


Florentin Smarandache Feng Liu

NEUTROSOPHIC DIALOGUES



2004

Xiquan

This book can be ordered in a paper bound reprint from:

Books on Demand
ProQuest Information & Learning
(University of Microfilm International)
300 N. Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346, Ann Arbor
MI 48106-1346, USA
Tel.: 1-800-521-0600 (Customer Service)
<http://wwwlib.umi.com/bod/>

Copyright 2004 by Xiquan
510 E. Townley Ave., Phoenix
AZ 85020, USA

More books can be downloaded from the following **Digital Library**:
<http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/eBooks-otherformats.htm>

Peer Reviewers:

Dr. M. Khoshnevisan, School of Accounting and Finance, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland 9726, Australia.

Prof. Dragoş Constantinescu, College of Arts and Letters, Rm. Vâlcea, Romania.

Dr. Jean Dezert, Office National d'Établissement et de Recherches Aérospatiales (ONERA), 29, Avenue de la Division Leclerc, 92320 Chantillon, France.

ISBN: 1-931233-72-1

Standard Address Number: 297-5092

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

On the Cultural Contrast: East-West, preface by F. Liu	4
Abstract by the Translator to the Chinese Translation of Neutrosophics.....	12
Preface by the Translator to the Chinese Translation of Neutrosophics.....	13
Biography of the Translator.....	18
Publication Review by F. Liu.....	22
Annotation in the Chinese Translation of Neutrosophics.....	27
Neutrosophic Dialogues.....	51
Absolute Truth.....	68
Science, Destiny, and Buddhism.....	79
Call for Papers.....	94
Neutrosophy and Dialectic, postface by Anthony Mansueto.....	95

On the Cultural Contrast: East-West

(preface)

Liu Feng (surname, given name)

Dept. of Economic Information, School of Information, Xi'an University of Finance and Economics
44 Cuihua Nan Road, Xi'an, Shaanxi, 710061, P. R. China

1. Introduction

Thanks to Dr. Smarandache for his interest in Chinese culture. I cannot decline his warm request to write the preface, even with my fragments of knowledge – no insight nor wisdom, and therefore can be misleading. I have been extremely regretful for my ideological errors and mistakes in previous publications, especially those concerning Buddhism. As I mentioned in this book, I am not qualified.

So please note that I am limited in my knowledge and enlightenment of the giant of Chinese heritage. I can express nothing more than my personal bias.

In what aspect can Chinese culture be distinctive from western ones?

The difference between Western and Eastern cultures, on the whole, lies in the distinctive points of views: the differential view and the integral view.

In medicine, Chinese traditional science regards humans as a part of the universe, and as being in constant exchange with the universe. Problems occur when humans lose the balance in the exchange, when selfishness surpasses their natural harmony. In contrast, Western medicine cares more about the scars when the harmony is broken. However, the scar is much more easily cured than the maintenance of the harmony. This is the reason Western culture never solves the problem of health. Unfortunately our Eastern culture is being lost while fewer and fewer people are qualified to inherit, resulting in the blind following of the West. Our nation's people are losing confidence in their own culture!

In education, Chinese classics place special emphasis on the harmony of humans with the universe, to maintain inner balance and peace. This kind of peace is worth far more than money and power that often serve private purposes. In this sense, our ancients are educated to abandon selfishness to maintain the peace – first the internal peace, then the peace of family, extending to the peace of society. In spite of wars, this manner of education has continued from generation to generation, for thousands of years, and proved excellent for society. In contrast, Western children are educated to compete with others for self or group interest, growing up in a struggle or conflict, leading to wars – losing the harmony.

In science, Chinese culture pays more attention to spiritual harmony than material wealth. Here arises the basic problem: Should human beings chain themselves to wealth? Should they become slaves to it, or free themselves from it? We find most wealthy people are merely slaves, and more and more followers choosing to be slaves. How can this kind of civilization bring happiness to society? Unfortunately Eastern people are turning to the West. more and more people prefer a material civilization to spiritual harmony. As a matter of fact, those material civilizations are merely illusions. We are too infant toward the real understanding of nature and the universe, but persisting fast in the most primitive knowledge called science.

In politics, Chinese prefer a natural discipline, a natural order in the society. This means that everyone is educated, starting during childhood, to abide by the natural law, namely Dao, never to indulge oneself. Western people, on the other hand, are educated to free themselves from all such doctrines, to maintain the “real” freedom with which a blind people accept power in everything: freedom in all. This includes sexual pleasures, and is especially visible in public media, leading to the heavy pollution in society that ruins one

generation after another. However, wise men are always the minority, even the few, seemingly fooled.

As the result, Western people become more and more arrogant towards Eastern people; they become more blinded living in such a polluted society. The nation is marching quickly to the edge of war due to such arrogance toward other nations, and the world is moving closer toward its own ruin.

Ironically, the East is following the dust of the West!

What can we do with current cultural disaster and save the world?

Some wise people have appealed to save the world, which is in trouble. It has proven ineffective in Western manners; the only way lies in the East, especially in traditional Chinese culture, or specifically, Confucianism and Buddhism.

2. The Distinct Perspectives of the Universe

How much do we understand the universe?

Due to my ignorance of physics, it is difficult to expand upon this topic. However, I reserve the right to ask, “How much do Western people understand the universe?” In a science report at the Great Hall of People, Beijing, the world famous Nobel Prize winner Tsung-DaoLee said that scientists understand no more than 10 percent of the matter discovered. He implied that our highly advanced science and technology are merely primitive in society.

What limitations do we find?

Despite being a blind man myself, I am trying to determine the reasons for the limitations:

The first is the limitation of devices upon which experiments rely. Through three-dimensional devices we see the three-dimensional world, but scientists argue that we live in a multi and infinite-dimensional world. What devices can show such a world?

Another limitation lies in the accuracy. There are no devices that are perfectly accurate.

Furthermore, people have assumed the determinate measurement, despite being ignorant of the indeterminate aspect of the same world, such as the universality of wave-corpusele duality as a basic form of metabolism in the nature. This results in the intentionality of everything – intentional economics, intentional politics, intentional manner of education, even intentional research philosophy of science. In contrast, Laozi proposed the wuwei philosophy thousands years ago.

In general, for every science there exist exact axioms which are regarded as being absolute, but are unfortunately always broken through. They exhibit more or less our subjectivity: a kind of illusion.

The second reason might lie in the essence of the universe. Western culture examines the outer appearances, never reaches the internal appearances, while the Eastern culture directly touches the internal ones, rather than the outer illusions that bewilder people.

The Eastern view of the universe focuses on its change – Ten thousand times change in appearance doesn't depart from its nature. What remains unchanged is the genuine nature, hence come the (so called) religions of the East.

What is the genuine nature of the universe?

To help us see through the appearances, Laozi proposed that (in my personal interpretation – I am not an expert.):

There is Dao (as the symbol of nature, the natural way or the natural discipline),
but not what we call (what we describe).

- He might imply that when we conceptualize something, what we have achieved as the concept is

simply false.

- We can name things, but the name can never be properly understood.
- He might imply that the names in our conception are far from the truth. The genuine name can be inexpressible in our eyes.

Do we share the same genuine nature with that of the universe?

Take “the universe” for example. Do we refer to the outer phenomena or the nature? If to the nature, the universe might be ourselves in limitless extensions, and everything can be in the nature of ourselves; we are god by nature. However, we normally fail to see the truth in our nature, and thus are blind to the nature of the universe too.

Once seeing this fact, we do feel the incompleteness, imperfection and shallowness of science compared to the Chinese culture. Even though humans can conceptualize everything, we never reach the edge of truth in such a manner. Although scientists have suggested a unified field of existence, it is still a kind of dream in present scientific manner.

From Eastern heritage however, we know that we share the same genuine nature with that of the universe and have to keep harmony. Through proper educations, especially Buddhism, countless people do succeed to see the ultimate true world (e.g., See <http://www.larong.com/larong/fawang/bio.html>. For those interested,, please find sources at <http://www.drba.org/index.htm>, the City of Ten Thousand Buddhas [CTTB, USA] for English, and another site see <http://www.larong.com/> [mirror: <http://www.physics.utah.edu/~junyu/larong/index.html>] for Chinese).

Do we have wisdom eyes to see our nature, and how can we reach?

In Chinese culture, everyone has the power and wisdom to see and even to reach the reunification (We are in unification by nature.) of man and heaven (the universe) once we get rid of all our improper, false and misleading ideas that have dominated us in limitless life cycles. It is our false opinions that govern the ups and downs of our fate, not the external god (See Liaofan’s Four Lessons, <http://www.amtb.org.tw/e-bud/liaofan.HTM>, <http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/Text/ChangingDestiny/index.html>, <http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/Text/LiaoFan/index.html>).

Do we have enough courage to change our opinions? Although rare in the history, there are plenty, who successfully escaped our maze of illusions (They are what men call Buddas, the successful people. See Master Chin-Kung’s web sites, <http://www.amtb.org.tw>, <http://www.amtb.org.sg> for the introduction of Buddhism.).

Is science a kind of truth or illusion?

If it is a truth, why does it need countless evolution or revolution so that one can never assure the validity of the current stage of art? Is there any science that can hold true for 5000 years, or even 5 million or 5 billion years? Therefore, it is almost or completely an illusion, due to the extents of our enlightenment on the absolute truth.

How can science be illusion? The answer is very simple. Are scientists free from suffering (vexation, wars, unhappiness, etc.)? Are they gods? Of course they are not. Then how can you be sure they are representing the truth and nothing false? As a matter of fact, they are reflecting the same realm of the universe as we do, even the misunderstood universe. Ants live in their own world and have their own characteristics of perception and language of truth (of science), so do birds and humans. When false beliefs are repeated ten thousand times, they become truth (As was demonstrated in our common paper “Logic: a Misleading Concept”, opinion can be made up of field, and when more and more people gather strength [accumulate believes] to it, it can become a force, even a misleading force.). This is a cause-effect chain. “Truth” is merely what the majority believes but is far from validity. In this sense, science plays merely the

portrayal of the internal realm – a representation of the inner heart. By no means can we change our fate without any inner change (internal change, or the enlightenment of the mind).

Then what role does science play, and what can be the truth rather than illusions?

Apparently science is currently more a means to achieve wealth than the true civilization, because it is developed to satisfy human greediness and thus leads to wars and ultimate ruin.

The crucial point lies in the real change of destiny. How can we believe in such a change when the genuine harmony (the most genuine treasure) is being lost?

In which way can we definitely reach the change of destiny?

The natural discipline, or the natural order (natural law), the natural way of the universe is actually the same as that of ourselves. We are merely an image, a “holograph” of the universe. Everything in the universe lies in our instinct. We are, by nature, in unification with the universe. Why then, should we seek the external universe?

Therefore Buddhism teaches us the right way to discover ourselves, to discover external things, and to discover the universe through the change of an internal world. The result is the alteration of the fates of individuals, or of a society, or even that of a nation, and to the change of mankind. Meanwhile, all our brilliant cultures: Confucianism, Laozi, etc., are illustrating the same truth. Liaofan’s Four Lessons is a classical example.

3. The Integration of Logic

What is the essential distinction of logic from conventional description?

There is originally no track, but men trample out the road.

The essence of fact and rule has been described once in our common paper, “Logic: a Misleading Concept,” as is again discussed below:

- Fact as a kind of opinion exists in a form of field, and everyone adds his opinion to this field to form a cumulative effect.
- When the field is strong enough to convince a portion of people, it becomes logic – facts or rules.
- However, people are normally self centered. Essentially, they base their opinions on their different backgrounds in both space and time domains. This adds indeterminacy to the logic, as illustrated in neutrosophy as the limitless versions of opinions.

For this reason we need to have a fresh new definition of logic, as the contradiction between logic director and logic implementation as shown in my presentation to the ICM2002, “On both A and Anti-A in Neutrosophics of Logic in Excitation-Inhibition Perspective.” For example, logic A can be implemented into a variety of versions, even Anti-A.

Anything about the dynamic integral of logic?

In this differential-integral contradictory point of view, logic becomes a yin-yang problem, as is illustrated in multi-agent description in my presentation above, leading to a dynamic weight methodology.

Without this contradiction, how can we demonstrate logic as a composite force?

4. A Different Look upon Neutrosophy

Is there any counterpart of neutrality in Chinese culture?

The neutrality in neutrosophics seems similar to “Madhyma-pratipada” and “Mean” in Chinese culture, which might mean proper (no mental move, no self consciousness added, as if no self exists, I believe): neither left nor right (Doctrine of Mean may refer to our mind move: neither left [affirmation, as being] nor right [negation, as non being]. So it may mean to abandon our mind move [vikalpa, my metaphor as vain intention] rather than to blend or merge our mind moves), but neutrosophy is conveying different meanings at present. For example, if A stands for white and Anti-A represents black, then Neut-A should mean gray. However, either black or white can add to our subjectivity and should not be adhered to (As we are blind to the ultimate truth, it can be more wrong to imagine the being and non-being.). Otherwise, we are unconsciously moving into this dimensional world that inhibits our access to the “infinite dimensional” world.

Why does the Chinese counterpart refer to the infinite dimensional world?

According to Laozi’s saying, we should neither stick to the idea “it is white” nor to “it is black”, that is to say, not to any idea, nor to “it is gray”, or, still we realize nothing (opinion) on us even we can feel it (as if we turn a blind eye to it, paying no heed).

In the taiji figure, there is a “wuji” hidden behind “taiji” in the figure (the circle), which bears yin and yang. Men normally care too much about the fragmental details of the universe to maintain the hidden integral. In fact, every mind is gifted with the gene of a universal mind: the integral of our ultimate inner nature, which is identical to that of the universe. This is what I call yang in I-Ching (the originator). It is formless, shameless, and timeless-the complete opposite world from our believed consciousness. I call it the prior natal aspect, or wuji in the Taiji figure, or possibly Dao in Daoism. In other words, every distinction (every idea, e.g., good in contrast to evil - When good is born, evil is simultaneous born from this distinction. You like something because you hate something else, so are truth and falsity.) is born from something seemingly void in form called wuji. This is the starting point to understand Dao as the symbol of nature, the natural way or the natural discipline, or the starting point to understand Buddha-the enlightenment of genuine nature.

Wisdom in essence is not a set of signs that point to the ultimate truth, but to our real enlightenment toward the ultimate truth (See my recent paper Truth and Absolute Truth in Neutrosophic Logic.).

Is there a component of philosophism in neutrosophy?

However, Dr. Smarandache is blending A with Non-A all the time For example, he blends God with a malicious God to create their neutrality “DevGod” – a monster. In this sense:

- If someone lives in heaven, he should have gone to the hell to experience the suffering. It is only reasonable in the sense that heaven is not a perfect place where samsara still exists.
- If someone is doing good, he should have to commit something evil as well – sheer nonsense. It is only reasonable for an ordinary person, in the sense that his merit is mixed more or less with selfishness.
- When someone is praying for truth, he should have been praying for evil as well, or for hell as well; this is a misleading explanation. It is only reasonable in that his selfishness brings him to the hell while he prays for heaven.
- DevGod may refer to our ordinary person with both tendencies. However, man can eventually become enlightened on the ultimate truth himself and choose the right route.
- Chinese culture teaches us to follow truth, eliminating evil deeds and ideas, to save us from the sea of misery.
- As to truth, in contrast to our common sickness (If no sickness exists in the eyes of wisdom, there would have been no truth at all.), Chinese culture teaches us to abandon our old propensity – the former idea of “good” or “bad,” ambition, etc., to see our genuine selves, not to blend good with bad

nor to blend good ambition with malicious ambition.

In this sense Dr. Smarandache is not showing wisdom at the moment. On the contrary, he may be doing something philosophism.

Although he claimed to base his theory on the summarization of all the logic schools of the West, he might lose insight in oriental heritages to which even the Chinese are blind, due to the abandon of such education in our modern history. It is true that he did fail to catch the oriental cultures such as Buddhism and Hindu philosophy.

5. The Unintentional Science

Is oriental culture a kind of science?

There lies a crucial difference in that Western science seeks the exterior solutions outside the heart. However, our ancient sages illustrated that humans are an integral part of the universe, and all the phenomena never skip out of the heart. And very fortunately, many wise men did succeed in cultivating their hearts to testify to the profound truth. So our Eastern classics focus on our inner cultivation.

However people, including the overwhelming majority of the Chinese, would regard such education as being an extra (to life or science). Then I tried to refer to http://www.amtb.org.sg/2/2_10/2_10_1/2_10_1.htm, a link in the Dallas Buddhist Association (<http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/index.html>), to find an explanation, but unfortunately in Chinese.. Please contact the corresponding Taiwan or Singapore websites, where there are plenty of English versions of texts and videos of Buddhism, to request the standard translation.

“What is Dao (Tao)? It is the natural principle all over the universe, the natural order, the essentiality of nature. The great universe has its order and rule, where the education of ancient sages roots. Education stems from here, and a human being has to obey the natural principle –Dao. In our Chinese notion of the integral of humans and nature; heaven, earth and human are an integral whole. Humans should understand the heart of heaven. What is the heart of heaven? The natural law, or natural rule. For humans, it is the human relationship, of husband-wife, brothers and sisters, monarch-subjects, friends, etc. It is the natural rule, not regulations or systems, nor schools or doctrines. Individuals conforming to it are said to practice Daoism. There is practice; there is gain bodily and heartily, called virtue or morality, which is the partial standard of daily conduct. However, this partial standard should accord to the universal Dao and natural law. This is where the education of ancient sages roots.

The Chinese emphasized education starting in a prenatal stage. A pregnant mother should be upright in heart, truthful in appearance; for every emotion: pleasure, anger, sorrow or joy, influences the fetus. The Chinese understood this principle, and therefore their babies were gifted, and developed in the ten months of pregnancy. Parents had the responsibility for their children. As I often mentioned, disaster falls nowadays, and still is imminent in the future, why? I have only one answer, “Suffer comes from disobeying the olds (the Buddha, Laozi, Confucius, etc.)” It is the power of the culture that makes China survive for thousands of years, and the marrow of that culture lies in education. The rulers were supported by people, for they didn’t rule with their own imperial edicts, but with the sage’s education of Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism. The society maintained peace, enjoying the wise period of prosperity, which was attributed to the ancient education, so they benefited from the olds’ teachings. Since the Republic of China, unfortunately, Chinese people have lost their national pride, and have therefore fallen into a tragic state. An overwhelmingly large number worship and keep the blind faith in foreign countries, as to overthrow our own culture. Yes, but is there any better substitute to benefit people? If no, troubles arise.

Have you seen the pernicious aspect of current science?

In spite of material achievements in Western sciences, people still suffer from endless desires for wealth. For this reason life becomes competitions, upgraded as struggles and conflicts, and the world would thus become a battlefield, in which everyone has to fight for a living: from scientists, and students, to children. They are educated to set up their enemies. However, there are strictly limited resources in the world, not enough for such endless desires. Western sciences are causing the world to resort to wars.

The appeal to peace has always been too weak to conquer the endless scientific desires, because people educated in such a manner are too ignorant of the danger hidden in such sciences. The most eminent people in the world are normally “well educated,” and this sort of knowledge dominates the public media, and therefore dominates the people.

Ironically people are proud of this kind of education, and more arrogant with the advance of science, especially the United States, followed by a group of European countries, and then the world.

Still more ironically, China is diligently following the dust of the West, ignoring and even blind to its own treasures.

Of course, science has no sense of merit or evil. However, men apply the most advanced technologies in weapons, hundred or thousand times more powerful than the prototype that exploded in 1945. Are you proud of such a dangerous world full of atomic killers which can destroy the globe? Of course not. However, the media are always playing the role of peacemakers, as if people have put an end to their desires.

Can God save us?

How can men solve the problem? People are naively counting on God to save the world . Where is God? Is he omnipotent enough to save us? I am afraid not – our destiny is created by ourselves, not by God; He can merely help us see the cause and effect, but can never change the cause-effect principle (The principle is most clearly illustrated in Liao-Fan’s Four Lessons.).

How can a blind science lead the world?

The point is, ”How much do Western people understand science?” What on earth should we learn from the West?

On the contrary, Chinese classic culture based all its theory on the unification of man and heaven (the universe), i.e., on the unified field, illustrated in Confucianism, Daoism, Buddhism, etc. This is actually human nature, our hidden instinct, or our genuine wisdom. Unfortunately, due to our blindness, we common people prefer a self-centered world (the so called freedom) over the real unification, for which we have developed all our illusions that lead to disaster.

To reach the supreme science, we need first to open our eyes to wisdom, to abandon our blindness forever. This is what all the Chinese culture, the unintentional science or wuwei science in modern language, concerns.

I welcome instruction on account of my little talent and learning.

References:

Chin-Kung: Reestablishing Morality and Educating the Youngsters – An Interview, 2002,

http://www.amtb.org.sg/2/2_10/2_10_1/2_10_1.htm.

F. Liu, F. Smarandache: Logic: a Misleading Concept – A Contradiction Study toward Agent’s Logic Ontology, Proceedings of the First International Conference on Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Logic, Set, and Probability, University of New Mexico, USA, 2002,

<http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/NeutrosophicProceedings.pdf>, also in *Libertas Mathematica* 2002.

F. Liu: On Both A and Anti-A in Neutrosophics of Logic in Excitation-Inhibition Perspective, presentation to

the ICM2002 Beijing, see this book.

Suodajikanbu (Mandarin translation of a Tibetan name): Buddhism and Science,

http://www.larong.com/larong/online/buddhism_science/index.html.

Liao-Fan Yuan (ancient): Liaofan's Four Lessons, <http://www.amtb.org.tw/e-bud/liaofan.HTM>,

<http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/Text/ChangingDestiny/index.html>, <http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/Text/LiaoFan/index.html>.

Abstract by the Translator of the Chinese Translation of Neutrosophics

Neutrosophy bases its exploration of every macro and micro structure from science and technology to literature and art on the joint Eastern and Western cultures. As well as in unity of opposites perspective, trying to construct a unifying field from logics to a transdisciplinary study, which surpasses the boundaries between natural science and social science. Neutrosophy tries to solve the indeterminacy problem that universally appears in current cognitive, information, system sciences, economics, quantum dynamics, and so on; to reform current sciences, natural or social, with an open methodology; to promote their innovation and supersession. As the first Chinese translation of the study, the work is divided into two major parts: neutrosophic philosophy and neutrosophic mathematics, the former as the basis for neutrosophic research, and the latter as the new generation of classical fuzzy mathematics, to theoretically support all the applied studies. Welcome undergraduates, postgraduates, researchers and teachers in science philosophy, fuzzy mathematics, information science, artificial intelligence, system science and other fields refer, join in and help in the development.

Preface by the Translator to the Chinese Translation of Neutrosophics

Liu Feng (surname, given name)

1. Science Puzzles

Why was neutrosophy born?

Neutrosophy originates in 1995 in the US. It bases its exploration of every macro and micro structure from science, technology to literature and art on the Eastern and Western joint cultures, in unity of opposites perspective, trying to construct a unifying field from logics to a transdisciplinary one, which exceeds the boundaries between natural science and social science. Neutrosophy tries to solve the indeterminacy problem universally appearing in current cognitive, information, system sciences, and economics, quantum dynamics, and so on; to reform current sciences, natural or social, with an open methodology, to promote their innovation and upgrade. As a blank page in China, I am formally denominating the subject and introducing it to China.

Is science the truth?

One of the most outstanding problems in current sciences is the monotonic logic used in knowledge representation, processing, and communication: values of either true or false that fail to cope with conflicts and contradictions. Consequently from artificial intelligence, such as a computer network, database, information engineering, e-business, e-administration, they are more or less in a blind alley. The problems appear to occur in fuzzy mathematics of coordinate logic in , but are essentially in the fundamental structure. They invoke the re-recognition and restructuring of basic concepts in philosophy, logics, sets, cognitive science, information science and many other fields.

China is learning to follow the West, but only on the surface, ignoring the intrinsic structure of science and infrastructure implied in the scientific concepts and principles (the infrastructure inside infrastructures), and is therefore unable to construct skyscrapers, nor to be independent in science. China is tiring of blindly following in the footsteps of the West.

Science, often considered as the eternal truth, is not eternal at all. It is in a constant state of dynamic alternation, metabolism, and self-negation self-cleansing. An eternal science in science, if such a thing exists, would eventually be overthrown by followers. Science is a battle, and neutrosophy is the science of this stratagem and tactic.

The theory of relativity, as a most eminent science, is based on the speed constant, which is currently being overthrown by people.

Have men realized the critical, indeterminate aspects and the openness of science?

The fatal constraint of science development in history includes:

1. Over-blindness in the following instead of self negation.
2. Sedulously seeking exactitude so as to ignore the indeterminate mode.
3. Closed conception ideology; no way to be extended and opened to a general level.

Quantum dynamics, semantic concepts, logic and knowledge are not exact in nature, but we are seeking completeness without vagueness. Although science is born from intangible immateriality (I am not referring to nihilism, but to an intangible fountainhead.) and shaped in materiality, in relativity perspective, the material shape is not fixed at all. It is relative, not absolute. It grows up coping with specific situations and

thus forming specific cultures. In other words, science is essentially immaterial, in which “essentially” refers to its nature, and “immaterial” refers to its being unfixed or unconfined to any shape. However, people are too accustomed to the precise scientific forms to see the indeterminate aspect in structure as another part of science.

Einstein proposed in his unifying field research a unity of opposites in physics: material unites with spirit; time unites with space. Logic automation as the backbone of computer science is always focusing on what is true and what is false. To affirm truth, one has to negate what is false, and vice versa. They seem contradictory in the fundamental definition: no unity at all? Truth containing false and false containing truth is a universal phenomenon in nature. They imply, bear, and complement each other as twins. This prompts us to ask, “Is there an intermediate state between them? Can ‘both true and false, neither true nor false’ be logical?” Is logic a closed static form or an open and dynamic practice? (I have shown in the International Congress of Mathematicians [ICM2002 Beijing] that logic is a unity of conception and implementation) Can rational knowledge be separated from perception and practice? Logic never provides a satisfactory answer.

In semantics, “new words” and “known words” are an open, dynamic structure. “New” contains “known” and “known” contains “unknown;” they are open to each other.

Accordingly, scientific concepts should be open. It is denominable but not restricted to its name – name, denominable, but not the normal name.

Open science – science is rational but not restricted to only reason: Dao, daoable, but not the normal Dao.

Contradiction is the eternal momentum of science. Science sets up its opponents by birth. “Why seek the dense willow trees and bright flowers (an enchanting sight in spring time) till the road seems ending in the hills and streams?” (People normally infer from Lu You’s poem that one doesn’t realize another prospect, just with a change of mind, until the extremity of a path.) Neutrosophy seeks the new prospect at its birth, gestates the new prospect with dialect model, and develops the new prospect in a scientific manner. Neutrosophy replaces the conventional isolated, static, and partial structure with an indeterminate, open structure of the unity of opposites. It gets rid of the stale and brings forth the fresh to create new generation science using contradictions. Is there another (conventional) science that can positively gestate contradiction from its own structure? If not, how can it be a real science? Many scientists fail to see the self-contradiction because they are in the maze; they are too clever to be bewildered (Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise.).

2. On Mixing Science with Philosophy, Literature and Art

Do we need a unifying theory?

Professor Smarandache creatively applies the structure of unity of opposites in literature and art creations, and therefore began the avant-garde movement in literature-paradoxism that sets up a new trend. He also proposes a serious question: Can science be combined with literature, art, and philosophy? Accordingly he builds up neutrosophy, to mathematize philosophy and reciprocally, to form a transdisciplinary, multilayered, horizontal and vertical exchange and merge the immense subjects.

I have to admire the great pioneering of the current scientific age, but meanwhile, he is faced with world puzzles. For example, what is the original source of science? What is its direction? And what are those of literature, art, philosophy and even religion? Neutrosophy tries to construct a trans-continent, trans-region, trans-age, trans-discipline holographic unifying field that surpasses the boundary between natural and social sciences.

I agree with him on this point from an oriental perspective. Natural science and social science are not divided in nature; they are a unity in essence. Einstein, for example, admired Buddhism since both physics and Buddhism focus on the originality of nature, society and humanity. Our traditional Chinese culture tells

me that they all come from the same original source.

A crucial question arises. It concerns the interrelation between matter and spirit, to which natural and social sciences present their different partialities. From my apperception in traditional Chinese culture, they should be considered one entity, not as the saying that one determines the other. The error lies in the incompleteness and partiality of humanity.

So, they are sure to be combined or reunited, for they are originally one family.

How can we find a unifying way?

I have to maintain a critical mind towards neutrosophy. On the one hand, Smarandache is indiscriminately applying his neutrosophic formula regardless of situations and cultures, and very likely to formularize the yinyang dialectic philosophy. He is a writer, and artist, but also a mathematician, and it is very promising that he sometimes leans toward mathematical formula. On the other hand, as a seedling, neutrosophy is open to Chinese, actively seeking traditional Chinese cultures, especially general outlooks upon the world like Daoism and Buddhism. He is therefore sparing no effort to induce the study to the Chinese, looking forward to the dense willow trees and bright flowers in Chinese. As possibly the first Chinese friend in this area, I gained his respect with my prompt introduction of traditional Chinese culture, with my ignorance, and with errant areas in opinion.

It would be incongruous, in my personal opinion, to base the unification on Western science and technology, it would be the perception of heaven in the eyes of a frog deep at the bottom of a well: smaller and smaller. (As is mentioned later, science and technology are in fact the portrayal of the human mind.) No more than ten percent of matter is known to scientists, said Nobel Prize winner, Tsung-Dao Lee in a science report at the Great Hall of the People, Beijing. Lee's position is that our highly advanced science and technology are still primitive in society. People have strayed too far from the appropriate comprehension of social science to have a unified look at both sciences. We therefore have no way other than through traditional Chinese culture, in the perspective of our ancient sages, to achieve the unification. This might be the only route, since our culture has spread throughout the world, including the areas of science and technology. At this time, science only understands a small portion of the universe, much like what a frog would see from the bottom of a well. Unfortunately our treasures, including Chinese classics, have been lost to modern people. Are we qualified to say that we are Chinese?

3. Of Excitation and Inhibition of Yinyang: Youwei and Wuwei

Can the supreme wisdom be captured?

Although many things, such as postnatal ability, can be pursued, some, such as prenatal (innate) wisdom, cannot. Postnatal ability can be acquired through youwei (I prefer intentionality over action in interpretation, since it might refer more to mental action.), but innate wisdom can be acquired only through wuwei. (I prefer unintentionality over inaction, since it refers more to mental inaction)

Unlike other sciences that challenge postnatal abilities, neutrosophy challenges the innate wisdoms of human beings. Its development relates more to wuwei sciences, which Western sciences cannot catch up with.

4. Author's Background Compared with Oriental Culture

As a Westerner, despite significant contributions in some areas, Smarandache still remains in some ways ignorant to the reality of China, and even biased toward some problems, due to the sharp contrast of Eastern and Western cultures. This is a normal phenomenon. There is no need to pursue or admire without a critical mind.

Neutrosophy aims to establish an intrinsic description, because it is too partial merely in perspective of <A> rather than in the interrelation with others. So <A> is always accompanied by <Non-A> and even <Anti-A>, somewhat analogous to “intentionality and unintentionality.” The Chinese inaction (wuwei) means non-action (mantal) in the action, not the absolute no. However, neutrosophy doesn’t appropriately reveal this point. (See our dialogues in this book.) Instead, it describes the <Neut-A> as the mixture, as in the inheritance of genes. Our Chinese culture tells us not to persist in appearance; one has to perceive the essence with the supreme wisdom of wuwei.

Although Smarandache stresses the wisdom of neutrality in the subject name translation, it still differs fundamentally, I feel, from “Madhyma-pratipada” and “Mean” in Chinese culture. Although neutrosophy stresses “neither stick to <A> nor to <Anti-A>” in description; our Chinese culture shows in depth (“When the mind is either being or non-being, it falls into the trap of affirmation. When the mind is neither being nor non-being, it falls into the trap of negation.” Either affirmation or negation is a trap from which one must free oneself in order to reach suunyataa [the ultimate reality], Ch'an Buddhism: Logical and Illogical, <http://ccbs.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/ew27057.htm>), not simply as blending <A> with <Non-A>. Blending a black coat with a white coat doesn’t show the originality (the true face) of the wearer.

He fails to catch the essence, and errs in many philosophic problems, especially Eastern philosophies. However, he opens his mind to learn about Chinese cultures from me.

Regarding religions, he can propose such a silly question as, “Can God commit suicide?” Yet I know he does so out of kindness, and it is a reflection of Western society. I tried to answer his inquiry as best I could. As far as the equity of men and women, Westerners deflect the subject to the sexual life in a matriarchate, far away from the essence.

Nonetheless, the author exhibits his keen discernment on some issues such as materiality of spirit, spirituality of matter, retrogression in evolutionary progress, progress in retrogression, anti-human-rights in human rights’ propaganda, non-democracy in the democratic system, and inequality in an equal society. If we Chinese can objectively regard the Western society with impersonality, like him, who would blindly admire the Western society?

5. Barriers of Science is the Representation of Internal Barriers of Human Beings

Through my knowledge of traditional Chinese culture, I am beginning to realize that everything in the world is no more than representations of our hearts. Mental realms are merely the portrayals of our internal selves. Therefore, science and technology are no more than reflections of an inner world, and scientific barriers are no more than the reflections of our inner barriers.

In the unified matter-consciousness perspective, we would rather lay everything down and correct our inner consciousness than pursue outer representations. This should be the only means to cure our troubles from the source.

6. The Role of Science in Social Development

Is science the biggest religion?

People look to science as though it is God, as if it can prolong lives, solve environmental crises, war, disasters, etc. However this is the fiction of science fiction. Beyond the fiction, whether science really changes the fate of human beings remains a question.

We cannot help examining our consciences: pressure from primary school to compete for the entrance to better middle school, and again competing for senior high school at junior graduation, and competing for entrance to universities, but still facing competition from society when graduating, and then seeking

postgraduate degrees, such as a PhD. Science is, on one hand, putting people through an unseen war: combat among our selves, with its unique bewitching power. On the other hand, science constitutes the biggest religion in the world (as least the blind admiration for the material world). In retrospect, has society advanced so much? Does our wisdom exceed that of the ancients?

Meanwhile, men of insight point out that science acts as a vicious power that promotes men's greediness. Because of greediness, there is no stop in human desire for science. Men, therefore, unconsciously live in the abyss of misery towards science; they sacrifice their all for this illusion.

I have to admit the goodness of science, but the greediness could be most formidable because humans are destroyed by their own greediness. If individuals continue in this manner, in what direction does society progress?

Due to my lack of knowledge, I welcome any additional instruction that readers can provide.

Biography of the Translator

Liu Feng (surname, given name)

Born in 1964 in Xi'an, China, I entered Xidian University after graduating from Xi'an Middle School, acquiring a BSc in computer engineering. I then accepted the state assignment to work in the computer center of Xi'an University of Finance and Economics. (Its former names include Xi'an Junior College, Shaanxi Business Management Institute and Shaanxi Economics and Trade Institute.) I am now an associate professor in the Department of Economic Information in the School of Information.

Why did the diligent hard worker yield nothing? Are we governed by destiny?

Many of my opportunities for overseas study proved fruitless, despite my hard work.

This seems to be a common problem, but I took the wrong stance at first. I was anxious to succeed; as I had acquired government aid for further study abroad (Information Technology Development Unit, Kingston College of Further education, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2AQ, UK, artificial intelligence, supervisor Richard Ennals, not for degrees) at the age of 21. To attain the best education in the shortest duration, I learned some qigongs. (mental and physical excises in traditional Chinese way to maintain health, “gather” energy from the universe, and “open” our unusual talent) Unbeknownst to myself, I began my unfortunate luck with my selfish intentions held fast in my mind.

It is not until recent years, when I came across some Buddhist classics, that I began to realize:

1. Everyone has goodluck and bad luck. Energetic work and great efforts don't necessarily change your luck.
2. Fate is not destined by heaven or God, but is merely a portrayal of the inner heart. An evil heart can turn good luck bad luck, and a virtuous heart can turn bad luck back into good luck. All the methods are in vain if one doesn't cut off the the power of karma (in Chinese yeli, especially for vile spawn, seed of evil, sin, bane and trouble, retribution in this life for the sins of a previous existence) in his mind.
3. Fate, in essence, is the cause-effect phenomenon of good and evil. Everyone can change their fate, which is also illustrated in detail in “Liaofan's Four Lessons,”(Liaofan Sixun in Chinese, see <http://www.amtb.org.tw/e-bud/liaofan.HTM> for the English version.) on which Master Chin Kung was invited to present in Shenzhen, China, recorded in 20 VCD disks.
4. This is really human nature, so how can a society, a nation or the world be exceptions?

Can everyone definitely change their destiny?

Everyone compromises the future when altering their fate, but, due to the propensity deeply rooted in their natures, they would take the devious route with frequent retrogressions. (See Liaofan's Four Lessons rich with examples in Chinese history.) There are plenty of examples recorded in Chinese heritage and many vivid facts around me. In February of this year (on the 9th of the first lunar month), my wife hurriedly crossed the street and was knocked nearly two meters by a speed taxi, frightening the driver along with the pale and shocked the onlookers. However, except for the severely bent bike, she was up and walking around as if nothing happened: “as if held by some people, I didn't hit the ground at all.” This good luck can be attributed entirely to her practice of Buddhism and accumulation of good deeds.

Why does an innate question remain so long? Why has it developed into a cultural puzzle?

I lost enthusiasm for computer application technology after non-degree related study in the UK, perhaps due to my misunderstanding of current science and technology, or as a result of my stubbornness. I paid more

attention to philosophic issues. Science and technology have advanced into such a recondite ness that they have ignored the most basic principle of philosophy. (I tried to seek postgraduate study, but bewildered by my choices, I had no idea what to study)

Unlike many scientists who are anxious to construct mathematical models of cognition, I discovered the infancy of mathematics, which I have illustrated in the International Congress of Mathematicians (ICM2002 Beijing). Western cognitive science seems to focus on mathematical models rather than the depth of philosophy. (As a consequence, the new achievement of neural network technology fails to bring about the qualitative change that had expected.) The Eastern giants see through the common mistakes in opinions, such wise men as Laozi, Sakyamuni, etc. who attained the Way. Unfortunately, due to a number of happenings in Chinese modern history, the great treasures of the culture have even been ignored by the Chinese. I would like to remind scientists of the world that even the inequilibrium theory is not beyond Laozi's philosophic realm. The puzzles Westerners have encountered have all been illustrated in our Eastern philosophies, but we are not gifted in our self-cultivation and practice.

Due to my keenness to this essential point, I didn't follow the Western view, but changed to another perspective instead. Is our science really advanced? As a matter of fact, science acts as no more than the silhouette of the human heart; the realm of the inner heart determines the outer realm as in science. People gamble blindly on science and blindly admire the West, without much gain from excellent Western cultures but accumulating the wastes. We are facing a profound cultural disaster in our Chinese heritage, inconceivable in depth and width – exceeding the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976 through out the mainland), by at least ten times.

What is the current cultural disaster?

We Chinese have stood for the philosophy of cultivating the inner heart since ancient times, and not to apprehend the external realms. With this principle, our Chinese classics and various religions (“religion” is a label put on by ignorant people) have achieved a splendid culture and created many eminent men in the thousands of years of history. It is a shame that a cultural desert now appears in generations of Chinese people, due to the replacement of classical Chinese with vernacular Chinese, and also to the Cultural Revolution that ruined almost all of the traditional culture. Numerous people have lost their discernment at the opening of the door, mistakenly regarding Westerners as the saints. The Chinese idiom of “Who cares whether the cat is black or white as long as it catches the mouse?” is being applied. However, a good cat is just a cat and not a sage. Money is not the primary thing. Be sure not to lose the inherent quality of China, or in other words, the characteristics of China. As the crisis goes on, China is not dying out of sons in forms, but in culture – the crisis of existing in name only.

Professor Wang Caigui's worldwide movement of Chinese classics is a step in the right direction.. As an education expert of Taiwan, he successfully spearheads the Chinese classics reciting project among children, an attempt to save the culture of China. I feel pity as I cannot convey my thought to students, although I have found something unusual through my own learning and through life. People now are changing their minds in modern society; they would rather pursue trifles than undertake something with merit. Our generations are losing our basics in a man, as the consequence of our cultural disaster.

As a product of the Chinese culture, I am unwilling to engage in the blind adoration of the west, and follow the aspects of Chinese culture in neutrosophy. Namely, the maintenance of scientific creativity by avoiding absolutes. This is just what Professor Smarandache expects.

Can we see the limitations of Western mannerisms?

Will science develop into a joint venture with religions? Neutrosophy surpassed the limits of Western philosophers like Hegel, and is seeking all possible joint ventures. People found limits in quantum dynamics, (Western) literature and art, cognitive science, information science, system science, economics, and

education; and they try to seek the way out in orient cultures. What a pity we Chinese are taking our excellent treasures as superstition. This is exactly our current cultural disaster.

The limitations of Western mannerisms are, in my personal view, the relationship between the fundamental and the incidental: Are Americans universally unselfish, living on highly advanced science and technology? Are Tibetans universally selfish, living on the most primitive science and technology? Are we attending to trifles and neglecting the essentials in the blind pursuit of advancement in science and technology? According to Dr. Wang, has Taiwan brought up a new generation with considerable education expenses? (Please see Dr. Wang's introduction to the Chinese classics reciting project for Children.) What then should I say about current education? Although science and technology bring about quantitative breakthroughs, there is no qualitative leap. On the contrary, our TV networks and computer networks are contaminating society, bringing it into disorder beyond recognition. So men of insight in Taiwan and the U.S. have to admit that the United States would be ruined from television. Is it better in our mainland?

How can we be saved from cultural disaster?

My contribution last year to the Shaanxi Association of Computer Education analyzed the English education method of Professor Zhong Daolong using the traditional "discipline, meditation and wisdom" Buddhist perspective. However, its implementation calls for a new social environment. Here I appeal to the educational world: no longer should science and technology be taken as the fundamental basis for education and state management. Instead take moral education as the principal role, and vigorously promote the classics reciting project for children in order to save the future China.

Is Western society really ideal?

A frequently asked question is really a complicated one to answer: Which is better, education at home or abroad?

1. Is Western society closer to paradise, or is it the opposite? I was deeply touched through our talks (Dr. Smarandache's and mine) in one of our ICM2002 participant's hotel, dorm 18 of Tsinghua University.
2. Both are acceptable if one is right in opinion. The foreign moon is round, no different from the Chinese moon.
3. But if it is not right, and one seeks refuge, it might be found abroad. But a friend of mine (Songyi Ye) who in 1987 emigrated to the U.S., told me that the United States is a battlefield for the young. Liao-Fan's Four Lessons tell us that there is no refuge to the destiny outside the cultivation of goodness. (I know one who does seek refuge everywhere possible in the world, until finally she had no choice but to listen to Buddhism)
4. If one is aware of mistaken opinions and wants to try the correct education, they should avoid the (senseless) busy modernization of life.
5. If one foresees the disaster of human beings, and is willing to begin a new life in the pure Buddhist land, he should avoid all temptations (however tempting), such as the so called liberty.
6. For an achiever, trying situations can serve to strengthen determination.
7. Many people, including children, are eager to seek their fortunes abroad. However, they should never forget an invaluable asset: the Chinese language, which cannot be retrieved with a fortune, because buried in it is an incomparably excellent Chinese culture. It will cause various foreign cultures to lament their insignificance before the vast ocean. Skyscrapers can be rebuilt, but our traditional Chinese culture exists as an inner pattern of a society, irretrievable when lost. (The inner pattern is universally applicable to all the outer patterns of society from "primitive society" to the ideal society based on evolutionary description. Why do I say "primitive society?" Because a sublime merit exists in primitive society and in the ideal society. Maybe everyone is free of greediness, and therefore in peerless wisdom and limitless

reach of genius, living easily and comfortably without the need of so many external machines and tools. A layman would regard them as primitive, lagging behind.

Due to my lack of knowledge, I welcome any additional instruction that readers can provide.

Publication Review

Liu Feng (surname, given name)

My research related to neutrosophy originated in 1988 from my study of artificial intelligence (A.I.) in England. Unlike those who were anxious to follow the tide, I instinctively adapted the contradiction theory. In 1988 my personal view was internationally published. In it, I found A.I. lacked an effective philosophic foundation and was becoming ominous, and also that any system of thought should conform to the core idea of unity of opposites. But this point was not widely accepted then, so I didn't continue the research, until I found neutrosophy, which joins with oriental culture. Then in such a hurry, I hastily applied our heritage, our Chinese traditional culture, Daoism, Buddhism, I-Ching, to the audacious dispute and reconstruction of logic, where modern sciences and mathematics root. But due to my insufficient background in our traditional culture, improper and incorrect opinions frequently appeared in my internationally published papers, mainly in my interpretation of Buddhism. It is the most objective, realistic and transcendent education as well as the most ideal, perfect unification of matter and spirit, of absolute truth and relative truth. Unfortunately Buddhism in my prejudicial explanations has been distorted into a sort of nihility, or absolute voidness. I deeply regret my taking my personal imaginations as reality, I have no qualifications to explain Buddhism.

In my previous papers, I have made a number of observations:

- A typical assertion is: "We don't intend to create something as judgment; for any judgment is prone to yield selfishness, such as liking, disliking, etc. Truth is written to conduct our behavior; therefore it does not lie in any sophisticated model, but in our conduct, as we often contradict our own aphorisms in behavior. Thus the issue turns to the understanding of our nature, which is not expressed or represented in any fixed form, or truth cannot be absolutely fixed in form too. (See the draft of *Truth and Absolute Truth in Neutrosophic Logic*)

The point is:

1. Although the absolutely natural mental state is free of logic, and only with the most (absolutely) right genuine instinct, it is shown as normal, as if he had his private opinion in appearance, even though he has nothing of his own in essence.
2. If one really gets rid of all ideas and minds, he is then no more than a stone – Truth is alive not dead.
3. One needs to abandon all his previous ideas only to adapt to the greatest education, and not to abandon his brain.
4. In order to acquire the genuine source of truth, independent of specific representations possibly belonging to different worlds, it is necessary to compromise, neglect even, to get rid of all the ideas, logics, conceptions, philosophies and knowledge. One must get rid of *only the ideas belonging to those misleading worlds*, in order to return to an infant nature, as a preliminary step for the cultivation of unconstrained wisdom.

- In regards to my previous assertion that "Name is merely our mental creation. It is rather a belief than an objective being, and varies among different people,"⁸ I would like to offer an explanation. In practice we have to assume that for incomplete knowledge systems as in ordinary humans, one can regard the truth as existing in relativity to an individual's practical situation. Truth exists in variant form corresponding to the variant form of individual error. The absolute truth, even there exists, is not perfectly shown in any particular form (It has no form.), and therefore is inexpressible with symbols. So in this sense, it is absolutely absurd to sedulously look for absolute truth in theoretical manner; and only in this sense is the most complete logic system by no means complete.

The point is: If there were no particular forms to carry out an education that can correct our mistakes and misunderstandings, there would have been no education one can accept. In this way, what one looks for is a proper form of education rather than the voidness.

● (The same paper: Denominable and Undenominable) “In fact, this belief of ‘it is’ is always critical (Buddhism). In Buddhist saying, all such beliefs are created by ourselves.”

The point is:

1. To our ordinary minds we normally employ our consciousness, but to those who understand the essence, it is not at all critical.
2. Buddhism doesn’t tell us to negate everything, nor is it nihilism. It tells us to completely abandon our subjectivity and really understand everything. Although there are great prejudices in every ordinary man, this is not to say absolute infallibility doesn’t exist. Nor is the world a nihility where there is nothing but our imaginations. The world appears differently to the varying mental realms of individuals.
3. Although I am a Buddhist, I am only a beginner, and like a primary school student, I am prone to mistakes and misunderstandings. But it is important to note that a tiny difference can lead us to hell. (“One word’s difference from the sutra is equal to the devil’s saying.”) So I am not necessarily conveying the finite truth of Buddhism.

● “There is no absolute fact.”(Paradoxes Review—On Neither <A> Nor <Anti-A>, Smarandache Notions (book series, Vol. 13), edited by Jack Allen, Feng Liu, Dragos Constantinescu, American Research Press 2002, pp.200-203)

The point is: absolute truth doesn’t non-exist, but is perceived through wisdom.

● (From the same paper, “Paradoxes Review”) “There is no fact, but merely beliefs created by ourselves.”

The point is that we cannot deny the existence of the genuine and ultimate reality. We cannot assert that there is nothing objective in the world but our subjectivity.

● (From “Paradoxes Review”)“When we see wind blowing a pennant, we will naturally believe we are right (that it is the wind or the pennant that moves) in our consciousness; however, it is subjective (Actually it is our minds that move.). In other words, *what we call the objective world can never absolutely be objective at all.*”

The point is that it is anti-Buddhism. Buddhism asserts that all living creatures can reach absolute objectivity through the proper education.

● (From “Paradoxes Review”) “Whenever we believe we are objective, this belief, however, is subjective too.”

This is absolutely wrong for a wise mind.

● (From “Paradoxes Review”) “In fact, all these things are merely our mental creations (also called illusions in Buddhism) that in turn cheat our consciousness: *There is neither pennant nor wind, but our mental creations.* ”

Although I am not an expert in this area, it is my conjecture that it may be our imperfect consciousness (vikalpa, as I imagine as separating (splitting) and the mind (vikalpa)) that sees the objects as the moving wind and the moving pennant, but we cannot say that the wind and the pennant are merely mental creations instead of objective items.

- (From “Paradoxes Review”) “The world is made up of our subjective beliefs that in turn cheat our consciousness. This is in fact a cumulative cause-effect phenomenon.”

The point is: We can say that we are constantly cheating ourselves with our constant subjective illusions, but we cannot say that the world is made up of subjectivity – a kind of nihilism rather than Buddhism.

- “Everyone can extricate himself out of this maze of illusion,” (In some sources it is miswritten as “...is illusion.”) said Sakyamuni, “and all the Buddhas, Bodhisattvas around the universe, their number is as many as that of the sands in the Ganges.” (Mostly in “Logic: a Misleading Concept A Contradiction Study toward Agent’ s Logic Ontology,” Proceedings of the First International Conference on Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Logic, Set, and Probability, University of New Mexico, 2002, pp.88-100, <http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/NeutrosophicProceedings.pdf>; Libertas Mathematica, University of Texas at Arlington, 2002; Los Alamos National Laboratory archives [New Mexico])

The maze refers to our subjectivity. We learn Buddhism just to conquer subjectivity and to objectively understand the world. It is shown in Buddhism Sutras that everyone can achieve it, but the maze is not directly mentioned, so it is implied.

- (From “Logic: a Misleading Concept”) “Logic is always partial.”

The point is, logic is largely mixed with subjectivity, so one becomes partial when they stick to it. This is a criticism of the conventional logic defined in truth-false figures. But for the universal truth, we cannot regard such logics as partial, for example the cause-effect principle, Daoist, or Buddhist basic principles. It is not the fault of logic, but our reflection and the way we apply it. Logic is alive; it is a wise method that is not at all fixed.

- (From “Logic: a Misleading Concept”) “Fact: a Belief rather than Truth.”

This refers to the same nihility error as was discussed above. Knowledge exists in the contradiction between the known and unknown for us. What is known to us is like a tiny water droplet and what is unknown is as expansive as an ocean. In this sense, facts or truth relative to our ordinary conception can hardly reveal all reality, but it doesn’t mean there is no reality.

- (From “Logic: a Misleading Concept”) “There is no truth and false; actually there is because the outcome has to meet someone’s desire - they are merely the attributes of a tradeoff. One false deed can be true in another perspective, e.g., eating much is good, because of the excellent taste and nourishment, but it is also bad when he gets weighted. Neutrosophy shows that a true proposition to one referential system can be false to another.”

The point is that although the same truth can be illustrated in contradictory languages relative to the specifics of individual minds, we cannot say there is no self-enlightenment. Such an assumption is arrant subjectivism and arrant anti-Buddhism. For example, ignorance of cause-effect doesn’t indicate the non-existence of cause-effect. Cause-effect universally appears in every action even every mental move (idea). Ignorance of natural Dao (natural way, natural law) doesn’t mean the non-existence of such Dao.

- (From “Logic: a Misleading Concept”) “Whenever we hold the belief ‘it is ...’, we are losing our creativity. Whenever we hold that ‘it is not ...’, we are also losing our creativity. Our genuine intelligence requires that we completely free our mind —neither stick to any extremity nor to ‘no sticking to any assumption or belief.’.... As we mentioned previously, whenever there is truth, there is also false that is born from/by truth—this abstraction (distinction) is fatal to our creativity.... Because everything believed existing, true or false, is nothing more than our mental creation, there is no need to pursue these illusions,

as illustrated in the Heart Sutra...”

The point is:

1. Creativity is an easy metaphor for our inner “wisdom,” “nature of instinct,” but is far from explicit. This is because inner wisdom germinates from a tiny seed, naturally grows up exposed to the wind and storms. It is not at all something that is created.
2. There is only a tiny step between the genuine truth and fabrication. Truth pertains to a natural way, but when anything private is added in, it deteriorates.
3. Mental creation comes from our private minds, but we cannot deny our wise beliefs. The right belief is the light in the darkness, not at all our mental creation, although normally mixed with our mental creations.
4. It is absurd for a child to comprehend the mind of someone who has a PhD. It is far more difficult to explain the Heart Sutra with our knowledge. The more we try to explain, the more absurd we are. Therefore it has been far too absurd for me to explain Buddhism.

In general, it is not that we should abandon the mind, but we should abandon our private minds to adapt to the universal mind.

A full list of international publications:

Published (paper quoted, books in italics):

- F. Liu: “The AI Elephant”, *AI & Society*, Springer-Verlag London, 1989, vol.3, pp.336-345.
- F. Liu: “Dynamic Modeling of Multidimensional Logic in Multiagent Environment”, *2001 International Conferences on Info-tech and Info-net Proceedings*, IEEE Press, People’s Post & Telecommunications Publishing House China, 2001, pp. 241-245.
- F. Liu: “Name, Denominable and Undenominable, —On Neither <A> Nor <Anti-A>”, *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Logic, Set, and Probability*, University of New Mexico, USA, 2002, pp.107-113,
<http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/FirstNeutConf.htm>,
<http://xxx.lanl.gov/ftp/math/papers/0306/0306384.pdf>.
- F. Liu: “Growing and Anti-growing: Metabolism in Neutrosophy, —On Neither <A> Nor <Anti-A>”, *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Logic, Set, and Probability*, University of New Mexico, USA, 2002, pp.114-120,
<http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/NeutrosophicProceedings.pdf>,
<http://xxx.lanl.gov/ftp/math/papers/0306/0306384.pdf>.
- F. Liu, F. Smarandache: “Intentionally and Unintentionally: On Both, A and Non-A, in Neutrosophy”, *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Logic, Set, and Probability*, University of New Mexico, USA, 2002, pp.81-87,
<http://xxx.lanl.gov/ftp/math/papers/0201/0201009.pdf>,
<http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/NeutrosophicProceedings.pdf>,
<http://xxx.lanl.gov/ftp/math/papers/0306/0306384.pdf>, also by Octogon, Brasov, Romania, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 194-203.
- F. Liu, Florentin Smarandache: “Logic: a Misleading Concept — A Contradiction Study toward Agent’s Logic Ontology”, *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Logic, Set, and Probability*, University of New Mexico, USA, 2002, pp.88-100,
<http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/NeutrosophicProceedings.pdf>,
<http://xxx.lanl.gov/ftp/math/papers/0306/0306384.pdf>; *Libertas Mathematica*, University of Texas at Arlington, 2002; Los Alamos National Laboratory archives (New Mexico, USA),

<http://xxx.lanl.gov/ftp/math/papers/0211/0211465.pdf>; “Dialectics and the Dao, On Both, <A> and <Non-A> in Neutrosophy and Chinese Philosophy”(title changed), *Seeking Wisdom journal*, Gallup, NM, USA, No. 1, pp. 56-66, Spring 2003.

F. Liu: “Paradoxes Review——On Neither <A> Nor <Anti-A>”, *Smarandache Notions (book series, Vol. 13)*, edited by Jack Allen, Feng Liu, Dragos Constantinescu, American Research Press 2002, pp.200-203

Jack Allen, Feng Liu, Dragos Constantinescu ed.: *Smarandache Notions (book series, Vol. 13)*, American Research Press 2002 (ISBN 1-931233-56-X).

Florentin Smarandache, *A Unifying Field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic: Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability*, translated into Chinese (with Simplified and Traditional Chinese Characters) by Feng Liu, Xiquan Chinese Branch, 2003;

<http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/NeutrosophicsChinese.zip>.

Annotation in the Chinese Translation of Neutrosophics

Liu Feng (**bold sentences**)
Florentin Smarandache (regular sentences)

Does Dr. Smarandache's emigration change his destiny?

(From the author's biography) Smarandache escaped from Romania in September of 1988 and waited almost two years in the political refugee camps of Turkey, where he performed unskilled jobs such as construction, scavenging, house painting, and worked as a whet stoner in order to survive.

In March 1990 he immigrated to the United States. (**Translator's annotation [all in bold]: He told me during the International Congress of Mathematicians [ICM2002 Beijing] that he didn't live a happy life after the immigration. On the contrary, his life was full of storms. This experience makes me feel that fate is really created through previous lives, and the change of fate does not depend on effort alone; only with great wisdom can one change it).**)

Does Dr. Smarandache's style of poetry really represent naturalism?

"The flying of a bird," for example, represents a "natural poem" that is not necessary to write down, being that it is more palpable and perceptible in any language than some signs laid on the paper, which, in fact, represent an "artificial poem." They are "artificial" because they are deformed, and are the result of a translation by the observant of the observed, and by a translation one falsifies. (**The "originality" might still stay in the externality instead of the essentiality.**)

Does the social system really restrict Dr. Smarandache's fate?

Later, I based it on contradictions. Why? Because in that society we lived a double life, an official one propagated by the political system, and another real one. In mass-media it was promulgated that "our life is wonderful," but in reality "our life was miserable." The paradox flourished. (**Is destiny enslaved by something external? In traditional Chinese culture, destiny is created by oneself, not anything else**)

Does the Statue of Liberty really signify real freedom?

2.6. *Third Paradoxist Manifesto:*

.....I thus came to America to re-build the Statue of Liberty of the Verse, delivered from the tyranny of the classic and its dogma. (**External freedom is different from the internal one. The Statue of Liberty doesn't necessarily mean the real freedom**)

Can science and technology unify the spirit?

Unsolved and open problems of mathematics are like very nice poems of the spirit - in this technical century we must turn the art into science. (**By no means can science and technology remold the spiritual world. They are of distinct meanings in essence [e.g., science as means of material pursuit], but the author is full of creativity.**)

Does <Neut-A> in its original definition meet Dr. Smarandache's intention?

<Non-A> is different from <Anti-A>.

For example:

If <A> = white, then <Anti-A> = black (antonym),
but <Non-A> = green, red, blue, yellow, black, etc. (any color, except white),

while <Neut-A> = green, red, blue, yellow, etc (any color, except white and black). **(It is the toughest thing to describe <Neut-A>. Neutrosophy is merely at its beginning.)**

Are our minds swinging up and down, or is the truth up and down?

And yet, the whole of philosophy is a *nihilism* **(Although the author sees some of the subjectivity in philosophy, one cannot deny the existence of absolute truth.)**, 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 overly-informative, and is a posteriori knowledge.

Now, one can ejaculate: All is false, even the truth. **(Although truth can be misapplied or inversely used according to the will of humans, by no means can all the truths be false.)**

Does tautologism + Nihilism have anything to do with philosophy?

- In this theory one can prove anything!

- In this theory one can deny anything!

Philosophism = Tautologism + Nihilism **(“Yin and yang constitute what we call Dao.” Philosophy reveals the unity or harmony of being and “non-being,” but not the mono extremity of being [tautologism] or non-being [nihilism].)**

What does evolution mean?

Marx's 'spiral' of evolution is replaced by a more complex differential curve with ups-and-downs and with knots - because evolution means cycles of involution too. **(“Yin and yang constitute what we call Dao.” Dao is natural, but our minds misinterpret things unnaturally, so as evolution and retrogression, <A> and <Non-A>. Even so, Darwin did fabricate such a pure evolution, rather a fiction.)** This is *dynaphilosophy*, the study of infinite road of an idea.

<Neo-A> has a larger sphere (It includes, besides parts of old <A>, parts of <Neut-A> resulted from previous combinations), more characteristics, and 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. **(I admit only its openness, because when <Neut-A> is born, <Non-<Neut-A>> is born simultaneously)**

And so on, until the previous <A> gets to a point where it paradoxically incorporates the entire <Non-A>, being indistinct from the whole. And this is the point where the idea dies **(Something can die in form, for example, a scar can be cured, but the seed of disease lurks within.)**, it can not be distinguished from others.

Therefore, Hegel was incomplete when he assumed that a thesis is replaced by another, called anti-thesis; that the 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). **(“Yin and yang constitute what we call Dao.” Dao is not confined to any form, but our minds swing among forms, never reaching the essence.)**

Does the finger pointing to the moon equal the moon?

O) Philosophical Formulas:

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

Why, concomitantly with the introduction of a notion <A>, <Non-A> is its reverse resulting?

Now, one presents philosophical formulas just because in the spiritual field it is really difficult to obtain [exact] formulas. **(Philosophy, at most, points out the direction to the practice; it does not supersede practice.)**

Is there a unity in opposites?

A) Law of Equilibrium:

The more <A> increases, the more <Anti-A> decreases. **(How can they be in antagonism only and without unity?)** One has the following relationship:

$$\langle A \rangle \cdot \langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle = k \cdot \langle \text{Neut-A} \rangle$$

where k is a constant depending on <A>, and <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:

$$\langle A \rangle \cdot \langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle = k,$$

where k is a constant depending on <A>.

It is interesting in particular cases **(The author falsely regards industrialization and spiritualization, science and religion, being and non being, materialism and idealism as in antagonism only. And therefore he falls short of completeness. In fact, the antagonism is out of human's vikalpa [I understand it as splitting mind.] How can he formalize the phrase [my personal interpretation], "One more chasm, one more gain in knowledge.")**:

Industrialization \times Spiritualization = constant, for any society.

The more industrialized a society is, the less spirituality its citizens have.

Science \times Religion = constant.

White \times Black = constant.

Plus \times Minus = constant.

In pushing the limits, in other words calculating in the absolute space, one gets:

Everything \times Nothing = universal constant,

or $\infty \times 0 (= 0 \times \infty) = \text{universal constant}$.

.....

Materialism \times Idealism = constant, for any society.

How can gaining oneself result in losing oneself?

B) Law of Anti-Reflexivity:

<A> in the mirror of <A> gradually vanishes itself. **(Whenever there is "self", one loses his true face.)**

Or <A> of <A> may transform into a distorted <A>.

Is unity or conflict innate?

J) Law of Particular Ideational Gravitation:

Every idea <A> attracts and rejects other idea 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) the ideas, the stronger the attraction will be. **(Genuine knowledge comes from the unity of opposites, while unity is an innate identity, not attraction; contradiction is merely man-made.)**

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 continuous motion, and their frontiers changing accordingly. **(I don't think in such simplicity.)**

As a Chinese individual, what philosophic issues mentioned in this book do you find to be strange?

Examples:

Perfection leads to imperfection. **(Opposites yield each other. People seek perfection, including in mathematics, science and technology. How can they truly achieve it in such a manner [youwei]?)**

Ignorance is pleased. **(It is neither pleased nor not pleased; only with wisdom can one reach mukti or vimukta.)**

Particular Case:

Everybody tends to approach his specific level of incompetence. **(The narrow view of the author, because competence implies arrogance too, incompetence in self-consciousness [not necessary in the views of others] implies modesty and prudence, i.e. competence.)**

When all <Non-A>_i versions fall into <A> we have a catastrophe. **(The unity of yin-yang does not necessarily mean the end, or death. Death does not necessarily mean extinction. Why is it seen as a catastrophe?)**

P) Neutrosophic Studies and Interpretations of Known Theories, Modes, Views, Processes of Reason, Acts, Concepts in Philosophy.

To any launched idea there are pro and con reactions, but also neuter (indifference, neutrality) as well. Hegel's <dialectic> [Gr. *dialektikē* < *dia* with, *legein* to speak] doesn't work. It consequently has to be extended to a somehow improper term *trialectic*, 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* (∞ -alectic). **(The author might mean that Dao yields everything.)**

(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.

An unstable-made stability, and stable-made instability. Or equilibrium in disequilibrium, and disequilibrium in equilibrium. **(To those within the realm of yin-yang [ordinary minds swinging up and down without stability {samādhi-bala}], disequilibrium is absolute. It is absolutely different for those who have surpassed the realm of yin-yang.)**

We denote, a very dynamic system by rapid small changes, characterized by a derivative. **(derivative: relativity In fact, individuals are in innate unity with the integral, the identity of differential and integral. Yin-yang is merely projected from each human's splitting mind [savikalpa].)** The static system is dead.

Leon Walras was right: monopolies reduce competition, and thus progress.

My opinion is that some philosophers grope and stumble. They don't have clear ideas or systems, or even precise directions on a subject.

What one asserts today, another will deny tomorrow.

Many times they talk too much and say nothing. Some have points contrary to experience and evidence, while others employ inadequate reasoning.

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 author might mean to quantamize philosophy, but how can we identify differential individuals without integrality?)**

Mathematization is required because it is not possible. **(See my negative attitude in the translator's preface to the Chinese version, on the unifying field.)**

I understand spirit as quality, and material as quantity.

Of course, they melt together. **(They are in one unity, not one aspect determining the other.)**

The structure of ideas reflects the structure of objects **(both in one unity)**, and reciprocally.

In the mind-body problem:

The mental phenomenon is of a physical nature, and the physical phenomenon is of a mental nature as well. **(They are an unbreakable unity, and also cause and effect to each other, thus leading to the chain reaction)**

Third world countries' creators and inventors are also handicapped by language, poor living conditions, and less technology for doing research **(chiefly an ideological difference)**.

Arguing with Plekhanov (who says that 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 **(It is managed by the composite force of merit and evil of all the people.)**

Philosophy of Philosophy:

- Why do we need philosophy today?
- Why don't we need philosophy today?
- What direction is philosophy going to?
- What direction is philosophy not headed?

One feels that philosophy is for people who have nothing else to do, like puzzles or rebus. **(Humans hardly maintain tranquility in every second.)**

In conclusion, I want to be what I don't want to be:

I don't want to be a philosopher. That's why I am not. (That's why, maybe, am I?)

(“To become a scientist,” I entered the university. Feeling still not till graduation, I thus continued pursuing [supposed] both my Master's and PhD degrees..... Why still not? until some day I would be recognized by other people; however, I was not content with it, and was 100% determined to be a scientist. Therefore I will never be one. In fact, my lifetime pursuit is such a temporary moment: it may finally come but in fleetness. Am I embarrassing myself? My fault is: the “myself” in the pursuit is merely an instant me, i.e., a shadow or image of mine in some instant, not the real “myself.”)

Sociological Theory **(The author can be too partial. The following is for reference only):**

.....

Sexuality plays an immense role in the manipulation of men by women, because the women "have monopoly of sex," as an American friend explained to me.

.....

Sexual pleasure influences different life circles, from the lower class to the leading spheres. Freud was

right.

One uses women in espionage, in influencing politicians' decisions, in attracting businessmen. By using their feminine charms, they obtain faster results than their male proponents.

Wwomen have more rights than men in Western societies (in divorce trials). (**“People misunderstand the equality between the sexes,” Master Chin-Kung once said. Men promote virtues and women bring up new generations of virtues. Social education has roots in home education; therefore, sages of the future are reared by women. In this sense, the future of the world is held by women. Professor Wang Caigui of Taiwan successfully applies the education of Chinese classical culture to children, even infants because ages 0-3 year are of crucial importance for the life span.**)

Social Paradox:

In a democracy should the non-democratic ideas be allowed?

a) If non-democratic ideas are allowed, then it is no longer a democracy. (The non-democratic ideas may overturn the society.)

b) If other ideas are not allowed, even those that are non-democratic, then again the democracy no longer exists because the freedom of speech is restricted. (**As I illustrated in related papers, they are a unity in essence: individual's interest is subordinate to the community's interest; selfless devotion is the only way to achieve the real self-value. A government lasts long only if it serves people.**)

Paradoxist Psychological Behavior:

How can we explain contrary behaviors of a person: in the same conditions, without any reason, cause?

We can explain them because our deep unconsciousness is formed of contraries (**of merit and evil**).

Ceaseless Anxiety:

What you want is, normally, what you don't get. And this is for eternity. Because, when you get it (if ever), something else will be your next desire. Man can't live without a new desire (**because of greediness**).

Inverse Desire:

The wish to purposely have bad luck, to suffer, to be pessimistic are stimulating factors for more and better creation or work. (This applies to some artists, poets, painters, sculptors, and spiritualists.) (**What we yearn for is real, thorough, perfect, satisfactory happiness, not the blind one leading to suffering. Featherwit of the world shows off his cleverness while great wisdom takes looks of folly.**)

Divine 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.

(**As I stated in a paper, there are many misunderstandings toward God.**)

[Religion is full of god-ism and evil-ism.] (**God and evil don't come from religion, but from our consciousnesses.**)

The Ultimate Paradox:

Living is the process of dying. (**“Life” and “death” have different meanings, depending on different savvies. Chinese Tibet is full of real stories of reincarnation.**)

Reciprocally: Death is the process of somebody else's life [an animal eating another one] (**totally biased**).

Exercises for readers:

If China and Japan are in the Far East, why do we go West from the U.S.A. to get there?

Are humans inhuman, because they have committed genocides. **(Human beings are by no means intelligent, since they are destroying themselves.)**

The Invisible Paradoxes:

Our visible world is composed of a totality of invisible particles. **(Science has the multilateral knowledge to quantum: Every quantum is of the property of wave-corpuscule duality.)**

The essence of a thing may never be reached. It is a symbol, a pure, abstract and absolute notion. **(There is distinction in this point between Eastern and Western cultures. In Eastern culture we call those Buddhas, who see through appearance directly to a person's genuine nature. Meanwhile, everyone [every living thing] is of this innate nature,. That is, everyone is full of the potentiality of limitless wisdom; everyone can achieve. Everything lies in our instinct, no wisdom is beyond achievement, except only the difference between enlightenment and delusion.)**

There are three main types of humans: not only Nietzsche's "overman" with his will to be powerful, but also the <midman> with his will to be mediocre (people who love to live anonymously every single day, dull), and the <underman> with his will to be weak (homeless, tramps, criminals who indulge in laziness, illegalities). **(The most powerful will is often falsely taken as mean; for the one lives neither for fame nor wealth. The so called "overman" is too weak to the allures.)**

Lenin's "things 'dialectic creates the ideas' dialectic, but not reciprocally" still works vice versa. **(I personally regard "matter" and "consciousness" as different aspects of one thing. Because of different understandings and thus different realms, beings live in an infinite number of worlds, such as heaven, hell and the worlds of humans. In one kind of the worlds of time and space are in unity, for example, past-present-future, big-small, far-near, dynamic-static, even being-nonbeing are perfectly unified, like a holograph. In comparison, the intelligence we recognized is somewhat like that of an ant – no more than a frog deeply at the bottom of a well)**

To think means to be unusual and intriguing and uneasy in the eyes of others. **(The author stands for contradiction as the source and momentum of every development and progress.)**

I see the ideas. They are red and blue and white, round and sharp, small and big and in between.

I look through the objects and see the essence **(too extreme)**.

"Subjective" is, in its turn, objective too.

Objective is subjective as well. **(If not in the sense that "there is objectivity in subjectivity," and "there is subjectivity in objectivity;" it can be subjective idealism.)**

"Subjective" is, in its turn, objective too. Objective is subjective as well. **(Subjectivity is out of a sticking manner, and sticking to the external phenomenon of objective being is also subjective. Therefore, one should neither stick to materialism nor to idealism.)**

We extend the solipsism theory, which states that the source of all knowledge of existence is the self alone. **(I can neither totally agree, nor totally deny this idea. It depends on the realm of understanding of the "self". For instance, to the wise men, all are created by heart, and so is "self". Do they then mean**

that no creating leads to no self? This is not necessarily true. Firstly a no-self is created. Secondly one can only see the real self when “no self” is no longer created [“no creating” is no longer created].) The solipsism theory is extended to the pluripsism theory, which states that the source of all knowledge comes in all beings, because we get influenced by others' beliefs, hopes, desires, and fears. **(A sage is different from an ordinary person in his clear estimation of himself, and the way he is not influenced by the faults of others. In some sense, it is not distinct in essence from solipsism in this point.)** It's impossible to live in complete isolation; not even hermits or monks stay alone. They at least interact with nature. They have to do so in order to survive. **(A sage can understand the realm of the [so called] solipsist while we, if as “solipsists”, are absolutely wrong if we try to understand the sages! In fact, although a selfish person doesn't seem to be in seclusion with the world in an external form, he is in seclusion with nature. What a pity that he enjoys it. In fact, those who practice Buddhism in isolation might actually know everything, and constantly communicate uninterruptedly with the most powerful universe, as if they actually live in the pure land.)**

.....
Sometimes people don't even know why they reacted in the way they did. Something came from their innermost depths, or unconscious, something they were not aware of. **(Every action, even every intention of a living thing has its cause and effect. Even in medical death, the previous cause-effect is lurking deeply in memory. This memory is not lessened nor does it vanish in another life cycle; retribution is done when destiny comes. Although we are blind to it, it is not void. It cannot be denied in the Chinese “Book of Changes” [I-ching] that an event can be altered, but cause-effect never changes. It is fundamental to the change of fate to stop evil causes and widely cultivate good seeds, and understand cause-effect. The knowledge seems far in heaven but close at hand, which is regarded as rubbish by laity, but is regarded as treasure by wise men.)**

.....
"Any big philosophy ends up into a platitude" (Constantin Noica). **(This is not necessarily true. Genuine knowledge always shines, despite the change in form.)**

The power of the monarch derives from its powerless people (Juan de Mariana, 16-17th centuries). The monarch's position would be in danger if the people had any power. **(However big, the power will vanish if the ruler stands against the people. On the contrary, a party can become strong from weakness if it really reflects the interest of people. And even in dictatorship it is also supported by people. Therefore, they are not necessarily antagonized.)**

“It looks like the great systems started to lose their influence, because they vainly slide over the universe.”**(Daodejing illustrates that “Always without desire we must be found. If it's deep mystery we would sound. But if desire is always within us, its outer fringe is all that we shall see.” Only a peaceful heart can see the genuine essence.)**

The more things are changing, the more they stay the same **(the identity of dynamic and static nature).**
The Eleatic School holds that <all is one>, and does not accept change and plurality.

We say that <one is all> either, and it is unchanged; and singularity doesn't work in real life. **(As Sushi's “Topic to Xilin Wall”states, “A great mountain by vertical and horizontal view, far, near, high, low, and each not same. I can't see the true face of Lushan, because I am just in there.” It seems to be changing in one perspective, but doesn't in another perspective.)**

Time is fluid, visible, and material. It is like an organism, a living being. We are part of it. **(We can be regarded as part of time-space. In this sense, we live in this specified time-space field. However, we can**

also regard the time-space field merely as a form of the consciousness field of living beings. This field can also create any time-space; in this sense time-space is part of us.)

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, and truth-value.

Those characteristics are inversely proportional with:

vagueness, discontinuity, triviality, and falsity-value.

(There are always exceptions in science. Oriental culture asserts that “wuwei er wubuwei”: “He diminishes it and again diminishes it, till he arrives at doing nothing [on purpose]. Having arrived at this point of non-action, there is nothing which he does not do.” [This is a very reluctant interpretation by James Legge] “The Way takes no action, but leaves nothing undone. When you accept this, the world will flourish in harmony with nature.” My personal opinion is that omniscient lies in being incompetent. How can we measure the limitless with limited measures? Mind the opposite effect in extremity. [The failure of an Indian ascetic monk failed just in this.] Beware of counting the uncountable. Sages could have nothing to tell, or there would be no absolute truth. As long as this sort of measure continues, I personally think, a magic medicine is okay for one kind of symptom but improper for another. Therefore, it is better to correctly understand and successfully accomplish than to persist in the exact measurement.)

“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. **(Science is merely the representation of man's [mental] realm. Science is sacred if you believe human beings are sacred. On the contrary, it is negligible if human beings are regarded as being small.)**

The world is made up simultaneously of material and psychic natures. They may not be separated, as the materialist and idealist philosophers tried to do. Not only is the psychic the superior result of the material, but the reciprocal sentence is as well. **(Materialism and idealism are out of vikalpa; therefore, one should neither stick to materialism nor to idealism.)**

We can paraphrase Hegel by:

What is rational is antagonistic, and what is antagonistic is rational. Furthermore, 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 in neutrosophy. **(If there is something, it also belongs to non-neutrosophy. Therefore it belongs to neutrosophy. I don't necessarily like this logic.)**

The world as a paradox:

Schopenhauer said that the "world is my idea" using <vorstellung> (Germ.) for <idea>; therefore, material is immaterial (because 'idea' is 'immaterial'). **(If two brains coexist in a human, with one seeing it as matter and the other as non-matter, the self-contradiction is man-made. No other example is more interesting than “blinds sizing up an elephant.” Men interpret unity as a contradictory thing because of their**

upside down thinking. "I can't see the true face of Lushan, because I am just in there.")

A paradoxical argument:

"Man is by nature good, and only our institutions have made him bad" (J. J. Rousseau). (**"Renzhichu, xingbenshan" in Sanzijing [My personal interpretation is that kindness is an innate nature of humans. Humans in their original forms are kind.] does not mean that.**)

Art is a God for our soul. **(How can one change their fate by singing, dancing, chanting poetry, or painting pictures? Forgetting suffering doesn't eliminate suffering.)**

"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. **(Is a female your god?)**

In learning, we become worse (*civilization paradox*).

Rousseau attacked the arts and literature on account of corrupting ethics and replacing religion. By modern standards, we don't differentiate between each other, but instead conform in speech, clothes, and attitudes. In this way, we appear to be what we are not. (God doesn't bind you, you are what you make of yourself.) People are the same, but still remain different.

His irony against politicians:

"The politicians of the ancient world were always talking about morals and virtues; ours speak about nothing other than commerce and money."**(People now are too clever and are overly-intelligent.)**

"Man is born free; and anywhere he is in chains" (J. J. Rousseau, <The Social Contract>). **(Every man is born with a free nature. Those who are enlightened to the truth remain free, despite being slaves in body. Those who pursue external things [Shenwaizhiwu, who was believed to be himself but was not really.], have an enslaved heart, although they are free in body.)**

Eternity does not exist. It is a poem.

Eternity is passing...

Eternity is a delusion of the spirit thirsty for the absolute.

Not even the absolute inward exists, it has been invented by humankind as a goal that you are not able to aim at.

(It is pitiful that people work hard and gain nothing. Where is eternity? It is merely a dream. However, when you doubt the hills and the streams, and that the road would continue, you eventually find the dense willow trees and bright flowers. Stop preservation, abandon intentionality, never become attached to the world. Get rid of vain intentions [mind move, vikalpa], in order to see that you have limitless wisdom, limitless power, limitless faculty of understanding, limitless blessingAn ordinary being is blocked by themselves, while a sage sees through all with his wise eyes. This is the originality of nature. The world should look at the East, and the East should cherish its discarded valueless treasures, until one day we suddenly awake: "we are a Q merely.")

Nothing is perfect; nothing is permanent.

Any notion is sullied by opposite elements. The contrary's umbrage is imprinted on it. **(A sage listens bilaterally, and an ordinary person turns suddenly left and suddenly right.)** An object is lighted by its shadow.

Question: Is there a limit to civilization's advancing behind those it's not possible to pass?

Science expanded over culture, strangled it, and occupied its place in the society. **(Science is in such evolution that it seems to replace the Bible. One has to ask, "Is science used by humanity or is humanity a slave to science?" The more humans evolve, the more they lag behind if science is developed to limit them. An Oriental sage 2500 years ago responded that humans will eventually surmount everything, regardless of their material or spiritual chains. The chains are merely man-made, and everyone can break them. [See the biography of Sakyamuni by Master Xingyun].)**

There exists (feminine) YIN Energy, the left channel, and (masculine) YANG Energy, the right channel, for psychic or spiritual power.

The first one is that of desires.

The second one is that of projects.

Both are of a biological nature. **(Yin-yang can be divided on its prenatal [innate] and postnatal attributes. The prenatal [belonging to yang] is one that creates [gives birth to] those in form, and the postnatal one [yin] is one that brings up the seed. An ordinary person sees only the developed form, and is ignorant to the originality, the prenatal aspect, especially that of "self." This leads to confusion. To understand the truth of "self," one has to abandon preserving the conventional illusion of "self" and stop attachment to any world.)**

In certain forms of yoga, seven chakras coexist in the human body, but they can't be traced out through physical, chemical, or anatomical means. **(Science is blind in some senses.)**

Kundalini Energy (of divine nature) is the universal energy's projection in us.

Athman (individual, inward) blends with Brahman (collective, inward) in Indian philosophy. **(The individual and community is one entity originally, on the same root.)**

Yogic meditation consists of the purification of chakras and the touch of without-thought status, causing Kundalini Energy's to increase. **(I am not qualified to explain this. Maybe every living creature is of limitless Kundalini, and because it is infinite, there is no such saying as "increase" or "decrease." Therefore, what is increased is the power of enlightenment and vain intention is decreased (vikalpa, mind move). Meditation is merely a means to understand the true face of self. The "universal energy" is merely another form of life, and is, in my personal view, a form of field [unnecessarily, a known form].)**

Human beings are in a continuous DESIRE, continuously SEEKING, and are continuously in DISSATISFACTION. And these are good, for they bring progress. So, humans are under constant stress. **(Maitreya says [according to my personal interpretation] that the world is originally all right, but mediocre people ask for trouble.)**

A root cause of the decline of all empires (None of them lasted, and they will never last indefinitely.) is the self-content of their leadership role in the world, thus slowing their creative and vigilant engines.

In a universe there are more (concentric or not) universes **(“Concentric” may refer to identical realms, and “more” to multi-realms.)**

in a space: more spaces

in a time: more times

in a move: more moves

We meet, as such, within a system in other systems; and so on...

sub-universe

sub-space

sub-time
sub-move
sub-system

And these concentrations pass upward and downward away to (macro and micro) infinite levels.

Nietzsche: "All is chaos." But that chaos is organized, hair arranged in curlers on an uncombed head. **(Beings and a void are merely an appearance, in which they inter-include each other, with the realm dependent on the level of understanding.)**

The Theory of Happenings and the Theory of Unhappenings of Phenomena correlate. **(In my personal view, they are in cause-effect relation. Ordinary individuals pay much attention to effects rather than the causes, which only sages stress. Things become mysterious due to ignorance of causes.)**

"Metaphysical sentences are neither true nor false, because they don't assert anything; they don't contain consciousness or errors" (Rudolf Carnap). **(Humans insist on knowing another realm within their own realms; thus they are incongruous. Accordingly, the key lies in the self consciousness that has to be eliminated.)**

Try to save what can't be saved! **(It is not impossible to hold the truth, but it is impossible in a dead form. The truth is alive while books are dead.)**

Imaginary is more real than the reality **(utterly subjective idealism).**

"Knowledge is power" (Francis Bacon). But knowledge brings weakness too (An example is a cancer patient who knows he's sick.). **(False understanding leads to corrupt power.)**

Power in one direction signifies weakness in another direction, and mediocrity in a third direction. I believe that power and weakness and mediocrity combine. **(As a Chinese idiom says, it is difficult to become wise, but still more to become muddled. Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise.)**

Ah, if I had the ability to change what's unchangeable! **(God cannot hold one back from the route to the hell. Since God is unable to change a person's fate, they must do it alone, through self-enlightenment.)**

"Homo homini lupus" (Lat., meaning the human is the wolf for the human.) **(The devil is not able to spoil one's fate; individuals spoil their own fates.),** that's why there is a *bellum omnium contra omnes* (Lat., meaning the war of everybody versus everybody.) as a "natural status" (Hobbes from Plaut). And Spinoza oppositely with *homo homini deus* (Lat., meaning human is God for human) **(People can change their own fates, while God is not able to.),** while Feuerbach said that the God of humans is humanity itself. **(Both are right: humans are the enemies of themselves. They are also the dominators, or say, the god of themselves as well. They and only they can either spoil or save themselves.)**

Schleiermacher's personalism proposes that all social problems be solved by evasionism, by intercommunication with God, or by withdrawal into personal "dimensions". **(The world is all right. Trouble is made through absurd thinking. Where is trouble when people cease reaching in vain for their desires [vikalpa, mind move]? For instance, "It is really terrible for me?" It would not be negative to stop comparing yourself with higher individuals. As is more clearly demonstrated by a**

Chinese idiom, troubles are asked for by oneself. Beyond conquering vain intentions [not to evade], is there a higher science or technology?)

"It looks like the grand narratives started to lose their influence, because they slide in a sterile manner over the universe" (P. úuÛea, <Philosophia Perennis>). **(Science and technology cannot halt the deterioration of the mind. Humans can not distinguish between good and evil. An evil seed is blossoming and yielding fruit. Science and technology become an important means to attain greediness.)**

"Know yourself," says a Latin adage.

But it is impossible to penetrate the internal infinity. It is question of psychical and even philosophical approximations.

Many times we feel that we are strangers to ourselves, acting against our thoughts or senses. We act like people we would disapprove of. **(It seems that fate is not created by God; for the evil seed is planted through evil deeds, even they may be unintentional. Only a sage can command his fate, and through diligent practice, he has stopped his sins and can command his fate. How? The first way is to accept the sage's [I especially refer to the Eastern sages.] education and put it into practice. Then, abandon evil and do good. The second way is to accept a sage's standard of manner, of words, deeds, behavior, intention, ideas, and thoughts. Real [genuine and complete] command of oneself [independent of fate] depends on a person's own enlightenment; otherwise even God cannot help them.)**

Humanity is an organized chaos, endowed with an abyss of reason, limited senses, and unbounded irrationalism. All is a continuous and transcendental field. Not even phenomena are totally derived from others, and there is effect without cause because the irrational has its act empire. **(Men believe in their correctness of wisdom and opinion, without any confusion.)**

There is an existence of absconded contradictions, therefore of a continuous instability in the moving essence of things and phenomena. **(Changes cannot go beyond their nature; in other words, its nature never changes.)**

Of course, we can find harmony in contradictions and stability in the middle of instability. They are dialectically tied. As well as

an absolute into absolute
perfection into perfection

and an infinity into infinity. **(Are we fishing for the moon in water? Is what we acquire merely part of the void? Are men embarrassing themselves?)** "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 úuÛea).

Decoding the paradox headed in the problems' core.

Style means "unity in diversity." "Life can be framed in the form of an unstable equilibrium."

This is a precise imprecision.

(Who can assure "the splendid future?" No one is aware until disaster falls, but then it is too late.)

How can we interpret the Biblical expression. "Enthrall me, God, for I long to be free" (Imitatio Christi). **(God is not able to.)**

Liberty is a unruly demon from the spirit, and dissatisfaction leads to the revolt of liberty, until it becomes an equilibrium.

While Țuțea has another opinion: "Human's liberty is the divine part of him." *Divina particula aurae* only. **(The freedom in common sense is a misunderstanding; for it leads to chains, such as Western human rights based on such freedom. The actual, complete, perfect, ideal, and exact freedom lies in attaining enlightenment in a Buddhist sense).**

According to Țuțea, Christ is the divine 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!" **(In my personal guess, meditation originally means "it." Zen is daily life; it is the life with wisdom, and the wisdom in life – not metaphysics.)**

Are there phenomena without history, and things without history?

No, this notion of "history" is incorporated in the essence of essences. Even things without history have their history **(the loop of cause-effect).**

Nicolae Iorga considered the idealist factors that have determined materialism in society's evolution.

Conversely, it is still right. **(What is evolution? Is it based on the material standard, or on the level of wisdom [enlightenment]? I believe Darwin can be too superficial in his view of the world. In such a manner, we can by no means understand objective idealism. People will eventually find that materialism and idealism are out of vikalpa [mind move]; therefore, one should neither stick to materialism nor to idealism.)**

"I thought the truth is universal, continuous, eternal" (Mircea Eliade, <Oceanografie>).
Of course, it is not **(Absolute truth doesn't non-exist).**

Goethe-ian principle of bi-polarity:

The idol and the devil are interior powers of human beings that are in a permanent dispute. (Mephistopheles & Faust)

We plead for a pluri-polarity among various combinations of idol and devil in our souls and minds. **(Many people believe that they can become enlightened on the truth through indulgence. However, what they acquire is merely a vacancy.)**

Pure philosophical concepts are not to be found. This is a dialectic of metaphysics; and similarly, it is metaphysics of dialectic. **(As if people seek the truth and find nothing. It is a kind of enlightenment, lying deeply in heart.)**

The death of neutrosophic philosophy would signify the death of philosophy as a whole, and of humankind too. **(I disagree with this idea since philosophy, even science, is the outcome of retrogression of human instinct. Humans are omni-potential. Our instincts reach everything in the universe without obstacles, and without the help of schools such as the "Book of Changes", science, thoughts, ideas or philosophy. Unfortunately people now are blind to their instincts; they have to rediscover and understand themselves through philosophy. They have no alternative, although written symbols can never be the perfect form of communication, and in this sense there are "philosophers knowing nothing of philosophy.")** (The philosophy of philosophy will reveal it.) What would it look like to have all people thinking in chorus, in unison all over the world? **(What kind of chorus would it be? The mouths**

are specious, and the minds are perverse. Should the chorus in heart be vocalized by the mouth?)

There are two types of *totalitarism*:

.....

Also, there is an ideational oppression of classics floating in the air, and the permanent revolt of the contemporaneous. (Such “celebrities” of classics may also come from the praise of men.)

Spirit and Matter:

Spirit is an emanation of 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 is matter spiritual?

Both, spirit and matter, have ambi-(even pluri-)valent characteristics. **(I agree with this. There is no trouble originally, but mediocre people ask for it themselves. Spirit and matter are originally in unity. Opposition is manmade, just as ignorant people sizing up an elephant. Unity is the essence, as the Heart Sutra says: “Form does not differ from emptiness; emptiness does not differ from form. Form itself is emptiness; emptiness itself is form.” In my opinion, they illustrate their unity. Either matter or spirit, and even everything in the universe, is of the duality of “form” [rūpa] and “emptiness” [śūnya]. However, to come to the understanding of this unity, one has to be bold enough to abnegate his so-called “genius”, even what is commonly called science. Therefore, it is neither correct to stick to materialism nor to stick to idealism, since materialism and idealism are out of vikalpa [mind move]. But each regards itself as infallible, and even criticizes and misrepresents, or twists classical Chinese culture. In this sense the excellent traditional Chinese culture is now unrecognizable.)**

My personal life became public when I printed my diary., therefore my private life is not private anymore. (It is clear that no one truly understands you even if they read your diary a hundred times.)

How will the universe and humankind look like in a million years?

(This is not a science-fiction/fantastic question, but a more scientific problem.) In what direction will they converge? **(A clever man counts too much! No science can command the world of tomorrow. Peace is by no means assured.)**

Today's society creates inhumanity, not superhumans (Nietzsche's übermensch). This is 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 to these accelerated dynamics. **(So increasingly more people now suffer, since their hard work yields hills of rubbish to acquire. Where does civilization lie? In the end, our excellent heritages will either be ignored or scorned, for people will be too proud of modern civilization. No one will ever think that we live in a sea of bitterness. Disaster will fall exact from this.)**

As in the Ramayana epic, neutrosophy adopts a skeptic attitude simultaneously rejecting and contradicting the famous philosophical theses. In other words: a LOKAYATA in contemporaries, or a CARVAKA. **(This is school of thinking set up by Brihaspati, who asserts that the foundation of the universe consists of four principles or elements: the air, the fire, the water, and the earth. Some philosophers in this school added a fifth element: the ether [explained in e-mail by Dr. Smarandache, the following is my annotation]. For example, the air, fire, earth, and water in natural science are all formed from the four principles. It suggests a more dialectic view of matter, far more complete than that of natural science, while natural science is merely a very tiny aspect of it.)**

Man must live in accordance with the natural world around him (Pueblo Indian philosophy).

While genius should not! **(It might not be the genuine genius.)**

Philosophy shows the human spirit's formation. **(Does philosophy show it, or does philosophy trigger the internal power of enlightenment already rooted in the human mind?)**

"Because a philosopher writes with the 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"). **(In admitting the effect of Western philosophy, I have to keep modest to some oriental philosophies. On the contrary, I feel the ignorance in me, what a pity.)**

God is the supreme nature. The divine reality inside is 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. **(“Matter, in its nature, is void” in a sage’s eyes. But it does not refer to the void ness independent of matter, but to the unity of them. As to the absolute void ness, are we asking for conflicts on purpose?)**

How curious!

We behave strangely and peculiarly. **(Ordinary people take illusions as real; they are suffering from misconceptions.)**

In our being, there are an "I" and a "Non-I" that dispute the priority. It is that interior dissection **(vikalpa, mind move, or vain intention, e.g., selfish desire)** which splits our existence in two dual pieces.

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. **(As noted above, it is our actions from deep consciousness that split them into being and nonbeing.)**

"You become what you are in the context of what others did from you" (Sartre). **(You are the god in the eyes of your sweet heart, since you are thoroughly believed even when you are wrong. You are a child in the eyes of your parents, even when you are right.)**

Hence, you are what you are not.

I am asking if the form may exist outside of matter. Aristotle denied it. But the thoughts, the ideas... Do they have some form? **(have form, and have no form either)**

Criminals are transformed into heroes. Sinners into saints. This is the contemporary world!

Innocents and the obedient become victims (the poorest) of society. **(Everything is not beyond the cause-effect of merit and evil. Seeds of merit yield good fruit, and those of evil yield evil fruit. The ups and downs of fate originate entirely from this. Unfortunately, ordinary people fail to distinguish good from evil, thus resulting in misunderstanding. To see the truth of fate, please refer to Master Chin Kung’s number of teachings of “Liao-Fan’s Four Lessons,” Once in Shenzhen, China, there are 20 VCDs recorded.)**

The exterior world is real, but dependent on our consciousness. Therefore, it is not real. **(This is utterly subjective idealism. The same world can appear in different images, e.g., the ant’s world, the lion’s world, the ordinary person’s world and the sage’s world. The “sage” is merely an ordinary individual**

who is not bewildered by different realms or phenomena.)

The cure is worse than the problem it is supposed to treat. **(Problems help one to correct their mistakes, while the problems disappear or are forgotten when they heal.)**

Western culture is progressing in a wrong direction, towards the European man's crisis (Husserl, "Phenomenology"). **(We in the East should maintain especially sharp vigilance to the blind adoration of the West. This has already led to Eastern crises, such as the corruption of society, which leads to national corruption. For instance, some TV stations in Hong Kong even put the discussion of "legalizing the red light district" on the air last year. Because of the growing danger in four corners, our mainland is following the dust to a great extent.)**

Humans get to identify with God, on the way to the soul's liberation and the status of detachment from the world (*abgeschlidenheit*) [Meister Eckhart, <Die Deutsche Werke>]. **(To be extricated does not necessarily mean to leave this world.)**

But humans get to identify with the devil as well, by revealing the misery of the soul and private life. **(Why is it difficult to become extricated? It is because people are blind to the actual [real] *mukti* or *vimukta*.)**

Essence is God (*essential est Deus*), essence is the devil (*essential est Diabolus*) either. Both, God and the devil, are necessary to keep an equilibrium. **(This is totally biased.)** God and the devil identify **(This is totally biased. But the devil is often disguised as God, and God can sometimes be in the devil's appearance too.)** because they are abstract, symbolic, infinite, fuzzy, even neutrosophic notions. And, this is especially true, 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, incest, and sins.). **(Different people may see God in different images, including an image that serves selfish interest.)** The devil, in his turn, does beneficial work (Because this is like a vaccine, which helps our mind to produce immunity to bad behavior, or "disease" by causing the formation of spiritual "antibodies," which we would call "*antispirits*", produced by our brain.). **(Only in this sense can we say yin and yang complement each other.)** From vice we again rise, on a long staircase, toward virtue. From virtue, we decline back to vice (the opposites attract) **(The "opposites attract" in this sense, is totally biased; a better explanation would be the reverse effect in extremity. For example, humans enter paradise as the result of accumulative virtue and good deeds. However, since the material life in heaven is inconceivably abundant, far beyond those of human kings, greediness in this way is accumulated. In the long run, his blessing ends, and he may return to our human world, doing evil to serve his greediness. But humans can also escape the constraint of the reverse effect in extremity, once they surpass the yin-yang realm, and this may possibly be what the Buddhists call pure goodness.)** - passing through neuter, because monotony is against our biological rhythm. And the cycle is habitually rotated.

There is neither God nor 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*. **(My objection to the "middle point" is that it conveys the different sense than the Chinese Middle Way, or the Doctrine of Mean. It would be our minds that habitually swing up and down, thus comes the twisted representation as God and devil concepts. What does the author mean by "devilish god" and "godly devil"? A man can be a god in the eye of God, and can be a devil in the eye of the devil. He can also be a bilateral figure to the ordinary eye. As a farfetched interpretation, we'd better say everything appears in the complementation of yin-yang, with each bearing the other. [Or according to James Legge's Translation, "All things leave behind them the Obscurity (out of which they have come), and go forward to embrace the Brightness**

(into which they have emerged), while they are harmonized by the Breath of Vacancy.”])

To most questions:

- There is no exact right answer.
- There is no exactly wrong answer.

Or

- Every answer is right.
- Every answer is wrong.

This is because it is an interpolation of them. **(Again, this is too extreme; I cannot agree)**

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 negative tomorrow. **(Everything in the world goes and comes, and comes and goes in its own course. Is there any need to hold it in hand? Is there any need to pursue it?)**

Philosophy reflects the existent from the non-existent. **(Dao creates everything, but Dao doesn't refer to nihilism.)**

Heraclitus found a consensus of opposite propensities and tensions, as that of bow and lyre. People can't imagine how in-harmony-with-itself the discord is. **(It will become an antagonist philosophy if the stress is emphasized over the conflict.)**

I thank God He told me He doesn't exist.

This is my *Te Deum laudatum*! **(God might not exist as a dominator, He but universally exists as a teacher.)**

Wouldn't it be possible to set up a religious holiday for atheists in the calendar? **(Then is neutrosophy a kind of god? Or is it a religion?)**

There is a unity between the scientific and artistic languages, and this is not Neurath's *physicism*, but an accommodation of variability. **(Science in the form of common sense is too narrow.)**

Because humans are mortal, they want to become immortal (by their creation in arts, science, and history).

What would happen if all humans were immortal? **(In essence, doesn't "immortal" mean that.)**

Every man bears an internal supra-man (positive energy), an infra-man (negative energy), and null-man (no energy side):

It is himself projected outside of himself.

It is himself projected inside of himself. **(The author may refer to the cause-effect phenomenon of samsara [transmigration].)**

They are sporadically activated. **(If in the sense of cause-effect loop of merit and evil, we can say that.)**

"Man is an upsurge towards it's-not-possible" (Ion Ornescu, "Poems from Prisons"). **(Everyone can become a Buddha in the Buddhist view.)**

Causes and effects are antagonistic. **(Only confusion can lead to such bias.)**

We never could imagine how infinity would look like in daily life! The concept of infinity has raised questions which fascinated us...

Must we go, and never to reach an end? If you ever find an end, how is it? Is it a wall that is hundred miles high and thick? It is a precipice, or a chasm? Is the universe circular, meaning that we turn indefinitely? The universe, as a sphere or closed surface, has no beginning, and no ending. **(An achiever sees the real truth, not imaginations.)** Neither the small infinity nor the big infinity have been perceived other than in an abstract theoretical mode. **(The more arrogant a man is, the smaller the space is that he sees. He is like an ant ignorant of man and his intelligence. How does man reflect a sage? Isn't he the same in manner?)**

This was the great surprise which disturbed his rival mathematician Kronecker.

But no one can pull out the charm, and overwhelm the science world (and from the new truths which, as part of old reference systems, deny the superannuated classicized assertions). **(This may be the internal cause of science.)**

Any positive has its negative and null side effects.

Peace of mind does not exist. The systems' war grinds and is reborn in our neurons. **(Don't the new neurons forget the distinction between positive and negative?)**

How can one dispute an indisputable subject? **(There is no original trouble in the world, but mediocre people ask for it themselves.)**

Neutrosophic Existentialism:

Life is now mechanized. Machines are now humanized by science's sensorial improvements.

This is a nonexistent existence.

Humans are dehumanized! What is humanity's alienation? **(Human beings are enslaved by themselves [by mechanisms created by humans]. This is another portrayal of human beings reaping what they have sown - suffering a big loss for little gain.)**

A person is governed by their neutrosophic senses. I was surprised that people didn't grasp the concept. **(I don't think this is so. We can say ordinary people are dominated by selfish desires, but sages are free. How can we say that they are dominated by freedom?)** They all shunned it, suffering from ignorance. They lacked variations in opinions; therefore there would be no evolution.

Does "human existence" (Heidegger's *Dasein*) lead to Non-Existence through its nonsense and absurdity? (Somehow: self-destruction?) **(Won't one become superstitious once they venture too far in understanding beyond their actual faculty?)**

Any evolution ends by closing the cycle (demise)!

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

The existent, in its apogee boiling, passes to non-existent. <E> is transformed in <Non-E> (not necessarily <Anti-A>), which is transformed in <F >, which is transformed in <Non-F>, and so on.

The victim loves his executioner.

The loser like his prejudice.

The thrall adores his landlord.

The dog licks the whip which beats him. **(Maybe the author means that humans do not have enough courage to recognize and correct their own faults, thus being unable to change fate. Fate depends on oneself rather on heaven; see Liao-Fan's Four Lessons <http://www.amtb.org.tw/e-bud/liaofan.HTM>.)**

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. **(Maybe we can reach the point that "action" is mind move, but it is difficult to see the "inaction" also as mind move.)**

(Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, "Bhagavad-Gita: A New Translation and Commentary with Sanskrit Text")

Miguel de Unamuno: When two folks Juan and Pedro talk, there are six folks who actually talk:

- The real Juan, with the real Pedro;
- Juan's image, as seen by Pedro, with the Pedro's image as seen by Juan;
- Juan's image, as seen by himself, with the Pedro's image as seen by himself.

Actually, there are more:

- Juan's images as seen by various people around, with Pedro's images, as seen by various people around.

How many dialogues have taken place?

But how many dialogues have taken place in a group of people, when everybody talks? **(People have various ways of understanding the same thing, why impose on a computer?)**

In biology which one, the fixist theory or the evolutionist theory of beings, is true? **(We have to see what aspect it is in evolution. Is Darwin's theory real? He might not illustrate reality.)**

In 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"). **(It is not that there is no universal language in the world, but that it is impossible to make universal, because its comprehension differs among individuals.)**

"Every YES must to lean upon a NO (Otherwise, what Archimedes' lever would lean upon?)," (Ion Rotaru). **(This is not absolute, or this statement also leans upon NO.)**

Philosophy is not solid.

Idea gives birth to non-idea (not necessarily anti-idea); otherwise the previous would become an indoctrination. The new spirit builds on the old spirit by destroying it. **(We cannot mechanically see it. For instance, yin and yang inter-transform, and do not inter-destroy.)** Another conventional logic replaces the superannuated logic. **(since you stick to logic)** Any assertion is a limitation, that's why a non-assertion comes out regularly in order to push the limits.

Contemporary Neutrosophic Moral Issues:

There are arguments for, against, and those that are neutral: abortion, euthanasia, homosexuality,

pornography, reverse discrimination, death penalty, business ethics, sexual equality, legal use of drugs, and economic justice. **(Morality is not the problem of logic. How can we bombard the vacuum with artillery?)**

Man is infinite in his interior, and finite in his exterior. How is it possible that a finite entity includes an infinite one? **(Maybe the author means that humans measure the infinite by partial means, thus leading to a short-sighted view as mice.)**

Your happiness is inside of you (from Buddhism). Thus, God is inside of man. Your sadness is also inside of you. But man is inside of God as well. And yet man and God do not coincide. **(This “inside” may not refer to the god in the Bible. People behave against their true hearts due to their confusion.)**

Philosophy had to govern the state in the Athens’ democracy (Karl Popper). Yet in the modern "democracy" of Hegellian inspiration, the philosophy became the slave of the suspicious demagogues. **(Every thought or school can be either positively or negatively applied. Why? Men appreciate magnificent appearances.)**

The crowd is manipulated by the mass-media, which became the strongest force in society. People's consciences have been stolen. **(The United States could be destroyed by TV and networks. If China follows, say nothing of the future, the present is already too dreadful to think of! Couldn't the mass media convey something meaningful?)**

The everyday citizen, in accordance with the illuminist Rousseau, wears a "mask." Due to sophisticated technology, they can't look inward. Instead, they swim through the world passing besides themselves. **(People mistake external things as treasure.)**

Only the spirit of humans are brave enough for their inward retrieval (La Rochefoucault), enduring that "luxury humiliation." **(Men lose invaluable things because of luxury. What a shame.)**

A technological person doesn't say what they feel, think, or what is true. Instead, they say what's good for them to answer (in order to keep their social position/job or to be promoted, or in foresight of rewards). They are robotized. They are dehumanized. They are false...

The individual is surpassed by universal. **(drifting with the tide, and thus losing oneself)**

According to Plato, essence precedes existence, which is easily explicable for objects. You first think you need an apparatus and what characteristics to have, and then you build it. **(Maybe it refers to all those which are formed [postnatal], are born by innate nature [prenatal].)**

Then, which one came first, the egg or the hen? **(People only see the postnatal aspect, not the prenatal aspect of themselves.)**

According to Nietzsche, God is dead.

According to Dostoevsky, if God did not exist, everything would be permitted. **(Man can be ignorant of the cause-effect of merit-evil, but it doesn't mean this cause-effect is out of existence.)**

Spiritual pathology:

This philosophy is my life's disease. **(Is the “philosophy” absurd, or is the reader’s mind in trouble?)**

The happiness of the artist persists in his unhappiness. **(This is not necessarily correct.)**

The greatest moral lessons are developed by immoralists (It is because they landed in trouble, and are experienced.). **(Sure, but this is not necessarily all in the principle of opposite effect of extremity.)**

There is neither a definite end nor an ultimate purpose. **(I don't agree.)**
The theologians ignore the happening's role, and so do the vitalists.

According to Heraclitus, All is changing. But according to Parmenides, Nothing is changing. **(It is as if you are failing to see the movement of a train when sitting in the train.)**
Who is right?

According to Heraclitus, Individual is essential. According to Parmenides, Universal is essential. **(To push oneself above the collective group, or a subordinate to the collective, depending on the understanding of individuality.)**

Who is right?

Heraclitus: pluralist.

Parmenides: monist **(Neither can be made absolute.)**

Who is right?

(Both of them are correct in each case! And, simultaneously, both of them made mistakes.)

Every reference system reflects a sentence in a different light.

All is necessity and happening at the same time. **(People regard those "reasonable" as necessity, and those "unreasonable" happening, as if they can reason the world. How artificial this seems.)**

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 headed into 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 lives;
- Activist solution: to accept the suffering and to condemn the evil (Tudor Vianu).

But what are the man's attitudes in the presence of good or joy?

- Ecstasy
- Arrogance
- Indolence
- Decline

(To understand this, one has first to understand cause-effect. No wisdom, no blessing can last long.)

This is the close circuit of man's attitudes in the presence of "-", "0", and "+".

Idealism and Realism

Schopenhauer asserts that the "world is my representation," which is distorted by the plurality of various imaginations. **(One fails to see his true face, due to his vain intention [vikalpa, mind move].)**

Eliade reveals an "unrecognizable God," who is present without being made known, an echo of the Buddhist paradox of presence-absence grounded by Nâgârjuna. Hegel (according to H. Kûng) shows a "God

who sacrifices himself." **(This is a Buddhist teaching, twisted out of confusion.)**

The spirit couldn't even breathe without opposition and neutralities, and would wither itself as a plant. **(What does the author mean by the death of spirit? What does he mean by the breath, and withering of the spirit? I don't think they are proper descriptions.)**

a) Object Philosophy: A building through its architecture, a flower, a bird flying, etc., any object are all ideas, or inspire ideas. They are not necessarily to be written down on paper because they would lose their naturalness, and their essence would be distorted. The philosophy should consequently have a universal language, and should not cling to a specific language (How would we translate, for example, Heidegger's *dasein*, and why would we entangle in a notion, syntagme, or word?!) **(Every language, including this universal language, has its limitations.)**

A three-valued Para consistent system (LP) has the following values: "true," "false," and "both true and false." The ancient Indian metaphysics considered four possible values of a statement: "true (only)," "false (only)," "both true and false," and "neither true nor false." J. M. Dunn (1976) formalized this in a four-valued Para consistent system as his First Degree Entailment semantics.

The Buddhist logic added a fifth value to the previous ones, "none of these" (called *catushkoti*). **(Although Buddhism contains logic and philosophy, it is in essence neither logic nor academic research. One can't measure a tree trunk with a leaf.)**

In neutrosophic theory: between being and nothingness, **(I don't like the word "nothingness.")**

existence and nonexistence,

geniality and mediocrity,

certainty and uncertainty,

value and nonvalue,

and generally speaking, $\langle A \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Non-}A \rangle$, there are infinitely many transcendental states.

(transcending the intelligence we are aware of) And not even "between," but even beyond them. There is an infinitude of infinitudes. They are degrees of neutralities $\langle \text{Neut-}A \rangle$ combined with $\langle A \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Non-}A \rangle$.

Rodolph Carnap said, "Metaphysical propositions are neither true nor false, because they assert nothing, they contain neither knowledge nor error..." **(It is not that metaphysics asserts nothing, but that we never properly reach it, either shorter than or beyond, both are false.)**

3.4. Philosophical Examples:

Or, how to calculate the truth-value of Zen (in Japanese) / Chan (in Chinese) doctrine philosophical proposition: Is the present eternal and comprises in itself the past and the future?

In Eastern philosophy, the contradictory utterances form the core of the Taoism and Zen/Chan (which emerged from Buddhism and Taoism) doctrines. **(The author may fail to reach the essence of Buddhism and Daoism. Ordinary people might see Chan [Zen] in the same manner as that in which an ant sees humans. "Why don't you spare a glance for our hole? How comfortable it is!" Who realizes the narrow confines of "science"? To explain Chan with science, as if one is defining such an empty set that is also the universal set, or defining 0 as infinity; maybe one recognizes the universality of an unifying field to all matter, like the universality of wave-corpucle duality. How should we start? Only by abandoning all concepts of so called empty set, universal set, zero, even so-called mathematics, so called science, might one find the new start.)**

#2. The probability that candidate C will win an election is, say, 25-30 percent true (percentage of people voting for him), 35 percent false (percentage of people voting against him), and 40 or 41 percent indeterminate (percentage of people not coming to the ballot box, or giving a blank vote - not selecting anyone, or giving a negative vote - cutting out all candidates on the list).

Dialectic and dualism don't work in this case anymore. **(That, "It is yin and yang that constitute what we call Dao" doesn't refer to this. For example, merit from evil, bad from good, indeterminate from determinate, and reciprocally.)**

Neutrosophic Dialogues

Florentin Smarandache:

Neutrosophy means that any proposition has a percentage of truth, a percentage of indeterminacy and a percentage of falsity (some of these percentages may be zero).

For example the proposition "Tomorrow it will be raining" can be 40% true (according to some sources), 30% indeterminate (because of some unknown/hidden parameters), and 55% false (according to other sources) (The sum of percentages is not necessarily 100% like in fuzzy logic.).

In my book, I showed it is possible for a proposition to be true and false at the same time, especially in philosophy. I showed how a philosopher X proved that an idea was true, and later another philosopher Y proved that the same idea was false, and both of them were right!

In other words, neutrosophy is supposed to be a way to decipher the meaning or truth value of an idea. There are propositions whose percentage of indeterminacy could be zero, and whose sum of other percentages is one. For example, a proposition can be 30% true and 70% false (And this is a particular case, called fuzzy logic.), but also it can be 40% true and 70% false. This happens when the information about that proposition comes from different and conflicting sources.

I neutrosophically interpreted various well-known ideas from philosophy.

Neutrosophy also makes distinctions between absolute truth (a proposition true in all possible worlds), which is noted by 1^+ , and relative truth (a proposition which is true not in all worlds, but is true in at least one), which is noted by 1 .

Neutrosophy is not true or false, but is a tool that measures the logical value of a proposition.

In the study you read, I neutrosophically analyzed some well-known ideas in philosophy - showing that both: idea $\langle A \rangle$ and its opposite $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$ idea can be true simultaneously in humanistic fields, and I somehow extended the fact that the truth is in the middle: between $\langle A \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$ (for some ideas).

More generally, $\langle \text{Neut-A} \rangle$ is neither $\langle A \rangle$ nor $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$, but because the frontiers between $\langle A \rangle$, $\langle \text{Neut-A} \rangle$, and $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$ are vague and unclear, we also can say that $\langle \text{Neut-A} \rangle$ is both $\langle A \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$.

See, not all $\langle A \rangle$ is $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$ and not any time. I feel that their frontiers are unclear, and there are some points which can be both $\langle A \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$, or neither!

The Theory of Everything or the Logic of Everything is the neutrosophic logic!

I split a unity into two parts: $\langle A \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Non-A} \rangle$.

Then $\langle \text{Non-A} \rangle$ is split, in its turn, into two sub-parts as well: $\langle \text{Neut-A} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$.

Hegel used $\langle A \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$ only; I added that $\langle \text{Neut-A} \rangle$ should also be in between. Therefore we have, as a general picture: $\langle A \rangle$, $\langle \text{Neut-A} \rangle$, and $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$ for each unity.

$\langle \text{Neut-A} \rangle$ is a zero zone (that contains the zero point too), meaning things that are neither $\langle A \rangle$ nor $\langle \text{Anti-A} \rangle$.

Feng Liu: I don't like the term "percentage," but prefer "propensity". For all the external phenomena are no more than representations of our inner struggle. They are the balance or tradeoff of our two inner propensities, one leading to the integral view and the other to the partial view.

FS: Is a normal one single-minded, double-minded, triple-minded or none-minded?

FL: Let's discuss them individually. First let's discuss single-minded. He would hold that there is only one single value in a proposition, is it practical?

FS: What a numeric calculator. So, fuzzy mathematics adds another value and suggests two propensities.

FL: This is an important gateway. In fact, logic should have been defined as the unity of contradiction between logic direction and logic implementation. Chinese Daoism asserts that everything is defined in the unity of opposites, namely yin and yang. Accordingly, yang conducts change, and yin brings it up (I-Ching, also known as Book of Changes). In this way, I have redefined logic in an indeterminate style to facilitate "both A and Anti-A" etc. in the neutrosophics of logic. The unity of opposites is also described as neutrality in neutrosophy. This methodology of excitation/inhibition suggests a rhymed way of logic, leading to a dynamic methodology of weight strategy that links logic with a neural network approach. In this way, neutrosophy conforms to the crucial role of indeterminacy in logic, as a fatal criticism of classical mathematics and the current basis of science.

FS: In which aspect did they fail in the definition of logic?

FL: Logic is, in essence, rather a dynamic balancing act than the static truth-false concepts. This behavior can be represented in neutrosophy as "both <A> and <Anti-A>", "neither <A> nor <Anti-A>", or by more profound operations, promising a unification in the balancing. Values in the percentage are inefficient to characterize the unification in the tradeoff.

FS: What do you mean by "balancing" or "tradeoff"?

FL: Logic, in its social aspect, is an integration of distributed actions (conceptualization and implementation), rather than rules or fuzzy rules only. Logic is derived when people neutralize opinions among countless versions of implementations and applications, in contrast to the absolute accuracy and completeness in conventional mathematization. How can we measure un-intentionality with intentionality? For this reason, I would abnegate the mathematical pattern; for what is called "mathematical" is no longer mathematical at all in the views of neutrosophy and Chinese classic philosophies. Things will develop in the opposite direction when they become extreme, or "wujibifan" in Chinese. The logic "both A and anti-A" can be invalid in conventional logics, but valid in an excitation/inhibition rhythm; at least they imply each other and exist in one family.

FS: Is logic a fixed concept or an endless evolution?

FL: Let's explore the evolution of logic:



Prior natal (prenatal, innate) aspect (void)

↓
intention (first implementation)

.....

↓
full implementation
<A> <Anti-A>
Δ

If we regard <A> as the positive attitude and <Anti-A> the negative attitude toward a desire, an intention, inspiration, assumption, etc.; <A> and <anti-A> have in this way become logic operators. Take “I can speak English” for example:

As a positive operator <A>, it doesn't mean one speaks good English at the moment, but is confident in his success. In this way, he acts in a positive manner.

As a negative operator <Anti-A>, it doesn't mean he speaks improper English at the moment, but he lacks of confidence in his success. In this way, he acts in a negative manner.

FS: Yes, I saw the point in your ICM2002 presentation.

FL: In reality, logic comes as the balancing between these two actions:

Unity of opposites: both <A> and <Anti-A>

The hidden integral: Every mind is gifted with the gene of the universal mind: the integral part of our ultimate inner nature, which is identical with that of the universe. This is what I call yang in I-Ching (the originator). It is formless, shameless, timeless, the completely opposite world of our believed consciousness. So I call it the prior natal aspect, or wuji in the Taiji figure, or possibly Dao in Daoism.

Postnatal aspect: What we see, acquired knowledge, sets of rules, etc., are regarded as a specific implementation of some source in a specific situation

Prior natal aspect: What is hidden, or lies under the phenomena, is the origin of logic. <A> and <Anti-A> should be derived from the same source, namely the prior natal aspect (It can be void in representation, but nothing nihility.).

Yinyang perspective: The balancing is based on both priornatal and postnatal aspects. This unity is called a contradiction.

Practical description: This is the intention (priornatal, implemented, indeterminacy), where those implemented have been represented as truth or false, and those not implemented have been attributed to indeterminacy.

Key issue: There remains a gap between these two aspects, and the same source can be carried out in different ways

Simplified description (definition): The unity of the contradiction between logic director and its implementation.

FS: Why do we need to describe the prior-natal aspect of logic?

FL: The ambiguity of logic definition lies in the lack of distinction between conception and implementation. A concept without substantial implementation is usually abstract or even arcane, because it can never be understood by humans (For example, the primitive intention can be haphazard, underlying or void, i.e. non intention, such as, “why was I born?”), therefore, it is always void of significance. The implementation, however, can seldom match with exact accuracy the presumption in concept (As shown in Intentionally and Unintentionally and Logic: a Misleading Concept. Logic is largely mixed with subjectivity, so one becomes partial when they stick to it.). There must be inconsistency or even contradiction between them; therefore, we need to examine the relation (we call contradiction) between them to carry out the definition.

FS: Should logic be defined on the differential basis or the integral basis of these opposites?

FL: Men normally care too much about the fragmental details of the universe to maintain the hidden integral. In fact, every mind is gifted with the gene of the universal mind. It is the integral part of our ultimate inner nature, which is identical with that of the universe. This is what I call yang in I-Ching (the originator); it is

formless, shameless, timeless, the complete opposite world from our believed consciousness. So I call it the prior natal aspect, or wuji in the Taiji figure, or possibly Dao in Daoism. Chinese Daoism asserts that everything is defined in the unity of opposites, namely yin and yang, where yang conducts change and yin brings it up. So here I assume that yang directs change, and yin implements it (a sample model: excitation and inhibition in unity). The unity is also described as neutrality in neutrosophy, but my personal inspiration from Daoism indicates more.

Since ordinary humans are very limited in their enlightenment on nature, i.e., their knowledge appears as incomplete in both time and space domains (Spatial incompleteness refers to their partiality, and time incompleteness refers to their lack of insight to cause-effect. This leads to the lack of insight regarding essence and nature, also the partiality.). I should define a priornatal aspect of knowledge (referring to the innate aspect) as contrasting to the acquired aspect. This is because the acquired one is in fact born, grown and developed from the innate aspect, as if a sophisticated human figure is developed from a single gene. I have to assume this, even if it can be void in form. The prior natal aspect corresponds to yang.

In practice however, the absolute priornatal aspect is intangible; therefore, I exploit a relative concept that an implementation (e.g., a complete set of rules) is derived from a relatively “prior natal” intention. This can either be regarded as the absolute prior natal aspect or as an intermediate implementation. So I apply (Priornatal, Implemented, Indeterminacy) these as its status.

This status representation has suggested a novel strategy toward association, for example, when the three components are represented as operators, or in sets, and in a recursive manner.

To simplify this discussion, I simply use the contradiction between the director (as the prior natal aspect) and implementation to illustrate the essence of logic. This reveals the fact that any set of rules is a specific implementation of a priornatal seed under or in a specific circumstance, condition or situation.

FS: Is there any significance in such a contradictory definition?

FL: Logic refers to practical or even endless actions, rather than dead rules.

There are always a director and an implementer in every action of logic. The former provides new directions (e.g., assumption, idea, assertion) to the action, and the later carries it out (provides substantial support, verification, proof or negation).

There is always contradiction (unity of opposites) between them, with the contradiction sometimes appearing in the identity and sometimes antagonistic.

It is this contradiction that defines the validity of logic: truth, falseness, and indeterminacy.

The contradiction shows much more than values do. It is very likely to signify the trend of further development, and illustrate the status in both quantity and quality.

Neural networking and logic are in fact homogeneous.

FS: Does this have any relation to neutrosophy?

FL: Logic has never found out where true and false values are born. In fact, they are born from each other. Each is born from the human distinction of the other, and the more we care about them, the more we adhere to a logic. Thus we spoil our prior intention (a live one rather than a dead one). Therefore logic itself undergoes an endless evolution, leading to its own extinction: non-logic.

Therefore, logic is merely an instant image of reasoning. The first attempt comes out of indeterminacy (e.g., the prompting to be engaged in a study), then the theoretical approach, which when fully developed, is fixed into such a logical model as a concept, model or science. The science, however, will face its final stop when people all adhere to it, and it yields uncertainty when men take it as absolute certainty (e.g., Newton’s classical physics) due to the incompleteness, or absolute incompleteness of any fixed model.

FS: Are there similar approaches?



FL: There is one from the neurology-I-Ching background (Chris J. Lofting: Integration, Differentiation, & Meaning (IDM): The Properties and Methods of Personal and Social Identification [e-book], 2003, <http://pages.prodigy.net/lofting/idm001.html>), which summarized some of the related dialectical models and approaches including logics similar to neutrosophy. But I cannot assure its conformity with the Chinese classics, because it seems to be a combined philosophy. It deviates the main focus from a trifle branch (Our main theme should be Dao, so it is primarily suggested to study Daodejing before any further exploration.), but is useful to neurology.

FS: Can one explain many of the unexplainable concepts in neutrosophy?

FL: Sure, things shown diversely in different perspectives come out of the same root, the difference of different selves and different manners of reflection. To explore information fusion, one needs to cultivate the deeper backgrounds or hidden layers, and eventually, reach the common basis shared by all. In fact, we all stem out of the same root (the deepest layer commonly owned by all) as nature. But as the derivative (the fully grown-up form), logic is in constant evolution. It continues from birth, to growth, to prosperity, to withering, and finally to death, but something must lie underneath this change. So we pay more attention to the seed of logic while regarding logic only as an instant image.

More profound wonders lie in the neutrality, or zero between 1 and -1. In this state, for example, there is no longer any distinction between truths and falsities. One may reach a practical mind: a natural mind, in unity with the objectivity, but note the multi-fold implication:

1. A casual or instant balance of the opposites can be temporarily reached but soon broken down when one still has his private desires. A casual or instant unification of the opposites can be temporarily reached but prone to be disturbed if he has not yet reached the complete natural way.
2. An idiot can be blind to any truth or falsity, but he can never reach this unification as long as he suffers.
3. A stone heart (deprived of consciousness, e.g., an absolutely void consciousness) does not live in the unification, but just the opposite. It is a permanent apart of yin-yang.
4. It is the most sophisticated and difficult thing in the world to understand this point. People would sacrifice all they own to attain a proper education. For short let's use a metaphor (I add the latter two items):


“How much can your mind contain?”		
in a full cup: 	in an empty cup: 	For the no cup:
“No more, because it is fully occupied.”	“One cup.”	“It can contain the universe, because it is not confined to any form, shape or boundary.”

Therefore this emptiness is neither the normal void ness nor the nihility.

FS: Do you see the connection of neutrality with the Chinese Middle Way?

FL: As for the Western understanding of the Chinese Middle Way (or Doctrine of Mean), it needs to be further developed. For, “When the mind is either being or non-being, it falls into the trap of affirmation. When the mind is neither being nor non-being, it falls into the trap of negation.” Either affirmation, or negation, then, is a trap from which one must free oneself in order to reach suunyataa (the ultimate reality).”[2]

The Doctrine of Mean may instruct to our minds move: neither left (affirmation, as being) nor right (negation, as non being). So it may mean to abandon our mind move (vikalpa), rather than to blend or merge our mind moves. The distinction between current neutrosophic logic and the Chinese Middle Way may be:



wuji

No mental move;
Free of ideas that implies every idea;
Dao that implies everything.



Combining being and non-being in the way of I-Ching (Book of Changes).



Or mentally creating some new being as a truth to pursue, in a heretical way.

FS: So in this way, you have outlined the trends of neutrosophy:

FL: Yes. First, the tendency toward I-Ching (Book of Changes), that wuji (the outer circle, seemingly void being but the originator [the prior natal A] of all - in my personal interpretation) bears yin and yang. (Taiji, or in other words, wuji generates two. <Anti-A> is simultaneously generated when we conceptualize <A>, as good from bad, and like from hate.) This, then, in inter-combination and inter-transformation bear yin-in-yang and yang-in-yin (two yields four, from <A> toward <Anti-A> we have <Neut-A>⁺, and reciprocally <Neut-A>⁻), going on to yield eight trigrams (like descendants of <A> and <Non-A>), and so on to infinite distinctions.

Second, since yin in yang and yang in yin combines to form something neutral, someone has interpreted the action as the new taiji in the center. This is however a heresy of Daoism. (I experienced a qigong illustrated in the same manner, which is called Yuanjigong. It brought me total disaster, and was extremely pernicious. [Qigong is a physical and mental excise to attain strength or health, or is regarded to gather the energy of the universe for the special faculty of talent. However, by no means can qigong change the destiny upon which many people count.]).

FS: Is your accusation against neutrosophy?

FL: The point is whether one (even a follower) sets neutrosophy as a fresh new doctrine to mentally pursue (just to refresh his mental imaginations or mental creations), or has it developed and completed as a guide to a natural way. So, I still don't know where you would position your theory. Second, if people habitually develop or apply the theory in a wrong direction, it would very much become a heresy; even you wouldn't understand yourself.

FS: How can it be misleading?

FL: No sooner have we achieved in practice the correct manner of the Middle Way, than the theoretical assumptions were put forward. It seems to be a scientific adventure, but is actually a well described manner in Chinese culture.

FS: A neutrosophic set allows a quantum representation of a particle. For example, having two particles occupy the same space in the same time.

FL: The illusion might lie in our conception of particles. Our Middle Way may tell us neither to trap ourselves in the pit of quantum descriptions, nor in the pit of waves. Only by ignoring all our descriptions can we maintain our peaceful minds, undisturbed or moving. This is preliminary for our inner cultivation on which any external manner depends (To the extremity of inner cultivation, there is no need for any external scientific manner or external tools.). So men have reversed the priority order, and have thus mutually created an upside-down scientific world.

FS: Does the Middle Way suggest a natural way?

FL: Sure. The neutrality in neutrosophics seems similar to “Madhyma-pratipada” and “Mean” in Chinese culture, which might mean proper (I believe no mental move, no self consciousness is added, as if no self exists.). Neither left nor right, but neutrosophy is conveying different meanings at present. For example, if A stands for white and Anti-A black, then Neut-A should mean gray; however, either black or white can add to our subjectivity and should not be adhered to. (As we are blind to the ultimate truth, it can be more wrong to imagine the being and non-being.) Otherwise, we are unconsciously moving into this dimensional world that inhibits our access to the “infinite dimensional” (I prefer the non-dimensional term) world.

Confirmation yields partiality, as does negation. In seeking partial confirmation, partial negation, or indeterminacy, I realize that neutrosophy is seeking a natural way between intentionality and unintentionality, or between minded and unwitting. The Chinese Middle Way really exhibits the most genuine nature of our behavior, thus leaning toward the most genuine and ultimate truth, but it is by no means easy to understand; therefore, we have five thousand years of culture to illustrate the truth. Those years span from Confucianism, Daoism to Buddhism, in which Confucianism and Daoism served exactly as the basis of Chinese history for the introduction of Mahayana. But I strongly suggested that one never seek the meanings of the Chinese classics when they read. This distracts one from the Chinese Classics Recital Project of Prof. Wang (mentioned in my biography), or what I call here the infant way. Whenever one does seek, they are seeking distraction unwittingly. Plant rather than reap, or you will definitely distort the essence.

FS: Is that what you mean by the way that is not “minded”?

FL: Yes. If the quantum world reveals the more general objectivity, it is very possible that an expert in classical physics is less apt at quantum physics, due to his inadequate education. The same reasoning holds true for human conflicts, with each insisting on their own sphere of truth due to faulty educations or individual perceptions that are incomplete or even misleading. A possible conciliation lies in compromising – diminishing the minded way, to reach the understanding of another sphere:

(The idea of) A diminishes toward no-sticking-to-A

(The idea of) B diminishes toward no-sticking-to-B

Since a fact reflected from the mirror of A implies the private background (referential point) of A and the creation (including the negative, distorted) of A, both need to be compromised to see a mutual base.

Provided that A implies a more general way that covers B, should A ignore their idea? Sure, since the relatively more complete idea is misinterpreted in the language, background, or referential system of B. As I mentioned in an earlier paper [5], the best language should be no (no-sticking-to) language.

If everyone could ignore the idea of themselves, there would be no misunderstandings in the world. Therefore, the best idea would be no (self) idea or non self-idea (I don't mean a stone, a nihility, but a natural way.). However, man would be too clever to believe it.

So the conciliation to current crises lies in education. If we find our education is contrary to nature, not only should we compromise, but we should also diminish and abandon it (e.g., the “n-dimensional” manner) to adapt to a universal (“infinite dimensional”- non dimensional) manner. To lose is to gain, if there is no loss, there is no gain. One needs to abandon the old to adapt to the new. People must abandon their private minds to reach the universal one; they must abandon illusion to acquire the truth, and they must abandon the capricious to acquire the eternal.

It is also dangerous if we persist in the leaves but are blind to the trunk or roots. For example, science is developed to change destiny, but what on earth is destiny? Liao-Fan's Four Lessons [9] shows the principle and practice necessary to change destiny. But no understanding is beyond practice. We can never reach the correct understanding through any means of judgment or measurement based on our “scientific” referential manner; as I mentioned, science would reflect the same world in which few are able to command fate.

FS: Then you mean that logic itself brings faults that negate it, so as to overthrow logic?

FL: Yes, **whenever there is logic, there is incompleteness.** Logic is a relatively dead representation of our live sensations.

In a talk about English learning for the Chinese, I stressed that the students have spent a huge amount of time in reciting vocabulary, but they acquire far less.

“Why can it be wrong?”

“Because what they have learned is not English – they are merely symbols, an illusion.”

“Why?”

“Do they reflect the symbols in English or in Chinese logic? As a matter of fact, they first reflect the symbols in Chinese, and then carry out the logic inference in the Chinese way! Are they learning English or Chinese?”

“What's the point?”

“The point is, what they have learned are merely such pointers that point to English. Symbols are supposititious; one cannot infer anything without experience, so I call their effort in vain.”

“Then what is the true manner?”

“The sensation of English. All your activities, reading, listening, oral and writing, all serve this motif. Chinese students failed just in this. They pay too much attention to grammar rules and Chinese logic in interpretation, as if they are always interpreting the English literals in Chinese logic; however, it is just such logic that inhibits the sensation.”

“Do you mean my logic inhibits my language aptitude?”

“As you know, the best language learner is an infant. The success lies in the ignorance of logic. Logic can be a kind of dead sensation; when one infers in logic, do they exploit this sensation any more?”

“Do you mean we should feel English instead of inferring it?”

“No, do just the opposite. Do not stick to feelings, ideas (that are, in fact, no more than distraction), and even ignore yourself (e.g., the role of a student busy for exams) Can you concentrate on the author's role, even the unconscious of acquiring of English, like a baby learning by playing? Learning is equivalent to playing a role that needs great concentration. Sensation is shapeless, like ‘creativity’. We can never shape them.”

“But it is too distant of a goal.”

“Sure, you’d employ all the means to understand the context, but soon when you have done, try to abandon such means to build up your English sensation. When one is able to walk, do they still carry the crutches along with them?”

“But how can I read English without referring to its Chinese meaning?”

“Can you read without referring, as if the words had no meaning? Whenever you mind what they mean, you are using your Chinese logic again. Comprehension would lie in the ignorance of comprehension. Otherwise, how can you forget yourself in the role of the author?”

“Then how do you interpret some famous English language teachings, like those of Li Yang and Zhong Daolong?”

“Li Yang’s ‘Crazy English’ negates the sensation theory, but his manner happens to enhance the sensation by inhibiting logical reasoning. He leads the students to perform all his hand gestures while reciting English just, in my personal opinion, to get rid of all mental distractions from their learning habit. Professor Zhong Daolong’s contrasting (as contrary to the impatience for the students’ success) learning manner conducts the students’ coordination of all their possible senses. They see English, listen to English, write in English, speak English, etc., simultaneously, with special emphasis on dictation rather than on reading with their eyes only. This serves the same motif – to abandon their imaginations, and to get rid of mental distractions; for in this manner, no one has time to apply logic any more.”

“You mean to retrieve our own ability from an infant?”

“A famous Taiwan educationist, Professor Wang Caigui, made a through investigation, and asserts that the crucial or deciding learning period of an entire life span is from zero to age three, including antenatal education. Children are naturally gifted with an innate aptitude in everything. Whatever seed you plant, all is absorbed like in foam rubber. However, their innate aptitude diminishes with age. They become disturbed or distracted by worries or vexations, and that aptitude withers even beyond the age of 13, so a great figure should accept an earlier education of the giants.”

“Can one retrieve that after the age of 13?”

“Sure, as long as they are resolved to conquer the distraction.”

“How?”

“First, don’t apply logic (pertaining to our misleading education, since we have been educated in an incorrect way), since logic itself brings you distractions. Never mind what you acquire toward unintentionality. Second, recite (silently, if you choose) the greatest pieces as long as you have time, such as Confucius’s, Laozi’s, or just ‘Amitabha,’ to constantly replace distractions.”

“Does Amitabha have any meaning?”

“The innate aptitude of children lies just in this: they never guess the meaning. Whenever you guess or infer the meaning, you are seeking distraction unwittingly.”

“Does it work?”

“It is not my personal invention, but comes from our lost Chinese classics. A patient of diabetes was suffering from insomnia, and failed in all her efforts at counting numbers: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and so on. After my wife changed her mind to recite ‘Amitabha,’ she immediately had a perfect sleep. The point is, never add more distraction or doubts. The power lies in your confidence and concentration.”

“Why did she fail at counting numbers?”

“I am afraid the numbers help nothing (There are such cases when one builds up their internal power of concentration with numbers, but I prefer the external power. With this help, one can eventually cultivate their correct internal power.), but ‘Amitabha’ (There are countless means in Buddhism, not necessary this one.) signifies the greatest power of the universe, which she resonates with.”

“Then, you believe our mind acts as a receiver tuner?”

“Exactly. A child can resonate with any signal they perceive, such as sentimental wounds or evils,

entirely absorbed like foam rubber, and they perform it as soon as they grow up. On the contrary, the Classics Recital Program for Children initiated by Prof. Wang signifies a great educational technique. Classics bring you the source of human wisdom. To recite these classics is an important path to develop potential, to learn language, to enhance cultivation, and to open the gates of wisdom for children. On account of our own Chinese culture, I would prefer Daodejing of Laozi, Buddhist scriptures, ‘The Great Learning, the Doctrine of the Mean,’ etc. Children should not be asked to understand the meaning of the books, but should be led to recite all the books line by line, and paragraph by paragraph.”

“Do you believe logic is a minor, subordinate, or trifle aspect of intelligence?”

“A head of the School of Information Engineering and Automation of the Xi’an University of Technology alluded to the emphasis on logical thinking in engineering. I answered that if the logics come from the celebrity, how can one escape or surpass the constraints of the celebrity?”

Logic is relative to the world one belongs to, e.g., the ant’s world, or the bird’s world. Each has its own characteristic of logic. Is our world the perfect one?”

“No.”

“Are we willing to be confined to the logic of the imperfect world? If one believes in the after life, then their present realm of mind determines their future life.”

“But nearly all students take the word list (Chinese logic in word interpretation) or grammatical structure (structural logic) as being highly important.”

“If the average rate of passing the exam is 10 percent, you have the same probability.”

“I would not. But logic is really important.”

“Logic merely acts as a language of sensation, not at all the essence of wisdom, and could be the dead representation of our live sensation. People need it to express their sensations, to communicate. It is in fact a scientific language, not wisdom. Great mathematicians are often philosophers; however, mathematicians often find faults in their basic axiom systems, and many mathematicians assert that it is sensation that conducts logic deduction.”

FS: Can we conclude that logic always has limitations but sensation does not? Logic is relative, and sensation is not confined as long as one is resolved to cultivate. Logic is relatively dead, but sensation is alive.

FL: Yes, logic can never be complete if one splits its original unity. But to cultivate sensation, one needs to escape all the distraction (for the sticking manner) from logics, knowledge, and even the concept of sensation. One must return to the infant nature, being seemingly ignorant of everything; however, great wisdom often lies in the fool: “Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise.”

FS: Now that logic can never be complete, can we then infer that conception itself yields incompleteness as long as it employs logical means, or, does conception yield anti-conception?

FL: Sure. In education, especially in English as a second language for Chinese, students are normally eager to immediately get directly to interpretations when they meet a new concept or word, phrase (in Chinese, or in mathematics and science, from existing concepts). However, since each school or thought is limited to a specific background or referential frame, and it is usually hardly possible for one to turn to such multi-points of focus. Then, I am considering “defocusing” to maintain refocusing: forget all distractions and get to the right route.

Like other things in the world, science and technology also exist in alternation of fashions. For example, the quantum world can be completely different from classical physics. This makes people meditate: how can a well educated scholar change his point of view? Unless their minds are returned to infancy, this is

unknown.

In English learning for Chinese, those always interpreting it in Chinese never catch the essence of English. They would always understand English in Chinese logic, background, or points of view, and never switch to the heterogeneous referential point of view. One has to abandon their native language in order to command a foreign language. This is another case of the infancy effect. As we know, infant language aptitude lies in its ignorance of thinking, reasoning, or idea, logic; where there is no knowledge, there are no rules.

Thus arises the challenge to the change of mind: to learn but never to assume what is known – the way of *humility*:

Being the entrance of the world,
You embrace harmony
And become as a newborn

(Chapter 28 of Daodejing, Peter A. Merel)

(See also Chapter 4 of Liaofan's Four Lessons - The Fourth Lesson: Benefits of the Virtue of Humility [9].)

Like all things in the world, whenever there is birth, there is also death from this distinction:

When beauty is abstracted	So alive and dead are abstracted from nature,
Then ugliness has been implied;	Difficult and easy abstracted from progress,
When good is abstracted	Long and short abstracted from contrast,
Then evil has been implied.	High and low abstracted from depth,
(Chapter 2 of Daodejing Peter A. Merel,	Song and speech abstracted from melody,
http://www.chinapage.com/gnl.html)	After and before abstracted from sequence.

A concept is always accompanied by an anti-concept, as in the taiji figure, whenever there such a distinction exists. Then one should argue about the role of concepts: both positive and negative roles are integrated into one entity. Is there a proper way of conception that can effectively inhibit the negative role, or the death of concept? Sure, in order to keep it indistinct, as in its original, unspecified, indeterminate or *infant* state. To keep it primitive, immature, as if unborn, even we need it for communication to different spheres of the mind. So it is wise to vacate our minds (free our mind) to maintain “creativity” (an improper metaphor for a wisdom seed) alive (on going), as in an infantile way. In fact, creativity lies in the ignorance of creativity as against the confined or constrained (e.g., to a spot-oriented world - A science fiction film has compared our globe to a tiny spot in the universe.) way. Otherwise, a philosophy can be believed true when it serves our motif, and can be seen as false when it doesn't. In this manner, the world would be led into a self-centered society. As our self-centered ideology expands, bringing all the people into the real nihilism, no gleam of truth can be seen anymore in this blind world. When will human beings sacrifice their own motifs to adapt to the motif of the universe?

To command science, one has to abandon (ignore) science. To acquire genius, one has to abandon (ignore) genius. To acquire oneself, one has to forget or lose oneself. But more importantly, they must abandon everything only to get to the right education, the route of absolute truth. We are not defocusing, actually, but changing our focus to the universal mind.

FS: By “universal mind,” do you mean an absolute mind, free of errors, exists?

FL: Certainly, but not externally (as if only with the characteristic of some external god). It is internal to every living being (Everyone can cultivate this internal power and become a god.).

What creates the world?

1. The Tao that can be trodden is not the enduring and unchanging Tao. The name that can be named is not the enduring and unchanging name.
2. It is (conceived of as) having no name; it is the originator of heaven and earth; it is (conceived of as) having a name; it is the mother of all things.
3. Always *without desire* we must be found. If its deep mystery we would sound; But if desire always within us be, Its outer fringe is all that we shall see (Daodejing, James Legge, <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/text/tao/tao.htm>).


The Way that can be experienced is not true;
 The world that can be constructed is not true.
 The Way manifests all that happens and may happen;
 The world represents all that exists and may exist.

To experience without intention is to sense the world;
 To experience with intention is to anticipate the world.
 These two experiences are indistinguishable;
 Their construction differs, but their effect is the same.

Beyond the gate of experience flows the Way,
 Which is ever greater and more subtle than the world (Daodejing Peter A. Merel).


As mentioned previously, men normally care too much about the fragmental details of the universe to maintain the hidden integral. In fact, every mind is gifted with the gene of the universal mind: the integral part of our ultimate inner nature which is identical with that of the universe. This is what I call yang in I-Ching (the originator). It is formless, shameless, timeless, and is the complete opposite of the world from our believed consciousness. So I call it the prior natal aspect, or wuji in the Taiji figure, or possibly Dao in Daoism.

We illustrate this character of no-desire (Actually it is no mental move, through which to achieve the greatest desire.) as wuji:



- In this way, we see the integrity of the universe.
- Or in a Chinese saying, the unification of man and heaven.

But if there is desire, we can break the unification [denoted by wuji state] into taiji (moving mind):




When beauty is abstracted,
 Then ugliness has been implied;
 When good is abstracted
 Then evil has been implied [8].


So it is that existence and non-existence give birth, the one to (the idea of) the other ...



And with the desire growing:



things are thus split up,
loosing their integrity.



But still, there remain both propensities: the integral way and the splitting way:

It is crucial that we would rather create more symbols theoretically than follow a natural way.





- If someone points to the moon, can we reach it by holding his fingers fast?
- If someone points to the truth, can we reach it by holding fast his theories?
- Because in

this way, we are merely holding fast such pointers that point to reality, not reaching anything like reality. What we have reached are merely such road signs.

How can one then reach the truth? First, understand the universal heart that lies in non self desire. Second, abandon our splitting manner (vikalpa, mental creations, mind move). The undo principle (to undo our mental change):



The splitting way
returns to an *infant* way.



(As illustrated in Chapter 28 of Daodejing, Peter A. Merel):

- Using the male (Having no name, it is the originator, or father; having a name, it is the mother. So we cannot be partial to either of them in case of breaking the yin-yang unification - my personal annotation, as follows), being female,
- Being the entrance of the world (wuji),
- You embrace harmony (Dao)
- And become as a newborn (returning to the originality, the genuine nature).

So the only way is to abandon all our usual ways pertaining to our current misleading world, as the preliminary step toward the true world. Since truth and false, in the conventional sense, are out of the splitting way (vikalpa, mind move): (conventional) according to the logical way, we should also abandon such logical ways to reach the completely natural way, returning to our natural integrity.

FS: How would we then regard neutrosophy?

FL: As either a new concept of more complete truth, or as a novel class of logic. It follows the birth, growth, prosperity, withering, and the death cycle as in every science. Does one prefer a pointer or the ultimate true world?

If neutrosophy pertains to an instant state of art, due to the constant update, there is no need to adhere to it.

If it pertains to the soul of science, it is no longer external. So the way also lies in our inner cultivation.

FS: You seem to stand only on the religious background; why don't you switch to a scientific background?

FL: It is regarded religious because it is not commonly understood, it doesn't mean superstition. There is superstition in our understanding, but the nature namely, Dao or Way, can never be kidding.

When the great man learns the Way, he follows it with diligence;

When the common man learns the Way, he follows it on occasion;

When the mean man learns the Way, he laughs out loud;


Those who do not laugh do not learn at all. (Chapter 41 of Daodejing, Peter A. Merel).

As a matter of fact, if one finds such scientific ways fundamentally critical and the religious way more general, they would then reversely regard religious ways as scientific and so called "scientific ways" religious.

FS: How can you then explain "the question of being" from your background?

FL: First, if one regards their reflection of being as absolute, they might be trapped, because truth in common sense is relative to our senses and default beliefs. Let's see what on earth the following figure is:

"A circle" in student's eyes, or: "A cake, a dish, a bowl, a balloon [...], the moon, the sun" in child's eyes.



So such being is merely our mental reflections. It is more a belief than the common people's ultimate reality, and it varies among different people. In the story, "Blind People Touching an Elephant" by Mahapra Janaparamita Sutra, the same elephant has been interpreted as different things, such as a turnip, a dustpan, a pestle, a bed, a jar and a rope by different blind people who are ordered to touch the elephant in turn. The first one touches the tusk, the second the ear, the third the foot, the fourth the back, the fifth the belly, and the last the tail.

FS: So is logic, it is also relative to our different worlds.

FL: Is $1+1=2$ correct? Consider:


black+white=? explosive+fire=?, warm+cold=?, theory+practice=?, and yin+yang = ?

Logic comes as a mental reflection, so it is not the problem of logic (validity) but the ways we reflect it. Otherwise (if no one reflects), it would become the nihility (merely instructions).


FS: Thus come the individual worlds?

FL: Sure:


An artist lives in his own world: he is attracted to such a world:



And a singer fan:



We have been living in such a desire-driven world so long as to take it for granted



But actually it is only believed true.


For example, "I want to realize myself."

So, these are what they have realized:

So is a game player who lives in his world - he is attracted to such a world:




And a man falling in love lives in his world: he is attracted to such a world.



But actually it is such love that binds him to imperfections.

The supreme beauty merely lies in the lover's eyes. What a blind love!

They must have some mutual desire that drives them to this common world that is shared by all.





Further, something is commonly believed true when it meets the common desire of a group, a society or a world ... until no one doubts.


“I want to live in a big mansion”,
“I want to have a nicer car”,
“I”,

As a matter of fact, they are accumulating power in this world of self. Then something is true when it meets someone’s desire.

So our reflection of the world is created by this accumulative composite field of the beliefs of every being belonging to it. But it is a bewildering field.





It is a bewildering field; for everyone holds endless desires that negate the present being, for example:




They are not realizing their real selves, but are persisting in an instant image of self:

I have a house, but someone has a big mansion ...
I want to enter a university ...
I want to be a postgraduate ...
I want to be a PhD,
I want to uncover the mystery ...
I want to be a real scientist ...
I want to be a real lawyer ...
I want to be a real billionaire ...


This is a vicious chain of desires, for if every Chinese person owns a car, no one would actually drive, due to the traffic jam, and no one would have enough gas unless we waged international wars, and thus killed ourselves.



So is our world; we are not realizing our real selves, but are persisting in an instant image of ourselves, and of the world.



Why? Like the blind love mentioned above, whenever there are such vain intentions (vikalpa, mind move), there is partiality (Although the love is not for a figure, it is still for something that blurs and blocks our eyes.).



FS: So we are blind even to ourselves?

FL: The point is: Do we see the genuine nature of reality, or do we misinterpret an instant phenomenon as ourselves? Fish, ants, bats, etc. see and feel their own worlds, but it is distorted, because they are confined to their senses. Sages see through all their outer appearances, or outer coats of the universe, and describe the truth in various ways, but mostly in what we call “religions”. For example, they see Dao as the ultimate world.

FS: So, is that the non-minded way?

FL: Yes, it should be.

FS: What about the triple-minded way?

FL: It is your neutrosophic description. But in fact, it is of all those components discussed above: the dialectic way, the middle way (the natural way), and the heresy way.

FS: Is this necessarily consisted of the bad component?

FL: If not, it is no longer neutrosophy, but is an absolute doctrine. Even for the most absolute truth, there might be no absolute language to represent. “As virtue rises one foot, vice rises ten.”

FS: For one misbehaving, does absolute unintentionality mean still more misbehaving?

FL: By absolute unintentionality, one may have two-fold misconceptions. First, such a will is as an inanimate being, such as stone. I am sure by “wuwei” in Chinese culture; Laozi doesn’t mean that. Second, it is as such a will as doing absolutely nothing, as if a saint slept all day without any will until death – absolute inaction. It means neither of these.

FS: I understand that in Chinese philosophy, neither left, nor right, etc. But this in neutrosophy means:

- In some specific conditions it is neither left nor right.
- In other conditions it is both left and right at the same time.

They are not misleading, but combinations of + and -, trying to reconcile opposite directions, showing that both <A> and <Anti-A> can be true in one specific time-space, and false in others. That’s neutrosophy.

FL: Some people accept the first opinion which signifies one aspect: no mental move. Some accept the second-the unifying aspect, depending on their background and way of interpretation. It is still hard for me to confirm or negate, because there lay both pro and con perspectives. In the former aspect, no mental move implies integrity, the second aspect. However, if they themselves are formalized into concepts as something new to pursue, one also loses the integrity. The concept can never be complete, and therefore needs the de-conception coordination. Meanwhile, wuwei may be actually the best means of action – to carry out (implement) good wills, not to become inanimate or to die.

Absolute Truth

Florentin Smarandache: Regarding "absolute truth," I agree with you that there is a *dynamic* of each truth. Therefore, an "absolute truth" today might become only a "relative truth" tomorrow. This occurs when new worlds are discovered in which this previous truth is not 100 percent true anymore. What I argue, is that we are not sure if we know *all* possible worlds. An "absolute truth" is true in all possible worlds, but how can we make sure we know all these possible worlds? How can we make sure that new worlds will not appear tomorrow, while old worlds disappear? Maybe that is cautiously why not to assert anything as "absolute truth". However, what would you say about a tautology like "A=A" or "1=1"? Would it be possible to find a world in which such a tautology is not 100 percent true?

Feng Liu: I have to wonder if it is really the "truth," that points to a true world of understanding, namely the source of truth. Truth in the former sense is capricious (wuchang in Chinese, or anitya, anityatā in Sanskrit). This makes people feel that there might be no absolute truth. What I understand as the absolute truth is the universal mind, harmony with the universe. All branches of truth must serve this motif, or deviate from it in vain. This might be the reason why people fruitlessly seek truth, because it is assumed to serve private purposes, rather than the harmony of humans, or the universe.

It may not be the fault of the truth, but that of the reflection from a self-centered mental world. This might be the reason why we never reach a universal truth, since we never correct our sins (See Chapter 2 of Liao-Fan's Four Lessons – The Second Lesson: Ways to Reform [9].).

A pointer to the truth is different from the truth. Any form of symbols serves only as pointers. For example, when one draws an elephant on a blackboard, it is no more than a figure. When one points to the moon, should we regard their finger as the moon? So the truth is also false, and since we adhere to such symbols, we are blind still.

The absolute truth, as harmony with the universe, would appear to be more natural behavior than a school of philosophy. When one completely melts into the universe, there would be no distinction in their mind between themselves and nature. And every intention reveals the kindness of nature; there is nothing evil at all. So they would not distinguish anything unnatural, and would never maintain an eluded perspective. Of course, one may never be aware that there is a philosophy or truth in their mind.

Does it then mean there is nothing to follow, as there is nothing we can hold in our hand? No, because every good education is teaching us the correct way rather than the correct symbols and to correct our mistakes (See Chapter 1 of Liaofan's Four Lessons – The Third Lesson: Ways to Cultivate Goodness [9].).

Does it mean there is no truth? In regards to God (By "God," I mean a being who is identical to the truth.), He would answer no; there is no philosophy needed, for he understands everything by intuition. The over-truth is no more than false, since the manner would sentence a live truth to death (By dead truth, I mean the fixed mind inflexible to literal or other forms of changes.). Regarding an ordinary person with countless mistakes, truth exists in the implication of our faults: misbehaviors or misunderstandings. Misbehavior or misunderstandings definitely lead to unfortunate events or even misfortunes, so the truth results (See Chapter 1 of Liaofan's Four Lessons – The First Lesson: Learning to Create Destiny [9].).

I am afraid the truth is not represented by any absolute language.. It is represented, according to our own language. (How can one fix the live truth into some dead symbols, reflected differently by different realms of the mind?) It is not proper for us (in our blind world) to measure it. Is it possible to measure a more general teaching (scientifically, the "infinite dimensional" manner) with a clumsy, inept measurement (e.g., infinite dimensional manner)? In measuring, one is accumulating doubts about their genuine consciousness. (They are unconsciously reflecting the symbols with their eluded consciousness.) A good way would be more efficiently shown through conduct, behavior, etc., to correct our mistakes and misleading opinions (See

Chapter 2 of Liaofan's Four Lessons – The Second Lesson: Ways to Reform [9].).

Is there absolute truth in science? There is if it serves the well being of people. There is truth if it serves greediness, which teaches us to abandon science. Since, as the symbol of nature, Dao (in my belief) is of the nature of humility, sacrificing itself to nonentity and thus spreading all over the universe, as large (or in scientific terms, as many dimensions) as infinity. Therefore, to reach the universal perspective of absolute truth, one has to sacrifice any ideology of habitual referential models. (Refer to Chapter 4 of Liaofan's Four Lessons - The Fourth Lesson: Benefits of the Virtue of Humility [10] for more.)

I conclude that: The absolute truth is only seen by the heart when one abandons all possible knowledge and philosophies belonging to the different worlds that bewilder them. This should be a necessary means for one to get rid of all the distractions from these realms, and cultivate themselves to practice the true light of unification.

Awareness of relativity of the forms of absolute truth, one may argue about the similarity between absolute truth and nihilism. In the Chinese a room experiment [9], the Englishman will manipulate symbols in Chinese, and will give a correct answer in Chinese. But they are not conscious of what they did. Nihilism implies a dead consciousness. However, not only is a genuine consciousness alive; it also reflects the genuine truth.

Just as Lu You (of Song dynasty) wrote (a loose interpretation),

The road seems ending in the hills and streams, I doubt,

But I see the dense willow trees and bright flowers of another village.

Don't worry about yourself; only by forgetting yourself can you follow the light. Otherwise, you never understand the truth due to your endless doubt.

FS: Does the genuine mind (true heart) reflect the determinacy?

FL: Exactly; it reflects the truth, and in such a world there is no kidding, no confusion, no vain intentions, no illusion, no sickness, no death, no dissatisfaction, no evil, and no unintelligence.

FS: Is it too fantastic?

FL: Just because a universal mind adds nothing personal or private to their mind, doesn't mean they don't "reason" in logic, but rather with intuition – nothing minded (although with the greatest will). Therefore, they have the universal mind. As discussed previously, whenever a more or less private mind exists, there is a private or partial way, and anything against this private will or private way should certainly be regarded as indeterminate. The resulting notion is that, "We live in relativism, approximation, continuously changing worlds." We measure everything in a partial, private, more or less self-oriented, and even eluding referential manner. We are blind to the cause-effect ourselves, as if we drive a plane without any knowledge of the landscape, navigation, or even our current position, or destination. We are using the absolutely wrong measurement to indicate longitude, latitude; but we are unaware of it.

FS: Is that the reason why we have indeterminacy in neutrosophy?

FL: Yes. It should be a gateway to a more realistic specification of the contradiction between subjectivity and objectivity. Because we know our limitations, we'd better behave in humility. As someone once said, we are born in sin.

FS: Does humility mean anything in science?

FL: People normally over-emphasize the pros of science and neglect the cons. Not only has neutrosophy summarized both, but it also implies the humility in science – the indeterminacy, indicating both the incomplete and illusionary aspects of scientific manner.

FS: Does neutrosophy imply anything religious?

FL: Certainly. “When the mind is either being or non-being, it falls into the trap of affirmation. When the mind is neither being nor non-being, it falls into the trap of negation.” Either affirmation, or negation, then, is a trap from which one must free oneself in order to reach *suunyataa* (the ultimate reality) [2].

The pro aspect is that neutrosophy implies that both affirmation and negation are inadequate to illustrate objectivity, so it adds indeterminacy serving as the neutrality in between – neither affirmation nor negation, as guidance toward reality.

The con aspect is that neutrosophy fails to reach a deep realization of neutrality, thus conveying a different meaning from “The Doctrine of Means of Confucianism.” Because, according to my understanding of *Daodejing*, affirmation and negation are counterparts. They yield each other; one affirms something while simultaneously negating something (even the same thing). One would fail to reach the “Middle Way” without compromising both affirmation and negation, or by ignoring the measurement.

In conclusion, neutrosophy should coordinate with the pros, cons and with neither, with the “neither” implying the ignorance of both. In this way, neutrosophy implies the ignorance of neutrosophy. It can be integrated in one word: humility. However, as one can point to the moon but fail to reach it, one needs to follow an education called “religion” to realize (acquire) the virtue of humility.

FS: I feel that we live in relativism, approximation, or continuously changing worlds.

FL: I don’t mind what you feel, but I know my feelings usually cheat me, so I need to follow a proper education.

FS: Actually, neutrosophy is a tool to measure the truth of an idea, not necessarily a philosophy in itself. Liaofan’s learning lessons are full of a kind of popular aphorisms.

FL: I don’t mind what measurement you employ, but I always fail to measure our Chinese heritage – I doubted from time to time with my believed modern scientific manner, but the outcome was just the opposite: it is far, far, far beyond what men are able to measure.

However, one may argue whether it is necessary to discard old habits and ideologies, even modern culture. I feel that in this severely upside-down world, one seldom sees what is alive-Confucianism or Daoism, because they are overwhelmed by greediness etc. Society has almost lost its inner justice. Without basic social regulations, or without strict commandments, neither civilization would have been built up, nor would any dharma have taken place, from any teachings. (Any great culture will definitely deteriorate in this way into the devil’s saying.) So it is suggested more to popularize Confucianism in society (in which the most valuable thing is being lost, and the real civilization is dying, impacted by Western modernization), as a preliminary step toward further educations. (Confucianism and Daoism served as the exact basis in Chinese history for the introduction of Mahayana. So it was a wise deed to popularize these classics as basic education.) Liao-Fan’s Four Lessons are among the most basic educations, which form the basis for skyscraper constructions.

FS: You didn’t really catch the essence of *neutro*-sophy, did you? It shows the unknown, vague, imprecise,

unclear, subjective aspect of things through its second component, I = Indeterminacy. Of course, not everything is measurable. For example, how do we measure the immeasurable?

FL: I can say I understand your scope of science but don't feel I need to do so. So I would rather ignore it. All of mankind is holding the unreal measurement, isn't it?

FS: Intelligence and unintelligence are in a cycle. I don't think there is someone who is only intelligent in all situations, or is only unintelligent. From a brave action we may go to a bad inaction, and reciprocally. We have wisdom in a topic and silliness in another. No body knows all; only arrogant people pretend they do.

FL: I would never care about intelligence any more, but habitually care about it, thus making me unintelligent. So in this sense I don't prefer the saying "intelligent," and would rather change my habit.

FS: I exist more in one sense or direction than in another, and I may be dead in the opposite direction which does not interest me, or that I am not capable of.

FL: Actually, one has been accumulating the cause of death since birth. One is losing capabilities when they are achieving them. But the genuine instinct is not attained, and therefore is not lost.

FS: Great works are done only after mountains of transpiration of the mind! The magnificent pearl is the result of garbage that penetrates the inside of the oyster. Thus, beautiful <A> is involved by ugly <Non-A>. And vice versa: the nice flower is transformed into a faded plant with time. Also, happiness results from suffering.

Only by storming our brains and hearts can we realize the unrealizable. If you don't strive, you don't become a master or saint – of course talking in *largo sensu*.

FL: Sure. May you succeed! But remember, Buddhism had been among the basic educations in China, not reserved for masters or saints. It is an important part of culture. But nowadays one cannot assure that masters or saints of Buddhism are necessarily real Buddhists.

FS: As to the question of whether our minds move or the objects move, or whether the universe divides or our minds divide all, can we say that they are the effect of both? Is a fight and coalition between subjectivity and objectivity actually a fight between idealism and realism?

Reality is a reflection of our conscience, and conscience is a reflection of the reality. The objects move in reality independent of our conscience, but the objects can also move only in our conscience (through our minds, imaginations, and dreams).

FL: Actually I don't know it at all, but am far, away from reflecting the saying properly. And it should be pernicious and fatal for one to climb for wisdom (misinterpreting the reality with one's own imaginations), and although there are millions of theories, ideas or thoughts: I know what I cannot. Therefore, I would rather abandon the exploration than imagine anything of truth.

"Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise".

FS: Neutrosophy doesn't mean paradoxes, only that neutrosophy can characterize paradoxes { NL(paradox) = (1, I, 1) } among other sentences.

FL: I don't like the game of science.

FS: No, they are not part of a "game of logic." They are serious. I wanted to prove that many philosophical ideas are true in a referential system, partially true in another referential system, and partially false in yet another system.

FL: Is all mankind playing games in some point of view?

Life is busy, a struggle, a kind of war, but the war is merely a game ...

Like "A Dream of Red Mansions" ...

FS: If it is a dream, why aren't men awake?

FL: Can anyone distinguish that they are in a dream while they are still dreaming? Just as:

A great mountain by vertical and horizontal view,

Far, near, high, low, and each not same.

I can't see the true face of Lushan,

Because I am just in there.

*

FS: Non-normalization is imposed on the sum of the lower and upper limits of components T, I, and F in order to catch a bigger generalization. Fuzzy logic, for example, requires normalization.

In 1995, in U.S., I invented the word "neutrosophy"= neutro+sophy, etc., i.e. neutral wisdom, i.e. wisdom with no bias, i.e. wisdom that is not directed pro and contra something. Paradoxism originated in the 1980s in Romania. Paradoxism implies the neutrosophy. Neutrosophic logic can characterize paradoxes (Paradoxism is based on paradoxes, contradictions, antitheses, antinomies, odds, peculiarities, and oxymorons.): $NL(\text{paradox})=(1, I, 1)$, i.e., the logical values are true and false in the same time (and indeterminate as well).

Actually, in neutrosophic logic, a special place is reserved for "absolute truth," which means truth in all possible worlds. It is different from "relative truth," which means truth in at least one world but not in all possible worlds. For example: $NL(\text{absolute truth})=1^+$, while $NL(\text{relative truth})=1$, where 1^+ means $1+\text{epsilon}$; neutrosophic logic is the only one making distinctions between relative and absolute truths.

In fuzzy logic, $FL(\text{absolute truth})=1$ and $FL(\text{relative truth})=1$ too.

" $A=A$ " is an absolute truth, therefore $NL(A=A)=1^+$.

FS's answer to Ivan Stojmenovic: New things face opposition, misunderstandings, and skepticism (especially from old persons/referents) all time. Generally, young people are more open to novelties and changes.

In philosophy there are many controversial ideas and much subjectivity. Philosophy is the topic where one can prove anything and nothing! This was the point of my survey paper.

The referent failed to understand the big picture of the paper:

For example, the fact that in philosophy, a philosopher X states a proposition P and proves that it is true. Later, another philosopher Y states an opposite proposition Non-P, and also he/she can prove it is true! Therefore, both P and Non-P are true. And this is allowed in neutrosophic logic, but not in fuzzy logic.

If a referent says the paper is bad, it doesn't mean it is bad; if a referent says the paper is good, it doesn't mean it is good. It really is his/her intentional/subjective opinion according to their beliefs and interests.

Additionally, if a theory provokes negative (some of the referents) and positive (C. Le, J. Dezert, those attending the neutrosophic conference) reactions at the same time, it's not bad, but is better because the theory becomes more approached and cited. Unanimity is not normal in an open society. New things are not immediately accepted, and there are thousands of such examples in the scientific and humanistic fields!

The article "Neutrosophy, a New Branch of Philosophy," collects many such remarkable opposing statements from famous people, all proven "true" (although contrary to each other) by their initiators, and they then combine them. (For example, initiators try to get a midpoint between them, and try to reconcile them; neutrosophy means study of neutral/reconciliation ideas).

Neutrosophic logic can deal with paradoxes; whereas no other form of logic (fuzzy logic, etc.) can.

Chris Lucas: I'm unclear regarding the abilities and synergy of your logic. This has two aspects: firstly in the way two tuples can combine to generate a result that gives a greater or lesser result than an algebraic sum suggests.

FS: I defined some logical connectors for neutrosophic logic, and set operators for neutrosophic sets. However, because of this subjectivity/context, and because of other hidden parameters, their definition depends on them, For each specific problem, the solver should create his/her connectors. Using such kinds of connectors, one can combine the opposite data in order to get a better result.

FL: (in a very early email, but now no more such ideas) Although this is very vague, I need to show the key points to provide you with further information. I am considering a logic dynamics model: logic should be viewed via dynamics, as in physics (So now the idea has been developed into the description of propensities, between which, man always maintains a kind of balance or tradeoff.), and measured with inertia-anti_inertia, momentum-anti_momentum, potential energy of positive and negative, etc. So your neutrosophic logic can be measured in other terms instead of percentages.

FS: In neutrosophy, one correlates not only separate actions (as in synergism), but especially opposite actions that are correlated into an organic action. That has a greater total effect than the sum of their individual effects. And, to do this, one calls to paradoxes, to contradictions, and to anti-theses.

The intrinsic has an extrinsic feature, and vice versa.

Contraries attract and reject themselves at the same time in order to neutralize, for example positive and negative charges, and men and women. Contradictions give birth to new realities; they are engines of discovery.

Carlos Gershenson: "Nor yes nor no, but precisely the opposite!" said a former Mexican president.

FS: An aphorism from Buddhism said "Turn the suffering into rejoice"; suffering is thus good.

FL: But only with wisdom can one turn it. To understand it, in practice, there remains a long way of correct education, which has long been ignored in China.

FS: A friend from Holland reminded me of a French one: "il faut souffrir pour être beau" [one has to suffer in order to become beautiful].

FS: God exists and doesn't exist.

FL: Dao would exist as the way of nature, not necessarily as a figure.

FS: He is conditioned and unconditioned.

FL: The way of nature lies universally intrinsic to every mind, but one rarely sees the way.

FS: He is seeing and unseeing.

FL: Sure, people reflect it in diverse ways.

FS: Virtual and real.

FL: Although deeply hidden, the way of nature is rooted in every mind, despite misinterpretations.

FS: Transcendent and non-transcendent.

FL: Everyone is innate and has the most genuine wisdom seed, which is transcendent, but represented in relativity.

FS: I believe, and I don't believe in God.

FL: Humans are too ignorant of the nature of reality, and so need the proper education.

FS: I'm theist and atheist.

FL: I wonder what Dr. Smarandache means by "theist," but I am not a theist (an awakened scientist? I don't know what I am.).

FS: I am Christian, Buddhist, and Muslim, all at once, yet none.

FL: I don't know what Dr. Smarandache means. There are historical reasons in China, where the Cultural Revolution ruined almost all the classics and heritages. Romania might also do this to its culture, judging from my talk with Dr. Smarandache in Beijing.

FS: I hope neutrosophy will reconcile science with religion...

FL: It is so-called religion because it is not universally understood, and the other is called science because it is universally believed in. Neutrosophy lies just in between the two, as it is more practical than conventional science but less abstruse than religions. In fact, many scientists, including Einstein, exhibited strong interest in religion. In my knowledge, our Eastern Buddhists can explain science in the perfect way, so as to foresee its outcome; but pure scientists never succeed.

CG: Many ideas through history seem to be non-practical at first, until someone finds an application for them.

FL: A wise man cares more about the seed to plant, not the fruit to reap.

FS: The Neutrosophic Probability and Statistics could be this in the future.

F. Liu wrote somewhere that, "There is no truth (as if there is no drug actually, just because there is

sickness. There is no method, just because there is error, and also in Laozi [Daodejing] there is the parallel sentence.), and it may be a Chinese idiom that there is only one step between truth and false.” Then did you negate the absolute truth?

FL: First of all, Buddhism is not a teaching of nihilism, but a basic teaching of life; I am correcting these fatal mistakes in my publication reviews.

Second, Daodejing illustrates the yin-yang complementary phenomenon – whenever we abstract something as truth, we simultaneously negate something (even the same thing) as false in this splitting way.

Third, as mentioned before, it requires that we abandon this splitting manner to understand the genuine truth, and do not hold fast, mentally, to something as an absolute logic to pursue.

Finally, we are usually full of mistakes or misbehaviors, so we need to follow the correct ways regarded as truth. It is regarded absolute, because there exists the genuine natural way independent of different worlds.

FS: F. Liu interprets from a communist-Buddhist point of view.

FL: I am not a Communist, nor am I qualified to speak in terms of Buddhism. I merely express my personal views.

FS: A mutual point among opposite beliefs is the limit of neutrosophy. There is a Romanian proverb: Neither black nor white!

Neutrosophy comprises paradoxes and distinguishes between absolute truth and relative truth.

Other paradoxes:

<A> is not <A>.

<Non-A> is really <A>.

The complement of <A> is not <Anti-A>, but <Non-A>.

FL: Men would habitually see the world without integrity, due to our partiality, either a lack of belief or over-belief. Thus comes the saying, “Using yin, being yang,” telling us to maintain the integral way. When the truth is over-believed, it becomes false or prejudiced. Since we habitually see the world in an upside down manner, we need the right way.

FS: Telesthesia means extrasensory perception of distant objects. Could neutrosophy deal with extra-senses?

FL: When one always excites partial senses, they may inhibit integrity, consciousness, and cause one to falsely regard the lost sense as extra or abnormal.

FS: Do you mean humans are in retrogression?

FL: I mentioned in the Chinese translation that the evolution and retrogression of human society is more or less a misleading concept. People have followed an incorrect teacher like Darwin, and those who diligently follow Dao could be sniffed at. People would be too wise in their scientific (material) accomplishments to remain critical to their own referential worlds, in which they have been educated since birth.

FS: But the Chinese are opening doors and learning from the west.

FL: Yes, but meanwhile we Chinese are adopting increasingly more wastes than treasures from the West, regardless of the real treasures. When one is deprived of all their treasures, or they replace them with means,

they begin a beggar's life. What an exchange of cultures!

FS: (in his e-book of neutrosophics) In our beings, there are an “I” and a “Non-I” that dispute the priority. It is that interior dissection which splits our existence in two dual pieces.

FL: It is also that interior dissection which splits the unified time-space into fragments, and creates the eluding world we believe to be true.

“Any system based on axioms is incomplete because the axioms cannot be proven from the system, just believed” (Carlos Gershenson, “Comments to Neutrosophy”). In the sense of Gödel (1931) and Turing (1936),

“Beliefs are the axioms of reason and thought. Reason cannot prove the beliefs it is based upon.” Thus, “Reason is incomplete” (Carlos Gershenson, “Comments to Neutrosophy”).

FS: Neutrosophy is based on contradictions, not only in philosophy, but in any other field, especially in humanistic ones where the truth is more flexible and subjective than in rigid scientific fields.

It handles paradoxes. Many contradictions are true simultaneously.

Neutrosophy deals with inconsistency, which is commonplace, and part of our lives. Even in the worst possible situation, there exists a bit of goodness, and vice versa.

Neutrosophy likes to question, even deny, what’s well approved, and to reconsider what’s negated by everybody.

According to Carlos Gershenson’s Silly Theorem Problem, "There can re-be any silly idea Is so that there is at least one context for which it is consistent." It is a particular case of one of Neutrosophy's Main Laws (H):

Let $\langle \alpha \rangle$ be an attribute, and $(T, I, F) \subset] 0, 1^+]^3$. Then:

- There is a proposition $\langle P \rangle$ and a referential system $\{R\}$, such that $\langle P \rangle$ is T% $\langle \alpha \rangle$, I% indeterminate or $\langle \text{Neut-}\alpha \rangle$, and F% $\langle \text{Anti-}\alpha \rangle$.

- For any proposition $\langle P \rangle$, there is a referential system $\{R\}$, such that $\langle P \rangle$ is T% $\langle \alpha \rangle$, I% indeterminate or $\langle \text{Neut-}\alpha \rangle$, and F% $\langle \text{Anti-}\alpha \rangle$.

- $\langle \alpha \rangle$ is at some degree $\langle \text{Anti-}\alpha \rangle$, while $\langle \text{Anti-}\alpha \rangle$ is at some degree $\langle \alpha \rangle$.

“The absolute (a-being) is independent of the observer, infinite. The relative being (re-being) is dependent of the observer, therefore finite, and different in each individual. The re-being can approach as much as we want to towards the a-being, but it can never comprehend it. Objects a-re. Concepts, representations, and ideas re-are.” (Carlos Gershenson, “Comments to Neutrosophy”).

Mathematically we could say that

$$\lim_{re \rightarrow \infty} (\text{re-being}) = \text{a-being.}$$

$re \rightarrow \infty$

There are neutrosophic sets A, B such that: $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq A$, but $A \neq B$.

a) If A is a subset of B, then:

$$\text{If } x(T_1, I_1, F_1) \in A \Rightarrow x(T_2, I_2, F_2) \in B,$$

$$\text{where } \inf T_1 \leq \inf T_2, \sup T_1 \leq \sup T_2, \text{ and } \inf F_1 \geq \inf F_2, \sup F_1 \geq \sup F_2.$$

b) And if B is a subset of A, then:

$$\text{If } x(T_1, I_1, F_1) \in A \Rightarrow x(T_2, I_2, F_2) \in B,$$

$$\text{where } \inf T_2 \leq \inf T_1, \sup T_2 \leq \sup T_1, \text{ and } \inf F_2 \geq \inf F_1, \sup F_2 \geq \sup F_1.$$

Therefore, for $T_1 = T_2$ and $F_1 = F_2$ but $I_1 \neq I_2$ we have:

$x(T_1, I_1, F_1) \in A$ and $x(T_1, I_2, F_1) \in B$, but $A \neq B$ because the indeterminacy component is different.

FL: Do T,I,F denote figures or actions?

FS: They are originally figures.

FL: This is the point! Those figures are no more than the image, projection or out-of-date trace of an action or intention.

FS: Why then can there be indeterminacy?

FL: T may signify a steady action – the confidence in one’s intention, and vice versa for the steady negative action. But for the unsteady intention or confidence, there is indeterminacy. There remains a complicated curve from one’s first intention to the final accomplishment due to their subjectivity, and thus they see the relative world.

FS: Okay.

FL: So by no means should we ignore the inner cultivation and blindly follow science. We are merely children in some aspect, we have no right to comment on Jesus or the most eminent sages in the world.

FS: I did that in one context, not generally. Sometimes God doesn't exist, other times He does.

FL: According to your saying, the death of neutrosophy means the death of human beings. You are setting neutrosophy up as a religion, above many others. It is an evil deed.

FS: I said this in context too. Remember, every sentence depends on the referential system that reflects it.

FL: Sure, but don’t you see that I am building up a mansion of imagination we call the absolute truth? But in fact, I have achieved nothing in practice toward actual realization. Therefore, I need to abandon bombast and touch solid ground.

FS: I didn't say that I have answers to all your and others' questions. There are many questions in the world with no answers.

FL: Especially when most of them are silly questions like mazes that attract and trap minds

FS: I wanted to say that neutrosophic logic is a generalization of fuzzy logic and of other logics as well.

FL: This could be a good start toward Oriental cultural-the ones transcending science and technology. It is, however, a long march with great hardships.

FS: I don't want to be a philosopher; that's why I study philosophy. We have different, maybe opposite, cultural backgrounds. Yet as you know from neutrosophy, it is possible to find common points to disjointed sets, or $\langle A \rangle$ (which may be Liu Feng) intersected with $\langle \text{Anti-}A \rangle$ (which may be Florentin) is not the empty set.

FL: I am afraid the intersection tells more about our common faults. It would be better to conduct a good life than to waste time in imagining truth.

FS: There is not a precise definition of "truth." I understand it from a more scientific/logic way, while you from a religious/Buddhist way.

FL: As mentioned before, it is regarded as religious because it is not commonly understood. As a matter of fact, if one finds such a scientific way fundamentally critical and the religious way more general, they would then reversely regard the religious way as being scientific and the so-called "scientific way" as religious.

Why did I choose the con-logic side? Why should I be on the opposing side? I shouldn't have cared. How silly I am to trap myself in a pit of truth, philosophy, intelligence, wisdom ... all such fancy illusions! I would rather be unwise, unintelligent, humble, and mean. How can I disguise my ignorance with a magnificent coat?

I don't want to win, because I don't want to bother any theory or school in order to convince anybody. I just want to quit the game, and be free of ideas.

References:

- [1] Chin-Kung: Reestablishing Morality and Educating the Youngsters – An Interview, 2002, http://www.amtb.org.sg/2/2_10/2_10_1/2_10_1.htm
- [2] Chung-Yuan Chang: Ch'an Buddhism: Logical and Illogical, <http://ccbs.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/ew27057.htm>.
- [3] Carlos Gershenson, *Comments to Neutrosophy*, <http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/CommentsToNeutrosophy.pdf>.
- [4] Kurt Gödel, Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme, I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, Vol. XXXVIII, 173-198, 1931.
- [5] Feng Liu: Name, Denominable and Undenominable, — *On Neither $\langle A \rangle$ Nor $\langle \text{Anti-}A \rangle$* , Proceedings of the First International Conference on Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Logic, Set, and Probability, University of New Mexico, USA, 2002, pp.107-113, <http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/FirstNeutConf.htm>, <http://xxx.lanl.gov/ftp/math/papers/0306/0306384.pdf>.
- [6] Peter A. Merel: TaoDeChing - Lao Tze, GNL's Not Lao Version 2.07, 1995, <http://www.chinapage.com/gnl.html>
- [7] F. Smarandache, A Unifying Field in Logics: Neutrosophic Logic. Neutrosophy, Neutrosophic Set, Neutrosophic Probability, American Research Press, 1999, <http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/eBook-Neutrosophics2.pdf>.
- [8] A. M. Turing, On Computable Numbers, with an Application to the Entscheidungsproblem. Proc. London Math. Soc. (2), 42, 230-265, 1936-7.
- [9] Liao-Fan Yuan (ancient): Liaofan's Four Lessons, <http://www.amtb.org.tw/e-bud/liaofan.HTM>, <http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/Text/ChangingDestiny/index.html>, <http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/Text/LiaoFan/index.html>.

Science, Destiny, and Buddhism

FS: Does science have anything to do with Buddhism?

FL: Let's examine the views of a number of scientists and authors regarding science and Buddhism:

ALBERT EINSTEIN (The twentieth century's most famous scientist): "If there is any religion that would cope with modern scientific needs, it would be Buddhism."

SIR EDWIN ARNOLD (Author of "The Light of Asia"): "I have often said, and shall say again and again, that between Buddhism and modern Science, there exists a close intellectual bond."

BERTRAND RUSSELL (Famous philosopher and mathematician): "Buddhism is a combination of both speculative and scientific philosophy. It advocates the Scientific Method and pursues that to a finality that may be called rationalistic... It takes up where science cannot lead because of the limitations of the physical instruments."

RADHAKRISHNAN, Ph.D. "If Buddhism appealed to the modern mind, it was because it was scientific, empirical and not based on any dogma."

GRAHAM HOWE, Ph.D. (Famous British psychiatrist): "To read a little Buddhism is to realize what the Buddhists knew, 2500 years ago, far more about modern problems of psychology than they have been given credit for. They studied these problems long ago and found the answers also. We are now rediscovering the ancient wisdom of the East."

H.G. WELLS (Famous scientist and historian): "Over great areas of the world, Buddhism still survives. It is possible that in contact with Western science, and inspired by the spirit of history, the original teaching of Gotama, revived and purified, may yet play a large part in the direction of human destiny."

KARL GUSTAV JUNG (The world's leading psychologist from Zurich): "As a student of comparative religions, I believe that Buddhism is the most perfect one that the world has ever seen. The philosophy of the Buddha, the theory of Evolution and the law of Karma were far superior to any other creed."

Bhikkhu ANOMA MAHINDA: "Buddha taught facts of nature, twenty five centuries ago, which Western scientists have only discovered in the last decade. The Dharma is the greatest living force in the world today which can bring among men and nations."

THOMAS HUXLEY (Famous British scientist): "Buddhism is a system which knows no God in the Western sense, which denies a soul to man and counts the belief in immortality a blunder, which refuses any efficacy to prayer and sacrifice, which bids men to look to nothing but their own effort for salvation, which in its original purity knew nothing of the vows of obedience and never sought the aid of secular arm, yet spread over a considerable portion of the world with marvelous rapidity and is still the dominant creed of a large fraction of mankind."

FS: Is reincarnation true?

FL: Please examine the text, "Scientific Research in Reincarnation" through a link on <http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/index.html>.

FS: How do Buddhists regard science?

FL: The most famous and authentic essay is the Chinese e-book, [Fojiaokexuelun](http://www.physics.utah.edu/~junyu/larong/index.html) (My personal interpretation: [Buddhist Theory on Science](http://www.physics.utah.edu/~junyu/larong/index.html)) by Suodajikanbu (Mandarin translation of the Tibetan name), <http://www.physics.utah.edu/~junyu/larong/index.html>, which presents the perfect examination of current

science.

Sure, the treasure (core) is in Chinese, are you disappointed? See a leaf from the trunk, on the web: “The famous scientists, such as Albert Einstein, have recognized the contribution of Buddha’s teaching regarding the knowledge of human life. In addition to the Dependent Origination (law of conditionality) and Karma teachings, Buddha taught Abhidhamma (A Buddhist Psychology held in the highest esteem in Theravada tradition.) and Vijnanavada teachings (used more in Mahayana tradition). These teachings have explained many psychological areas that science has not touched, such as the classification of Consciousness (or Mind, Citta in Pali), the relationship between Mind and Body, the Five Aggregates (corporeality or matter, feeling, perception, volitional activities and consciousness), and so on. Buddhism is scientific and empirical because we can prove the theory we learned by our experience in practicing. The Buddhist faith is not the same as faith in other religions; it is based and built by the experience gained in the practice. The Four Noble Truths point out the causes of suffering and show that we must follow the Eightfold Path, practice Morality (Right Speech, Right Action, Right Livelihood), Meditation (Right Mindfulness, Right Concentration) and Wisdom (Right Understanding, Right Thought) to deliver ourselves from Suffering.”(<http://zencomp.com/greatwisdom/uni/u-vbud/vbpha014.htm>)

There are many sutras on the mystery of the universe collected in Dazhengzang (the great Buddhism collections) which, illustrates the perfect truth without the slightest flaw.

FS: How do you find the modern information or media network?

FL: It is just this sort of advanced technology that has destroyed our society from the root:

“Environmental pollution has become a serious problem, and now humankind has finally begun to understand the need for protecting our environment. However, the problem of mental or spiritual pollution is many times more serious than that of the environment. This is the source of worldly ills that not many people realize. The Chinese have a saying, ‘Education is most essential to establish a nation, train its leaders and its people.’”(From a talk by Master Chin-Kung on education, <http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/Text/Education.html>.)

FS: How much has science enhanced the faculties of human beings?

FL: I am afraid science has brought about far more negative effects. See an address by the famous Master Hsuan Hua (who founded the CTTB, USA), who presents an essay on the future of man (http://www.drba.org/future_of_man.htm):

“In this era, when technology and materialism flourish, we want to take a careful look at the thinking of the times and ask ourselves whether or not this is a good age to live in. Science has made great advances in technology, and that certainly counts as good. But we should also realize the truth of the saying,

“Anything taken to the ultimate point, transforms into its opposite.”

In the case of technological advances, good things also beckon misfortune. Let’s look at television, for example. I know people will object to my analysis of TV, saying, “Dharma Master, you’re a throwback to another age. You’re an anachronism. You’re out of step with the times.” Nonetheless, in my opinion, the television is a menace to human life. The television is a man-eater. Did you know that? Look at children these days. Instead of doing their schoolwork, they sit in front of the television set. They’re glued to the screen, and it eats up their very life-force. The children might as well be dead, because they will never learn the basic principles of being good people. They will learn only how to stare dully at the television.

And what does the TV teach them? Every kind of strange and freakish behavior you can imagine. They learn precious little of value. The kids very quickly learn to enact the evil and harmful lessons they watch. In

no time at all, they learn all the bad things that people can do.

Before television came into the world, the “people-eater” was the radio. Radios sucked up humans’ life-force. People used to stick a radio in their ear and completely forget everything else. Radios made us forget about eating, sleeping, and the ordinary events of life. Now the television has confused us to the point of not knowing whether we’re coming or going.

Computers have followed along right after the television. In Chinese, the word for computer translates literally into “electric brain.” In the future there will be electric eyes, as well as electric ears, electric tongues, electric noses, and electric bodies. Every one of the six organs will have disposable modules, like cassettes, and will gain an electric boost. Eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body, and mind will be computerized. Even the mind will tie in organically with “know-it-all computer memory banks.” Is this a good time to be a person? Impossible! This is a dark age in human history.

In this benighted era, our wisdom has been stolen away by material things. Nobody has any natural wisdom to speak of. Our inherent brightness has been replaced by products and goods, and once we substitute things for wisdom, then people will grow up blank, like idiots. Wisdom will become outmoded. People will no longer serve any useful function. Mark my words: in the future, people will become obsolete. Would you say this is a serious problem or not? Look into it! People will soon be rendered useless!

For instance, some unethical scientists now are busy inventing miraculous monsters. You say it’s human? It’s not really human. You think it’s an animal? It’s not exactly an animal either. Since they graft human genes onto animal bodies and alter human genes with animals’ strains, this mutual genetic modification produces a freakish, mutant, hybrid that resembles neither parent.

Now people can be born with horns, or elephant-like trunks. In my opinion, a human born with a nose like a pachyderm is more like a goblin than a person. These goblins and freaks are all within the realm of possibility today.

Furthermore, the range of computers has grown out of control. Within the next two centuries, telephones and the like will be totally obsolete. Televisions and computers will have disappeared. Every person’s physical body will contain the capabilities of these machines. Nobody will have to bother dialing a telephone. A person will only need to beam the number of the desired party from their own built-in phone, with its antennae located in the eyebrows, perhaps, or from the hair. The other person will receive the call in the same built-in way. “Hello! Good morning!” That’s how easy it will be to place a phone call.

At this point, somebody may be thinking, “Dharma Master, that’s the craziest talk I’ve ever heard.”

Well, I ask you to consider this. How many people would have believed you if five hundred years ago you had said, “In five hundred years, there will be airplanes, television, and radios?” Everyone would have considered you insane. But all these inventions are commonplace now. Why do I mention this topic in the first place? Because we should recognize that advances in science, and in material benefits are not necessarily good for humanity in the long run. They are incomplete, imperfect benefits,

Wisdom, on the other hand, is the most thorough-going benefit for the entire world. Thinking and attitudes born of morality and virtue are thoroughly good for all. The Buddha’s Four Measureless Attitudes of kindness, compassion, joy, and even-mindedness are totally advantageous to all creatures. When we base ourselves in thoughts such as these, we can go ahead and put technology to work for us. There’s no fear that we will forget the fundamental aspects of humanity: our own bodies for example. In the future, people will forget entirely what others look like. We will all become like animals. I’m not scolding you; this prediction is a cold, hard fact.

That’s how the world turns. Good taken to the ultimate point turns bad. Evil, once it reaches an extreme, turns good. A person who is poor to the bitter extreme of poverty can suddenly strike it rich, while rich people can lose every penny overnight. Once born, we are tiny infants, but we grow up, grow old, get sick, and die. That’s the cycle of creation and destruction that continues all over the world. It is a natural process of progressive, cyclical change, a process of metabolism, and transformation. If we recognize the state, then

getting rich won't especially appeal to us any longer. And if we should lose our wealth, then we will see things according to the proverb:

“The superior person, even in poverty,
maintains his integrity;
The petty person stops at nothing
to strike it rich.”

So it is most important in this day and age of insanity to not go crazy, and to not forget what it means to be a person. We must keep in mind the original purpose and appearance of human beings. That's my message for all today. I hope the young people who hear me won't go insane. The elderly should keep an even stronger grip in their sanity. The children can learn along with the adults. Learn how not to go crazy.

I always say, “Everything's okay, no problem!”

There's a bit more to add here. Don't get scared when you hear me call television, radios, and computers man-eating goblins. There is no need to be afraid. My hope is that you will clearly recognize these things for what they are. Once you recognize them, then electric gadgets lose their power to confuse you. That's enough to know. But if you're confused by them, then they can gobble you down.

The same principle applies to beauty. If the sight of an attractive person has the power to confuse you, then you've been swallowed by a man-eater. If the sight of money confuses you, then you've just been devoured by a man-eater. If your purpose is to establish your reputation, and fame confuses you, then you've just been swallowed by the goblin of fame. If good food confuses you, although you feel you've just enjoyed a tasty dish, in fact, the food has eaten you. The food has eaten your spiritual soul, your Dharma-body. It has eaten up your wisdom, and left you stupid. If sleep keeps you in a stupor for several centuries, and you finally wake and see by your wrist watch that it's already half-past noon, and if then, you simply roll over and go back to sleep, then you've been devoured by sleep. Get the point?”

FS: Can science save mankind?

FL: I am afraid science has long been used as a means of competition that leads to conflicts, wars and ruins. Can conflict solve any problem? Definitely not. Examine this talk by Master Chin-Kung (<http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/Text/WorldFreeOfConflict.html>):

“In recent years, our world has become beset with adversities and our lives filled with increasing unhappiness. As time goes on, these adversities will become more and more severe, more and more frequent. Someone asked how the compassionate Buddha and Bodhisattvas help all sentient beings to be free from pain. They do this by teaching us to overcome greed, anger, and ignorance so that our minds will no longer be deluded, but awakened, by teaching us the Law of Cause and Effect.

To end our suffering, we first have to know what causes it. As human beings, we undergo the sufferings of birth, old age, sickness, and death. We suffer hardships, the inability to attain what we seek, separation from those we love, and association with those whom we resent or even hate. We are surrounded by all of these with no apparent way of being truly free.

We need to understand that catalytic conditions or circumstances have to exist for a cause to generate an effect. By controlling these catalytic conditions, we can have some influence over our consequences. We need to practice good deeds during our lifetime to generate good karma. Then we will truly appreciate that living a happy and fulfilling life is the karmic result generated from a good cause and a good condition, and this is the way to attain liberation from suffering and to attain happiness.

Today, many of us feel the weight of our negative karma as we witness the unhappiness and suffering around us. They are caused by our selfish and erroneous behavior, by our choosing to benefit ourselves at the expense of others. How do we remove this negative karma? How do we prevent further occurrences? We do so by dedicating ourselves to helping and benefiting society, by not protecting ourselves while harming

others.

Most of us have the subconscious desire to control other people, animals, even inanimate objects. But by letting go of this attachment, we can be liberated. Awakened beings live their lives with great ease. They fulfill their responsibility of advising and educating sentient beings by explaining to them the true reality of life and the universe, the Law of Cause and Effect by explaining that every cause, every thought, word and action has a result.

Whatever people decide to do, it is their choice, their consequence. We simply accord with the condition as we educate them and then leave the rest up to them. By doing this, our minds will remain serene, as it generates the concentration and thus the wisdom to effectively interact with people, matters, and objects. The benefits that can be derived from such practice are infinite and boundless. Not only can our present suffering be resolved, but our negative karma accumulated over infinite life times can be eliminated as well.

Why then are we unable to realize the true benefit? Because we are obstructed by our own negative karma, unable to see what is right before our very eyes. We are constantly reminded by the images of awakened beings. We are constantly prompted by our reciting the sutra, impelled by our daily chanting and listening to Dharma talks. Yet, we are still unable to truly comprehend the teachings, still unable to apply the principles in our daily lives.

We cannot blame the Buddha and Bodhisattvas for not helping. The fact is they are trying to; we are not paying attention. We have a wondrous and rare chance that is about to slip by us. To be born as human beings who are able to hear the teachings is an unbelievably rare opportunity, not encountered for millions of years.

It is as rare as a bubble rising to the surface of a vast sea and breaking the surface of that sea inside the one wreath of flowers that is floating upon it. Allowing this to happen will be a tragic mistake that is entirely of our own making. To prevent this from happening, we need to reflect and feel remorse for our mistakes. This is a learning process that will enable us to overcome our afflictions and bad habits, and thus to remove our negative karma. How do we do this? By feeling deep regret for our mistakes and vowing to not commit them again. Daily practice will help to decrease our negative karma. It is to practice in the midst of society, not to be separated from it. Our goal is the mind of sincerity, purity, equality, compassion, and awakening. Only with this mind will we be able to solve all problems. They cannot be solved by physical force, by war. They are solved with gentleness and loving-kindness toward all other beings, animate and inanimate.

It is in our best interest to be rid of the desire to control, for it will only result in our committing further transgressions, thus increasing our negative karma. No one can truly control another. History provides us with many examples of countries that tried to use force to control another country; Hitler's invasion of Europe, the Japanese invasion of China, the Russians in Afghanistan and the United States in Vietnam. All failed.

Instead of those countries spending huge sums of money on warfare, they could have spent the money on caring for and supporting people who were suffering hardships. In this way, they would have peacefully won them over. Or they could have used the money to educate their own citizens, to help them become self-sufficient, to pay more attention to the country's internal needs instead of constantly interfering with external affairs.

Our every thought needs to be directed toward benefiting all sentient-beings. Not only should we never hurt any sentient beings through our behavior, but we should also never give rise to a single hostile thought, or say anything that can cause distress to others. If we can truly follow this teaching in our daily lives no matter what we do, there will be great goodness and great gentleness. This is the way to truly influence people, with loving-kindness and compassion. Using physical force to try to solve problems will not only create enemies, but will also generate the cause to be born into the hell realms. By practicing in accordance with the teachings, we will achieve results; for in this way we will transform our minds. Since everything is a reflection of our minds, everything can be transformed *by* our minds. When we are in accord with the teachings, our thoughts will change; our actions will be proper and correct.

We would do well to let go of selfishness, to only have thoughts that benefit others. Instead, we are wrapped up in our own concerns, thinking only of protecting the interests of ourselves, our group or our country. This way of thinking has led to quarrels between people, feuds between families, and wars between countries. It has led to massive damage on both sides: the tragic loss of lives, the excessive monetary cost, the disastrous destruction of land, the final destruction of friendships and peace, and the grave consequences incurred due to the Law of Cause and Effect.

Our complete lack of concern for plants, living, and non-living creatures of our natural environment has resulted in the destruction of our environment. Ultimately, we are the ones who suffer from this negligence and lack of compassion. We are all one entity, one being, all interrelated closely with one another. Everything, including us, arises from the coming together of causes, so to harm others is to harm ourselves.

Once we truly comprehend this, we will have no more problems. Being overly concerned with our own interests and those of our groups and country is the root cause of all misfortunes and adversities. Taking care of this problem solves everything else. When we practice accordingly, with proper and caring behavior, we will see an increase in our good karma and a decrease in our bad. In turn, our suffering will be reduced or eliminated, and we will experience a favorable change in our circumstances.

When we give rise to one single bad thought of inequality, we turn a favorable situation into an unfavorable one. However, with one single good thought of equality, the Buddha realm will appear in that moment. When we give rise to one single thought of holy beings, the Heaven realms will appear in that moment. Likewise, with one thought of greed, anger, or ignorance, our daily lives will become unsettled and unmanageable. However, with one thought of purity, our lives will become harmonious and peaceful.

Our lives are short. However, we are unbelievably fortunate to have been born human, able to learn and understand that the Law of Cause and Effect is unchangeable, permanent. We reap what we sow. By sowing good causes, we reap good consequences; by sowing bad causes, we reap bad consequences. Even beings with perfect understanding, wisdom, and compassion cannot alter this reality.

However, with the causes that we have already planted, we can learn how to alter our catalytic conditions before they come into effect. Furthermore, we need to refrain from committing any more bad deeds and to do more good deeds, to distance ourselves from adverse conditions. In some cases, this can reduce or eliminate the bad effects. In this way, we can control our own consequences, transform our environments, and change the directions in which we are currently headed.

We are learning of increasingly more prophecies that speak of upcoming disasters, even of the end of the world. These prophecies also tell us that these could be reduced, delayed, or even prevented if we replaced our incorrect ways with those that are good, and with those that benefit others and not ourselves. But if we do not turn back now, then it will be very hard to avoid them.

It is crucial that people understand that using physical force cannot solve problems; for even if we destroy a country, even if we detonate enough bombs to wipe out the face of the earth, it still will not solve our problems. We cannot waste this opportunity but need to instead cultivate in a sincere and diligent manner, to apply the principles with unselfish thought and behavior. We need to be good, warm, sincere, and to put all our efforts into helping others. In this way, all that is good will come our way.

Buddha Shakyamuni told us that there are three cataclysmic disasters in this world: fire, water, and wind. Fire is caused when we feel jealousy and hatred. Where do floods come from? They come from our greed. Disasters caused by wind are the result of ignorance.

If we want to avoid or to be rid of these, we must sever our greed, anger, ignorance, and arrogance. We should neither feel greed for worldly teachings nor for any other teachings. For to feel the slightest trace will block us from severing the mind of greed; it will block us from eradicating the disasters, which are increasing in both frequency and severity. This is very important. These have been predicted by many ancient

prophecies from respected religious leaders in many different countries.

Three thousand years ago Buddha Shakyamuni told us of the partial destruction of the world, which would be from war, epidemic, and famine. He foretold a war that would last for seven days and seven nights, then an epidemic that would last for seven months and seven days, and finally, a famine that would last for seven years, seven months and seven days. In the past, it was difficult to imagine how a war could last just seven days but have such devastating results. It was beyond imagination.

But anyone who has been to Hiroshima or Nagasaki would realize that the Buddha was describing nuclear warfare. In Nagasaki, after the atomic explosion, many people survived the explosion itself, but were infected with atomic fallout. Consequently, many of them died during the first six months. This can be defined as an epidemic.

The radiation sickness that results from atomic fallout is insidious. It starts by destroying one white cell, and gradually progresses until there is massive cell destruction, then uncontrolled bleeding, and finally, death. Anyone who was still alive at least seven months after the detonation would be considered as having survived the immediate effects of the bomb.

For years after the explosion, there were no trees, plants, or grass; all was barren. The trees and grass started to grow approximately eight years after the bombs' detonation. It was as we had been told: the ground would grow nothing for seven years, seven months, or even seven days. In this period, all will suffer from famine.

From this, we realize that the partial destruction of the world that the Buddha predicted is indeed that of nuclear warfare. Could it really happen? Many believe it is very likely. Access to nuclear weapons is becoming more widespread and more difficult to control. No one knows how long this tentative control can be maintained. Very honestly, the only way to attain real control is to encourage and help all to understand the need to prevent human-made tragedies. If we observe the world situation objectively, then we will see it is very difficult to avoid this probable disaster.

If the war were to happen now, half of the world's population could be killed. How can we escape such a war? We need to stop all bad thoughts, speech, and behavior, and accumulate good deeds. How? We can do so by ceasing all selfish ideas, by constantly thinking of how to benefit all others, and by letting go of our own interest for the sake of others. This will help us to avoid all that is bad and embrace all that is good. But, if our every thought is only of ourselves, it will be very difficult for us to avoid even more problems.

Why do we persist in our anger, our hatred, our fighting? Why do we have conflicts and the inability to tolerate others? Why do we seem so determined to keep heading towards the brink? This is all due to selfishness, erroneous viewpoints, the inability to truly care for others, and the inability to truly understand that everything arises from our minds. The inability to understand that every thought we have is instantly felt throughout the entire universe.

We need to let go of our selfishness and comprehend that the whole universe is our home and that we are one with the universe. We have the same self-nature as enlightened beings. The difference between them and us is that they comprehend this. All sentient beings have been our past parents. All sentient beings are future enlightened beings. Understanding this, how can we not be respectful to all beings? How can we possibly harm them?

We originally had this comprehension, this great broad mindedness. Then why are we so narrow-minded now? We are deluded, unable to see through our false beliefs and incorrect viewpoints. Our innate wisdom and abilities are thus temporarily lost to us. However, if we can break through this delusion, then we will be able to uncover this wisdom; for it is not permanently lost. In the Flower Adornment Sutra, we can see the broad-mindedness of enlightened beings. All of the infinite and countless numbers of beings at the assembly who gathered to hear this unsurpassed teaching are one.

If we could just understand this true reality and expand our minds, then we too would recognize that regardless of race, religion, or culture, we are all one. With this wisdom, discrimination, misunderstandings,

and conflicts among beings would naturally diminish. First, human-made tragedies would be avoided. Then what we think of, as natural tragedies would likewise dissolve.

The environment changes with our minds. When our minds are serene and compassionate, our living environment will become tranquil and peaceful. Today our living environment is being polluted and destroyed. Some say that the earth is rapidly becoming unsuitable for living. How did this happen? It is the result of the bad intentions and deeds of human beings, and this is the real reason for what is happening. To save our world, we need to use great wisdom to help those who are deluded to become awakened. How? It can happen through education. All the great sages have used education to overcome ignorance.

Recently, a practitioner asked how he could be assured of being freed from the cycle of birth and death, and from reincarnation. He was told to let go of all desires, good, or bad. We cannot be truly free if we have not yet let go, and we cannot let go because we are still clinging to something. Find it. We must find it! If we cannot, then even if we are born into the highest level of heaven, even if we will live through eighty thousand cycles of creation, existence, and complete annihilation of the world, we will still be mired, lost in the cycle of birth and death. What can we do? Find out what we are clinging to and LET GO! Let go of all attachments. Let go of all feelings of gain and loss. Let go of discriminating and wandering thoughts. Let go of the thought of how others treat us. Let go of the thought of those who owe us, of those we owe.

Only with purity of mind can we let go, and only then can we attain genuine and permanent happiness. If we cannot do this, then we are truly lost for our vows; our beliefs are not sincere enough. No matter how much we practice, we will be unable to be free, serene and at peace. We are still clinging to one of the five desires of wealth: lust, fame, food, drink, and sleep. We are still discriminating between what we perceive as right or wrong. Greed for these will lead us into the downward spiral of the three bad realms.

And although, with enough good karma, we can go to the highest heavenly realm of Neither Thought or Non-thought, where the beings have a life span of 80 thousand eons; with enough bad karma we go to the hell realms, where the beings have a life span of infinite eons. When compared to 80 thousand eons, the time spent in the hell realms is unbelievably long. When we consider the time spent in this world compared to the other realms, our time here is a flash of lightning, a drop of dew, a fleeting cloud; it is inconsequential.

Today, we still have obstacles due to our lack of understanding. Why can we not let go? We are still clinging to something. Because of this clinging, we are still mired, still lost in the cycle of birth and death, and still lost in the ten realms of existence. We need to know that if we cannot transcend the cycle of birth and death, most of our time will be spent in the three bad realms. Greed is the cause of the karma that results in our being born into the hungry ghost realm. Anger is the cause of our being born into the hell realm. Then why are we born into the animal realm? This is the consequence of being ignorant. An example of such a situation follows.

There was once a very famous priest in a very old religion. He decided it was the right day to perform the ritual sacrificing of a goat. In his ignorance, he thought this was an offering demanded by his god. He obtained an appropriate goat for the sacrifice. He ordered his servants to take the goat to the holy river, wash him, and decorate him with flower garlands. Then they were to wash themselves, as part of the purification practice.

Down at the riverbank, the goat suddenly understood that today he would be killed. He also became aware of his past births, deaths, and rebirths. He realized that the results of his past unwholesome deeds were about to finally be completed. So, he laughed an uproarious goat-laugh, like the clanging of cymbals. In the midst of his laughter, he realized another truth - that the priest, due to his ignorance in sacrificing him, would suffer the same terrible results. So, he began to cry as loudly as he had just been laughing!

The servants, who were bathing in the holy river, first heard the laughing and then the crying. They were amazed. They asked the goat, "Why did you loudly laugh and then cry just as loudly? What is the reason for this?" He replied, "I will tell you the reason. But it must be in the presence of your master, the priest." Since they were very curious, they immediately took the sacrificial goat to the priest. They explained all that had

happened. The priest too, became very curious. He respectfully asked the goat, "Sir, why did you laugh so loudly, and then cry just as loudly?"

The goat, remembering his past lives, said, "A long time ago, I too was a priest who, like you, was well educated in the sacred religious rites. I thought that to sacrifice a goat was a necessary offering to my god, which would benefit others, as well as myself in future rebirths. However, the true result of my action was that in my next 499 lives, I myself have been beheaded!

"While being prepared for the sacrifice, I realized that today it is inevitable that I will lose my head for the 500th time. Then I will finally be free of all the results of my unwholesome deed of so long ago. The joy of this made me laugh uncontrollably. Then I suddenly realized that you, the priest, were about to repeat the same unwholesome action, and would be doomed to the same result of having your head chopped off in your next 500 lives! So, out of compassion and sympathy, my laughter turned to tears."

The priest was afraid this goat might be right, so he said, "Well, sir goat, I will not kill you." The goat replied, "Reverend priest, even if you do not kill me, I know that today I will lose my head and finally be released from the results of my past unwholesome action." The priest said, "Don't be afraid, my fine goat. I will provide the very best protection and personally guarantee that no harm will come to you." But the goat said, "Oh priest, your protection is very weak, compared to the power of my unwholesome deed to cause its necessary results."

So the priest canceled the sacrifice, and began to have doubts about killing innocent animals. He released the goat and, along with his servants, followed the goat in order to protect him from any danger. The goat wandered into a rocky place. He saw some tender leaves on a branch and stretched out his neck to reach them. All of a sudden, a thunderstorm appeared out of nowhere. A lightning bolt struck an over-hanging rock, and cut off a sharp slab, which fell and chopped off the goat's head! He died instantly, and the thunderstorm disappeared.

There was a fairy that lived in a nearby tree, and had seen everything that had happened. He appeared, gently fluttering in the air overhead. He began to teach the curious people, saying, "Look at what happened to this poor goat. This was the result of killing animals! All beings are born, and suffer through sickness, old age, and death. But all wish to live, and not to die. Not seeing that all have this in common, some kill other living beings. This causes suffering also to those who kill, both now and in countless future rebirths.

"Being ignorant that all deeds must have consequences for the doer, some continue to kill and heap more suffering on themselves in the future. Each time they kill, a part of them must also die in this present life, and the suffering continues even by rebirth in hell worlds!" Those who heard the fairy speak felt that they were very lucky indeed. They gave up their ignorant killing, and were far better off, both in this life, and in pleasant rebirths.

Fellow practitioners and guests, please listen carefully. The Law of Cause and Effect is unchangeable and immutable. Our greed, anger, ignorance, and arrogance have resulted in disasters that are increasing in both frequency and severity and are approaching a scale that is impossible for us to imagine.

Everything arises from our minds. But just as we have given rise to the cause of this approaching disaster, we can also give rise to another, greater cause that can maybe reduce, or possibly even prevent it from happening. We must replace thoughts of self with thoughts of others. We must give up feelings of pride, the desires for fame and wealth. We must let go of thoughts of trying to control others. Let go of narrow-mindedness and biased viewpoints. Let go of criticizing, blaming, and gossiping. Let go of the thought of those who owe us, of those we owe. We must let go!

Only by letting go, can we return to purity and tranquility. Only in this way, will our hearts become gentle, and our minds become serene, as we give rise to the wisdom to accord with all beings, animate and inanimate. For only with gentle hearts and serene minds will we be able to solve our problems. The goodness that we can bring to others by using our loving-kindness and compassion is infinite. And this is our best, our only way to bring true peace to our world. Not for ourselves but for the sake of all sentient beings.

FS: Is fate destined?

FL: Let's see Liao-Fan's first lesson:

My father passed away when I was young. My mother persuaded me to learn medicine instead of studying and passing the imperial examinations, because it would be a good way to support myself while helping others. Perhaps, I could even become famous through my medical skills, thus fulfilling my father's aspiration for me.

One day, I met an elderly but distinguished looking gentleman at the Compassionate Cloud Temple. He had a long beard and the look of a sage. I immediately paid my respects to him. He told me, "You are destined to be a government official. Next year, you will attain the rank of Learned First Level Scholar. Why are you not studying for the examination?" I told him the reason.

I asked the elderly gentleman for his name and where he was from. He replied, "My family name is Kong, and I am from Yunnan Province. I have inherited a very sacred and accurate text on astrology and prediction. The text, written by Shaozi, is called the Imperial Standard of Governing the World. By my calculations, I am supposed to pass it on to you and teach you how to use it."

I invited Mr. Kong to my home and told my mother about him. She said to treat him well. As we tested Mr. Kong's ability to make predictions, we found that he was always correct, whether it was for big events or for minor everyday matters. I became convinced of what he had said, and again began to think of studying for the examinations. I consulted my cousin who recommended Mr. Yu, who was teaching at the home of a friend, and became Mr. Yu's student.

Mr. Kong then did some more calculations for me. He told me that, as a scholar, I would be placed fourteenth in the county examination, seventy-first in the regional examination, and ninth in the provincial examination. The following year, I placed exactly where Mr. Kong had predicted in all three examinations.

I then asked him to make predictions for the rest of my life. Mr. Kong's calculations showed that I would pass various tests in various years: the year that I would become a civil scholar, and the year that I would receive a promotion to become an Imperial Scholar. And lastly, I would be appointed as a magistrate in Sichuan Province. After holding that position for three and a half years, I would then retire and return home. I would die at the age of 53, on the 14th day of the eighth month between one and three o'clock in the morning. Unfortunately, I would not have a son. I carefully recorded, and then remembered everything that he said.

The outcome of every examination turned out exactly as predicted. Mr. Kong had also predicted that I would only be promoted after receiving a ration of 259 bushels of rice. However, I had received only 20 bushels of rice when the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Tu, recommended me for a promotion. I secretly began to doubt the prediction. Nevertheless, it turned out to be correct after all, because Mr. Tu's replacement turned down the promotion.

It was not until some years later that a new Education Commissioner reviewed my old examination papers and exclaimed, "These five essays are as well-written as reports to the emperor. How can we bury the talents of such a great scholar?" The new Commissioner wanted the magistrate to issue an order for me to become a candidate for Imperial Scholar under his authority. After undergoing this eventful promotion, my calculations showed that I had received exactly 259 bushels of rice. From then on, I deeply believed that promotion or demotion, wealth or poverty, all came about in due time and that even the length of one's life is pre-arranged. I began to view everything in a detached manner and ceased to seek gain or profit.

After being selected as an Imperial Scholar, I was to attend the University at Beijing. During my year-long stay in the capital, my interest in meditation grew, and I often sat in silence, without giving rise to a single thought. I lost interest in books and did not study at all.

The following year I went to Nanjing. Before I was to enter the National University there, I paid a visit to

Master Yungu, a venerable Zen Master at Qixia Mountain. We sat in meditation, face to face in the Zen hall for three days and nights without sleep. Master Yungu said, “The reason why ordinary people cannot become sages is because of all their wandering thoughts. In our three-day meditation, I have not observed a single thought arise in you. Why?”

I replied that Mr. Kong had clearly predicted the entire outcome of my life. I had seen that the time of life, death, promotion, and failure are fated, so there was no need for me to think of anything. The master smiled and replied, “I thought you were someone of remarkable capabilities! Now I realize you are an ordinary person!” Feeling confused by what Master Yungu had said, I asked him to explain. He told me that an ordinary person’s mind is forever occupied by wandering and imaginary thoughts, so naturally his or her life is bound by the mathematics of destiny. We cannot deny the fact that destiny exists, but only ordinary people are bound by it. Destiny cannot bind those who cultivate great kindness, or those who have committed flagrant wrongdoings. Since I had lived my life just as Mr. Kong had predicted and done nothing to change it, I had been bound by destiny. Thus, I was a typical ordinary person.

Taken aback, I asked if we could change our destinies. The master answered, “We can re-create our own destiny and seek good fortune. It is the true teaching and is found in the Book of Songs and the Book of History. In the Buddhist teachings, it is written that if we wish for and seek wealth, a high position, a son, a daughter, or long life, we can attain it. Since the Buddha told us that lying is one of the greatest transgressions, we can be assured that Buddhas and Bodhisattvas would not deceive us.”

I told Master Yungu that I had heard that Mencius once said, “Whatever is sought can be attained. The seeking is within ourselves.” This refers to inner qualities such as virtue, integrity, and kindness. These are all values we can work toward. However, when it comes to outside factors such as wealth, fame, and prestige, how can we seek to attain them? He replied that Mencius was right, but that I had misunderstood his meaning. Master Yungu said that Master Huineng, the Sixth Patriarch of the Zen School taught that, “All the fields of merit are within one’s own heart. If one seeks from the true mind within, one can be in touch with all that one wishes for.” By seeking within ourselves, we will not only attain the inner qualities of virtue, integrity, and kindness; we will also attain (external benefits such as) wealth, fame, and prestige. To be able to attain both inner qualities and external benefits is invaluable.

Master Yungu then told me that if one does not reflect inside one’s own heart, but instead blindly seeks fame, fortune, and long life from outside sources, no matter how one schemes to pursue them, one can only attain, at most, what had been destined. Seeking from the outside, one might lose both inner purity and what one was destined to have; thus, the seeking would have been in vain.

Master Yungu next asked about Mr. Kong’s predictions for the rest of my life. I honestly told him everything. He asked if I felt that I deserved imperial appointments or a son. Reflecting on my past deeds and attitudes, I answered that, no, I did not. Those who received imperial appointments all had the appearance of good fortune, but I did not. I also did not work towards accumulating virtues to build up my good fortune. I was very impatient and narrow-minded, and would show off my intelligence and abilities by putting others down. I behaved as I pleased, and spoke without restraint. These were all signs of scant good fortune and virtue. How could I possibly receive an imperial appointment?

There is an old saying that “life springs from the dirt of the earth, while clear water often harbors no fish.” The first reason why I felt that I did not deserve a son was that I was obsessive about cleanliness. The second reason was that while harmony is the cultivator of life, I was quick-tempered. Third, although loving-kindness is the cause of fertility, and harshness is the cause of sterility, I was selfishly concerned about my reputation and would not sacrifice anything for others. The fourth reason was that I talked too much, and this wasted a lot of energy. Also, I drank too much. And finally, I did not have a son because I often stayed up all night and wasted my energy. Aside from these, I had many other faults that were too numerous to mention.

Master Yungu said, “According to you then, there are many other things in life you do not deserve, not only fame and a son! Those who have millions of dollars in this life cultivated the good fortune worthy of

that amount in the past. Those who have thousands of dollars must also have the good fortune worthy of that sum. Those, who die of starvation, were in fact meant to die in that manner. The karmic result today is simply the fruit of their own deeds and has nothing to do with external powers.

“For example, if a person has accumulated enough merits and virtues to last a hundred generations, then he or she will have a hundred generations of descendants. One who accumulates enough merits and virtues to last ten generations will have ten generations of descendants to live out that good fortune. The same applies to three or two generations. Those who have no descendants had too little merits and virtues.

“Now that you recognize your shortcomings, you need to do all that you can to change and correct your misdeeds that caused you not to have a child or not to become an imperial official. You need to cultivate virtue and tolerance, and to regard others with good will and compassion. You also need to care for your health and conserve your energy and spirit. Live as if everything in the past dissolved yesterday and a brand-new future begins today. If you can accomplish this, then you are a person born anew, a person of virtue and sincerity.

“If even our body is governed by destiny, then how can a body of virtue and sincerity not evoke a response from heaven? As is said in the ‘Tai Jia Chapter’ in the Book of History, ‘One may run away from the retribution of heaven, but one can never escape the retribution for one’s misdeeds.’ It is said in the Book of Songs, ‘To permanently accord with the mind of Heaven and to seek our own great good fortune.’”

“Mr. Kong had predicted that you would not receive an imperial appointment or have a son. These are the retributions of Heaven, but even they can be changed. You only need to develop your virtue, diligently strive to practice goodness, and work to accumulate many hidden merits and virtues. These are your ways to re-create good fortune. How then is it possible that you will not get to enjoy it? I Ching, the Book of Changes, was written to help people accrue good fortune and to avoid adversity. If everything is destined with no room for change, how can we hope to do this? The first chapter of I Ching said, ‘Families who often perform good deeds will have an excess of good fortune to pass on to the following generations.’ Do you believe this?” I replied, “Yes.”

I gratefully accepted his advice and paid my respects to him by prostrating. Then I began to regret all my past wrongdoings, large and small, in front of the Buddha’s image. I wrote down my wish to pass the imperial examinations and vowed to complete 3,000 meritorious deeds to show my gratitude towards my ancestors, Earth, and Heaven. Upon hearing my vow, the master showed me a merit-fault chart and taught me how to keep a daily record of all the good and bad deeds I had done. He warned me that bad deeds would neutralize the good ones. The master also taught me to recite the Zhun Ti Mantra. Only with a mind of purity and concentration could I attain what I sought. He explained that specialists in drawing talismanic figures had said, “Those who are considered experts in the art of drawing charms but do not know the right way to do so, will be laughed at by spirits.” The key to drawing charms is having no thoughts from beginning to end. Understanding this, begin the first stroke with a still mind after the primal darkness. In the process of drawing, one must let go of all wandering thoughts. Only in this way can a charm be effective.

“When one prays for and seeks something or tries to change one’s fate, it is important that one does so without giving rise to a single thought. In this way, one will easily receive a response. Mencius wrote, ‘There is no difference between long life and short life.’ At first glance, one would find it hard to understand how they can be the same; however, when there is no thought, there is no duality in short or long life.

“Upon careful analysis, there is also no duality between a good or bad harvest. Understanding this, we will be content with our present situation, be it one of wealth or poverty. And with understanding that there is no duality between poverty and wealth, our minds will be content with our present status in society, be it high or low. Also, there is no duality between long and short lives. Understanding this, we will be content with our existing life spans, be they long or short. The most important concern for human beings is that of life and death. Thus, early death and longevity subsume all conditions, whether favorable or unfavorable, and whether of gain or loss.

“We have to wait until our cultivation reaches a certain level, then our destinies will change. This change depends on the accumulation of merits, on seeking a response from the heavens. When cultivating, we need to be aware of our faults and resolve to correct them, as if we were curing a sickness. While waiting, let go of the thought of desiring something that we are not supposed to have and the thought of wishing for a reward. At this level it would be a state of reaching the ‘innate nature of no thought’ that is the actual learning and practice of wisdom.

“I know that you are still unable to accomplish the state of no thought, but you can practice reciting the Zhun Ti Mantra continuously without counting the number of recitations and without interruption. When you reach a higher level of constant mindfulness, you will be able to achieve the level of ‘to not recite when reciting and to recite when not reciting.’ When you no longer have wandering thoughts, the mantra will become effective.”

My name used to be Xuehai, which means “broad learning.” But after receiving these teachings from Master Yungu, I changed it to Liaofan, which means “transcending the ordinary.” It signified my understanding of the fact that we could re-create our destinies and that I did not wish to be like ordinary people who were controlled by destiny. From then on, I began to be very cautious in whatever I thought or did. Soon, I felt quite different from before. In the past, I had been careless and without self-discipline. Now, I find myself being naturally watchful and conscientious. I maintain this attitude even when alone, for I know that there are spirits and heavenly beings everywhere who know my every thought and deed. I am cautious not to offend them with my thoughts. Even when I encounter people who dislike or slander me, I bear their insults with a patient and peaceful mind, and do not feel compelled to quarrel with them.

The year after I met Master Yungu, I took the preliminary imperial examination in which Mr. Kong had predicted that I would come in third place. Amazingly, I was first! Mr. Kong’s predictions were beginning to lose their accuracy. He had not predicted that I would pass the imperial examination at all, but that autumn, I did! Although I had corrected many faults, I found that I could not wholeheartedly do the things I ought to. Even if I did do them, it was forced and unnatural. I reflected within and found that I still had many shortcomings, such as seeing an opportunity to practice kindness but not being eager enough to do it, or having doubts when helping others.

Sometimes I forced myself to act kindly, but my speech was still uncontrolled and offensive. I found I could contain myself when sober, but after a few drinks, I would act without restraint. Although I often practiced kind deeds and accumulated merits, my faults and offenses were so numerous that they seemed to outweigh the good that I did. A lot of my time was spent vainly and without value.

It took me more than ten years to complete the 3,000 meritorious deeds I had vowed to do. I was unable to dedicate the merits from these 3,000 good deeds at a temple until I returned to my hometown in the South, a few years later. At that time, I had the opportunity to ask two monks to dedicate them for me. Then, I made my second wish, and that was for a son. I vowed to complete another 3,000 good deeds. A few years later, your mother gave birth to you and named you Tianqi.

Every time I performed a good deed, I would record it in a book. Your mother, who could not read or write, would use a goose feather dipped in ink. She made a red circle on the calendar for every good deed she did. Sometimes she gave food to the poor or bought living creatures in the marketplace and freed them in the wild. She recorded all of these with her circles on the calendar. At times, she could accumulate more than ten circles in one day!

Everyday we practiced like this, and in four years, the 3,000 deeds were completed. Again, I invited the same two masters to make the dedications, this time at our home. On the 13th day of the ninth month of that same year, I made my third wish, and that was to pass the highest level of the imperial examination. I also vowed to complete 10,000 meritorious deeds. After three years, I attained my wish and passed the examination. I was also made the mayor of Baodi County.

I prepared a small book to record my merits and faults, and called it the Book of Cultivating the Mind.

Every morning, when I began work in the office, my servant would bring the book and have the guard place it on my desk. I would record my every deed, good or bad, no matter how small. At night, I set up an altar in the courtyard and put on my official uniform to emulate an officer in the Song Dynasty. I burned incense and reported all my deeds to the heavens.

Once, your mother was concerned when she saw that I had not accumulated much merit. In the past, she was able to help me in our accumulation of good deeds, and we were able to complete the 3,000 meritorious deeds. Now, I had made a vow to complete 10,000 more deeds, but there were fewer opportunities to practice them at the government residence. She worried about how long it would be before my vow could be fulfilled.

That night, I dreamed of a heavenly being, and told him of my difficulty in completing the 10,000 good deeds. The heavenly being reminded me upon becoming mayor, I had reduced the taxes on the farmlands. That one good deed was worth 10,000 merits. My vow was already fulfilled! When I had become mayor, the farmers in the county were highly taxed, so I reduced the tax by nearly half. But, I felt bewildered and still had doubts. How could just one deed be worth 10,000 merits?

Coincidentally, the Zen Master Huanyu was traveling from Wutai Mountain and stopped in my town. I invited him to the government residence, told him of my dream, and asked whether it was believable. Master Huanyu said, "If one does a good deed with such a true and sincere heart without expectation of reward, then one deed can indeed be worth the merits of ten thousand. Besides, your act of reducing the taxes in this county benefits more than ten thousand people!" Upon hearing this, I immediately gave all my savings to him to take back to Wutai Mountain. I asked him to use the money for a food offering for ten thousand monks and to dedicate the merits for me.

Mr. Kong had predicted that I would die at the age of 53. However, I survived that year without illnesses; although I did not ask the heavens for a longer life. Now I am 69. The Book of History explains, "Destiny exists, but it is changeable. Destiny is not set, but is created and determined by ourselves." All this is true. I came to understand that both good fortune and misfortune are the results of our own actions. These are truly the words of sages and virtuous people! If someone said that good fortune and adversity are determined by the heavens, I would consider that person ordinary.

Tianqi, my son, I wonder what your life will be like. We should always prepare for the worst. Therefore, even in times of prosperity, act as if you were not fortunate. When things are going your way, be mindful of adversity. When you have enough food and clothing, be mindful of poverty. When you are loved and respected by all, remain apprehensive and conservative. When the family is greatly respected, carry yourself humbly. And when your learning is extensive and profound, always feel that the more you learn the less you know.

For the past, we can think of how to advocate the virtues of our ancestors. For the present, we can think of how to conceal the faults of our parents. For the country, we can think of how we can repay its kindness to us, and for the family we can think of how to bring about its good fortune. For other people, think of how to help those in need around us, and for ourselves, think of how to prevent improper thoughts and actions from arising.

We need to find our faults daily and correct them immediately. If we are unable to detect our faults, we will think that everything we do is right. When we are unable to correct our faults, improvement will be impossible. There are many intelligent people in the world who cannot improve in either their cultivation of morality and virtues, or in their work. Their failures in this life are owed to a single word: laziness.

Tianqi, the teachings of Master Yungu are most worthy, profound, real, and proper. I hope that you will learn them well and practice them diligently. Use your time wisely and do not let it slip by in vain. (Please refer to <http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/Text/LiaoFan/index.html> for the complete e-book.)

FS: Can I examine Buddhism in scientific way?

FL: I am afraid science can only be a tiny drop in the ocean of Buddhism, and the time-space or the universe described is still far from the kernel of Buddhism. One can enhance science through Buddhist learning, but we mainly surmount, surpass, or get rid of its limitations. So it is strongly suggested that one never seek the meaning of the Chinese classics when they read, just in the way of Chinese Classics Recital Project of Prof. Wang (mentioned in my biography), or what I call here the infant way, as a good start. Whenever one does seek, they are seeking distraction unwittingly. Plant rather than reap, or one will definitely distort the essence. For example, to recite Heart Sutra (In Tang dynasty, Master Xuan Zang started from present Xi'an and went to India on a pilgrimage for Buddhist scriptures, which is the basis for the novel, Record of a Journey to the West. In his long journey he frequently faced death, but Heart Sutra saved him; see "Datangxiyuji". It has long been proved in history that such civilization really exists, e.g., see <http://www.larong.com/larong/fawang/bio.html>.):

“When Bodhisattva Avalokiteshvara was practicing the profound Prajna Paramita, he illuminated the Five Skandhas and saw that they are all empty, and he crossed beyond all suffering and difficulty.

Shariputra, form does not differ from emptiness; emptiness does not differ from form. Form itself is emptiness; emptiness itself is form. So too are feeling, cognition, formation, and consciousness.

Shariputra, all Dharmas are empty of characteristics. They are not produced, not destroyed, not defiled, not pure; and they neither increase nor diminish. Therefore, in emptiness there is no form, feeling, cognition, formation, or consciousness; no eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body, or mind; no sights, sounds, smells, tastes, objects of touch, or Dharmas; no field of the eyes up to and including no field of mental consciousness; and no ignorance or ending of ignorance, up to and including no old age and death or ending of old age and death. There is no suffering, no accumulating, no extinction, no Way, and no understanding or no attaining.

Because nothing is attained, the Bodhisattva is unimpeded in his mind, through reliance on Prajna Paramita. Because there is no impediment, he is not afraid, and he leaves distorted dream-thinking far behind. There is ultimately Nirvana! All Buddhas of the three periods of time attain Anuttara-samyak-sambodhi through reliance on Prajna Paramita. Therefore, know that Prajna Paramita is a Great Spiritual Mantra, a Great Bright Mantra, a Supreme Mantra, an Unequaled Mantra. It can remove all suffering; it is genuine and not false. That is why the Mantra of Prajna Paramita was spoken. Recite it like this:

Gaté Gaté Paragaté Parasamgaté
Bodhi Svaha!”

FS: Where can one find the related audio and video downloads?

FL: In the English language, please visit <http://www.drba.org/index.htm>, to find more links, for example, <http://www.bttsonline.org/>, another site is <http://www.amtb-dba.org/English/index.html>, audio video links: <http://www.amtb-dba.org/Audio/English/index-Eng-Basic.html>, including lectures, teachings and talks in English on changing destiny and Liao-Fan's lessons.

FL: And your favorite site in Chinese?

FL: Of course <http://www.larong.com/>, <http://www.zhihui.org/> and <http://www.nmzx.com/>, of the biggest Buddhist academy in the world, where residential students count to tens of thousands, and non-residential number in the millions. Students there really see the events as “unbelievable” (to common people), which are commonly seen there and in Tibet.

Call for papers

Articles and notes in English on neutrosophy, or neutrosophic logic, neutrosophic set, neutrosophic probability, neutrosophic statistics are welcome, and they will be published in a collective volume. The authors will receive a free copy. Please send them to:

Dr. Florentin Smarandache
University of New Mexico
200 College Road
Gallup, NM 87301, USA
E-mail: smarand@unm.edu
URL: www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/philos.htm

Neutrosophy and Dialectic

(postface)

Anthony Mansueto
President, Seeking Wisdom
7 November 2003

During the long years of the Cold War when students in the West spoke about “Eastern European philosophy” they were almost inevitably referring to Marxism on the model of the old “diamat” or dialectical materialism. And if they meant anything else, they almost always meant “dissident” philosophy, either liberal and pro-Western or Orthodox and Slavophile. More than fourteen years after the fall of the Berlin Wall and more than twelve years after the collapse of the Soviet Union these stereotypes are only beginning to fade. Unfortunately they have largely been replaced by new ones. It is common knowledge in the West, for example, that “Marxism is dead” in the East and that no serious philosopher would consider working in the Marxist tradition.

For many years now *Dialectic, Cosmos, and Society* and its successor journal *Seeking Wisdom* have labored to make readers in the West aware of the contributions of the “culturological school” of Pavel Gurevich and Boris Goubman, and the synergetics of Helena Knyazeva, both of which represent creative developments of the dialectical tradition. The Neutrosophy of Florentin Smarandache represents, in many ways, a parallel development.

Neutrosophy draws on the larger tradition of dialectical logic developed during the socialist era, but also engages in dialogue with “fuzzy” logic, intuitionist logic, and paraconsistent logic, of which it considers itself a generalization. Specifically, Neutrosophy considers every notion or idea $\langle A \rangle$ together with its opposite or negation $\langle \text{Anti-}A \rangle$, as well as a whole spectrum of neutralities $\langle \text{Neut-}A \rangle$, i.e. ideas which support neither $\langle A \rangle$ nor $\langle \text{Anti-}A \rangle$. According to Smarandache, every idea $\langle A \rangle$ is neutralized by $\langle \text{Anti-}A \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Neut-}A \rangle$, so that statements about the truth-value of an idea are no longer limited to two or three options (true, false, or indeterminate), but rather reflect in a nuanced way what we know –and what we don’t, including the ambiguity involved in interpreting evidence for an idea. Thus in neutrosophic logic, every logical variable x is described by an ordered triple $x = (T, I, F)$, where T is the degree of truth, I is the degree of indeterminacy, and F is the degree of falseness. Classical and fuzzy logics require that $T+I+F = 1$. Intuitionist logic, which stresses the incomplete

character of our information, requires that $T+I+F < 1$. Paraconsistent logic, which attempts to accommodate the existence of inconsistent information about the same event or object, allows $T+I+F > 1$. Neutrosophy recognizes the possibility of all of these cases, while also distinguishing between relative truths and falsehoods which hold in one or some worlds, and absolute truth of falsehoods, which hold in all logically possible worlds. This allows us to take into account the fact that evidence may reasonably be interpreted in more than one way. The Second Law of Thermodynamics, for example, has been interpreted both as evidence against the design argument for the existence of God, on the grounds that an intelligent and benevolent creator would not design a universe in which death and decay are inevitable, *and* as evidence that the ultimate meaning of the universe lies beyond the physical world, in an other-worldly salvation.

One of the most interesting features of Neutrosophy is the dialogue it has initiated with Asian philosophy, Buddhism and Taoism in particular. Both of these traditions have a long history of calling attention to the always and only relative truth of propositions, including such basic claims as the existence and non-existence of the universe. Smarandache's principal interlocutor in this dialogue, Feng Liu of Xi'an of the University of Finance and Economics in Xian, China, has pointed out many points of contact between these two approaches.

There are, to be sure, important questions which might be asked about the central claims of Neutrosophy, as there were about the more radical forms of the older dialectical logics. Does ambiguity regarding the proper interpretation of evidence really affect the truth-value of a claim? Or does it merely suggest that we cannot claim with absolute certainty to know whether or not the proposition in question is true? Even the most paradoxical of Buddhist metaphysicians (Nagarjuna, for example) would not have argued that the world *both* exists *and* does not exist *in the same sense*. Rather, according to this view, the world exists in the sense that we experience it, that it causes pleasure and pain, etc. and does not exist in the sense of being necessary, i.e. having the power of Being in itself. Nagarjuna, in other words, differs from Aristotle and Ibn Sina and Thomas not so much with respect to logic as with respect to metaphysics. Is there not, perhaps, a confusion here of epistemological and metaphysical with logical issues? But then the dialectical tradition since Hegel has been at pains to deny the relevance of these distinctions!

However one resolves these questions there can be little doubt that Neutrosophy demonstrates the enduring vitality of Eastern European philosophy generally and of dialectics in particular. Dialectics is not dead and is certainly not limited to diamat. We await further contributions from this interesting and vital philosopher.

Neutrosophy is a theory developed by Florentin Smarandache as a generalization of dialectics. This theory considers every notion or idea <A> together with its opposite or negation <Anti-A> and the spectrum of "neutralities" <Neut-A> (i.e. notions or ideas located between the two extremes, supporting neither <A> nor <Anti-A>). The <Neut-A> and <Anti-A> ideas together are referred to as <Non-A>. The theory proves that every idea <A> tends to be neutralized and balanced by <Anti-A> and <Non-A> ideas - as a state of equilibrium.

In this book a dialogue or bridge between two opposite cultures, Est (Bhuddism) and West (Neutrosophy), is presented.

\$19.95