

APPENDIX #3A
TO THE PROPAEDEUTICS FOR
“PHILOSOPHY OF PURE REASON
SUB SPECIE AETERNITATIS.”

PLUS ONE, MINUS ONE
AND NULL.

Preface.

"...we should not regard order number as anything separate from things which are ordered and number but should think of them simply modes under which we consider things in."
Descartes, "Principles of Philosophy" Principe 55.

The theme of this Appendix is the consideration of two different numbers: minus one, plus one and zero. All that will follow is going to be adroitness of the mind without any optical illusions!

1

Everybody knows that:

$$\begin{aligned}1+(-1) &= 0 \\ 0 + 0 &= 0 \\ 1-(-1) &= 2 \\ (-1)-1 &= -2 \\ 0+(-1) &= -1 \\ 0 + 1 &= 1\end{aligned}$$

Is it true?

According to my supposition that there is SOMETHING and NOTHING I can assume that null is NOTHING and, therefore, can the Whole numbers be SOMETHING? Cynicism studies not objects, but the qualitative relations between objects; the replacement of these objects by numbers is therefore indifferent to the method: SOMETHING exists in the Yang condition of substance exclusively and the Whole numbers are not SOMETHING. But what are they?

Is zero opposed to the number one of both signs? If we take a look at Plato we can see that he asserted that "opposite things came from its opposite thing" and "the opposite itself could never become its opposite, never that in us or that in nature"¹. Based upon these assertions may I say that in all judgments in which the relation of zero to one is thought this relation is possible only in two different and similar ways: one is equal to zero, as SOMETHING which is (covertly) contained in this notion of NOTHING²; and one lies outside the concept of zero, although it does indeed stand in connection with it? May I admit that the number null and

¹ BIB:(19.50),[103b] Here we have the initial idea, which forced me to formulate "Nonpredicative definition".

² "Therefore absolute unity, where no duality is possible, is the absolute maximum or God Himself. By the fact that it is unity at its absolute perfection, it excludes the possibility of the existence of another such being because it is all that it can be. It cannot therefore, be a number[p.15]... the Maximum is a being which is neither the same as, nor different from any other, and how all things are in it, from it and by it[p.48]..." BIB:(19.37)

number one of both signs are the ultimate frontier numbers of and for all continuums -- the universals?

In other words, I strive to prove that these two numbers are not a pair of opposites even if it seems so! By these two numbers, I mean minus and plus one and zero; where I think there is not a difference between number one of both signs: any closed set has a power equal to the power of the empty set and, consequently, we have two equal closed-empty sets of different signs³.

I assume that the row of Natural numbers is the row of whole numbers, which means that they are *apeirons-NOTHING*, but the row of cardinal Natural numbers is the row of numbers which count NOTHING -- the infinity itself. Indeed, as for the terms "one" and "null", they mean nothing positive in things considered in themselves, nor are they anything other than the moduse of thought, or notions, which we form from the mutual comparison of things⁴ -- from the universals⁵: if one counts parts of substance, this one counts 'things-in-itself' which are imagined as unchangeable things that do not have any qualitative characteristics in themselves and are not *the* things but only their abstract concepts. So, even if any Whole set is NOTHING it is still countable as an abstract idea of *the* thing⁶! Naturally, 'the part of substance' and 'simple substance' are not the same; 'the part of substance' means a qualitative measure-description, but 'simple substance' means that a thing does not have any nature⁷. It is reasonable to expect that 'simple substance' as the One is not opposed to *plurality* and that

³ Due to the fact that there is no theory which can offer a more or less satisfactory explanation for the nature of negative numbers: how they are different from, and how they can annihilate positive numbers, I will risk putting forward my own theory. If we have the row of cardinal whole-Natural numbers, what can be counted by use of negative Natural numbers? I guess that if we always have two opposites: two properties of parts of substance (magnetic and electrical); positive and negative meanings of Inertia; Increments of Moduses of Inertia mass and space, we can infer that the negative cardinal numbers count something that positives do not: opposites are the principles (BIB:(1.10),[p.188^α,25]). This is easy, isn't it?

⁴ BIB:(22.55),[p.143]

⁵ In this sense it can be concluded that all *a priori* opinions (which are required by one only for practical purposes) *deal exclusively with the relations of universals*; where universals are the Limits (BIB:(22.03),[p.103]) and insofar as knowledge, in spite to Hegel (BIB:(8.01),[p.132]), stands on the same side as Absolute does, *a priori* knowledge does not exist -- nobody can operate with the Whole.

⁶ Furthermore, any closed set(which cannot be considered as a cardinal number but only as a countable base for a point) cannot be regarded as a class notion: a closed set exists as long as it is the *simple* substance(no number exists without an object inspiring its existence). BIB:(18.70), [p.75-7]

⁷ BIB:(1.10),[1072^α,35]

the process of converting the One to the *plurality* is that mysterious *prime* move for the substance as the Whole⁸. One may ask: what does two, three, and etc. mean? If we have the smallest part of substance -- Quantum -- I can say that two means that one must consider the Given *apeiron* as a set which contains two Quanta in it⁹ -- it means that two plus two is not equal to four!

2

Generally, the Cynical theory of Intentionality sounds like this: all one's mental states and the events by which they are caused to exist are of things that can force¹⁰ one to doubt them.¹¹

⁸ BIB:(1.10),[1004^α,5-20]

⁹ BIB:(18.70;22.03)

¹⁰ "Each is the mediating term to the other, through which each mediates and unites itself with itself; and each is to itself and to the other an immediate self-existing reality, which, at the same time, exists thus for itself only through this mediation. They recognize themselves as mutually recognizing one another." BIB:(8.11),['Lordship and Bondage'; p.72] For instance, consider the following sentences: (1)'It is true that other people exist' and (2)'It is useful to know that other people exist'. (1) and (2) have the same meaning and express one and the same concept: when one exists other must exist or one is the One and does not exist. If one is not the One it means that one is forced by other minds to see their existence.

¹¹ BIB:(22.32)[p.1] The final(Cynical) solution for the 'problem of other minds' is that other minds exist as long as they resist the striving of one to become the One -- "If there is a man -- there is a problem; if there is not this man -- there is not this problem." BIB:J.Stalin

So, to do wrong or to return a wrong is neither right nor wrong: injuring people is different from wrongdoing. BIB:(19.50),[49e] It follows from this idea: all actions change Meanings of Inertia of all parts of this predicative defined universe and, therefore, they 'injure' them while the achieving of solipsism means *the rest*(BIB:(19.52),[349]) and, accordingly, it is the essential necessity to understand that the idea: "The highest and last principle of philosophy is, therefore, the unity of man with man"(BIB:(4.45),[#63]) does not work! Thus, one may achieve the absolute righteousness up to the time that one stops to be -- the Best acts as soon as the One is disturbed: *apeirons* begin to

If one thinks about a number one thinks of an open set of parts of substance; where this set at the same interval of time causes the same effect.

I assume that the only problem for the Cynical theory of Intentionality was the problem of searching for a metaphysical basis, which can sufficiently explain: what provokes a living part of substance to think? This problem found its solution in the supposition that a mind of any part of substance is the manifestation of the Law immanent in Substance: *mind is the limitlessness that endeavors to define itself*. -- to be Pure Reason. All the foregoing follows upon the main thesis of the Cynical theory of Intentionality: all our beliefs, thoughts, wishes, dreams and desires are about things -- are they good or not, how can they be included into the open set of the Given part of substance and how will they change the present Meaning of Inertia of the Given alliance. Equally, the words we use to express these beliefs and other mental states are about things and possible operations under them¹².

One may think about things that exist, but another one may have beliefs, hopes and dreams about things which do not exist, as when a child expects Santa Claus. How does the Cynical theory of Intentionality plan to explain why this may happen? This kind of thinking about objects which do not exist is rooted in such a cause as this: due to the fact that the necessity is the beauty, one's mind (which somehow realizes the "feedback rule" for the interaction of the Given union with this universe) produces dream-images which are responses to one's internal wish to interact with a beauty (which may not be the necessity)¹³. All these dreams-thoughts-illusions-fantasies¹⁴ are built on the basis of three laws which are the Laws of

exist -- the essence of one is contained in one's striving to be *the* singularity but it is not contained in the community and unity of one with others; it is the singularity, however, which brings rest. BIB:(4.45),[#59]

¹² "And thought thinks itself because it shares the nature of the object of thought; for it becomes an object of thought in coming into contact with and thinking its objects, so that thought and object of thought are the same." BIB:(1.10),[1072^α,20] Cynicism asserts that a thought and the object of thought strives to become the same.

¹³ As a result, if we have the statement "John is thinking about a unicorn" the answer to the question 'How are we using 'unicorn' in 'John believes that there are unicorns?' is: John somehow needs to use the unicorn or the idea of a unicorn because it (either the idea or the unicorn itself) can decrease John's Meaning of Inertia. This is the rule of the Pragmatic Esthetic: if John believes in something -- it exists, and only other beings can change John's mind concerning unicorns.

¹⁴ Cynicism asserts that one cannot have the experience of ideas which fall into order of themselves and without any known cause -- such as are one's desires, such are one's necessities. Any thought has its own cause to exist -- if one has a proposition which in

Cynical Dialectic: the Law of the Unity and Struggle of Opposites; the Law of the Transformation of Quality to Quantity and the Law of Negation of Negation¹⁵.

3

This work gives an idea that one of both signs and zero are the Singularity!

being thought is thought as a *necessity*, it is an 'a priori opinion' that is caused to be by and causes to exist the continuous interaction with others but it is not an ultimate a priori judgement that, in fact, does not exist. The statement "All bodies are heavy" confirms that only interaction can be known as the only a priori factor of this universe. BIB:(12.00),[B2-4]

¹⁵ If one can have only opinions, one is closer to pure knowledge the bigger one's Measure of Reasonableness is. It should be understood that one is neither wrong nor right but one knows a smaller or bigger part of the only pure truth. One's expectation of an event that may happen is based on one's faith in *things* hoped for, the conviction of things not seen (BIB:(2),Hebrew,11). But, can one ask: "What about things that are going to be in the future? Does a man have the criterion of these within himself? When he thinks things *will be*, do they actually happen, for him, as he thought they would?" (BIB:(19.54),[178c]) The Cynical explanation of the fact that not all "things hoped for" can become reality is: first, the DEATH of a part of substance may happen in different mediums and no one can foresee which piece of a Given part will become Ether and how other pieces will unite, and this is called 'Chance'; second, in the case of a human mind, the presence of Cancer causes a permanent error in any attempt at an adequate consideration of Reality. Therefore, only one's mistakes cause the deductive method to look like it opposes the inductive but, in reality, they do not oppose each other: in any case, "for the end should not be just any last thing, but the best(BIB:(1.10),[194^α,30])". I state that what appears as real in certain respects, consequently appears as illusive from another point of view only because of Chance's and Cancer's existence(Axiom #9, Propaedeutics): what seems as reasonable may become actual; what is actual is reasonable(BIB:(Hegel, Preface to *Philosophy of Law*, p.XIX)) -- the anthropological may become the true and real. BIB:(4.45),[#50]