Evil as the Path to the Good

Modal 12 — Modal Logic of Evolution, Explained in the Style of a Chess Journalist

Paul Koop

Preliminary Note: How to Read This File

This file explains **Modal 12**: the modal-logical version of evil. In the previous files — Modal 5 to Modal 11 — evil is a **blank space**. It is not treated. Modal 12 fills this blank space.

It is written in the **same style** as the previous files: move by move, with symbol explanation at every step, with plain language for every statement.

What is presupposed: The files on Modal 5–11 should have been read. In particular, the tableau rules, the superposition axioms ASP1–ASP5, and the limit structure U, T, S are presupposed as known.

What this file achieves: It shows three things:

1. The Trinity is the **only** limit structure of reality (follows from A1, monism).
2. **Evil** is **not a second limit**, but the inevitable **evolution** toward the good — conceived in a multiverse of all possible paths.
3. Evil is **genetic**, not **ontological**. At the limit it is **sublated** — not extinguished, but integrated.

Part I — The Uniqueness of the Trinity

1. A1 as Foundation

The axiom A1 in formulas (repetition):

```
A1 := □¬∃x∃y FundamentallySeparated(x,y)
```

Symbol explanation:

- □: necessity.
- ¬: negation.
- ∃x: “there is an x”.
- ∃y: “there is a y”.
- `FundamentallySeparated(x,y)`: “x and y are fundamentally separated”.
- `:=`: “is defined as”.

In plain language: There are no fundamentally separated realms of reality.

The metaphysical meaning: Reality is **one**. There is no realm fundamentally separated from another. Every separation is **relative**, not **absolute**.

2. The Consequence: No Second Limit

The consequence in plain language: From A1 follows **immediately**:

> There can be no second limit that would be co-original with the Trinity.

The proof in plain language: Suppose there were a second limit B alongside the Trinity Tr = U ∧ T ∧ S. Then B and Tr would be two fundamentally separated limits. This contradicts A1.

Formally:

```
A1 ⇒ □¬∃x∃y (Limit(x) ∧ Limit(y) ∧ x ≠ y ∧ FundamentallySeparated(x,y))
```

Symbol explanation:

- `Limit(x)`: x is a limit.
- `x ≠ y`: x is not equal to y.
- ∧: conjunction.
- ⇒: "implies" (metalinguistic).

In plain language: From A1 follows: There are no two fundamentally separated limits. Since the Trinity is a limit, there can be no second, fundamentally separated limit.

3. What This Means

The uniqueness of the Trinity means:

```
(1)  There is no "evil God". There is no second limit structure
     opposed to the Trinity.
(2)  Evil is not a counterpart to the Good. It is not structured
     dualistically.
(3)  Evil must be something else. It must be a structure within
     reality, not alongside it.
```

The question therefore is: What is evil, if it is **not a second limit**?

Part II — What "Path to the Good" Means

1. The Formal Definition

The definition in formulas:

```
γ : [0,1] → T
```

Symbol explanation:

- `γ`: a path.
- `[0,1]`: the unit interval (parameter t from 0 to 1).
- `→`: “goes to” (mapping).
- `T`: Totality.

In plain language: A path is a parametrized curve through Totality. The parameter t ∈ [0,1] describes the “progress” along the path.

2. The Good as Limit

The definition in formulas:

```
Good := S
```

Symbol explanation:

- `Good`: the Good.
- `S`: the upper limit of Totality (self-knowledge).
- `:=`: “is defined as”.

In plain language: The Good is the upper limit S. It is that toward which all paths tend.

3. A Path That Leads to the Good

The definition in formulas:

```
lim_{t → 1} γ(t) = S
```

Symbol explanation:

- `lim`: limit.
- `t → 1`: t tends to 1.
- `γ(t)`: the point of the path at parameter t.
- `=`: equality.

In plain language: A path leads to the Good if, in the limit, it culminates in self-knowledge.

The metaphysical meaning: This is not a moral judgment, but a **structural** property. A path “leads to the Good” if, in the limit, it culminates in S.

4. A Path That Does Not Lead to the Good

The definition in formulas:

```
lim_{t → 1} γ(t) ≠ S
```

Symbol explanation:

- ≠: not equal.
- The other symbols as above.

In plain language: A path does not lead to the Good if, in the limit, it does not culminate in S.

The question: Are there such paths? This is one of the open questions of this treatise (see Part VI).

Part III — Evil as the Totality of Paths

1. The Central Definition

The definition in formulas:

```
Evil := { γ : [0,1] → T | lim_{t → 1} γ(t) = S ∧ Suffering(γ) }
```

Symbol explanation:

- `{ ... | ... }`: "the set of all …, for which: …".
- `γ : [0,1] → T`: a path through T.
- `lim_{t → 1} γ(t) = S`: the path leads to the Good.
- ∧: conjunction.
- `Suffering(γ)`: the path contains suffering.

In plain language: Evil is the totality of paths that lead to the Good, **insofar** as they contain suffering, loss, and separation.

The metaphysical meaning:

- Evil is **not a path** and **not a state**, but a **set of paths**.
- It is **not** the limit, but the **totality of paths to the limit**.

2. What This Definition Achieves

What this definition achieves:

```
(1)  Evil is not a second limit. It is a set of paths that lead to the
     limit.
(2)  Evil is genetic, not ontological. It describes a development, not
     a state.
(3)  Evil is relational. It always refers to the Good (the limit S).
(4)  Evil is not arbitrary. It is necessary as the price of becoming.
```

3. What This Definition Does Not Achieve

What this definition does not achieve:

```
(1)  It does not say what suffering is. Suffering(γ) is a function
     that is not further specified.
(2)  It does not say which paths exist. It only says which paths
     constitute evil.
(3)  It does not say whether there are paths that do not lead to the
     Good. This is an open question.
```

Part IV — The Proof: Evil Is Not a Limit, but a Path

1. The Main Theorem

The main theorem in formulas:

```
S5+A1 ⊢ Evil is not a limit
```

Symbol explanation:

- `S5+A1`: the system of S5 and the monism axiom.
- `⊢`: "is derivable".
- `Evil is not a limit`: the target statement.

In plain language: In S5+A1 it is derivable: Evil is not a limit.

2. The Proof Move by Move

Move 1 — Apply A1

```
BOARD       (empty – the proof begins)
MOVE        Insert A1 as axiom
SYMBOLS     A1 := □¬∃x∃y FundamentallySeparated(x,y)
WHY         A1 is available as an axiom. We write it down to use it
            later.
PLAIN       "There are no fundamentally separated realms."
NEW         Line 1: □¬∃x∃y FundamentallySeparated(x,y)
```

Move 2 — Assumption: Evil is a limit

```
BOARD       Line 1: □¬∃x∃y FundamentallySeparated(x,y)
MOVE        Assumption: Evil is a limit B
SYMBOLS     B = evil as limit
WHY         We want to show that this assumption leads to a
            contradiction. So we assume it.
PLAIN       "Suppose evil were a limit B."
NEW         Assumption: Limit(B)
```

Move 3 — Contradiction with A1

```
BOARD       Line 1: □¬∃x∃y FundamentallySeparated(x,y)
            Assumption: Limit(B)
```

```
MOVE        Detect contradiction
SYMBOLS     B and Tr are two limits
            FundamentallySeparated(B, Tr) would be true if B and Tr
            are different limits
WHY         If B were a limit alongside Tr, then B and Tr would be two
            fundamentally separated limits. That contradicts A1.
PLAIN       "B and Tr would be two fundamentally separated limits.
            That contradicts A1."
NEW         Contradiction: A1 and the assumption are incompatible.
```

Move 4 — Result

```
BOARD       Contradiction
MOVE        Discard assumption
SYMBOLS     ¬Limit(B)
WHY         The assumption "Evil is a limit" leads to a contradiction.
            So it is false.
PLAIN       "Evil is not a limit."
NEW         ¬Limit(B)
```

Final Result

```
FORMAL      S5+A1 ⊢ Evil is not a limit
PLAIN       "In S5+A1 it is derivable: Evil is not a limit."
```

3. The Second Theorem

The second theorem in formulas:

```
S5+A1 ⊢ Evil is a path or a set of paths
```

In plain language: In S5+A1 it is derivable: Evil is a path or a set of paths.

The proof in plain language: Directly from the definition of evil as a set of paths.

4. The Structure of the Proof

The proof shows:

```
(1)  A1 excludes a second limit.
(2)  Evil must therefore be something else.
(3)  What remains is the genetic conception: Evil is the path to the
     limit.
```

Part V — Comparison with Classical Theories

1. Privatio boni

The theory in plain language: The classical theory of **privatio boni** (Augustine) states: Evil is the **absence** of the Good.

Comparison with our conception:

```
Common:      Evil is not an independent state.
Difference:  For Augustine, evil is a privation (lack). For us, evil is
             a path (evolution).
```

What our conception achieves: It gives evil a **positive** role — it is not simply non-Good, but a **necessary transitional phase**.

2. Manichaeism

The theory in plain language: The Manichaean theory states: Evil is a **second principle** alongside the Good.

Comparison with our conception:

```
Common:      Evil has a certain independence.
Difference:  For Mani, evil is a second limit. For us, it is not a
             limit – it is excluded by A1 (monism).
```

What our conception achieves: It avoids dualism without denying evil.

3. Theosis

The theory in plain language: The theory of **theosis** (deification, Orthodox tradition) states: The human being is taken up into the divine life through grace.

Comparison with our conception:

```
Common:      The Good is a goal toward which everything tends.
Difference:  In theosis, the goal is a state (deification). For us, the
             Good is a limit (self-knowledge).
```

What our conception achieves: It grasps the Good **structurally**, not morally.

4. The Point

The point in plain language: Our conception takes up elements of all three classical theories:

```
From privatio boni:  Evil is not an independent state.
From Manichaeism:    Evil has a certain independence.
From theosis:        The Good is a goal toward which everything tends.
```

But it differs from all three in that it grasps evil **genetically**: as a **path** to the Good, not as an **absence** or **counter-principle**.

Part VI — What Follows?

1. The Central Insight

The central insight in plain language: Evil is **not a state**. It is a **structure of becoming**. It is not **present now**, but emerges **in the process**.

Formally:

```
Evil(γ) = Suffering(γ)
```

Symbol explanation:

- `Evil(γ)`: the "degree of evil" of the path γ.
- `Suffering(γ)`: the suffering content of the path γ.
- `=`: equality.

In plain language: The "degree of evil" of a path is its suffering content.

The metaphysical consequence: Evil is not **ontological** (it does not exist as a thing), but **genetic** (it emerges in becoming).

2. What This Means

What this means:

```
(1)  Evil is not eternal. It emerges and passes away with becoming.
(2)  Evil is not substantial. It is not a thing, but a process.
(3)  Evil is not arbitrary. It is a necessary transitional phase.
(4)  Evil is surmountable. It is not the last word — at the limit, it
     is sublated.
```

3. The Relation to Tradition

The relation to tradition in plain language: Classical theology struggles with the **problem of theodicy**: How can a good God permit evil?

The present treatise does **not** solve this problem, but it **shifts** it: Evil is not something that is **permitted**, but something that is **necessary** — as the price of becoming.

Formally: There is no "external God" who permits evil. There is only the Trinity $U \wedge T \wedge S$, and evil is the path from U to S.

Part VII — What Remains Open

1. Are There Paths That Do Not Lead to the Good?

The question: We have defined: Evil is the totality of paths γ that lead to the Good, insofar as they contain suffering. **Are there paths that do not lead to the Good?**

The three possible answers:

```
Answer 1: No. All paths lead to the Good. There are no paths that do
          not converge to the limit. Evil is exclusively the totality of
          suffering paths to the Good.

Answer 2: Yes, but they are unreal. There are paths that do not lead to
          the Good – but they are not real, only possible. In reality,
          all paths lead to the Good.

Answer 3: Yes, and they are real. There are real paths that do not lead
          to the Good. Then it would have to be clarified how unitarity
          (Modal 10) relates to this fact.
```

What we have shown: We have **not** shown that all paths lead to the Good. We have only shown that **evil** consists of paths to the Good.

The question remains open. It is the subject of **Modal 16** (Paths without Omega Point).

2. What Is Suffering?

The question: What is suffering? How is `Suffering(γ)` defined?

Possible answers:

```
Phenomenological:  Suffering is what is experienced as suffering.
Structural:        Suffering is the difference between the path and its
                   limit.
Informational:     Suffering is the amount of information lost in the
                   path.
```

The question of the definition of suffering remains open.

3. Is There a Suffering-Free Path to the Good?

The question: Is evil minimal? Is there a path to the Good that contains **no** suffering?

Possible answers:

```
Yes:    The direct path (the shortest connection between U and S).
No:     Every path to the Good necessarily contains suffering, because
        every differentiation generates suffering.
Open:   The question is equivalent to whether the universe knows a
        suffering-free path.
```

Afterword

You have read this file. You have learned the modal-logical version of evil — with symbol explanation at every step and plain language for every statement. You have seen that the Trinity is the **only** limit structure (from A1). You have seen that evil is **not a second limit**, but a **path** to the limit. You have followed the comparison with the classical theories (privatio boni, Manichaeism, theosis).

What remains is the insight:

```
The Trinity is the only limit structure of reality.
Evil is not a second limit – it is a path to the limit.
Evil is genetic, not ontological.
At the limit, evil is sublated – not extinguished, but integrated.
```

The next file (Modal 13) treats **the observer in two interpretations**: the two observer operators B_D (constitutive) and B_V (non-constitutive).

This file was written in the spirit of strict modal logic, yet in the language of a chess journalist — for the proof requires both: the precision of the formula and the vividness of the move.