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Greetings, my fellow readers! First, I will tell you the plan and specify the goal of my work, so you can decide either to stop or continue reading.

1. I have stated that there is a crisis of modernity. It’s irritating, but here I will get to the bottom of this and specify this idea by rejecting it.
2. By this point we will know what the actual “crisis” is, so we should prepare an adequate plan to find an answer to this “crisis”.
3. The world of valuable ideas and Socrates’ irony.
4. What if Kierkegaard’s followers “understood him too quickly”?
5. Finally, I will present some “old-new” ideas and prepare you for a new branch of philosophy (I. Presenting new philosophy; II. A belief system; III. Introduction to my spirals; IV. Learning spiral. Big history approach in educational subjects by rising complexity; V. Expansion of cartesian argument, value system).
6. It’s time to challenge this philosophy and see how it is good in fighting problems.
7. The victory is true when there is future, so I will share my thoughts about this philosophy’s applicability, limitations, and dangers.
8. My sincere thanks for the knowledge provided / sources of inspiration.

Before we start, I must say that this work is written first of all for myself, because I think that it is convenient to keep big-ideas-paper in the internet. Nevertheless, I am glad to see you here and I hope you will enjoy yourself reading it. I think reading and thinking is a good way to spend time. I have no need to impose my ideas. So, if you feel that my writing has become obtrusive and pressing, please, accept my
sincere apologies, you are free to stop reading whenever you want and you don’t have to read it to the last word.

1. The crisis of modernity

The crisis is often associated with problems. Climate Change; Wars and military conflicts; Water contamination; Human rights violation; Global health issues; Poverty; Children’s poor access to healthcare, education, and safety; Access to food and hunger...

Are these problems unsolvable? Do these problems have something in common? Common cause? Let’s try the word “resources”. Climate Change is partly created by exploitation of Earth’s resources and lack of resources (Greentech energy) to replace them. Other problems will easily be solved with bigger amount of resources. Are the resources limited? Well, if you can prove that the Universe isn’t infinite, then yes. So, it’s hard to prove that these problems are unsolvable, and I think that we are not in the position when we really need all the resources from the Universe. We lack knowledge of how to get to resources outside the Earth, but we go beyond our bounds every day.

So, what is “the actual problem”? You may say that “the actual problem” is in the crisis of institutions and traditional values. But can you prove that this problem is unsolvable and that there is no such a thing as absolutely righteous society? What if we are a few steps from utopia? And the current situation is just an illusion of moral decline [1]. Well, let us imagine (do a thought experiment) a utopia – a world with no problems.

Chapter V-oice The Problem

After leaving the City I have visited many places and other cities, but there are no problems so far. Here people live in harmony with themselves, with nature, with the world. Finally, I came back where it all started. What should I do? You should do good. Oh, you are here. Why were you silent this whole time? You didn’t ask questions. Ah, yes, people here are so wise, they live simple lives, but it’s good. So, can I find a problem in an unproblematic world? No, you can’t. Let’s try a different approach. What are the natural laws of this world? This world has no problems. Well, surely, I can’t find them. Ok, thank you, I think it’s time to come back. Can I come back home? Yes, you can.

My surroundings have changed and I’m at home. But something is off, it feels as good as there. Voice are you here? Yes, I am. Hey, I want to come back home. It is your home, isn’t it? Well, not exactly, my home is where the problems are. There is no world with problems. Hey, it isn’t true. Are you kidding? No. Am I stuck here? Yes, you are. Well, that is my problem. Do you hear me? Is my problem that I am stuck here? You are always where you are, you can’t be stuck, because there is no such a thing as empty space, you just can’t diffuse through some objects. But here you are not stuck, because this world is infinite, so there is no bound you can’t cross, because there is no bound. Hey, but you said that I am stuck. Am I stuck? No, you aren’t. Hey, you contradict yourself! I guess he is kind of a sophist. If there is only one rule – this world has no problems, then everything is possible. Am I doomed to be here forever? Yes. I need to find an absolute problem. By the way, why am I here? You are here because you don’t have any infinite sensual desires. For example? You don’t seek infinite power, love, prestige, pleasure, or money. You don’t even seek infinite knowledge. Well, surely,
that is why infinity is infinite, it can’t be reached. I don’t want to burn in hell or lose my mind. Yes, here are no problems, and in hell there are infinite problems. In my world you can’t solve problems by thinking about them, because people don’t understand what to do to get rid of all problems. Here everyone understands me without a problem. My problem is that I can’t find a problem. Aah! My problem is that I don’t have any problem. Aah! I negate myself. My problem is that I can’t find a problem that I can’t find a problem that I can’t find a problem... Aahh.

Problem!... Problem! Ok, I need help. Unproblematic world, paradise,... Promised Land! Yeah. Can you answer one more question? Yes. Why was Moses not allowed to enter the Promised Land? Because he didn’t believe in God for a moment. Well, to believe in God, you must believe in yourself. People here live in harmony because they can’t see this unsolvable problem – themselves. They are not afraid of saying something, because they say what they think, and think what they see, and all see the same. They don’t realize that their soul is naked. Try to refute this argument. My problem is that I am a... problem!

Well, it was hard! So, the absolute problem is that I may have a problem and this problem may be me.

Let’s specify the meaning of the word “absolute”. Absolute is a thing that can exist without me or can end with me, but not before me. Did you notice? We solved paradox “my problem is that I can’t find a problem...” by stating that I may have a problem and this problem may be me. The actual problem is that to live in an unproblematic world I need to live in harmony with the world.

2. How to live in harmony with the world?

How should I change myself to live in harmony with the world without destroying myself? Yes, final solution is to destroy myself, but it is not the best solution. Despite emerging problems life can coexist with the world. How? Well, animals are doing well. However, becoming another living thing is still not the best. I won’t be a human anymore.

How can humans coexist in harmony with the world? What makes a human? Let’s talk about me from a broad perspective (without Great Doubt). What possibly can make me a ME? A new absolute thing we need to find...

Appearance (externality, look)? Well, there are siblings, but they don’t live the same life. Furthermore, it can be too easily changed.

What do other people think of me? Thanks, 1 million people = 1 million opinions.

Memories? If the memories can be stored, it can be copied.

Life (time I was born, hardships I survive) I have lived that is recorded in history of the Universe? Hmm, let’s think. Can we make two identical humans in one place?

Suppose we can. The question is what is one place? There is no center of the universe! But how can it be? Ok-ok, let me not undermine physics so easily. Nothing is ever in the same place twice. The Earth revolves around the Sun, but the Sun revolves around the center of the galaxy. So, you can’t create two humans in exactly the same place at the same time. So, place and time (and other conditions) shape my thoughts and me. People may be “blank slates”, but all these “blank slates” are different. You can’t have two identical humans in one universe (you can do it in parallel universes, but they are parallel, they can’t intersect, so it just negates the whole idea).
Everything makes me, but my mind (my thoughts and where they appear) is the most distinct thing to other people. We believe that instinct control animals, humans are conscious, so they can go crazy and act against their subconsciousness. We don't do the first thing that pops up in our mind. We think, we try to be objective. But the time is running out, we think only to realize that there is no absolutely good solution to a problem. When we proved ourselves wrong once, who can tell that we aren't making mistakes now?

Well, when you are a part of society you go to the authority. But what if authority is an illusion? If you think so, you must find the truth by yourself.

The easiest way to find a solution is to ask people who sought (or even found) a solution before you. After reading their works you can identify loopholes or find the point where they have stopped. Fortunately, philosophers not only tell the answer, but try to prove the answer, so you borrow a lot of useful tools from them.

3. The world of philosophical ideas

First, should I read all the books to start writing my own book (article)?

“A scientist who, in essence, only “turns over” mountains of books - the average philologist up to 200 a day - completely loses the ability to think independently in the end. If he doesn't turn the page, he doesn't think. He responds to a stimulus (to a thought he has read) when he thinks - he only reacts in the end. The scientist devotes all his strength to affirmation and denial, to criticism of what has already been thought out - he himself does not think anymore ... The instinct of self-defense has dulled in him, otherwise he would have defended himself against books. The scientist is decadent. I saw this with my own eyes: gifted, rich and free natures are already “shamefully well-read” by the age of thirty, they are only matches that need to be rubbed so that they give a spark - “thought”. - In the early morning, at the beginning of the day, in all the freshness, at the dawn of my strength, to read a book - I call this vicious!” — Friedrich Nietzsche said [12].

Oh, thank you, Sir! You saved me a lot of time. Actually, I want to criticize you, but I'm too lazy to parse your every word, and there are quite a few of them here.

“To study and not think is a waste. To think and not study is dangerous,” — Confucius. “Who studies but does not think will lose himself, who thinks but does not study will destroy (worsen) himself.”

What's the point of filling a vessel if you're not going to drink from it? What is the point of filling the vessel if it cannot be filled (there is a hole in it)? What is the point of filling the vessel if it is already filled? Seems fair. So, I will think and write my thoughts down when something seems precious to me and read when I run out of inspiration!

Nevertheless, Western philosophy is much closer to me in space and time. Anyway, logic is the same everywhere. I came prepared. These philosophers-thinkers-writers influenced my work. It should be noted I learned too early to learn from the opposite.

- Socrates (starting point), Plato, Diogenes (oh, their “friendship” is something), Aristotle (everyone knows him),
  -The-Dark-Ages-
- Descartes (cogito ergo sum), John Locke (the most enlightened man),
  Baruch Spinoza (influenced Goethe, Hegel, Nietzsche, Einstein),
• Immanuel Kant (my first philosopher, known for me from Einstein’s biography),
• Georg Hegel (showed me “who thinks abstractly”),
• Søren Kierkegaard (Socrates of Copenhagen), Fyodor Dostoyevsky (ethical problems), Taras Shevchenko (a sage for me as Ukrainian),
• Friedrich Nietzsche? (what doesn’t kill you makes you stronger),
• -The-Period-of-Great-Catastrophies-and-Great-Scientific-Discoveries-
• Sigmund Freud (the concept of subconsciousness), -Jean-Paul Sartre?, Ayn Rand?, Simone de Beauvoir (!), Should we restart the Enlightenment?

Writers: folklore, Timothy Zahn (Star Wars), John Tolkien, Alexandr Duma, Henryk Sienkiewicz, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, and selected works. The philosophers’ order shows the development of ideas. The writers’ order shows the order I read them.

4. Kierkegaard’s heritage

Kierkegaard has been called a philosopher, a theologian, the Father of Existentialism, both atheistic and theistic variations, a literary critic, a social theorist, a humorist, a psychologist, and a poet. Two of his influential ideas are “subjectivity”, and the notion popularly referred to as "leap of faith".

I think that Sören Kierkegaard like Socrates is controversial. He criticizes everything and everything becomes nothing from which anything can arise. Yet this “anything” has constraints, doesn’t it?

Sophists argue that they can build everything. Existentialists argue that they can build something, but everything is still absurd. The problem is that both sophists and existentialists argue that the world is absurd. There is no meaning. Can I really stand up and prove that the world isn’t meaningless? Or if the meaning can arise from absurdity, was it a real absurdity? Can I find an absolute absurdity (meaninglessness) that can’t be changed by my weak will? Is the Universe indifferent to my struggle? The last one is easy, the Universe doesn’t have any feelings.

5. I. Presenting a new philosophy.

First, to present philosophy I need to understand what it is. Is it material (a thing like a computer)? Looking at the mountains of books on philosophy it’s hard to disagree.

Is philosophy invented? Is philosophy kind of an instrument? Theoretical answers should be given to theoretical questions since sensory perception in fact cannot serve as an argument against the theory.

So, philosophers ask questions and different philosophies give different answers. Behind the answer should be a reason. Reason should be justified by other reasons, or it should be an axiom. Anyway, that is what I observe. Before moving further, I suggest you read my article “Possible solution to Gödel’s incompleteness theorem and Gödel’s second theorem” [2] where I try to prove that every mathematical system needs an observer. If a system is based on reasons (on logic) then it is a mathematical system.

So, to present a philosophy (philosophical system) I need an observer whose existence only he can know, because whose existence cannot be proved or disproved, but can be doubted. I’m lucky enough because I’m such an observer and I doubt my existence.
Absolute axioms are axioms by definition or axioms that would make sense in meaningful world.

1. Every mathematical system needs an observer.
2. The thinker's thinking is consistent and complete.
3. The Future is unpredictable (undetermined); Mathematics is undecidable.
4. Lack of identity over time – everything is changing; every moment is unique; "if the statement is true, then it must be true right now." Walter Burley
5. Around Absolute Zero nothing can be distinct from Absolute Zero; the world is interconnected and interdependent.
6. The Universe was created from nothing, or the infinite Universe was always.
7. Infinity can be proved only by infinity.

1. I exist (first absolutely unjustified premise created by definition of a mathematical system)

When did I start to exist? I started to exist when someone thought about me (thought about the possibility of my existence). Everything without observer can be false and true, because if something is true it should be justified by someone, but if something is false it can be true in another reality.

2. Existence precedes living.

When did I start to live? I started living when my mother gave birth to me. Birth is the physical separation of the child from the mother's organism through the mother's desire to give life.

3. I came to living through birth.

Who is my last universal common ancestor (LUCA)? This is the first organism that is controlled not only by chemicals but also by biological laws.

4. The material part of me was born from matter.

From whom did I get the nonconscious part of mind? Natural selection states that the organisms that are able to survive and reproduce with the changing environmental conditions are selected by nature while the ones that cannot survive are eliminated.

5. My genes and my environment determine my biological processes.

From whom did I get the subconscious part of mind? The answer is not ready yet.

6. I know nothing about my subconscious part of mind, except that it is governed by unknown divine laws of physics.

From whom did I get the preconscious part of mind? The answer is not ready yet.

7. I know that preconscious can bring me my memories, strange "enlightening" thoughts, or dreams to my conscious through my will or by subconscious whim.

From whom did I get the conscious part of mind? The answer is not ready yet.

8. I can go against my subconsciousness; I have free will.

Am I free? The Future is undecidable, so I should be free. Am I absolutely free? Can I do everything? No, I can do only what I know I can do.

9. I can do only what I know I can do.

When do I obtain consciousness?
10. My subconsciousness grants me consciousness when I have need to communicate with people.

Am I responsible for my actions when my subconsciousness grants me consciousness?

11. My parents (society) are responsible for my actions because they tell me what to do if I obey them (I can't disobey).

When do I become free?

12. I become free (irresponsible) when I doubt authorities (even myself).

What causes this doubt? Wars, injustice, deaths, seeing other people doubt, or when society rejects an individual. Life seems absurd at this moment.

13. I start to doubt when I realize that some of my beliefs (or others' beliefs, convictions) aren't true.

What is the meaning of such a life?

14. The meaning of life is to live.

When do I become responsible? When I understand the meaning of rational life.

15. The meaning of rational life is to live with hope, live with faith in life that life wants to preserve not only life, but the meaning that living in the harmony with the world is absolutely good and that the conscious life should find out through reason, through examined life and faith in the absolute good how to live in the harmony with the world.

Here we can take a little break and contemplate what we have done. How should I name the philosophy? Well, you will accuse me of indiscretion (immodesty) and selfishness, but I believe that it is not my fault that I am Vitalii.

Behold, my dear readers! The old-new philosophy is Rational Vitalism.

Is the world meaningless? No, when you meet people, often their first question is “what is your name”? Every name is a word, and every word has a meaning, and when parents or society call you, give you name, they have already assigned a meaning to you! You are free to change yourself, but others’ opinion won’t change so drastically (quickly).

5. II. A belief system

Before we continue our exploration of what it means to live rationally, there is something that deserves your attention. When an individual loses his faith in society, searches for subjective truth and returns to society again, an interesting process actually occurs. By doubting he inadvertently changes his belief system. He jumps restlessly from a less stable to a more stable degree of belief to match his level of doubt. Let’s have a look. I have a belief system (the first two are Descartes’ argument).

1. It is true that I exist (1st order beliefs)

2. My feelings are true (2nd order beliefs): if I am sad, then I am sad, if I think that I am hungry, then I am hungry (assume that I can identify my feelings, this does not mean that I am really hungry, certain biological processes may be disturbed, how seems is true).

3rd order beliefs: “common sense”, what “everyone knows”: our reality; to live, one must eat, drink and breathe, not jump from skyscrapers, show respect for others.

4th order beliefs: “uncommon sense”, “applied knowledge”, what “not everyone knows”, “knowing how to do something”: the Earth isn't flat (there are people who
believe the opposite), climate change is bad; how to cook pasta, which water is safe to drink, how to properly baptize in Orthodox and Catholic churches. That is, certain groups of people know this: from nations to families (kinds), communities.

5th order beliefs: theoretical knowledge (physics, chemistry, biology, economics, other social sciences), namely physical laws, why some chemical reactions occur at certain temperatures; why we have such genes; surrounded by such animals and plants.

6th order beliefs: pseudoscience, some (actually millions of them) people believe that black cats can influence luck. I don't believe it, but I just can't ignore millions of people (when I've already accepted the reality of the 3rd, 4th, and 5th levels of belief).

7th order beliefs: the belief that I somehow understand another person's way of thinking or thoughts (another person's soul is a dark forest).

Pseudoscience? Am I talking nonsense? Well, according to the 5th absolute axiom everything affects everything. So, does a person's name affect his life?

Albert Einstein – noble (modest), bright, famous. He is considered one of the great physicists, even a genius, but at the same time he modestly claimed that he believed in absolute determinism, which rejects personal merit (makes it meaningless).

Kurt Gödel – Courteous, polite; wolf. Well, he has politely broken mathematics.

Isaac Newton – One who laughs or rejoices. He was not predicting the end of the world would occur in 2060, so much as the end of an era. The world will go on.

Nikolai Romanov- victorious; conqueror of the people. After questioning his divine will people truly became cogs in the Wheel (the Formation of Soviet Man).

Napoleon Bonapart – lion of the new city. He glorified this name.

Can one not live up to his name? Yes, one is free. But in my case, it is very difficult. Vitalii – vital, viable, the one who gives life. Can some names make better tandem?

St. Constantine I the Great and his mother Helena – Constant, steadfast and shining light. The speed of light in a vacuum is a fundamental physical constant, isn’t it? I think you got the point. Nameology, astrology are pseudosciences.

So, I believe more that the world is a figment of my imagination – my own system, which may not exist in reality, but when I write an article then I automatically have to believe in the readers, so in the course of writing the article I gradually add other levels of belief. 1 level of belief excludes all others, a higher level of belief includes all previous ones. Level 3 accepts reality and people that are similar to me, but only level 7 accepts that they think roughly the same as me. More “unjustified premises” need to be accepted.

As you could see, I didn't even manage to prove that I exist (because in fact you can doubt everything), I used intuition, which at this stage of logic is by no means a normal justification of beliefs. When Descartes claims that he thinks, therefore he exists, he was using our logic, but how he can tell that logical reasoning can justify believing in something when you doubt everything, even logic? When Socrates said that he knows that he knows nothing, in fact he, at least, knows that he knows nothing, so this “knowledge” is knowledge, so the logic breaks down here as well.

*It is impossible to know because... Skepticism: Our beliefs are false or unreliable. Relativism: there is no truth to know. *Protagoras: “Man is the measure of all things.”
As I have shown, I have no choice, I must accept “unjustified premises”.
So, if you accept the first 5 levels of beliefs, then you can correct the article under them, but I think it is better to include the levels slowly, because then the knowledge will be more thorough. Personally, I am still learning to use the technique of 7-thinking. Does it sound absurd? In fact, people have been using it for a long time (and not only for bad purposes). Proof from the opposite is possible if only you really believe the opposite fact.

In general, there is one question. Was mathematics created, invented or discovered? If I am alone, then I created it (level 1). If nature (reality) existed before me, then it was created by nature and invented by people – level 3. If we accept evolution, then mathematics was created with the universe, invented (adapted) by living organisms, and people continue to discover its laws (level 5-7).

5.III. Introduction to vital spirals

What things are infinite?
1. Decrease to emptiness, to quantum fluctuations?
2. Human's imagination or humans' stupidity?
3. Combined humans' mind (society)?
4. Our universe?
5. Multiverse?

Einstein stated: "Only two things are infinite: the Universe and human stupidity, but I’m not sure about the first one." I think about human stupidity as an endless denial of facts by inventing nonsense.

Let me tell a complete, but wrong, story about the Universe.

From an absolute zero happened an infinite Universe of quantum fluctuations, some fluctuations cause the Big Bangs. In the universe humans live who can't prove finiteness of their universe by reaching the end in the universe, because they can't go faster than light. Our universe is expanding, because other universes are shrinking, but it's all happening in the Multiverse that is absolutely infinite that actually is a sea of quantum fluctuations that are actually nothing. Is there a law that can prove that constants can only be like ours?

“Vital spiral” means path that is created by you making a full circle and realizing that the starting point has changed.

Let's look at another example of changing the meaning.

Plato divided the soul into three parts: the logistikon (reason), the thymoeides (spirit, which houses anger, as well as other emotions), and the epithymetikon (appetite or desire, which houses the desire for physical pleasures) [9].

Freud contested that our conscious behavior is only the visible 10% of our psyche – the tip of the iceberg if you like. The mind is like an iceberg, it floats with one-seventh of its bulk above water. The deeper drivers of our behaviors – the other 90% – lie submerged in our subconscious or unconscious mind[9].

Transactional Analysis identifies three Ego States, called Parent, Adult, and Child. This is not about actual parents, adults, and children, but about different experiences [6].

So, what is it? Reason – consciousness – adult; spirit – subconsciousness – parent; appetite – unconsciousness – child. So, why Rational (Reasonable) Vitalism is only two words? Well, there is a secret. Rational Vitalism has two attributes reason
and life. Reason is an analytical tool and life is a synthetical tool. Rational part gives you reason and life, Synthetic (Vital) part gives you Rational Vitalism – heart (core) or soul. I hope you got the point.

Is one nucleus and an equivalent set of protons with neutrons the same thing?
The mass defect is the difference between the rest mass of the atomic nucleus of a given isotope, expressed in atomic mass units, and the sum of the rest masses of a component nucleons (mass number).

5.IV. Learning spiral. Big history approach in educational subjects by rising complexity.

My philosophy is very simple, isn’t it? Well, that’s because you need a lot of time to study everything, not only philosophy.

Philosophy (first philosophical questions – a person learns to ask questions).

Logic (a person learns to find answers).

Mathematics (a person learns to display answers).

Physics (laws, fields, phenomena of inanimate nature without special transformations of matter, a person learns to check the answers).

Chemistry (transformation of matter, a person learns to apply the answers).

Biology (the emergence of life is difficult; a person learns to live with the answers).

Neuroscience (the problem of the mind and the body (mind-body problem), the transition from an instinctive life to a meaningful life. In general, I think that many people divide the sciences, so this science can be like a boundary between "natural" and "social" sciences. For me, it's a formality). A person learns about the origin of the answers.

Psychology (science of behavior, a person learns about the shape of the answers)

Sociology, Economics (a person learns how to find reasonable answers without thinking). (A group of people, a nation, a much higher level of complexity)

History (a person learns how the answers have changed over time).

Aesthetics, politics (I wrote these two disciplines together, but in fact the second cannot exist without the first, a person learns what answers are considered "beautiful").

Philosophy (extremely complex issues of human civilization, a person questions what has gone wrong if he doesn’t feel fulfilled).

The meaning of life is to live. The meaning of rational life is not only to live (preserve life), but to preserve your mind and yourself (heart, soul). You are free to pay attention to everything that catches your interest (imaginary heroes or another “unconventional” data analysis). Actually, everything is a part of human culture (civilization) and every study is meaningful if it’s meaningful for you.

5.V. Expansion of cartesian argument, value system.

My argument emphasizes that I am a thinker. You can choose another most important thing, but to think about it you need to be a thinker. Another way to know who you are is by asking authority (parents, or representative of the religion or government,).

1. I exist

2. I have true 2nd order beliefs (contents of my mind?)
I am a thinking thing (being) 
4. If there are any things outside of my mind, they can only have primary properties (have to do with extension, number, location, direction, and velocity of movement, etc.)
   What should I do?
   5. As a thinking being I should think
   Is it precious to think? Thinking is an ability that I'm fully aware of. Other abilities can be just illusions.
   6. Thinking is precious.
   What is the purpose of thinking?
   7. Thinking provides knowledge of various kinds
   Is it good to think? Well, thinking provides knowledge. Knowledge isn't good or bad, but it can make me suffer or feel good, but it depends on my attitude.
   How should I treat other thinking beings if there are any? I can hear their different perspectives, their stories, their common sense, their axioms, their premises. It can help to enhance my thinking, so I will have a broader perspective to find better solutions to preserve life, mind, and soul.
   8. I should appreciate other people (similar thinking beings) and all living things (potential interlocutors). It points out that all forms of discrimination are groundless (for me intelligence (conscientiousness, thinking) is not measurable, logic is everywhere the same, it's just hard to explain one's thoughts).
   9. Things that can explicitly lead to deaths should be avoided.
   If I have a great purpose of enhancing my thinking what means should I use? I can't be 100% sure that this kind of means will help me achieve my goal, so I shouldn't use bad means if there is a chance of success by using good means.
   10. Purpose doesn't justify means.
   Why am I writing this? Firstly, my memory is weak, it's better to have my thoughts written, it's much easier to revise. Secondly, I want someone to read it to criticize it.
   11. It's comfortable to have thoughts in written form to constantly revise
   Should I worry that my readers won't understand exactly what I mean? No, thoughts are difficult to express, and even more so to convey. “I am not upset if people do not understand me - I am upset if I do not understand people,” - Confucius.
   12. The loss and twisting of information is huge and inevitable in communication.
   13. Every thinking being has own original understanding of what is going on.
   Should I challenge 3rd order beliefs (“common sense”)? Should I really eat, sleep and do other things and not do things that can “obviously” harm me?
   History has a lot of examples of people who have fled from our reality. Why is another reality any better? As I remember I'm eating, sleeping, and doing other things my whole life and I have started it before my newly developed critical (doubtful and logical) thinking so I guess it's logical to assume that is important. Evolution gave me this clue that it is safer to continue this process of eating etc.
   14. I shouldn't challenge 3rd order beliefs without a significant purpose.
   How can I have and not have these 3rd order beliefs ("common sense")?
15. I should demarcate 1st, 2nd order beliefs (true beliefs) and 3rd, 4th, 5th order beliefs (doubtful beliefs) by double thinking.

What are 4th order beliefs? They are “uncommon sense”, “not so common sense”, know-how knowledge. It has to do with applied natural sciences: the Earth has a spherical shape, bad habits (smoking, drinking a lot of alcohol) are bad for health, how to make a computer, a car; how to make something or what will happen if we do this or that.

16. I should accept 4th order beliefs only after thinking and checking with my intuition, authority, logic, and evidence (or what seems to be this kind of thing).

What are 5th order beliefs? They are theoretical knowledge, how we humans imagine the world works. They are useful to systematize 4th order beliefs, see patterns and speed up learning to expand, as Marcelo Gleiser said, “our island of knowledge” to improve lives and gain better know-how knowledge.

17. I should use 5th order beliefs (theoretical knowledge) to create some understanding of know-how knowledge, to simplify the process of gaining new know-how knowledge by making some classifications and patterns.

Is my thinking good? It seems good to me. Thoughts don’t mean actions. What should happen if I find the truth, but I don’t like it? I doubt everything, but...

18. As long as I can’t prove something wrong, I should accept it!

“If you hate, then you have been defeated.” Confucius. What about love? Who should I love? Let’s ask Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard proposed that there is a ladder of love, from the most undemanding to the true. On the first rung of the ladder, we love those who love us; then we love those who do not love us, then we love those who persecute us and finally, and triumphantly, we should love everyone without exception. Yes, but I think you can’t love someone you don’t know anything about. And most importantly, you should love exactly the good that is in a person. It would be hypocrisy to say that I love a bad person, I love a good person that is in a person. Life is good, so every person is potentially good. But infinitely good is only God, so it will be a hypocrisy that I love someone more than God, but it would be true if I say that I love God when I love neighbor.

19. God is infinitely good. I love God when I love goodness in neighbor.

I know that I don’t know anything. I see that there is knowledge that is hidden. I understand what ideal I should strive for. I need to live in harmony with the world. The person who can for infinite amount of time exist and live in harmony with the world is the infinitely good person God.

20. “What I really need is to be clear about what I am to do, not what I must know... It is a question of understanding my destiny, of seeing what the Deity really wants me to do; the thing is to find a truth which is a truth for me, to find the idea for which I am willing to live and die," - Søren Kierkegaard.

21. My Lord is God.

22. I have no need in other gods.

23. I can’t materialize the infinity of God.

24. I must remember one day and give one day to God trying to hear him.

25. I must honor my father and my mother.

26. I shall not kill.

27. I shall not commit adultery.
28. I shall not steal.
29. I shall not bear false witness against thy neighbor.
30. I shall not covet (desire) thy neighbor's house, or neighbor's wife or his slaves, or his animals, or anything of thy neighbor.

Why shouldn't I worry about not having something? “I will not be concerned at other men's not knowing me; I will be concerned at my own want of ability.” — Confucius. So, I should be concerned about me, not my desires. How can I be so sure that I need something material especially when I don't have it?

What is absolutely bad? How bad comes into the world? Unfortunately, life (good) creates bad (death) when it's afraid to face the truth. The ugliness of a person is not a shadow, it is a hump (shell) where a person puts all his fears and experiences. Life is a problem, but how you solve it is up to you. Without life the world's meaning can be in creating life. The meaning of matter is to create life. How can wars solve the problem?

31. Wars (military conflicts) can't solve any human (vital) problem. They just kill (change) the people who don't understand it. Phrases from Internet:
32. Three things should not be lost: peace, hope, honor.
33. A person can destroy oneself by chemistry, pride, anger (indifference).
34. Creating your personal brand is a way of clarifying your values, your aspirations, your character, your expertise, and how you add value [10].
35. Your brand is a promise you present to others based on an honest assessment of your values, character, knowledge, and expertise [10].
36. The principle of the situation. Never let a situation mean more to you than a relationship.
37. The principle of accessibility. Ease in relationship with ourselves helps others to feel free with us.
38. The principle of the trench. When preparing for battle, dig a trench for yourself so that a friend can fit in it. When you want to change society, you should understand for whom you want to change it.
39. The principle of celebration. The true test of a relationship lies not only in how faithful we are to friends when they fail, but also in how much we rejoice when they succeed.
40. “Sow a thought - you reap an act, Sow an act - you reap a habit, Sow a habit - you reap a character, Sow a character - you reap a destiny.” (Charles Reed, writer)
41. There is meaning in unfortunate victims: do not become them.
42. If your philosophy and principles do not benefit you, throw it away.
43. “Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results.” (Albert Einstein)
44. Wisdom lies in flexibility, not stubbornness. Bend like a willow, don't resist like an oak or you'll be broken, but your beliefs must be deep enough, or you'll be uprooted, so don't try to take root where you can't.
45. The way of a successful person who has not yet achieved success is to correct mistakes and draw conclusions from them, pretending that there were no mistakes at all.
46. “Be busy. This is the cheapest medicine on earth - and one of the most effective”. Dale Carnegie. Learn to have a good rest in order to work well if you really need to work.
47. “Pick a job you love, and you won't have to work a day in your life.” (Confucius) At least, try to find such a job.
48. Tell me what it means to be someone, and I will answer whether I am like that.
49. Boring books can be left unfinished. They won't judge you or take offense.
50. Learn to say “no”. This will save you a lot of time and nerves. Remember that every time you say “yes” to something, you are saying “no” to something else.
51. Don't waste your life on second-rate things.
52. Don't be afraid to pause in conversation when you don't know how to respond. Be silent for a few seconds to give the interlocutor the opportunity to understand what he said. It is possible that he himself will try to correct his phrase. Learn etiquette to better deal with such situations. Sometimes just repeat the truth.
53. “Try not to promise anything, and if you promised, do it.” Confucius
54. If no one asks, do not go into other people's business. Do not impose and do not interfere if it is not part of your duties.
55. If the world is logical, then it is fair.
56. Focus on what you should do and can control.
57. People can forget what you said and did, but they won't forget how they felt.
58. You probably won't miss the important news.
59. Follow trends, not news.
60. Visualization stimulates the brain to work toward a goal. Let your subconsciousness work by giving it time. Always try to find reliable workers to do work, improve habits to do things effortlessly, don't do everything by yourself.
61. Strive for balance in everything, even in the pursuit of balance.
62. Remember the three rules of physicist David Deutsch. First, problems are inevitable. Second: problems are solvable. Third rule: every decision creates new problems that need to be solved. This is how our life works.

Thank you, David Deutsch, and all these phrases. No matter how much “advice” I will write here it is “useless” because they don't change the world like anything else.
63. The choice is all yours and only yours.

6. Solving problems and accepting paradoxes
Here I will mainly deal with logical paradoxes, irony, and ethical dilemmas.
I once again want to emphasize that this article was written exclusively for me and for people who are simply curious. I highly recommend you read information sources at the end of the article.
1. Irony: "The road to hell is paved with good intentions". Alternative form: "Hell is full of good meanings, but heaven is full of good deeds."
Acceptance: only society can give an objective assessment of human actions (this assessment can and does change over time).
2. Irony: if you explain to a person with words that he understands, he will get angry or stop listening (like why explain, what I understand; words can be too sharp), if you explain to a person with words that he does not understand, then he will not understand. A person can understand if he is willing to understand.

**The trolley problem**
The trolley problem is a series of thought experiments in ethics and psychology, involving stylized ethical dilemmas of whether to sacrifice one person to
save a larger number. Let's simplify. You are given to make a choice between A or B, if given time runs out, you automatically choose C (C can be A) that seems wrong. What choice will you make? A, because it's first, or B, because it's right (opposite to the left).

On the 1 level of belief there is no such a thing as moral choice. On the 3 level of belief there is a reality. If reality (no one or your own subconsciousness) coerces you to choose you need to choose according to your intuition if you don't have sufficient information. Sufficient information is information that can tell you what to do based on “justified” (by you or society) premises (if P then S). When a hardly rational (normal) person (maniac) coerces you to choose, it seems meaningless to make a rational choice. In both situations I would prefer to try and challenge the situation to save all people or save the most precious (important, loved) one if there is a big danger of losing everyone. Rational Vitalism allows self-sacrifice if it helps to save the life of civilization using Kant’s categorical imperative. In ethical philosophy, Rational Vitalism undermines Utilitarianism (a family of normative ethical theories that prescribe actions that maximize happiness and well-being for all affected individuals) if happiness can make society rationally weak.

**Can rational vitalist lie?**

By claiming (saying) something you make a promise that you believe that this is true. There is no point in telling the truth when no one's asking for it (I think there is no point in running around and shouting laws of physics, though it's ok with me). You can refuse to answer the question. Lying to a responsible person means disrespect because a responsible person wants to hear true answers.

What to do if someone coerces you to tell the truth? Well, we'll consider it later, but remember no one can make you do something, it's against your free will. If you can't refuse to answer (for example, your life is in danger) you can say whatever you want. No one should do something out of coercion! Categorically!

**Catch-22**

Let there be a barber in some village who shaves everyone villagers who do not shave themselves, and only them. Does the barber shave himself?

The 1st solution to this paradox is that this barber cannot live in a village where the barber shaves all the villagers who do not shave themselves. If the barber still lives in this village, then he must shave and not shave himself at the same time, that is, shave himself so slowly that the hair grows back. Of course, while performing these two actions at the same time, he cannot "do" anything else. Unfortunately, he will soon die or be condemned for doing the job too slowly, because the hair of people who don't shave will grow very much. The same fate awaits any barber, if he doesn't have time to escape (it's good that hair grows long and he will have time to figure it out), as he is assigned to the village.

Actually, the system remains uncontroversial and complete, it simply states that all barbers with growing beards living in this village should be imprisoned immediately, because they are breaking the law. I did not come up with such laws! "The law is a tyrant over people, it has arranged many things by force contrary to nature."

The 2nd solution to the paradox is that a barber is not a barber when he shaves himself (he does not pay for a service to himself). If he does not want to shave like a
man, then he must shave himself like a barber. If he refuses both as a barber and as a person, then he breaks the law and is subject to imprisonment.

The problem of the paradox is that if a person does not do something, then another person does it for him, for whom this occupation is a profession. Of course, all laws about forcing someone to do something are wrong from this point of view. It turns out that laws should prohibit doing something. In general, this paradox with the barber shows all the cruelty of intolerance. This is terrible!

7. New philosophy's limitations, applicability, and dangers.

Rational Vitalism is built on axioms. I (you, all people) have Free Will, but it can't be proved. We can prove only that we don't have Free Will. The Heisenberg uncertainty principle is a fundamental principle of quantum mechanics, which states that it is fundamentally impossible to simultaneously measure with arbitrary accuracy a pair of quantities describing a quantum object, such as, for example, coordinates and momentum. Are we forbidden to know the future, or is it true that no one can know the future?

1. This philosophical system can be developed; it can bring new advantages.
2. In logic, finding the paradoxes of this philosophical system is very important.
3. In science, a prediction is a rigorous statement, forecasting what would be observed under specific conditions. If we have Free Will and the Future is truly unpredictable then science should predict that it can't predict everything.
4. In society, this philosophy can face crisis of modernity by saving the individual to save society.
5. In environmental ethics, Rational Vitalism emphasizes that Climate Change is not about a rejection of civilization, but change our attitude to the Nature. We must understand that nothing happens without consequences. With the power to shift the balance comes great responsibility "We must restore this balance. It's not just an obligation; it's a path to survival [3]."
6. In culture, society should cultivate the image of a knight of faith like I. Newton who fights against the darkness of ignorance and misunderstanding, not only a knight of sword. Knight of faith shouldn't be afraid of String Theory, Neuroscience, Sociology, or the possibility to prove the absolute determinism, but fight valiantly to broaden their horizons despite knowing that the shores of our ignorance will only be growing.

The danger of Rational Vitalism is that pushing science further can create not only weapons that can destroy our civilization, but weapons that can destroy our universe, so Irrational Morism (the path of death and destruction) will always be a threat. Life has no protection against life. I will see you off here. May the winds bless your travels!

8. My sincere thanks for the knowledge provided / sources of inspiration
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