

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 1/108**

**UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND
UNIVERSAL METHODOLOGIES OF
(COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE)
SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION
AND BEST DECISION-MAKING**

Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. Lev Gelimson

**Academic Institute for Creating Universal Sciences, Munich, Germany
Publishing House of the All-World Academy of Sciences “Collegium”, Munich, 2017**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 2/108**

**UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE)
SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL APPROXIMATIONS TO
PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING**

Gelimson Lev Grigorevic,

literary and artistic pseudonym Leo Himmelsohn,

Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. in Engineering

in the section “Physical and Mathematical Sciences”

by the Highest Attestation Commission Classifier,

Director, Academic Institute for Creating Universal Sciences,

Munich, Germany,

Russian, Ukrainian, English and German poet,

Director, Producer, Literary and Artistic Manager,

Multilingual Literary and Musical Theater, Munich, Germany

E-mail: Leohi@mail.ru Web: http://kekmir.ru/members/person_6149.html

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 3/108**

Abstract. The universal methodologies of (collective) (multiple) successive textual approximations to perfection and best decision-making organize estimating and improving any subjects/objects with their possible qualitatively agreed collective best choices from the sets of subjects/objects. Examples: life activity, ((self-)limiting) (self-)estimation, creative work, multilingualism, (self-)education, (self-)development, technology, methodology, research, competition summarizing, (life) decision-making.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 4/108**

**Keywords: unicommultiscientific unimethodology of
collective multiple successive textual approximations to
perfection and best decision-making, unitextologic of
unilifecreativing, self-limiting self-estimation of life
activity, unipsychophilological uniphilosophy with
unilogic, essential exactness in uniphilology, moving
unitextology, creative unicommultilingualism.**

UDC 00:1:50:60:8

**Publishing House of the All-World Academy of Sciences
“Collegium”, Munich, 2017**

**References to some subsequent works by the author on
the subject may be added**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 5/108**

**ВСЕОБЩАЯ ТЕКСТОЛОГИКА И ВСЕОБЩИЕ
МЕТОДОЛОГИИ (КОЛЛЕКТИВНЫХ) (МНОЖЕСТВЕННЫХ)
ПОСЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬНЫХ ТЕКСТОВЫХ ПРИБЛИЖЕНИЙ К
СОВЕРШЕНСТВУ И ПРИНЯТИЮ НАИЛУЧШИХ РЕШЕНИЙ**

Гелимсон Лев Григорьевич,

литературно-художественный псевдоним Лео Гимельзон,

**доктор технических наук в разделе «Физико-математические
науки» по Классификатору Высшей Аттестационной Комиссии,**

директор, Академический институт

создания всеобщих наук, Мюнхен, Германия,

русский, украинский, английский и немецкий поэт,

директор, продюсер и литературно-художественный руководитель,

Многоязычный литературно-музыкальный театр, Мюнхен,

Германия, E-mail: Leohi@mail.ru

Web: http://kekmir.ru/members/person_6149.html

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 6/108**

**Аннотация. Всеобщие методологии (коллективных)
(множественных) последовательных текстовых
приближений к совершенству и принятию
наилучших решений упорядочивают оценку и
улучшение любых предметов с возможным
(качественно согласованным коллективным)
выбором из множества. Примеры:
жизнедеятельность, ((само)предельная)
(само)оценка, творческое произведение,
многоязычие, (само)образование, (само)воспитание,
технология, методология, исследование, подведение
итогов конкурса, принятие (жизненных) решений.**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 7/108**

**Ключевые слова: униединомногонаучная
униметодология коллективных множественных
последовательных текстовых приближений к
совершенству и принятию наилучших решений,
унитекстология унижизнесотворения, самопредельная
самооценка жизнедеятельности,
унипсихофилологичность унифилософии с унилогикой,
сущностная точность в унифилологии, движущая
унитекстология, творческое униединомногоязычие.**

УДК 00:1:50:60:8

**Мюнхен: Издательство Всемирной Академии наук «Коллегиум», 2017
Добавляются ссылки на некоторые последующие труды
автора по теме**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 8/108**

INTRODUCTION. THE APPARENT INADEQUACY OF CLASSICAL THINKING AND CLASSICAL SCIENCE

Everything as the Universe with the denotata of language and speech is alive, at least slowly and for a long time [4], as the mineral kingdom and man-made objects of the technosphere [12, p. 682]. “Everything flows” in life according to Heraclitus and to universal life creativing [4], and in the Heraclitean sense of the Logos [12, p. 134–135, 323–324] as “the through semantic ordering of being and consciousness”

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 9/108**

and in the infinite continuous universal logic of universal life creativing [2, 4] in life, the psyche [12, p. 547–548] and activities. The most important and most ordered special case of change is development [12, p. 561–562] as useful directed successive change. In this, but not in the driving force of this, creationism [12, p. 282] and evolutionism [12, p. 786] are in consensus. Nature [12, p. 529–531] is superrationally ordered, surprisingly well utilizes all the possibilities available to it and successfully transforms them into reality.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 10/108**

When judging by the life quality of a person [12, p. 314–316] and society [12, p. 448–452], then very rare persons only well use the great opportunities of human (self-)development. Moreover, modern scientific and technological revolution [12, p. 408–410] with a sharp acceleration of scientific and technological progress [12, p. 410–411], especially in informatics and technosphere development, is accompanied by the degradation of many persons. Refusal of writing with a pen on paper deprives fine motor skills necessary for brain development.

Many persons do not know the multiplication table and do not aspire to knowledge [12, p. 192] at all, especially deep, orderly, methodological [9, p. 299–300; 12, p. 364–367], and if necessary refer to calculators and search engines on computers and smartphones connected with the Internet. Obtained fragmentary data usually do not go beyond instantaneous memory [12, p. 475–476] and, therefore, are not used for personal development.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 12/108**

The planting of the Bologna process and education system is not the cause of the “achieved” degradation, but the consequence of indulging it instead of overcoming it by returning the best in the pre-revolutionary and Soviet education systems. It is no coincidence that after the first successes of Soviet cosmonautics, professor (for decades) of the high-ranking Stanford University in Palo Alto (the flight from Los Angeles to San Francisco during the around-the-world trip was above Palo Alto), academician S. P. Timoshenko

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 13/108**

**(the teacher of the first vice-president of the
Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, academician
G. S. Pisarenko who was the head of the
defense of the Ph. D. dissertation and the
scientific advisor of the Dr. Sc. dissertation of
the author) was sent to his former homeland.
And he made the right conclusion: the key to
success was the Soviet education system which
taught a wide range of solid knowledge and
ability to think.**

De Bono [1] already in dozens of books for half a century most clearly shows an obvious lack of (based on the “stone logic” [12, p. 316–322]) classical thinking [12, p. 391–392] by Socrates [12, p. 625], Plato [12, p. 496–499] and Aristotle [12, p. 35–38] and suggests a transition to the “parallel”, “lateral” “de Bono thinking” based on “water logic”. The known concepts of thinking [12, p. 391–392] fully conscious only in complete isolation from feeling, will expression [12, p. 90–91], behavior [12, p. 504] and activities [12, p. 151–152]

clearly wrongfully consider thinking necessarily logical, contrary to the research of Amos Tversky and the Nobel laureate Daniel Kahneman [5, 6], who discovered the conjunction error, or the “Linda problem”.

Those concepts limit thinking hierarchy [12, p. 201–202] to the two levels of reasoning and understanding [12, p. 567] according to Kant [12, p. 242–244] and do not take into account the huge differences in the thinking levels of different persons.

With interesting personal constructs, Kelly's approach to any person as a scientist [7] is doubtful. Clearly understated common sense [12, p. 90] and allegedly harmful prejudice and prepossession [12, p. 526] are regarded to be generally beyond the limits of thinking. The generally accepted definition of truth [12, p. 226–227] and classical logic [12, p. 316–322] are clearly insufficient.

Dichotomy [12, p. 171] truth–falsehood is erroneous, since they are not antonyms [9, p. 35–36], and is clearly insufficient because of its uniqueness in the diversity of life and sciences. Thinking is studied by classical philosophy [11, 12] (epistemology [12, p. 678–680], logic, aesthetics [12, p. 805–808]), cybernetics [12, p. 83–84], linguistics [9], science studies [12, p. 406–407], psychology [12, p. 549–551], neurophysiology, mythology [10], psychopathology and ethology with their limits and apparent deficiency.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 18/108**

THE DISCOVERY OF UNIVERSAL THINKING AND ITS HIERARCHY

Universal thinking in universal life creating is together with it holistic and healing, commultiscientific and commultilingual, based on the synergy of universal infinite continuous logic, philology with scientifics, psychology [2–4]. The hierarchy of universal thinking includes the levels of experience [12, p. 462–463], habits, rituals, customs [12, p. 454], traditions [12, p. 692], universal sanity (healing sense), namely vital faith and confidence, confident knowledge [12, p. 192],

**universal prepossession, universal prejudice,
reasoning (classical logic) [12, p. 567],
heuristics [12, p. 786–787], understanding [12,
p. 567], cognitivity [12, p. 263] (theorizing [12,
p. 676–680] including reflection [12, p. 579–
580]), metacognitivity, metametacognitivity,
sapience, intuition [12, p. 49–50, 216–217, 326],
wisdom, insights [12, p. 209] and universal
logic with the universal discoveries and
inventions of universal life creativing [2–4].**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 20/108**

Universal thinking as a part and the side of the holistic psyche with feeling, will, behavior and activity is in many ways, like speech production, unconscious [12, p. 52–53], however, not only subconscious, but also superconscious [12, p. 622–624] on the heights of insights and universal logic with the universal discoveries and inventions of universal life creativing. Universal prejudice with universal prepossession precedes reasoning [12, p. 567] and also expresses personal and social experience [12, p. 462–463],

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 21/108**

wisdom, intuition [12, p. 49–50, 216–217, 326], faith and trust, and this helps universal healing sense. Universal healing sense (with its discovered essence, hierarchies and development methodologies), prepossession and prejudice are the highest available, vitally superior and even sufficient levels of universal thinking (over the levels of experience, habits, rituals, customs, traditions) of the vast majority of humans successfully living without classical logic and abstract [12, p. 7] thinking. And without life logic as an order, it is impossible to live.

Clearly, the conjunction error, or the conjunction fallacy, or “the Linda problem”, is artificial and has nothing to do with the experience of successfully solving real life problems. Naturally, simple everyday logic of greater plausibility statistically wins in the presence of at least partial associative [12, p. 39–40] sufficient reason. And theoretically correct, but much more complicated classical logic and the multiplication theorem of probability [12, p. 79] theory far exceed the capabilities of the vast majority of persons with concrete thinking (mindset) only.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 23/108**

And the hierarchy of universal thinking takes into account huge differences in the available levels of thinking of different persons. The universal truth and plurality of right dichotomies were discovered. The exact measurement, expression and discrimination in the infinite and infinitesimal, including continuous, were invented. For the first time in 25 centuries, Zeno's paradoxes [11, v. 2, p. 44; 12, p. 31–32, 190] denying motion and change were solved.

Universal thinking with universal logic is infinitely, continuously and exactly leading to universal discoveries and inventions [4].

Actions even without reasoning, unconscious, by experience, habits, rituals, customs, traditions, common sense, namely life faith and trust, confident knowledge, universal prepossession, universal prejudice, sapience, intuition, wisdom and insights are very often successful. In the more rare vital cases, free willful acceptance of the best (not immediately apparent) of a set (a long list) of possible reasonable decisions is required.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 25/108**

**THE INVENTION OF UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE)
(MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION
AND BEST DECISION-MAKING**

**The intuitive adherence from childhood to the own
future holistic, synergic teaching about the creative
(self-)management of the (self-)implementation of the
desired, healthy, happy and successful life of a person
and society, that has become the basis of own universal
psychology with lectures and reports since 1987,**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 26/108**

**led to the universal methodologies of (collective)
(multiple) successive textual approximations to
perfection and best decision-making.**

**Here collectivity holds for namely collective decision-
making, and multiplicity refers to the best choice from a
set of objects, e.g. a long list of decisions under
consideration or a short list of preselected decisions.
These universal methodologies are based on weighted
qualitative [12, p. 252–253] and/or quantitative [12, p.
263–264] assessments and characteristics and lead to
making the best decisions [12, p. 583] and to improving
objects of even worldviewwise significance.**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 27/108**

**THE UNIVERSAL METHODOLOGY
OF THE UNIFIED COMPARISON
OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE
SELF-LIMITING RELATIVE ESTIMATES
OF DIRECTLY INCOMPARABLE OBJECTS**

**The universal methodology of the unified
comparison of quantitative and qualitative self-
limiting relative estimates of directly
incomparable objects has enormous
significance for life and science [12, p. 403–411].**

The need for mediated commensurability of the not directly commensurable was called in some scientific works.

The classical example of expressing a single value (socially necessary labor input) of the directly incompatible use values of various commodities by the universal equivalent (K. Marx, Capital) [12, p. 342–344] is perhaps the most famous.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 29/108**

This universal methodology is based on the origins, principles, laws and rules, or properties, of universal life creativing as the healing holistic, synergic hierarchy of universal sciences [2–4] with universal thinking, logic, worldview, philosophy, psychology, mathematics, metrology, mechanics, strength and philology. On November 10, 1992, this fateful universal methodology led to the discovery of universal stresses and of the first universal strength laws of nature with their hierarchy and thus to the second birth.

Strength is determined not by the stresses themselves not directly expressing own destruction danger degrees, but by the comparison of stresses with their limits. The infrequent combinations only of the principal stresses in the main directions at a point of a body are reproducible in the expensive tests of samples. Therefore, it is necessary to bring a complex (three-axis, triaxial) stress state to the equivalent (equidangerous) one-axial (uniaxial) stress state. However, the stress limits can be different for tensile and compressive stresses, and especially for the material anisotropy as a difference in its properties in distinct directions.

Therefore, previously known strength criteria can be applied to narrow special cases only, as a rule, to isotropic (having the same properties in all the directions) bodies under constant loads. For the general case of an anisotropic (having different properties in distinct directions) bodies under varying loads, there were no proposals for the formulation of strength criteria. Consequently, no universal strength law of nature was known. Universal mechanics and strength have revealed self-limiting universal stresses as relative (dimensionless), brought to their own limits of the same directions and signs.

With the simplest approach, the universal stress is the usual value of each of the three principal stresses, divided by the absolute value of its limiting value of the same direction and sign, provided that the other two principal stresses are zeroed. The universal unit scale is used. However, if the stress state at the point of the body is not uniaxial, there are no a priori constraints on the universal stresses. They become vectorial with loads varying in time. The equivalent (equally dangerous) universal stress is given by vector algebra.

The essence of the universal methodology of a unified comparison of the quantitative and qualitative self-limiting relative estimates of directly incomparable objects is as follows:

- 1. A universal scale is chosen, for example, the unit scale.**
- 2. For each object, its own upper limit (known or at least conceivable highest paragon) is determined in a certain sense, comparable to the object itself (for example, similar to it) in the sense that it is possible to give a reasonable estimate of the object**

with respect to its upper limit, for example to define this estimate as a measure of the ratio of the object to its upper limit.

3. On a universal scale, each of the objects to be compared is evaluated against its own upper limit.

4. All the objects to be compared are compared and ordered according to their self-limiting relative estimates.

For example, an estimated sonnet can be compared with Shakespeare's sonnets as possible and permissible for taking them as the paragons (upper limits) of this genre.

In fact, the basis of commodity exchange in its centuries-old history was namely the value that the political economy classics did not invent, they discovered the value.

Even at school, in essence, in many respects, relative marks are made on a unified scale, for example, a five-point scale, in comparison with the imaginable (representable) best, and it is not clear which “works” (say, answers, not just writings) are yet to come.

For example, in the allowed multi-genre nomination of a literary competition, it is necessary and possible to compare the qualities of heterogeneous, directly incomparable works.

If a masterpiece appears, it becomes a new paragon, is formally compared with itself and obtains the deserved highest score and a victory in the competition.

If a fundamentally new work is difficult to evaluate according to a known system of criteria, then this system must and can be developed via introducing and refining the criterion of originality in the development of literary criticism and art history.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 37/108**

This universal methodology assumes for each work, if necessary and/or useful, precisely a flexible, own system of criteria with its own system of their weights (coefficients of their relative importance) in terms of the origins, fundamental principles, laws and rules, or properties, of universal life creating and in its spirit. That is, even if the work has nothing to compare with, it can still be estimated if the evaluating person proceeds from own imaginations and supplements the dryness of algebra by the harmony of verbal estimation.

How exactly the evaluating persons can pass between Scylla and Charybdis in each given case, depends on the deciding personalities. It is important that they can, if desired, consciously or intuitively use this universal methodology. Its idea is much simpler than its description, scientific justification and application, quite difficult to perceive. It is possible to hit heterogeneous, directly incomparable works in one nomination of a literary competition. For example, in the nomination “Prose” of the literary contest about the Great Patriotic War, there were:

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 39/108**

**the genuine (literary-unprocessed) text of the diary of a
juvenile concentration camp prisoner;
authentic (literary-unprocessed) memoirs of participants in
the war;
literary-processed memoirs;
feature articles;
publicistic articles;
essays;
stories;
excerpts from the narrative;
the synopsis of a novel and excerpts from it;
a play;
a scenario.**

The reasons could be as follows:

the impossibility of such fragmentation of the nomination into too many subnominations, which will ensure the homogeneity of the works in each subnomination;

the impossibility to provide in advance in the competition regulations all genres (without exception) of works

which will be later submitted;

the need to ensure a fixed minimum of the number of works in each subnomination;

**the shortage of judges (reviewers);
the inadequate controllability of a contest with too
many subnominations.**

**And here the jury chairman can choose a unified
universal scale, for example the ten-point scale.**

**By using this scale, each judge (reviewer) evaluates
each work (in the nomination) via comparing it with
the best, in the opinion of this judge (reviewer) using
own imagination, possible work of the same genre.**

**Then all the works in the nomination are compared
with one another and ranked**

according to their relative estimates.

The details could be as follows:

1. Preselect a universal scale of relative ratings, which is unified for all genres and all works in the whole nomination. From the scientific point of view, it is logical to choose the unit universal scale, that is, to limit these estimates from above via 1. But, from the psychological and practical point of view,

it seems possible to advise the ten-point universal scale, that is, to limit these estimates from above to 10.

In the necessary cases, estimates can also be fractional if, for example:

one subtly takes nuances into account;

the unified integral evaluation of a work by using several criteria at once is obtained by using all the partial evaluations of the work by separately using all the criteria.

2. On the basis of the deep thorough literary analysis of each work in the nomination, give, instead of the absolute, the relative (in relation to the actual or supposed best, in the opinion of the judge (reviewer) using own imagination, possible work of the genre of the given work) quantitative evaluation according to the previously chosen universal scale of relative ratings in the whole nomination.

3. To determine the award-winning works in the nomination, compare their relative estimates on the specified unified scale and arrange them.

4. Consider rewarding valuable evidences of the epoch, especially genuine ones (literary-unprocessed), with an indispensable consideration of the circumstances of writing, via special awards for the contest (prizes, diplomas, certificates, etc.). For example, the reviewer of the nomination compares the received synopsis of the novel (with excerpts from it) with the best, in the own opinion, really possible (taking into account the limitations of the nomination for the topic, volume, etc.) novel (with excerpts from it)

or with the own imagination of such a paragon and gives the synopsis of the novel (with excerpts from it) the relative estimate of 7.5 on the ten-point universal scale. Such an integral relative estimate can be set as a weighted average of the relative estimates of the received synopsis of the novel (with excerpts from it), which are based on certain criteria including, for example, the following:

the degree of the correspondence of the novel to the theme of the contest nomination;

the degree of the disclosure of the theme of the novel and its conformity to the synopsis;

**the degree of the integrity and depth of the novel and
the achievement of the purpose of its writing;
the degree of the originality of the creative style and
composition of the plot, as well as the degree of the
unpredictability of its development;
the degree of the elaboration and presentation of them
and of the images of the main characters;
the degrees of the literary mastery of the author and of
the artistry of the novel;
the degrees of the richness and originality of the
language and its relevance to the tasks;
stylistic and linguistic literacy.**

Then the same reviewer of the nomination similarly compares an essay with the best (in his or her opinion, really possible with taking into account the nomination limitations for the topic, volume, etc.) paragon of essays (or the ideal self-representation of it) and gives the essay the relative estimate of 7.2 on the ten-point universal scale. Similarly, the same reviewer of the nomination gives relative ratings on the ten-point universal scale to all other works in the nomination, arranges them according to these estimates from the top down and makes a personal proposal for their awarding.

The same holds for the other reviewers of the nomination. Finally, the leading reviewer of the nomination prepares (for example, by using the universal methodologies of (collective) (multiple) successive textual approximations to perfection and best decision-making), on the basis of the received personal suggestions of the reviewers of the nomination, the general proposal as the total result of the reviewers of the nomination and submits this general proposal to the jury chairman for consideration, corrections and approval.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 50/108**

**THE ESSENCE OF UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE)
(MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND
BEST DECISION-MAKING**

**The essence of the universal methodologies of
(collective) (multiple) successive textual
approximations to perfection and best decision-
making is expedient to show at first in the simplest
particular cases, namely, without collectivity and/or
multiplicity.**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 51/108**

The universal methodology of successive textual approximations to perfection and best decision-making leads to single-minded weighted qualitative characterization and/or quantitative evaluation of one object of consideration, for example, personality, work, decision, and also to the improvement of this object even of worldviewwise significance. Under the name of the object, place a table of five columns for the parts of the work or for the individual features of the object, the substantively significant arguments “for” (“pro”) and the corresponding objections, the essentially significant arguments “against” (“contra”) and the corresponding objections.

Then considering the results of the previous (beginning with the first) filling (approximation) leads to changes (refinements, additions, exceptions) and thus to the next approximation.

The general consideration is completed in the absence of changes.

In obvious cases, arguments and objections can be limited to internal speech [9, p. 85], and the authors can write works (for example, scientific, artistic) and the characteristics of the objects of examination.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 53/108**

The universal methodology of multiple successive textual approximations to perfection and best decision-making develops its particular case above without multiplicity as follows. Previously, from the long list, eliminate all apparently not the possibly best reasonable decisions. Then a small short list, usually of two or three possibly best decisions, remains. Write each of them at the top of the long side of its sheet with the table below of the four columns for all the substantively significant arguments “for” and the corresponding objections, the essentially significant arguments “against” and the corresponding objections.

In essence, these are dialectical internal dialogues with the use of written (and in fairly simple cases oral or even internal [9, p. 85]) speech.

Finally, compare with one another all the possibly best decisions from the short list with their substantively significant arguments “for” and “against” and the corresponding objections and, on this basis, select the only best decision with the greatest excess of the merits over the shortcomings, preferably with the greatest merits and/or the least shortcomings.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 55/108**

The universal methodology of collective successive textual approximations and the universal methodology of collective multiple successive textual approximations to perfection and best decision-making differ from the previous two universal methodologies by adding collective agreement in the spirit of the known methods of a namely qualitative consensus (unanimity) or at least agreement with significant advantages over the purely quantitative methods of voting and of averaging personal quantitative estimates which do not express namely qualitative opinions about objects.

These qualitative opinions can and must be expressed necessarily verbally, textually, and not via numbers themselves. All these universal methodologies have helped in successfully managing a number of literary contests and their nominations. It is important that all these universal methodologies in practice predetermine the purely literary, as far as possible, consideration of the works themselves (without the transition to personalities), full harmony between the observers (reviewers) of the nomination, their amicable work and mutual study.

There were no unnecessary cases, skirmishes and conflicts. The authority of the jury chairman and of leading reviewers was not tested. There was no hint of a conflict within the jury of the nomination. And its reviewers became good acquaintances and even friends. Every nuance in the opinion of each reviewer about each work was completely taken into account. With minor discrepancies, the reviewers made reasonable compromises. Everything was aimed at the final review of the works in the nomination.

From this final review, the places and awards follow almost unambiguously. Quantitative estimates were not used as unnecessary. In fact, we have the long-term creative test laboratory conditions rather than television express competition. Of an intermediate estimate itself, for example, 7 out of 10, neither other reviewers, nor the author, nor readers can understand what exactly this reviewer thinks about the merits and demerits of the work. And if the justification is given, then nobody needs a number estimate formally objective, but by nature quite subjective.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 59/108**

This would be the last possibility in the extreme case of a complete divergence of estimates. But by us, this was not the case. We always came to full coherence, unanimity, consensus. In order to avoid “leaks”, all primary information relating to reviewing the works is sent by e-mails and can be discussed by phone, but it does not appear on the literary portal even in a private jury forum. The order of considering the works and distributing the awards by the reviewers (observers) is from the bottom up, to avoid the pressure of authorities, and is useful for learning.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 60/108**

Preliminarily, the leading reviewer “places” the observers by their names from the bottom up and sets the terms for each observer to execute all stages of the collective work of the jury. The least experienced observer (reviewer), for example an intern, begins the collective review. The leading reviewer completes it. At the first stage of the jury’s work, the reviews of the works are prepared. After the deadline for submitting works for the contest, the least experienced reviewer makes up a file containing all the works in the nomination,

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 61/108**

**writes a personal review of each work under it with
indicating his or her first and last names and, not
later than the deadline indicated by the leading
reviewer, sends the file to all other reviewers of the
nomination. If, in the opinion of this reviewer, a
work does not fall into a long list, then the
corresponding review can be very brief, for example:
“Boringly, dryly, prolonged. A lot of mistakes.”
Then the next, more experienced reviewer adds his
or her reviews of all the works under the reviews of
the previous reviewer,**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 62/108**

taking them into account and adopting everything acceptable, and not later than the term that the leading reviewer has termed, sends the supplemented file to all other reviewers. The leading reviewer adds his or her reviews, final in the nomination, of all works under the reviews of all previous reviewers. In doing so, he or she takes full account of the reviews of all previous reviewers and takes everything possible from there. If the common efforts failed to understand something (for example, a poetic image),

then he or she consults with colleagues and asks the author. Then the leading reviewer sends out the supplemented file to all other reviewers of the nomination, waits for their comments and suggestions, makes corrections, including the special opinions of individual reviewers in the final review of the nomination, and obtains the final review of the nomination, signed by all the reviewers.

Of course, the final review may not include something that can offend the author as a person.

At the second stage of the work of the jury of the nomination after the final review of the nomination, when the qualitative estimations of the works were already agreed, the results of the jury's work are summarized.

The least experienced reviewer adds his or her long and short lists and awards with indicating his or her name and surname at the end of the file and sends the supplemented file to all other reviewers of the nomination not later than the deadline indicated by the leading reviewer.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 65/108**

Then the next, more experienced reviewer takes into account the results of the previous reviewer, adopts everything acceptable, adds his or her long and short lists and awards with indicating his or her name and surname at the end of the file and, not later than the term the leading reviewer established, sends out the supplemented file to all other reviewers.

The leading reviewer as the latter adds his or her long and short lists and awards, the final in the nomination. In doing so, he or she fully takes into account the long and short lists and awards of all previous reviewers and takes from there everything possible.

Then the leading reviewer of the nomination sends out the completed file to all other reviewers of the nomination, awaits their comments and suggestions, corrects the file, including the special opinions of individual reviewers in the long and short lists and awards of the nomination, and obtains the final results of the nomination, signed by all the reviewers. Unprofessional works, illiterate and carelessly decorated, are unacceptable in the short list.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 67/108**

Then the leading reviewer of the nomination sends the final review of the nomination (all works, or a long list only, or a short list only, by the decision of the leading reviewer) and the final results of the nomination with the signatures of all the reviewers of the nomination to the jury chairman for verification, corrections and approval.

With these universal methodologies, all nonliterary criteria, cronyism, groupism, tug of war and scandals within the jury are almost eliminated.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 68/108**

Of course, it is easier to set and average the number estimates. But after all, reviews are still needed, and we must take into account the opinion of each reviewer.

And reviews may not be adjusted to the previous evaluations. If it is a matter of resolving fundamental issues, it is necessary to bravely pursue technical difficulties.

These methodologies lead to the goal in a straightforward, obvious way, and confidence in this is worth a lot.

This is a good sieve, through which the works without brilliance cannot get on the pedestal. It is very important to move namely to literary achievements.

And quiet work is very useful for the health, happiness and creativity of the authors and the jury.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 69/108**

These universal methodologies are the simplest in two senses: nothing is superfluous and can be omitted without result quality loss; there are no simpler methodologies (and not random “approaches”), which, according to the plan, would allow to take into account all the nuances of personal opinions without exception and promote them to a general qualitative estimation. We must also take into account the human gain of full peace. A complete description of any, even disorderly “approach” is unlikely to be less severe. “The more you sweat in training, the less you bleed in war.”

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 70/108**

Namely in those nominations, where these universal methodologies were applied most fully, the results were summed up faster than in all other nominations, and long before the appointed time. Each reviewer freely, without pressure, expresses his or her own opinion, and everything is fully taken into account also as special opinions. The sequence from the bottom to the top is also not random. These transparent universal methodologies exclude a disorderly undercurrent struggle with the advancement of proteges and nervous internal strife, when sorrowful literature huddles in the backyard and one can hear voices about the weakness of the awarded works.

The final results of the nomination are based on a thoroughly weighted and coordinated qualitative analysis of all works in the nomination. Of course, the chairman of the jury has the right not to approve the final results of the nomination.

But under such conditions, he or she must clearly and very convincingly justify his or her objections and constructive proposals and send them to all the reviewers of the nomination for consideration and recording.

Next, there is an agreement (in fact, even consensus, unanimity) by using these universal methodologies.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 72/108**

It is important that it is thanks to them in all cases that it is purely literary estimation of the artistic works themselves without a hint of a transition to personalities and without collisions.

The self-expression of the reviewers is additionally provided by the ability to bring special opinions to the reviews and their personal reviews.

These universal methodologies lead to a consistent mutual approximation of the team of the reviewers of the nomination of the competition to consensus, unanimity or at least to agreement in the qualitative estimation of each work in this nomination.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 73/108**

At the same time, the most accurate and complete accounting of every nuance in the opinion of each reviewer about each work is achieved along with reasonable consistency and the universal focus on the final review of the works of the nomination, from which the placement and awards follow almost unambiguously. It is impossible to simplify the names of these universal methodologies.

It is about the community, or the team, of the reviewers of the contest nomination.

For brevity, the adjective is better.

With regard to approximation, the directly related “collective” is much better than the mediated “social”. The choice possibility requires to specify the multiplicity. The sequence of the reviewers of the nomination of the competition sequentially considers the sequence of the works in this nomination and sequentially approaches to unanimity or at least to agreement in the qualitative estimation of each work in this nomination. It is precisely the mutual approach of the team of the reviewers of the contest nomination to such unanimity or at least agreement.

Therefore, the names of these universal methodologies exactly express their essence. And most importantly, namely the textual qualitative estimations of the works accurately and unequivocally express the essence of each reviewer's opinion about each work in this nomination.

The numerical, purely quantitative evaluations of the works do not allow to understand what namely reviewers think about works.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 76/108**

Averaging such estimates, exhibited by the work of all reviewers, is similar to “the average temperature in the hospital”. Simple triad voting with trichotomy for–against–abstain is even still rougher and worse. This corresponds to an extremely meager trio of white–black–gray logic and such a picture of the world.

And at all it is not similar to a black-and-white photo with every possible gradation of gray shades. Gray is here only one exactly in the middle between black and white.

Known indigenous tribes (Iroquois, Bushmen), who make decisions by consensus at the levels of experience, habits, rituals, customs, traditions, universal healing sense (sanity), namely life faith and trust, are in this far ahead of many far more enlightened peoples with their thoughtless rate for a simple ternary vote also on the levels of experience, habits, rituals, customs and traditions.

These peoples have not enough common sense to understand the great advantages of the long-known consensus and to introduce it everywhere instead of simple ternary voting.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 78/108**

The universal methodologies of (collective) (multiple) successive textual approximations to perfection and best decision-making in the particular case of collectivity act just in the spirit of consensus. However, in these universal methodologies, universal thinking works at its highest hierarchical levels of heuristics, understanding, cognitivity (theorizing with reflection), metacognitivity, metametacognitivity, sapience, intuition, wisdom, insights and universal logic with the universal discoveries and inventions of universal life creating.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 79/108**

Above the long-known methods of consensus and below the universal methodologies of (collective) (multiple) successive textual approximations to perfection and best decision-making, there are the following hierarchical levels of universal thinking: confident knowledge, universal prepossession, universal prejudice, reasoning (classical logic).

The universal methodologies of (collective) (multiple) successive textual approximations to perfection and best decision-making are extremely uniphilological, unitextological, as soon as the approximations are just textual.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 80/108**

And here textuality is namely the primary means of the universal discoveries and inventions of universal life creating, no secondary expression of extratextual, pretextual thoughts. These universal methodologies are based on universal textual logic, or unitextologic, in universal philology including universal linguistics, literaturology and scientificistics.

Universal commultilingualism also here creates and discovers unprecedented opportunities for the multidimensionality of universal thinking through uniphilological games of commultilingual texts with parallel multilingualism and expedient replacement of languages with successive multilingualism.

The synergy of these games is also unipsychologically extremely useful due to the language switching of the attitudes of universal thinking.

The universal commultiscientism of universal life creativing impregnates these universal methodologies and gives them unprecedented synergy.

A good example is the universal methodology of a unified comparison of quantitative and qualitative self-limiting relative estimates of directly incomparable objects.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 82/108**

This universal methodology was invented as purely quantitative for the discovery of the universal stresses and of the hierarchy of the first universal strength laws of nature in universal mechanics and strength. And then, in universal life creating, this universal methodology acquired universality including quality, for example, in universal philology when summarizing the literary contest with heterogeneous works in one nomination.

Quality is not so clear and unambiguous as quantity, but is much broader, richer and more diverse than quantity. This can be seen in the comparison of numbers with language and speech, which are easy, natural, immediately understandable and, although often cumbersome, can express any number. The converse is not true. If words or phrases do not reduce themselves completely to the names of numbers, then numbers cannot in the slightest degree directly, without tricks, express such words or phrases.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 84/108**

The indirect, with contrivances, expression of any text via a sequence of numbers is possible if, for example, each letter and every punctuation mark, including a space, are replaced with their ordinal numbers in an artificially arranged alphabet, extended by punctuation, including a space, or much more complicated in cryptography. However, such expressions cannot be understood directly. It is absolutely necessary to first turn such a sequence of numbers into a text.

In complicated cases, universal hermeneutics in universal philology [2] can help by operating, like these universal methodologies, on all six overlevels of the hierarchy of universal life creativing [2–4] and marks its integrity, synergy and even healing by regulating and perfecting universal sciences, universal commulticreativity and life activity in general. These universal methodologies, together with universal philology, build these six overlevels as follows.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 86/108**

**BUILDING UP OF ALL SIX OVERLEVELS OF
THE HIERARCHY OF UNIVERSAL LIFE
CREATING BY THESE UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES TOGETHER WITH
UNIVERSAL PHILOLOGY**

I. From the real universal infinity, these universal methodologies intelligently choose the feasible efficient finiteness and, in the best way, successfully use this finiteness. In universal mathematics, they uniphilologically, unitextologically develop, above all, its quality.

In classical mathematics, the method of successive approximations is widely used as a one-source simple iteration. In universal mathematics, multisource and multichannel, as well as intelligent, iterations were created and developed as universal sciences about successive approximations, primarily scientific quantitative ones with the development of qualitative, including vital, approximations namely via these universal methodologies. Personal multilingualism [9, p. 303], creative from childhood [8], is an important special case of multisource and multichannelness.

And the universal methodology of a unified comparison of quantitative and qualitative self-limiting relative estimates of directly incomparable objects develops the quantitative nature of universal metrology and gives it also qualitative character. Science and life activities on the whole have to be metrologically coherent. Therefore, qualitative, including textual, measurements are necessary, indispensable.

Increasing the essential exactness (by necessary words) of speech including translation [2] via successive approximations according to these universal methodologies is unimetrological.

II. In universal naturology, ontogeny [12, p. 457] and phylogenesis [12, p. 725] are successive approximations to perfection and are expressed namely by these universal methodologies of successive textual approximations. And the universal methodology of a unified comparison of quantitative and qualitative self-limiting relative estimates of directly incomparable objects is created just for the discovery of universal stresses and universal strength laws of nature in universal physics with its universal mechanics and strength.

Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 90/108

Along with mechanisms, mechanics, mechanicality, mechanistics and material resistance introduced into language and speech, not only in mechanics, universal loading and loads, pressures and stresses also generalize psychic personal and social (self-)loading and (self-)loads, (self-)depression and (self-)stress.

III. In universal philosophy, by using these universal methodologies, there are natural generalizations from materiality to spirituality and (comm)unity in ontology.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 91/108**

In universal epistemology, cognition via the universal methodologies of successive textual approximations is indispensable. Universal logic implements universal ordering namely via these universal methodologies. Universal discontinuity and continuity give sequence nature understanding also in universal ethics, aesthetics and cognitology. They are expressed by these universal methodologies of successive textual approximations.

IV. In universal psychology with the universal ordering of thoughts and feelings, the personality and its (self-)cognition are consistently (self-)developed at the levels of the hierarchy of universal thinking and are expressed in accordance with these universal methodologies of successive textual approximations. In the case of making the best decisions, it is important to add multiplicity.

This applies to universal intuition, lifepsychocoherence, lifepsychoanalysis, lifepsychodiagnostics, lifepsychohealing and geniusology with the unipsychological (in the spirit of the psychological [9, p. 405–406] in philology) direction in universal philology with the revival and enlightenment of language and speech and living in them.

V. Universal creation, or multifaceted commultilingual with interference [9, p. 197, 303] commulticreativity, includes universal life creativing as a whole, universal philology with its universal linguistics, literaturology (with new genres) and scientistics, commultilingualism and commultiscientism, uniingenuity with uniartology and new genres, as well as uniengineering (unicommultiengineering). All of them are expressed and developed according to these universal methodologies of successive textual approximations.

VI. Uniphilological universal management, universal pedagogy with the establishment of multiply partially accumulated and assimilated knowledge and person's (self-)development with successive approximations and the attainment of the greatest benefit, as well as universal sociology with regarding the consistent development of a person and society are expressed and developed according to these universal methodologies of successive textual approximations. In the case of making the best decisions, it is important to add multiplicity and, possibly, collectivity.

CONCLUSION

So, it has been shown that huge (self-)development opportunities are not used by most humans. Their thinking is insufficient and illogical. A two-level hierarchy of thinking is limited. Great differences in the thinking levels of different persons are not regarded. The essence, vital superiority and even sufficiency of universal healing sense, prepossession and prejudice are revealed. The conjunction error, “the Linda problem”, is explained. Also unconscious actions without reasoning are often successful.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 97/108**

The best decision-making is sometimes required. Universal psychology and text logic led to the universal methodologies of (collective) (multiple) successive textual approximations to perfection and best decision-making (in the spirit of consensus by collectivity) on the highest levels of the discovered hierarchy of universal thinking. These methodologies can perfect the personality, society, life activity, ((self-)limiting) (self-)estimation, creative work, multilingualism, (self-)education, (self-)development, technology, methodology, research, competition summarizing, (life) decision-making, etc.

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 98/108**

The base is universal life creating as universal commulticreativity with infinite continuous universal logic of the Universe with the denotata of language and speech. The universal methodology of a unified comparison of quantitative and qualitative self-limiting relative estimates of directly incomparable objects has enormous significance for life and science.

Universal thinking in universal life creating is together with it holistic and healing, infinite, continuous, commultiscientific and commultilingual,

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 99/108**

**leads to universal commultidiscovers and
commultiinventions, is based on the synergy of
universal infinite continuous logic, psychology,
philology including universal linguistics,
literaturology and scientistics. The exact
measurement, expression and discrimination in
the infinite and in the infinitesimal, including
continuum, are invented. For the first time in
25 centuries, Zeno's paradoxes denying motion
and change have been resolved.**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 100/108**

These universal methodologies are extremely uniphilological, unitextological, as soon as the approximations are just textual. Here textuality is namely the primary means of the universal discoveries and inventions of universal life creativing, no secondary expression of extratextual, pretextual thoughts.

These universal methodologies are based on universal textual logic, or unitextologic, in universal philology and build all the six overlevels of the hierarchy of universal life creativing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1. De Bono E. The Mechanism of the Mind: Understand How Your Mind Works to Maximise Memory and Creative Potential. London: Vermilion, 2015. 352 pp.**
- 2. Gelimson L. G. Universal (Methodo)Logicity of Uniphilological Unihermeneutics, Multilingual Equivalence and Essentially Exact Translation [Electronic Resource] // Studies in Philology and Cross-Cultural Communication: Scientific Research and Practical Solutions: Electronic**

Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 102/108

Scientific and Practical Journal. 2017. No. 1 (1).

URL: <http://vfmk.ru/journal/01/0116.html>

(Publication Date 12.07.2017).

- 3. Gelimson L. G. Universal (Philo)Logicity of Multilingual Universal Life Creativing and Unilifecreativing Uniphilology [Electronic Resource] // Studies in Philology and Cross-Cultural Communication: Scientific Research and Practical Solutions: Electronic Scientific and Practical Journal. 2017. No. 1 (1). URL:**

Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 103/108

<http://vfmk.ru/journal/01/0114.html> (Publication Date: 12.07.2017).

- 4. Gelimson L. G. Universal (Psycho)Logicity of Multilingual Universal Philology [Electronic Resource] // Studies in Philology and Cross-Cultural Communication: Scientific Research and Practical Solutions: Electronic Scientific and Practical Journal. 2017. No. 1 (1). URL: <http://vfmk.ru/journal/01/0115.html> (Publication Date: 12.07.2017).**

- 5. Kahneman D., Slovic P., Tversky A. Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 544 pp.**
- 6. Kahneman D. Think Slowly .. Decide Quickly. M.: AST, 2013. 656 pp. (Kahneman D. Thinking, Fast and Slow. Farrar: Straus and Giroux, 2011. 499 pp.).**
- 7. Kelly G. A. The Psychology of Personal Constructs. Volume One: Theory and Personality. Volume Two: Clinical Diagnosis and Psychotherapy. London: Routledge, 1992.**

Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 105/108

- 8. Kudryavtseva E. L. From Multilingualism to Creativity: Innovations in Polycultural Education // Russian Language and Literature in the Expanse of World Culture. Materials of the XIII Congress of the International Association of Teachers of Russian Language and Literature (MAPRYAL): 15 vols. 2015. P. 123–127.**
- 9. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary / Ch. ed. V. N. Yartseva. M.: Sov. entsiklopediya, 1990. 686 pp.**

Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 106/108

- 10. Mythological Dictionary / Ch. ed. E. M. Meletinskiy. M.: Sov. entsiklopediya, 1991. 736 pp.**
- 11. New Philosophical Encyclopedia: 4 vols. / Sc. ed. council head V. S. Stepin. 2nd ed., rev. and add. M.: Mysl', 2010.**
- 12. Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary / Ch. eds.: L. F. Il'ichev, P. N. Fedoseev, S. M. Kovalev, V. G. Panov. M.: Sov. entsiklopediya, 1983. 840 pp.**

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 107/108**

CONTRIBUTOR'S PROFILE & ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

Name	Gelimson Lev Grigorevic, literary and artistic pseudonym Leo Himmelsohn
Ф.И.О. (полностью)	Гелимсон Лев Григорьевич, литературно-художественный псевдоним Лео Гимельзон
Degree Current position	Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. in Engineering in the section “Physical and Mathematical Sciences” by the Highest Attestation Commission Classifier Director Director, Producer, Literary and Artistic Manager
Должность, звание	директор, д-р техн. наук в разделе «Физ.-мат. науки» по Классификатору ВАК директор, продюсер и литературно-художественный руководитель
Institutional affiliation	Academic Institute for Creating Universal Sciences, Munich, Germany

**Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. LEV GELIMSON: UNIVERSAL TEXTUAL LOGIC AND UNIVERSAL
METHODOLOGIES OF (COLLECTIVE) (MULTIPLE) SUCCESSIVE TEXTUAL
APPROXIMATIONS TO PERFECTION AND BEST DECISION-MAKING 108/108**

	Multilingual Literary and Musical Theater, Munich, Germany
Место работы	Академический институт создания всеобщих наук, Многоязычный литературно-музыкальный театр, Мюнхен, Германия
e-mail, эл. почта	Leohi@mail.ru
Postal address Почтовый адрес	Ph. D. & Dr. Sc. Lev Gelimson, Westendstrasse 68, D-80339 Munich, Germany
Science Index (SPIN)	8046-6818
Scopus ID	6505889792
Researcher ID	R-5007-2016
ORCID ID	0000-0003-0627-84