

Exploring the concept of Non-classical logic

Abstract: – The purpose of this paper is to explore the following issues in depth: is Non-Classical Logic, by any means, useful to Mathematics at all? Do we see any use in any Non-Classical Logic system in the scope of Mathematics? Can one confound Mathematics with, for instance, Fuzzy Logic applications? - If NCL is not useful in Mathematics, is it useful, for instance, in Theology at all? Where lies the possible use of NCL? Is Christianity inconsistent with NCL beliefs?

Key-words: Non-classical logic, Mathematics, use, God, Christianity, Jesus, religion

1 Introduction

In reading the book ‘Fermat’s last theorem’, by Simon Singh ([8]), one may wonder, as we did: what is happening in the World of Mathematics that we do not know? what are ‘nouveau’ mathematicians doing with Non-classical Logic? do the perversion of the classical rules so well posed by Russel and Friege lead to anywhere nicer than the own classical rules of reasoning? - If so, how? With that major thought in our mind We came to Australia to learn what Non-classical logic was in 2000. And, in fact, there are quite a few mathematicians around the World working with such a thing. But for our astonishment, little is of use inside of the own Mathematics.

In this paper, we try to explain what the major issues are when trying to apply Non-classical Logic to Mathematics so that philosophers and others involved might try to put them down. However, from our end, it seems very well grounded that there is absolutely no use for Non-classical Logic in what is called Mathematics. Non-classical logic seems to be, at most, useful for computer applications and/or reasoning, or ways to express it, but not for the perfect World of Mathematics.

In a sense, Non-classical Logic looks more like games of imagination of the sort ‘and...if’. However, it is very interesting to notice the need humans have of expressing as much as possible in reduced symbolic language and, for that purpose, Non-classical Logic seems to be quite useful.

With the reduction of the amount of words, the inferences and all the logical system involved in human activities seem clear to everyone else and it is actually very interesting to start devising things like legal cases being well grounded and proved with NCL (shall use this notation, following G.P. [1]).

Human reasoning is, by far, non-classical, in the sense that contradictions, for instance, (Paraconsistency) do not usually make us crash, we usually do something when receiving contradictory information. If we do something, our logical systems do not crash. Therefore, we do not reason in a classical way in which we would simply do everything at once. In this sense, one could say, as Dr Priest utters ([9]), that Paraconsistency is ontological and, at least, belongs to the Ontology of human beings. It may belong to animated beings, but it is nonsensical to think that it belongs to non-animated human beings. In this sense, it is not really ontological in terms of human beings either, it is simply the way we reason about things, it is simply the case that one of the characteristics of the logical system Paraconsistency is indeed part of some human beings who may deal with contradictory inputs. Therefore, it does not actually belong to the Ontology of human beings in general and it cannot be said to belong to the Ontology of human beings at all as conclusion, even because, the whole paraconsistent system does not belong to even a normal human being, who can say it belongs to the species?

Once we are mathematicians and, so far, classical, we will stick to utter simply, choosing the most accurate utterance we can, once that is what Maths is about, that Paraconsistency is not ontological, but part of its logical system features are definitely present in some human beings. The same, however, applies to diverse non-classical systems and, even, the classical one. Retards and other mentally diseased human beings might easily have their reasoning equated to machines, some even doubt the use of keeping a few of them alive and suffer from really exotic experiences when dealing with them having what is called a ‘standard human reasoning’. Lots of movies bring that subject up, that is obviously the artistic evidence of the shock a normal person would receive in having only classical thinkers in the World. If everything was ‘yes’ or ‘no’, ‘black’ or ‘white’, and every assertion could actually be precisely classified as ‘right’ or ‘wrong’, we would be exactly the same as OLD machines, once even the machines have evolved from classical reasoning (see, for instance, the paraconsistent robot [2]). With this new information added, we can certainly state that Paraconsistency belongs to the ontology of that specific robot, that species.

We would like to think that we hold the truth, but it is obviously the case that we might not have seen it all even though we seem to have had contact with the latest in the field and only Intuitionism was somehow applied to Mathematics but, again, it did not convince us as an application, simply as a different way of expressing thoughts, more symbolic. We basically do the same thing we used to do before with symbols instead of words.

With all this, we would say that NCL seems to be part of Computer Systems and Arts in general, but not of Mathematics. It is a Science in the same sense that Computer Science was called Science and once one abstracts from the language word, it does look like a different

World which could, indeed, fall easily into the scope of Science, different from language and from Psychiatry or Psychology. In fact, however, if Psychiatrists and Psychologists loose the fear of Symbols, it might become a joint Science and they could possibly classify mental diseases much more easily this way, so that Psychiatry and Psychology might really become scientific once the way it is nowadays looks as empirical as it was in Freud's time.

Truth is that if everything is put to work together: NCL, Psychiatry, Psychology, Computer Science, the results might be quite amazing and one could even be able to predict when a certain patient might fall into a crisis and express certain behavior just based on what he/she have been living so that it might be so useful, but so useful, that might also become a criminal tool in the sense that mentally diseased persons might be able to solve a criminal case just by being, themselves, observed in their reactions (what is meant here is that any mentally impaired person may use a computer and the behavior of a psychopath, for instance, could be all described by a computer system if such study ever shows results. Notice here that we are, indeed, stepping over fields we really do not control much about, just suggestions).

Weird enough, the universe that unveils is fantastic and infinite in its possibilities. Every Human Science Faculty might find it useful to actually add a few subjects in NCL and CL so that Philosophers will also be absorbed in work scopes they never devised before and they could not become more useful to humanity than this way.

Imagine, for instance, Paulo Freire's thoughts being told in NCL terms? Or Piaget? It is well known that certain expressions, when used in education, for instance, such as 'you are wrong', might lead to bad traumas, whilst others, such as 'there is a chance you are right if...', might lead to successful students, what is called these days, neurolinguistics. Imagine all that changed into logical lingo so that the consequences of each expression may be measured in figures and we may rate effects on students of group of sentences... Wow, there we go, one more sub-Science. It is really amazing!

To the main issue, however, We will stick to: we are deeply sorry, Mathematics is classical and get out of here, pals from NCL!

Problem with Mathematics is that it is only perfect if it is like that, and Pythagoras ([1]), as us, like it because of its perfection. If we say one plus one might not be two, and joke about it (see [3]), people like us enjoy the joke, read, but we are only happy to understand that in a context - it is always a precise figure and there is no doubt about it - sorry. Who would really want anything different from classical when dealing with Mathematics, really? The thing is the World is totally imprecise and the fight should go the other way around, how to make communication more effective, how to make things more precise (in those regards, please check on [11]. There is a good explanation there for why we should let what is precise being precise in terms of communication).

That is when we say it is useful for humanities where a fair bit of imprecision lies, and NCL may make it more precise, what helps it to be closer to the Mathematics World - but, Jesus, who wants to mess up with what is already perfect? We just don't do it, we respect it, the

same way we should respect God.

God is perfection and because of its human version, it is unattainable. God is all that fills the gaps and is all that makes us move. It is simply everything that is perfect. Mathematics is part of God, it is perfect. Therefore, not human. But what humans really enjoy is touching it, controlling it, sensing it, with all respect in this World. And blessed are the ones who can do it: clairvoyants, necromancers, saints, mathematicians, etc.

For millennia now, people have been trying to prove God does not exist. Have they succeeded, ever? Try to prove Mathematics does not exist. It is there, everyone is able to learn it if they are not impaired. Everyone who actually learns it has no way of not enjoying it. It is useful, it brings pleasure, it makes people relax or entertain themselves with it if they were ever able to learn it properly. Yet, it is all abstract, all in paper and we tell you it does exist because we know it and believe it. Later on, you get to be convinced of why some of the things in the World of Mathematics are indeed logically obtained or provable and you still believe the rest for believing, not really even minding about proving it all on your own, but totally convinced it works and that is enough.

Now, whilst proving God does not exist seems to be impossible given that it does not matter how time goes by, there is always a miracle happening, isn't it much easier to just assume it does exist and respect it? Nobody tries to change God because God is perfect. They may give it other names, they may split it into several deities, but it is still God. Even those who defy it, still refer to it as God. We may feel the impulse of denying it given that God's words teachers have successfully being lying to humanity and as soon as a curious reader gets the Bible they defy their teachers' words. That would certainly provide humanity with a feeling of dissatisfaction and will to defy God. But that is as bad as a bad Maths teacher and even visiting the book and finding your teacher to be wrong, or fixing their proofs intuitively, still does not make you stop believing the World of Maths. What that simply means is, we have studied the whole Bible in detail, line by line, considered that only the coherent bits are God's words once it was all reassembled by the time of inquisition by the crimes of the Catholic church, and we did not find a single logical mistake, just like in Mathematics, the Logic involved here being the mother of Maths, the philosophical Logic. Therefore, the same way you believe in Maths, God is believable. Do not change God's nature or you will also have to defy Mathematics to be coherent. Try to make a convincing argumentation and you will certainly win an award. But would it not be just wasting your time? Why not let go of what is perfect in logical terms and works? That is what Mathematics is about. Perfection. If something works, is useful, pleases humanity, makes humanity feel better, why can't people (damn) respect it??

So, please, we would say to NCLogicians, go and apply it somewhere where things are not yet perfect and imperfections are noticed by everyone else. Who in the World thinks we cannot be labeled schizo tomorrow and put up in confinement but still be totally sure we are sane? Yet, who can take us out besides the guy who put us in or his/her fellows? Do we want human beings to be the owners of our own life, is that perfection? No. So, there are infinitely many

fields where perfection is needed and NCL might be the actual response on how to make those fields perfect. Please, NCLogicians, be useful. This is basically the message of this paper. It might look rude, but it is Science, why not being objective? We develop this introduction with the main message, then depart to talk a bit about classical and non-classical systems plus the difference between themselves, how NCL could be really interesting to humanities, and we then finally defend Mathematics and God.

We must say here that it is also very interesting to notice the association between NCLogicians and atheism. Perhaps, if they understand they might be useful to make other sub-Sciences/Sciences perfect in the sense of fulfillment of the adjective attributed to themselves in all that is involved in the concept, they will actually convert and accept God. Perhaps the miracle of applying their logic will make them see the own God, as controversial as it may seem. But if God is indeed perfection, as we state, the love for perfection will make them see the own God. We must tell the reader that if someone does not believe in God it is just because they have not seen enough miracles/perfection around. Let them see Mathematics the way Pythagoras saw it, the way we see it, have contact with all the wonders of History, read the Bible page by page and follow it to check on its truth/falsity, observe the miracle of smiles where one would think that that was logically impossible, the miracle of love where none was received from any human being, that is, the opposite of the computer thinking: can only give if fed, the miracle of generosity in those who never got any from anyone else, and we assure the reader: we will believe and respect an atheist who tells us they did all that and are still atheists, but we have never met a single one who could sincerely say it.

2 Classical and Non-classical systems

In the classical system, devised by Friege and Russel (see [5]), every assertion must be either TRUE (value= 1) or FALSE (value= 0), that is, there is no doubt, ever, as to whether something is false or true, what perfectly matches Mathematics where no doubts may be allowed. In the classical system, some inference rules also have very well defined rules such as implication. The so called sentence of the sort 'If...then...', the implication, will only be considered False if the antecedent (part preceding the 'then') is TRUE and the consequent (part coming after the 'then', including then) is FALSE. It is interesting to notice and write about EX FALSO QUODLIBET (this principle is very well mentioned in [3]), very mentioned in literature, principle observed when one has got FALSE antecedent, case in which the implication is always TRUE no matter the value of the consequent, that is, FALSITY implies everything allowed in that system is attainable. It is also the case that contradictions are the same as uttering nothing in the classical system, making every implication trivial, that is, meaningless. Here the difference between explosion in the sense that everything is allowed and how useful that would be in a computer thinking in the classical way. Information content= 0 in terms of computer

input. That means crashing, doing nothing. In this sense, contradictions and false antecedents would hold the same computer entry information content, ⁰ It is all very human logical, so that everyone accepts that rule: If one states ‘If the pope is a woman then the moon is the sun’ that makes sense for the listener because the information they are understanding is that the pope is obviously never a woman therefore anything could be implied. Or the other way around. The message received bears no equivocation ever from the part of the listener. Everyone infers from that that the information provided is nil, no use, once it departs from an obvious absurdity.

In the non-classical systems, what happens is a true perversion of the classical rules mentioned before. This way, assertions may have other graduations of veracity rather than only TRUE or FALSE, and, with that, all other rules are perverted as well, including the rules for inferences. [5] is definitely a good summary on Non-classical logic systems and may help the reader to understand how they work better.

However, we must remind the reader of the fact that Logic is about convincing people with argumentation (obeying the rules of Philosophy), not about computer-friendly lingo, so that [5] is not enough to understand Non-classical Logic ever, it is just part of its set of elements once there are obviously non-classical systems, and we shall include some reduced already suggested Psychiatry diseases logic systems on that, that already exist in the World, but are not described in philosophical friendly way or have been but in papers that are not usually read by logicians.

3 The actual modern use of NCL

There is some trial of using NCL in Mathematics, unfortunately. It is named Intuitionism. However, as we understand it, it is just new symbology for what was said with words before, and those symbols just make Mathematics more non-accessible rather than improve the way we deal with it. Therefore, it is not good for humanity once we also like the principle of ‘making it simple if it can be simple’, that is, nobody wants to make something in Maths look like a monster when it is really a gorgeous prince. Another point is that we also defend the principle that Mathematics should actually be useful for some sort of already existing problem, even if it is an approximation, that is, we do believe in the principles exposed by Pythagoras in his School of Logic, perfect is what is more present in real life, what is more used in real life. Therefore, there is no way we would support lingo that leads to divagations in that lingo creating higher order problems in non-popular accessible ways, so that someone may pretend to be useful for something when what they are doing is built over an already totally abstract part of a major

¹Notice here the clear distinction amongst all these Worlds: in the Language World, there is always content once it is formed of even sounds with no meaning at all registered in the dictionary, still understood by others, things like ‘uff’ or ‘argh’. Still meaningful, still Language, but not part of a dictionary, that is, not part of Philosophy of Language; in the computer World, there is usually no content once most of the Language World is not useful for computer inferences or databases records; in the logical World, it all coincides with what is useful to Philosophy in general, still a reduced scope of natural Language.

Science, Philosophy, which is already distant from the real World, which is definitely not as perfect as Mathematics is.

And, apart from that, in terms of actual real life applications, there are some things we are aware of such as the paraconsistent robot or Fuzzy Logic real life application (as told to be).

However, Fuzzy Logic is a logical system and Fuzzy Logic equipments just made use of some sort of superficial idea of it, just as if some sort of person who did not belong to Logic had watched Zadeh's ([4]) talk and, with their poor and superficial understanding, had thought of their own profession and found some use for something they thought to be really boring and complex. With that, Fuzzy Logic mechanisms are not really an actual application for Fuzzy Logic, are an application of part of the reasoning behind Fuzzy Logic only. Fuzzy Logic, itself, was never applied in full, so that, as mathematicians, we state 'Fuzzy Logic was never applied in real life' or, alternatively, 'Fuzzy Logic has never found a single useful application in real life', only a Language idea generated by part of its logical reasoning was applied to real life.

The paraconsistent robot, as well, is a robot which would not crash when receiving conflicting information from the environment such as he is programmed with 'if it is black emit sound, if it is not black, walk' (this black is obviously what the programmer inputs as black in the robot system, it does not mean that it will coincide with your black) but faces something which is not white or non-black, it is just something else, 'the gap', 'the area in between'(for details, check on [3], [10], [11]). The classical robot would then crash or do everything he could possibly do at once. The paraconsistent robot, on the other hand, is told what to do in that sort of situation and clearly performs a single action of his possibilities. Again, this is only the implicational aspect of Paraconsistency, but it is not Paraconsistency. Therefore, there is absolutely no application of Paraconsistency Logic in real life either there.

We have actually not seen any application whatsoever, therefore, of non-classical logic, the systems were simply never applied!

We believe the major mistake that has been done over the years is that they thought of it as belonging to machines but classical logic belongs to this World whilst non-classical logic transcends it, it is actually human, so far.

So let's face it as such and give up on trying to use it for things that oppose its nature!

4 Perfection of Mathematics, closure, perfection of God, closure

It seems to us that God has got a logical system fully contained in the Bible. It might be the case that the Inquisition tribunal during Medieval Times made a lot of unwanted changes to the Book of all religions (almost) but the essence of the message is still there and nobody denies it. All that is necessary to learn the true logical principles of God is reading the Bible by ourselves and study it deeply just like any other book, practicing the practices there suggested

that many practiced such as fasting by the time they read that passage and are inspired to do it ([12]), that is, truly opening our hearts and minds to whatever communication is possible. With all that, the person is able to finally work out what the basic principles are and will find out, at the end, that they are a bit more than the commandments, but not that much more. The Bible is a quite exotic book in the sense that it is huge, all those ways are important to be learned and, yet, by the end of it, the person is logically left with little but, spiritually, fully filled. The own book is a true miracle. It is almost as if the stories there contained are necessary for a person to truly understand God and how He works on people and society. We make a few strong assertions in this paper and believe we are entitled to as long as we think we have argumentations to convince the reader of those assertions:

- The Bible brings God's logical system and the Bible is a collection of books put together by Inquisition times;

Argumentation: A Logical System is basically a system with Axioms which generate, with no confusion or mistake, all the premises or assertions in the own system. It might contain symbols if it is a computer friendly logic, or not. A Logical System is well presented and built if there is not true premise or assertion which is true and may not be built or derived from its Axioms. That means it is complete if it contains all possible generating axioms of itself. It is sound if no false premises may be inferred from those Axioms. We also need that no set of Axioms in the Logic are contradictory ([13]). Basically, the whole Bible may be almost summarized into the commandments² and everything from there derives, if Language is well understood. One can certainly not infer a false sentence from those Axioms. For instance, if one wishes to support that God prohibits abortion, it is possible to prove in the axioms that this is not the case. One, God said 'Do not kill'. Some would then imply directly from it that Abortion was forbidden by God. However, not only the own Catholic church has got crisis relating that item to a point of discussing

²several other inclusions must be made. We talk about that when we speak about completeness in terms of Axioms that generate the system (smallest number of Axioms that generate the system). God gave the commandments as a starting point for us, the most basic rules. However, with time, God became more explicit due to the situations that men faced and got confused. God is a kind God and does award every person who truly respects and loves Him with all their hearts throughout the Bible. He would never oblige a mother who does not want to be pregnant to hold a baby. Perhaps, in seeing that happening on Earth and the crisis of the poor mother who was a believer, God decides to further explain. Perhaps He just decides to do it in advance. Kids being sent along rivers because the mother did not want to have an abortion but was not prepared to be stoned or facing the others...God is fair and just and He would not bear more dignity than an assassin if He was not going to explain further His Language words, which cannot ever capture every possible real life situation with a first and unique trial the same way we cannot do it. If god spoke in Languages, as they say in the Bible, or via dreams, how could He possibly communicate it all regarding all real life situations in only ten major lines? He first gives the most basic ones considering what had happened that far and the doubts presented by men, He then lets His designated people to speak for Him, in His name, and explain it further so that the law is well applied but allowances are made not to let His people unhappy once that was never His intention

where life really begins, but there is another axiom in the commandments³ which exempts the mother from any guilt, which is ‘do not do to others what you do not want done to yourself’ ([19]). That basically means that if she thinks the baby is going to be unhappy and she does not think unhappiness is a good thing, she is allowed, not forbidden by the Bible, by Jesus, Son of God, God Himself for some, to do it. Not only the Bible has got a logical system in Philosophy of Language, but because it is Language, one has to really watch out for every inclusion of part of the meaning involved in one assertion in more than one axiom, so that proofs and deductions deserve a specific definition for Philosophy of Language, something more explicit than what it has got nowadays. If anyone, ever, wants to teach the Bible to others, what is, again, contrary to what God intends, once He Himself says a explicit No to that end, they are obliged to at least include more lines and commandments when ever referring to the commandments as the smallest unit of Axioms which generate all logical assertions contained in the Bible. Therefore, it is necessary to add something about abortion, for instance, as a remark attached to ‘Not kill’ once that has become a major issue for women, since times of Old Testament, amongst others. Apparently, it is very clear, to every person from every religion, that ‘You shall not judge’ is a major directive from the Bible. That, no one refutes. We then are obliged to say people are sexist and want to put all the weight of humanity mistakes over women’s shoulders if they think that this inclusion is allowed but not the other one. Worse than that, this is the opposite of what God intends once He tends to put all the weight on men, not women. He actually collects a woman who is about to be stoned for having sex with a married man and basically tells everyone else that they are either stoned together, and once He sees them all as sinners, even the ‘stoners’, or she is as free as they are. On the other hand, He also makes it clear, all the time, that men and women are only allowed to sin once in their lives and immediately repent to get God’s attention and forgiveness. That is a very important point to keep it also fair and equal to human kind. God is the own equity in terms of the World. If someone wants to say something about God, therefore, keep in mind He could, at most, be labeled feminist, as a true feminist should be, women are equal in every possible sense, not sexist.

We were not able to find any truth in Jesus’ acts or texts of the Bible which were not fully described/inferred from the commandments⁴ and, therefore, we have no reasons to

³one should really consider the inclusions in order to be able to state that the commandments generate God’s logical system. Were it ever the case that they should not be seen together with the rest of the Bible, the Bible would not be full of special cases and allowances. For instance, there is a passage when God tells a person to marry the wife of his brother once his brother is not a good husband anymore. One could easily think that is incoherent with not desiring the brother’s wife. However, if God thinks someone does not belong to His people or is not there anymore doing what they should for their partners, the wife, if a God’s person, is still entitled to be happy, that is, God wants His people to be happy no matter what. And those who are not His people do not deserve His blessings or even the knowledge of His ways.

⁴revised version

believe it is not complete. We were also not able to infer something false from the Bible once anything false such as ‘priests cannot marry’ may be easily put down by considering the missing principle that Language demands subtleties that are not present in Mathematics only, such the ones we mentioned before. Basically, no commandment states such a thing and the Bible actually does not even mention priests at all. When it does mention something similar, it actually also reinforces the Axiom that everyone should obey blindly the only Lord so that what would be a priest would have to be pointed out by the own God who would personally touch or speak to that person and tell them to become such. With this, we believe to have convinced the reader that the Bible does contain God’s logical system and it is a complete, consistent, sound, system, per se.

- God is not His logical system but His logical system is God;

Argumentation: God cannot be His logical system because God is all is one of the Axioms of the system. There is nothing above God. Therefore, if God is all, it can certainly not be reduced to a set of sentences or rules of inference. On the other hand, His logical system has to be God once if it is not, then it would not be the God’s logical system, that is, part of God, the same way we are not what we assert with veracity to others, but what we assert with veracity to others is definitely part of us, of our reasoning, of our features, of our personal ‘ontology’([14]), in the sense that ontology is the study of the beings in general and we here take the license to reduce it to ourselves. One must pay attention to the fact that several leaders were sent by the Lord to Earth after Jesus and did utter or prove that they were. They also revised the understanding of the Bible people had. For instance, Chico Xavier, the medium from Brazil, was definitely blessed by God to speak with the deceased. Now, once God forbids this to happen in terms of humans trying it, it is obvious that He also showed us there was some allowance in what comes to Chico. Chico never predicted the future, only told the past about the deceased so that people could believe his communications with their deceased people. He did have some encouragement words, but did not predict future, and that confirms the statements in the Bible that no deceased could ever be consulted in what regards decisions for the future. Consciousness of one’s actions is necessary for God to regard that human being as His people. Nobody can blame the deceased or anyone else for their decisions as long as they are not confined, slaved, oppressed, etc. Freedom is a necessary element of humanity for God. Otherwise, He shall really not listen. The point here is, truly, make the reader notice that the Bible is stuck in time as much as we are. It should be growing and being updated as God sends more messengers. The rejection of the actual Word from His chosen ones will definitely lead us to total destruction and damnation. And as He predicted His Son was going to be murdered, He also predicted the World is going to end⁵. What one must understand is we always had a choice to stop the process. It

⁵Even though there is some room for doubts here.

obviously depends on how much we truly listen to what is correct and comes from God, what matters is how our hearts are, nothing else. In other terms, the axiomatic system (minimum set) that generates God's system is far better explained and detailed nowadays and must also deserve urgent revision to include what is necessary. However, God also stated He would not care about the lazy people so that updating the commandments is perhaps not a good idea. Suffices knowing that whoever wants the truth has to look for it. In virtual terms, however, we must state that the axiomatic system is a bit bigger than the commandments. Still generates it all so far.

- Since God transcends His logical system, humanity has to transcend the logical system in order to actually access God directly;

Argumentation: Jesus is the obvious key to access God. Jesus did transcend humanity once He is portrayed with no sexual desire at all, lives with only one sort of costume or several of precisely the same looks, similar to Franciscans, eats little and basically the same (bread, wine, fish, simplest foods ever), walks in sandals (also the simplest and most comfortable shoes for hikers until nowadays unless one goes to the bush which was clearly not Jesus' case), shares all with his mates, disciples, all the time, only being in private to speak to God (who should be totally respected in His desire to only speak to His son, so disgusted He got with humanity at a point of sending a human figure He desired to exist but could not find amongst the sinners who were living on Earth back then), sleeps in caves or simple covers. Jesus is definitely a superman in the sense that it is a miracle that someone is living like that and still has got patience, love, care - to share with others, heal others, make miracles to feed others, etc. Jesus does not say in vain: I am the way. He is the new element of distance created by a disgusted God who thought we would never deserve His personal attention anymore if we failed with Jesus. And...we did fail. He dies in an outrageous way, being given even vinegar to make things worse. Not only men fulfilled his most pessimistic view of humanity, but, for the last shot of cruelty, they provide His only allowance to humanity with vinegar - the bitterest element which was liquid that they could find - instead of the desired water for someone already suffering the horrors of the cross. God never came back, but sent other infinite number of people, including Chico Xavier, Mother Teresa of Calcutta, Gandhi...all with lives/logical systems coherent with His own logical system and transcendence requirement. Notice that, with God, the only way for us to access Him is fasting, dressing rags, begging. His attention, in opposition to the Old Testament, when He happily invites people to talk with Him, is now only via the worst way as possible. God is sick of human kind and each time it does get worse. Jesus is the factor transcending the logical system - it is an actual material evidence - it is really for those who cannot read. Whilst the hope of God was once with those who could, it is definitely over now (like God really thinks it is a waste of time writing scientific papers if the only ones who read them always get it wrong and

teach it all wrong to humanity or use it to do evil instead of good). With Jesus, God was stating: Hey, it is me, do you like it? - That is pictorial teaching to see if it finally works. With the introduced extreme sacrifice, it is actually proven by God that those to preach must be like Jesus, nothing less, if they ever want to be candidates. So that it is really easy to state that there are no priests acting for God, but against Him in every possible sense. Healing others is necessary, so is sharing all the time, clarity of procedures, to be in the open day and night, lonely to pray/speak to God, and only in that instance, live to serve, gather followers, etc. One can easily see how it is a condition to claim being a representative of God on Earth that the person can actually heal others. Amongst others. This was not our point here. We believe to have proved the transcendence point, however.

- Mathematics is its own logical system and some reasonable way of checking God's logic system completeness must be created if people really feel the need for it;

Argumentation: We believe there is a huge confusion in terms of Language signifieds ([15]). Basically, a logical system is part of a reduced scope of Logic (it does get a bit confusing here once all Philosophy is logical. There should be no acceptance in Philosophy of non logical Philosophy trends. However, there is room for 'in study' Philosophy, which is still classified under it but it is not actually Philosophy, so that there is part of the Philosophy which is obviously not Logic) which is, again, a reduced scope of Philosophy, which is, again, a reduced scope of Language, which is, again, a reduced scope of Communication. Mathematics is not a Science, Philosophy is the Science which generated Mathematics and contains it, as well as so many other sub-sciences. Some people might try to state that calculus, for instance, is not philosophical. But as long as it demands a clearly stated logic, it is still Philosophy. This way, Philosophy should not ever be anything we want to possibly state. Philosophy should be what can actually be proven by philosophical argumentation, which, basically, includes mathematical argumentation once Language includes Mathematics. However, due to the reduced scope, already explained, of Mathematics lingo, it is necessary to expand that Universe to Logic lingo, which is philosophical but not mathematical. Logical systems may or may not be classical. The classical system is that used in Mathematics. The axioms define the logical system of Mathematics and generate all its assertions, so that it is only complete when everything that generates is mentioned. A logical system is generated by the Complete set of its most reduced needed axioms sets to generate it in full but the logical system is all that forms that sub-Science. Similar to God's logical system, the logical system in Mathematics is generated by outsiders of the system, humans or deities. Always non-machines, however, as explained by us profusely before ([10]). Always the need of a human element, at least. Deities are more than humans so that they may generate all that exists, including all human systems, as it is actually stated in the Bible in Genesis, for instance. With that, a deity transcends the own God's logical system, and this deity is the God of Abraham,

Isaac, Jacob. The same way Russel, Frege, etc, transcend the Mathematics logical system and God transcends their own system, logical or not. A logical system is consistent if no contradictions are proved by the axiomatic system, that is, inferring both veracity and falsehood of something is not possible, and that no false premises may be inferred from the axiomatic system. It is complete if all that is true may be inferred from the axiomatic system ([16]).

Nice observation is that, for a logical system just created or in constant need of updating, if there is any new assertion that is true and cannot yet be proven in the provided basic axiomatic system, just adding that assertion to its axiomatic system would solve the problem, with reasonable testing in terms of reduction. Sounds reasonable. Once one can always do it, why is it incomplete? On the other hand, how can one prove that God's system is complete? It is not possible at all unless we are, ourselves, God. Because we never access how God thinks in full. And He created His own system. This way, it all makes sense, definitely works, all generator axioms are there, they are not conflicting in principle, needing some care when it comes to God once it is Philosophy of Language, outside of the scope of Mathematics. If you ever want to prove it complete or not, however, you will need to see more than what we see. Soundness should really be enough if the system is too big or too complex. An interesting feature about God's logical system is that with the possible inclusion of part of the signified in more than one Language word, some things are not forbidden and may be allowed. For instance, where does it say that one should not make use of contraceptives? Nobody can use Genesis, where there were only two people in the World and procreation was necessary. Language is about context and reference, not about isolated signs. Another interesting point is that in the Portuguese translation of the Bible, things that are forbidden have increased in a very interesting way when compared to the English Bible. For instance, in the English Bible it says 'Do not murder' ([17]), but in the Portuguese Bible it says 'Do not kill' ([18])⁶ Interesting as well is the fact that there is absolutely no passage in the Bible which ever shows God stopping anyone else from doing so. Things go the other way around, someone is dying badly and they ask God to be in this World for longer, then Jesus goes there and puts them very alive once more. The whole point is that if one pays attention to what is going on with God's logic then everything is very well understood. More interestingly, the Spiritualist book does not go against the Bible at all and it possibly supplements it. The book 'House of Spirits', a basic Spiritualist book, talks about life after death in quite a useful way that matches people's personal experiences with those already deceased. The

⁶Interesting the conflict. When visiting the Brazilian Portuguese Wikipedia ten commandments, it actually reads that in Hebrew the word would mean murder and kill, so that the Portuguese translation would be more accurate. But the English Bible contains only Murder so that a suicidal would be excused. Once God states that only those who know The Word shall be punished, the English people killing themselves would not get punished, but the Brazilian would!

Bible states we should never invoke the deceased, however, once they should rest and to us it is not allowed to know the future from those. God does not like it and shall punish the infractors hugely (Old Testament). Basically, as said before, there is the need of a creation of a better understanding, more encompassing than the one for mathematical logic for Philosophy of Language. If anyone wants to use the same sort of tools, it is obviously that a proper extension is urgently demanded. Nobody would dare using the same tools for convexity and s -convexity (Mathematics), for instance, before extending them (we also did this work). It is a larger scope of World, it is necessary to reduce it to logical lingo somehow. Still, possibly, passive of reduction. Notice that, in our example about abortion, ‘do not murder’ and ‘don’t do to others what you would not do to yourself’, had to be used jointly to justify why abortion is not forbidden. Why? Because the simple word abortion encompasses several implications and nuances in its signified. Basically, almost every English words couple will bear intersection at some level so that defining a precise way of going is just like trying to solve the Sorites paradox with Mathematics only tools...waste of time. It is obvious that a more reduced field cannot be used to fully prove something in a higher-order. The opposite is true, however. Basic mistake, still being done for years and getting publications in Science (?).

- Mathematics has got its transcendental element.
Argumentation:The transcendental element in Mathematics is the generator, the people who made it, just like God transcends His own axiomatic system and all its derivations. The human factor, being a normal human, with all functions normal, is always going to transcend anything that even resembles machines ([10]).
- Several books bring Mathematics’ logical system with consistency.
Argumentation: Apparently, nobody doubts this assertion so that argumentation is not necessary.
- Several books bring God’s logical system with inconsistencies easily found.
Argumentation:Unless we hold direct access to the original Bible texts, we will always suffer from remainders of that joke: the cordless telephone game. We mentioned above, for instance, the most basic difference of all because of which a confused Brazilian could get damnation. There is still no problem in what regards God’s laws once His laws should be obeyed as they are read in His books. However, Brazilians are unfairly getting less life choices (in what regards our mentioned example, ‘do not kill’) than Americans, Australians, and the whole English speaking World, so that it is one more down for the Brazilian side who should always be favored once it is already an almost third World Country, if the legal principles are ever obeyed.

We are then concerned about proving Mathematics could only be God’s creation and part of God due to its perfection. However, there is an actual good chance that Mathematics is

somehow able to be fully computerized, but God does not hold any chance of being such. Mathematics is a well known object of human adoration (see for instance [1]). However, despite the perfection of Mathematics, one must always remember that there are things far more perfect and a good example is God. That is not to fall in the scope of adoring things that are not the Lord: God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob.

Interesting enough, however, the way things stand, the World of Mathematics is far clearer and much easier to be accessed than the World of God. Not because of the Bible, but because of the infinite number of non authorized intermediaries to talk about it in whom an infinite number of people lazily trust. With Mathematics, however, one does need a degree at least, an acceptance as an employee or service provider, etc.

This way, even though the World of God, as a whole, brings far much more goodness to the World, the right message should be grasped by those willing to be part of it and that is not happening. Whilst Mathematics, a computer friendly discipline is passing the right message in precise terms. This, unfortunately, is a further evidence on how sick society has become. Each and every day, machine language is more valued because it is far more reliable. But not because of its signifieds; it is, indeed, because of the intermediaries.

We would like to make here the same sort of distinction made in [10], between Language and Mathematics. Even though we sometimes use logical problems stating they belong to Mathematics, one could easily notice that even though Mathematics is Logic, Logic is not Mathematics. Just like God transcends its logical system, Logic is far more than Mathematics. A good example is non-classical logic. If we stick to numbers and mathematical objects, classical logic is perfect and works, that is, there is no need to create anything else to work with that. Therefore, here, when we refer to logical system of Mathematics we actually refer to classical logic and all mathematical operations and entities.

The consistency of an axiom system is determined by [6]:

- There is no well-formed formula A such that both A and not- A are provable; or
- There is at least one well-formed formula A that is not provable; or
- $(0 = 0')$ is not provable.

God is not provable by His logical system, His logical system is just an evidence He exists. God could be seen as our well-formed formula A that is not provable, therefore, whilst everything else that is part of God seems to be. Notice that if well-formed refers to well-formed in Philosophy of Language, a simple 'God exists' would do.

With Mathematics, it could be infinity. In fact, here one gets a hint on how similar both systems are and that they could only be intimately related.

With that, God's axiom system is consistent. If it is consistent, it does not mean that it is perfect as an axiomatic system. However, if no evil is ever derived from God's system, if all that it brings to the World is harmony, ethics, equity, why would it not be perfect?

On the other hand, is it not the same case with Mathematics? Also perfect then. Nobody tries to replace God. Some people split it into several, some people deny His existence, some people define Him differently. But it is still God and even those who not believe Him utter comfortably ‘ We don’t believe in God’. But the own assertion actually is a statement that they know He exists and they generate an immediate contradiction because if something exists and one states it exists, one actually believes it. If they really want to claim atheism, they should actually state ‘ We don’t believe anything or We don’t believe there is a boss of everything, etc’, that is, they would actually have to deny one of the several functions attributed to God. In fact, they are going to become confused as they have to prove that one of His attributes does not really belong to Him. Because common people make utterances, but logicians should prove whatever they state. Problem is that other people are trying to defend God’s existence whilst those who deny Him should be worried about proving His non-existence somehow once it is a belief the majority of people hold and, therefore, intuitively correct, if nothing else. Good Maths is that that will always present proofs so is good Logic. If God’s axiom system is perfect, show us another system that is as perfect as His and explains what His does better or with the same power. And if that does not exist and that system is totally out, explain things otherwise explained by His system.

Problem with that is trying, for instance, to deny people constantly have experiences with the deceased, even people who were atheists before. The Bible explains it. Find another system that is not complementary/supplementary to the Bible or derives from it, such as Spiritualism, which can explain that and is consistent. The Bible does mention consultation with the deceased as existing, as well as life after death to some. It is all there, just look for it. And this is just another detail.

And if someone can come up with a consistent system which overcomes the social use of Christianity, that is, may be better for the World, let’s listen to themselves. But, so far, nobody did. And it is millennia and millennia, nothing changes.

The same way Mathematics goes. So that there is no point in trying to change it once it is perfect. No point in trying to modify it by using non-classical logic. The most one can try is getting a system as perfect and as useful to replace it and if it is only as...as, one would wonder why replacing, it would actually have to be better in some sort of sense, not equal. Once Mathematics has been doing its job pretty well to all it is destined for and there are infinitely many fields where non-classical logic would be immediately of use, one would suggest: please try to be the most useful you can and apply it immediately to where it is screaming ‘we need it’. After one finishes that work, perhaps one goes for frivolity. We doubt anyone would think that is not reasonable. Frivolity is replacing or messing up with something that works and is perfect. Let Mathematics alone. Experiment with other areas.

That is, perhaps, the main goal of this paper: suggesting a generator of a group of infinitely many members which represent the possible application for non-classical logic.

The same way one goes about Mathematics, one should go about Christianity/Bible: If some-

thing makes society better (Christian schools education, even universities, for instance, are of better quality than other atheist ones; Christianity miracles of making aborigine stop killing humans and fixing: criminals, alcoholics, drug addicted people, etc., making males be better (the Bible actually seems to be very clear in this sense, that the males should be the more religious ones) for society as fathers, as companions, as professionals, etc.), why would one drop it? Has atheism performed any miracles? What can atheism do that is better for society? One can, of course, claim that any sort of religion is harmful to society, in which we hold no opposition. Anything that makes people stop thinking by themselves can only be harmful. However, if Christianity is faced as a logical system, as a Philosophy which convinces for being perfect, there is nothing wrong with it, absolutely. Therefore, if non-classicists hold this sort of concern, it is not God's axiom system that needs to be modified or replaced, it is the way people are spreading it around or applying it. In such case, it is still not to the non-classicists the task of changing that if sticking to their professions only, unless they want to call themselves something else such as politicians, priests, etc.

The point here is stating that NCL should not even try messing up with the perfect World of Mathematics and Christianity with which humanity is really happy about. Should try to do something else and this something else should be useful.

Apart from that, there is also the side point of making NCLogicians re-think their usual positions as atheists once things are not only compatible, as we believe to have proven God is also Logic as well as logical, but it is best for humanity that NCLogicians hold the human factor as well and do feel responsible for society evolvments/changes in a holistic way.

5 If there is no room for NCL in religion or Mathematics, what is it good for?

Many, many, areas miss a lot of Logic because they are called Science, are respected as Science, but hold nothing like one would expect from a Science as defined in good philosophical terms. For instance, if Mathematics states we can judge any mathematical assertion as being true or false, it states so because there are principles universally accepted in Mathematics that would convince anyone of that.

But Psychiatry states they can judge people on their sanity. Can anyone convince anyone else they actually can (Notice note on that in [20])?

Mathematics can judge assertions inside of its own universe because mathematics has spelled out very specific and clear rules, very convincing.

The thing about Psychiatry is that it can only be called a Science if they can spell out what minus x and what plus y are necessary for a person to be classified as belonging to the group affected with disease W in very precise and convincing terms, universally convincing. This way we can also judge the own Psychiatrist and determine if he/she is, first of all, free of mental

diseases, as a basic condition to judge others. In second place, it is part of Medicine, but is it really so? All people want in Medicine is getting closer and closer to the absolute specification and mechanized diagnosis of diseases. Here we must remember how many sad faces we have seen in our lives with diagnosis as simple as 'it is some sort of virus'. Jesus, nobody wants to pay their fees to get that answer. Not only there are infinitely many viruses around but money is not that easy to be given away to someone who states what anyone else who knew nothing apart from high school Biology would.

If even Medicine is not able to fully diagnose physical diseases, and still commits mistakes as bad as sending a patient home so that they die 48 hours later of internal hemorrhage, but the human body is already fully mapped and controlled, imagine something like brains...Basically, it is missing that people from every sort of Science (?) do study not only an Ethics code, actually part of Philosophy, but Philosophy/Logic as well. Here, another suggestion of scope of work for Logicians in general. Philosophy should actually be taught to everyone at school at all levels in different depths. That is simply because it produces people with Logic and, with Logic, no psychiatrist would choose labeling someone as a schizo if there is ANY possible room for doubts. With an open mind, a psychiatrist will choose not to do it when in doubt, as any reasonable classical computer would.

We think that humanity can only be truly blind to let psychiatrists call themselves professionals. Who can be a professional if they are studying something that is still not producing ANY results? - has anyone been healed of any mental diseases so far? Are doctors professionals? Some specializations, where things are really developed, hold people who might really call themselves professionals. But this general practitioner who is able to charge for a consultation, even prescribes medicines and claims it is just a virus or the psychiatrist who labels someone a schizo still in doubt if they are being bullied or not, sincerely...The point is: we are translators, for instance, one of our side jobs. Someone hires us. They tell us they hold an assignment and they wish to know how much we charge. Are we going to charge and not give the final result they expect and instead of translating parts of the document, for instance, just stating that it is a word in the other language belonging to the educational group (as analogy to the virus part)? Or, alternatively, what about being given an assignment in a Language not of our expertise, not understanding it in full and asserting to the client 'it is in Hebrew' (as analogy to schizo label)? Are we totally insane or what?

What do mathematicians do? You present them a problem and they return it FULLY SOLVED. We suppose that is what we expect ANY professional to do: You go to a lawyer and you want them to do everything they can to put a winning case before the court and, if possible, bet on their work in a 'no win no fee' basis...that is being professional. In fact, lawyers, as well, could easily become more professional if hiring a Logician to work with themselves as to guarantee the case is that much percent won already/lost. Mathematical and logical proofs are precise and close the issues. If a good logician proves an item of a case, there is no way to loose.

It is easy to observe how some mental diseases produce really common behavior in several

patients. Therefore, there must be some sort of logical system of thinking, or at least behaving, produced by reactions of some sort, that fully characterizes that disease. Everybody, in fact, holds a logical system of thinking and acting. But it is obviously nonsensical and useless to even try to write such a thing in terms of a normal human being once human beings are not machines and will never be. Human beings that are normal simply transcend, they hold the ability of being Jesus (not God whilst on Earth, just Jesus), that is, transcending. Machines will never have intuition, perception, not even close to human beings. Turing machine contests ([7]) are there to prove if anyone doubts that, what would be crazy.

However, criminal behavior, mental disease - even because crime is a social disease - and other things, such as animal behavior, can easily be suitable to modeling by non-classical systems.

Not only that would enlarge infinitely the scope of work for non-classicists (oppressed by the continuous extirpation of Human Sciences), but would turn the discipline into something finally meaningful. Instead of going around the World giving talks and creating useless logical systems just for the sake of giving their names to a logical system, non-classicists could actually do something infinitely useful to humanity and, hey, that is what mathematicians are about: being useful.

Mentally diseased people judge what they sense in the environment somehow, some interact. Something triggers their ill behavior, and it is not easy to fully map each disease, but there must be a way of starting with the simplest one, something like the Down Syndrome.

Another area is Judging. Law is very cold and rational, usually consistent. However, trials are well known for not being fair and one of the major problems of human history is innocent people being wrongly blamed for crimes.

Imagine how great it would be having a non-classicist being hired by a court just to map logically that sort of action specific of the trial on an individual being accused and logically convince others that the person could not be guilty or has to be guilty with a full stop.

Imagine how much unfairness could end in this World if non-classicists were used to determine cases of harassment, for instance, where there is usually only the victim and the wrong doer. It is not rare that the victim even ends up being charged with defamation. We could then state: non-classicists, play God the right way! Here, you can actually make justice.

One can easily see that there is absolutely no point in willing to fully map a specific person's actions or thoughts because we are never going to be machines unless someone kills part of us somehow, that is, our true image (Seicho) is somehow artificially modified or blurred. Therefore, any trial of fully mapping a normal individual's thinking system is a trial which is going to demand an infinite amount of time and is never going to succeed once the true image cannot possibly be mapped that way. But specific aspects of our personality such as if we are logically accepting of harassing someone given our logical premises, may be fully mapped. The same way Psychologists use those well known tests to learn whether a driver is careful or not, non-classicists may devise their own tests, which might even take into consideration the life history of the individual to measure things. Imagine what a dream that would be? A logical way of

going about something people only had weak proofs or intuition to deal with.

Reality is that the same way we don't want to pay and get an answer such as 'it is a virus', we don't want to have the trouble of getting dressed to attend a court where there are no convincing proofs and the selected audience is going to vote guilty or not. For God's sake, how many Jesus are we still going to have? Is it not true people prefer Barrabas intuitively in their vast majority?

Another easy way to use non-classicists to improve human systems is to measure the beliefs of the selected voting audience regarding the matter of the trial before they sit for the court via their logical mapping in order to make a better choice of voters. That because it is actually reality that lots of people could accept murdering someone in some situations but they are never going to declare it. Would people from the general audience prefer that person there or someone who fully defends no murder at all? Is it fair?

One could say Psychologists or Psychiatrists could do that, but if we don't see them as scientists yet and we do see non-classicists as such, why polluting law with something that is not as consistent as Law is, why making blasphemy to it? (The same sense God's perfection cannot be outrageously offended by someone paying less respect to it than it deserves, so can't the laws. Laws are, in principle, also perfect. Someone else could easily develop reasoning on that. It is however in the history of Law that it was also born in Philosophy. The commandments are probably the most ancient source of laws known by Christians so that God was the first philosopher that ever existed according to Christians.)

6 Conclusion

We are Mathematicians and, therefore, believe in the basic principles of Mathematics:

- there is no elegant proof, there is the shortest and the clearest;
- there is usually more than one way of proving something so that no trial of proof should not be examined;
- a proof is something logically perfect and logically perfect means never infracting any mathematical law and obeying all of themselves when required.

The same way, we believe that non-classical logic is a sub-Science of Philosophy as much as Classical Logic, that could be as respectable as Mathematics and, by the way, they do follow the principles mentioned above, just replacing mathematical with logical. However, it is missing being useful. Mathematics is useful for almost everything in this World. If non-classicists make their sub-Science useful, it will acquire relevance. With relevance, we might all respect it as much as we respect Mathematics.

We believe to have proved that, so far, non classical logic systems are not useful to human kind at all, or perhaps they have been so useful as a painting hanging on the wall, in the sense that it might trigger inspirational thoughts in others but there is nothing to the painting besides adornment of spaces.

The World of Mathematics and the World of God are complete and perfect as they stand right now. That is a final reason to motivate NCLogicians not to mess up with any of those logical systems.

We have proved that being a NCLogician and a Christian are not incompatible things at all: they are actually complementary and good for humanity if they come together. In this sense, the same way that countries governments choose to be Catholic and state it is best for their population sometimes, we suggest that NCLogicians choose to be Christians once it is better for their students/disciples, fellows, and the World/society in general. All scientists should aim perfection and, therefore, look for perfect belief systems also in the spiritual arena. We believe to have proved that the Christian system is perfect, it is just mistakenly passed onwards so that if mistakes are corrected by the student of that logical system, its perfection is finally believed/supported.

References

- [1] (1992) *Topicos de historia da matematica - Numeros e numerais, Trigonometria.* (Atual editora, Sao Paulo)
- [2] ABE, JAIR M. (2000) *IWeWorld Congress on Paraconsistency* (UNICAMP, Sao Paulo)
- [3] READ, S. (1995) *Thinking about Logic: an introduction to the Philosophy of logic.* (Oxford University Press, Oxford.)
- [4] ZADEH, L. A. and Bellmand, R.E. (1976) *Local and fuzzy logics.* (ERL Memorandum M-584)
- [5] PRIEST, G. (2000) *Introduction to non-classical logic: moving about in worlds not realized.* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)
- [6] EDWARDS, P.(1967) *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, v.3, p.353.* (Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., NY & the free press, Collier Macmillan Publishers, London)
- [7] CASTI, J. (1998) (translated by M.R.Pinheiro), *CINCO REGRAS DE OURO.* (Escritorio de Direitos Autorais, Rio de Janeiro).
- [8] SINGH, S. (1997) *Fermat's last theorem.* (Fourth Estate)
- [9] PRIEST, G. (2000) *Personal communications.* (UQ)
- [10] PINHEIRO, M.R. (2006) *A solution to the Sorites Paradox.* (Semiotica, 3/4)
- [11] PINHEIRO, M.R. (2006) *The inferential step in the Sorites paradox - logical or human?* (preprint, www.geocities.com/mrpprofessional)
- [12] PINHEIRO, M.R. (2003) *Voce ja fez algo de bom por alguem hoje?* (Editoras EST)
- [13] WIKIPEDIA EDITORS. (Acc. 2006) *Logic.* ([http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logical_system – Philosophical_logic](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logical_system_-_Philosophical_logic))
- [14] WIKIPEDIA EDITORS. (Acc. 2006) *Logic.* ([http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ontology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ontology))
- [15] CHANDLER, D. (Acc. 2006) *Semiotics for beginners.* ([http : //www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/S4B/sem02.html](http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/S4B/sem02.html))
- [16] WIKIPEDIA EDITORS. (Acc. 2006) *Completeness.* ([http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Completeness](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Completeness))

- [17] WIKIPEDIA EDITORS. (Acc. 2006) *Ten commandments.* ([http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commandments - Text_of_the_Ten_Commandments](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commandments_-_Text_of_the_Ten_Commandments))
- [18] WIKIPEDIA EDITORS. (Acc. 2006) *Dez mandamentos.* ([http : //pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dez_mandamentos - Os_Dez_Mandamentos](http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dez_mandamentos_-_Os_Dez_Mandamentos))
- [19] WIKIPEDIA EDITORS. (Acc. 2006) *Ethic of reciprocity.* ([http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethic_of_reciprocity](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethic_of_reciprocity))
- [20] WIKIPEDIA EDITORS. (Acc. 2006) *Psychiatry.* ([http : //en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychiatry](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychiatry))