

Reframing the Existing Spiritual Framework of Dualism.

It is not uncommon to hear a “sophisticated modern thinker” declare that, “good cannot be fully understood, or exist in a meaningful way, without the contrasting concept of "bad", or evil.” In effect, suggesting that, a person cannot see something as good, if they have not seen something bad. Or that “*good can exist only because bad exists*”.

If pressed for clarification on the meaning of this view, the answer one gets, boils down to the idea that, *neither good nor bad really exist*. And they use the framework of **Dualism** to support their perspective.

Right away, this perspective creates confusion. Not clarity. How can “good” emerge from” bad”? Or how can one truly say that *good or bad cannot exist independent of the other?*

Everyone knows to their core when they see or feel wronged (i.e. someone has done something unpleasant to another - **bad**) Or when they see or feel joy (someone has done something pleasant for another – **good**)

Yet, **Dualism** or **Duality** is not a modern concept. It appears in Theologies and Philosophical thoughts that date back to over 1,000 BC. And its longevity suggests that the concept must have some educative principle, and message that makes life more understandable.

For that reason, we find it expressed in different ways by different religions. In some it is described as the constant struggle/conflict between Light and Darkness (i.e. *forces of nature* , “Good”, and “Bad”, heat, and freeze, storm, and still, etc.). In others it is symbolic of the *complementary nature* of the dualistic forces that operate in all aspects of Life (i.e. the Ying and Yang – Masculine and Feminine, Positive and Negative, Creation/Upbuilding and Disintegration, Birth and Death). It also symbolized the dichotomy in the **structure of nature** (i.e. visible and the invisible, as above, so below, etc.)

From this alone, we can see that the original concept of duality is quite comprehensive. It is (was) a multifaceted framework for trying to explain or understand all that man can see, imagine or comprehend of the activities in the universe. By contrast, the opening statement to this article, which the modern thinker wishes to align or attribute to the ancient philosophy of dualism/duality, creates confusion, and does not bring clarity.

So, how did this confusing idea become associated with the ancient concept of duality that strives to bring clarity and meaning to life?

The answer can be found in the modern Psychology theory of **Interacting Opposites**. This theory defines **Duality** as the *co-existence of opposing emotional forces (in people)*, i.e. negative and positive emotions. And by *accepting this complexity, one can reduce the stress of "black and white" thinking, thus improving their mental health*.

Clearly, this theory is a mechanism for coping with emotional responses triggered by interactions with each other, or our environment. Because it helps us manage our mental health does not mean that the theory can also be applied to the working of the entire Universe, of which man is but a tiny part.

It is true that we experience the effects of the many alternate states covered by Duality. But we do so only to very limited degrees. Therefore, it is a fallacy for modern man to think that we can reframe the vast and preexisting frame work of Dualism or Duality, as it operates in Creation, into our own very limited thinking. And to suggest that our reframed concept is what really governs our life and environment, without regard to the overarching governing principles of existence.

Is it surprising that the conclusions drawn, or suppositions made, using this reframed and limited concept to understand our lives and environment can only lead to more confusion, instead of clarity?

So, once again, how can one say that neither *good or bad exists, as such*?

As we reflect on this question, we would be better served to consider the following:

The forces of Light and Darkness (good and bad) have existed for millennia, even before man became aware of them. They do not need man's recognition or acknowledgement to remain active, even on man himself. And, there are specific laws that govern how man is affected by these forces, to his benefit or detriment.

Man is given the ability to recognize these forces. And it is in our best interest to use these abilities because they serve two purposes (1) as safeguard, and (2) to recognize how these forces support or retard our inner development

Any philosophy that intermixes, or diminishes the potency of these forces poses a danger to the one who adopts such thinking, because it makes them vulnerable to the independent activity of the forces.

Their belief that bad does not exist, leaves them vulnerable to the forces of bad. And their belief that good does not exist, weakens their attachment to the notion of good. Also, the belief that one wipes out the other, or that they are of equal potency, is incorrect. We know that there are various stages of development and potency in life. Therefore, one cannot assume the equivalency implied in the statement. Besides, good and bad have different attributes, and therefore different potency.

The unrecognized effect of this "reframing" is that it gradually weakens one's moral compass. It makes the adopter prone to an **amoral** life (i.e. indifference to the moral principles of good and bad).

Although Amoral is not the same as Immoral (violating known morals), its effects on the individual, clearly cannot bode well. These effects include :

- **Disregard:** the tendency for conscious or unconscious decision to operate without reference to moral standards.
- **Contextual Necessity:** moral considerations are more likely to be suspended to attain one's goal, even at the expense of others.
- **Incapacity:** reduced or total loss of cognitive ability to comprehend moral concepts. In effect ultimately eroding one's cognitive capacity back to the level of infants or animals

Closing Remarks

The danger exposed here is an example of just one of many, from the growing trend to fuse theories emerging from modern Psychology and the sciences with religious/spiritual teachings.

Evidently, despite increasing secularization in many societies, many are still seeking for meaning to our lives, and how to reestablish a connection with something higher than ourselves. But this time we are looking for a more rational or logical basis for our beliefs.

The desire for objectivity in our belief is not unwarranted. The fact is, the progression of human development has clearly brought us to the stage where simple faith or superstition can no longer satisfy our inner urge for knowledge. This too is the result of the operation of the Law of Development, defined as **Upbuilding** in dualism.

However, the much-desired reconnection must be established on the secure foundation of the Laws of Creation, and not on limited human theories or observations. Otherwise, the new framework would harbor great dangers for seeking humanity. This will create more confusion in our lives and retrogression, that will then lead us down to collapse, described as **Disintegration** in dualism