**Memorandum (second part) for the Minister of Education (Romania)**

**Gabriel Vacariu**

**(Departament of Theoretical, Bucharest University)**

At the beginning of the second Memorandum I mentioned that on 21.03.2022, I posted the first Memoriu I (it can be access here: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359417875_2022_Gabriel_Vacariu_Memoriu_De_ce_am_avut_si_am_cea_mai_slaba_promovare_cand_am_cel_mai_bun_CV_din_Facultate_de_Filosofie_UB>

[https://philpapers.org/rec/VACGV-7)](https://philpapers.org/rec/VACGV-7%29)

And I received from the Director of Department of Theoretical Philosophy (UB) on 05.04.2022.[[1]](#footnote-0)

 Fist of all, in the Reply signed by the Director of Department of Theoretical Philosophy (UB), it is no answer to my main question from my Memorandum I: “Why I have had, during my entire career, the WORST promotion, even if I have had, and I have now, the best CV from the entire faculty?” The director of our department writes, among other things that there is the law in Art 2 which indicates that:

Candidatul la examenul de promovare pe un post vacant trebuie să îndeplinească, în mod cumulativ, condițiile de mai jos: a) să fie cadru didactic titular în Universitate și în Departamentul în statul de funcții al căruia se află prevăzut postul prevăzut pentru examenul de promovare și să depună o cerere scrisă în vederea promovării pe gradul didactic imediat superior celui pe care îl ocupă [...]”.

We emphasize that all the members of Department of Theoretical Philosophy have been infomred, through electronic mail, about the existence of this Metodology on 26.07.2021, the message having in attachment the text of Methodology. The addresses toward prof. Constantin Stoenescu sent this message included two addresses used by Conf. Dr. Gabriel Vacariu, namely: gvacariu@yahoo.com and, respectively, gabriel.vacariu@filosofie.unibuc.ro. We mention that mr. Conf. Dr. Gabriel Vacariu have not posted any requirement in this sens until now, a letter written following the Methodology.”

I want to emphasize that in all discussions that I have had with the head of our department, Prof. C-tin Stoenescu, with previous heads of the department, with (actual and previous) deans and with actual Rector of UB, none of them specified me the rule that it would be necessary for me to write that letter-requirement for being promoted! After I received this official reply to my Memorandum I, the actual Director of Department specified that this rule had been introduced last year. My remark is that I have had the WORST promotion during my entire career, not only in the last year. Anyway, I consider that the director of department is obliged by having this position to help the members of department to acquire the knowledge of such rules, therefore, it was compulsory for this director to inform me abut this rule. He is paid for such helping the members of this department. Maybe the director did send an email indicating the methodology, but I emphasize again, that in many discussions that I have had with him, he has NEVER told me about the fact that I need to write such letter! (I mention I have been employed at this department, Faculty of Philoophy, UB in 1998.)

 In 2021 (or maybe 2020, I do not remember exactly), Mr. Dean and mr. Rector insisted to tell me that my promotion depends directly by the decision of the director’s of department, not by them. They did not tell me anything about the letter that I need to write regarding my promotion. After I had the discussion with the dean and there rector, I returned to the director of department to talk again about my promotion, but he did tell me nothing about the letter I need to write. He just told me that I could not be promoted, there are not enough “hours” for creating a new position, etc. Another question: “How has it been possible all my colleagues have been promoted each time (there were enough hours for creation of a new position) when they have had enough years in their career as being employed at this faculty/university, but the director did not find enough hours for creating a position for which I could be a candidate?”

 The official Reply has this paragraph:

Dl. conf. dr. Gabriel Vacariu face, în cuprinsul memoriului său, o serie de aprecieri subiective cu privire la valoarea relativă a contribuțiilor sale academice în raport cu cele ale colegilor săi, afirmând că CV-ul său „este cel mai bun din facultate”. Precizăm că ne delimităm net de afirmațiile domnului Vacariu, cu atât mai mult cu cât la autoevaluarea pentru anul 2021 domnul conf. dr. Vacariu însuși și-a acordat calificativul „Satisfăcător” (Conform Fișei de evaluare încărcată de domnia sa pe data de 13.01.2022), iar la evaluarea colegială a obținut cel mai slab punctaj din Facultatea de Filosofie.

I emphasize that in my memorandum, I mentioned that my CV is the best only based on INTERNATIONAL criteria, not national criteria! The Reply indicates one error contained by my Memorandum: “as my name being the most quoted name” from all members of faculty. Indeed, it was this error in my Memorandum, but I was referring to my CV (the “most quoted name” being one criterion mentioned there). Obviously, it was my error (there is name of a colleague better quoted than my name). However, in my Memorandum, I was referring to my entire CV (not only to that criterion!). Even if my name is not the “most quoted name” among the names of all my colleagues, my name is the second or third, maybe. Moreover, based on all international criteria, my CV is the best from the entire faculty. Another essential criterion is at what journals and publishing companies the professor has published her/his works. Moreover, an essential criterion is the main ideas of *accomplishments* realized by the publications. If the name of my colleague is more quoted than my name, it is necessary to identify the main reasons why her name is quoted in relationship with why my name is quoted. If my colleague have worked on the “history of thinking” (her PhD thesis is on Francis Bacon, for instance), my contributions have been published at one of the best journal of Philosophy of science, my book has been published at one of the best publishing company in Europe and entire world, Springer (Germany). This book (2015) is a summary of my previous books published at Bucharest University Publishing Company, all in English and posted FREE at my webpage and other Internet pages. Since th ebeginning, in all my books/articles I have had GREAT contributions to the main topics of various domains (Physics, Cognitive (Neuro)science and Philosophy). For instance, in USA, one of the most important criterion is, indeed the number of quotations of your ideas in your works. However, this is a quantitative criterion, but there are other qualitative criteria (more important than the “number of quotations”) necessary for the promotion of a professor. One of the qualitative criteria refers to how important are the main ideas published in articles/books of an author. In USA (the first country regarding the accomplishments in academic environment in the entire world), the professors fro universities are highly appreciated regarding their main ideas published in a few articles/books, ideas which represent great changes in one or more domains.

 I emphasize that wit my ideas published in my articles/books, I have realized the GREATEST CHALLENGE in the history of HUMAN THINKING: I have realized the change of the old framework of thinking, the idea of the “Universe” or “world” (concept which have been used by any scientist or philosopher in the last 2500 years until me) with a new concept, that of “epistemologically different worlds”, the “EDWs”. The proof I have done this accomplishment? Many “professors” have published UNBELIEVABLE similar ideas to my ideas, years later after me! So, I am the first thinker who has published these ideas, the ideas which have changed everything in Physics, Cognitive (neuro)science and Philosophy. (The manuscript about these “UNBELIEVABLE similarities” can be found on Internet on various addreses like researchgate, philpapers, scribd.com, etc. I update this manuscript almost in each month just because I find at least one author which publishes UNBELIEVABLE similar ideas to my ideas!) Or, the ideas published by me in official works (articles belonging to various journals and books published at various official publishing companies starting from 2002 until now) have changed the framework of human thinking for all physicists, cognitive neuroscientists and philosophers from all countries on this Earth. I mention just few great problems solved by my EDWs perspective: I solved/furnished

- a new ontological definition for “existence”, “interactions”, “entity”, processes;

- the mind-brain problem

- emergence, supervenience

- the problem of mental representation and their relationship with neuronal activations

- a new definition of “self” and the relationship between the corresponding “organism” and its external environment

- I rejected all great theories of cognitive (neuro)science (computationalismul, conexionism and dynamical system approach, for instance)

- all the great problems of quantum mechanics (entanglement, nonlocality, etc.)

- the dispute between Einstein’s general relativity and quantum mechanics

- a new definition for Big Bang and related notions (I rejected Guth’s “inflation”, etc.)

- a new definition of “life” in correspondence with the organism

- the impossibility of any ontological status of “spacetime”

- God (of eny religion) could not even exist

- I have re-written Einstein’s both special and general relativity without “spacetime”

- a new ontology for thermodynamics and its main notion, “entropy”

- new definition of dark matter and dark energy.

- in 2019, together with my twin-brother, I have published a novel, “G.’s life” which had a great success at critics and public.

 Qualitative criteria are very important for another reason: for instance, Nobel prize is given based on qualitative (not quantitative) criteria. It does not matter the number of quotations of the name. Or, if we include also these qualitative criteria, my CV is much better than the CVs of all my colleagues!

Another very good criterion for my CV: I have had several “international interviews” and I have been especially invited to write a chapter/article for special books/journals. For instance, in 2020, a physicist form Great Britain invited me (together with my twin brother) to write a chapter regarding dark matter or dark energy for a book edited by him. (I emphasize that all the chapters of that book has been written by scientists, i.e., physicists from Great Britain and other countries! Our chapter is the only one written by philosophers!) Also, in this year, it will be published a book edited by two scientists at Springer in which me and my twin brother have a chapter about the EDWs perspective applied to Physics, Cognitive Neuroscience/Biology and Philosophy. The HUGE number of “professors” (from many countries (USA, Germany, Great Britain, Canada, Australia included), from many domains (Physics, Cognitive Science or Philosophy), on many topics) who have published articles and books having UNBELIEVABLE similar ideas to my ideas (published years before them) is an proof for my changes regarding the “framework of thinking” of all human beings.

 At my CV, I add also the studies accomplished by me at Oxford University (Soros scholarship), New York University (Fulbright scholarship), CEEPUS scholarship in some Eastern European countries, etc. I have to PhD degree, one at Bucharest University and one at University of New South Wales (Sydney, Australia). During several years, I led a CEEPUS project at my department, a project that I had to close it because of an administrator from university…)

 Another objection that I have regarding the Reply written by the director of Department of Theoretical Philosophy refers to the fact that his reply did not have any answer why I have had the worst promotion during my entire career? Even the title of my first Memorandum refers to this idea. I emphasize that there are some of my colleagues from the faculty who have been employed 10 or 12 years later than me, and they have CVs much worst than my CV, but they occupy the same position as I have: “conferentiar-professor”.

 In this context, I inquire again: “Which have been the main reasons/arguments for the promotion of my colleagues and my self?” It would be quite absurd to receive the answer: “You have not written the letter for asking the director of department for promotion”! During my entire career, I have asked, almost in each year, for my promotion, but I have had the worst promotion comparing with all my colleagues, even if, I repeat I have had the best CV. The leaders of Faculty of Philosophy have never informed me that I have to write such letter! (I do not ask why I received the worst score regarding the evaluations of my colleagues: envy produced by the fact that I have had the best CV is the answer.) Moreover, I mentioned that if someone would realize a survey/poll among students asking them a degree for all professors, I am sure ny name will be among the firsts. In each year I have had discussions with the students form our faculty and many of them have strongly been impressed by my courses/seminars and my publications. If the leaders of department/faculty believe this is only my personal opinion, they can organize an official survey.

Because so many “professors” have PLAGIARIZED my ideas, I believe the EDWs perspective will be the framework of thinking for the next 200 years for all scientists and philosophers. Today, I consider my CV as being one of the best in the entire world. I believe if I were American or German, I would have received at least a Nobel prize (for Biology/Cognitive Science and/or Physics) since I have solved all great problems of these particular sciences. Anyway, in the history of human thinking there have not been any thinker (philosopher or scientist) who was able to solve so many problems from different sciences/domains. Moreover, I believe, in the history of humanity, nobody has been reading more books and articles (from different domains) as I have read. (See the Bibliographies from my books/articles)

The reader of this Memorandum2 can take alook at my first Memoradum1 and at the Reply furnished by the Director of Department; she/he will have immediately the confirmation of how I personally judged this reply. In that Reply, nobody could see any remark that I have indeed solved such great problems I nparticular sciences and philosophy. My colleagues could pretend they are not specialists on the topics I have been working and therefore they are unable to understand what I have realized. However, they could understand, if they wish, that I have published my ideas at Synthese (2005), one of the best journal of philosophy of science in USA and the world, and a book at Springer (Germany). This book is a summary of my main ideas published in my first FIVE books (all posted FREE at my webpage and other sites). In fact, this has been one reason so many “professors” have PLAGIARIZED my ideas. The history of human thinking will not forget them, bu it will be only the title “Vacariu’s list” and not the names from this list since they are more than 1000 professors. I ask my self, what it will happen with the names of my colleagues who all have signed that reply or of those who have created me so many problems during my entire career?

I add here that during the 12 (or more) last years, I have hold a optional course/seminar “Philosophy and movie” (second semester) referring to Andrei Tarkovsky’s last four movies, “In the mood for love” si “2046” (Wong Kar Wai), “Blow up” (Antonioni) and Constantin Brancusi’s method in his sculpture. I wanted to hold this optional course this semester but it was IMPOSSBILE! Why? I received the answer from the director of department: I did not asked, through a letter, to hold this optional course in September last year! Until now, I have hold this optional course without writing such letter. And my course have had great success among students from our faculty. Maybe this was the reason, the leaders applied this rule so rigorously this year. (I do not see any other reason for this rule…) Until last year, such optional courses were voted by the “Consiliul Profesoral”, the main committee of this faculty, but this academic year, my course (for instance) needed to be voted by the members of my department! (I supposed (just a supposition) that many members of my department would vote against my course, probable the reason being that too many students would follow it.)

 After I received the Reply signed by the director of Department, prof. Stonescu, I asked him if he has ever talked with students from our faculty and asked why so many students did not attend the studies of our faculty, why less than 1/3 of the students from the first year, graduate the studies? It is clear no student would dare to tell to the Director the reason so many student-colleagues give up graduating the studies of this department/faculty. Talking with my students, I understand the reasons are the same: the students are not satisfied by the level of courses, by the teaching modality of our professors, by the level of knowledge of courses/seminars, etc. Probable, other students will give up graduating our faculty just because they could not get points following my course “Philosophy and movies”. Anyway, my colleagues do not care too much for the fact that there are so little number of students who graduated the studies of our faculty, since their monthly incomes received from the Bucharest University ( a state university!) do not depend, directly, by this number. (At one private university in USA they would immediately lose their jobs and, we have to recall the best universities in USA and in the world are private universities!)

 During my entire career, I have had many problems with the directors of department, with different deans and even with a rector of Bucharest University (one of my colleagues!).

In the end of this Memorandum2, I repeat that, with my EDWs perspective, I have realized the GREATEST CHALLENGE in the history of human thinking (the main particular sciences like Physics and Cognitive (Neuro)science but also Philosophy are included here). Therefore, I end this Memorandum with a quotation from Einstein (a quotation which fits perfectly with this memorandum):

Great spirits have always encountered violent opposition from mediocre minds. The mediocre mind is incapable of understanding the man who refuses to bow blindly to conventional prejudices and chooses instead to express his opinions courageously and honestly. (Albert Einstein)

I am waiting for an official answer furnished by the Minister of Education (Romania)

11.04.2022 Conf. Gabriel Vacariu

 Departamentul de Filosofie Teoretica

 Facultatea de Filosofie, Universitatea din Bucuresti

 

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359875536_April_2022_Gabriel_Vacariu-_Memorandum_for_MINISTER_of_EDUCATION_RO>

<https://www.scribd.com/document/569260890/April-2022-Gabriel-Vacariu-Memorandum-for-MINISTER-of-EDUCATION-RO>

<https://www.academia.edu/s/65a27bf9e4>

1. After I read the Reply, I had the impression of reading a letter written by a chief of a communist CAP (“Coopérative agricole de production” from a village like Scornicesti, district Olt), the letter being a Reply against a professor who has dared to publish something against the political policy of Communist Party. It remind me about the event from ‘50s years, when a tractorist (tractor-driver with four classes) is named as new “mayor” (or a kind of chief) and who, using a tractor, tried to demolish the famous Brancusi’s “Endless Column”, considering the monument as being realized for “bourgeois”. However, the tractor overturned, but not the “Column”… The name of that tractor-driver has not been written in the history of human thinking, not even like the name of “Salieri” who stole Mozart’s last composition (composed when he was dying), “Requiem”. Neither the names of my colleagues (which signed this document) will be written in the history of human thinking because they are too many… [↑](#footnote-ref-0)