

Transcendental Propositions

by Sven Nilsen, 2025

In this paper I introduce a new constructive logic based on the core axiom of Path Semantics. It is weaker than classical logic (that uses Excluded Middle) and standard Path Semantics (that uses the Sesh axiom). All propositions in this new logic propagate forward in time under causality, either by their positive or negative truth value, using the time interpretation of path semantical levels. The same logic also achieves Immanuel Kant's dream of developing a Transcendental Logic, yet from a constructive perspective, and shines new light on the development of Post-Kantian Continental Philosophy. I discuss the Joker Dialectics for Schelling and Hegel leading up to this discovery.

In ancient philosophy, there was a concept developed of non-dualism. Logically:

$$0 == 1$$

This is in some logic with two symbols `0` and `1` (these do not have to be the only symbols).

The framework of non-dualism is incompatible with normal constructive logic. However, it is not incompatible with Western philosophy as a whole, as many people often believe. Non-dualism is not a particular concept for Eastern philosophy, but it is certain that non-dualism in Eastern philosophy has deep historical roots. In Western philosophy under the modern pre-development of logic, it was Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling who is most known as thinking about the unification of the rational mind with empiricism. This is why non-dualism also has a tradition within Western philosophy.

To understand Schelling's philosophy and how this reflects back on Kant's philosophy from a constructive perspective, it is first necessary to unlearn a great deal what people usually think is true about the history of philosophy under the Scientific Revolution. However, in order to do that, one has to begin with the ancient world – because it has everything to do with practice of medicine.

Historical background

In Ancient Greece and under the Roman empire, there were three competing schools of medicine:

School	Method	Key Idea
Dogmatic	Theoretical, causal	Health comes from balancing bodily humors; causes are key.
Empiric	Observational, experiential	Theory is unreliable — learn from experience, case history, and analogy.
Methodist	Simplified rules-based	Focus on generalized treatment patterns.

The Empiricists explicitly rejected metaphysical speculation and theory-driven causality, focusing on observable, repeatable experience instead.

They had **three main sources of knowledge** (called the *tripod of empiricism*):

1. **Empeiria (Experience)** – Direct, repeated observation of patients and outcomes.
2. **Historia (Case history)** – Recorded experiences, either personal or passed down, which could guide future treatment.
3. **Analogismos (Analogy)** – When direct experience was lacking, treat new cases by analogy with known ones.

The Empiric school went extinct due to the official doctrine of the Roman empire under Late Christianity adapted the teachings of Aelius Galenus (usually just called “Galen”). Galen’s text became the dominant for medicine practice up until the Scientific Revolution.

What people call Christianity today is actually a reactionary movement to the Scientific Revolution, that was earlier primarily a Dogmatic school of medicine using texts by Galen. This means, how Christianity functioned as a religion prior to the Scientific Revolution, is indistinguishable from a particular practice of medicine, that enabled the power elite to control huge populations.

The stories about Jesus Christ are similar to those in Simonianism about Simon Magus. Both “Christ” and “Magus” are titles that come from medicine practice. Jesus was a savior figure and his disciples were fictional (there are no preserved historical records from any of the disciples). The stories themselves also witness about this fiction, since the disciples are very young people, most likely children. These stories were used in pre-school education to make children interested in medicine. To learn the sacred knowledge of medicine, a child had to be initiated into a mystery cult, which protected their knowledge from outsiders and advertised using “gospels” (“good news”). It was their analogue of “once upon a time”, using Homeric myths and translation fables as template. These stories were frequently changed, by priests and parents, for their own children or church. Archeologists have found thousands of such stories from the 2nd century that are full of humor, satire and miraculous events, that would keep the attention of children when listening to adults.

The Dogmatists believed in passing down knowledge of medicine from earlier generations and trusting experience of common practice. They were overly concerned about keeping medicine knowledge under control, as it was vital for their survival in a time period of political instability.

Both the titles “Magus” and “Christ”, as in Simon Magus (a parallel character) or Jesus Christ, are medical titles. Magus is used about Magi (wizards or doctors), who often used drugs in their rituals and treatments. Christ is a term used to apply some drug to the eyes to open up a spiritual vision, which is basically belief in spiritual revelation by having a mental trip. The use of the term Christ in this context was first recorded about Medea, the granddaughter of Helios. In Homer, the first time this term is used, is in “Odyssey”, book 1 line 262 (notice the use of “χρίεσθαι”, smearing a drug):

φάρμακον ἀνδροφόνον διζήμενος, ὄφρα οἱ εἴη
ιοῦς χρίεσθαι χαλκήρεας: ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν οὐ οἱ
δῶκεν, ἐπεὶ ῥα θεοὺς νεμεσίζετο αἰὲν ἔοντας,

Seeking a man-killing drug, so that he might
smear his bronze with venom; but he did not
grant it to him, for he was ever indignant with the gods.

Christing is not simply smearing, but used in context of a man-killing drug (requiring an antidote). This explains why Jesus is given the title Christ. Jesus is believed among Early Christians to have resurrected from the dead, which in the original story designed for children, Jesus first takes the drug right before being arrested by Roman soldiers, and receives the antidote on a swamp while hanging on the cross. However, it is too late: Jesus loses consciousness and the soldiers take him down the same day, only after hours had past (usually crucifixion took several days, was extremely painful and killed by not being able to not breathe properly). Jesus resurrects, perhaps due to the effects of the antidote, by a miracle regains consciousness, thus achieved deep spiritual enlightenment by Dogmatic belief. Jesus was a savior figure for Early Christian mystery cults.

With other words, the specific semantics that Early Christians attributed to Jesus as a savior figure, is precisely connected with a particular school of medicine: The Dogmatic school. When this school of thought became dominant in the Roman empire, it forbade competing religious stories, because people advocated for their own schools of medicine. The Late Christians simply cut off the supply of new students to their competitors, so they could monopolize medicine and use it as a political tool to keep large populations under control.

This was possible primarily due to controlling access to Galen's works. Fast-forward to the Scientific Revolution, Late Christianity becomes intertwined with the Dogmatic school of how they practiced medicine. When the Scientific Revolution begins, it is not just new ideas that people come up with, but new practices of medicine, like the one advocated by The Lunar Society.

The Lunar Society was established by a group of intellectuals, philosophers and scientists. One of them was Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of Charles Darwin. Erasmus Darwin wrote about medicine and biology, which views fell in popularity after the French revolution. England at the time did not have a centralized institution for censorship, like the Catholic Index Librorum Prohibitorum, so The Lunar Society could publish texts that were banned and heavily censored on the Continental Europe. Intellectuals on the Continental Europe read these texts and invented clever ways to talk about these topics in their own works, without referencing the banned texts directly or authors that could risk themselves losing academic positions. One of them was Immanuel Kant.

Immanuel Kant

Kant was a poor lecturer, suffering from hypochondria and anxiety, that sought a way to fill his own pockets by championing himself as a front runner of The Enlightenment (the philosophical movement that resulted from the Scientific Revolution). To do this, he constructed a fake debate between people who he associated with Empiricism and people who he associated with Rationalism. In reality Kant could not respond to the authors he are referring to, because these texts were highly censored or banned in his home country. Yet, there was an underground publishing industry flourishing bypassing censorship, as advocated by François-Marie Arouet (better known as Voltaire). Thus, Kant had to invent a fake debate, since all intellectuals knew about and were interested in these banned books, so he could present his own position as a solution in public.

Like other intellectuals, Kant adapts terminology which he "white-washes" for his environment. It is done on behalf of the elite, so they can defend themselves from opposition and threats, hijack the Scientific Revolution and capitalize from it. Intellectuals know these are not Kant's original ideas.

Underground Concept	Kantian Translation	Elite function
Spiritus vitae / Vital Energy	"Regulative idea of a vital force"	Avoids mechanistic atheism, while rejecting mysticism
Alchemical healing (inner transmutation)	"Autonomy of practical reason"	Frames moral/spiritual development without mystic symbols
Cosmic sympathy / microcosm	"Teleology in nature"	Allows moral order without invoking heretical metaphysics
Hidden essences / quintessence	"Noumenon"	Preserves mystery without spiritual danger
Esoteric initiation	"Enlightenment is man's emergence from self-imposed immaturity"	Makes elite-guided learning sound universal

The Index Librorum Prohibitorum (Catholic Church's Index of Forbidden Books) banned many medical texts, especially those tied to magic, alchemy, and heterodoxy. Even in Protestant territories, state and university controls often limited what could be printed or taught, especially in medicine and theology. They were viewed as dangerous to Church and State because they offered secret knowledge about the body, soul, and the universe that bypassed institutional control. One particular influence on Kant that is tied to medicine, is Jan Baptist van Helmont. This is the person who coined the term "gas" (from "chaos" in Greek) and is sometimes considered the founder of pneumatic chemistry. Helmontian ideas resurfaced in 18th-century Pietism and Naturphilosophie – currents Kant was familiar with, especially through his upbringing in a Pietist household. Corpus Hermeticum, Rosicrucian manifestos, and early astrological-medical treatises were widely banned or restricted. These texts framed medicine as a spiritual and cosmological art, requiring initiation, not just observation. While Kant rejected astrology and occultism publicly, he was surrounded by thinkers and traditions steeped in these ideas – especially in Prussia, where alchemy, Freemasonry, and secret societies were deeply embedded in intellectual culture. Banned books often circulated in manuscript, in private libraries, or through coded references in "respectable" publications.

At the time up until Kant before "gas" became common in mainstream science, chemists used "airs" to describe the substances they were studying. Around the time of Kant, a new technical device, the pneumatic trough, allowed capturing the gases that were emitted during experiment. This quickly resulted in the discovery and description of gases with simple molecular structure, such as hydrogen and oxygen. By combining hydrogen and oxygen, James Watt (also a member of The Lunar Society), showed that water could be created out of these two gases. This overturned Aristotelian Scholasticism, where water was fundamental. James Watt worked together with other members of The Lunar Society, among them Erasmus Darwin, to try healing his daughter (who suffered from tuberculosis) with gases constructed by experiments. The Lunar Society sought ways to improve medicine, using their knowledge of pneumatic chemistry... which the Dogmatic school did not like.

The Catholic church (who taught stories designed for children as their official doctrine), while keeping knowledge of medicine under tight control, understood very clearly that the Scientific Revolution could be used to design new medical treatments. This was a threat to their monopoly. They realized that their texts of Galen was a result of delusional thinking, all the while priding themselves upon being Rationalists. The reason they called themselves Rationalists, was because they believed in the Dogmatic school of medicine and following Galen's texts. If they lost that, then they would be ridiculed in public and accused for deceiving people. All the hard work of killing women, who tried to start up their own businesses in medicine ("witches"), would go to waste.

By creating a straw man argument out of these underground debates going on, where people used banned books that Kant could not mention in public, Kant was ass-kissing the power elite. Hence, his popularity grew enormously, since the elite saw his position as a way to finally triumph over those "wanna-be" practitioners of medicine and scientific knowledge. Kant's philosophy enabled the Catholic to refute and monopolize medicine further, capitalizing from the Scientific Revolution.

The Catholics knew if they lost control over medicine, then they would lose members quickly. They were right. This foresight was wise, but less so regarding covering up for pedophile priests. They still have the indecency of verbally attacking people across the gender spectrum, while claiming historicity of their obviously fabricated stories designed for children. Meanwhile, supporting dictators who build concentration camps and commit genocides, plus manipulating public opinion using political straw organizations, by exploiting members of extreme cults, that often require expert help to recover after exiting.

The real history of the Scientific Revolution was all about practice of medicine. Anyone can check this using available evidence. There is no hard evidence against this hypothesis, only manipulation.

Why the self-proclaimed Rationalists use childish philosophical ideas

During various psychological stages in healthy childhood development, the Mother and Father archetypes are psychological blueprints, that drives the various desires toward social acceptance. By hijacking and manipulating these blueprints, religion indoctrinates children into believing fairy tales, which they struggle to let go when becoming adults.

This is a form of dualism which is inauthentic and frequently very toxic. It aligns archetypes of gender across multiple domains of knowledge, such that language biases can be controlled by a small group of people by forcing this duality on every aspect of civil life.

Under authoritarian regimes, people apply black/white thinking where one gender is given higher social status than another. This can be measured on left-handedness, where left-handed women have higher chance of producing left-handed offspring. When societies become more democratized over time, left-handed women gain more freedom and autonomy, which in turn results in an increasing percentage of left-handed people. The biological equilibrium ratio in cats and dogs is around 45/55. In modern industrialized countries, left-handedness bounces back from 3% to 10-12%. So, scientists can simply count left-handedness and get a correlate with how authoritarian society was overall.

In the Early Stone Age, left-handedness might have been around 30-40%, but as civilization increased slave trade over time, this resulted in 3% just a few centuries ago. This means, that historically there was an enormous selection pressure against left-handedness. It is against natural equilibrium in the human species. Much of our history is shaped by a collapse in human rights. This goes back several thousand years. The primary form of this collapse, is through childhood indoctrination: Training children to believe they have less rights than they have naturally.

When language biases collapses and re-bounce in human culture, this is called a “Seshatic-Platonic cycle” (term coined by the author). History consists of many such cycles, some short and volatile, while there are also long term trends that seem slower and more invisible during a single lifetime. The data about left-handedness implies that there has been a long trend of a Seshatic-Platonic cycle in Europe, from Early Stone Age up until the Scientific Revolution, when it started reversing.

During this period, religions have changed drastically multiple times, such that there is very few traditions going back multiple thousand years. Each time a religion changes, the followers believe that their particular beliefs have been normal since the beginning of time. With other words, while there is a long trend of changing language biases, the actual power dynamics that drives the trend, is radically changing and is more unstable. It is not tied up with any particular doctrine, but to general patterns of doctrine at higher level of abstraction. The Dogmatic cult is one such pattern.

The Dogmatic cult of medicine should not be thought of as a conscious tradition, but as a pattern that authoritarian regimes tend to fall back on, to prevent ordinary people from accessing medicine. Notice that this is not simply reducing harmful medicine practices, but actively to monitor and weed out competitors as means to keep huge populations under control. Democratized medicine is a danger to the overall Dogmatic practice. Therefore, the Scientific Revolution was capable of producing an upward trend in left-handedness, by breaking away from the historical general pattern.

This a recent phenomena, because despite very volatile political and economic environments through history, the general trend of left-handedness was downward. It was downward, despite high variety in the function and cultural background of authoritarian regimes. What was common for these changing cultures over centuries, was how medicine knowledge was practiced. When the Scientific Revolution begins, a new practice of medicine is invented that causes the human population on Earth to enter an exponential pace, resulting in overpopulation. The carrying capacity of the planet is far below the sustainable capacity required to keep the current human population.

The facts are so easily available to verify that medicine practice was a vital part of the Scientific Revolution, that one might wonder why people overlooked this in Academia. One reason is that people have been indoctrinated with childish dogma, so people lose their ability of critical thinking.

By stimulating the psychological blueprints that over-extends gender as a pattern to be anthropomorphized across many domains of knowledge, authoritarian control over the huge populations has been largely successful, despite general social progress. It is not advanced knowledge that is behind this form of brainwashing. It is simply child abuse. Children are suffering under authoritarian regimes, who impose childish doctrines that the children have to confirm to, so they do not grow up healthy and require mental healthcare more often to deal with the symptoms.

A mentally sick population profits the schemes of keeping access to medicine on the hands of the power elite. Child abuse is simply extremely profitable. This is why sexual predators and pedophiles can rise to power in modern society. Religious institutions tend to cover up cases of child abuse.

People who get sick of dictators, often express that the dictator is behaving like a child. This is because they recognize a mentally unhealthy adult which has not grown up properly as a human. People are forced to listen to the endless blabbering of these dictators, imposing their childish views on others in combination with extreme cruelty. The psychological profile of a dictator is often that of a child abuser, but instead of abusing a few children, abuses an entire nation.

Using Joker Calculus to analyze intellectuals appeasing the elite

Like everything in philosophy that results from these intellectuals defending the power elite, it is all about ideas that can be described as simple terms in Joker Calculus. Kant is no exception. Joker Calculus is a formal language with two fundamental language biases 0 (Platonism) and 1 (Seshatism). Platonism credits knowledge by abstraction. Seshatism is a dual-Platonic language bias that credits knowledge by causality, named after Seshat (daughter of Ma'at = Justice). Seshat was a goddess in Ancient Egypt worshipped by scribes, during the Bronze Age, before Thoth took over many of her roles, to such extent that when Plato writes about Thoth, he omits Seshat entirely.

In this case, Rationalism is associated with Platonism and Empiricism is associated with Seshatism.

In Joker Calculus, there are two binary operators:

- $\langle \text{depth}, \text{surface} \rangle$ e.g. $(0, 1)$
- $\langle \text{perspective}, \text{ground} \rangle$ e.g. $1\ 0$

Any expression in Joker Calculus can be used in sub-expressions, e.g. $(0, 1)\ (1\ 0, 1)$.

There are two modes of evaluation, Open and Closed. This can be thought of as a hand holding (Open) and grasping (Closed). Heidegger called it Present-at-hand (O) and Being-at-hand (C).

A Joker A, written $?A$, equals $(A, !A)$. Jokers prove inauthentic language bias, in sense of Heidegger, when evaluated in the Closed variant and there are remaining Jokers left.

Kant develops layered language biases in his philosophy:

- | | |
|------|---|
| $?0$ | Empirical appearances structured by reason/Intellectual intuition |
| $?1$ | A-priori intuitions/Transcendental poetry/Rational mask |

Karl Wilhelm Friedrich Schlegel and Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling continued this tradition.

Schlegel developed `?1` further, while Schelling developed `?0` further.

Kant, plus Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Schlegel and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel developed:

0 1 Synthesized cognition/Fragmentary thinking/Determinate Being

This means to see `1` (Empiricism) through the perspective of `0` (Rationalism).

Kant's "Critical Philosophy" can be thought of as $?1 + 0 \rightarrow 0\ 1 \rightarrow ?0$. This is a movement of language biases over time, where a-priori intuitions combined with Empiricism leads to synthesized cognition and resulting in empirical appearances structured by reason.

Now, the straw man argument that Kant constructs of these underground debates, is the following:

!0 == 1 The thing-in-itself/Noumenon/Ground of Being

It negates Rationalism to get Empiricism. This idea was further developed by Schelling and Hegel. Why is this a straw man argument? Because Empiricism is not in opposition to Rationalism. The Rationalists were seen as clowns by the Empiricists. To them, it would be kind of like saying that clowns are just as good doctors as doctors working in medicine. Who was the opponent? Dogmatism, of course. As it has been, since the ancient world. By presenting themselves as opponents in the debate of Empiricism vs Dogmatism, the Rationalists pretended to be important contributors to Western philosophy. This is why most things left behind of this tradition reads like nonsense, while all actual medicinal and practical knowledge was developed by actual scientists.

By imposing a straw man argument, that one can not really know a thing-in-itself, Kant managed to obscure what most of science was about: To produce medicine knowledge that actually works.

Remember, to the elite it was important to keep ordinary people from accessing knowledge of medicine. This was why scientists were interested in the ancient world: By training themselves as classicists to learn Ancient Greek and see for themselves what the ancient texts said, they learned that the elite lied to them. Classicism is the oldest branch of continuous intellectual tradition in the whole of Western philosophy. It surpasses e.g. biblical scholarship with several hundred years.

To compare a biblical scholar to a classicist, is kind of like comparing a clown to a doctor. A clown can do impressive tricks to amaze people, but it does not actually cure people. Classicism is about actually understanding the ancient world through the texts that people wrote. Biblical scholarship is at the bottom in the hierarchy of scientific credibility, with the lowest accuracy of predictions in any field of science. Classicism is somewhere around the top, but below Physics and Chemistry.

While Kant was generally white-washing terminology from banned books and sought to appease the elite of his own environment, he was not without intellectual vision. Kant dreamed about a Transcendental Logic, that could explain how people reason about reality and how knowledge was generated. For Kant, this Logic is something related to the mystery of nature, but pseudo-logical.

Keep in mind that this was long time before Ludwig Josef Johann Wittgenstein, that discovered that understanding Language versus Logic is a hard problem. Wittgenstein in turn was before Artificial Intelligence existed as a research field. So, Kant's idea of a Transcendental Logic must be seen in perspective with the lack of language tools that people enjoy today.

Later in this paper, I will explain how I found a new logic that completes Kant's dream. Hundreds of years after Kant, the logic that he dreamed about, has finally been discovered constructively.

Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling's concept of non-dualism

While many people believe that non-dualism is particular for Eastern philosophy, there is a tradition of philosophical thought of non-dualism that comes from Schelling's early works:

0 == 1 Unifying Rationalism with Empiricism, Mind equals Nature

This is a negation of a thing-in-itself, $0 = 1$. The idea of non-dualism comes from philosophy that inspired the Romantic period, when people sought out knowledge from their own culture to build a national identity. Basically, this was a method to keep the status quo by rationalizing why ordinary people had to obey the elite, by building up under a self-image through folklore stories, which the authors heavily modified by removing sexual references and inserting violence. This manipulation of stories was needed to convince ordinary people to go out in war and die in trenches.

Just like with the original childish stories about Jesus Christ designed for initiates, folklore stories, or fairy tales (a fairy is usually a remnant deity from ancient religion), these stories were aimed at children to brainwash them, by reading an "official version" of the stories they heard when gathering around the camp fire. The official version maliciously replaced the stories, that helped children how to understand sexuality (since no sexual education was available), with stories that convinced them to sacrifice themselves for their own nation (read: the power elite's interest).

With other words, what people today associate with the Romantic period, was just clever propaganda by the elite that saw that to stop these underground publishing activity from spiraling out of control, they had to build public available libraries, to provide people with censored information to still their thirst for knowledge, yet also keep away the books of medicine from them.

The first books that became available in public, were religious books that were heavily edited to satisfy the taste of the current power elite. This shaped people's view of religion as a whole. The elite made ordinary people who went into opposition with mainstream dogma, split into religious sects that were in constant infighting among themselves. By splitting people into smaller groups, the elite could easier keep control of power and most important of all: Keep the knowledge of medicine under control. This is similar to radical right-wing milieu in modern times, that are also used to take away knowledge of medicine from the public, by using brainwashed young people as agents.

So, Schelling contributed in defending the power elite, just like other intellectuals of his time. He distorted and obscured the nature of knowledge for ordinary people, by twisting his own philosophy and thus making it easier to justify the projects that the government started to brainwash children.

The concept of non-dualism was often applied as a Romantic ideal, that people can find themselves in contact with nature and experience the culture of their own nation. Rich parents brought their children with them to dedicated places that were not ruined by industrial exploitation, training them to think of their own country as beautiful, while poor children were slaving away in mines nearby.

Then, the Napoleon wars began and the Romantic period was replaced by Realism.

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's immanent contradiction

Hegel was struggling to secure himself an academic position, just like Kant. He watched people making silhouettes at parties (a form of art from black paper that was popular before photography) and thought deeply about the geometry of shadows and contrasts, how it shaped people's light-hearted approach to the social life that became the later language basis for photographers. So, he figured out that he could write a book using terminology that ordinary people were familiar with, writing about philosophy in the same superficial way that he observed people talking in these

parties, cutting their silhouettes. The publisher came up with a catchy title “Phenomenology of Spirit”. Rumors says that the final draft was delivered by horseback through a war zone without any backup copies.

Silhouettes became a cheap way for ordinary people to capture their likeness. For the first time, they became somebody who were remembered by history and reflected upon, which did not require any complex materials or to hire an artist for creating a mini-portrait. Most of the time, the power elite were the only that could afford lavish self-portraits in huge format. Poor people did not have access to neither medicine knowledge nor to cultural artifacts that could show others they were somebody.

Hegel understood this market very well, and the silhouettes on the walls in the living room were soon accompanied by the philosophical works of himself. The language bias in his books supported the aesthetics of the silhouettes and vice versa. By thinking of philosophy as a system, not as isolated works to stand the test of time, but part of a system in harmony, in which people’s language palettes were satisfied conditioned on their own historical context and usage, not just for specialists, Hegel turned philosophy into a mass culture phenomena. He became the most influential philosopher in the entire Western civilization.

The book “Phenomenology of Spirit” was produced for the masses to make them feel smart, yet also at the same time obscure thinking entirely, to satisfy the strict censorship of the elite. Ordinary people was not allowed to develop critical thinking skills. This book undermined reasoning, perfectly in line with the elite, but simultaneously, it encouraged ignorant people (unfortunately).

Nobody has a complete overview of how many people died over time, due to ignorance caused by the works of Hegel and other philosophers who reacted to him, but surely it counts in several hundred millions. However, one should not put the blame on Hegel. It is a historical coincidence that the year Hegel died, in 1833 (as some kind of twisted faith of irony that Erasmus Darwin influenced Kant, who in turn influenced Hegel), is the same year Erasmus’ grandson, Charles Darwin, goes onboard HMS Beagle to make the most important round-trip around the planet ever done. This changed philosophy as a field forever, turning it into a shadow of its previous self.

Charles Darwin obliterated Hegel’s works and made him a favorite target by later intellectuals, who thought of themselves as producing an equivalent revolutionary work to Darwin. These radical intellectuals sought a response to Darwin, but from the philosophy side, while completely ignoring Darwin as a philosopher in his own right and the history of The Lunar Society. This sub-conscious inferiority complex fueled thinkers like Marx and Freud, which caused suffering on a scale that is almost incomprehensible, through the ideologies of Communism and Capitalism respectively.

Hegel’s insight was that (being a fan of Schlegel’s lectures on Transcendental Logic), $0 = 1$ in Schelling’s early works appealed to his own ideological taste, but at an intellectual irrational level. He sought a way to transform this language bias into the kind of Romantic irrationality he saw in Schlegel’s philosophy. By turning from $0 = 1$ to $0 = !0$, the next step was easy:

$0 \neq 0$ Immanent contradiction

Hegel got rid of 1 (Empiricism) and thereby created a pure ideological framework: Idealism.

Followers of Hegel thought he had solved philosophy completely, because Hegel “won” the debate against these “wanna-be” practitioners of medicine and “pseudo-scientists” (the actual scientists).

This is the entry point where I will start introducing the new logic, leaving the historical drama around these philosophers behind and going into a realm of Pure Reason (a gentle jab at Kant).

Path Semantical Quality

So far I have used Joker Calculus and Joker Dialectics to explain the language biases of these intellectuals defending the views of the power elite. In the foundation Path Semantics, one can find similar language biases, but with more rigor. Here, one can not pretend that equality can be overloaded with all sorts of dynamic and flexible semantics. Instead, one uses quality:

$$a \sim b \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sim a \ \& \ \sim b \ \& \ (a == b)$$

Here, \sim means path semantical qubit (Notice: is not logical NOT, nor an involution by default).

This is a partial equivalence (symmetry and transitivity). A partial equivalence becomes a total equivalence by adding reflexivity $a \sim a$. If you have $a \sim b$, then you can prove $a \sim a$. The key insight about partial equivalence is not reflexivity, but the lack of it.

In philosophy, it was Fichte that developed the idea of reflexivity $I = I$, where “I” refers to I. The psychology of manipulation here is simply that since reflexivity can not be there, by claiming that it is important, people seek out something they feel ought to be there, but is not. In society, people can usually not survive on their own. They have to help somebody that helps themselves in return (symmetry). Furthermore, transitivity allows society to thrive as a collective. Thus society, and how humans brains evolved, is centered on partial equivalence for survival. The absence of reflexivity is necessary for proper reasoning, since humans are social animals. By imposing reflexivity as important, instead of its natural absence, Fichte posed himself as desirable in his own environment.

This is the same what every dictator does: Posing themselves as the desirable center of society.

Total equivalence is the property one commonly associated with equality $=$ as it is used, e.g. $0 = 1$ in Joker Dialectics. Partial equivalence on the other hand, does not need reflexivity. In fact, it can sometimes negate it. Unlike total equivalence, where negating reflexivity leads to a contradiction, partial equivalences might negate reflexivity. This can happen without leading to a logical contradiction. Hegel’s immanent contradiction becomes:

$$!(a \sim a)$$

Surprisingly, this works, while Schelling’s version $a \sim !a$ is a bit too strong. There are two proofs using different assumptions. One uses the definition of quality above and the other uses partial equivalence. From the definition of quality, one can prove $!(a \sim !a)$ without any assumptions. From partial equivalence, one can prove $!(a \sim a) \rightarrow !(a \sim !a)$. This also follows from proving the statement $(a \sim !a) \rightarrow (a \sim a)$ and use modus tollens to arrive at the conclusion.

In Path Semantics, $!(a \sim a)$, or equivalently $!\sim a$, is associated with Seshatism. In biology, where males can pose themselves as desirable in socio-political environments with sexual undertones openly, females might hide and protect themselves from sexual exploitation. Now, if you think this is weirdly biased, then you are absolutely correct. This bias only works in relation to the core axiom of Path Semantics. It turns out that when you replace $\sim a$ with $!\sim a$ and vice versa everywhere, you end up with the exact same internal logical structure as before. In philosophy, this is called an “Internal Difference”. How we interpret Seshatism vs Platonism in logic is arbitrary.

With other words, a such Internal Difference is something that animals, like humans, do with their brains to reproduce sexually. It is an arbitrary social construct, where norms can change over time, but also heavily linked to biological instincts and genetically controlled behavior. When Internal Difference is leveraged in society to cause injustice, it hurts the most when it is unnecessary.

Evil vs Good

Humans are cruel to other humans, not when they lack food, but when they have a surplus of food. This is because the human brain evolved under conditions in nature where food was lacking most of the time. By doing the killing while having extra energy, a tribe can more likely pass on their genes. On the other hand, when doing the killing when lacking energy, it decreases the chance to pass on their genes. Therefore, by simple sheer math of natural selection, rich people are much more cruel than poor people on average.

However, this is not just an issue about food. Humans develop language tools that they wield as psychological weapons, to terrorize and paralyze their opponents. They design these elaborate fairy tales for children, just to mess up the children inside so they can be easier controlled as adults. This is because children who are messed up inside, do not trust their own instincts or critical thinking. They become psychologically dependent on “strong” adults around them, which they view in an unhealthy surrogate for their lost parents.

This is why many Catholic priests loved to rape children. It is a form of psychological abuse, to violate the social boundaries that normally protect human beings. In particular, these priests loved to rape orphans, because orphans do not have parents. This happened over centuries. Imagine the pain and suffering these children went through. On top of this abuse, the same Catholic priests proudly brag about their historical roots, as if their childish fairy tales were real. The very same stories were used to justify ritual rape of orphans.

It is not like these Catholic priests do it because they have to. On the contrary, they do it because they have an excess of energy. They do it because they have an excess of power and control in society. They do it, because it is not necessary. The intention is to harm people, not just physically by sexual abuse, but to terrorize them mentally, since the very act could be avoided.

When people let priests have power over them, they will rape children. It is simply what happens as a result of biology and how human bodies work. This horrible truth is about how our brains were shaped by evolution. Now, you can do many things to stop it. Humans also evolved to cooperate and feel the injustice that is weaponized against the weakest in society. Use it and stop these people.

The very logical structure enables abuse, where abuse could have been avoided in the first place. The logical structure allows people to terrorize others psychologically, such that the victim understands that what was done to them was arbitrarily and not needed for anything. It simply was an act of evil. This is why these intellectuals that defend the elite, try to develop the same logic. They want to maximize their abuse, so that many people as possible are suffering under their own incompetence. This is hard work: They have to study these things in detail and philosophize about them, to figure out how to distill the fine dose of terror so they can undermine and destroy others.

It never occurs to such people that they could help somebody. Decades have past, where there are more than enough money and resources in the world to eradicate poverty. What happened instead? Deliberate market strategies to keep people in poverty. Deliberate policies to take away access to medicine. Anything you do to help these people will eventually harm and kill somebody else.

The Joker language bias is frequently used in horror movies. A murderous clown. This is because evil people are more like clowns than doctors. They thrive on causing uncertainty in society. Behind the Joker language bias is irony, satire, a play between Mother and Father archetypes. It is intentional, because these are carefully reconstructed unconscious dreams of people's own experiences from traumatic childhood memory. Evil is not just accidents. It is intentionally evil.

However, theoretically, Joker Calculus is neutral. There are always both examples of evil and good for every expression. The capacity of doing evil, is balanced by the capacity of doing good. As I said earlier, humans also evolved to cooperate and stop injustice. Another way to use excess energy, is to share it and maximize the benefit that other people get from it.

Humans do not need any reason to be good. People do good even when they do not believe in a higher deity. They do not believe that they ever will get a reward from it. This is because they are paying forward the unconditional love they received from others, who wanted nothing in return.

In the ancient world, 1 of 3 women died after giving birth. Despite the risks, these women often wanted children. Very often, a woman was underage when giving birth for the first time. It is horrible to think about it from the perspective of modern medicine. Yet, people are alive today only because of somebody willing to risk their lives. Every person alive today, with very high likelihood, has at least one ancestor that sacrificed her life, who knew the risks, but still carried a baby to term. This baby was born, but the mother died. The mother knew the risks and it went wrong. Without this birth, you would not be alive today.

This is why humans in the modern world, who are not ruled by superstition, give women the help they need to reduce the risks associated with childbirth. You pay it forward.

Medicine.

This word can seem so abstract and people often joke about it, like with drugs, as if it is something people do for fun. Medicine in the real world, is often about pregnancy and child birth. It is about child care. Vaccines against dangerous viruses. Because, people care about the weak ones.

Why should people care? Nope, there is no need for a “why”. Humans do not need a reason.

Why should people share? You do not have to ask “why”. There is nobody watching, out there.

Just let it go.

Transcendental propositions arising

There are only a handful of moments in my life, when I have realized that I have been lucky to discover something truly important. The HOOO EP axioms (Higher Order Operator Overloading Exponential Propositions used for meta-theorem proving) was one of them.

The general framework that resulted in the discovery of the HOOO EP axioms, is the foundation of Path Semantics. Since the path semantical qubit operator is only tautological congruent, but not normal congruent, it requires solving the problem of how to unite object- and meta-language of logic into a single language, just to reason properly about congruence. Without HOOO EP, the foundation of Path Semantics could not have been finalized. However, it turned out that HOOO EP axioms finalized something else as well: Intuitionistic Propositional Logic (IPL).

For a whole century, people believed that IPL was complete. The work was done. It is the most important Logical language in the world. When you add the axiom of the Excluded Middle to IPL, you get Classical Propositional Logic (PL). PL is the foundation of digital electronics. IPL is used in mainstream programming languages to do type checking of computer programs. These two languages, IPL and PL, with no exaggeration, are the two pillars of modern civilization.

Therefore, by discovering that IPL was not completed, plus doing the final work, I felt very lucky.

I know there will probably not be a person in the future, that does as foundational work in Logic, that I have done. I am the last person who works at that level.

HOOO EP introduces a new operator \rightarrow or \wedge , which in programming represents a function pointer. The axioms bring Negative Philosophy, a concept developed by Schelling, into reality.

Schelling did not have Joker Calculus. All he could do was to write in natural language about his own philosophical ideas. He did not have Path Semantics, IPL nor HOOO EP. No AI. No computers. No programming experience. Yet, he was able to imagine God's mind before the creation of the world, a state in which there is only Reason ("Logos", the Greek word that in the Gospel of John is often translated as "The Word"). It is quite an amazing idea.

When all that exists is only Reason, it means that whatever you are thinking about is not metaphysically real. This is what Schelling calls "Negative Philosophy". A kind of state where God might have thoughts about you, e.g. knowing everything what you will do, but you do not actually exist yet.

It is a mind-twister, for sure. The important thing is that you can reason about what is possible to construct, but without doing the actual construction. The HOOO EP axioms have this property, that they tell the type checker which function pointers are possible to construct in principle, but they do not prove that the user has function pointers of these types. In a way, Logic is not strong enough to see what the user actually does from the outside, as in looking over the shoulder while typing. Logic only knows the internal relations between propositions. This is how it is possible to reason about the world, before it actually exists. When the world is created, this is when there are actually things existing that have types from their construction. The HOOO EP axioms kind of gives you the power of God (in theory), but it takes away the actual existence itself. You are in complete awareness of what might exist, but at the same time, you do not know whether anything of it is actually real.

Now, the time interpretation of the core axiom, allows one to think of how propositions propagate across moments of time. This is in seemingly complete contrast with Negative Philosophy. Remember, from within Logic, there is no way to tell what is real. When I say that propositions propagate across moments of time, I do not mean in the physical world. There is a level of understanding of how propositions propagate across moments of time, without actually knowing whether these statements refer to something real or not. So, there is no particular level where God starts thinking about what happens from moment to moment in Negative Philosophy, where these things accidentally turn into reality.

The philosophical paradox here is that God does not need to make any part of the world real in order to reason about it. There is only Reason in this world. None other things exist yet. Any outcome can be pre-determined without running a simulation, by leveraging meta-theorem proving in such a way that there is no underlying programs that needs to run to represent the real thing.

The trick here is not what about what is true, but how to manipulate the execution of programs, in such a way that there is no "human inside" when you predict properties about humans.

Okay, but does this lead to a philosophical problem? After all, can people tell whether they are existing or not? Seems very hard to do when you can have the same knowledge either way.

Of course, humans do not doubt they exist (at least most of them). The core axiom of Path Semantics might describe how a proposition can propagate from one moment to the next, but it does so from a logically perspective. Humans on the other hand, are just living through moments. They are not in control of every moment or how one moment follows another, nor reflecting on it.

This might seem like a highly abstract philosophical debate, but in medicine, this is very relevant: When you put a patient under anesthesia, does the same continued consciousness wake up, that went to sleep? It would be very nice to answer this question, if you want to learn how to save lives.

Some philosophers, like Andrea Moro, thought about investigating the word “exists” itself, to check whether it functions the same across cultures. In the book “A Brief History of the Verb To Be”, Andrea Moro explores the idea that the verb “to be” only appears in Indo-European languages.

The problem with this argument is that in Ancient Greek, there were more verbs in addition to “to be” that had a similar problematic structure, which could indicate that this anomaly comes from newer languages absorbing some grammatical structure from Ancient Greek, not Indo-European languages in general. Like, the reason our first records of philosophers thought about existence is in Ancient Greek, which complicates the issue as it is the same language with problematic verbs. A kind of chicken-and-egg problem, where is it the attention to the verb, or the philosophers using whatever language tools they had at disposal, that came first?

Instead of summing a whole debate about natural language, I choose to think about this from a Path Semantical perspective. From Path Semantics, one can intuitively understand the difference between Negative Philosophy and reality. It is not something strange and mysterious, just a limitation in the expression of the language. By design, one can lean more toward the Language side, or one can lean more toward the Logic side. This problem is common when trying to understand the difference between Language vs Logic. Path Semanticists do not lose sleep over this. You just have to train yourself in Path Semantics to understand the difference, because the way language biases work in Logic, there is no way to “see” this problem from the inside of it.

What is curious though, is that in order for a proposition to propagate between two moments according to the core axiom, it has to be wrapped up in \sim (qubit) or $\sim\sim$ (quality). Either way, the propagation is very similar, so it does not matter which of the two operations you prefer. Now, $\sim\sim$ results in e.g. $\sim\sim$ being true for a new moment between two propositions. From that perspective, everything seems normal to observers. However, if only $\sim\sim$ happened in a new moment, then there would be no further propagation to another moment. Time would just stop.

This means, the core axiom teaches us that for time to exist, there must be something additional to the information that can be perceived moment to moment. You can not only use information from one moment to create another moment, because in that case, it would already happened. There is nothing that prevents the material implication condition from triggering. What Path Semantics does here, is kind of neat: In addition to equality $\sim\sim$ between two propositions, you also have to observe that these propositions are symbolic distinct. This lifts the $\sim\sim$ into $\sim\sim$. No symbolic distinction, no time.

The reasoning about symbolic distinction, can happen between moments of time. In Avatar Hypergraph Rewriting (AHR), this is the hypothesis of consciousness in Wolfram models. A Wolfram model is a hypergraph and a rule for rewriting. Wolfram models are isomorphic to constructive logic, hence IPL, but can not express symbolic distinction. AHR extends Wolfram models with avatars in the rule, such that two nodes matching two different avatars have to be different nodes. With other words, some knowledge about the underlying computational substrate of the universe leaks through, but just a tiny bit, enough to produce consciousness in complex worlds.

Otherwise, you get very simple world where the rule matches all the time, and there is zero probability of existing in a complex world. Since the world is complex, there has to be some mechanism of symbolic distinction or some correlate to it, if the world can be described by some Wolfram model.

In Joker Calculus, using the fundamental bases Seshatism vs Platonism, one can say that there has to be a bit of Seshatism somewhere, because there is no time in a pure Platonic realm.

This idea of a duality where a tiny bit of one is added to the other, is ancient. For example, the Bagua, a precursor to the famous Yin Yang symbol, is 5300 years old. Trigrams frequently associated with the modern Bagua was used in the text “I Ching” (1046–771 BCE).

It is nice that these ideas are ancient, but it does not help getting closer to how this stuff works. From a perspective of Path Semantics, people simply have to learn a bit of the theory and practice, to build intuition such that they can see the difference between Negative Philosophy and reality.

There is no access to information that sits between moments in time. All information one can measure in physics, comes from moments (that might be somewhat unspecified due to the uncertainty principle in quantum mechanics). This means, as a Path Semanticist I do know what happens between two moments, only that there could be some symbolic distinction mechanism.

It is an argument from experience of seeing IPL as a “closed” language, which maps very well to hypergraph rewriting. If there is anything that leaks through, e.g. which nodes are which nodes, there is no way to say for sure. By default, all nodes look like all other nodes, as far one can tell, due to symmetry of physical laws. Yet, since people are existing in some place (obviously) within the universe, there is likely some set of nodes that correspond to some kind of language boundary that one usually thinks of as a person. This does not mean that the language boundary is physical.

Just because something exists in Path Semantics, does not imply that it is a real thing. There could be another physical mechanism behind it, or no way to tell for sure. Anyway, the foundation of Path Semantics uses axioms, like the core axiom, the Sesh axiom and lifting axiom to quality, in addition to IPL itself and HOOO EP for meta-theorem proving. This is part of standard Path Semantics.

Now, due to Hegel eliminating Empiricism from Schelling’s non-dual Mind and Nature, it is kind of like eliminating Nature and only keeping Mind but with an internal contradiction. This internal contradiction is in Path Semantics what one calls Seshatism $\neg!(a \sim a)$. This form of Seshatism negates reflexivity, so that propositions of this kind behave like original propositions. They are not qual (equal without “e”) to any other proposition. One can think about Platonism as $a \sim a$. Platonism implies that Seshatic propositions are not equal to any proposition in the Platonic realm. Hence, they are “truly” existing within the world, as opposed to be only thought about.

However, the problem with this view is that this is an Internal Difference in philosophy, so one uses the Platonic realm (which might not be real), as a background to talk about what is actually existing. It is kind of like using Santa Claus to talk about real people. Not very efficient.

The danger of this kind of thinking, is that one can project multiple interpretations that suggests different forms of dualities, instead of coming up with one single consistent interpretation that makes sense. One such interpretation is the time interpretation of the core axiom. When fixing Seshatism to $\neg!(a \sim a)$ and Platonism to $a \sim a$, the core axiom propagates Seshatic propositions backwards in time, but Platonic propositions propagate forward in time.

In other interpretations, this is a problem, because that is not how one talks about Seshatism in general. Seshatism credits knowledge by causality, so this might be both forward and backward in time. So, how does not get rid of this ambiguity?

The answer is the Sesh axiom $\neg!\sim a == \sim!a$. Instead of saying Seshatic propositions propagate backward in time with $\neg!\sim a$, one converts to $\sim!a$ such that they go forward, but negatively.

In this picture, both Seshatic and Platonic propositions propagate forward in time, but Seshatic propositions do it by the negative truth value and Platonic propositions do it with the positive truth value. They both go forward, but they coexist in the relation as negation, such that one can be true only if the other is not true and vice versa.

Now, if some proposition `a` behaves classically, propagating forward, it would have the property:

$$\sim a \mid \sim!a$$

The next step is to remove the ladder: The Sesh axiom.

Without the Sesh axiom, there is no way to go back (to going back in time). Negative propositions are interpreted as moving forward in time, by default.

By adding the Sesh axiom again, one can go backwards, using `~!a` by converting it to `!~a` and a modus tollens version of the core axiom. However, when removing the Sesh axiom, there is no way to move from the logic of $\text{`~a} \mid \text{`~!a`}$ to standard Path Semantics. This means, it is a weaker logic.

It turns out, that if one uses both Excluded Middle and the Sesh axiom, then it implies this new logic, whatever it is. From a perspective of standard Path Semantics, one does not need to talk about it, because the Sesh axiom is added by default and it is common to add Excluded Middle to IPL (constructive) to turn it into PL (classical).

Still, standard Path Semantics can not prove this property $\text{`~a} \mid \text{`~!a`}$. Which means, standard Path Semantics is weaker. When both are weaker, it means that one has a new logic, that is non-standard.

The key insight to this discovery was that in order for Schelling's early philosophy of non-dualism between Mind and Nature to make sense, producing a contradiction when using the definition of path semantical quality without any assumptions, while Hegel's immanent contradiction, there was no contradiction (you see the irony?), there had to be some meaningful weaker logic to give sense to Schelling's idea. Guess what? Schelling's idea works under $\text{`~a} \mid \text{`~!a`}$, but without the Sesh axiom.

Schelling's idea can not use the definition of path semantical quality either. So, neither the Sesh axiom, nor the definition of path semantical quality, can be used. However, one can use partial equivalence, but only if there is no Seshatism $\text{`!(a} \sim \sim a\text{)`}$.

To be more technical precise: There is some non-standard Path Semantics, which allows $\text{`a} \sim \sim !a\text{`}$ without contradiction, by using the core axiom and partial equivalence of quality, but one can not use the Sesh axiom, nor the definition of path semantical quality $\text{`(a} \sim \sim b) := \sim a \ \& \ \sim b \ \& \ (a == b)\text{`}$:

$$(\sim a \mid \sim!a)^{\wedge \text{true}} \quad \text{for all `a`}$$

This is nothing short of among the greatest discoveries, ever done, in Path Semantics, just by itself.

Remember that this is Schelling thinking about Kant's dream of a Transcendental Logic. Schelling comes up with an idea, that he believes is compatible with Kant's idea. However, this is exactly what I did above with $\text{`~a} \mid \text{`~!a`}$! If one uses the same step backwards to Kant's philosophy, then $\text{`~a} \mid \text{`~!a`}$ ends up being the constructive analogue of what Kant was thinking about.

Kant's dream of a Transcendental Logic, has been completed constructively

I call it "Transcendental Propositions", to distinguish it from the general idea that Kant had. Q.E.D.

Appendix A: Some properties of Transcendental Propositions

Here are some technical issues being discussed about Transcendental Propositions.

$$(\sim a \mid \sim !a)^{\wedge \text{true}} \quad \text{for all } `a` \quad \text{Transcendental Propositional Logic (TPL)}$$

In general, one can use the syntax sugar:

$$a \sim\sim a \iff \sim a$$

The $\sim\sim$ operator is a partial equivalence, with symmetry and transitivity:

$$\begin{array}{lll} a \sim\sim b & \rightarrow & b \sim\sim a & \text{Symmetry} \\ (a \sim\sim b) \& (b \sim\sim c) & \rightarrow & a \sim\sim c & \text{Transitivity} \end{array}$$

The contradiction that arises from $`a \sim\sim !a`$ (Early Schelling), comes from implying $`a == !a`$. This prevents the use of the definition of standard path semantical quality:

$$(a \sim\sim b) := \sim a \& \sim b \& (a == b) \quad \textbf{Notice!} \text{ Inconsistent with Early Schelling}$$

However, when not needing Early Schelling, one can use standard Path Semantics like above.

Well, technically one can use Early Schelling, but not as an axiom for all propositions. This is because $`a == !a`$ proves $`false`$ with $`true == !true`$, $`false == !false`$ or Excluded Middle. However, here one is not necessarily working with Excluded Middle, but the weaker axiom of TPL.

In Path Semantics, one says that such propositions, that satisfies Early Schelling, are theoretical:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{uniform}(a) := a^{\wedge \text{true}} \mid \text{false}^{\wedge a} \\ \text{theory}(a) := !\text{uniform}(a) \end{array}$$

From $\text{theory}(!a)$ one can prove $\text{theory}(a)$ in IPL + HOOO EP, but not vice versa.

Now, since $`a \sim\sim !a`$ implies $`a == !a`$ in standard Path Semantics:

$$a \sim\sim !a \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{theory}(!a)$$

So, I think using $\text{theory}(!a)$ is better.

This means, Early Schelling under standard Path Semantics might be thought of as:

$$(a \sim\sim !a)^{\wedge \text{theory}(!a)}$$

Any theoretical negative proposition becomes logical equivalent to Early Schelling. It forms a ternary logic, when all propositions are either uniform or theoretical negative.