only become but must not be equal to itself unless it is the Whole<sup>4</sup>:  $a$  is a means that there is only one  $a$  -- the singularity; where only the empty set is the singularity. Any act under the Reality means that it is becoming **SOMETHING** -- a thing: Cynicism states that operations of summarizing and negation mean that a few particles are interacting and that these things mutually compensate for their Meanings of Inertia and, practically, they are to become **NOTHING**; the signs '+' and '-' mean that at least two parts of substance change their condition of substance.

Therefore,

---

<sup>2</sup> Ayer thought that "And therefore we should, I think, conclude that the validity of ethical judgments is not determined by the felicific tendencies of actions, any more than by the nature of people's feelings; but that it must be regarded as "absolute" or "intrinsic," and not empirically calculable." BIB:(1.67),[p.105] Cynicism states that if I say to someone, "You acted wrongly in stealing my money" I mean that this one is to increase my Meaning of Inertia: stealing money is wrong because it influences my condition of substance! BIB:(1.67)[p.107]

<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, an experiment cannot be completely verified -- the conception of this experiment is Pure Truth if and only if one in effect becomes the One. Also, Leibniz's assertion: "Our reasoning is founded on two great principles: The first is the principle of contradiction, by virtue of which we consider as false what implies a contradiction and as true what is the opposite of the contradictory or false"(BIB:(15.00)) is not valid anymore because the truth or/and falsity of an act does not concern the presence of contradiction in it but only of its result.

<sup>4</sup> If two plus two is not equal to four, it means that all Whole-Natural numbers are the universals and it must not be said that the empty set plus another empty set is equal to the third empty set, because there is only one empty set -- **NOTHING** is the singularity -- and it must not be a defective **SOMETHING**: **NOTHING** 'is' not an object or a subject for changes while it 'is' **NOTHING**!!!

Pure Truth = Pure Truth  
(the becoming NOTHING becomes the becoming NOTHING)  
or  
Pure Lie = Pure Lie  
(the being NOTHING becomes the being NOTHING)

are not proper assertions: the sign '=' means that opposites are becoming NOTHING, but not that they are equal. The only correct supposition is:

Pure Truth = Pure Lie  
(Pure Truth is becoming Pure Lie);

where this assumption expresses the *ultra-relativistic* nature of Cynicism.

Clarification 27. Nonpredicative definition -- the Whole definition -- does not describe NOTHING: NOTHING does not have predicates because what is essential to the world cannot be said about NOTHING; for then it could be otherwise, NOTHING possesses predicates and becomes SOMETHING that opposes to others<sup>5</sup>.

Clarification 28. The *Yin* condition of substance is the condition of the first derivative of *the Reality*; the *Yang* condition is the condition of the second derivative of *the Realty*<sup>6</sup>.

Substance' = a thing-in-itself;  
Substance'' = the thing<sup>7</sup>.

Clarification 29. If two are always arguing not about words but about their own pragmatic interests<sup>8</sup>, it means that these interests ought to be put in conceptions which must have the logical form of SOMETHING if they are to be conceptions at all<sup>9</sup>: grammar of any language is not

---

<sup>5</sup> BIB:(24.17),[p.34]

<sup>6</sup> "He continuous to live in the tree states of consciousness -- waking, dreaming and dreamless sleep. As long as he continuous in these three states, he is the individual self... He is the reality behind all existence. He who made this great spectacle of waking, dream, and dreamless sleep -- he I am... know this, and break all bonds... From me all emerge, in me all exist, and to me all return. I am Brahman -- One without a second... I am pure..." BIB:(24.45),[*Kaivalya*, p.115-116]

<sup>7</sup> There is no *an* apple that 'is' red but *the* apple that 'is becoming'/'had became' red.

<sup>8</sup> "But, in all such cases, we find, if we consider the matter closely, that the dispute is not really about a question of value, but about a question of fact... What we attempt to show is that he is mistaken about the facts of the case." BIB:(1.67),[p.110-111]

<sup>9</sup> "For if, say, I give the meaning of my words through explanatory statements and definitions, that is by help of other words, one must ask further for the meaning of these words, and so on. This process cannot proceed endlessly... The final giving of meaning

the expression of what *the Reality* 'is' but of SOMETHING's striving to become *the Reality*. This goodness of SOMETHING is the only property that is needed and which is the same both in language and in SOMETHING<sup>10</sup>: all logical concepts are to be expressed by two groups of opposed things/by two opposed things plus a verb and/or plus an adjective, participle, gerund; where these definitions<sup>11</sup> manifest qualitative changes of things' predicates during the endeavor of those parts of the Best to become the Best<sup>12</sup>.

Furthermore, language is always an interactive phenomenon and a concept in one's mind is arranged by words and is severed from other concepts only if others coerce one to reciprocate with them.

Clarification 30. Any proper name, any opinion about SOMETHING that can be used by one without any supplementary description and which is not an universal(the Limit) has a meaning of the first derivative from *the Reality*: for instance, the meaning of the term 'house' without the notion of time does not need predicates; this term has in itself only a general idea of form and content<sup>13</sup>.

The condition of the second derivative affixes predicates to a thing; which predicates are able to describe and distinguish one from all others. As a rule, verbs, adjectives, participles and gerunds serve human beings for this purpose: they signify the presence of acceleration -- the presence of the Force of Interaction. Moreover, insofar as predicates manifest the change of a part's of substance in time they are also to be imagined as Irrational numbers: there are no certain colors without shades, there are no sounds without nuances, etc. Therefore, the existence of synonyms -- words with almost the same meaning -- is caused by the differences in human being's minds and by the impossibility in the *Yang* condition of substance to define-stop-grasp the moment of certainty<sup>14</sup>. As a result, the ideas

---

always takes place therefore, through deeds. It is these deeds or acts which constitute philosophical activity." BIB:(1.66),[Moritz Schlick, *The Turning Point in Philosophy*, p.57]

<sup>10</sup> "...logical thinking in general must not be interpreted merely in terms of a subjective activity, but rather as what is strictly universal and hence objective at the same time. It should be added that this applies to the understanding as well, which is the first form of logical thinking. The understanding must therefore be regarded as corresponding to what people call the goodness of God, where this is understood to mean that finite things are, that they subsist." BIB:(8.10),[p.127]

<sup>11</sup> Verbs, adjectives, participles and gerunds are qualitative definitions.

<sup>12</sup> "A proposition is not a proposition unless it occurs within a grammatical system." BIB:(24.17),[p37]

<sup>13</sup> "...the thing-in-itself is that which is indeterminate, absolutely without form and therefore without content..."

<sup>14</sup> "A proposition has the same kind of relation to reality that a measuring rod has to an object. This is not a simile; the measuring rod is an example of the relation." BIB:(24.17),[p.6]

in a human mind follow to the rule of the 'inexplicable economy'<sup>15</sup>: an idea strives to become a simple one -- to become the ultimate antiderivative.

Clarification 31. If one strives to become the Best one learns/teaches language by using it during the process of interaction with other minds as long as one tries to 'understand' others because one desires to be led by linguistic convention to a right expectation<sup>16</sup>; where this 'expectation' is determined by Pragmatic Esthetic -- an opinion is to attach to SOMETHING only if a few beings communicate. Accordingly, a proposition strives to be a picture of *the Reality* in the sense that all subjects and objects of this picture of possibilities endeavor to become the certain Absolute<sup>17</sup>: an adequate picture of *the Reality* is NOTHING. Thus, in formulating a general, simple and precise picture of this universe on the basis of experiments one has therefore only obeyed a necessity from which the human mind cannot free itself<sup>18</sup>.

Clarification 32. The Cynical clarification for Frege's example<sup>19</sup> sounds like this:

The rising sun is to become a new every morning and these two conditions of the one thing: the evening and morning sun may be(!) only with an element of certainty seen as the same.

---

<sup>15</sup> BIB:(11.00),[p.18]

<sup>16</sup> BIB:(24.17),[p.5]

<sup>17</sup> But Russell thought that "the axiom internal relation is thus equivalent to the assumption that every proposition has one subject and one predicate. For a proposition which asserts a relation must always be reduced to a subject-predicate proposition concerning the whole composed to the terms of the relation. Proceeding in this way to larger and larger wholes, we gradually correct out first crude abstract judgments, and approximate more and more to the one truth about the whole. The one final and complete truth must consist of a proposition with one subject, namely, the whole, and one predicate." BIB:(22.04),[p.57]

<sup>18</sup> BIB:(20.01)'[p.120]

<sup>19</sup> "The meaning of 'evening star' would be the same as that of 'morning star', but not the sense." BIB:(17.77),[p.201]