

## Logic 101: God is Good-Evil

Derek Dey  
May 2, 2013

The other day a few people insisted that God is imperfect – in fact holds to evil potentialities. The old dualisms of good and evil is back! This was defined as good and evil potentialities lying within the creator. The argument was supported by the logic of the cause and effect proposition. If the effect (humankind) is flawed the creator must be also. Traditional or classical theology and philosophy does not respond effectively to this overall argumentation where freedom is not posited as the cause but human nature is. But there is an answer in Panphysic philosophies and in consciousness studies which is quite simple.

Intellectual logic, empirical, and biological thinking, (Aristotle and biological categories) is now challenged by a unified field of thinking which is called integrative and ‘translogical.’ This non-dual system of consciousness tells us something very different from isolated logical proposals. The universe can not be defined by cause and effect particularly since Newtonian science was struck down years ago, and now within contemporary consciousness and spiritual disciplines. One quote from DP was supplied – it can be found at the end of the piece.

---

The idea that logically evil must belong to the creator as a natural outcome of cause and effect is interesting. This reasoning is formulated by the intellect alone which is usually defined as analytical and logical. However intellect is not a philosophy of mind in of itself, and analysis is related to synthesis within the structures of the whole psychic apparatus. In fact CG Jung supposes the intellect alone is Luciferian, if left to its own devices. Perhaps this is best revealed by the European philosophic tradition based on intellect, where recent developments have led to reductionism, analyses, and deconstructivism, in nature; none of these systems offer a theory of aesthetics in the passing, and usually end in elements of fragmentation. ‘Principle’ pre-supposes a recent root of philosophic thinking in German Idealism (philosophies of Kant, Hegel, Schelling, etc, and Jung). Kant proposed ‘synthetic a priori’ thinking – much more than logic. He suggests mind participates with external or transcendent categories, which might be read simply as archetypes - and mind is more than intellect. This scheme in the philosophic tradition is embraced by Panpsychism, which states the universe, quantum fields, and nature, all hold to mental-like properties and we participate in this. At the highest level of complexity these mental-like properties and interactions becomes consciousness. Indeed there are many philosophers and psychologists who state clearly, there can be no development of the mind without this participation. This is different from rational and enlightenment norms of thought which run down to materialisms, scientificisms, subjectivisms, and intellectualisms.

The idea that the intellect is the prime function of the human psyche is no longer tenable today either. In fact major philosophers, psychologists, quantum thinkers, REM studies, and SMM, amongst others state emotion is the prime force in the universe. Even Plato held vaguely to philosophic Eros in his later development. Dreams, archetypes, synchronicity, are all activated by strong emotional fields. Within contemporary studies the psyche is a conscious unconscious system of which, Gilbert Rose, a psychologist, investigated the aesthetic properties of the mind and stated, that all these conscious properties of the psychic architecture are highly fluid, interactive and interchangeable -participatory. Therefore mind is not just intellect. Intellect is in fact a single holon embedded with all the others within the holarchy of the self. Panpsychic philosophers generally support integration (Gestalt-like) like this – Many Panpsychic philosophers, in fact, are recorded in history despite the fact that the Enlightenment has worked to obscure this reality. If one moves to a philosophy of beauty or aesthetics, likewise, no contradiction and no opposing forces like good and evil, are to be found. Again, Kant proposes the ideal of beauty as a categorical idea, (Critique of Judgement) as a primary reality in the universe; and states he is therefore fascinated by “the starry heavens above and the moral law within.” This “as above – so below” idea, substantiated by beauty, contradicts the notion that the creator is an unresolvable mixture of dualities like good and evil. In fact ‘Beauty’ is never an unresolvable mix of good and evil, it is a source of virtues. One might note Jung and Whitehead say much the same, saying feeling and an approach to beauty reveals principles lying at a deep structure of reality. In quantum research cause and effect are limited proposals in of themselves, and belong to the ephemeral/phenomenological world only – like evolutionary theories also. Quantum entanglement for example does not function like this, as cause and effect; it does not hold to, or is contained by, such classical physical laws. If we posit an ephemeral physical world and a transcendent world as the sum total of created reality logic might suggest properties of a first cause and effects in one area but not another. The proposition that we are fatally flawed therefore God is fatally flawed also, is likewise untenable because as we read, God lies beyond time-space. The laws and dynamics of entanglement also lie beyond basic physical laws (functions with no time and no space/distance) and cannot be defined by mechanistic proposals.

Certain realities lie beyond Newtonian physics and the simple framework of cause and effect which thinkers ascribe to a transcendent reality are simply insufficient today. These quantum properties and networks are actually named as properties of an 'acausal' dimension. They function beyond the superficial laws of a material world. The question concerning a true philosophy of mind cannot be developed based on intellect alone – intellect is only a fragment – one piece of the puzzle.

Principle like quantum, psychology, and transcendent or Panpsychic philosophies holds to synthetic thinking and interrelatedness – participation. The term 'connected body,' or deep ecology illustrates this point; indeed this is the overarching definition of unification. The mind therefore holds to intellect-will emotion plus the intuitive and symbol forming unconscious, all of which function as an interrelated and interdependent dynamic. This is the new philosophy of mind and it is not mechanics. Synthetic thinking and non-dual states are exemplified by transcendent levels of consciousness. This means calm reflective thinking as proposed by Plotinus, prayerful states of consciousness as evidenced by Francis of Assisi, Hildegard of Bingen and Meister Eckhart, mystical states as seen in various religious traditions or meditative states such as Ken Wilber proposes in his Integral Philosophy, and dynamics evidenced within creative acts. Even the top of most psychological growth stages hold to similar proposals. Virtues extracted from these levels of being have been seen to include, lucidity, patience, kindness, truthfulness, humility, forgiveness; in fact all properties of the non-dual field. Whereas logic alone says little of these virtues. The intellect left to its own devices ultimately fragments reality, takes a higher position over all, and declares itself to be truth above all others – the sole definition of just how reality works; whereas in consciousness studies the higher integrated function usually proposed, leads to non-dual states of mind. Studies like this are well laid out these days – Wilber's spectrums of consciousness alone, supplies us with tables of many thinkers propositions regarding layers of consciousness from Piaget to Aurobindo, all illustrating these non-dual levels, found at the back of his 'Integral Psychology' for example – developmental stages of consciousness which cover a broad spectrum of other thinkers who agree on these basic propositions. Wilber, affirms Atman as a high spiritual state of mind, a non-dual way of approaching the created order: not perfect in all things but supportive of integration and integral/holistic thought and something more than logic.

In Unification Thought both Logos and epistemology require much further development with regard to these issues. The term Logos as many perceptions go, leads to thinking that creation is driven by a rational mind or single masculine force if read on the surface, whereas a harmonized creative body requires Logos to participate With Eros – this is the image found in nature and the interior of humankind. Yet the definition of Logos – Eros in participation is weak here. The unconscious-conscious orientation of the psychic structure and creative existence also mirrors this reality. And Logos is moreover often seen as Christ and by definition, the archetypal model of the self – a single masculine proposal – this also requires revisioning. Naturally the single male and the rational mind hold to certain limitations as does the isolated Intellect. Is God fatally flawed – probably not – but fragments supply concepts of dualisms – how we perceive reality is often flawed and dated. Perhaps its time for change.

(N. B. This quote was given in the argument and reveals how freedom alone does not explain bad behaviour. "Even in freedom argument can't resolve this because Principle states in the (1974) DP book, p. 92 (bottom of page): "It cannot be that man would fall because of freedom." Also p. 94 (middle of page), "Despite the fact that freedom allowed Eve to respond to the angel ... it was by no means freedom ... that made her overstep the line....")