

# RELIGIOUS PLURALISM

## and the TRINITY ABSOLUTE

### *the Soul of One God*

### *and a Universal Metaphysical Vehicle of Peace*

by Samuel Stuart Maynes

## PREVIEW

**Religious Pluralism** is a term used to designate more than just mutual acceptance and peaceful co-existence among different religions. The Integral Pluralist worldview is that the major religions are, to a large extent, just different ways of looking at the same God. Religious variety can be a wonderful source of cultural stimulus, when religious beliefs are looked at in a comprehensive context which recognizes the differences, but integrates their best attitudes in an inclusive framework.

Our world has a lamentable legacy of bloody wars in the name of religion and religious exclusivism. The challenge of relations among peoples of different religions has been made very clear by the Twin Towers event of September 11, 2001 and its global aftermath. Nevertheless, as religious communities and as growing nations, our futures are inextricably linked, being joined at the hip so to speak. We must develop a truly multi-cultural, multi-religious society in order to get along.

In the past, religious misunderstandings have caused immense grief, but civilization is rapidly approaching the point where the very survival of the world depends on overcoming anti-social religious conflicts, and the negative impacts of increasing population on the planet. The human race can no longer afford religious strife that divides people and disturbs urgent cooperation on mutual issues such as conservation and sharing of resources, combating climate change, stimulating healthy economic growth, etc.

Peace in the world requires peace among religions. *Integral* religious pluralism is a necessary paradigm shift whose time has come.

This book shows that an abstract version of the **Trinity** is an excellent metaphysical vehicle for a new form of Religious Pluralism that is systematically inclusive, universally moral, and highly synchronized with **the world's three basic underlying religious attitudes to the Absolute**; as well as totally unified, through the systemic metaphysical necessity of synthesis, and the principle of the unity of all truth.

In a constructive worldview: east, west, and far-east religions present a threefold understanding of One God manifest primarily in Muslim and Hebrew intuition of the **Deity Absolute Creator**, Christian and Krishnan Hindu conception of the **Universe Absolute Supreme Being**; and Shaivite Hindu, Buddhist, Taoist apprehension of the Destroyer (meaning also Consummator) – **Unconditioned Absolute Spirit** of All That Is.

Together with their variations and combinations in other major religions, these religious ideas reflect and express our collective understanding of God, in an expanded concept of the Holy Trinity, embracing three fundamental human attitudes.

The **Trinity Absolute** is an exciting new narrative of Religious Pluralism. A flag of peace through multi-dimensional unity, planted in an exhaustive analysis of past and present major religions and philosophies. **Religious Pluralism** based on the Trinity Absolute could be a providential paradigm for mutual understanding and world peace, just waiting to be discovered or rediscovered, and activated.

This is not a new religion, but a glorification and renewal of the old religions, demonstrating a natural *circumincession* or procession in the systematic unity of the core values at the spirit-heart of all the major religions of the world. Jesus came to proclaim spiritual liberty, encouraging free personality and spiritual originality, within the broad limitations of spiritual unity. Christianity and Hinduism have brought us a basically threefold multi-dimensional concept of God. But, just as Jesus/Krishna may be regarded as the universal Supreme Being, so Buddha/Lao Tzu may be seen as apostles of the mysterious Holy Ghost or Infinite Spirit, and Muhammad/Moses as messengers of the almighty Creator.

Integral religious pluralism is epitomized in the view that all major religions are just different perspectives on the same God. This research paper documents ample evidence to show that, in an expanded understanding of the Trinity, this common sense idea is quite true. For the sake of all, it deserves to be taken seriously, as a potential blueprint for peace, whether or not we can ever really “prove” that it is true. As the great idealist philosopher Immanuel Kant put it, practical reason requires us to “act as if God exists.”

For it is not God (whose will it may however be), but *pure reason* that gives us the prime moral directive, which boils down to: **Act only as you would have everybody act.** At the same time, *practical reason* tells us that it is only from the rational systematic unity of One God (creating all humankind equal); that we know unequivocally that morality must take a universal view.

Check It Out! Let’s give **peace** a chance. Perhaps, we have nothing to lose but our inconsistencies. Please leave your thoughts for the Bulletin Board on my e-mail at the end of this Preview, or on the Contact page.

## **DIVERSITY OF RELIGIONS ROOTED IN THE DIVERSITY OF THE DIVINE LIFE**

God seems to have manifested himself through several historic messengers. We’ve learned that no single point of view is the complete truth. However, there must be some metaphysical systematic unity in these teachings, because ultimately all truth (including science) must be part of the explanation of the creation, as we grow to understand it.

Pluralism claims that religious differences are best seen as the ways in which different cultures have perceived and interpreted those messages and representatives of God. However, the religions which have sprung from them are not necessarily the perception of many different Gods. It is rather more likely that the One and Same God may pervade most of them, casting multiple expressions of his multi-dimensional nature.

Religious pluralism is premised on the significance of real spiritual differences as a source of vibrancy and strength – same God, but slightly different flavors and distinct characteristics. Pluralism is the engagement not the abandonment of distinctions. Pluralism leads to a less myopic view of one's own religion. Other religions hold a piece of the puzzle called diversity. Pluralism looks for the musical harmonics of distinct tones in a symphony of beliefs, not uniformity, but a polyphonic melody.

Pluralism means diversity, genuine respect, interfaith dialogue, and accepting other major religions as valid/legitimate – not coercion, not compulsion, nor indiscriminate indifference to other truths. Religious variety provides a pleasant respite from the monotony of too much uniformity. Diversity is healthy and something to be celebrated. As well as being democratic, Pluralism also has the virtue of being a universal moral worldview.

Realistically, as the world becomes more and more religiously and culturally diverse, we will have no choice but to practice pluralism in order to avoid a “clash of civilizations” over what amounts to a possibly preventable and ultimately correctable misunderstanding.

At the dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, nature (climate change) and human events (religious and economic warfare) have reached a perfect storm. But, we need to “clean up our act” morally, before we can do it physically. In order to combat the breakdown of civilization, we need to curb endless cycles of heartless attack and ruthless retaliation, in conflicts over ideology. We need to construct or reconstruct, a new alliance of Religious Pluralism based on a “new deal” for the people of all major religions. This could be a religious and social contract of spiritual respect and freedom, based on the pluralistic spirit of One God evident in three natural groupings of mainstream religions, united in their underlying metaphysics.

Despite apparent differences, the fundamental similarities among religions strongly suggests the possibility that they may all represent merely different facets of one multi-dimensional cosmic reality. Then, by the *principle of the unity of truth*, all the diverse parts of truth must fit into a compatible whole. There must be some form of creative pluralism or constructive interpretation that will allow all groups to agree to a “minimal consensus” of shared beliefs in a systematic unity.

Mere toleration is too fragile a foundation for a world of religious differences in close proximity. It does nothing to unite people, and leaves in place the stereotypes and fears that underlie old patterns of division and violence. In the world in which we live today, our elitism and ignorance of one another will be increasingly costly. If the interactions of

society are to be at all a rational process, some set of principles must motivate the general participation of religious groups in the oneness of the community, without hindering the maintenance by each group of its own personal spiritual identity.

Recently, a number of theologians have suggested that the Trinity may provide the key to an inclusive theology of religions, and a new understanding of religious diversity. The doctrine of the Trinity can function as a metaphysical “architectonic principle” to unlock the providential purpose and meaning of religious variety, in the portrayal of the multi-dimensional nature of God.

A deeper understanding of the Trinity might include a synthesis of all that God has revealed of himself, as contained in the wisdom of all the world’s major religions. Thus, an abstract version of the Trinity could be Christianity’s answer to the world need for a divine structure and language of pluralistic theology.

If in the beginning, God said “Let us make man in our image” (Gen. 1:26); then later on, he might also have said “Let us *help humans* make their religions in our image.” Indeed, if the Trinity concept is correct, it is quite probable that the inspiration for different human religions reflects particular expressions of the triune identity of One God. On the face of it, God may be telling us something about his multi-dimensional self, through the diversity of major religions, which can be seen to fall into three basic attitudes to (or perspectives on) the Divine.

## **HYBRID PERSPECTIVES ON THE TRINITY**

Based on the abstract concept of Trinity given by Immanuel Kant’s classification of transcendental ideas, including the **unconditioned**, under “**three absolutes of unity**,” this overview presents a synopsis of related perspectives discussed in detail later in this Preview (see Comparative Views on the Trinity).

1) A Buddhist-Christian View highlights frequently quoted Buddha statements that Nirvana consciousness is “the **unconditioned** state,” to which he refers often in the “*neither one extreme, nor the other, but a middle*” way of speaking distinctive of Buddhists. Shows how this is analogous to the third idea or expression of the Trinity, which is “neither the Father, nor the Son,” but the unconditionally united Spirit of both.

2) A Zen-Taoist View further expands on Buddhism, bringing in the **undifferentiated** Tao or Great Way, which is highly comparable to the *unconditioned*. Suggests that this unconditioned third coordinate closes the metaphysical circle of creation, and thus the *Trinity is a philosophical inevitability*. Appeals to Zen *satori* “**Nothingness**,” or rather undifferentiated consciousness, as a mode of intuiting the mysterious third persona (the Holy Ghost), who is neither transcendent nor immanent, but “All That Is” (and is not).

3) A Quantum Physics View notes quantum theory and evidence of quantum fluctuations of “entangled” particle pairs, appearing sometimes *ex nihilo* (**out of nothing**), in complementary states such as: positive and negative, on and off, **1 and 0**, etc. These

combined states are only determined in a final measurement, which by entanglement rules also determines (reveals) their coordinates. Notes that the “*qubit*” (1&0) in quantum computing may represent the **undetermined** complement (neither 1 nor 0, but both), and suggests this is analogous to the Unconditioned dimension of the Trinity.

4) A Panentheist-Christian View defines panentheism as **all in God**. Argues this is what St. Paul was preaching about in the Bible (being “**in Christ**” not just in church). Names many recognized authorities who argue for concepts of the Universe Absolute Allperson, World-Soul, or **Supreme Being** (as the second person of the Trinity).

5) A Hindu View notes that major tenets of the Hindu religion are **highly analogous** to Trinitarian, Christian, and Panentheist views; as well as overlapping with Buddhism.

6) A Muslim View argues that statements in the Qur’an and Muslim traditions tend to confirm the Religious Pluralist view, and add to our understanding of the “second coming.” Points out that in the Qur’an (4:171 and 5:73), Allah through Mohammad **condemns not** the abstract concept of **One God** in the Christian Trinity, but rather polytheism and the ancient carnal trinity of Father/Mother/Son (see Qur’an 5:116).

7) A Religious Pluralist View notes that the Trinity Absolute is a systematic unity reflected in religions, demonstrated in science, echoed in psychology, and composed in Three Absolutes of Creation. Concludes that this abstract concept of Trinity is an excellent paradigm for a coherent understanding of One God, and potential world peace, expressed through *integral religious pluralism* – which is simply the view that major religions are just different ways of looking at the same God.

## AN ABSTRACT DEFINITION OF TRINITY

In his *Critique of Pure Reason* dealing with the fundamentals of metaphysics, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) gave an abstract definition of the Trinity which should have attracted much more attention than it has. Kant argued that all transcendental ideas arrange themselves in three classes or absolutes: (1) the absolute unity of the thinking subject – the *I am* or Primal Being; (2) the absolute unity of the series of an appearance – the manifold object or Supreme Being; (3) the absolute unity of all objects of thought in general – the **unconditioned synthesis** of the one subject and the manifold object of all appearances, i.e. All That Is or the Being of All Beings.

“All the relations of our representations, of which we can form either a concept or an idea, are threefold: 1) The relation to the subject (condition); 2) The relation to the manifold of the object in appearance (conditioned); 3) The relation of all things in general (**unconditioned**)... It follows that all transcendental ideas arrange themselves in three classes: the first of which contains the **absolute unity** of the thinking subject (the condition); the second the **absolute unity** of the series of the appearance (the conditioned); the third, the **absolute unity** of all objects of thought in general ... the thing (the unconditioned) which contains the highest

condition of the possibility of **all that is** capable of being thought.” Critique of Pure Reason – I. Kant, P.A333/B390.

“The manifold nature of things is only an infinitely various mode of limiting the concept of the highest reality, which is their common substratum... The object of the ideal of reason – an object existing only in reason itself – is also termed the **Primal Being**; as having no existence superior to him, the **Supreme Being**; and as being the condition of all other beings, which rank under it, the **Being of all Beings**.” Critique of Pure Reason – I. Kant, P.A578/B606.

Immanuel Kant seems to have been the first to articulate the concept of the **Three Absolutes of Unity** (Potentiality or Creation), and the first to define the Being of all Beings as “**all that is**.” Taken altogether in consistently abstract terms, Kant’s description of the three classes of transcendental ideas may be summarized as the relationship of three metaphysical absolutes of unity – the essence of the **Trinity Absolute**, i.e.:

1. That absolute unity which is the condition of a categorical synthesis in an *ideal* thinking subject – the Primal Being or existential **Deity Absolute** (transcendent).
2. That absolute unity which is the conditioned hypothetical synthesis in a series or sum total manifold object of all *mundane* appearances – the Supreme Being or experiential **Universe Absolute** (immanent).
3. That absolute unity which is the unconditioned disjunctive synthesis of the existential and experiential realms in a *systematic* unity of All That Is – the Being of All Beings. The ultimate **Unconditioned Absolute** (transcendent/immanent, spiritual/material being), or **Absonite** Consummation – neither **Absolutely** infinite, nor absolutely **finite**.

## THE TRINITY ABSOLUTE

The research gathered in this book shows how the major religions of the world map directly onto the Holy Trinity, when considered in the abstract absolute form it naturally exhibits; i.e. the Trinity Absolute. Indeed, One God is craftily hidden in his creation.

Trinity Absolute provides the most readily-available all-inclusive language for speculating on systematic unity in matters of metaphysics and religion. This abstract understanding is of some urgency, for a truly democratic settlement of this world into a universal civilization, constructed on the highest ideas and concepts of all our basic religions and cultures – our common world heritage.

These “divine ideas” are individualized, personalized and conserved in the concept of the three fundamental personae of One God, reflected in **the world’s three basic underlying personal mental and spiritual attitudes to the Absolute**. Taken in their over-lapping teachings, world religions articulate the members of the Trinity in an absolutely elegant, universally good, and truly beautiful portrait – the Soul of One God.

In a rational pluralistic worldview, major religions may be said to reflect the psychology of One God in three basic personalities, slightly different but potentially united in spirit, and universal in mind – analogous to the orthodox definition of the Trinity. In fact, there is much evidence that the psychologies of world religions reflect the unity of One God in an absolute Trinity.

We don't have to invent anything, because it is readily acknowledged that Allah, Abba or Father (as Jesus called Him), and Brahma are religious representations of the Creator. But the Creator is the first Absolute person of the Trinity of the thrice-personal One God. So in at least one respect, we can say that a large portion of humankind apparently worship the same God – the **Deity Absolute Creator** – reflected in three world religions: Islam, Christianity, and Hinduism. This pluralistic worldview becomes inclusive if you consider that Buddhism, Confucian-Taoism, Shinto, and some other major religions seem to be variations on the third Absolute, while certain others, e.g. Sikh, Baha'i, Zoroastrian, etc., suggest combinations.

The loving parallel between the Christian and Krishnan religions in their perception of the **Universe Absolute Supreme Being** (Son/Krishna) as the “gestalt” of personal consciousness – that allsoul, oversoul, or supersoul of all souls (“in Christ”) – which will be the Mahdi/Messiah/Maitreya, foreshadowed in the various religious teachings of the second coming, etc.; is too well-known to bear repeating. (Nevertheless, I try to recite it in new ways – see below).

Based on the three distinct psychological *attitudes to the Absolute* evident in religious teachings, it is possible to predict the eventuation of an ultimate “minimal consensus” of world religions on the conceptual identity of the Christian Spirit of the Holy Ghost, Muslim Angels and Jinn, Hindu Destroyer/Consummator, Buddha's middle way of the “Unconditioned” (Nirvana), and Lao Tzu's ultimate great way of the yin and yang (Tao) – even the **Unconditioned Absolute Spirit of Destiny Consummation**.

In taking onboard the Buddhist idea of the Unconditioned or undifferentiated, and the early-Christian idea of the Supreme or panentheism (both echoed in ancient Hinduism); we begin to see that in a rational pluralistic worldview, major religions *do* reflect the psychology of One God in three basic personalities, of exquisitely related spirit, and universal rational mind – analogous to the traditional definition of the Trinity. In fact, there is much evidence that the psychologies of world religions reflect the unity of One God in an absolute Trinity.

The **Trinity Absolute** is portrayed in the logic of world religions, as follows:

1. Muslims and Jews may be said to worship only the first person of the Trinity, i.e. the existential **Deity Absolute Creator**, known as Allah or Yhwh, Abba or Father (as Jesus called him), Brahma, and other names; represented by Gabriel (Executive Archangel), Muhammad and Moses (mighty messenger prophets), and others.

2. Christians and Krishnan Hindus may be said to worship the first person through a second person, i.e. the experiential **Universe or "Universal" Absolute Supreme Being** (Allsoul or Supersoul), called Son/Christ or Vishnu/Krishna; represented by Michael (Supreme Archangel), incarnated in Jesus (teacher and savior of souls), and reflected by others. The Allsoul is that gestalt of personal human consciousness, which we expect will be the "body of Christ" (Mahdi, Messiah, Kalki or Maitreya) in the second coming – personified in history by Muhammad, Jesus Christ, Buddha (9<sup>th</sup> incarnation of Vishnu), and others.

3. Shaivite Hindus, Buddhists, and Confucian-Taoists seem to venerate the synthesis of the first and second persons in a third person or appearance, i.e. the Destiny Consummator of ultimate reality – unqualified Nirvana consciousness – associative Tao of All That Is. This third identity is the absonite\* **Unconditioned Absolute Spirit** “Synthesis of Source and Synthesis,”\*\* who/which is logically expected to be Allah/Abba/Brahma *glorified* in and by union with the Supreme Being – represented in religions by Gabriel, Michael, and other Archangels, Mahadevas, Spiritpersons, etc., who may be included within the mysterious Holy Ghost.

Other strains of religion seem to be psychological variations mostly on the third person, or possibly combinations and permutations of the members of the Trinity – all just different personality perspectives on the same God. Taken altogether, these three *attitudes to the absolute* embodied in the world’s major religions give us at least two insights into the first person of this thrice-personal One God, two perceptions of the second person, and at least three glimpses of the third.

\* The ever-mysterious Holy Ghost or Unconditioned Spirit is neither **absolutely** infinite, nor **absolutely finite**, but **absonite**; meaning neither existential nor experiential, but their ultimate consummation; neither fully ideal nor totally real, but a middle path and grand synthesis of the proto-conscious and the super-conscious, in *consciousness of the unconscious*. This “3D Ultra High Definition” concept of the Holy Ghost gives a stereoscopic view composed of three colourful supporting images or expressions of the Holy Spirit, i.e.: the Hindu Destiny Destroyer/Consummator, the Buddhist “Unconditioned” Spirit of Nirvana, and the neo-Confucian Tao of All That Is (and is not) – synthesis of yin and yang.

\*\* This conception is so strong because somewhat as the Absonite Spirit *is a synthesis* of the spirit of the Absolute and the spirit of the Supreme, so it would seem that the evolving Supreme Being may himself *also be a synthesis* or “gestalt” of humanity with itself, in an Almighty Universe Allperson or Supersoul. Thus ultimately, the Absonite is their Unconditioned Absolute Coordinate Identity – the ***Spirit Synthesis of Source and Synthesis*** – the metaphysical Destiny Consummator of All That Is.

The above definition and personification of the **TRINITY ABSOLUTE** is refreshing because the Trinity concept and its reflection in world religions are discussed in universal terms unencumbered by specifically Christian dogma. Nevertheless, it is edifying because it ties in so well with the Holy Trinity expression of One God.



## THE SPIRIT OF RELIGIOUS PLURALISM

While admitting that it is a simple construct of pure reason, and that it is not even particularly original, I argue that this *new narrative of RELIGIOUS PLURALISM* has a certain logical inevitability to it, because it is the “only adequate metaphysical vehicle” for a much-needed new universal social contract of pure and practical reason. And also because it is based on a “constructive interpretation” of World Religions, using the very “core beliefs” which are affirmed in their *own* theologies, to demonstrate an expanded concept of the Trinity, which also rings true with psychology, philosophy, and science.

Why Trinity? – Because there is no other readily available adequate metaphysical vehicle to fill the need for a common language in religion and metaphysics. “The meeting of religions cannot take place on neutral territory or in a ‘no man’s land’ because it is scarcely possible to speak of these subjects from outside one or another tradition, for it is these very traditions that have the determining terminology.” (Raimundo Pannikar – Father of the triune conception of religious pluralism).

While admitting that I have deliberately selected evidence in support of a new image of Religious Pluralism in the Trinity Absolute, I contend that this Trinity is self-evidently coherent, consistent, comprehensive, and consummate – qualities which are usually regarded as a good test of closeness to true knowledge. Perhaps I’ve argued away many differences, and ignored some others, but I have not falsified the record, nor pushed the evidence into any shape it did not already want to go.

If the concept of One God embodied in the Trinity Absolute is true, then it should be able to stand on its own feet with the necessary breadth and *gravitas* to provide what Plato called a sufficient “rational account” (what Kant called a transcendental deduction), explaining even creation *ex nihilo*. But the Trinity Absolute *is* creation out of nothing but the idea or “notion” of itself in the three Absolutes of potentiality, and their reflection in human psychology, philosophy, religion, and science! *Ergo*, it very well could be the necessary metaphysical formula philosophers have been looking for.

“Made in God’s image” is the answer to the need for systematic unity, rational integrity, and an adequate vehicle of creation. From Kant we know that all the “transcendental concepts of the understanding” can be subsumed under three “absolutes of unity,” as he called them; and we take it from Hegel that the Absolute is the highest of its kind, and the highest of all kinds is God.

Jung (the panentheist) maintained that we are all related as brothers and sisters of a “common” inner experience – part of what he called the “collective unconscious.” Freud (the atheist) confused the collective unconscious even superconsciousness of the Allsoul, with the *conscience* of the individual, which he misnamed the superego.

However, the indwelling “superego” must be something like a prepersonal spirit “thought adjuster,” not another ego trying to dominate or usurp the human personality. Therefore,

it must not be confused with the personality of the Supersoul. It is the spirit that advises the individual personal ego. It is a spark of the Holy Spirit, as well as of the Allsoul (who inform each other); and an overplus of the spirit of the Deity Absolute, who is the primal creator personality (with whom they resonate).

As an ultimate metaphysical necessity of unity, this indwelling superconscious pre-personal spirit endowment is essentially part of the subtly different but united spirit that is present not just in the Deity Absolute, nor only in the Supreme Being, but “conjointly” in their Unconditioned Spirit, and “corporately” in their Trinity.

I reason that, “For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God... by adoption,” (Rom. 8:14/15), then possibly my indwelling spirit is seeking personalization as some sort of new and original sub-divine correlate, of human participation in the Supreme Oversoul of all souls. Other times I feel the spirit of the Father, and sometimes the Spirit of both Son and Father together, as a single spiritual entity. And then, I see all three together in the Trinity of One God.

This was the Roman Stoic ideal of trying to find God and be like Him, later subsumed into early Christianity, but subsequently almost forgotten. Never entirely eclipsed, this idea has recently been called Panentheism (all in God), and propounded most brilliantly by Whitehead and Hartshorne, in connection with the conception of the World-soul or Allsoul as virtually identical with the supersoul or paramatman of the Vedic scriptures from ancient India (and other insights of “process panentheism”).

My contribution has been merely to sort the teachings of the major religions into the three consistent groupings, suggested naturally by the preponderance and interconnectedness of their corresponding evidence, of an underlying unity. Of course, I went down many blind alleys, and kissed a lot of frogs, before arriving at a full-blown concept of the Trinity Absolute. But what began as a more or less random search for evidence of unity, led eventually to a highly articulated, systematic, existential/experiential/unconditioned, triune metaphysical principle (and a library of evidence for it).

Starting with an abstract definition of the Trinity, I knew I was onto something, when it began to bear fruit in my studies, leading to an understanding of new (to me) systematic levels of both differentiation and integration, out of and into primordial pure practical reason, reflecting on religion, philosophy, psychology, science, and all that is.

I discovered that destruction is joined with consummation in Shaivite Hinduism – Siva – the Destiny Destroyer/Consummator. Then, I realized that the whole Zen/Greek dialogue about what Buddha called the “Unconditioned” state of Nirvana (neither being, nor not-being, but becoming – neither condition, nor conditioned, but unconditioned – neither one nor many, but all) is entirely analogous to the Christian Spirit or Holy Ghost; who is neither the spirit of the Deity Absolute, nor the spirit of the Supreme, but their glorified Consummate Spirit of All That Is “proceeding” from them both.

At the same time, I could see how tightly these teachings fit with the Neo-Confucian Tao (Way) of the yin and yang, and how the Tao equally differentiates as well as encircles (integrates) the thesis and antithesis, in their synthesis.

As I found more and more confirmation in books of philosophy and religion, I began to think that God is telling us *something systematic* in all the revelations, and glimmers of revelation, which he has inspired in us down through history. And then, I was swallowed by the subject I set out to study. I'm still trying to express what this "something systematic" is, but I am also drawn to the "mechanics" of becoming worthy of fuller participation in the Allsoul, and what that means (see e-mail Contact button at the end of this book preview).

All major religions and creation itself cohere in the Trinity of the three Absolutes of creation: Deity Absolute Creator, Universe Absolute Supreme Being, and Unconditioned Absolute Spirit. The Trinity is One God, universal in mind and united in spirit, but especially personalized in three *dramatis personae*, faces, phases, facets, expressions, counterparts, co-relatives, cohorts, co-partners, coordinates, or manifestations.

Again, the Trinity Absolute includes not just the spirit of the Deity Absolute, nor only the spirit of the Supreme, but also their Glorified Holy Spirit – originally precessing in, and ultimately proceeding from, their undifferentiated consummation. As already pointed out, the resolution of this "neither/nor" dichotomy may also be seen in the mystery of the Destroyer/Consummator, the "Unconditioned" state of Nirvana, and the Tao of yin/yang.

This abstract formulation of the Trinity is not just the Supreme Being, nor only the Absolute Creator, but also their Ultimate Spirit – all united in a threefold creative *perichoresis* "dance" or procession of joyously shared metaphysical creative necessity.

If we are entitled to speculate that one of the strongest expressions and greatest satisfactions of the **Deity Absolute** is "loving and being loved" by his co-equals in the Trinity, and his many "children by adoption;" then, as a matter of rational consistency (for our own, as well as for God's sake), we must postulate that the Trinity Absolute (or something very like it) approaches true knowledge of the Divine, manifest in a universal idea, upon which we all can stake our moral lives.

We must reciprocate (validate) by at least acting "as if" God's spirit-life is in us, and we are evolving actors as part of His/our Supreme Allsoul, as well as involved participants in the eventuation of Their/our ultimate destiny consummation. At least we can take some satisfaction in being on a universal "path with heart," even if perchance we don't personally reap in this life, the harvest of good providence, for which our commitment entitles us to hope.

Muslims and Jews seem to have a mutual psychological proclivity and preference for what can only be called the **Deity Absolute Creator**. Some fundamentalist Christians also believe in the absolute monarchy of *God the Absolute* – envisioned as the one and

only Creator God, to whom all other beings are merely secondary “modes” or subordinate representatives, at best.

The believers in this fundamentalist view of what is admittedly a “multi-dimensional” God, should be encouraged to continue worshipping the person of the Deity Absolute or Creator. But at the same time, they must be asked to acknowledge that Trinitarian Christians and Krishnan Hindus can also worship *Him* through devotion to *His* second persona – the Universe Absolute Supreme Being or Allsoul Preserver.

They should also be asked to recognize how well this fits with worship or homage directed to expressions of *Their* mysterious third persona – the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit – envisioned by Shaivite Hindus as a personal Destiny Destroyer/Consummator spirit, and by Buddhists as the neither personal nor impersonal Unconditioned Absolute spirit, and then again by Taoists as the pre-personal spirit of the Tao of All That Is. Different views – Same God.

The abstract Trinity Absolute is a philosophical inevitability, and a Christian rock on which to anchor religious pluralism. It is intuitively acceptable to far-eastern religions, but not yet rationally absorbed by middle-eastern monotheisms. Many fundamentalists cannot get over the elementary contradiction to unity presented by the Trinity’s thesis (Creator) and antithesis (Universe Supreme Being); nor conceive of their synthesis (Unconditioned Spirit Consummation); nor entertain the systematic unity of all three, as a metaphysical necessity of creation.

“Monarchism,” in the form of over-identification with the imposingly awesome Deity Absolute seems to be a natural psychological *attitude* of many Muslims, Jews, and some fundamentalist Christians (*submission and reverence*). This attitude has its counterpoint in the pronounced proclivity of many Christians, Krishnans, and others towards “devotionalism” or bhakti, rendered primarily to the apparently almighty Universe Absolute Supreme Allsoul or Supersoul (*love and rationalization*). Similarly, Shaivite Hindus, some Buddhists, Taoists, and others seem to venerate primarily the mystery of the seemingly ruthless Destiny Consummator, the indefinable Unconditioned Absolute, and the unspeakable Unqualified Tao or Spirit of All That Is (*respect and acceptance*).

These three attitudes or modes of religious belief and worship – fundamentalism or monarchism (God is One), devotionalism or pan~~e~~ntheism (All in God), and mysticism or pantheism (All is God) – are quite righteous and laudable views when taken in moderation, with respect to each other; but quite insupportable when taken exclusively and unblended.

Fundamentalist Christians, Muslims, Jews, and others must be asked to recognize the equal validity of other personalized views, which answer the metaphysical necessity that, in addition to subordinates and created beings, Allah or Yhwh must have at least two co-eternal, co-creative, co-equals. These can be called *His* universal absolute being, and *Their* unconditioned absolute spirit, because that is true in a personal sense. However, the fact is that the minimal necessary concept of cosmic creation *ex nihilo* is based on the

interplay of three absolute dimensions of potential creative force (the three Absolutes of potentiality or creation), i.e.: the Deity Absolute, Universe Absolute, and Unconditioned Absolute.

This book shows that each of the major religions relates closely to one or the other of the members of the Trinity, such that an abstract concept of Trinity is an excellent paradigm for a coherent understanding of One God expressed through **religious pluralism**. When documented in detail, characteristic religious attitudes of parallel identification with individual persons of the Trinity are clear and distinct, which is usually regarded as a good test of truth. The rational goodness, moral attraction, and potential beauty of a system of belief that incorporates the best in all religions strongly suggests that such a comprehensive outlook avows multi-dimensional knowledge of God.

Meeting the demands of metaphysical science, this research paper demonstrates that there *is* a wonderful systematic unity to be found in the world's major religious reflections of God. Embracing also psychology and physics, this abstract conception is consummate, consistent, and coherent.

As a point of departure, this “constructive interpretation” presents a brief synopsis of new or renovated proofs and disproofs of God, reconciled and synthesized in a sublime proof, backed up out of all the most respected authorities, in the most inclusive philosophical research paper of its kind. The result is a well-rounded distillation of relevant philosophy packed into a curious and highly provocative construct of intellectual work, pointing to a definitive explanation of heaven, earth, and all that is – a **“new narrative” of religious pluralism**.

Absent any better idea, it would seem that this TRINITY ABSOLUTE concept of One God in three phases or personae is **the only adequate metaphysical vehicle** necessary and sufficient for a real form of religious pluralism that is more than just lukewarm toleration and talking past one another.

Religious Pluralism in the form of the Trinity is not trying to abrogate, but rather to assist all religions in metaphysically connecting and uniting their individual and collective ideas of God; so that they may rationally include themselves more fully in a multi-cultural community committed to universal values.

All religions can deepen their own understanding and strengthen their own communities, by looking at themselves and each other as different but related images of One God – multidimensional and manifest in the Trinity Absolute.

The ubiquitous triad, so notable in all the dimensions of physical nature, remains merely a curious coincidence, and a subject of mysterious mystical superstition; until clearly analogous relationships to world religions and human psychology are properly appreciated, completing the triune exposition, in all its natural significance.

The liberating concept of world religions as reflections of the members of the Trinity Absolute (and their variations or combinations) finds considerable support when the evidence is examined closely. The claim that pluralism is a metaphysical “blueprint for peace” is a logical truth, assuming that a pluralistic unity is possible, and not absurd.

The suggestion of a parallel between the personal relationships of the members of the Trinity, and the threefold psychological nature of the human soul is an illuminating reciprocal insight, with vast implications for the understanding of both God and humankind (assuming that humans are patterned on God). The *perichoresis* or intimate interplay of the three elements of the soul – personality/mind/spirit – is a logical extension, in analogy to the traditional Christian inspiration of the dynamics of the Holy Trinity. This breaks up the otherwise myopic “modalistic” view of these relationships.

The claim that this internal makeup of the human soul is part of the “only adequate metaphysical vehicle of creation” is elegant in its simplicity and outrageous in its implications of unity in plurality, up to and including all that is.

The Trinity is united in spirit, universal in mind, and three in personality.

God’s nature reveals itself in the dynamic relations among the divines – the joyous parade and fascinating pageant of the free persons of the multi-dimensional Trinity, in a fellowship of interpenetrating personality interaction, and mutual threefold creativity.

The Trinity Absolute is about freewill religious and political pluralism, not exclusivism. Not one religion, but one world. Not one way, but one God. Not globalism, but internationalism. Not ghettos, but true multiculturalism. **Religious pluralism**, democracy, and a reformed (no-veto or limited-veto) United Nations under universal law (or something very like it) must be made to work. There is no practical substitute for building on what we’ve got, and good free will is all we need.

Like the individual personae of the Trinity, modern nations have the dignity of freewill persons in relation to each other, even though they depend ultimately on each other, being joined at the hip, so to speak. Some respect and reasonable accommodation are required.

If the threefold human soul – personality/mind/spirit – is modeled on the Trinity, then individual humans may inevitably have an innate predisposition to worship any one, any combination, or all of the persons of the Trinity. Some toleration is required.

The Bible says that there is no way to the Father, except through the Son, and implies that Jesus Christ will be the Supreme Judge of all human beings on “Judgment Day.” However, it would only be fair if Christ shares that judgment seat with Muhammad or the Mahdi in the case of Muslims, Indra or Krishna for Hindus, Gautama or Maitreya for Buddhists, Lao-Tzu for Taoists, and so forth. Some just recognition is required.

Christians believe that a spark of the divine spirit of God indwells all humankind, and this is essentially the same spirit that is in the Father, in the Son, and glorified in the Holy

Spirit of Father and Son. The Qur'an agrees that "the spirit of Allah is closer to you than your jugular vein." Hindus call it the "Purusha." Buddhists refer to it as the "Unconditioned." Neo-Confucians call it the "Tao." Spirit is the glue that binds.

**Unity in religious plurality** does the seemingly impossible – it "squares the circle" in a triumph of pure and practical reason, basing the necessary metaphysical foundation of itself on the various existential relationships of the Trinity, which are ultimately made out of nothing but the rational notion of each other, and the loving goodness of their being.

Together with the testimonies of philosophy, and the birthmarks of physical science; the arguments from echoes in psychology and reflections in world religions define and demonstrate the existence of the Trinity of One God, for most practical purposes.

Meditating on the existence and nature of God, human reason naturally and inevitably rises to a divine concept of universal pure practical moral duty, which requires freewill, and can only be perfected in a sequence of lives, with the help of God.

Includes, but is by no means limited to, the traditional interpretation of the Christian Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in an expanded conception. More than just a rational construct, **the systematic unity of this comprehensive worldview** authorizes us to stake our lives on the principle of universal morality – the one categorical imperative or Golden Rule (reconciled with universal utilitarian consequences) – and the three postulates of practical reason: freewill, God, and immortality.

## COMPARATIVE VIEWS ON THE TRINITY

### 1) A Buddhist-Christian View – the "unconditioned"

By equally specious or fair-seeming arguments, the existence of God may be both proved and disproved. By the basic logic of the law of identity, contradiction, and the excluded middle: A is A, and thus the proposition that A is not-A is a contradiction which excludes any middle ground. The law is A and not-A cannot both be true at the same time and in the same respect. But this implies that A and not-A may both be true at different times, or even more significantly, at the same time in different respects, and thus the "middle" may not be entirely excluded.

For example, despite the obvious apparent contradiction, physicists have found that in some respects light may be regarded as a wave, subject to diffraction phenomena; and in other respects light behaves like a stream of particles, subject to quantum mechanics. Many believe that these two opposing views will eventually be united in a "grand unified theory of everything," which will resolve all such great dichotomies.

In general, thesis and antithesis may be reconciled in synthesis, unity and plurality are combined in totality, form and substance are conjoined in existence, etc. Likewise, the extremes of theology and physics – God and not-God – may both be true explanations of the cosmos, when looked at from different points of view. Similarly, the Neo-Confucian

Tao or “Great Way” harmonizes the opposites of yin and yang, and the Buddhist “Middle Path” avoids the existential extremes (**neither being, nor not-being**).

“Everything exists: That is one extreme. Everything does not exist: That is a second extreme. Avoiding these two extremes, the Tathagata (Buddha) teaches the Dharma via the **middle**.” Samyutta Nikaya (SN 12.15), Kaccayanagotta Sutta: On Right View – translated by Thanissaro Bhikku.

The Middle Way is the noble eightfold path to Nirvana. In the Itivuttaka Sutta (Iti 44 – Nibbana), Buddha calls **Nirvana** consciousness “the **unconditioned** state.”

“Bhikkus, I will teach you the **unconditioned** and the path leading to the **unconditioned**.” Majjhima Nikaya (M 119), Kayagatasati Sutta, Satipatthana – translated from the Pali by Piya Tan.

“Among what is **unconditioned**, Nirvana is the highest to reach.” With Buddha. CNP (Catukka Nipata Pali).

The Nirvana Sutras of Gautama Buddha state that it (unconditioned Nirvana) is the “end of stress.”

“My mind has attained the **Unconditioned**. Achieved is the end of craving.” Dhammapada (Udana Vatthu) Jara Vagga – translated by N. M. Thera in Dhammapada: a Translation, P.154.

“ O Bhikkus, there is an unborn, ungrown, **unconditioned**. Were there not that unborn, ungrown, unconditioned, there would be no escape from the born, grown, conditioned. Since there is the unborn, ungrown, **unconditioned**, so there is escape from the born, grown, conditioned.” Udana 8.3 – translated in What the Buddha Taught – W. Rahula, P.37.

“One attains Enlightenment by gradually detaching the mind from the conditioned and directing it towards the **Unconditioned**... Nirvana consists in the absolute cessation of all such discriminations, and realization that **undifferentiated** and homogeneous Emptiness, Suchness, Sameness may be variously denominated (Ultimate) Reality.” A Survey of Buddhism – B. Sangharashita, P.258/9.

The Middle Path to the Unconditioned – also known as the Great Way (Tao) of the Spirit – is neither thesis nor antithesis, but their transformed, transcendental/experiential consummate synthesis; neither one nor many, but **all**; neither condition nor conditioned, but **unconditioned**, neither differentiator nor differentiated, but **undifferentiated**.

“Manu says in his Smriti: In the beginning all this existence was One **Undifferentiated** Mass of **Unmanifestedness**, unknown, indefinable, unarguable and unknown in every way. From this (primordial nothingness or non-existence)...



arose the Universe of name and form, through the medium of the Self-existent Creator.” Discourses/Articles – Swami Krishnananda, P.3.

When asked to describe Nirvana, Buddhists launch into a series of negations to which there are always opposed affirmations. For example, the Unconditioned is neither coming nor going, but both coming and going; neither arising nor passing away, but both; neither form nor matter; neither transcendent nor immanent; neither divine nor mundane, etc. Avoiding extremes, Buddha teaches the Dharma of the “Middle” bracketed by antinomies or opposites.

“In Mahayana Buddhism, final nirvana is both mundane and transcendental, and is also used as a term for the **Absolute**.” A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms – W. E. Soothill & L. Hodous, P.328.

“Finally, the Bodhisattva (ascended master) on his Path cognizes the unreality of all the separate elements of existence, which are intuited by him as merged in the unique **undifferentiated Absolute**.” Buddhism edited by R. A. Gard, P. 43.

Ultimately, nothing can be said directly about the unconditioned without to some extent conditioning or qualifying the unqualified. This is why Buddhists sometimes refer to the unconditioned state as emptiness or **nothingness**. Sometimes, Buddhists and Christians get around this metaphysical paradox by way of the *via negativa*. For example, the “middle” may be said to be neither being, nor non-being, but becoming; neither the one same, nor the many other, but the essence of all; neither **absolutely infinite** nor **absolutely finite**, but **absonite**.

Neither wholly transcendent, nor strictly immanent, the middle path is illuminated by the Spirit of both, as echoed in the Tao or great way of All That Is.

Similarly, the Christian Holy Spirit is said to be “neither the Father, nor the Son, but only the Spirit of the Father and the Son” (St. Augustine). The glorified Infinite (absonite) Spirit is said to be “neither created, nor begotten, but **proceeding**” from both the Father and Son (Athanasian Creed). In its abstract absolute form, the Holy Trinity may be said to be the Creator, his Supreme Being, and their consummate Unconditioned Absonite Spirit – the mysterious Holy Ghost (the ultimate cohort) who is their Superspirit.

In Christian/Buddhist terms, it may be said that neither the Father alone, nor the Son by himself, nor even both together as one Absonite Spirit person; but only the Trinity is potentially infinite One God.

Apparently, the abstract laws of pure reason (e.g. mathematics and logic, including the laws of contradiction and sufficient reason, etc.) are immutable and eternal truths, existing before anything and after everything, made out of nothing but the power of ideas and the force of reason itself.

Just how and why this *existential* realm of transcendent ideas, and the material universe with its *experiential* realm of mundane consciousness, create and reflect each other remains to be fully explained. However, it would seem that the only adequate metaphysical source/destiny for their individual existence is their **mutual** existence in the synthesis of their *existential/experiential* “unconditioned” consciousness – their *ultimate* Spirit of Destiny Consummation. These three realms of consciousness may be called the **three absolutes of creation** – the primal proto-consciousness of the Deity Absolute Creator, the super-consciousness of the Universe Absolute Supreme Being, and the pre/post-consciousness of the unconscious or Unconditioned Absolute Spirit.

The **Trinity** is not a first state of self-conscious being, nor merely a second identity, but ultimately both; and eternally all three in thrice-self-conscious One God. Trinity knows only itself – there may be no other.

While the construction of ideas in this treatise may be viewed by some as the product or invention of a human mind, they seem to the author to be merely an evolving personal, as well as incipient social, **discovery of something that was always there**.

Similarly, some say that mathematics and logic are inventions of the human mind, while scientists and others, whose work is based on these laws and their demonstrated implications, almost always feel that their most coherent equations and best theories are **not invented**, but are valid extensions of the abstract laws of pure reason. They are true in a lasting sense, which exists both before and after their ‘discovery.’ In essence, they may be in fact, part of **everlasting ideas**, and form the metaphysical basis of a systematic unity which is self-sustaining and thus absolute.

However, in a Christian-Buddhist view, it seems likely that the approach to **ultimate truth** must be both created (invented) and discovered (as well as being neither merely created, nor exactly discovered); and/but **mutually** synthesized and otherwise eventuated, ultimately by the conjoined will of the Creator and the Creature, informing the Creation.

Buddhism, particularly the Zen branch, understands this as what Buddha called the “unconditioned state” – Nirvana – the original and ultimate source/synthesis or undifferentiated state of consciousness. Trinitarians point out that the Creation Inceptor and the pro-Created Supreme Being do in fact wilfully differentiate from that original source, which is merely a chaos of potential energies, with no distinctive will or particular character of its own, pending their self-realizing action.

Until co-sponsored by their consciousness of themselves and each other, in their ultimate synthesis: the co-creation (with its Creator-spirit and its Creature-spirit melded in their unconditioned Conjoined Spirit of All That Is) may be said to be “nothing.” The original Source is only a potential something, until invested by the original Creator in conjunction with his Creatures – whom he sets free as co-Creators – in actualization of their systematically unified dream of Destiny Consummation, “proceeding” from both.

As a personal Destiny Consummator, this **spirit of synthesis** sometimes seems so indefinable or “undetermined” as to be open to random chance and quantum uncertainty, as much as divine force. But its randomness must cancel out in the long run, leaving only the possibility of providential guidance, or nothing at all. But there *is* something rather than nothing!

This overlooks for a moment, the “many worlds” hypothesis of creation, which is so mystical, ghostly, and filled with *unnecessary* duplication of energy; that it would only be consistent with the suspiciously divine extravagance already witnessed frequently in nature and evolution. If nature really is only random quantum fluctuations, then it is impossible to account for the energy of the many worlds it would take to randomly produce our world, short of postulating the infinite divine goodness of a Deity Absolute, and his Supreme Being, melded in their Source/Synthesis of All That Is – the **Trinity of One God**.

By the principle of the dialectical synthesis of great antinomies or contradictions, it is logically necessary that from past-eternity, both of the ‘first’ two absolutes of personal consciousness must have been associated with each other in a third absolute coordinate dimension of reality including both. Their totality is neither personal nor not-personal, but pre-personal spirit consciousness, out of which they emerge, and into which they mingle and meld.

Preserving the law of the conservation of energy/mass, this totality synthesis acts as a reservoir of equilibrium or equipoise, constituting the necessary metaphysical source and sink of the individuality of the existential, and the plurality of the experiential, in their consummate identity. This “Spirit of All That Is” must be an active, breathing counterpart and vibrant counterbalance of the ideal and the real, compensating their development and growth with its own reciprocal and complimentary expansions, such that however large the system of polarizations becomes, the total energy always balances out to zero.

This closes the metaphysical circle of creation in a triunity of existential, experiential, and associative phases, manifesting each other out of nothing but the potential energy of the rational notion of themselves and each other, pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps, so to speak.

## 2) A Zen-Taoist View – the “undifferentiated”

Buddhist and neo-Confucian interpretations of the Middle Way and the Tao, always imply a third option between (or combining) two extremes – being and not-being mingled in becoming – yin and yang melded in the Tao – Deity Absolute and Supreme Being fused in their Absolute Spirit of **undifferentiated** Unconditioned Consciousness.

“Our two eyes see dualistically, and dualism is at the bottom of all the trouble we have gone through. This does not mean that dualism is to be abolished, only that there ought to be a third eye. The important thing is that the two eyes must remain, but at the same time there ought to be another... The third eye is not

between or above the two eyes – *the two eyes are the third eye*. The Awakening of Zen – D. T. Suzuki edited by Christmas Humphreys, P.31.

“Zen does not say that God is transcendent or immanent... (Only that) when we use our minds, we have to understand things dualistically – either transcendently or immanently. When I have explained that, there is nothing more to say. All that is needed is the opening of the third eye. When we have a third eye (absonite consciousness), it does not annihilate the two eyes....The transcendental and the immanent God exist at the same time. When they exist at the same time, you cannot say anything about them, i.e., affirm or deny one or the other.” The Awakening of Zen – D. T. Suzuki edited by Christmas Humphreys, P.31/32.

Superficial logic says that contradictory statements, such as the universe is infinite versus the universe is finite, cannot both be true. However, highly respected philosophers have shown that great dynamical antinomies *may both be true* in different respects. In this case, they could both be limitless or *absonite*. Indeed, in order to give a coherent account of all that is and is not, it has to be assumed that in the greatest of all contradictions, both sides *must* somehow be valid and true.

“We must not shut anything out, but try to reach the point where all distinctions are seen to be void, where nothing is seen as desirable or undesirable, existing or not existing... the enlightened man is capable of perceiving both unity and multiplicity without the least contradiction between them.” Huang Po quoted in The World of Zen – N. W. Ross, P68/9.

“In the higher realm of True Suchness (nirvana) there is neither ‘other’ nor ‘self.’ When a direct identification is asked for, we can only say, ‘Not two.’ In being not two, all is the same. *All That Is* is comprehended in it.” Bodhidharma quoted in Essays in Buddhism – D. T. Suzuki, P.201.

Nirvana (the Unconditioned) consciousness may be said to be neither personal, nor non-personal, but prepersonal (indwelling spirit) consciousness of the ‘unconscious.’ Ultimately, Nirvana is the absolute spiritual complement of the consciousness of the transcendental heavenly Deity and of the immanent worldly Supreme Being. It is a combination, transformation, and reconciliation of the duality of those two manifestations, synthesized in a third entity – their coordinate and co-equal Buddha Spirit. And thus, awakening Nirvana Consciousness makes three: – the Deity Absolute Creator, the Universe Absolute Supreme Being, and the Unconditioned Absolute Consummate Spirit of Nirvana or All That Is *and is not*.

“Zen, being practical, wants us to make the noble determination to give up our dualistic life for the sake of enlightenment and eternal peace... the ultimate truth, in which thesis and antithesis are concretely unified.” Essays in Buddhism – D. T. Suzuki, P.278.

In light of the ancient world-view, confirming the idea of the “ultimate” compound path of the **undifferentiated** Unconditioned Absolute; the dream of “enlightenment and eternal peace” is surely something at least supreme, if not divine – something positive, not empty or void, in the usual sense. If this Middle or Tao is neither thesis nor antithesis, then it must be a synthesis; and ultimately these expressions may be used to designate the totality of All That Is manifest in heaven and earth.

For Zen-Taoists, the key may be found in the *unconditioned totality* of the *divine and universal*, which is the third or synthetic dimension of the Trinity of transcendent existential Deity, immanent experiential Supreme Being, and their undifferentiated Unconditioned Absolute Spirit consciousness of “All That Is” (God is transcendent, immanent, and transcendent/immanent).

“The Tao is called ‘mystery’ or ‘mystery of mysteries’ (Chapter 1 of the Tao Te Ching), so it is at once **transcendent and immanent**... There are things which seem to be opposed, but in reality are complimentary, such as easy and difficult, long and short, high and low, in front and behind (Chapter 2).” Tao, Sages, Immortals: towards a Christian-Taoist dialogue – Fr. J. H. Wong.

The Tao or “Great Way” is conceived as the harmonization of yin and yang identified in positive and negative, or otherwise contrasting terms. In the Taoist symbol of yin and yang, the S-shaped line separating the black and white spaces may be interpreted as the Middle Path between opposites, while the circle that encompasses them both suggests their synthesis in the **Tao of All That Is**. Likewise, the black and white circles may be taken to represent a nucleus of the converse truth in both yin and yang, e.g. the affirmative buried in Buddhist negations.

“There is something **undifferentiated** and yet complete, which existed before heaven and earth. Soundless and formless, it depends on nothing and does not change. It operates everywhere and is free from danger... I do not know its name; I call it the Tao.” The Way of Lao Tzu – translated by W. Chan, Chapter 25.

Likewise again, in Christian Trinity terminology this is not the spirit of the Father, nor the spirit of the Son, but the mutually glorified Holy Spirit “proceeding” from them both, taken together – as one entity – personally distinct from his co-equal, co-eternal and fully coordinate co-sponsors, who differentiate from him, as well as mingle and meld in him. Christians sometimes call it the Holy Ghost – that mysterious third manifestation or expression, who may be conceived as the pre-personalization of the Absonite Spirit in *perichoresis* with the ‘first’ two persons of the Trinity fellowship, eventuating in the emergence of *their* ultimate Destiny Consummator.

In the ultimate analysis, antinomies may *both* be true in different respects, as the philosophers have shown. Plato perceived this truth as a mingling, melding, and fusion of the existential realm of the divine ‘idea’ with the experiential reality of the mundane world. Pythagoras and Plato saw it in mathematical terms as the All, which includes the One and the Many in their unqualified Totality of source and sink. In existential Trinity

terms, the spirit of the Creation Inceptor and the spirit of his Grand Architect of Supreme Being are fused in their Holy Spirit of potentially Infinite Destiny Consummation, which is neither the one same, nor many other, but their “mingled essence.”

The third dimension of consciousness is a synthesis of the first and second – their ultimate development, so to speak. However, it is just as true to say that both existential and experiential consciousnesses emerge, separate or precipitate, out of their unconditioned consciousness of the Unconscious – their primordial source (and ultimate sink). Presently, this “unconscious” seems to be neither an ‘idea’ (dream), nor a reality; but always on the verge, or in the middle, of both levels of consciousness.

Thus, in a sort of “dancing around” of the alternating perspectives, evident in human intuition of the Trinity, the **undifferentiated** or **unconditioned** All That Is may be viewed as the primordial Source or origin (and in this sense “creator”), as well as the ultimate Consummation or combination (and in this sense creature), of the Creator and the Created.

It is just as valid to say that the Deity Absolute Creator and his Universe Supreme Being create themselves and each other, by differentiating from their original source/synthesis. This entity is, was, and always will be their mutual Spirit persona – neither self-subsistent, nor begotten or created, but an eventuated destiny consummation, which is at once a past-eternal potential, and a future-unlimited *existential/experiential* third absolute of being, or state of consciousness. This dimension of cosmic consciousness may be said to be neither totally personal nor only impersonal, but is sometimes sensed as a pre-personal spirit “thought adjuster,” inspirational muse, and conscience indwelling the human soul, prior to fusion with that individual person.

“From the beginning, neither alone or not-alone, neither affirmed nor denied, upstream (and down-stream) of all duality. It is the primordial Being (of All Beings, including the absolute and the supreme, eventuating in their Ultimate Original Spirit).” H. Benoit quoted in *The World of Zen* – N. W. Ross, P246.

“In the beginning was the Tao. All things issue from it. All things return to it.”  
Tao Te Ching by Lao Tzu: A New English Version, translated by S. Mitchell, Chapter 52.

Evidently, the “Middle” of the Buddha and the “Way” or Tao of Lao Tzu *are* substantially equivalent to each other and to the “All” of the Platonic Trinity of the One, the Many, and the totality of All That Is. And this inclusive consciousness of the Unconditioned unconscious is the metaphysical synthesis, which closes the circle of pure practical reason, constituting the coordinates of the Trinity.

It appears that the consciousness of each member of the Trinity emerges out of nothing but the goodness of the rational notion of themselves and each other. Since some sort of conflation of ideas would seem to be the only adequate metaphysical vehicle of creation *ex nihilo*, the primal idea (concept construct) of **Trinity is a philosophical inevitability**.

If religious pluralism as an expression of Trinity is a genuinely good idea, it will eventually gain the acceptance it deserves.

For Zen Buddhists, “satori” (enlightenment) is the ultimate meditational goal of more or less sudden personal realization, and at least momentary awakening to cosmic consciousness of the unconscious – the “Unconditioned.”

“But this Enlightenment experience, the revelation of the (Unconditioned) Absolute Self, is beyond the dualistic way of thinking. We therefore naturally start by negating all those forms of dichotomy... we realize that each negation implies in it an affirmation...” The Awakening of Zen – D. T. Suzuki edited by Christmas Humphreys, P.92.

“When tranquility is firmly established, the inner conditions are at last favourable for the opening of *satori*, in which dualism is conciliated by integrating itself in a ternary (threefold) synthesis.” H. Benoit quoted in The World of Zen – N. W. Ross, P44.

“In one sense, *satori* is a leaping out of an abyss of absolute nothingness, and in another sense it is going down into the abyss itself. *Satori* is, therefore, at once a total annihilation and a new creation... destruction and construction are one.” D. T. Suzuki quoted in The World of Zen – N. W. Ross, P232.

Satori is sometimes said to be Sunyata or “Nothing” – neither divine nor mundane, neither God nor not-God, neither the one nor the other, and so on ad infinitum. Then, logically, this Nothing is either nothing at all (nonsense), or it represents the mutual Spirit of *both* unity and plurality, which may be thought of as the integration of both the one differentiator, and the many differentiated, in the **undifferentiated** totality of all that is. Thus, Nirvana may be seen as that total Emptiness or **undetermined** Nothingness out of which the dialectic emerged, and into which it is merged or mingled and melded – the Unconditioned.

We have the authority of one of the foremost Zen Buddhist writers in the West, Dr. D. T. Suzuki, that sunyata (nothing or the “empty” void) is also something *both* transcendental and immanent... experienced as *both* subject and object.

“*Sunyata* is not a negative term, as might be suggested, when it is translated as “emptiness” or “void”... The doctrine of *sunyata* is neither an immanentism nor a transcendentalism; if we can say so, it is both... *Sunyata* is experienced only when it is both subject and object.” Zen Buddhism – D. T. Suzuki, P.261/2.

“*Sunyata* (emptiness or void) is formless (unconsciousness), but it is the fountainhead of all possibilities (of consciousness).” The Awakening of Zen – D. T. Suzuki edited by Christmas Humphreys, P.55.

### 3) A Quantum Physics View – the “undetermined”

Hesiod called it the “Void” or “Chaos” out of which comes the prime differentiation of the One, and the Many, from the “All” – the totality out of which they initially emerge and into which they ultimately integrate. Plato called it the “Mingled Essence” of One Same and Many Other. More recently, the astrophysicist Sir Arthur Eddington defined it as “Undifferentiated Sameness” indistinguishable from boundless “Nothingness.”

“The whole Universe may have appeared out of literally **nothing at all**, created as a **quantum fluctuation** in the same way that quantum uncertainty allows a virtual pair of particles to appear and to exist for a short time before annihilating.” In Search of the Big Bang – J. Gribbin, P.372.

“Quantum fluctuations may have been very important in the origin of the structure of the universe: according to inflation the ones that existed when inflation began were amplified and formed the seed of all current observed structure.” Wikipedia explanation of quantum fluctuation – Google P.1.

Quantum fluctuations produce what physicists call “entangled” pairs of particles which behave as a *single entity*. The success of quantum computing and the **qubit** ‘1&0’ (neither ‘1’ nor ‘0’, but both); in a form of quantum “superposition” or consummation, would demonstrate the validity/applicability of **quantum entanglement**, which persists as a birthmark, no matter how far apart the particles become. By harnessing the power of metaphysical synthesis with an electronic blueprint, the qubit could exponentially increase the speed of computer computations, and achieve other possible breakthroughs.

A quantum computer achieves an exponential speed-up over classical linear computing by using the phenomena of superposition of quantum states in the electronics itself, as a variable representing the disjunctive “global” combination of the entangled opposites, or sides of a question. In qubit devices, the 1&0 is a compliment of the 1 and the 0, in a **superposition**, asserting the value of a disjunctive antinomical third coordinate (the aggregate or synthesis), without specifying the values of the disjuncts separately. This brings in quantum uncertainty, but gives systematic freedom grounded in synthesis (1&0) added to the dialectical perspective (1) or (0).

Because the undifferentiated (1&0) qubit always retains its own **undetermined** complementary identity, its ultimate value is only revealed in probabilities. The metaphysics of the triad of ‘1’, ‘0’, and ‘1&0’, ties in so well with the triads and trinities reflected in the words and worldviews of Buddha, Lao Tzu, Plato, Jesus Christ, Immanuel Kant, and others, that it seems to have the same coherent, consistent, and comprehensive basis.

The point is that 1&0 is neither 1 nor 0, but an **undetermined** third coordinate proceeding from both. It may be significant that this abstract formula is parallel to the traditional definition of the third person of the Trinity who is neither the spirit of the Father, nor the spirit of the Son, but the Holy (holistic) Spirit “proceeding” from them



both. Somewhat like the Holy Ghost, the qubit is neither totally ‘on’ nor only ‘off,’ but both – neither differentiator, nor differentiated, but undifferentiated – neither determiner, nor determined, but undetermined.

Perhaps quantum mechanics seems so mysterious because it relates closely to the infinite underlying formula (the only apparent adequate metaphysical vehicle) of creation – the Trinity Absolute. The secret of the Trinity may be discovered and disclosed in the *synthesis* of the third or unconditioned coordinate – the **undetermined** identity or “hidden” variable some physicists have been looking for.

Evidence of the power of quantum computing would validate qubit theory, and by implication support the concept of Trinity Absolute, as its possible metaphysical basis.

Modern radio astronomers have apparently found the background radiation left over from a sudden and definite “Big Bang” which occurred about 14 billion years ago. The idea of a sudden explosion of energy into matter fits well with what is known of the current composition and expansion of the cosmos. If the distance between galaxies is increasing today, everything must have been closer together in the past, and the universe may have begun from a point of infinite density.

“This event that marked the beginning of the universe is all the more amazing when one reflects on the fact that a state of ‘infinite density’ is synonymous with ‘nothing.’ There can be no object that possesses infinite density, for if it had any size at all, it would not be infinitely dense. Therefore, as astronomer Fred Hoyle points out, the big bang theory requires the creation of matter from nothing (but infinite potential).” *God: Readings in Philosophy* edited by T. A. Robinson. P.65.

Exploding from apparently nothing but the potential energy behind and power of goodness inherent in the idea of itself, balanced and cradled in the arms of the Trinity Absolute; perhaps the ‘seed’ of material reality suddenly appeared out of ‘nothing’, and began to grow and evolve, becoming the expanding universe we know today. Just as the abstract laws of pure reason (mathematics, logic, cause/effect, etc.) are immutable and eternal truths, existing before anything and after everything, made out of nothing but the power of ideas and the force of reason itself; so the concept of Trinity may be a past-eternal potential, and probably infinite.

#### 4) A Panentheist-Christian View – “all *in* God”

Based on the principle that great contradictory explanations of the cosmos, such as theology versus science – *God versus Not-God* – may both be true in different respects, and from the conception that opposites may be reconciled in their synthesis; it may be argued that some sort of consummation of religion and science in a theory of “all that is” would be the logical third coordinate of a metaphysical version of the Trinity (One God in Three personae, expressions, phases, facets, counterparts, manifestations, etc.).

Looking for that mysterious coordinate, one begins to notice that the psychologies of the major religions of the world map directly onto the Trinity. Logically, the threefold human soul may also be modeled on the Trinity – its only adequate metaphysical vehicle. Coincidentally, space, time, energy, and matter are all naturally three-dimensional.

A search for the Prime Creator finds that Allah/Abba/Brahma is the first person of God in three world religions – Islam, Christianity, and Hinduism. Other major religions seem to be variations or co-relatives of these three – not counter-examples, but exquisite and sophisticated permutations of the basic psychological expressions of Trinity.

A review of beliefs in reincarnation and resurrection leads to the idea of a Universe Absolute Supreme Allsoul personified by Muhammad, Jesus Christ, Buddha, and/or others. Some such systematic unity of resurrected incarnate personality seems to be the only adequate concept we can discover for the understanding of a truly Supreme Being.

If only half of what the Scriptures say about Jesus is true, then he would seem to be an incarnation of the Supreme Being. Muslims might argue that something similar can be said of Muhammad, and Buddhists might suggest Buddha (whom some Hindus identify as the 9<sup>th</sup> incarnation of Vishnu); while the Neo-Confucians might say Lao Tzu, etc.

These superb human beings are civilization's candidates for the title of that entity whom Kant referred to as "the whole of experience as an individual thing" – the Supreme Being. In human terms, such a conjunction of the consciousness of all individual humans would amount to an Almighty Universe Allperson – what the Hindus refer to as the Paramatman or Supersoul, what Plotinus called the All-Soul or World-Soul, what Auguste Comte called "le Grand-Etre," what Teilhard De Chardin called "the Greater Myself," and what Ralph Waldo Emerson termed the Supreme Being or Over-Soul.

The concept of the Worldsoul, Allsoul, Supersoul, Oversoul, etc. may be regarded as a form of *panentheism*, which is a composite of the terms "pan," meaning *all* or everything, "en," meaning *in*, and "theism," meaning *God*. "**Process Panentheism**" seeks to avoid either isolating God from the world as traditional theism does, or indentifying the world with God as pantheism does. Panentheism (all in God) embraces a synthesis (gestalt) of active free souls, in the process of discovering, reconstructing, and experiencing their mutual identity, mingled and melded in a Supreme Allsoul, creating a future that includes the past more intimately in the present.

Panentheism was espoused by Plato, further elaborated by Plotinus and accepted by the early Christian leaders, but later almost forgotten. Never entirely eclipsed, panentheism emphasizes God's immanence in the world, and the world in God ("For in him we live, and move, and have our being" – Acts 17:28), as a complement to God's transcendence of the world. Process Philosophy was founded by Alfred North Whitehead (1861-1947), and applied with resurrectionary intent to theology and the psychology of the World-Soul, by his students led by Charles Hartshorne (1897-2000), et al.

Like the Trinity (their only adequate metaphysical vehicle), human souls share in rational mind and divine spirit, but differ distinctively in personality. The threefold psychology of the human soul may be categorized as follows: We *think* about ideas or concepts with the non-personal **mind**; *intuit* things at first sight, with the aid of the prepersonal **spirit**, and *judge* concepts and intuitions through our **personality** (executive of the soul). It may be concluded that we *feel* values with the whole **soul** (which is part of the Allsoul), and the **self** *expresses* values as identity or personal character, through bodily acts of will.

Just as the spirit of the Father, and the spirit of the Son (as well as the indwelling spirit spark of man) are united in their mutual Spirit, so all human souls are united in the **Allsoul** of the Supreme Being – **Christ**. “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?” (I Cor. 3:16)

In the Bible, St. Paul tells us that as, “The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit (fused with indwelling spirit)... The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven... And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.” 1 Cor. 15:45-49.

According to St. Paul, union with Christ is union with God. “For as in Adam all die, even so **in Christ** shall all be made alive.” 1 Cor. 15:22. So, at the second coming (in the final resurrection) we are no longer “in Adam,” but then we are “in Christ,” and renewed creations linked with the life of Christ. The most important truth in Christianity is that we are made alive in Christ, signifying human souls becoming at one with God, without loss of individual self-identity.

It is said that in his epistles, St. Paul uses the expression “in Christ” and its various equivalents 165 times. For example:

“There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one **in Christ** Jesus.” Gal. 3:28. “Therefore if any man be **in Christ**, he is a new creature.” II Cor. 5:17. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are **in Christ** Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life **in Christ** Jesus hath made me free.” Rom. 8:1/2. Writing some years later, St. John confirmed that Jesus said, “At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and **ye in me, and I in you.**” John 14:20.

Were Paul and Jesus referring only to the future church as the earthly ‘body of Christ,’ which is the self-serving claim of some Christian theologians? Or were they alluding to the far greater truth of what Jung called the “collective unconscious” – the Allsoul of the Universe Absolute Supreme Being?

In the larger sense, Paul uses “in Christ” to characterize an all-inclusive personality, in whom believers find themselves incorporated in a communal union with Christ. It is a real connection, but not an absorption or obliteration, nor a ‘falling asleep’ in church. Being “in Christ” individually and communally manifests in personally significant inner

experience, of which the church should be a mutually supportive outer demonstration of universal spiritual unity.

However, with a few exceptions, organised religion is currently saddled with doctrinal intolerance, and distracted by traditional sub-divisions; as well as permeated by narrow-minded views without much mutual momentum or living attraction. At face value, too many religions and religious factions are scarred with crude superstitions, and marked by raw religious racism. Perhaps even more significantly, inner religious experience suffers from a paucity of concepts, to which Religious Pluralism seems to be the only readily available antidote.

Being “in Christ” is not simply a metaphor or figure of speech, but a coherent personal reality. Prayer and meditation leading to states of enlightenment and cosmic consciousness, samadhi, satori, nirvana (the unconditioned), etc., are all reputed to be channels of communication between the individual and the persons of the Trinity, including (very significantly for Christians and Krishnan Hindus) our participation in the Almighty Allsoul.

“Ephesians takes the ‘in Christ’ formula further than any other epistle in understanding it as indicative of a dimension in which the believer, paradoxically, has always been: ‘even before his existence in space and time; a dimension in which God makes available to him through Christ the realisation of the mysterion (spirit) and its consequences, one of which is the assumption of his allotted place in the Body of Christ.’” C. C. Caragounis, P.137.

In Ephesians, Paul indicates that God has made the life of Christ the inheritance of the human race. Our very life and identity is bound up in Christ’s identity as the Universe Absolute Supreme Being or Allsoul. For example:

“That in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one **all things in Christ.**” Eph. 1:10. “For we are his workmanship, created **in Christ** Jesus unto good works.” Eph. 2:10. “Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are **members one of another.**” Eph. 4:25. “For we are **members of his body**, of his flesh, and of his bones.” Eph. 5:30.

Christ said, “I am the vine, ye are the branches... apart from me ye can do nothing.” John 15:5. And as that metaphor suggests, you cannot tell where the branch ends and the vine starts because they are one plant, sharing one life together. God raises us up together and we become part of one person in Christ, the supreme personalization or incarnation of divinity.

Just as the head and members of a body are all parts of one body, believers are part of Christ, as sovereign head of the human race. “Know ye not that your bodies are the **members of Christ?**” (I Cor. 6:15). Being “in Christ” is synonymous with sonship to God. The Son is that in which the Father sees himself, and becomes more fully self-conscious.

“But speaking the truth in love, (we) may grow up into him in all things, which is **the head, even Christ.**” Eph. 4:13-15. “For as we have many members in **one body**... So we, being many, are **one body in Christ**, and every one members one of another.” Rom. 12:4/5. “For as the body is one: so also is Christ... For the body is not one member, but many.” I Cor. 12:12-14. “For in him dwelleth all the fullness of Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the **head** of all principality and power.” Col. 2:9/10.

What is potential and existential in the Father is actualized and realized in the Son. Our common unity “in Christ” means ontological union and operational union, i.e., union of being and union of doing – all in all.

“And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh **all in all.**” I Cor. 12:6. “...the fullness of him that filleth **all in all.**” Eph. 1:22/23. ...is above all, and through all, and **in you all.**” Eph. 4:6. “...that God may be **all in all.**” I Cor. 15:28. “Christ is **all, and in all.**” Col. 3:11.

If God is “all in all,” then all are one with God, or all are *in* God, but not necessarily all *are* God. If Christ is “all in all” then he is the Allsoul, synonymous with the Supreme Being; and then Jesus Christ *is* God (or rather part God and part Man). The Creator and the Allsoul are unified in mind and united in spirit, but differ in personality; and their mutual Spirit appearance or apparition (Holy Ghost) constitutes a third co-equal persona, related in the same way.

Panentheism agrees with pantheism in denying the idea, taught by classical theism, that the world is purely a contingent creation of a deity who could have existed apart from this or any other world. By saying, instead, that it belongs to the very nature of God to be in relation to a world, panentheism implies that, although our particular world is contingent (created), its most fundamental principles (body and soul) are necessary.

Among the notable theologians and philosophers who have espoused the doctrine of the Allsoul or panentheism are Plato, Plotinus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, Proclus, Justin Martyr, Diognetus, Clemens, Origen, Dionysius, St. Gregory, Erigena, Nicholas de Cusa, Auguste Comte, Emerson, William James, Whitehead, Teilhard de Chardin, Hartshorne, and others.

## 5) A Hindu View – the “Trimurti”

The Hindu Trimurti may be interpreted to be entirely analogous to the Christian Trinity. In these terms, the correlation of the three members of the combined Trinity may be said to be: 1) Brahma or Abba – the Primogenitor or Primal Creator; 2) Vishnu or Christ – the Preserver or Supersoul; and 3) Shiva or the Holy Ghost – the Destroyer or Consummator.

This analogy is complete because in the Hindu religion, Shiva is regarded not as a negative principle, but rather as an auspicious agent of positive transformation, cyclical

regeneration, and even progressive evolution. Shiva is the Destroyer only in the sense of destruction as the necessary prelude of renewal, death as part of the cycle of rebirth, and culmination as the inevitable overture of consummation. This destroyer/consummator concept is analogous to the neither/nor of Buddhism, and the yin/yang of Taoism.

In a variation on the Trimurti (Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva), the Hindu scriptures recognize a parallel triunity in more abstract terms, i.e.: 1) Bhagavan – Primordial Lord or original personality of Godhead. 2) Paramatman – Supersoul, universal self or Supreme Being, 3) Brahman – Ultimate Cosmic Spirit, the impersonal God, undifferentiated, all that exists, root source and final destiny consummation (sometimes said to be “What is and is not”). In this conception, Shiva is sometimes thought of as a personalization of the impersonal Brahman.

Consistent with Christian panentheism, the essential unity of all souls within the Paramatman (Supersoul, Supreme Being or Allsoul) is a fundamental postulate of the Hindu religion, which has long had a tradition that Lord Vishnu is the existential Supreme Being (God) and sustainer (preserver) of the universe, while Krishna is the 8<sup>th</sup> experiential incarnation of Vishnu. Thus, Krishna represents the World-Soul or the Self of all men when he says:

“O Lord of Death, I (Krishna) am the Self seated in the heart of all beings. I am the beginning, the middle, and the end of all (material) beings.” Bhagavad Gita 10.20.

The word Paramatman is formed from two words: Param, meaning supreme or highest, and atman, which means soul or self. Paramatman is the absolute Atman, the Atman of all atmans, the Universal Self. Also known as the Divine Self or Cosmic Person, Paramatman is both part of the individual and part of the macrocosm. The Upanishads compare atman and Paramatman to two birds sitting like friends on a tree (body). Atman eats its fruit (karma), but Paramatman only observes his friend as witness to his actions. The atman and the Paramatman become one and the same when the atman attains true knowledge of the Supreme Being.

In Chapter 13 of the Bhagavad Gita, the Paramatman is described as Krishna residing in the hearts of all beings and in every atom of matter. In Jainism, each atman or individual self is a potential Paramatman or God, but remains as atman only because of its binding karmic limitations. In Jainism, all enlightened souls are called Paramatman and regarded as incipient gods. Jainism honours the soul of each human being as its own saviour and distinct personality.

In addition to later Christian co-relations, because Buddhism was born out of ancient Hinduism, there are naturally many resemblances and overlaps or parallels between them, particularly in their attitudes toward, and the way they speak about “unconditioned” consciousness – Nirvana or Samadhi – as an ultimate undifferentiated state of enlightenment and bliss.

## 6) A Muslim View – the “One” God

It should be noted that the Quran says Mary was an “untouched” virgin when she conceived the baby Jesus, virtually conceding that his conception was miraculous, and that he therefore may legitimately be regarded as some sort of incarnation or “Son” of God (an illegitimate union of ideas in the eyes of some Muslims).

The Qur’an states that Jesus did not “die” on the cross. See Qur’an 4:157/8 where it says, “For certain, they never killed him. Instead, God raised him to Him” And this is true in the Christian sense in which God resurrected him on the third day, and he ‘lives’ on.

It should also be noted that there is an Islamic tradition that Jesus will accompany the “Mahdi” (a descendant of Mohammad) in the second coming, and unite the Muslim and Christian worlds. Muslims also believe that in the finality, Jesus is second to the Mahdi, who is regarded as directly representing the One (without a second). But this already suggests that Jesus Christ should be regarded as (representing) the Supreme Being (the 2<sup>nd</sup> persona of God in Christian terms).

In line with Muslim thinking, it may be speculated that when they (Madhi and Christ) both “return,” their united Spirit will be with them; and that will precipitate Judgment Day (which may take years in terms of remaking the world). The Mahdi (Mohammad with the spirit Gabriel) will articulate the principles of the new world order; and Christ (Jesus with the spirit Michael) will administer them. Their rule is forecast to result in eternal peace, brought on by the unification of religions in some sort of *integral religious pluralism* that resonates profoundly with human nature.

Finally it may be argued that in the Qur’an (4:171 & 5:73), where Allah condemns the teaching of three gods, he was referring **not** to the Holy Trinity of One God, but to polytheism in general, and specifically to the old Egyptian trinity of the divine Father/Mother/Son (updated as in Allah/Mary/Jesus) – just the kind of primitive and unfortunate carnal idolatry which Christians also reject. For evidence of this interpretation, see Qur’an 5:116 – “Keep in mind, when Allah will ask Jesus son of Mary; didst thou say to the people: Take me and my mother for two Gods besides Allah?”

We could conclude that both Mohammad (as messenger) and Jesus (as personification) reveal the nature of God. To all intents and purposes, they are absolutely coordinate reflections and the logos (words) of God – the absolute, supreme, and ultimate divinity. The Deity Absolute Creator, his Universe Absolute Supreme Being, and their consummate Unconditioned Absolute Spirit – the Trinity Absolute – is an expanded concept of One God, in a threefold creation presided over by Allah, governed by Christ, and inspired by the Spirit of both Mohammad and Jesus.

In fact, when you overlook the harsh polemics, much of the Qur’an may be interpreted in a manner consistent with the abstract Trinity Absolute, and even with the Bible itself, particularly the Old Testament (which has some pungent polemics of its own).

## 7) A Religious Pluralist View – the “Trinity” Spirit

The major religions of the world relate so closely to one or the other of the members of the Trinity, that an abstract concept of Trinity is *ipso facto* an excellent paradigm for a coherent understanding of One God, and potential world peace, expressed through **integral religious pluralism** – which is simply the view that major religions are just different ways of looking at the same God. Indeed, God is craftily hidden in his creation – the not-so-obvious, hiding in plain sight.

The incorporation of beliefs in both reincarnation and resurrection, the identification of the Supreme Being with Jesus Christ and other leaders, as well as the definition of the Unconditioned Absolute Spirit as All That Is, may be appreciated by many people everywhere. The Trinity Absolute is a systematic unity reflected in religions, demonstrated in science, echoed in psychology, and composed in Three Absolutes of Creation.

Jesus came to proclaim spiritual liberty – free personality and spiritual originality – within the broad limitations of spiritual unity. His religion of the spirit is the religion of personal spiritual experience.

It is said that opening to the indwelling spirit spark of divine consciousness can lead to contemplation and communication with the supreme consciousness of the Allsoul or Supersoul – the Son (and grandsons by adoption) of God the Father. For some, these persons of the Trinity may be more readily approached via that third coordinate persona which “proceeds” from them both – *their* twice-blessed, doubly-glorious, and ultimately-united consciousness – the Unconditioned Absolute (absonite) Spirit or mysterious Holy (holistic) Ghost.

This third manifestation is itself reputed to be approached through prayer, meditation, world-centric consciousness, and holistic integral religious pluralism; accompanied by flashes of universal cosmic consciousness, which *is* the “unconditioned state” talked about by Buddha. This third Absolute is their source and synthesis completing the Trinity, in what eventually becomes (inevitably is) personalized as the forever-emerging unlimited Destiny Consummator.

All three may be said to share divine reason (mind), and to be quite similar in spirit; but they are most individual in character, with each being a freewill personality whose actions are limited only by the metaphysical necessity of supporting each other in a systematic unity – the ‘soul’ of One God.

Just because world religions come in different spirit flavors, does not mean that they are necessarily irreconcilable. This book documents how the three spirit-persons of the Trinity are reflected in a threefold natural and inclusive ‘procession’ of all major religions. The persons of the Trinity are characteristically different, but they share rationality. Their individual spirits only seem to be opposed in world religions, but these may actually be persuaded toward divine unification, in some form of religious pluralism.



There is an underlying systematic unity of religions that becomes more and more clear as it is polished up, and examined closely. It not only maps onto the Holy Trinity, but also the Hindu Trimurti, and includes at least three related views illuminating the Holy Ghost, who is otherwise merely a baffling mysterious invitation to superstition.

When documented in detail, characteristic religious attitudes of parallel identification with individual spirit-persons of the Trinity are clear, coherent, and consistent, which is usually regarded as a good test of truth. The rational goodness, moral attraction, and potential beauty of a system of belief that incorporates the best in all religions strongly suggests that such a comprehensive outlook closely approaches true knowledge of God, in what may eventually turn into an almost universal consensus.

Kant's moral insight was that what ought to be, not only may be, but *must* be assumed, in order to reach the higher levels of creativity and morality, beyond romantic virtues. Once postulated more clearly and absorbed at least partially, the three 'rational accounts' of the Absolute may put human consciousness well on the way to closing the circle of creation in its own destiny consummation.

Many things seem to demonstrate or confirm that the concept of **Trinity Absolute** (or something very like it) not only ought to be, but *is* metaphysical closure in a good (even divine) systematic unity – the first axiom and possibly the only adequate metaphysical vehicle of creation – the ultimate pure/practical abstract “design” which many philosophers and scientists, architects and engineers, as well as idealists and believers on all sides have been looking for.

Since this exposition helps to reconcile most contradictions, religious pluralism, in an expanded form of Trinity, recommends itself as a good universal metaphysical vehicle of peace.

### **The Grand Trinity Absolute or “Trinity Infinite”**

Based on the detailed exposition of the Trinity Absolute contained in this book, and the latest scientific thinking, it is argued that in an expanded metaphysical concept, time is an illusion in some respects, and is ultimately circular (spiral) when looked at as a whole. Thus, from a human point of view, the **Grand Trinity Absolute** may be thought of as three snapshots of that same Trinity Absolute at different times or ‘ages’ of its expanding or unfolding consciousness, through what may be called a “Trinity of Trinities.” i.e.:

The **first age** is speculated to be the earliest epochs of the original existential Paradise Trinity Absolute surrounded by pre-experiential heaven, before the “Big Bang.” This is the infinite immutable eternal age of the perfect **Existential Trinity** – sometimes called the “Ontological Trinity,” i.e.: (1) the Deity Absolute Creator; (2) his Paradise Absolute Eternal Architect of Supreme Being; and (3) their Unconditioned Absolute Holy Spirit of Infinite Destiny Consummation.\* – All three joyously immersed in a dream-like *intelligible* realm of perfect original intuitive self-existence.

The **second age** is conceived to be marked by the sudden appearance of the expanding universes of time and space, followed by a long evolution towards supreme being of the material realm of mundane reality. This is the finite evolving current age of the supreme **Experiential Trinity** – sometimes called the “Economic Trinity,” i.e.: (1) the Deity Absolute of universal realization through the indwelling of his spirit, helping to perfect individual and world-wide morality; in conjunction with (2) the Universe Absolute Supreme Being (Allsoul or Supersoul); assisted by (3) the Unconditioned Absolute Absonite\*\* Spirit envisioned by some as the personal Holy Ghost or Destiny Destroyer/Consummator, and by others as the beyond-personal/impersonal cosmic consciousness of the Buddha Purusha (Spirit) or unconditioned nirvana consciousness. – All enthusiastically engaged in perfecting rational experiential consciousness of the *empirical* realm of reality.

The **third age** is expected to be the synthesis of the two ‘previous’ ages in an epochal age of ‘grand universe’ eventuation – a *consummate* fusion of intuition and reason in cosmic consciousness of the unconditioned. This could be a never-ending age of construction. Or the universe could expand so rapidly that it leaves virtually nothing, out of which the experiential Trinity may replicate itself again as before, until a stable equilibrium for the expansion of Trinity consciousness is achieved.

This is the future “third” age of the consummate **Absonite Trinity**, i.e.: (1) the Deity Absolute of ultimate self-realization through absonite experience, together in mutual fellowship with (2) the Paradise/Universe Absolute (Grand Universe Architect) Supreme Being or Oversoul; abetted by (3) the Unconditioned Absolute Ultimate Spirit envisioned by some as the ruthless personal Destiny Consummator, and by others as the inscrutable pre-personal Tao\*\*\* of All That Is (yin/yang). – All creative expressions of the divine progressing inexorably towards ultimate perfection, which is the original ideal perfection made more mature and replete by unfolding in universal consciousness, and actually associating physically as well as spiritually in the *absonite* realm of consciousness.

From the abstract point of view, this **Grand Trinity Absolute** or Trinity of Trinities is systematically unified in a timeless dance of threefold creativity, on a threefold stage of consciousness ranging from existential... to experiential... to absonite; from transcendent... to immanent... to holistic; and from divine... to human... to divine *and* human, i.e.:

1.0 Existential Trinity – pre-universe – intuition – ‘intelligible’ consciousness.

- 1.1 The Deity Absolute Creator of original self-determination,
- 1.2 His Paradise Absolute Eternal Architect of Supreme Being,
- 1.3 Their Unconditioned Absolute Holy Spirit of Infinite Destiny Consummation.\*

2.0 Experiential Trinity – universe evolution – reason – ‘empirical’ consciousness.

- 2.1 The Deity Absolute of universal realization via his indwelling spirit-sparks,

- 2.2 The Universe Absolute Supreme Being or Allsoul of the collective unconscious,
- 2.3 The Unconditioned Absolute Absonite\*\* Spirit of cosmic Nirvana consciousness.

### 3.0 Absonite Trinity – grand universe eventuation – intuition and reason – unconscious.

- 3.1 The Deity Absolute of ultimate self-realization via consummation with the Supreme,
- 3.2 The Grand Universe Absolute Architect or Oversoul of collective consciousness,
- 3.3 The Unconditioned Absolute Ultimate Spirit Tao\*\*\* of All That Is (and is not).

\*The Christian Holy Ghost/Spirit parallels the Hindu Destiny Destroyer/Consummator.

\*\*Neither *Absolutely* Infinite, nor absolutely *finite*; but *Absonite*, proceeding from both.

\*\*\*Using the Tao or “way” of Lao Tzu, to suggest a later ‘era,’ or future development, of Buddha’s “middle way” via unconditioned Nirvana consciousness, alludes to the fact that (even though they were of the same historic age, and taught variations of the same third person of the Trinity) the sophisticated teachings of the Tao, and the rich symbolism of its icon, are only now beginning to be rediscovered and appreciated. Buddhism, on the other hand is widely established, and when joined in future with re-awakening Taoism, the wisdom of these two versions of the Third Absolute should “ultimately” help close the circle of human understanding and realization of the strength of the Trinity in portraying One God.

The Absonite Trinity is a synthesis of the infinite eternal Existential Trinity, and the finite temporal Experiential Trinity – neither the one nor the other, but ultimately ‘proceeding’ from both. This absonite *ultimate* Absolute Trinity may influence humans directly and indirectly via a spiritual fusion of *both* the Divine and the Supreme in their Destiny Consummator Spirit of all that is – existential and experiential consciousness, united in consciousness of the “unconscious” – spiritually both transcendent and mundane combined in absonite unconditioned cosmic consciousness.

This Spirit of the Unconditioned (consciousness of the unconscious) is said to be available now in brief glimpses, through disciplined contemplation, focused dreaming, balanced yoga and transcendental meditation (prayer), progressing to satori (enlightenment), and moksha (liberation), capped by nirvana (unconditioned consciousness), direct knowledge, equanimity, bliss, etc.

The following highly personalized version of the **Grand Trinity Absolute** or Trinity of Trinities is hopefully only a slight distortion, in concession to human interest and wider understanding, constructed on grounds well-prepared by philosophy, psychology, and the world’s great religions, i.e.:

- (1) Allah/Abba/Brahma, (2) Muhammad/Jesus/Buddha, (3) Gabriel/Michael/Mahadeva.

The main difficulty with the Trinity is that you have to be careful how you say things about it, in order to avoid merely confusing issues. Invoking that spirit of careful rational

clarity, I hope you will find this book reasonably consistent and easily followed, if not totally true and entirely original.

Samuel Stuart Maynes  
Surrey, B.C., Canada

Posted to: [www.trinityabsolute.com](http://www.trinityabsolute.com), May 2017.

Please e-mail your comments or questions directly to: [stumaynes@hotmail.com](mailto:stumaynes@hotmail.com).

## INTRODUCTION

### ABSTRACT

1. Summary Demonstrations of the thesis that God exists and the antithesis that God does not exist are reviewed, and the logic or validity of their reconciliation in a synthesis of theology and science is explored.
2. It is noted that three (3) is the first common denominator and birthmark of space, time, matter, energy, human psychology, world religions, and One God.
3. One God in the form of the **Trinity Absolute** is defined in abstract philosophical terms, unencumbered by specifically Christian dogma.
4. It is argued that the major religions of the world reflect the persons or manifestations of the abstract Trinity Absolute, in dialectical terms.
5. It is argued that Trinity is the only adequate metaphysical vehicle for understanding the nature of the human soul, in psychological terms.
6. It is demonstrated by summary quotations that a reflection of the differential attitudes of members of the Trinity Absolute may be seen in the books of three prolific authors of recent highly-respected “new age” literature.

Based on the principle that great antinomies such as theology and science – *God and not-God* – may both be true in different respects, and from the conception that contradictions may be reconciled in their dialectical synthesis; it is argued that the nature of ‘reality’ is a self-sustaining symmetrical construct of three absolute dimensions. These metaphysical cosmic coordinates may be called the Three Absolutes of Unity or Creation, i.e.:

(1) The transcendent *existential* thesis eternalized in the **Deity Absolute** – usually epitomized as the Primogenitor Creator, or Prime Being; (2) The immanent *experiential*

antithesis materialized in the **Universe Absolute** – especially personalized in the gestalt of the Almighty Universe Allsoul, or Supreme Being; and (3) Their ultimate *associative* synthesis sublimated in the **Unconditioned Absolute** – sometimes expressed as the Absonite Spirit of All That Is, or what Immanuel Kant called the “Being of All Beings.”

From the assumption that there must exist a systematic unity of reality, or there would be nothing; it is argued that the abstract concept of the three basic manifestations of the Trinity Absolute completes a circle or cycle of creation out of nothing but each other, and reason itself. Trinity Absolute is the systematic unity of heaven, earth, and all that is.

If, as it seems, it may be sufficiently demonstrated that the multidimensional nature of One God in Trinity manifestation is reflected in the **religious pluralism** of the world, and human psychology, as well as the metaphysics of space, time, matter, and energy; then and therefore, the existence of that God must be regarded as systematically self-evident. This proof anticipates the eventuation of a **Universal Consensus** of religion and science.

## MORAL WORLDVIEW

Integral religious pluralism is epitomized in the view that all major religions are just different perspectives on the same God. This research paper documents ample evidence to show that, in an expanded understanding of the Trinity, this common sense idea is quite true. For the sake of all, it deserves to be taken seriously, as a potential blueprint for peace, whether or not we can ever really “prove” that it is true. As the great idealist philosopher Immanuel Kant put it, practical reason requires us to “act as if God exists.”

For it is not God (whose will it may however be), but *pure reason* that gives us the prime moral directive, which boils down to: **Act only as you would have everybody act.** At the same time, *practical reason* tells us that it is only from the rational systematic unity of One God (creating all humankind equal); that we know unequivocally that morality must take a universal view.

Not God, but pure reason dictates, and practical reason authorizes us to assume the prime moral directive expressed personally in the Golden Rule, which is universal among all major religions; and more generally in the One Categorical Imperative, enunciated by the great philosopher. The prime directive imposes **three important Moral Tests**, i.e.:

1. Rational weighing of probable results and possible consequences (Utilitarian Realist) – the Universal Rule of Public Responsibility: “Do what will maximize happiness,” not just for yourself, but the happiness of everybody. Do what is in the best interest of all, as far as you can weigh the probable consequences (Consequentialism) and implement the optimal actions. Ask: “What will be the immediate results, later consequences, and best choices for the greatest happiness of everyone?” (public practical reason based on science and judgements of probability).

2. Muslim, Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, Confucian-Taoist... (Religious Pluralist) – the Universal Golden Rule of personal morality: “Do unto others as you would they do to

you.” Personally love one another and do good to all. Love even your enemies and forgive trespasses. Defend sacred public principles like religious freedom, universal law, and human rights; but overcome evil with good where possible. The old scriptures authorize us to wage ‘just war’ justly. But we make war *only if* absolutely necessary – and *only after* all personal approaches have failed – because “forgiveness is better.” Always give love and peace a chance. In considering moral action, ask: “How would you like it if somebody did that to you, or your group?” (personal pure and practical reason based on the highest religious and cultural values of virtue and goodwill).

3. The One Categorical Imperative (Rational Idealist) – the Universal Moral Law: Act only as you would have everybody act. “Act only in accordance with a maxim which you can at the same time freely will that it become a universal law.” Treat yourself and others always as ends, never as means only. Do the right thing consistently, and do not be overly-prejudiced by personal advantages or disadvantages. In judging a possible course of action, ask: “What if everybody did that?” (universal pure reason based on *synthetic a priori* concepts of systematic unity, assuming freedom, God, and immortality).

Ultimately, rational individuals act in the faith that they can correctly assess both overall consequences and universal duty, in most situations of moral choice. Of course, there is no guarantee that this combination will lead to the “**Summum Bonum**” (**All or Highest Good**), which in this world may be defined as the human satisfactions of virtue, universal morality, and other utilities of happiness. However, these tests would seem to be the only adequate metaphysical vehicle available for constructing supreme moral virtues. This Triad of Moral Tests, or something very like it, could be part of the preamble to a new spirituality, reconciling many religious/cultural contradictions and opening theology up to reason.

A **synthesis** of the sometimes-contradictory world religions could be a general recipe for conflict resolution, if perpetual fighting between religions (or tyranny by any one of them) is to be avoided. We must put together a civilization recognizing One God based on universal metaphysics, psychology, philosophy, democracy, and world religion; but not on any one of the individual religions, which ever take only a partial view, by themselves.

Kant’s moral argument may be stated quite simply: God is not directly apparent in the phenomenal material world, but may exist in a noumenal spiritual realm. Since humans can ‘know’ nothing directly about the noumenal realm, the existence of God cannot be ‘proven’ beyond a doubt. However, to account for moral feelings of conscience, the existence of objective moral law, and the rationality of pursuing the highest good (universal morality as a means to greatest happiness) we must assume the existence of God.

Note that the moral law springs from pure reason, and the necessity of God is only a demand of practical reason. It is a bit of an insult to a man’s character and personal virtue, as well as his understanding of reason, to require his sworn allegiance to God in order to trust him (as philosopher John Locke suggested). Without prejudice, we must

assume that the *rational* disbeliever, as well as the *doubting* believer, will act *as if* some sort of divinity exists, recognizing (if only obscurely or unconsciously) that the moral law (the universal categorical imperative of pure reason) is the absolute upon which the whole of law and justice are grounded, and that without God, nothing is Absolute, but all is relative.

You don't have to believe in God in order to be moral, but it helps. After all, it is only from the rational unity of One God (creating all humankind equal); that we know unequivocally that morality must take a universal view. Unfortunately, atheism is sometimes an invitation to, as well as a licence for, ethical relativism; and a self-centred materialistic morality, which is only universal when convenient, or a matter of personal taste (character virtues, values, and goodwill).

Nevertheless, all human beings seem to have an innate inner spirit of conscience, which distinguishes right from wrong. Conscience recognizes that reason cannot command us to obey the moral law in our pursuit of the highest good (greatest happiness via impeccable ethics), unless we can eventually achieve that goal. But, one life is too short to do that. To explain the existence of universal moral law (objective moral imperatives), and the undeniable feelings of moral conscience, as well as the rationality of always pursuing the highest good (in spite of the unlikelihood of achieving it without significant supernatural help); requires the assumption of what Immanuel Kant called **the three postulates of practical reason: freedom, God, and immortality.**

The personal pursuit of the highest good – happiness commensurate with the moral probity of the individual human soul, as well as the ethical integrity of a postulated World-Soul or Allsoul – is a duty we owe to ourselves and everyone else. But right away there is a problem. Due to insufficient time for training and experience, in a single life, we cannot achieve very much personal progress in practicing virtue, and becoming morally worthy. Indeed, for our society as a whole, one generation is clearly insufficient. Perfect virtue cannot emerge, let alone be adequately exercised and tested, in only a few incarnations.

Furthermore, the man whom many think best represents the World-Soul was crucified, and his exalted conception of moral law is not going to get us very far, if the basis of his teachings is untrue. Consequently, we must suppose that his “Father” (the Deity Absolute), not only exists transcendentally, in the realm of existential noumena; but also exists actually, by way of reflection (Jesus Christ), in the world of experiential phenomena; and that an afterlife of some sort is the destiny of all humankind.

At first thought, it would seem likely to be disruptive and unproductive to promote immature souls onward to heaven (let alone paradise), with defective and incomplete training from this world. Once is not enough! Some kind of reincarnation is needed.

On the other hand, early resurrection to some sort of intermediate school might be more helpful. Either way, future lives must be available, or it is difficult to see how we could

ever approach sufficient virtue to realize much happiness (if indeed, greatest happiness is highly correlated to flawless moral practice, and the maintenance of a clear conscience).

It is for the highest theoretical and practical reasons of systematic unity that we will that the maxim of our actions should conform to a universal law. This objective moral law – *the categorical imperative* – is expressed personally in the Golden Rule; *Do as you would be done by others*. In regard to any action of moral significance, this rule prompts the personal question: “How would you like it if somebody did that to you?” In more general terms, the universal categorical imperative boils down to; *Act as you would have everyone act*, which suggests the universal question regarding the morality of any contemplated action: “What if everybody did that?”

“If we take our stand on **moral unity as a necessary law of the universe**, and from this point of view consider what is necessary to give this law adequate efficiency, and for us, obligatory force, we must come to the conclusion that there is one only **Supreme Will**, which comprehends all these laws in itself... This will must be omnipotent... omniscient... omnipresent... eternal... and so on.”  
Critique of Pure Reason – I. Kant, P.A814/B842.

Kant does not say that morality always requires faith in the existence of God. Even cynical disbelievers may still be very moral persons due to good character disposition, upbringing, training, etc., as well as indwelling virtues, and a largely unconscious faith in high moral norms. Nevertheless, while virtue may be its own reward, if there is no truly objective morality, no categorically absolute imperative, and no Summum Bonum or highest good (greatest happiness in consonance with perfected personal ethics and universal morality), then moral maxims become relative to fashion, personal inclination, and passion; rather than reason.

Kant says only that One God is an absolutely necessary postulate to provide an *objective* basis of “adequate efficiency” for stable moral order, account for conscience, and achieve the ends of greatest happiness associated with impeccable ethics and lofty universal morality, i.e., the pursuit of the happiness of everyone, including yourself. Kant held that what reason requires must exist, at least as a construction of reason, in order for the world to be perceived as rational and coherent, e.g. space/time, cause/effect, mathematics, logic, sufficient reason... **moral law**, and God.

Part of the argument is that if there is no ultimately objective standard of morality (no God), then our constructs of moral reason have no basis, other than our feelings about their goodness. Then, moral maxims must be a matter of taste and muddled reason; and then there is no sound foundation for world-wide law and justice. But if there is no absolutely universal basis for morality (that most people can at least dimly sense and recognize), then mediocre and amoral maxims become acceptable (e.g. When in Rome do as the Romans do... Look out for number one, and devil take the hindmost... If you can get away with it, why not?... etc.). Then ultimately, even anti-social maxims bespeaking elitist attitudes are no longer not questioned, but are respected, and even celebrated by some (e.g., David Hume’s famous moral question: “Why should I not prefer the



destruction of worlds, to the scratching of my finger?” – What’s it to me?) ... But this self-centred godless morality is absurd!

Thus, we conclude that we *must* assume that there is One God upholding the absolute universal law of justice, mercy, and ethical behaviour; which is expressed in the personal Golden Rule (taught by Buddha, Jesus, Muhammad, and many others), as well as in the universal moral law of the One Categorical Imperative enunciated by Kant. This is the common denominator of the highest expression of objective morality, and we take it from Hegel that the highest idea is the absolute of its kind, and the Absolute of all kinds is God.

It should be noted that although “moral unity is a necessary law of the universe,” practical reason demands that we allow strict duty to narrow truths to be modified, in unforeseen emergencies or exceptional cases, by overall utility; in order to achieve a justifiable compromise leading to the highest pure practical moral result, which may be countenanced personally, publicly and universally.

“It may on occasion... be right to evade or disregard the duties of truthfulness and fidelity. We must look back to the fundamental principles of justice... first, to harm no one, and second, to serve the common good... It may happen, for instance, that to keep a certain promise or compact would be disadvantageous either to the one to whom the promise was made, or to him who made it... You should, therefore, not keep promises that would be harmful to those to whom you made them; or if to keep them would hurt you more than it would help the other. **It is no violation of duty to put the greater good ahead of the smaller.**” On Duty: Selected Works of Cicero – H. M. Hubbell, P.332.

This is where personal and public judgment of competing duties enters the picture, but there are many subtle rationalizations here, and a policy of transparent communication solves most moral problems, so beware of lying; for as you judge, so may you be judged.

## **METAPHYSICAL SUMMARY**

Apparently, the abstract laws of pure reason (e.g. mathematics and logic, including the laws of contradiction and sufficient reason, etc.) are immutable and eternal truths, existing before anything and after everything, made out of nothing but the power of ideas and the force of reason itself. Just how and why this *existential* realm of transcendent ideas, and the material universe with its *experiential* realm of mundane consciousness, create and reflect each other remains to be explained. However, by the principle of the dialectical synthesis of great antinomies or contradictions, it is logically necessary that from the beginning, both of these ‘first’ two absolutes of personal consciousness must have been associated with each other in a third absolute coordinate dimension of consciousness – their totality – out of which they emerge, and into which they mingle and meld.

Preserving the law of the conservation of energy/mass, this totality synthesis acts as a reservoir of equilibrium or equipoise, constituting the necessary metaphysical source and sink of the individuality of the existential, and the plurality of the experiential, in their consummate identity. This “Spirit of All That Is” must be an active, breathing counterpart and vibrant counterbalance of the ideal and the real, compensating their development and growth with its own reciprocal and complimentary expansions, such that however large the system of polarizations becomes, the total energy always balances out to zero.

This closes the metaphysical circle of creation in a triunity of existential, experiential, and associative phases, manifesting each other out of nothing but the energy of the rational notion of each other, pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps, so to speak.

In cosmological terms, these categories may be regarded as three necessary and co-eternal dimensions or absolutes of creation, forming the systematic unity of One God infinitely manifest in the Trinity Absolute – popularly spoken of as heaven, earth, and all that is. In abstract terms, the creative Trinity is united in the three compensating Absolutes, i.e.: the *noumenal* Deity Absolute, the *phenomenal* Universe Absolute, and their *coordinate* Unconditioned Absolute Source/Synthesis or Spirit of All That Is.

In his famous metaphor (Republic: Bk. VII) comparing experiential reality to flickering shadows cast on the wall of the “cave” in which humankind is chained, Plato suggested not only that the Many are a pale reflection of the One “existent(ial)” Idea, but that humans can break their chains, “see” the existential ideal realm in relation to the experiential material ‘reality,’ and leave the cave in the light of both – “the one intelligible and the other visible.” When their eyes have adjusted, philosophers bring the wisdom of their “journey dialectic” back to the cave for the enlightenment of their fellow men. Plato argued that the ‘idea’ is most real because it is based on reason, while the so-called ‘real’ world is based mostly on indeterminate experience, opinion, and illusion.

While positing a basic metaphysics of duality, Plato recognized that *three* is the minimum number required to compose a system, and that the union of two things is rightly a third thing – “a mixture of them both.” He identified or implied a number of triunities which express this fundamental metaphysic as the synthesis of a dialectic, e.g., one/many/all; limit/limited/unlimited; being/not-being/becoming; etc. Aristotle (harking back to Pythagoras) is reported to have said that *three* represents All (synthesis of the One and the Many), and hence is “the perfect number.”

The abstract idea of Trinity Absolute may be considered as the rational nucleus around which creation precipitates, out of nothing but the ‘force’ of pure practical reason. Trinity would seem to be the one and **only adequate metaphysical vehicle** of creation.

In more specific terms, the circle of creation may be conceived as complete unto itself, in three absolute and systematic coordinates, phases, or dimensions of separate but united co-creative expression, i.e.: the existential idea, its experiential reflection, and their synthesis in unconditioned consciousness. That synthesis is the ultimate combination reflected in the Middle Path of Buddha, the Great Way of Lao Tzu, and the Moral Spirit

of World Religions in general. That consummate Spirit is the Unconditioned Absolute ultimate destiny and primeval counterpart of the *ideal* Deity Absolute conjoined with the *real* Universe Absolute. And these Three Absolutes of Creation provide a systematic unity of One God first, foremost, and forever in Trinity manifestation.

Adding personal functional terms, the definition of the Trinity concept may be expanded to include the *transcendent* Deity Absolute Creator/Benefactor or Prime Being, his *immanent* Universe Absolute Supreme Being or Almighty Universe Allsoul, and their *ultimate* Unconditioned Absolute Spirit Source Synthesis – All That Is – the Destiny Consummator or Being of All Beings. In creative terms, these three compensating coordinates or postulated personae are co-equal and co-eternal. The Prime Creator, his Supreme Being, and their absonite Consummate Identity are not three gods, but three phases, expressions, or manifestations of One God – absolute, supreme, and ultimate.

In summary, the three Absolutes of potentiality or creation are existential, experiential, and absonite. The third realm is a synthesis of the first and second – an ultimate development, but also a primeval potential, in cosmological terms. As a matter of metaphysical balance, existential and experiential consciousness must emerge from, as well as mix/mingle/meld in, their unconditioned associative consciousness, which is their ultimate source and sink. This synthetic principle is the third of three intimately related compensating coordinates of creation, which compose a comprehensive systematic unity in the Trinity of One God.

Although an oversimplification in many ways, the number three is the first common denominator and birthmark of some very fundamental categories of reality, for example:

- 1) The cosmology of physical space in three basic dimensions of manifestation, i.e. length, breadth, and height or depth;
- 2) The geometry of the Pythagorean triangle closed in a compound synthesis, ( $Z^2 = X^2 + Y^2$ );
- 3) The division of time into three separate but related dimensions of experience, i.e. past, present, and future;
- 4) The existence of substance in three states of matter, i.e. solid, liquid, and gas;
- 5) The relationship between force, mass, and acceleration, ( $F = ma$ );
- 6) The three fundamental phases or states of electro-magnetism, i.e. positive, negative, and neutral (proton, electron, and neutron);
- 7) The relationship between energy, matter, and light, ( $E = MC^2$ );

- 8) The psychology of the human soul in three essential aspects of being, i.e. personality or ego self-consciousness, mind or id – conscious and unconscious, and spirit or superego – unconscious even superconscious;
- 9) The theology or divine formula of the nature of One God in the three abstract coordinates of the Trinity Absolute, which may be defined as the existential Deity Absolute Prime Creator (Benefactor), his experiential Universe Absolute Supreme Being (Almighty Allsoul), and their ultimate absonite Unconditioned Absolute Spirit of All That Is (Source/Synthesis). This is also defined in the Christian interpretation as the Holy Trinity of three persons – Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as well as in the Hindu Trimurti of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva;
- 10) The psychology of world religion in three major views or cultural attitudes, i.e.: Muslims and Jews may be said to worship the first person of the Trinity – the Deity Absolute; Christians and Vishnuvite Hindus tend to worship the first person through the second person – the Universe Absolute – Christ or Krishna; while Shaivite Hindus and some Buddhists and Confucian-Taoists tend to venerate the first and second persons through the third person – the “Unconditioned,” Consummate Absolute, or Tao of All That Is (and is not).

In short, the multidimensional nature of One God in Trinity manifestation is reflected in the **religious pluralism** of the world, and human psychology itself, as well as the metaphysics of space, time, matter, mechanical force, and electro-magnetic energy.

Metaphysically, systematic unity would seem to require a minimum of three coordinate absolutes of potential – the Trinity Absolute – or something very like it. In religious terms, Trinity is the first three dimensions of God, who is multi-dimensional, yet One.

The idea of One God present in the three counter-balancing coordinates of the Trinity Absolute may be the first adequate and only necessary metaphysical vehicle for the creation of anything and everything, including the Trinity itself, out of nothing more than pure and practical reason.

The key concept is the balancing of contradictions, particularly the great antinomies, the greatest of which is God and not-God. The idealist philosophers Immanuel Kant and Georg Hegel have shown that the thesis of religion and the antithesis of science may logically be reconciled in the wisdom of their synthesis – consummation of the existential divine idea and experiential universe reality. Moreover, the spirit of their synthesis is evident not only in the threefold metaphysics of space, time, matter, and energy; but also in the three-part psychology of the human soul, and in the multi-dimensional theology of major religions, which reflect the members of the Trinity Absolute and its variations or combinations, when looked at in relation to each other and the One God they portray.

This inclusive pluralistic world-view may be the absolute highest idea of its kind because it is patterned after the highest of all kinds, which is the systematic unity of One God in

Trinity expression. In particular, this unity may be conceived as God manifestly reflected in three basic religious psychological attitudes, supplemented by similar or related content in a number of other major religions, philosophies, and cultures.

While based only on indeterminate evidence, this argument represents the potential recognition of an almost **Universal Consensus** of beliefs, which are compatible, but only seem to contradict. The most widely known, example of such a cosmic contradiction is the theory that light is both a wave and a particle. These ideas apparently conflict, but logically differ only in respect to their relationship to reality and each other. In cosmological and nuclear physics, the eventual synthesis of all such antinomies or dichotomies into a **“general unified theory of everything”** is assumed to be probable, as a systematically necessary matter of pure and practical reason. The Trinity Absolute could provide a good starting point.

At the very least, the existence of a simple, coherent, systematic basis for a consensus of world religions suggests the high probability that these religions really *can* be regarded as just different reflections of the same Ideal, and therefore they may eventually lend themselves to some sort of reconciliation.

Another way of looking at the Trinity may be found in the “Zen riddle” posed by Hegel’s problem of the synthesis of thesis and antithesis – the resolution of the ‘non-resolvable’ – the quest for the ultimate in dialectical logic and metaphysics. The very paradox of the idea of Trinity seems to be the polarizing force which results in that primeval eruption of threefold power or energy, with which creation began.

Part of the paradox is that the Unqualifiable Absolute cannot be qualified directly. Buddha referred to this inexpressible dimension as neither existence, nor non-existence, but a “middle path” in relation to both. Similarly, the “great way” of the yin and the yang composed in the Tao of All That Is comes close to expressing the Unconditioned.

The Trinity Absolute is built on the idea of the resolution of metaphysical contradictions through their composure in a consummate identity which is neither the thesis, nor the antithesis, but a synthesis. The secret of this riddle is that both sides of a dichotomy may be true, but differ only in respect of certain characteristics which may more or less comfortably subsist. In many minor contradictions, one or both of the premises are largely mistaken. However, in the realm of metaphysics, both sides of the great antinomy of God and Not-God (theology and science) are ultimately true, in different respects.

Furthermore, both are necessary to the first metaphysical vehicle of creation – the Trinity Absolute. In that Trinity, the persona of the one is not the persona of the other. However, the spirit of the Many being a reflection of the spirit of the One, logic expects their consummate spirit – the Spirit of All That Is – to be a combination or procession of both, but mutually glorified in a third absolute person – a synthesis of the divine and the mundane in a union of spirit, and universality of mind.

This elegant idea is somewhat comparable to the concept of the Supreme Allsoul as a synthesis or “marriage” of the souls of all individual human beings “in Christ” (St. Paul). Just as the third member of the Trinity is a consummation and union of the ‘first’ two members in the Unconditioned All That Is (which precedes them impersonally, as well as succeeds them as a personal entity), so the world Allsoul is an association and melding of all human souls (which also do not lose, but gain personal identity in the Supersoul).

It is something very remarkable that the principles of reason appear to exist with no discernible support, except reason itself. Pure reason would seem to be self-existent, depending on nothing and created only by itself, out of nothing but itself. Therefore it seems logical to suggest that reason is the essence of the Absolute. But this emphasis on the divine mind overlooks the importance of the personality and spirit coordinates of God. A more articulate estimation is conceived in the Greek concept of the *perichoresis* or “dance” of the persons of the Trinity – the procession or “progress” within the Trinity – whereby their cosmological functions of creation, as well as their psychological characteristics of personality, mind, and spirit seem to be appropriated individually at certain times, and in certain respects, yet are ultimately shared in the larger analysis.

## DEMONSTRATION OF TRINITY IN BOOK FORM

Chapter One of this research paper presents some background and arguments for **Religious Pluralism**, highlighting the strong parallels between all major religions and individual members of the Trinity Absolute. Chapter Two describes and documents the history and development of the concept of the Universe Absolute Supreme Being, Allsoul, Supersoul, or Oversoul. Christian and Krishnan pan~~en~~theism is the key to religious pluralism for many. Having absorbed that understanding, then the other major religions quite naturally present themselves as overlapping representations of the Absolutes on either side of Christ, in the circle of the Trinity.

Chapter Three presents summary arguments for the thesis: God exists, and Chapter Four for the antithesis: God does not exist. These chapters give only a synopsis of the main arguments.

Chapter Five attempts to explain the metaphysical basis of the synthesis of existential Deity and experiential Universe, God and not-God, the divine and the mundane, theology and science; in the totality of All That Is. The triadic structure of thesis and antithesis resolved in synthesis is demonstrated to be the essential paradigm for the solution of the great cosmic mystery of One God in Trinity manifestation.

The Trinity thus defined abstractly is the One Absolute manifest in three absolute metaphysical coordinates or phases of conscious expression – the **Three Absolutes of Creation**, i.e.: the existential Deity Absolute Creator, or Prime Being; his experiential Universe Absolute Supreme Being, or Almighty Allsoul; and their ultimate Unconditioned Absolute Spirit “Synthesis of Source and Synthesis” – the Being of All Beings – All That Is (and is not).

For example, in ontological terms, trinity is being, not-being, and becoming. In mathematical terms, trinity is one, many, and all. In abstract terms, trinity is condition, conditioned, and unconditioned.

In psychological terms, trinity is personality, mind, and spirit. In moral terms, trinity is duty, utility, and ethical choice. In practical terms, trinity is freewill, determination, and action.

In conscious terms, trinity is infinite existential, finite experiential, and limitless associative consciousness. In theological terms, Trinity is the transcendent Deity Divine, his immanent Supreme Being, and their ultimate Absolute Spirit. In cosmic personal terms, Trinity is One God manifest in three expressions or persons, united in spirit and universal in mind, but especially integrated in multi-dimensional personality – the creatively unified nature of God.

The metaphysical dynamics of the Trinity Absolute are derived from the work of the great philosophers, especially Immanuel Kant on the synthesis of the transcendental dialectic of pure reason. We have the authority of Kant for the following three important concepts of the understanding:

1) **God.** There is a threefold foundation of six arguments for the existence of God: 1. The Cosmological and Teleological arguments from determinate experience; 2. The Religious Experience and Universal Consensus arguments from indeterminate experience; 3. The Ontological and Moral arguments by abstraction from all experience (i.e., from *synthetic a priori* concepts of pure reason alone).

2) **Trinity.** There are three dimensions of relation which direct the employment of the understanding in experience, and by means of which the understanding thinks: 1. The categorical synthesis in a thinking subject (the *I am*); 2. The hypothetical synthesis in a series of the sum total of all appearances (the world or universe); 3. The disjunctive synthesis of parts in a system (the categorical and the hypothetical, being neither just the one nor only the other, but conjointly coordinate in all respects).

In general, there is a threefold synthesis of the one, the many, and the all, in an absolute unity: 1. The subject; 2. The sum total of all appearances; 3. The thing which contains the (unconditioned) possibility of “all that is” capable of being thought. For Kant, Trinity is the Absolute object of the ideal of reason, the members of which were termed by Kant: 1. Primal Being; 2. Supreme Being; 3. Being of All Beings.

3) **Soul.** Human soul is a threefold substance, i.e.: 1. Immaterial substance object of internal sense (ego or personality); 2. Personal intellectual substance (mind); 3. Incorruptible simple substance (immortal spirit). In summary, it may be said that the human Soul is an immaterial immortal substance of individual personality, personal mind, and incorruptible pre-personal spirit.

Taking our cue from Kant, we may speculate that the ‘incorruptible pre-personal spirit’ of the human soul shows itself as an individual *moral* conscience or “thought adjuster” in the soul, which is a spark of that same divine Spirit which completes the Trinity and is not the spirit of the first person, nor the spirit of the second person, but the glorious Consummate Spirit Identity of both – the mysterious Unconditioned Spirit of All That Is.

On the other hand, in Christian terms, since the spirit of the Son is a reflection of the spirit of the Father, then the glorified Spirit of both is initially as well as ultimately that same basic spirit that is from the Father, through the Son, and magnified coordinately.

Any way you look at it, spirit completes the soul, just as spirit closes the first circle of creation, culminating in the “procession” of the Glorified Spirit, thereby forming the Trinity – an abstract nucleus of all existence constructed on the basis of the metaphysical necessities of reason reconciling natural contradictions and personality conflicts (which are potential even between divine persons). These internal viewpoints must be reconciled and harmonized, through the recognition of a third person or “mutual” unconditioned absolute consciousness, balancing divine and universal consciousness in a systematic unity.

The multidimensionality of One God would also account for a certain amount of psychological predisposition for individuals to identify their personality and inner spirit with any one, any combination, or all members of the Trinity; and to express this in their religions. If they differ, it is perhaps only in cultural personality and scriptures, not in their underlying spirit of good will, nor really even in rational mind when it comes to universal reason.

In abstract terms of pure reason, One God must always have existed, at least potentially, in three dimensions of manifestation – the Three Absolutes of Creation – without which there would be nothing. The ancient Platonic mystery of the one, the many, and the all is reflected in the Trinity Absolute *trinomial* formula of systematic unity through the thesis of the Deity Absolute, and the antithesis of the Universe Absolute, reconciled in the synthesis of the Unconditioned Absolute *binomial* totality of All That Is.

The Absolutes of Creation are One God in an indivisible systematic union of three phases, expressions, or “persons” of absolute rational and spiritual unity, i.e.:

- (1) **Deity Absolute:** the transcendent divine necessary existential condition – Prime Being – the categorical ideal thinking synthesis in a subject (thesis) – the *I am* personified as the Primogenitor Creator or Creation Inceptor – the initial Sponsor and Benefactor of all.
- (2) **Universe Absolute:** the immanent universal sufficient conditioned synthesis in an experiential series – Supreme Being – the hypothetical (postulated) series of the manifold object and sum total of all appearances of reality as an empirical whole (antithesis) – the *I am* personified as the Supreme Allsoul or Almighty Universe Allperson – the Demonstrator and Co-sponsor in and for all.



(3) **Unconditioned Absolute:** the transcendent/immanent necessary sufficient unconditioned synthesis in a system – Being of All Beings – the disjunctive coordinate fusion and holistic system of all things in general, including the condition and the conditioned, in the unconditioned and unqualified totality of All That Is, and all objects of thought in general (synthesis) – the *I am* personified as the Ultimate Synthesis of Source and Synthesis or Absonite Associative\* Spirit Source/Sink – the Destiny Consummator and Harmony Coordinator with all.

\*Note that God does not *have* associates, for He *is* His associates, and truly “Allah has ninety-nine names.”

In some English translations of the Qur’an (4:171 & 5:73), Allah seems to scoff at the Trinity, in effect denying his own creation. Thus, Muslims seem to be precluded from seeing themselves as the “adopted” children of God, as most Christians do. Nor are they connected to the Paramatman (Supersoul or Allsoul), as in Hinduism, also known as the Supreme Being in Christianity. Nor are they encouraged to recognize the significance of the Buddhist unconditioned Middle Path to Nirvana, and the Taoist synthesis of the Great Way of the yin and yang.

But this negative interpretation is based on a well-known misunderstanding. The ‘trinity’ dismissed by Muhammad in the Qur’an is not the Holy Christian Trinity, but the old Egyptian trinity of the divine Father/Mother/Son (updated as in Allah/Mary/Jesus) – just the kind of primitive and unfortunate carnal idolatry which Christians also reject. For evidence of this interpretation, see Qur’an 5:116 which says, “Keep in mind, when Allah will ask Jesus son of Mary; didst thou say to the people: Take me and my mother for two Gods besides Allah?”

Indeed, the second person of One God – the Universe Absolute Allsoul or Supreme Being is perhaps best expressed by Christ, whom many feel has earned the experiential sovereignty of the world, if not the whole universe. Muhammad and Buddha are close runners-up, and in their own way superb in teachings and character. But Mary was not the Holy Ghost – third member of the Trinity – the Unconditioned Absolute Spirit, who is better explained, as well as better represented by Buddha and others.

It must be noted that the psychology and character of Muhammad may more exclusively reflect the first absolute person (Allah or Abba), than does Jesus, who represents not only God, but also us, as we are members of Christ’s Supreme Allsoul consciousness. Also, Lao Tzu’s synthesis of the opposites of yin and yang in the Tao or Great Way is almost as helpful an expression of the Third Absolute, as Buddha’s “unconditioned” cosmic consciousness of Nirvana – the Spirit of “All That Is, and is not” – the mysterious Holy Ghost.

In so far as these are all just perspectives on the same One God, reason authorizes us to regard either Muhammad, Jesus, Buddha and others (or all of them) as the Supreme

Being of God, “who in a face to face meeting on the Day of Return (Judgment Day)... will enlighten us as to all that wherein we have differed,” as the Qur’an puts it.

Religious Pluralists are not making up names of Allah, but merely translating his name into the other major religious languages of humankind – Christian, Hindu, and others – which, together with Islam, correspond to the three metaphysical absolutes of creation, and the psychology of the human soul, among other fundamental things.

Buddhist and Neo-Confucian interpretations of the Middle Path and the Tao (Great Way) always imply a third option between (or combining) two extremes – abstract metaphors for the same metaphysics seen from other points of view; obliquely in the Christian Trinity, and confusedly in the Hindu Trimurti. In Christianity, the third coordinate is the distinct counterpart identity of the other two extremes or absolutes, in a synthesis of both the first and second spirit expressions of God, which are ultimately unified in their doubly glorious Spirit, and personalized in the presence of their universal mind.

This mystery persona – the Co-relative or Consummate Coordinate – is that holistic appearance of God surreptitiously acknowledged by Sufi Muslims, and obscurely recognized by most Christians, but inspiringly portrayed in world religions by Hindus, Buddhists, Confucian-Taoists, and others. This third Coordinate Absolute may also be regarded as a middle path between, or great way combining, the two alternative views of monotheism represented by: (a) Muslims (and Jews), *and* (b) Christians (and Krishnan Hindus).

Trinity may be the only philosophical inevitability – the Absolute manifesting in three personae or coordinates of creation: the Paradise Creator, his Universe Demonstrator, and their Superuniverse Consummator. Already evolving to supreme levels of development, it would seem to be manifest human destiny to explore ultimate realms reaching even to absolute expressions, which themselves ‘initiate’ the process.

I cannot think that evil has created the universe, but I can think that ‘goodness’ may be *the* Absolute in its most abstract form. Then, I can only imagine that there must be One God who is all-good, the best, even supremely perfect and ultimately absolute. I see evidence of His work all around me. I notice His moral commandment: “Do as you *would* be done by others,” written in my soul. In my own experience I sometimes feel a great sense of communion with Him and I am inspired to write, or even sing. I notice that others seem to believe the same things and have similar or analogous experiences.

On the other hand, sometimes I think that my ideas of God are supremely contradictory, largely absurd, and mostly incomprehensible. The idea of God is beset with contradictions of good and evil, freewill and determination, cause and effect, etc. I have difficulty conceiving the third Absolute as a person, even a spirit person, as seems to be required by the symmetry of the Trinity Absolute. My understanding of the evidence around me is incomplete and inconclusive. The history of religions is full of absurdities and there seems to be no clear consensus of beliefs. Indeed, the experience of God is unclear and indistinct, which gives every indication of defective knowledge.

Nevertheless, I take heart when I notice great philosophers (notably Plato, Kant and Hegel) have shown that conceptually there is metaphysical possibility, even need, for a synthesis of the most significant of all antinomies (contradictions) – theology and science, God and not-God. These and other philosophers from the Greeks on down support the contention that, just as small contradictions may be seen to be complementary in some respects, and therefore subject to profitable synthesis; similarly, as a matter of pure and practical reason, the greatest of all antinomies may subsume all the rest, both the transcendently ideal and the immanently real, in the sublime probability.

What may be contradictory and absurd to ordinary reason and elementary logic harmonizes in a higher synthesis, which is expressed in the dialectic of the dynamical and mathematical antinomies. The *absolutely* infinite and the *absolutely finite* are united in the limitless *absonite*, This is itself a separate absolute principle, forged in the counterpoint of apparent opposition, proceeding to the harmony of coordination, and completing the cycle of creation, begun by the first two absolutes of reason, hauling themselves up by their own bootstraps, so to speak, apparently out of nothing but the notion of themselves and each other.

At the metaphysical and cosmological levels, thesis and antithesis must be resolved in synthesis – the one and the many must be composed in the all. From pure *synthetic a priori* reasoning, Deity Absolute ideality and Supreme Universe Absolute actuality must be united in Ultimate Associative Being, i.e., condition and conditioned must be synthesized in their consummate coordinate – the Unconditioned and Unqualified Absolute. Logically, these three Absolutes must be One God, personally complete and replete, in the hypostasis of the Trinity Absolute.

While it might be less contentious to refer only to the three abstract manifestations or expressions of the Trinity, it is also proper to call them personae or persons because whatever more and whatever else God may be, He must also be a person. Otherwise, He would be subhuman or infra-human. On the contrary, He is the absolute, supreme, and ultimate personality unified in the gestalt of the thrice-personal One God.

If this Trinity were not past-eternal in the potentiality of the Absolutes and the Grand Universe, then nothing would have come into existence, and nothing would exist now. As humans experience and understand finite growth in progressive Universe Absolute manifestation of supreme being, so analogously, the Deity may ‘grow’ by divine expansions or unfoldings of infinite timeless realization, wherefore their Spirit of Source/Synthesis is always a limitless work in progress. Ultimately and inevitably, the primordial dream of the Deity Absolute, the Supreme Being, and the Holy Spirit must become existentially, experientially, and gloriously true in all respects, even if it takes forever.

Those who are convinced of the existence of God should find some sections of Chapter Three very edifying. Similarly, those convinced that God does not exist will find arguments in Chapter Four strongly defending that view. Even higher praise might apply

to the synthesis of these greatest of all antinomies argued in Chapter Five; because the successful construction of such a synthesis, especially the metaphysical, theological, and psychological foundations for it, could provide a blueprint for peace through progress in answering the fundamental questions of the nature of God, humankind, and the all that is.

Chapter Six gives ample authority for, and history of, the view that the human soul is a tripartite entity composed of personality, mind, and spirit. Specifically in psychology, the ‘substance’ of the human soul may be conceived as a triunity of (1) personality or ego self-consciousness, (2) mind or id – conscious and unconscious, and (3) spirit or superego – unconscious even superconscious.

However, it is not quite as clear how the human soul may be modeled on the Trinity. It seems that the individual personality may, with equal logic, adopt any persona of the Trinity as a religious point of view, or some of them, or all of them – in what might technically be called “psychological perichoresis,” akin to **Religious Pluralism**.

For example, if the human person is said to be in the ‘image’ of the Deity, the mind may be compared to the Supreme, and then the spirit in the human soul would be analogous to the Infinite Spirit. Thus, the threefold human soul may be seen as: (1) the free will of the personality like unto the Prime Being, (2) the logical mind of the individual endowment of reason comparable to the Supreme Being, and (3) the conciliating spirit of the moral conscience identified with the Infinite Spirit.

On the other hand, if a spark of the spirit of God the Father indwells and adopts us as His sons and daughters, then the first coordinate of the Trinity is represented in the human soul by the spirit of the Great Creator, and the personality may be comparable to either the second or third coordinates. Thus, for example, the Trinity may be mirrored in the attributes of the human soul as: (1) spirit of the Great Benefactor, (2) personality of the Supreme Universe Allperson, and (3) mind of the Ultimate Totality of All That Is.

A third way of looking at the human soul might draw a comparison of: (1) reason and logic in the mind of the Prime Being, (2) will and intent in the personality of the Supreme Being, and (3) moral conscience and intuition in the spirit of the Destiny Consummator or Being of All Beings.

Thus, we arrive at the hypothesis that the souls of humankind may have a psychological predisposition or predilection to one of at least three different points of view about God. At the same time, we conceive that God may be experienced by all, as the spirit endowment of the human soul, i.e. that advisory conscience of the personality, “thought adjuster” of the mind, and indwelling divine spirit or God-heart of each human being.

Chapter Seven presents some paradigms of morality as context to the moral worldview outlined near the beginning of the Preview. Chapter Eight presents some further thoughts on the concept of the Trinity Absolute, some Christian views, a brief history of the Trinity, and a synopsis of orthodox Christian beliefs, which may also be highly

provocative and even more persuasive, being an elaboration of the synthesis introduced in Chapter Five.

Chapter Nine presents some miscellaneous notes on cosmology, time, actuality, and the Supreme Being or Almighty Universe Allsoul. By way of explicating core concepts, beliefs, assumptions and source ideas, Chapter Ten presents three popular “new age” metaphysical revelations and speculations, in summary excerpts selected because they exemplify the counterpoint attitudes and parallel the dialectical structure of chapters 3, 4, and 5 of this book, i.e.:

- (1) Dr. William Sadler and his unidentified “sleeping subject” dictating the Urantia (Earth) Book on the nature of God and the metaphysics of creation. The critique of the Urantia Book presented in Chapter 10.1 is a logical extension of the absolute theological “GOD” thesis of Chapter Three.
- (2) Carlos Castaneda’s mysterious shamanic mentor commenting on mystic stoicism and the *experiential* warrior. Castaneda was a pragmatic-minded professor of anthropology and researcher of consciousness, based on thoughtful personal experiment and direct experience, as well as painstaking research. His skeptical questioning attitude towards shamanism is thoroughly rational and scientific. His practical warrior teachings summarized in Chapter 10.2 are essentially a variation on the modern empirical school of analytical science and stoic philosophy, complementary to the experientially-based rational doctrine of the “NOT-GOD” antithesis in Chapter Four.
- (3) Jane Roberts’ inner personality Seth speaking on idealism and reincarnation, etc. Seth says, “You and your gods create each other.” His teaching of “the universe as idea construction” is summarized in Chapter 10.3. This is a bridge belief fundamental to understanding the school of ultimate process philosophy – the inclusion of God and Not-God, theology and science, the transcendent and the mundane, inspiration and reason; in the unconditioned absolute concept of God as “ALL THAT IS,” complementary to the dialectical synthesis in Chapter Five.

It is with the utmost embarrassment that I admit that the Urantia Book, stimulus for much of my own thinking on the metaphysics and cosmology of the Trinity, is also the clearest offender when it comes to racism. However, that raw black/white racism and divine-seed religion contained in the depths of the “pre-historical” section of the Urantia Book is so outrageous and egregious that, on reflection, it seems intended as a transparent parody of the same confused racial mythology, which may also be read into the Bible and the Qur’an.

Contributing to the problem of religious racism, it often seems that despite many sublime similarities, there remain irreconcilable confusions between various religious scriptures and ‘revelations’ regarding fundamental metaphors of divine metaphysics. Nevertheless, it may be consistently argued that, essentially most differences only seem to contradict due to misunderstanding, but in fact they all point to three basic views of the same God.

Chapter Eleven presents a further critique of the Urantia Book, and Chapter twelve gives a detailed Metaphysics of Synthesis, which has been saved for last (even though it is the basis of everything else). Many people find the necessary “heavy lifting” of long stretches of Immanuel Kant and other authorities, “like chloroform in print,” as Mark Twain once remarked. Others will appreciate its inclusion, and review it first.

Among other things, this book tries to show that philosophically and psychologically, the creation is one, yet more than one, it is at least two; and must then be three to complete the circle or cycle of the creation of that One. Just so, God is One, but is understood and worshipped in three primary manifestations – the Trinity of the Deity, Universe, and Unconditioned Absolutes – by the great world religions, that is to say by the fundamental consciousness of almost all humankind taken together. This argument from Universal Consensus is the ultimate, and potentially the most persuasive proof that One God really does exist in something like the threefold form reflected in world religions. We see that He is over us, in us, and all around us, collectively, personally, and spiritually.

The Muslim Qur’an and Christian Bible are two views in search of a third. Reflections of that third view may be seen in the literature of the Hindus, Buddhists, Confucian-Taoists, and other religions. But alas, this triunity of the world’s religions has not been sufficiently assimilated and articulated. Partial believers on all sides languish in isolation and tremble in indecision. Meanwhile, our gods *really may be* just different views of the same Divine Idea – One God – united in a Trinity, naturally reflected in world religions.

This is a unified artifact of pure practical reason and logical speculation, with immense pragmatic value for the construction of a universal civilization of freedom and justice with mercy for all, conceived in and under One multidimensional God. For the sake of the more rapid development of a proudly civilized, highly moral, thoroughly prosperous and ultimately happy society, we must assume such a God.

In the last analysis, it may be that Goodness is the One Abstract Absolute of pure reason, which is the basis of the Trinity – the threefold manifestation of the nature of One God in the prime formula or “Form of the Good,” i.e. the Trinity Absolute. If so, then the absolute *kingdom of Good* could be some sort of transparently democratic ‘meritocracy’ based on the acceptance of religious pluralism, finding its supreme expression, and ultimate meaning, in the friendly fellowship of the good in all the different religions and traditions of the world.

It has been argued that the natural composition of the world’s religions, expressed and apprehended as three individual personae, would seem to be reciprocal reflections approaching the understanding of One God, from multiple different religious points of view or psychological *attitudes to the Absolute*. Furthermore, the ‘image’ of God seems to be bestowed on humankind, not only in religions, but in the nature of the tripartite human soul. Coincidentally, the Trinity Absolute seems to be stamped on physical reality as a birthmark.

Even if, for many people, pure reason is not sufficient, practical reason authorizes us to assume that there is a Divine Being, and coaches us to behave “as if” God exists. Thus, practical reason (even more than pure reason) makes it a moral duty to conceive and follow the idea of religious pluralism and the Trinity of One God into a fully rational community of universal laws. This could be a United Nations (with limited veto powers), or something like it, dedicated to rational world comparisons of means and ends in the Summum Bonum (highest good – a happy, moral, and universal civilization), taking account of what is good in all religions.

Pure reason may prompt us to follow our personal spirit ideals, even to quick forgiveness, and non-resistant protest against evil; but practical reason tells us that publicly we must, at any particular time, “render to Caesar that which is Caesar’s... tribute to whom tribute is due,” (Luke 20:25, Rom. 13:7). Therefore, in justice, we must support good legitimate government and a United Nations struggle for human rights, to make the world safe for the tender ideals of peace and higher morality in all religions.

One God may be recognized in His Supreme Being, which to me is represented by Jesus Christ (amplified by Moses, Muhammad, Buddha, Lao Tzu, and some others). At the same time, I see His Father’s absolute divinity in Allah (Abba, Brahma, and others), and Their ultimate mysterious expression in the unconditioned Spirit of many major religions. I have tried to show this balance in the following pages, and I wonder if this Trinity Absolute, or something very like it, could be the metaphysical basis for that peace which we all seek; through the sweet reason of religious pluralism and universal law, as seems logically self-evident and philosophically inevitable.

Samuel Stuart Maynes  
Surrey, B.C., Canada

Posted to: [www.trinityabsolute.com](http://www.trinityabsolute.com), May 2017.

Please e-mail your comments or questions directly to: [stumaynes@hotmail.com](mailto:stumaynes@hotmail.com).

## **CONCLUSION (SYNTHESIS)**

Chapters Three and Four of this book demonstrate that by equally specious or fair-seeming arguments, the existence of God may be both proved and disproved. The law of contradictions stipulates that A and not-A cannot both be true at the same time and in the same respect. But this implies that A and not-A may both be true at the same time in different respects.

The most widely known example of this is the dual nature of light, which behaves like a wave in some respects, but in other respects it is not a wave, but a stream of particles.

Likewise, the extremes of theology and science – God and not-God – may both be true explanations of the cosmos, when looked at from different points of view. Similarly, the Chinese Tao or “Great Way” harmonizes the opposites of yin and yang, and the Buddhist “Middle Path” avoids the existential extremes of being and not-being.

As expounded by the philosopher Georg Hegel (1770 – 1831), dialectical logic is premised on growth through the apparent opposition of antinomies, or contradictions, which do not “add up” in elementary terms, but nevertheless may be harmonized and incorporated in a more comprehensive and ‘tuneful’ understanding.

The triadic structure of dialectical logic allows otherwise intractable contradictions to be transformed into triune relationships, in which the third dimension may be seen to balance or compensate the antagonism of the other two. Thus in general, the opposition of thesis and antithesis is reconciled in their dialectical synthesis.

Hegel applied this idea to history, and Marx to material socialism, with only modest success in each case. However, the understanding of the dialectic of the divine idea and the mundane reality synthesized in ultimate associative consciousness has an altogether more fundamental meaning, which points to the threefold metaphysical basis of creation.

The ‘Absolute’ is an expression that has been used with various shades of meaning by many philosophers, but its modern definition and signification are due to Georg Hegel, the great idealist philosopher.

“In philosophy, the Highest is called the Absolute, the Idea... that which we call the Absolute has a meaning identical with the expression God.” – Hegel quoted in *Philosophy of Religion* – J. E. Smith. P.107.

“(Hegel also held that)... the totality of all things... is the Absolute Idea.” *Four Philosophies* – J. D. Butler. P.135.

Hegel held that the Absolute is the Highest, the Absolute Idea is the “totality of all things,” and that which we call Absolute is God. Experientially, the totality of all things is the universe, and this Universe Absolute Supreme Being is the experiential antithesis counterpart of the existential Deity Absolute Creator thesis. On the other hand, if by “the totality,” Hegel means both the mundane *and* the divine, then he is referring to the unconditioned or unqualified totality of all that is, and this Unconditioned Absolute is not the one, nor the other, but the transformation and synthesis – the reconciliation and fusion – of both.

Making things even more confusing, it must be noted that: In addition to the totality of the Universe Absolute Allsoul or ‘gestalt’ of human consciousness (Supreme Being), and the totality of the Unconditioned Absolute Spirit of “All That Is and is not,” there is what might be called the totality of all three Absolutes (including the Deity Absolute Creator), as a manifold or ‘corporate’ entity – the Trinity Absolute.



“According to Buddhist philosophy, the absolute antithesis in which “A” stands against “not-A” is only possible when there is a third concept, as it were, bridging the two terms... Non-discrimination underlies the discrimination of... (its) antithesis.” *The Awakening of Zen – D. T. Suzuki* edited by Christmas Humphreys, P.78.

“Zen expresses itself in the denial of opposites... The point is not to be ‘caught,’ as the masters would say, in any of the four propositions: (1) ‘It is A’; (2) ‘It is not-A’; (3) ‘It is *both* A and not-A’; and, (4) ‘It is *neither* A *nor* not-A.’” (This is the so-called *Tetralemma* based on the Discourses of Buddha – DN 1 – *Brahmajala Sutta*). *Essays in Buddhism – D. T. Suzuki*, P.275.

It should be noted that in the above Tetralemma, (3) “*Both*” is the positive one of two meanings allowed by the ambiguity of (4) “*Neither*” one nor the other (but possibly both). Something like this is seen in the Christian conception of the Glorified Spirit as **both** and **neither**. That is, the Holy Ghost is **neither** the spirit-person of the Father, **nor** the spirit-person of the Son, but the *Holy Spirit* proceeding from **both**.

In the ultimate analysis, antinomies may both be true in different respects, as the philosophers have shown. Plato perceived this truth as a mingling, melding, and fusion of the existential realm of the divine ‘idea’ with the experiential reality of the mundane world. Pythagoras (and Plato) saw it in mathematical terms as the All, which includes the One and the Many, in the unqualified totality of their source and sink.

Aristotle perceived this consummate coordinate as the “Golden Mean” of the central domain of statements which balance opposing extremes, particularly those arising when considering virtues, ethics, and human values.

The Greek philosophers and the German idealists were right to emphasize the importance of recognizing existential versus experiential consciousness, and their unconditioned ultimate synthesis. By many and fair-seeming arguments, for convenience of speaking, and because pure reason demands a beginning and a Creator; we contrast the thesis of the **Deity Absolute** with the equally specious argument that practical reason does not demand a beginning – only universal contingency – which is the **Universe Absolute** scientific antithesis of creationist theology.

Then, by the laws of dialectical logic, there is recognized a third argument of pure and practical reason – the **Unconditioned Absolute** synthesis, which is ultimately based on the perfection (unity) of the other two Absolutes – the spiritual, and the material – finally and eternally incorporated in the Trinity of all three.

Whereas some philosophers emphasized duality as the foundation of metaphysics, Hegel (as well as Plato, Kant, and others) saw through the dialectic of duality to the triad of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis as the necessary fundamental creative equation. Thus, in terms of the Absolute, the philosopher arrives at the metaphysical inevitability of the

Trinity of the three Absolutes of Creation, i.e. thesis: the transcendent **Deity Absolute**; antithesis: the immanent **Universe or “Universal” Absolute**; and synthesis: the ultimate **Unconditioned Absolute**.

The freewill creation includes not only the existential or ethereal body of the idea, and its experiential reflection or physical embodiment in material reality, but also the absonite (a combination of *absolutely* infinite and *absolutely finite*) spirit of the associative consciousness from which both the idea and reflection spring, and into which they both mingle and meld. Neither finite nor infinite, but a consummation of both, absonite consciousness gives humans some degree of consciousness of the unconscious, which has no beginning and no ending.

The coordinate Unconditioned Absolute Spirit is that mysterious paradox – that ineffable third member of the Trinity Absolute – which may be alluded to in various ways, but not fully captured nor directly expressed (because not fully known, due to ‘freedom’ – God’s seminal gift to the creation).

Ultimately, unconditioned consciousness (Nirvana) cannot be defined completely, but only formulated generally and glimpsed momentarily (although sometimes experienced vividly or felt profoundly). The formula is echoed in many variations of one underlying general pattern of thought and understanding – synthesis of thesis and antithesis, for example:

The one and the many composed in the all,  
Unity and plurality sublimated in totality,  
Egocentric and ethnocentric coordinated in worldcentric,  
Intuition and reason consummated in wisdom,  
Pure duty and practical utility blended in moral choice,  
Heaven and earth integrated in All That Is,  
Father and Son glorified in their Holy Spirit,

For Hegel the real is the rational, and in the ultimate analysis, it is rational that for the sake of necessary systematic unity, there must be an identity composed of opposites, and a synthesis consummating and completing a metaphysical basis of understanding for existence itself. The “dialectic” system of metaphysical unity can only resolve its contradictions in a synthesis, which composes the truth of thesis and antithesis, with respect to each other in time and place. The “synthetic unity” of the great antinomies or apparent contradictions has many expressions.

Substance is subject, as well as object. Self-consciousness is essence, in which there is an identity of thought and existence. Consciousness (will, reason, and love) creates reality and vice versa. Hegel suggests that the concept of the synthesis of dialectic reason is “the Absolute,” but in Trinity Absolute terms, he may be said to be referring most often to the Unconditioned Absolute Consummation of All That Is – third of the three absolutes of creation.

Hegel maintained that essence and existence are actually interrelated in history, as well as philosophy. Unfortunately, the historical context led him to over-emphasize mass existence at the expense of individual essence. Politically, he put the state above the person – an emphasis which has since shown itself to be a blind alley. In terms of historical analysis, his attempted identification of the epochs or ages of human progress has also been only slightly more fruitful. Nevertheless, his basic insight that metaphysics is synthesis through dialectics remains seminal.

Hegel says that the substance of the self-determining unity in this process can only be understood as “force.” In the cosmology of creation, this is the force of divine ideation, universal materialization, and ultimate consummation identified in the Trinity Absolute. In the psychology of the individual, this force is the personal freewill, rational mind, and indwelling spirit of the human soul.

In bestowing freewill, God set his creatures free to be co-creative. It may be said that the human soul is personality who wills, mind that reasons, and spirit which loves. More properly however, it is the whole soul that reasons, loves, and wills. One God is Creator of the cosmos, Supreme Architect of the Almighty Universe Allsoul, and also the Ultimate Spirit or general of the army of the “order of the whole,” or the sum of all things (the binominal totality of All That Is), incorporated in the ‘Trinomial’ Absolute.

Georg Hegel provides the definitive explanation of the dualistic concept of the composition of ‘reality,’ as *the* necessary idea. In Platonic terms, this is the One and the Many – the unity thesis of pure existential reason (space/time, geometry, mathematics, cause/effect, sufficient reason, logic, morality, etc.), which apparently exists metaphysically before anything and after everything; and its plurality antithesis of experiential reality (empirical knowledge and practical reason), which is the self-conscious reality of which we have direct experience.

Timothy Mahoney says that the perfect self-diffusing goodness of the love of the Father explains the generation of the Son and procession of the Spirit. The three Persons – each distinct in his personhood and intimately related to the two remaining Persons – are collectively *the* Absolute. Individual identity is retained in divine union, for divine union is a *perichoresis* (dance) of the divine Persons with each other, with their creatures, and with their other creations, within the life of the Trinity. Part of this *perichoresis* or intimate fellowship and sharing is reflected in the dual nature of Christ. Human nature has been assumed by the Second Person of the Trinity, so that creation itself may be assumed into the life of the thrice-personal One God. Thus in Jesus, God becomes what we are, in order to make us what he is.

“One must say that the whole Trinity is the Absolute, rather than just the Father who is the initiating principle of the Trinitarian relations. It is precisely because the Father accomplishes the perfect self-diffusion of goodness by communicating to others ‘His whole substance and nature’ that we cannot accord the status of the Absolute to the Father alone. In so far as the same divine substance and nature is communicated without diminution to the Son and the Holy Spirit, they must be

included in the Absolute. Thus, simplicity and multiplicity are the mark of the Absolute. In sum, the Christian finds (or should find) other metaphysical views deficient if they identify the ‘Absolute’ as something that in fact falls short of being the highest good, precisely in so far as the purported ‘Absolute’ lacks supreme (and ultimate) self-diffusive goodness because it cannot communicate its ‘whole substance and nature.’” Christian Metaphysics: Trinity, Incarnation and Creation – T. A. Mahoney (26/12/07), P.5. – Internet.

“In the Christian description of union with God, an individual’s ‘participation in the divine nature’ (2 Peter 1:4) implies that individual identity is retained. Indeed, when creatures enter into the life of the Trinity, they also enter into the life of all other creatures in union with the divine. The result is a sort of *perichoresis* of creature with creature, as well as creature with Creator. There is no absorption, and hence dissolution of the integrity of the creature. The otherness of the Persons within the Trinitarian life guarantees the integrity of creatures within the same Trinitarian life.” Christian Metaphysics: Trinity, Incarnation and Creation – T. A. Mahoney (26/12/07), P.8. – Internet.

For Baruch Spinoza, God is the totality of everything that is. God is that rational system whose existence he held to be guaranteed by the certainty of mathematical knowledge. Spinoza’s theory of everything is therefore set out in his writings in a pseudo-mathematical style purporting to outline the nature of God as the totality of All That Is. Spinoza’s theorems are short on the first two members of the Trinity, and therefore he was criticized for being a Pantheist, to whom nature and everything is God, rather than merely in God (Panentheism), or only under God (Monarchism).

Far from being constrained by the absolutes of his eternal being, which are *synthetic a priori* categories of understanding in their own right, God expresses, manifests, and fulfils himself in the Trinity Absolute, which frees him from all limitation.

Kant confirmed that in this life, we cannot directly know the “thing-in-itself,” with respect to God. Schopenhauer added that always the intellect interposes between the objective reality and the subjective individual, between the idol and the thing-in-itself, between the universe and God.

Referring to the divine mystery, some philosophers have concluded that we may know God is, but we don’t know quite what He is, i.e. the ‘substance’ of God is beyond our comprehension. Or is it? The synopsis of world religions mapping onto the Trinity Absolute outlined in this book may be a good start in developing a unified understanding of the basically threefold multi-dimensional nature of God, as revealed by the evidence.

Being One, it would be impossible for God to be other, unless that other is somehow part of Himself. For God, there is only thrice-personal Self. God knows no other, and there is no God but God. Creation is only explained with the conception of One God in the Trinity of the Three Absolutes of Creation, and this makes that Trinity a scientific as well as philosophical inevitability. Apparently this self-sufficient ‘good idea’ or ‘universal’

amounts to a past-eternal and future-permanent divine 'essence' of self-existence, providing a core of goodness for the eternal formation and unification of all that is.

In the final analysis, this Trinity manifestation of One God exists by virtue of His triune will-to-goodness, as the only adequate expression of the multi-dimensional divine nature.

The Greek philosophers were right to concentrate on the fundamental problem of being: "the one and the many." The 'trick' is to realize that the One and the Many are synthesized and consummated in the unconditioned totality of All That Is.

In spiritual terms, that consummation is paralleled in the Holy Ghost of Christianity (neither the Father, nor the Son, but the Holy Spirit proceeding from both), as well as the Destroyer/Consummator of Hinduism, and the neither/nor Unconditioned Nirvana consciousness, which Buddha called the middle way (analogous to the great way or Tao of yin/yang, encompassing all that is).

In physical terms, that consummation is reflected in the science of quantum entanglement and the qubit (neither 1 nor 0, but 1&0), which gets into probabilities indicative of a dimension of freedom complementing our otherwise totally deterministic science.

That consummation reaches its ultimate expression as the third member of the Trinity Absolute – synthesis of the Deity Absolute Creator and Universe Absolute Supreme Being, in the holistic concept of All That Is (God and not-God, theology and science).

The ancients believed that in the beginning was the differentiation of heaven and earth, from chaos or the void. Modern astronomers tell us that the universe is expanding, and proponents of the "Big Bang" theory calculate that it all started from an apparently infinitesimal point of infinite density about 14 billion years ago. Prior to that infinitesimal 'singularity' there was "undifferentiated sameness indistinguishable from nothingness," or perhaps merely nothing but unimagined force potentials of ineffable pre-energy/matter.

Idealists theorize that at that primordial point where space and time meet, there was a breakthrough, and God achieved 'critical mass' in terms of conceptual systematic unity. Seeing that it was good, the Creator-consciousness released and set free his dream creatures and creations. The Primogenitor 'let go' and became his creatures, participating with them in their creations, which seems to have been the intention all along.

According to the experts, time and space had a beginning that corresponds to the origin of energy and matter. The 'singularity' did not appear in space, rather space began inside the singularity, which seems to have appeared out of nowhere for reasons just as mysterious and unknown as the origin of potentials and reason itself.

It would seem that there may never have been a 'time' when the Deity Absolute was not the Primogenitor or Creator of the Supreme Being or Oversoul, as well as co-sponsor and coordinate of their Ultimate Unconditioned Spiritperson of destiny. Then, in the

beginning was not the void, but the Trinity of One God, at least conceptually and potentially. Out of these potentials emerged the existentially necessary Deity Absolute and the experientially contingent Universe Absolute, propelled and pulled along by the ultimately possible Unconditioned Absolute – that inscrutable spirit/person – the Holy Ghost.

On the other hand, perhaps there may have been a “time before time” when the divine consciousness thought and pondered within itself, gradually realizing itself in the eternal hypostasis of Trinity absolute, supreme, and ultimate; until the unbearable goodness of its potential being exploded in the origin of actual time and space, etc. From out of this *singularity* of goodness – generating and generated by an agony of divine longing and a frenzy of sublime dream creations – came prime energy, matter, and their interaction based on the immutable abstract metaphysical constant – Trinity.

In psychological terms, Trinity is conceived as One God manifest in three phases or expressions, united in spirit and universal in mind, but especially integrated in multi-dimensional personality. The Trinity could hardly be three souls, as that would constitute three Gods, contradicting the unity of God.

If God has only one soul, then psychologically, the Trinity must refer to the personality or persona of that Soul being threefold, for the mind of God must be universal and the spirit must be united. Then logically, we can say that God is “one” in essence of universal mind and cosmic spirit, but “three” in personality. More properly, the three spirit-persons of the Trinity are unified in “One” God.

The Many must be a reflection of what the One is, and if there is only One, there can be no other, except it be within the nature and purview of the One. Then, somewhat as the son reflects the father, so the threefold human soul might be expected to reflect the Trinity, with due allowance for the ‘perichoresis’ or procession of psychological factors. If so, then each individual may well have something like a divine spark of their Creator’s spirit, united with the spirit of his Supreme Being, and unified in the ‘glorified’ Spirit of their consummate Unconditioned Absolute Being. Similarly, human souls may also have access to meager portions of the ‘universal’ mind, and be endowed with attenuated reflections of possible combinations, and probable variations, of the divine personalities.

It should also be noted again that the “trinity” dismissed by Muhammad is not the Christian Holy Trinity, but the old Egyptian trinity of the divine Father/Mother/Son (updated as in Allah/Mary/Jesus) – just the kind of primitive and unfortunate carnal idolatry that Christians also reject. For evidence of this, see Quran 5:116 where Muhammad says, “Keep in mind, when Allah will ask Jesus son of Mary; didst thou say to the people: Take me and my mother for two Gods besides Allah?”

The Trinity Absolute does not undercut Allah, but supports him, by noticing and drawing attention to the integral logic of His *personal* expressions in major religions. The Trinity is One God reflecting and reflected in the overall unity and abstract symmetry of the expressions of God in Islam, Christianity, and Hinduism, etc. These world religions

correspond directly to the *three absolutes of metaphysical creation*, and indirectly to the threefold psychology of the human soul. These are all expressions of One God, variously called in the first person – Allah, Abba, Brahma, etc.

As the Supreme Allsoul is literally “all souls,” so the Absolute is “thrice-personal,” and the Spirit is “twice-glorious.” Continuing the declension, we might also note that the Deity Absolute is acknowledged to be “first-person” of the Trinity – the primogenitor and to some extent creator of his counterparts; but this already implies the two other personal co-creators of absolute coordinate status, without which the Deity himself would not be himself.

Many Christians find themselves slipping back and forth between personal and impersonal metaphors for understanding the Holy Ghost. Buddhists might say that the Unconditioned is neither personal nor non-personal, but the middle way of Nirvana. For Neo-Confucians, the incomparable Tao is mostly an impersonal (possibly pre-personal) ineffable force of nature.

Zen suggests that timeless primordial “Nothingness” enshrouds and conceals both the Deity Absolute and the Supreme Being. Their spirits seem to be mingling and melding in the Absonite Spirit of that void at one ‘moment,’ while in the next, they seem to be emerging or differentiating from their mysterious Unconditioned Counterpart, and becoming more personal.

In defense of the mysterious Spirit-Person concept, C. S. Lewis pointed out that when people get together in a family, or a club, or a trade-union, we talk about the ‘spirit’ of that union. Indeed, in an army, ‘esprit de corps’ is a widely recognized factor, individual to each unit and again particular to the army as a whole.

It is as if a sort of communal personality came into existence, at each level of association. “Of course, it is not a real person: it is only rather like a person. But that is just one of the differences between God and us. What grows out of the joint life of the Father and Son is a real Person, is in fact the Third of the three Persons who are God.” Mere Christianity – C. S. Lewis, P.149.

The “unconditioned” is also known as the *purusha* or spirit, in Hindu mythology. Purusha is depicted as a giant, who is sacrificed or dismembered and bestowed or “besprinkled” on all things both divine and mundane.

It is said that Purusha (spirit) along with Prakriti (matter) create the necessary Tattvas (truths) for the creation of heaven and earth. Purusha is both immanent in the manifest world, and transcendent to it. Purusha is the Spirit of All That Is and is not, comparable to the unconditioned Nirvana consciousness of Buddhism – neither being, nor non-being, but both (becoming).

God is the original or highest Purusha, but individual spirits (angels) are also Purushas. Humans are indwelt by Purusha – the indwelling spirit witness or guide – “I know him in my heart.” (The Purusha Sukta).

In terms of spirit beings, Muslims acclaim the angel Gabriel as God’s “special messenger” to Muhammad, while Christians are told that Gabriel was the “annunciator” of the birth of Jesus to Mary. Some Christians also associate the archangel Michael with Jesus, and Hindus recognize a class of semi-divine beings they call Mahadevas.

Just as the Creator Deities of the major religions (Allah, Abba, and Brahma) might be regarded as *existential* representatives of, or names for, the Deity Absolute; so the super-heroes of religion (Muhammad, Jesus, and Buddha) may be said to be *experiential* representatives of the Supreme; and similarly, the super-angels or archangels (Gabriel, Michael, and the Holy Ghost or Mahadeva) may be *absonite* representatives of the Spirit, in a Trinity of religions (Muslim, Christian, and Hindu/Buddhist).

Without the first absolute – the Deity Absolute – there would be no coordinate Absolutes. And without the Deity Absolute there would be no immortal human souls to compose his Universe Allsoul or Supreme Being. But without the Deity Absolute and the Supreme Being there would be no Ultimate Consummator to close the circle of creation. Without reasonable systematic closure, there would be nothing definite.

On the other hand, without the Universe and All That is, the Deity Absolute would be unfulfilled. Christian theology claims that the concept of the “father” nature of God includes ideas of sonship, which are among the highest ideals in the mind of humans; and from Hegel we understand that the highest is the absolute idea, which is God. Thus, we are justified in referring to God as Our Absolute Father. This intensely personal and universal term already implies his Absolute Counterparts in the Trinity, as well as inferring the many “children” of God as Deity Absolute Father, with whom everyone can claim intimate relationship, at least by adoption through his Son and their Spirit.

The Trinity Absolute concept gives a thorough-going rational account of the creation, ranging from metaphysics and physics to psychology and theology. By psychology, we mean the personality, mind, and spirit of the individual and collective soul. By theology, we mean the basic attitudes of the soul to the absolute reflected in world religions, which we observe come with three distinct ‘personae’ or characteristics, and consist in three similar but slightly different spirit flavours.

These three personal religious ‘attitudes to the absolute’ are rationally universal and spiritually united, as befitting the personal freedom and spiritual dignity of the rational soul of all humanity. This Supreme Allsoul is conceived to be coordinate with the Creator, and Consummator in the Trinity of One God, as best we can understand that God, based on the “evidence” we see around us.

Quantum fluctuation theory has introduced the “undetermined” qubit (neither 1 nor 0, but 1&0), which is just where freedom seems to enter our otherwise totally deterministic



science. This is challenging, but edifying because it points to what we have already concluded from experience and reason, i.e. freewill; which is the distinguishing prerogative of the human soul composed of personality, mind, and indwelling spirit.

So, it would seem that we are free to adopt any one, any combination, or all of the attitudes represented by major religions and their variations. Or we can reject all religious attitudes – but this is a species of spiritual suffocation (materialism), leaving the individual with belittled conscience, and no faith in absolutely universal moral law, let alone any explanation for his own existence.

Universal mind (pure and practical reason) is the steadiest component of the soul, followed closely by freely united spirit, and complemented (enlivened) by distinctly characteristic personality. Judgment and the executive power of the human soul involves and depends on all three.

The personality is not the ‘Monarch’ of the human soul, but shares executive powers with his coequal coordinates – the mind and spirit. Plato had a vision of the impetuous personality, as a horse yoked to the dependable spirit, getting out of the control of the rational mind (driver), resulting in the will of the personality to some extent taking over the direction of the chariot (soul). Plato tended to regard mind and sometimes spirit as the natural ‘sovereign’ of the human soul. Hegel held that ‘geist’ or spirit-mind is the essence of the absolute (soul), and Kant concluded that pure reason informs, but practical reason decides the will (of the spirit-person).

Both intuition and reason tell us that there must be a systematic unity to reality, or nothing would exist. If ideas may be said to have power, then it stands to reason that there must be some systematic unity of ideas, some overarching identity that ties together all reality – some absolute value, some comprehensive idea, which closes the circle of creation. Otherwise, it is difficult to see how there could be something, rather than nothing, and why there would be anything at all – even a dream struggling for coherence.

Then, there must be one simple but elegant all-inclusive idea that provides a metaphysical foundation (Kantian “transcendental argument” or Platonist “rational account”) for creation, out of nothing but pure and practical reason itself.

Science has peered inside matter to find that ultimately it is not modeled on the solar system as with the classical atoms, but on the relation of three sets of quarks. This gets into the theory of “quantum entanglement” or superposition of particle pairs which behave as “single entities.” These are described mathematically as “qubits” (1&0) asserting the value of a disjunctive antinomial third coordinate (the aggregate or synthesis), without specifying the values of the disjuncts separately. This brings in quantum uncertainty, but gives systematic freedom grounded in synthesis (1&0) added to the dialectical perspective (1) or (0). Of course, this may be just where our otherwise totally deterministic science makes room for freewill creation.

In terms of that creation, consider the ontological antinomy of necessary being and contingent existence, i.e. if anything exists, then something exists necessarily; versus nothing exists necessarily, all is an infinite regress of causes. This seems to be an expression of complete opposites. Nevertheless, it has been shown that by the laws of contradiction, both may in fact be true, and ultimately compatible, if taken in different respects or looked at from different viewpoints.

Likewise, the universe may be regarded as both finite and infinite, having a certain beginning in one sense, and no definite beginning when looked at in another way. Similarly, **freedom and determination may both be true**, but merely different perspectives. In general, if the great antinomies are simultaneously related in a systematic unity, then their synthesis itself is a third truth, which is neither the one nor the other, but a coordinate composition and powerful transformation of both.

The triune 'creation' may be rationalized as heaven and earth united in the grand cosmos, centered on Paradise, reflected in the universes of space and time, spiritualized by the sublime totality of all that is, and trinitized in Absolute, Supreme, and Ultimate Being.

That something as ephemeral as an idea could create an absolute polarity of potential force, having solid results in energy and matter, might seem at first glance to be a rather tenuous metaphysical explanation. However, in the last analysis, the inescapable 'gravity' of the immutable absolute ideas and concepts of pure reason may be the essence of self-existence in the intelligible, transcendent, eternal, existential, noumenal realm which underlies the empirical, immanent, temporal, experiential, phenomenal reality.

Although there can be only One God over all, in order to create anything, He would have to bestow something of Himself on that thing, and ultimately on all things. To create Himself out of nothing but Himself, He would have to be two, at least in some respects; and those two would ultimately have to join in three, in order to close the circle of One God, in mutual and manifold relations.

To be three in One, the inner nature of God must inevitably be threefold in at least one of his psychological characteristics – spirit, mind, or personality. It is difficult to see how any coherent reality could exist if God were of more than one (united) spirit and one (rational) mind. In that case there would be at least three Gods. On the other hand, One God could very well be manifest in three personalities – like the distinctions among world religions – different in personality character, but similar in spirit flavour, and the same in reason, as already implied by the large areas of agreement amongst the core beliefs of the major religions.

The abstract proposition that while God is a unity, his personal nature and his creation, in its broadest sense, must be at least threefold is a logically inescapable metaphysical necessity, and thus the idea of **Trinity is a philosophical inevitability**, as the only adequate assumption or postulate upon which to construct a balanced explanation of heaven, earth, and all that is (heaven and earth).

Trinity allows God to escape the awful fetters of His absoluteness, and to blossom in splendid colours of transcendence, immanence, and ultimacy. Trinity composes the circle of creation in a pre/post-ultimate triumph of pure and practical reason, constituting the necessary metaphysical basis of itself in three phases. Pythagoras and Aristotle called “3” the beautiful, magical, ‘perfect number’ because it closes the circle of creation in the trinity of one, many, and all – made out of nothing but the rational idea of themselves and each other – comprehensive and complete unto itself.

It is impossible to think that evil is the grand constructive principle of creation. We can only think that the systematic unity of the principle of the ‘good’ could possibly have sufficient coherence to be the secret of creation. Then, the ‘form of the good’ extolled by Plato and others may be thought of as the characteristic goodwill of the individual persons of the Trinity of One God manifest as the absolutely Good Creator, his superbly Supreme Being, and their sublimely Glorious Spirit.

Alternatively, the ‘form of the good’ may be regarded as a threefold characteristic of the good, super, and sublime Trinity in its manifold or ‘corporate’ identity, as a unified whole; in which all three divine persons participate in a free harmony of good judgment, made all the better by its multi-dimensionality, i.e. *Trinity is the form of the Good*.

Therefore, it should be no surprise that the psychological nature of the human soul would also be threefold, reflecting the Trinity as its only adequate metaphysical vehicle. There is certainly a long tradition that the human soul is threefold – personality, mind, and spirit (see Chapter 6.0). The Trinity is projected onto and reflected in the psychology of the human soul, experienced as a triunity of: (1) personality or ego self-consciousness, (2) mind or id – conscious and unconscious, and (3) spirit or superego – mostly unconscious, even superconscious.

What *is* somewhat astounding is the deep-seated and pervasive evidence that the Trinity is mirrored in world religions, as three absolute spirit-personae united in the soul of One God. Even though we may have suspected all along that the major religions are all just different views of the “Same God,” it seemed too simplistic or contrived, and too subversive of orthodoxy to be true, until examined closely.

But in fact, speaking colloquially, Allah, Abba (Father, as Jesus called Him), and Brahma may be said to be a world representation of the first person of the Trinity Absolute. Then, in a constructive world-view: east, west, and far-east religions present a threefold understanding of One God manifest primarily in Muslim and Jewish intuition of the *Deity Absolute Creator*, Christian and Hindu conception of the *Supreme Being*, and Hindu/Buddhist/Taoist apprehension of the *Destiny Consummator* or *Unconditioned Spirit* Tao of All That Is. Together with their variations and combinations in Shinto, Sikh, Jain, B’hai, and other major religions, this Trinity concept reflects and expresses the collective human understanding of God.

Muslims and Christians must ask themselves, who wants to deny that Allah (Abba) is the Deity Absolute Creator, when both Muhammad and Jesus made a revelation of that?

Secondly, who cannot accept that these human beings are true complements of that same Deity Absolute, expressing Universe Absolute Supreme Being (they are who they say they are)? And thirdly, who cannot begin to see the divine dignity of their Unconditioned Absolute Spirit, insofar as it is also expressed in the other major religions of the world, particularly Hinduism, Buddhism, and Taoism?

Religious Pluralism and the rational recognition of One God apprehended in the major world religions is not surrender to a colourless culture of homogenized religion, that is neither hot nor cold, neither one thing nor the other. Rather, it is a creative affirmation of the multidimensional reality that is One God, as humankind perceives that Absolute One from three basic points of view – emphasizing one, or other, or both – existential, experiential, and their conjoined unconditioned consciousness.

The pre-eminence of the concept of Triunity is confirmed by the intrinsically three-dimensional nature of space (length, breadth, depth), the experientially three-fold nature of time (past, present, future), the energetically three-phase composition of matter (electron, proton, neutron), the physically three-state existence of matter (solid, liquid, gas), the psychologically three-part nature of the human soul (personality, mind, spirit), as well as the three basic attitudes of religion towards the Absolute (Allah, Abba, Brahma).

Is there anything more frugal than the simple but basic triangle, the explanatory power of which should by no means be disparaged on account of the fact that three (3) is simply the first number defining the metaphysics of space, time, energy, matter, the nature of the soul, and the attitudes of religion? Truly, three is fundamental.

Therefore, it should not be surprising to find that “three” is the first systematic foundation for the recognition and understanding of the quantum metaphysics of creation, as already revealed in the **undetermined** qubit (neither 1, nor 0, but 1&0) of quantum computing.

However, it *is* somewhat surprising that in terms of theology, we find three fundamental religious responses in human psychology reflecting the make-up of the Trinity buried in the sometimes confusing and contradictory terminology of the Muslim, Christian, Hindu and other religions. As has been demonstrated, these religions are implicit and explicit variations on three basic psychological-cultural worldviews or attitudes.

We find this personalized in the Christian Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as well as the Hindu Trimurti of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva; with other religions emphasizing one, or other, or some combination of the three absolute coordinates.

It has been said that Muslims believe in One God as Allah *the* Absolute; and Christians recognize One God as Abba – the Deity Absolute Father of his Universe Absolute Son, and co-sponsor of their Unconditioned Absolute Holy Spirit. Similarly, Hindus worship many gods symbolized in the One Godhead – Brahma – portrayed as three faces representing the Hindu Trimurti composed of the Deity Absolute Creator, Universe Absolute Preserver, and Unconditioned Absolute Destroyer (Consummator). This Hindu Trinity is also known as Bhagavan, Paramatman, and Brahman.

Interestingly, while Brahma is not much worshipped anymore, most Hindus believe that it is really Vishnu “who takes the designation of Brahma/Vishnu/Shiva,” and for many others it is Shiva who is identified with “the ‘Trika’...namely Para (the Supreme), Apra (the Non-Supreme), and Parapara (the Supreme-Non-Supreme).” An Introduction to Hinduism – G. Flood, P.111&168.

Historically, Buddhism is an offshoot or development of Hinduism, and it should be noted that in prominent schools of Hindu thought, Gautama Buddha is said to be the ninth (9<sup>th</sup>) avatar or incarnation of the Hindu God Vishnu.

“At this time, reminded of the Kali age, the god Vishnu became born as Gautama, the Shakyamuni, and taught the Buddhist dharma for ten years.” Bhavishya Purana (3.1.6.35-37).

This is our authority for including Buddhism as a variation of Hinduism which maps directly onto the third member of the Trinity Absolute, with Buddha as a counterpart to Muhammad and Jesus.

Thus in terms of the Islamic, Christian, and Hindu/Buddhist religions the three persons of the Trinity of One God may be characterized as:

- 1) Allah/Abba/Brahma – transcendent existential Deity Absolute Creator,
- 2) Muhammad/Jesus/Buddha – immanent experiential Supreme Being,
- 3) Gabriel/Michael/Mahadeva – associative unconditioned Spiritperson.

The ‘second coming’ expected in many religions may be personalized in the gestalt of human consciousness or Allsoul represented by Muhammad/Jesus/Buddha, in their future incarnation as Mahdi/Messiah/Maitreya or Kalki, descending as the Supreme Being, with the glory and power of the Spirit of Destiny Consummation or ultimate reality, who/which will probably turn out to be Allah/Abba/Brahma glorified in the Unconditioned Spirit of the Absolute and the Supreme.

If “you and your gods create each other” in any meaningful sense, then something like this consummate and coherent interpretation of major religions could very well be a true metaphysical blueprint for world peace, based on the inclusive ideas of religious pluralism, rather than on the exclusive dogmas of failed orthodoxy. Building on the large areas of practical agreement we’ve already got makes good sense, because the beliefs of the major world religions lend themselves altogether fittingly to a universal worldview, despite some points of opposition having to do with personal attitudes, when looked at closely.

“According to Zen, we are too much of a slave to the conventional way of thinking, which is dualistic through and through. No ‘interpenetration’ (nor

interpretation) is allowed, there takes place no fusing of opposites in our everyday logic.” Essays in Buddhism – D. T. Suzuki, P.269.

There is an abundance of cogent evidence that the diversity of major religions is a more or less clear reflection of the multi-dimensional divine life. Same God – unified in spirit, universal in mind, and manifest in distinctive personal attitudes characteristic of the world’s major religions.

The limitless explanatory scope and elegant coherence of the Trinity Absolute concept is of such good universal philosophical implications, that it would seem to be a closer view of the true nature of God, even if many of the serendipitous ramifications of the abstract concept can never be “proven” beyond a doubt, nor fully explored.

“Same God!” – the great religions are different in personality, but similar in spirit; so that together with universal mind, they may be conceived as the ‘soul’ of One God.

Integral Religious Pluralism recommends itself as the only adequate metaphysical vehicle of rational religion, politics, and world peace.

Samuel Stuart Maynes  
Surrey, B.C., Canada

Posted to: [www.trinityabsolute.com](http://www.trinityabsolute.com), August 2017.

Please e-mail your comments or questions directly to: [stumaynes@hotmail.com](mailto:stumaynes@hotmail.com).