

LETTERS TO PROGRESS IN PHYSICS

## Tractatus Logico-Realismus: Surjective Monism and the Meta-Differential Logic of the Whole, the Word, and the World

Indranu Suhendro

The Zelmanov Cosmological Group; Secretary of the Abraham Zelmanov Journal  
for General Relativity, Gravitation, and Cosmology

“Surjective Monism” is a creation of a whole new stage after: 1) “Primitive Monism” of Leibniz, Pascal, and to some extent also the dualist Descartes. 2) “Reflexive-Geometric-Substantial Monism” of Spinoza’s geometric “Tractatus” and “Ethics”, which Einstein embraced, loved and lived, and its variants which he deemed more profound than Kantianism and which one can see very profoundly present in the scientific creation and philosophy of Zelmanov. 3a) “Machian Empirico-Monism” (as formulated in its final form by Bogdanov) along with “Pavlovian Material Monism” (a form defined as supposedly strict “materialistic ontology” in close connection with the school of Sechenov and Pavlov). 3b) “Russellian Neutral-Primitive Monism” (used in process philosophy). Thus “Surjective Monism” finally goes beyond Husserlian Phenomenology, Substantialism, Psychologism, Existentialism, Picture/Logo Theory and the Analytical Philosophy of Mind and Language (of Wittgenstein’s “Tractatus” and its “Language Game Theory” sublimation). It also complements Smarandachean Neutrosophic Logic and Multi-Space Theory. In the above, 3a) and 3b) simply ran developmentally parallel and somewhat competing in history.

Dedicated to the vastly profound intellection, memory, and solitude of A. L. Zelmanov (1913–1987), fountainhead of the celebrated Zelmanov Cosmological School; and to the closely following centennial anniversary of Einstein’s General Theory of Relativity (1915–2015)

### 1 OMNUS: “Omnetic Reality” and the Summary-Quiddity of Surjective Monism (the Surjective Monad Theory of Reality)

In condensed form, we can present our Reality Theory — Surjective Monism — as the following singular meta-differential picture, i.e., “Qualon-Logos” (“OMNUS” or “Metanon”):

$$M : N(U(g, dg)) \sim S .$$

- 1.1 Reality is absolutely ONE, one-in-itself, beyond concrete and abstract count, beyond even the oft-defined “phenomena” and “noumena” (the way most philosophical abstractions define or attempt them self-limitedly); such that
- 1.2 Between Reality ( $M$ ), i.e., Reality-in-itself, and Phenomenality ( $O$ ) there  $BE(S)$  — in the four-fold, asymmetric, anholonomic, meta-categorical (meta-differential) Unity of Sight and Sense (i.e., “Universum” ( $U$ ) of Subject-Reality ( $g$ ) and Surjectivity-Quality ( $dg$ )) of Surjective Monism — (capitalized with emphasis) a Surjective-Reflexive, Omnetic-

Ontometric, Verizontal-Horizontal, Meta-Differential, Diffeo-Unitic Meta-Picture of Reality and Phenomenality, of Being and Existence, of Surject and Reflex, of the Verizon and the Horizon, of Onticity and Epistemicity, of Unity, Unicity, and Multiplicity, of the Infinite, the Infinitesimal, and the (Trans-) Finite, of the Whole, the Word, and the World, of Eidos, Nous, Noema, and Plaeroma, i.e., of the most fundamental “Qualon” ( $N$ ) (Reality as its own Quality — “Qualicity”); such that

- 1.3 That which is meta-categorically between Phenomenality and Reality is EXISTENCE ( $X$ ), i.e., Existence-in-itself: the reflexive Mirror and Boundary and the meta-differential Horizon, while that which is between Reality and Phenomenality is BEING ( $M$ ), i.e., Being-in-itself: the surjective Reality, Unity, and Difference (the Qualon) and the meta-differential Verizon; such that
- 1.4 The meta-categorical Distance between Reality and Phenomenality is Different from that between Phenomenality and Reality:  $OM \neq MO$  — unless by way of Surjection (Reality’s singular Exception, just Reality is, in itself, the “surjective-diffeonic” Exception of itself); such that
- 1.5 Reality contains all things phenomenal but these contain Reality not; such that
- 1.6 Reality is meta-categorically Different from all differences and similarities — and Different still; such that

1.7 If Reality were not SUCH, Reality and Non-Reality (Unreality), Being and Non-Being, Existence and Non-Existence would be absolutely NOT, once and for-ever, which is meta-categorically absurd.

As such Reality, as outlined in Surjective Monism, has 7 (seven) meta-differential ontic-epistemic levels. In addition, Reality possesses 4 (four) asymmetric, anholonomic, meta-categorical logical modalities/foliages encompassing:

- M1. Meta-Onticity of (A, non-A, non-non-A, and none of these);
- M2. Meta-Ergodicity of (without, within, within-the-within, without-the-without);
- M3. Meta-Universality of (the material Universe, the abstract Universe, the Universe-in-itself, Reality);
- M4. Meta-Epistemicity of (thought, anti-thought, Unthought, Reality).

In the above surdetermination and most direct presentation of Reality, the Whole Object ([O]bject, Surject, Qualon) that intrinsically (in the utmost eidetic-noetic sense) transcends and overcomes all logical predication (transitive and intransitive) between object and subject — as well as between occasionalism and substantivalism, i.e., between existentialism and essentialism — is uniquely determined by the meta-differential “Qualon-Logos” (“Metanon”) of [O]bject = (Surject, Prefect, Abject, Subject, Object), through the unified qualitative-quantitative ontological-cosmological triplicity of Surjectivity, Reflexivity, and Projectivity.

## 2 ONTOMETRICITY: “Ontometric Reality”, Unified Field Theory (Geometrization of Space-Time and Substance, i.e., Fields, Matter, and Motion), and the Ultimate Nature of the Physico-Mathematical Universe

Our fundamental “ontometric picture” of physical reality is embodied in the following purely geometric (and kinematic) equation:

$$(DD - R)U(g, dg) = 0,$$

where  $DD$  is a differential wave operator and  $R$  is the very peculiar “ontometric spin-curvature” — both are built from the fundamental generalized asymmetric metric tensor ( $g$ ) and connection form ( $W$ ), in such a way that there is no point  $x$  in our space not dependent on the kinematic pairs ( $x, dx$ ) and ( $g, dg$ ) —, and  $U$  is the wave function of the Universe — again as a kinematic function of the metric and its differential. This way, there is no geometric point in our space that is merely embedded in it; rather it serves as a fundamental, fully geometric (and fully kinematic) “ontometric meta-point” — constituting already fully geometric and intrinsic charge, mass, magnetic moment, and spin-curvature — for which the space, derived from it, is correspondingly emergent as a meta-space of geometrized fields — the “ontometric meta-space” of geometrically emergent and unified gravity,

electromagnetism, chromodynamics, and superfluidity (matter) along with the fundamental properties of chronometricity, kinematicity, and orthometricity.

This section, just as the above introductory description, is again a condensed form of our peculiar views on the nature of physical reality as outlined in, e.g., “Spin-Curvature and the Unification of Fields in a Twisted Space” and several other unified field theories referred to therein, such as “A Four-Dimensional [Meta-]Continuum Theory of Space-Time and the Classical Physical Fields” — as well as the more recent superfluidity geometrization model “A Hydrodynamical Geometrization of Matter and Chronometricity in [Extended] General Relativity”. These are generally theoretical meta-pictures where I have attempted a theoretical “ontometric” meta-continuum picture of cosmophysical reality aimed at unifying gravitation, electromagnetism, and chromodynamics on one hand, and superfluidity, chirality, spin-curvature, matter, and motion — self-realizably along with Zelmanov’s chronometricity, kinematicity, and orthometricity — on the other, as also independently and quintessentially alluded to in our works cited above. Particularly, we will here outline a fresh summary of the nature of Universe whose ontological and epistemological reality would be most satisfactory to the sense of the profound Zelmanov school of scientific creation. Our common aim, as a scientific group and as a whole — in the tradition of Zelmanov — is not simply to “think differently” (a slogan readily laden with post-modern cliché nowadays), but also to be meta-categorically “different from all differences and similarities, and different still” in the truest and most qualified epistemic sense of science and scientific creation.

As a reminder, a present-day category of approaches to unification (of the physical fields) lacks the ultimate epistemological and scientific characteristics as I have always pointed out elsewhere. This methodological weakness is typical of a lot of post-modern “syllogism physics” (and ultimately the solipsism of such scientism in general). Herein, we shall once again make it clear as to what is meant by a true unified field theory in the furthest epistemological-scientific-dialectical sense, which must inevitably include also the most general (and natural) kinematic unity of the observer and physical observables, i.e., “ontometricity”.

Herein, I shall state my points very succinctly. Apart from the avoidance of absolutely needless verbosity, this is such as to also encompass the scientific spirit of Albert Einstein, who tirelessly and independently pursued a pure kind of geometrization of physics as demanded by the real geometric quintessence of General Relativity, and that of Abraham Zelmanov, who formulated his theory of chronometric invariants and a most all-encompassing classification of inhomogeneous, anisotropic general relativistic cosmological models and who revealed a fundamental preliminary version of the kinematic monad formalism of General Relativity for the unification of the observer and observables in the cosmos.

Thus, we can very empathically state the following:

1. A true unified field theory must not start with an arbitrarily concocted Lagrangian density (with merely the appearance of the metric determinant  $\sqrt{-g}$  together with a sum of variables inserted by hand), for this is merely a way to embed — and not construct from first principles — a variational density in an *ad hoc* given space (manifold). In classical General Relativity, the case of pure vacuum, i.e.,  $R_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ , there is indeed a rather unique Lagrangian density: the space-time integral over  $R\sqrt{-g}$ , the variation of which gives  $R_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ . Now, precisely because there is only one purely geometric integrand here, namely the Ricci curvature scalar  $R$  (apart from the metric volume term  $\sqrt{-g}$ , this renders itself a valid geometric-variational reconstruction of vacuum General Relativity, and it is a mere tautology: thus it is valid rather in a secondary sense (after the underlying Riemannian geometry of General Relativity is encompassed). Einstein indeed did not primarily construct full General Relativity this way. In the case of classical General Relativity with matter and fields, appended to the pure gravitational Lagrangian density are the matter field and non-geometrized interactions (such as electromagnetism), giving the relevant energy-momentum tensor: this “integralism procedure” (reminiscent of classical Newtonian-Lagrangian dynamics) is again only tautologically valid since classical General Relativity does not geometrize fields other than the gravitational field. Varying such a Lagrangian density sheds no further semantics and information on the deepest nature of the manifold concerned.

2. Post-modern syllogism physics — including string theory and other toy-models (a plethora of “trendy salad approaches”) — relies too heavily on such an arbitrary procedure. Progress associated with such a mere approach — often with big-wig politicized, opportunistic claims —, seems rapid indeed, but it is ultimately a mere facade: something which Einstein himself would scientifically, epistemologically abhor (for him, in both the pure Spinozan and Kantian sense).

3. Thus, a true unified field theory must build the spin-curvature geometry of space-time, matter, and physical fields from scratch (first principles). In other words, it must be constructed from a very fundamental level (say, the differential tetrad and metricity level), i.e., independently of mere embedding and variationalism. When one is able to construct the tetrad and metricity this way, he has a pure theory of kinematicity for the universal manifold  $M$ : his generally asymmetric, anholonomic metric  $g_{\alpha\beta}$ , connection  $W$ , and curvature  $R$  will depend on not just the coordinates but also on their generally non-integrable (asymmetric) differentials:

$$M(x, dx) \rightarrow M(g, dg) \rightarrow W(g, dg) \rightarrow R(g, dg).$$

In other words, it becomes a multi-fractal first-principle geometric construction, and the geometry is a true chiral meta-continuum. This will then be fully capable of producing the true universal equation of motion of the unified fields

as a whole in a single package (including the electromagnetic Lorentz equation of motion and the chromodynamic Yang-Mills equation of motion) and the nature of pure geometric motion — kinematicity — of the cosmos will be revealed. This, of course, is part of the emergence of a purely geometric energy-momentum tensor as well. The ultimate failure of Einstein’s tireless, beautiful unification efforts in the past was that he could hardly arrive at the correct geometric Lorentz equation of motion and the associated energy-momentum tensor for the electromagnetic field (and this is not as many people, including specialists, would understand it). In my past works (with each of my theories being independent and self-contained), I have shown how all this can be accomplished: one is with the construction of an asymmetric metric tensor whose anti-symmetric part gives pure spin and electromagnetism, and whose differential structure gives an anholonomic, asymmetric connection uniquely dependent on  $x$  and  $dx$  (and hence  $x$  and the world-velocity  $u$ , giving a new kind of Finslerian space), which ultimately constructs matter (and motion) from pure kinematic scratch. Such a unified field theory is bound to be scale-independent (and metaphorically saying, “semi-classical”): beyond (i.e., truly independent of) both quantum mechanical and classical methods.

4. Such is the ultimate epistemology — and not just methodology — of a scientific construct with real mindful power (intellection, and not just intellectualism), i.e., with real scientific determination. That is why, the subject of quantum gravity (or quantum cosmology) will look so profoundly different to those rare few who truly understand the full epistemology and the purely geometric method of both our topic (on unification) and General Relativity. These few are the true infinitely self-reserved ones (truly to unbelievable lengths) and cannot at all be said to be products of the age and its trends. Quantizing space-time (even using things like the Feynman path-integrals and such propagators) in (extended) General Relativity means nothing if somewhat alien procedures are merely brought (often in disguise) as part of a mere embedding procedure: space-time is epistemologically and dialectically not exactly on the same footing as quantum and classical fields, matter, and energy (while roughly sharing certain parallelism with these things); rather, it must categorically, axiomatically qualify these things. Even both quantum mechanically and classically it is evident that material things possessed of motion and energy are embedded in a configuration space, but the space-time itself cannot be wholly found in these constituents. In the so-called “standard model”, for example, even when quarks are arrived at as being material constituents “smaller than atoms”, one still has no further (fundamental) information of the profounder things a quark necessarily contains, e.g., electric charge, spin, magnetic moment, and mass. In other words, the nature of both electromagnetism and matter is not yet understood in such a way. At the profoundest level, things cannot merely be embedded in

space-time nor can space-time itself be merely embedded in (and subject to) a known quantum procedure. Geometry is geometry: purer, greater levels of physico-mathematical reality reside therein, within itself, and this is such only with the first-principle construction of a new geometry of spin-curvature purely from scratch — not merely synthetically from without — with the singular purpose to reveal a complete kinematic unity of the geometry itself, which is none other than motion and matter at once. Again, such a geometry is scale-independent, non-simply connected, anholonomic, asymmetric, inhomogeneous: it ultimately has no “inside” nor “outside” (which, however, goes down to saying that there are indeed profound internal geometric symmetries).

5. Thus, the mystery (and complete insightful understanding) of the cosmos lies in certain profound scale-independent, kinematic, internal symmetries of the underlying geometry (i.e., meta-continuum), and not merely in *ad hoc* projective, embedding, and variational procedures (including the popular syllogism of “extra dimensions”).

### 3 On the Furthest-Qualified Metaphysics, Phenomenology, Ontology, and Cosmology

We have, in our time, very fortunately witnessed the heroic emergence of a class of neutral, vast generalizations (“neutrosophies”, to use the Smarandachean term, after the pioneering logician, mathematician, and polymath F. Smarandache) of logic and dialectics — worked out entirely by very few original, profound minds of genuine universal character — aiming at envisioning a much better future for humanity in the cosmos, e.g., scientific, psychological, social, and economic terms, thus forming an inspirational surge beyond the blatant superficialities and tyranny of certain politically, inter-subjectively established paradigms often masquerading as the “true scientific method” and “objectivity”. The inherently flawed assumptions of these misleading paradigms, as such, can be seen only with clear independent epistemicity (true, objective knowledge, even “un-knowledge”, on the horizon of things), and not in terms of methodology alone (which can often be fabricated and imitated), as to how they are chiefly non-epistemic — thus ultimately pseudo-scientific and pseudo-objective — trends that pretend that certain ontically and epistemically intricate matters are already settled by “consensus” of the majority.

All this is crucially taking place in the incessant, highly nervous background of science and certain peculiar scientific affairs of today (as Thomas Kuhn has indicated just what the “tectonic rims” of science might be), just as it has always appeared historically, and will always appear as such, to rescue the state-of-the-art of science from “usual human tendencies towards promulgating corruption” at very critical epistemological junctions. The common objective of these generalizations is to form a broader window — a truly open window pretty much without cumbersome curtains indeed — for

a more genuine outlook on the landscape of science and humanity.

Having said the above, I hereby applaud any lone epistemic effort — among other such lone efforts — in the direction of a new reality theory and a new semantics theory aimed at, e.g., a new neutral synthesis of ubiquitous doctrines such as substantivalism and occasionalism, as well as absolutism and relativism, for cosmology and cosmogony. Such a work, to the one who knows “how corrugated, discrete, and paradoxical landscapes in the cosmos can be”, is a pure dialectical enjoyment in itself, in the solitary niche where true epistemic minds often hide their solitary effulgence and brilliance. Therein, one is obliged to outline a genuine solution to the persistent, often popularly misunderstood problems and challenges in scientific epistemology from the ancient epochs of the Greeks and the Indians (the Sanskrit/Vedic “Indo-Aryans”), through the medieval ages of the Perso-Arabic — and then pan-Hellenic European — civilization and Renaissance, to the most recent eras of modernism, post-modernism, and scientism.

However, the reader should be aware that behind this simple appraisal a supposedly genuine thought aimed at a conscious stationing (dialectical synthesis) of phenomena constitutes a train of further in-going paradoxical thoughts. Thus, let us do a brief (and yet dense), crucial, signaling surgery on the manifold of thoughts of modernism, post-modernism, and scientism (including critical post-modernism) — as to why such intellectual strands ultimately fail to transcend anything real — and on the dialectical anatomy (“cosmogony”) of the problems of the world in general.

Keep in mind, once and for all, that, despite diverse causes, the root of this meta-situation can be traced back to the cosmic “superset” as to whether the world we inhabit is essentially autonomous in itself or extraneously governed by some kind of intelligence. Further independent epistemic qualifications (including disqualifications) can be applied to these options as new horizons are encompassed. This should suffice to underline what is crucial in any original reality (and linguistics) theory, among other similar and dissimilar epistemically sincere proposals ranging from absolute agnosticism to a further sense of knowing and enlightenment.

I’d like to re-identify, in my own words, the very problem that any genuine reality theory has to deal with in terms of scientific epistemology as follows (as I have stated elsewhere on past occasions, especially in my work on a new kind of Reality theory, namely “The Surjective Monad Theory of Reality” or “Surjective Monism”, and on my seminal address “On Meta-Epistemic Determination of Quality and Reality in Scientific Creation”). Despite many conscious and conspicuous attempts at elevating the use of process-synthetic philosophy and integralism to a “new” key paradigm at the critical crossroads between world affairs and individual well-being, many thinkers have not developed the first-principle logical-dialectical tool needed to solve fundamental existential and

phenomenological problems in modern philosophy (that is to say, since Kant and Copernicus), be it one that directly or indirectly underlies the pure workings of science. This way, the complete surgical tool of meta-logic is still missing from their hands, and so true determination — in the profoundest sense of the word “determination” — is absent. Thus, the purported newness [and trend] of post-modern paradigms do not really constitute a first-principle philosophical newness: it is merely a magnified old-nostalgic trace of process-integralism, an issue contested by the likes of Russell and Whitehead (philosophically, scientifically, and morally) at the critical, dehumanizing, life-shearing onset of last century’s two world-wars as well as the cold war (which continues to prevail under the surface of history, precisely as a dialectical part of epistemicity and historicity, not mere hermeneutics, linguistics, and history).

This is precisely why mere post-modern visions of revisionist holism and inter-subjective facticity (somewhat akin to Gestalt psychology) — both as a natural scientific-revisionist investigation and a purportedly broader philosophical picture — still suffer from the contingency (that is, reflexes, conditions, and associations) of [their] embedding solipsistic sphere, when this on-going contingency ought to be categorically deconstructed in the first place, and not merely highlighted in the light of further arbitrary psychological associationism put forth arbitrarily as “objective science” (such as the “second-hand” inclusion of the convenient psychologism and propaganda that “syntax-only science supersedes semantics”).

Thus, while such an approach may be sufficiently inspirational for a psychological reform within a known, ultimately defective established scientific, political, and cultural system, it is not yet an adequate framework for genuine humanistic revolution and logical determination. A genuine thinker should look for a meta-language, a meta-paradigm for science; one that is free of the usual kinds of pretense and bigotry we encounter from time to time in the history of thought, especially modern thought: a journey from Cartesian dualism to Spinozic monism to Berkeleyan psychologism via the weary intellectual bridges of Hume, Kant, Hegel, Husserl, Heidegger, and Wittgenstein (both the analytic young Wittgenstein and the post-modern old Wittgenstein).

Or else, much of humanity has forgotten — or is simply absolutely, blissfully, complacently ignorant of — the essence of what Max Planck and Ernst Mach — the two pedagogy and epistemology giants (and innovative scientists in their own right) surrounding Albert Einstein in his scientific revolutionary days — once argued about. They argued about the essences, modes, limits, and expansions of science vis-a-vis Reality quite long before Einstein debated Niels Bohr on the nature of the quantum, cosmos, and Reality. And certainly long before Karl Popper outlined his epistemology and ideal criteria for “falsifiable science” against the overly-positivistic Vienna circle led by Moritz Schlick (whose po-

sition is blindly, arbitrarily taken by “thronges of scientists” in the USA and Western hemisphere as of today, whether they know it or not: few are those who are truly conversant with ontology and epistemology, and not just methodology, after all).

At the same time, in fact soon after Mach launched his epistemological program towards “purifying absolutism in science” (especially in Newtonian and celestial mechanics) in Europe, Russia, witnessed heated debates of the nature of science and philosophy vis-a-vis Reality as contested by the likes of Ouspensky (who defended the simultaneously neo-Platonic and neo-Aristotelian traditions of meta-physics), Bogdanov (who tried to generalize Machian thought into a single “empirico-monism”), and those who harshly forced the notion of “materialism over Machianism and all sorts of psychologism and idealism” on scores of Soviet scientists, gaining ultimate support from materialist philosophers and scientists such as the foremost expert on the “reflexes of the higher nervous system”, Ivan Pavlov.

In the sense of critical epistemicity, Einstein, for example, criticized both certain self-assured theists and atheists, among both vocal scientists and vocal lay people concerned about often blurry, oversimplified entities such as “god” and “nature”, as “rogue solipsists”.

#### **4 The Meta-Differential Logic of the Whole, the Word, and the World: Subjective Monism and the “Qualonic Unity” of Sight and Sense**

What, then, is a meta-science in our case? It is none other than the great reflex of ontic-epistemic Unity — the Unity of Sight and Sense — in the sense of beholding an object (or phenomenon), while recognizing categorically (up to a point of Absolute Difference) that Existence (Nature, space-time in the most qualified phenomenological sense) is as-it-is a mirror-like apogetic Horizon and Reality is in-itself an eidetic Verizon: one “perigetically” witnesses the object in space (“sight”) and “apogetically” withholds space in the object as “internal time” (“sense”) whereby time here is the sensation (a priori representation) of space by way of the complete dialectical-phenomenological unity of space-time, matter, and motion (in the sense of epistemologically qualified objective events, not arbitrary “frills”). When objectivity is asymmetrically moved along social time-lines and synthetic-paradoxical thinking (“Understanding”, i.e., “thinking about thinking” and “doing about doing”), it becomes “Praxis/Paradigm as it is” — Surdetermination —: a vortex of historicity, capable of creative-reflexive stellar motion at the societal stage, yet whose infinitesimal center of “insight” and “inhering” remains non-integrable and solitary. The highest (eidetic) degree of Quality concerning this, given as a Whole Object (where the Horizon is dialectically part of it, instead of arbitrarily including, eliminating, or excluding it), is none other than the furthest qualification of “noema”, while it shall

be termed “surholding” in the sense of “noesis”: it possesses “Surjective Verizon” as Being and “Reflexive Horizon” as Existence, and not mere inter-subjective projection and inter-objective boundary.

Mere integralism, just like non-epistemic oversimplification and over-generalization, is at best a rhapsodic trend in post-modernism and psychologism (including post-structuralism and neo-psychoanalysis); ultimately, however, it — like the psychologism of Gestalt — is no substitute for a first-principle categorical underpinning of phenomena, that is, the complete dialectical unity — the ontological-epistemological-phenomenological-axiological unicity — between the Real and the Ideal, the material and the mental, the whole and the partial, and all the asymmetric existential-predicative tension between the object and the subject in general. The same defect can be said about the uncritical use of process philosophy without original refined recourse to “noema” (objects-as-they-are) or phenomenology (at least in the sense of Husserl, who was both a mathematician and philosopher, as we need not mention how “phenomenologists” after him have easily misunderstood the fundamentals of Husserlian phenomenology and, thereafter, they have also arbitrarily misunderstood and dismissed each other in the realm of post-modernism).

Again, most post-modern authors of scientism, as well as the majority of so-called “scientists”, do not seem to intuitively emphasize the need for the deconstruction of the ultimately illogical-pathological state of a world much plagued with hypersemiotics, hypernarration, oxymoronism, sycophancy, pseudo-objectivity, pseudo-science, pseudo-philosophy, pseudo-spirituality, pseudo-artistry, solipsism, and ontic-epistemic shallowness.

As easy to see, the prevalent solipsistic type of world-scientism — and, indeed the associated panhandling and psychologism of scientific affairs, coupled with superficial political and economic affairs — is ultimately unscientific and non-logical for not taking into account in the first place the important logico-phenomenological branch of dialectics, let alone of neutrosophy, namely a comprehensive science that attempts to throw light at logic, empiricism, psychologism, existentialism, essentialism, science, philosophy, and history, thereby transforming mere history into dialectical historicity.

Consensus solipsism, no matter how much it is often falsely put forth as “science” and “objectivity” before both the more naive “scientists” and the gullible public, is solely based on a desired paradigm concentrated in, and funded by, corporate and governmental hands by way of visible and invisible “control by proxy” monopoly in many aspects of life, and it attempts to primitively capsize all the rest of scientific existence under its sway by non-dialectically embedding an essentially inhomogeneous, non-simply-connected, variegated world of paradigms and ideas (which it ultimately knows not!) in its own homogenizing pseudo-parametric space, and this, with all the bias, vested political interests, and dupli-

city contained in it, is often neatly disguised — helplessly by way of syllogism and solipsism — as the so-called “scientific method” (thus, some have warned us that there is not a single “scientific method” — just as there is not a single quantum mechanics: there is more than one version of quantum mechanics, than the one following the “Copenhagen interpretation” — and that a scientific economy precept known as “Ockham’s razor” is often misused). Clearly, a “given consensus science” hiding ulterior motives is not the same as science itself, for which new ways of thinking and genuine epistemic objectivity are the primary goals often following long processes of logico-dialectical thinking as well as solitary revolutionary thinking or ideation (alas, as Michael Crichton has pointed out, history has provided us with a set of scoundrels-in-power of mere opportunism when it comes to “consensus science”).

This stuff at the heart of the matter is essentially, intellectually primitive and cumbersome, no matter how much power, psychologism, techno-scientism, and modernity it displays: a set of mere opinions made strong by way of any kind of political favoritism does not solve the age-long problem of syllogistic solipsism and solipsistic syllogism in science and philosophy. Indeed, the world of science — supposedly inherited, both arbitrarily and qualifyingly, from the “ancients” and the more recent “Aufklärung”, just like the world of philosophy — still inherently suffers from mere syllogism and solipsism, albeit in a different intellectual category than other types of solipsism, thereby often resulting in advanced opaque types of dogmatism, absolutism, and relativism, and in the said types of sycophantism and sophism. Note how these are easily interchangeable in each other’s garb and served with fresh inductive duplicity on the daily menu of “loud, bubbly, verbose, trendy, big-wig scientism”.

That is why, a truly qualified science production is always crucial — beyond the said integralism and mere post-modern holism — in all the branches of science, including cosmology, ecological science, and the humanities: it must be based on independent, neutrosophically guided free inquiry, beyond all forms of superficial political control, especially funding systems and political interests. In this scheme, such science production is the first and foremost logical foundation of a revolutionary social-democratic culture, and not capital sums (and so not pretentious scientism — pseudo-intellectual big-otry — with all its hidden subjectivity and opportunism).

Back to the problem of ontology and epistemology as well as cosmology and cosmogony addressed herein, then wholly illuminated, by any genuine reality theory: is the Universe, our home, autonomous or is it dependent (on a supposed “demi-urge” or “creator” — while the word “creation” should in any case be epistemically qualified)? If it is autonomous, is it machine-like and ultimately random, or is it quasi-anthropomorphic and teleological, or is it absolutely autonomous? If it is dependent, what kind of dependency (or creation) is there: epiphanic (as in the neo-Platonic sense), or

theological (as in the Kalam cosmological argument and in the Thomian sense), or none of these? Before answering — or rather, epistemically addressing — such questions, a sense of mindful humility is very important, one akin to Einstein who, as known, did not believe in a personal god, but for whom — like for Spinoza — the word “God” should represent a very broad, genuine sense of Reality and Onto-Realism, namely a non-personal transcendental universal intellect whose attributes and laws are not anthropomorphic and arbitrarily projective but “summa-rational” and “meta-rational”, and whose horizon in the intricate and beautiful cosmos renders “mere reflective human minds” like vanishing dots thereon.

The philosophical propositions for cosmology and cosmogony elaborated upon by such a theory must then transcend the intrinsic self-limitations and extrinsic ex-limitations of both mere dogmatic materialism (solipsistic objectivism) and psychologism (solipsistic subjectivism): a more infinitely reflexive-neutral, let alone “surjective”, realism will be inherently different from mere passive, dogmatic, and biased (thus ultimately solipsistic) “randomness” and “design”, especially when determining a genuine sense of cosmic semi-autonomy as well as both the weak and strong anthropic principles. Such a vein then must be seen as sincere and epistemic enough, and is meant to enrich public understanding of the matter in the very arena of “science and philosophy at a cross-roads”.

Meta-physics is the science dealing not with “non-science”, “non-sense”, or “para-physics”, as many have misinterpreted it, but with the epistemic qualification and entification of the sciences. Ockham’s razor, too, is a meta-physical stance. And so is materialism. As such a “neutrosophist”, in countering the currently prevalent, financially and politically more supported dogma of a self-sufficient material universe emerging by chance and populated by randomness, does not side with creationism, let alone “biblical creationism” or “intelligent design” for he has assuredly maximum epistemic distance from falling solipsistically into this or that (while, like Einstein, considering “religion” only psychologically and historically); rather, like Einstein, he aims to humbly show how the problem is not culturally settled: be it among the Greeks, among medieval thinkers, or among the contemporary minds of today. He, like Einstein, humbly sees a “superior manifestation of intelligence” in Nature and on the horizon of things and, on a psychological and historical note, is merely sympathetic with the minority in this category — and the faintest of voices —, and this is true in any case.

No matter what one’s meta-physical stance is in science and philosophy, the problem presented here is a truly beautiful, profound one. In my view, Reality should be ontologically simple (yet “not that simple”) in the sense of what I term the “Qualic Unity (Unicity) of Sight and Sense”, while being epistemologically so complex (yet “not arbitrarily complex”) at the same time: it is necessarily One-in-itself beyond concrete and abstract, even “noumenal”, count. Metaphorically

speaking of Reality and the Universe, onticity is the whole mountain and ontology is the peak and the verizon; epistemicity is then the quintessential gradient and epistemology is the entire slope: this makes truly qualified knowledge and understanding possible, whether universal or particular, categorical or phenomenal, philosophical or scientific; phenomenology is the mountain’s appearance (verisimilitude) and “stuff” as well as the corresponding horizon and landscape; at last axiology is the rest as concerns judgment and values. This way, there is a profound, four-fold categorical, asymmetric, anholonomic difference between “Being” and “Existence” (as, again, outlined in my own “Surjective Monad Theory of Reality” as a qualified generalization of reflexive monism), just as the meta-categorical, ontic-epistemic, surjective-reflexive distance (“Qualicity”) between Reality and Phenomenality is asymmetric. I will undertake to explain this a little bit, as presented below.

### 5 The Diffeo-Unitics of Being and Existence in Surjective Monism

Whether one is concerned about the strenuous synthesis between the mundane and the other-worldly, between the economical and the ecological, between the one and the many — that is, basically between a thesis and an anti-thesis in a rather universal sense —, phenomenologically, dialectically speaking, one is essentially referring to Existence as a “negative totality” — instead of both the arbitrary, subjective Unknown of solipsistic mysticism and the equally solipsistic, overly positivistic valence of narrow (non-dialectical) material dogmatism —; that is, Existence is an “inconsistent inner multiplicity in and of itself”: it has parts that do not constitute the Whole by way of simple representation, and yet, unlike mere holism, it is livingly capable of unifying logical synthesis and determination when a portion of humanity is in touch with the said synthesis. The problem here since time immemorial, as renewed by Kantian categorical analysis, overly-symmetrically projected by Hegel, attempted by Husserlian phenomenological analysis, and brought to a further critical stand-still by Heidegger, has been the infinitesimal (essentially surdeterminate) difference between Being and Existence (“Being-as-Being” vis-a-vis “Being-here”) — and also between Idealism and Realism, between noumena and phenomena, as well as between Transcendence and Immanence. Only when this is universally — that is, categorically-eidetically — solved can one truly speak of what is beyond mere essentialism and existentialism, that is, the most qualified Thing-in-itself: the Word and the World, the Whole and the While. That is, in other words, true ontic-epistemic objectivity.

This way, then, Surdetermination (universal determination) of the Whole, the Word, and the World — in the sense of Reality’s Verizon and Horizon — must be aimed at the very Present, more than at the theoretical future.

A logical system is hereby categorical-synthetic-revolutionary (that is, universal) if and only if it encompasses the spiraling interaction between: 1) Existence as the eidetically negative totality and horizon of “non-A and non-non-A” for any entity “A” and the infinitesimality (surdeterminate infinite difference) of “non-A” and the infinity of “non-non-A” — the entirety of possible inter-related, compositional things — and 2) the “twice-aprioristic” (non-arbitrary objective-aprioristic) epistemic set of “A and non-A” representing things-as-they-are (categorically aprioristic-objective existents in pure phenomenological-natural space beyond mere societal conditionings). This, when fully implemented, gives a dialectical “humanity-epistemicity spiral” instead of both the concentrically closed circle of logism (such as dogmatism and monopoly) and the interconnected circles and “biosphere” of post-modernism (especially integralism). Such a fully phenomenological spiral (“connex of causation”) is in the “genes” of Revolution and Praxis without any need to resort to mere idealism and integralism (of the many, especially in the post-modern sense) — other than dealing with noematic object-magnification and object-illumination: not only can an island exist after all in its essentially negative and paradoxical oceanic surroundings, it can also be of the density of a great continent with its spiraling mountain peaks and profound valleys irrespective of its phenomenal size (as perceived by the majority of people).

Having said that, I maintain that “Being-qua-Being” is the “none-of-these” part of the above meta-logic and a most direct Surdetermination (“Surholding”) of Reality, in the subsequent vicinity of the most neutral “non-non-A” determination of Existence whose universal object is a “Qualon”, that is [O]bject = (Surject, Prefect, Abject, Subject, Object) — again, see the work on “Surjective Monism” for the peculiar new-contented glossary of these terms.

## 6 Epilogue

Such a meta-categorical view on Reality, as presented above, is in eidetic and twice-aprioristic contrast to the pseudo-synthetic, inter-subjective, commutative logism of a thing “A” being arbitrarily, conditionally given as “A and non-A” at the same time by way of a homogenizing, “modernizing”, “newly introduced” human interaction-type superficially (beyond just artificially!) prevalent in today’s society. Consider, for example, both the case of classical Hegelian solipsistic syllogism (in the case of absolutist history and sociology) and the generic example of the one-dimensionality (one-sidedness) between technological gadgets (which can easily be substituted by any given operational post-modern notion) in the “free market” and the majority of their users: a great gap exists between the given (gadgets as conditions) and the conditioned (subjects), that is, unless the subjects are the creators or producers — not mere buyers — of the said gadgets. Here, subjects do not genuinely, aprioristically exist with respect

to Existence (but only with respect to the capriciously conditioning inter-subjective society) and so are devoid of epistemicity; instead, they are conditioned by their whole range of habits determined through the given gadgets and associated contemporary urges.

The full extent of solipsism and syllogism — and the stark absence of true Eidos, Logos, and Eros (of course, not exactly in the Marcusian sense and use of the merely contrasting phrase “Logos and Eros”, rather in a most unified and qualified substantiation of the “Ergo” and not a mere “ego”, being somewhat akin to the very term “ergodicity”) is at the very heart of the problem of contemporary neo-simplistic world at large in relation to puppetry, especially intellectual puppetry: most contemporary people do not touch the ground with their feet (to know the real contour of Existence, and not just the “societal sphere”), and they are unable and not allowed to do so; instead, they are hanging (whether high or low) by conditional proxy and post-modern threads, prodded by ultracapitalistic-ultraconsumerist-hypernarrative rods and sustained daily by superficial image-making tantamount to overall solipsistic-syllogistic defect: that of hypernarration, hyperoxymoronism, hypersemiotics, duplicity, solipsism, and utter ontic-epistemic shallowness. In other words, they are not real, as they do not inhere within Existence (let alone Being!) and its noematic mirror: they are apparitions upon Existence and that mirror. They are not “wrong”: they are “not even wrong” (as a notable mathematician puts it).

The known towering figures of analytic philosophy, who have stood as stern horizons before many, have not been able to completely solve this epistemic problem, owing to the fact that their systems are largely overly-symmetrical, be they empirical, positivistic, or idealistic. Yet the fact remains that the unity referred to as Existence is indeed a negative totality with a positive nescience on the part of multiplicity of most conscious existents: it has an underlying asymmetric connection between things perceived as “parts” and is non-integrable by way of logical representation. Thus, the aim of dialectics is not to “integrate” Existence as such, but to synthesize the given ambiguities in the logical-ideal form of an eidetic-noematic category encompassing object-oriented Praxis/Paradigm, where a priori and posteriori categories are taken as not mere process (a-la Russell and Whitehead), but “surgical modalities” in the face of anti-dogmatism. This, then, would be a positive, dialectical kind of idealism capable of Progress (and real dialectical synthesis) in the real background of the said negative totality — again, akin to constituting a solid island or continent in the greatly paradoxical oceanic surroundings —, in contrast to mere syllogism and solipsism, dogmatism and sophism, absolutivism and relativism.

Except for those who are uncritically conditioned and embedded by it (unfortunately, such sorry individuals account for the majority, as in any age, which is why the superficial world of modernity remains running on misleading wheels



and false horses as it does today), Progress on all fronts of Ideation does not intrinsically belong to non-epistemic solipsism: never it has been so and never it will be. What is often taunted as “scientific progress” (not exactly the same as technological progress, let alone genuine epistemic scientific progress) in the fast linkage of contemporary dehumanization and pseudo-enlightenment (instead of a set of neutral, multi-fractal “micro-paradigms”: a model for an epistemological scientific system incapable of being integrated arbitrarily into an embedding political bastardization of dogmatic scientism and religionism on the large scale) often entails logico-moral duplicity which in turn causes a typical inept individual and stooge to deny any existential footing, almost deliberately mistaking the superficial world (in homogeneous, conforming chains) for the real, paradoxical, non-dogmatic terrain of Existence: the weight, the feet, and the ground of Existence he never realizes and touches, for he is ineptly hoisted high by the external manipulative world upon superficial hooks, hangers, and logisms (seeming situational logical thoughts that are ultimately, on the edge of the world, “not even wrong”), and still it is somewhat guaranteed by the collective solipsism of the majority that such one is able to derive his happiness — if not his entire absurd situation and way of being — from subconscious folly and conceit often arising merely from shallow international conformity and hidden feudalism based on common image-making (indeed, instead of common good and true democracy); in other words, from internal incapacity and inconsistency as to what really transpires on the small and large scales of the cosmos and the world of human activities and considerations.

In short, solipsistic logism, including both the schemers and the blind workers, suffers from all kinds of pseudo-objectivity, especially on the horizon of things. The penultimate revolutionary-intellectual human, however, firmly touches the ground with his own feet, and is capable of the paradoxical contour of Existence — by way of encompassing the four categorical, meta-epistemic “a priori’s” and “a posteriori’s”: ontic-eidetic-noetic, synthetic-apogetic-a priori, synthetic-peripheral-a posteriori, and subjective-psychological — leading all the way from the abyss to the summit, as Revolution in the sciences is always ardently wholly needed, not a mere reform: a new Word for the World, and a new World for the Word.

Submitted on: May 25, 2014 / Accepted on: May 30, 2014

---