

Evil as the Path to the Good

Modal Logic of Evolution

Modal Logic of Evolution

Paul Koop

Zusammenfassung

In the previous treatises, evil appeared as a blank space. The present treatise fills it. Central thesis: The Trinity $U \rightarrow T \rightarrow S$ is the only limit structure of reality (follows from A1, monism). The Good is the limit S . Evil is not its counterpart, but the inevitable evolution toward it — conceived in a multiverse of all possible paths. Formally: Evil is the totality of paths $: [0,1] \rightarrow T$ with $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \{t \rightarrow 1\} (t) = S$, insofar as they contain suffering, loss, and separation. It is not ontological, but genetic. At the limit itself, it is sublated — not extinguished, but integrated. The metaphysical consequence: Evil is not eternal, but the price of becoming.

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Preface: The Blank Space “Evil”	2
The Uniqueness of the Trinity	3
A1 as Foundation	3
The Consequence: No Second Limit	3
What This Means	3
What “Path to the Good” Means	3
The Formal Definition	3
The Good as Limit	4
A Path That Leads to the Good	4
A Path That Does Not Lead to the Good	4
Evil as the Totality of Paths	4
The Central Definition	4
What This Definition Achieves	5
What This Definition Does Not Achieve	5
Proof: Evil Is Not a Limit, but a Path	5
The Main Theorem	5
The Second Theorem	5
The Structure of the Proof	5
Comparison with Classical Theories	5
Privatio boni	5
Manichaeism	6

Theosis	6
The Point	6
What Follows? Evil Is Genetic, Not Ontological	6
The Central Insight	6
What This Means	7
The Relation to Tradition	7
Open Questions: Are There Paths That Do Not Lead to the Good?	7
The Question	7
The Three Possible Answers	7
What We Have Shown	7
A Second Open Question	8
A Third Open Question	8
Conclusion: What Has Been Shown?	8
Appendix A: The Axioms in an Overview	8
Basic Axiom	8
Definitions	9
The Main Theorem	9
Appendix B: Comparison with Classical Theories	9
Appendix C: The Three Open Questions	9
Afterword	9

*Past and future are horizons of knowledge.
The present is the locus of reality.
Nothing that was, is lost.*

Preface: The Blank Space “Evil”

In the previous treatises of the series — `modal5.md` and Modules 6–11 — evil is a **blank space**. It is not treated. The Trinity is unfolded as a limit structure, unitarity is shown as a theorem, timelessness as the structure of the present — but evil is left out.

The present treatise fills this blank space. It does so **not** in the sense of a second limit, but in the sense of a **genetic** conception: Evil is **not a counterpart** to the Good, but the **inevitable evolution toward it**.

The central claim of this treatise is:

The Trinity $U \ T \ S$ is the only limit structure of reality. The Good is the limit S . Evil is not its counterpart, but the inevitable evolution toward it — conceived in a multiverse of all possible paths. At the limit itself, it is sublated — not extinguished, but integrated.

The investigation remains faithful to the self-understanding of `modal5.md`: It shows **dependencies**, not truths. It shows that evil is **not an ontological state**, but a **structure of becoming**.

The Uniqueness of the Trinity

A1 as Foundation

In `modal5.md`, axiom A1 was introduced:

$$A1 := \Box \neg \exists x \exists y \textit{FundamentallySeparated}(x, y)$$

Reading: There are no fundamentally separated realms of reality.

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

The Consequence: No Second Limit

From A1 follows **immediately**:

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

Proof: Suppose there were a second limit B alongside the Trinity $Tr = U \wedge T \wedge S$. Then B and Tr would be two fundamentally separated limits. This contradicts A1.

Formally: From A1 follows:

$$\Box \neg \exists x \exists y (\textit{Limit}(x) \wedge \textit{Limit}(y) \wedge x \neq y \wedge \textit{FundamentallySeparated}(x, y))$$

Since the Trinity is a limit, there can be no second, fundamentally separated limit.

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**?

What “Path to the Good” Means

The Formal Definition

Let T be Totality and S the upper limit of Totality (self-knowledge). A **path** in T is a continuous function:

$$\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow T$$

Explanation: A path is a parametrized curve through Totality. The parameter $t \in [0, 1]$ describes the “progress” along the path.

The Good as Limit

The **Good** is the upper limit S :

$$\boxed{\text{Good} := S}$$

Reading: The Good is that toward which all paths tend.

A Path That Leads to the Good

A path γ **leads to the Good** if:

$$\boxed{\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) = S}$$

Reading: The path converges to the limit S .

Metaphysical meaning: A path “leads to the Good” if, in the limit, it culminates in self-knowledge. This is not a moral judgment, but a **structural** property.

A Path That Does Not Lead to the Good

A path γ **does not lead to the Good** if:

$$\boxed{\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) \neq S}$$

Question: Are there such paths? This is one of the open questions of this treatise.

Evil as the Totality of Paths

The Central Definition

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

$$\boxed{\text{Evil} := \{\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow T \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) = S \wedge \text{Suffering}(\gamma)\}}$$

Explanation:

- $\text{Suffering}(\gamma)$ is a function describing the “suffering content” of a path.
- 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**.

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.

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.

Proof: Evil Is Not a Limit, but a Path

The Main Theorem

Theorem B-A: In S5+A1: Evil is **not** a limit.

Proof:

Step 1: From A1: There is no second, fundamentally separated limit.

Step 2: Suppose evil were a limit B . Then B would be a second limit alongside the Trinity.

Step 3: From A1 and Step 2: B and Tr would be fundamentally separated. Contradiction.

Step 4: Hence evil is **not** a limit.

q.e.d.

The Second Theorem

Theorem B-B: In S5+A1: Evil is a **path** or a **set of paths**.

Proof: Directly from the definition of evil as a set of paths. q.e.d.

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.

Comparison with Classical Theories

Privatio boni

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**.

Manichaeism

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.

Theosis

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.

The Point

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**.

What Follows? Evil Is Genetic, Not Ontological

The Central Insight

Evil is **not** a state. It is a **structure of becoming**. It is not **present now**, but emerges **in the process**.

Formal version:

$$\text{Evil}(\gamma) = \text{Suffering}(\gamma)$$

Reading: The “degree of evil” of a path is its suffering content.

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

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.

The Relation to Tradition

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.

Formal version: 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 .

Open Questions: 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.

Question: 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 of whether there are paths that do not lead to the Good remains **open**. It is the subject of **Modal 16** (Paths without Omega Point).

A Second Open Question

Question: What is suffering? How is $\text{Suffering}(\gamma)$ 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.

A Third Open Question

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.

Conclusion: What Has Been Shown?

The present investigation has shown:

1. **The Trinity is the only limit structure of reality.** This follows from A1 (monism).
2. **Evil is not a second limit.** It is a path to the limit — or a set of such paths.
3. **Evil is genetic, not ontological.** It describes a development, not a state.
4. **At the limit, evil is sublated** — not extinguished, but integrated.

The central claim of this treatise is:

The Good is the limit S . Evil is not its counterpart, but the inevitable evolution toward it — conceived in a multiverse of all possible paths. At the limit itself, it is sublated — not extinguished, but integrated.

The questions of whether there are paths that do not lead to the Good, how suffering is defined, and whether there is a suffering-free path to the Good remain open.

Appendix A: The Axioms in an Overview

Basic Axiom

$$A1 := \Box \neg \exists x \exists y \text{FundamentallySeparated}(x, y)$$

Definitions

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Path} &:= \gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow T \\ \text{Good} &:= S \\ \text{Evil} &:= \{\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow T \mid \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) = S \wedge \text{Suffering}(\gamma)\}\end{aligned}$$

The Main Theorem

$$\boxed{S5 + A1 \vdash \text{Evil is not a limit}}$$

Appendix B: Comparison with Classical Theories

Theory	Conception of Evil	Relation to the Good
Privatio boni	Absence	Lack
Manichaeism	Second principle	Counter-principle
Theosis	Transitional phase	Preparation
This treatise	Path to the Good	Evolution

Appendix C: The Three Open Questions

Question	Possible Answers
Are there paths that do not lead to the Good?	No / Yes, but unreal / Yes, and real
What is suffering?	Phenomenological / Structural / Informational
Is there a suffering-free path?	Yes / No / Open

Afterword

You have read this treatise. Perhaps the idea surprised you that evil is not a counterpart to the Good, but a path to it. Perhaps the consequence impressed you that evil is genetic, not ontological. Both are fine.

The investigation has shown: The Trinity is the **only** limit structure of reality. This follows from monism. Evil is not a second limit — it is a **path** to the limit.

What remains is the insight that evil is **sublated** at the limit — not **extinguished**, but **integrated**. It was necessary, but it is not eternal. It is the price of becoming — and becoming itself is the path to the Good.

One final question:

Do we dare the leap into openness to the limit — even though the path there leads through evil?

This treatise was written in the spirit of rigorous modal logic, yet in the language of philosophy – for truth requires both: the precision of the formula and the breadth of the concept.