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Introduction

This Book is a collection of Essays or Tract Books previously published or written.
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It has been said that the only real, airtight proofs are those which are tautological in nature. Here, I present a tautological proof for the cognitional structure as found in the work of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, and Bernard Lonergan.

Lonergan asserts that knowledge is found through a threefold structure of knowing involving experience, understanding, and judgment and reflection. I will give an example of the structure and proof mathematically.

1. I experience four apples which are in front of me. These apples have a skin, a reddish-green color and a stem, respectively.

2. I understand that four apples correspond mathematically
to the number 4.

3. I judge that if I take two of the apples away and hide them, I will only have two apples left. I also reflect and judge that four minus two is two, in the abstract.

Thus, it is argued that:

experience + understanding + judgment/reflection = knowledge

The foregoing is tautological proof which cannot be disproved.

Put more simply:

1. I experience, experience

2. I understand, experience

3. I judge and reflect that my understanding is sufficient for knowledge

The foregoing is a tautological proof. I have just proved that experience exists as a matter of knowledge.

Next,

1. I experience, understanding

2. I understand, understanding

3. I judge and reflect that understanding exists
Now, the fuller proof of this is to define analytic understanding as the ability to categorize and compare and contrast ideas.

So, 1. I experience that an apple has a skin and stem and can be eaten and that an apple is not an orange. Thus, I have experienced my analysis of an apple and an orange.

2. I understand that I have an idea of an apple in my mind and the idea of an orange, and I understand that an apple is not an orange.

3. I judge and reflect that I have analyzed an apple and an orange, and that I have engaged in acts of analytic understanding, mentally, involving an apple and an orange.

Finally, 1. I experience judgment and reflection.

2. I understand judgment and reflection.

3. I judge and reflect that I know reality through judgment and reflection.

So, 1. I experience myself judging and reflecting that an apple is not an orange.

2. I understand myself judging and reflecting that an apple is not an orange.
3. I judge and reflect that an apple is not an orange, and, that I have judged and reflected that an apple is not an orange.

It is argued that the only way to disprove the foregoing is to start with one’s experience, elucidate one’s understanding, and then judge and reflect that knowledge is gained in some other way. This, however, is impossible since one’s actual cognitional operations would be inconsistent with one’s conclusion. In other words, there would be a contradiction between statement and performance. Such a contradiction involves the fallacy of hypocrisy.
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In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 3, Article 6, Thomas Aquinas argues that there are no accidents in God the Father. In considering this argument, it is first appropriate to discuss what an “accident” is?

In classical philosophy a distinction is made between that which is necessary, and static, and that which is contingent or accidental. Accident really does not mean what we ordinarily think. Strictly speaking an intentional act of a person drinking water would be considered an “accident” just as much as a car “accident.” Accident simply means that which does not necessarily and statically exist.

Now, it is argued that God is the Unmoved Mover, and therefore God really can’t do anything subjectively because this would be an accident for God. Thus, Thomas Aquinas suggests that God doesn’t laugh, for example. God simply and statically holds the universe in existence as Unmoved
Mover and Pure Act. Additionally, it is argued that God does not have potency in the sense that God cannot go from a state of hypothetical or imaginary incompleteness or inaction to action. Since God is perfect, God is static.

It should be pointed out, however, that God does relate to human beings. In the Old Testament God is the Burning Bush that communicates with Moses. The scriptures are inspired by God the Father. Just as God the Father answered the prayers of Jesus, so too, God the Father answers our prayers.

So, how does all of this square with Thomas Aquinas and the Summa? Well, as I have argued previously, part of God’s perfection is the Illiteration Doctrine, which is best translated as “logical accident.” Logical accident exists in God as a Necessary Cause and Attribute, while accident, as such, does not. God, while static, and perfect, acts in the world of contingency by reason of Illiteration. Thus, Aquinas work is incomplete in that he did not discuss Illiteration as Logical Accident. Once Illiteration is understood, it is clear that God can both be perfect and static, and relate to us all at the same time.
Chapter 3

Aspects of the Trinity
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The Trinity has been described as God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, Three Persons, each individually God and together, God. Orthodox Catholic theology, however, states that doctrine can be added to, supplemented, and clarified, even though certain church teachings are essentially without error and thus cannot be changed in the sense that they cannot be negated. I would like to argue for an expanded understanding of the Trinity.

I argue that for each Person of the Trinity there are at least four aspects or archetypes that God uses to manifest. This is illustrated by the chart below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Neuter Metaphysical (2)</th>
<th>Goddess</th>
<th>God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Being (Form of Form)</td>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>Abba-Yahweh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted Act of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Substantial Form</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Logos-Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy</td>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>Holy Ghost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some might think that Being and The Good have nothing to do with each other. In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 5, Article 1, Thomas Aquinas argues that Being and Goodness differ only in idea. Thus, Aquinas is arguing that Being and The Good differ only in form but not in substance. I would also argue that Being and The Good are the same in substance. Being has the perfection of being the Unmoved Mover. Being also has the perfection of being an Unrestricted Act of Understanding (Lonergan). Thus, when we intend Being we intend The Good. We do not need to intend The Good beyond Being, because there is no Good beyond Being. As Jesus said, Only my Father in Heaven (Being) is Good.

In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 5, Article 4, Thomas Aquinas argues that the end of human beings is Being, or The Good. Since
Being is the Unmoved Mover, and since Being is an Unrestricted Act of
Understanding, Being is the end of the human intellect. The intellect finds
fulfillment in Being. Similarly, Ken Wilber argues that the end of the
human being is Atman. I argue that Atman is the God of Being, or the
Supreme Good. As Aquinas says, God, who manifests Being, more than
any other existant, is not only Good, (Summa Theologica, Part I, Question
6, Article 1), but is the Supreme Good. (Summa Theologica, Part I,
Question 6, Article 2). God alone is Good, as such, because God alone
does not have as part of his being, accident. (Summa Theologica, Part I,
Question 6, Article 3).
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In Critical Thomist Jurisprudence, the cognitional structure set forth by Bernard Lonergan of experience, understanding, judgment/reflection, finds its parallel in civil procedure. Recall, that experience means the level of facts, or evidence. Understanding, is the level of consciousness concerned with generating a theory or conceptual structure which applies to the facts. Finally, Judgment/Reflection is the level of consciousness where the facts and conceptual structure are intuitively synthesized.

In Civil Procedure, on the other hand, the first level of procedure is the gathering of facts in the pre-filing investigation process. The second level of procedure is the filing of the complaint where a theory of the case is generated. Next, there is a return to the facts in the discovery process. Then, there is a return to understanding in the pre-trial memorandum process.
Finally, a trial takes place where it is determined as a matter of Judgment/Reflection whether or not the actual facts fit with the legal theory to coalesce into a judgment on the merits. So, we can see the parallel between Civil Procedure and Critical Thomist epistemology in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thomism</th>
<th>Civil Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. experience or facts</td>
<td>pre-filing fact investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. understanding</td>
<td>civil complaint filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. experience 2</td>
<td>discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. understanding 2</td>
<td>trial memorandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. judgment/reflection</td>
<td>trial judgment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, then, Critical Thomist Jurisprudence finds a parallel in Civil Procedure. This tends to show the objectivity of both the epistemology of Critical Thomism as well as the objectivity of Civil Procedure.
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Criminal Procedure and Critical Thomism
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In Critical Thomist Jurisprudence, the cognitional structure set forth by Bernard Lonergan of experience, understanding, judgment/reflection, finds its parallel in criminal procedure. Recall, that experience means the level of facts, or evidence. Understanding, is the level of consciousness concerned with generating a theory or conceptual structure which applies to the facts. Finally, Judgment/Reflection is the level of consciousness where the facts and conceptual structure are intuitively synthesized.

In Criminal Procedure, on the other hand, the first level of procedure is the gathering of facts by the police or prosecutor. The second level of procedure is the information or indictment where a theory of the case is generated. Finally, a trial takes place where it is determined as a matter of Judgment/Reflection whether or not the actual facts fit with the
legal theory to coalesce into a conviction. So, we can see the parallel between Criminal Procedure and Critical Thomist epistemology in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thomism</th>
<th>Criminal Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. experience or facts</td>
<td>police report of the facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. understanding</td>
<td>information or indictment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. judgment/reflection</td>
<td>trial judgment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, then, Critical Thomist Jurisprudence finds a parallel in Criminal Procedure. This tends to show the objectivity of both the epistemology of Critical Thomism as well as the objectivity of Criminal Procedure.
Chapter 7

Divine Providence
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Divine Providence is an interesting concept. Thomas Aquinas, in the Summa Theologica discusses Divine Providence. The general idea of Divine Providence is that God’s Providence somehow interacts with the world in a way which makes the world more meaningful. It is interesting to explore the question of whether Divine Providence affects all persons equally. I argue that some persons are the unwilling or unwitting instruments of Divine Providence without even knowing it. Such persons are used by Divine Providence for God’s ends.

Other persons, on the other hand, specifically place themselves in the Hands of Divine Providence for help, protection, and guidance. Such persons become, in a special way, agents of Divine Providence, having a special place in God’s ordering of the World and Universe.
What again is Divine Providence? Is it linear? I would argue that Divine Providence is the Dao of God’s Will and the individual will. Thus, Divine Providence is curvilinear, not linear. When one places oneself in the Hands of Divine Providence, the Dao of Divine Providence is enhanced by the willing cooperation of the person. God treats one who has placed himself in the Hands of Divine Providence as an End in himself, not merely a means to God’s ends. This difference takes place because the person actively uses his gifts of the Holy Spirit, as well as any natural gifts, in the service of God as a co-participant in God’s Plan for Creation. Those who do not place themselves in the Hands of Divine Providence are simply a means to an end for God. Such persons typically feel that blind chance is what controls their lives and destinies.
Does God the Father have a Body?
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In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 3, Articles 1 & 2, Thomas Aquinas discusses whether or not God the Father has a Body. In Article 1, Aquinas argues that God is Spirit and does not have a Body. Similarly, in Article 2, Aquinas argues that God is not composed of matter and form.

I argue that God’s Body is the Substance of the Holy Spirit. And that God the Father Exists in Bodily form in Substantial Form. Substance is a metaphysical quiddity which does not participate in potency as does matter. God, as a Necessary Being, exists in Substance. I would also argue that the body of Jesus on Earth existed in material form, that is, in matter and form, but that the resurrected Body of Jesus exists in Substantial Form.
The position that I have taken is consistent with the Church tradition found in religious art that God the Father has a Body, eternally, as does Jesus Christ.
Existentialism is often thought to have begun as a philosophical school by the philosopher Jean Paul Sartre. I would argue that existentialism is a universal philosophy which is ordered toward Being. I argue that the existential attitude is authenticity, and that authenticity manifests when one intuits Being.

Some people think that existentialism is a selfish philosophy. It is not. Instead existentialism is ordered toward the transcendent notion, or metaphysical quiddity, of Being. Being is defined as an unrestricted act of understanding, or in Platonist terms, Form of Form.

In his book, “Toward a Psychology of Being,” Abraham Maslow spends a great deal time discussing the existential attitude. Those in the Being mode, according to Maslow spend their time in self-transcending
activities, often in the service of others. They prefer artistic or helping oriented professions where they can help others.

In his jurisprudential work, author Tom Shaffer often argues for an ethic of community. I would argue that the existential attitude is the antithesis of community. Those who go to community to find their values are merely conventional. Conventionalism is often corrupt.

Being philosophy and Being Psychology is not quite mysticism, but there is some parallel. As I have said previously, existentialists intuit Being and thus get information from Being in an a linear fashion which is not strictly speaking rational. Neither, however, is it irrational. Being leads the person to a sort of existential reason that fulfills human nature. Being helps us to be who we were, and are, truly meant to be. If you wish to be all that you can be, then choose Being, not just as an abstract principle, but as an object of intuition and meditation.
Previously, I have argued that the United States Constitution incorporates by implicit and even express reference, The Declaration of Independence. Thus, the United States Constitution has an Independence Clause, guaranteeing “Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.”

Under the Independence Clause, I argue that all Americans are entitled to free, high quality, psychiatric care at government expense. Those persons suffering from mental health disabilities are not responsible for their condition. Their mental health condition has been thrust upon them by Nature. The costs of psychiatric care can be enormous. Additionally, ideally, independent living in a supportive housing apartment environment should be the goal for most psychiatric patients, or at least group home care in the community. The costs of such care should be borne by the taxpayer
and the government. Mentally ill people cannot be expected in most instances to pay for their own living expenses, let alone psychiatric care. Perhaps millionaires such as Ted Turner and Jane Pauley can afford to pay for their own lifestyles and treatment, but most mental health patients cannot.
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God The Father: The Infinite God of Being
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Many have wondered about the attributes of God the Father. In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 7, Article 1, Thomas Aquinas argues that God the Father is infinite. God the Father is infinite in Substance without potency. God the Father is Pure Act. God uses his Imagination to plan and play with possibilities and then carries out that which He decides upon using Pure Act. If God wishes to experiment, God can use probability fields to bring about certain multidimensional realities, probabilistically. God is very careful as to what manifests in Unitary reality.

God the Father also is Being, or Form of Form. In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 7, Article 1, Thomas Aquinas argues that “being is the most formal of all things.” The most formal of all that is, is, of
course Form of Form itself, or Being. As stated previously, God’s Substantial Body is Infinite, composing an Infinite Universe, as Pure Act, without potency. Jesus the Logos, also known as Jesus Christ, is Substantial Form, or Reason.
God The Father is in all Things

By
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© Copyright 2006 by Anthony J. Fejfar

God The Father is in all Things as Unmoved Mover, Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 8, Article 1. Put another way, God the Father, as Unmoved Mover, holds all things in existence. In this sense, God the Father is in everything. Additionally, God The Father is everywhere as Unmoved Mover. Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 8, Article 2.

It should be noted, however, that God The Father allows for Freewill. Although God is in all things and is everywhere as Unmoved Mover and First Cause, God allows for Freewill in terms of secondary causality. Thus, while God holds Joe Smith in existence as Unmoved Mover, Joe Smith still must individually decide what he will eat for breakfast. Joe Smith has Freewill and can move himself by an act of the will or creative inspiration to accomplish individual ends.
Chapter 13

God’s Omnipotence
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In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 25, Article 3, Thomas Aquinas argues that God is Omnipotent. Aquinas, further asserts that God is Omnipotent in the sense that anything is possible for God.

I argue, on the other hand, that God’s Omnipotence is limited by God’s Nature. God’s Nature is to be Good. God, as Being, is the Good. Therefore, it is impossible for God to act in such a way that is inconsistent with the Good. While evil is possible for many, for God evil is impossible. Therefore, God cannot act in such a way as to produce evil. Thus, God’s Omnipotence is limited to the Good.
In his book, “Intuition: Knowing Beyond Logic,” Osho discusses the difference between instinct, intellect and intuition. In so doing, Osho follows Aristotle and Plato with the levels of Body, Mind, and Spirit. I argue, however, that real intellect is a level three spiritual function, and that level two “mind” knowing involves only analytic understanding. The following chart illustrates the difference in vocabulary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Fejfar</th>
<th>Osho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Body Senses</td>
<td>Instinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analytic Understanding</td>
<td>Intellect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spirit/Intellect</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I argue, analogous to the argument of Ken Wilber, that Intuition, as such, is a Level 6 phenomenon. Level 4 is formal operations and Level 5 is Creativity. Once Intuition is “downloaded” to Level 3, mere analysis at Level 2 is integrated and transformed into intellect at Level 3. Thus, Level 3 intellection involves judgment and reflection, intuitive functions, not just analytic understanding. Moreover, it is possible to hypothesize that Intuition is downloaded even further so that Level 2 Analytic Understanding is complemented by Level 2 Intuitive Understanding, and, Level 1 Sensation is complemented by Level 1 Intuitive Experience.

Osho also argues that Intuition is irrational. I would argue, instead, that intuition is arational not irrational. Intuition represents arational wisdom. Intuition is curvilinear. Such wisdom can be discussed in poetry, parables, stories, etc. It can sometimes even be analytically thematized and categorized. Equity, for example is an intuitive-wisdom concept. Intuition emanates from the Spirit deep within all of us. Intuition is a matter of mind as much as it is a matter of heart. It is, however, the arational wisdom mind.
Chapter 15

Is God the Material Universe?
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In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 3, Article 8, Thomas Aquinas argues that God does not participate in the composition of the material universe. I argue that God’s Body, that is God the Father’s Body, is the Substantial Universe which is physical, real, but not material. The Substantial Universe is a parallel Universe to the material universe, and God can and does participate in the composition of the material universe by using Illiteration, that is, Logical Accident.

I am sure that God has other Bodies in addition to His Substantial Body, including and Astral Body and an Ethereal Body. God is a Critical Realist or a Critical Thomist, and, as such, participates the material forms and material causes, Quantum Form and Quantum Causes, and clearly where Necessary Cause is involved, Substantial Form and Substantial
Cause. Merely substantial forms and substantial causes manifest as logical accidents, participating in Illiteration.

Finally, I would argue that the Mind of God exists which is totally non-spacial and non-physical. This Mental Mind of God is a Mental Plane.

God is not the material universe, so that, pantheism is rejected. The Holy Spirit is Substance, so that in the material universe the Holy Spirit seems to be simply an immaterial Spirit, although this, strictly speaking, is not true.
In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 34, Article 1. Thomas Aquinas argues that the “Word” is a personal name for Jesus, God the Son. I argue, on the other hand that the Word really means “Logos,” and that Logos is best translated at Creative Form or Substantial Form, and, that such a name describes an essential aspect of Jesus, God the Son.

Hericlitus is the Greek philosopher who is given credit for first coming up with the term “Logos.” Logos is an active principle, and does not just mean a “word.” Logos, in its purest form can be described as Creative Form. As Walter Ong would tell us, if Jesus is the “Word,” he is an active, creative Word, not just static grammar. When considered in light of the Holy Spirit of Substance, the word Logos can also be translated as Substantial Form. It is out of the active principle of Substantial Form that
all other forms are created, except for Being, or God the Father, which is Form of Form, and except for Form, as such, which is the principle underlying the Holy Spirit of Divine Wisdom, or Wisdom.

Also, it must be stated that Jesus, also has the name Christ, which is an essential aspect of Jesus, God the Son. Christ is a Power archetype, technically meaning the anointed one, really meaning the King of Kings. Jesus is both Christ and Logos. Logos can also be translated as Divine Reason, or Reason.
Chapter 17

Knowledge of Truth
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In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 16, Article 2, Thomas Aquinas discusses truth. Aquinas argues that truth comes not from mere sense experience, nor merely from ideas, but from a threefold act of the intellect. As Aquinas puts it, “When [the intellect] judges that a thing [sense experience] corresponds to the form [analytic idea] which it apprehends [understands] about that thing [sense experience], then first it [the intellect] knows and expresses truth.” Thus, in Aquinas there is a threefold movement of the intellect which parallels that found in Aristotle
and in Bernard Lonergan’s work. The structure is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquinas</td>
<td>senses</td>
<td>form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle</td>
<td>senses</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonergan</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>judgment/reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing also parallels a similar idea found in Aquinas, Aristotle, and Fejfar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquinas</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>soul/mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>soul/mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fejfar</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>soul/mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I argue, as does Bernard Lonergan, and Aquinas, that knowledge does not come as a matter of sense experience at the body/senses Level 1 as the empiricists would tell us, nor does knowledge come as a matter of ideas at the soul/analytic mind Level 2 as the idealist and linguists would tell us, rather, knowledge or truth comes at Level 3 as a matter of Spirit/Intellect.
Intellect goes beyond mere analytic intelligence and integrates intuition, particularly intuitive judgment and intuitive reflection.
Chapter 18

Postmodernism and Schizophrenia
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Schizophrenia is a psychiatric disorder which has at its roots either severe delusions or hallucinations. I argue that a new type of Postmodern thought that is being taught in schools produces Schizophrenia.

When I was a kid, one of the things that we learned in First Grade was that some things are real and other things are imaginary. Soon we began reading books. Our teacher pointed out that some books are fiction, that is based on the imagination, and some books are fact, that is, based on experience, understanding, judgment and reflection, that is the basic stance of modern science. Now, what exactly my teacher said, I don’t remember, but I do remember that there was a clear distinction made between fact and fiction. In fact, two different parts of the library are involved in the fact-fiction dichotomy.
Unfortunately, now, some Postmodern teachers and scholars seem to take the view that there is no difference between fact and fiction. Because facts are said to involve values, facts are seen as subjective just like fiction. I argue that factual objectivity exists and that the failure to recognize the distinction between fact and fiction is a symptom of Schizophrenia. It is extremely delusional thinking to hold the belief that there is no difference between fact and fiction. Factual objectivity exists because we can use cognitive capabilities which transcend mere language in order to locate the real or the factual. Facts can be found through the process of experience, understanding, judgment and reflection. The idea that there is no difference between fact and fiction is psychotic.
In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 3, Article 1, Thomas Aquinas argues that God predestines certain persons to go to Heaven, and others not to go to Heaven. I argue that because of the operation of both individual Free Will and Grace, that no person is predestined not to go to Heaven.

In addition to God the Father representing the Good, as our End, God also functions as God the Son, who is Jesus the Logos. Logos is Divine Reason, or Creative Form, or Substantial Form. It is argued that Free Will will always allow for Grace to affect individual reason, through Divine Reason, to bring about a conversion to the Good, or Heaven.

Additionally, the Holy Spirit as Truth, Love, and Substance can intervene to save a person from Hell. Once again, a Grace filled conversion
can bring about the redemption of a soul which would otherwise be presumed to be lost to Hell. This movement away from Hell is accomplished through a substantial transformation of the person.
In his book, “Emotional Intelligence,” Daniel Goleman argues that there is such a thing as emotional intelligence, which is different that ordinary analytic understanding. Goleman argues that some people can analytically compare and contrast, and categorize ideas, but when it comes to emotional maturity, they have none.

For example, let us consider the mathematician who can add, subtract, multiply, divide, and can even engage in Calculus equations. However, this person, for example will not hold the door open for a person whose hands are full of packages at Christmas time. Instead such a stunted person might even laugh and say, “tough for you.”

Let us take another example. Let us say that I write an article criticizing a certain type of business for being irresponsible. Let us say that
this business is dumping toxic wastes into a nearby river. The response of the business person to the criticism is simply, “I don’t care.”

Now, psychiatry has the power to involuntarily commit people to psychiatric wards if a person is a danger to himself or a danger to another. I would argue that persons who have very limited emotional intelligence should be diagnosed in a mild case with infantile neurosis, and in a more extreme case, calling for involuntary commitment, with infantile psychosis.

Society cannot afford to have persons in positions of business, political, medical, or legal power, who have infantile emotional responses. Such people cannot morally or ethically reason, and they are always and essentially saying “gimme gimme gimme, my toy, my toy,” when they are being irresponsible. Psychiatry must take developmental and emotional psychology seriously and respond by taking infantily psychotic people out of positions of power where they are constantly hurting others.
I have argued previously, based upon the work of Plato and Aristotle, that the human being has at least three levels of consciousness, Body, Mind, and Spirit. In his book, “Healing the Soul in the Age of the Brain,” Dr. Elio Frattaroli, M.D., a Psychiatrist, argues that psychiatry must proceed based upon a model of the human being as having levels of consciousness which include: Body, Brain, Mind-Soul, Spirit. Because of this basic situation, Dr. Frattaroli argues that medication is never enough to treat psychiatric problems, but therapy is needed as well.

I have also argued that, the dominant model of reality for most psychiatrists is atheistic materialism. Dr. Frattaroli confirms this, arguing that the basic reality for most psychiatrists is scientific materialism, a similar concept. Frattaroli argues that the scientific materialist model of reality is
uprovable and absurd. The idea that a human being can just be reduced to brain neuronal activity is the equivalent of an irrational religious belief in materialism.

I would like to explore Dr. Frattaroli’s model further. I argue that if we think of the person as composed of Body, Brain, Soul-Mind, Spirit, then there should be an appropriate level of therapy for each level. Let us consider the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Therapy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Body</td>
<td>Body Work-Physical Therapy, Basic Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brain</td>
<td>Medication-Energy Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Soul-Mind</td>
<td>Logic Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Spirit</td>
<td>Intuition, Meditation, Symbolic Meaning, Higher Emotions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would argue, similar to the argument made by Transpersonal Psychologist Ken Wilber, that there is a type of therapy which is appropriate for every level of consciousness. I would agree with Dr.
Frattaroli that emotional-feeling work is important, however, I think that there are lower base emotions which involve level one therapies which must be treated differently than level 4 emotions, which are higher emotions such as compassion.
I argue that one of the next steps to be taken in science is the reconciliation of metaphysics, using such concepts as Being, Substance, Logos, and Form, with Quantum Physics and String Theory. It is not very much of a leap to argue that Quantum Field and Being are very close to being the same.

First, however, I would like to discuss the similarity between Quantum Theory and String Theory. I have argued that the Quanta or Quantum particle is the only real subatomic particle, and, that the Quanta can be “tuned” so that it vibrates with a different form or valence, manifesting as a different type of subatomic particle, such as an electron or a quark.
In his book, “Parallel Worlds,” Michio Kaku presents a short, but interesting discussion of string theory. Kaku argues that the basic building block of subatomic particles is a “vibrating string,” which then manifests as various subatomic particles. Thus Kaku states that a vibrating string can be “tuned” like a musical instrument so as to manifest a different subatomic particle. I argue that there is no real difference between Kaku string and my Quanta Particle, both have essentially the same attributes. So perhaps, then, the idea that the Quantum Field is analogous to a Field of Wheat Stems (or strings) makes sense scientifically. Thus Quantum Theory as well as String theory argue for a Unified Field Theory of Physics.
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Substantive Due Process is discussed both under the 5th Amendment to the United States Constitution and the 14th Amendment. The general idea of substantive due process is that there is some sort of minimal standard of rationality required for a law to be considered constitutional. Rather than discuss the current case law, I am arguing for a new approach to substantive due process using Critical Thomist jurisprudence.

Following the work of Bernard Lonergan, rational knowledge is obtained through the person engaging in the cognitive operations of: experience, understanding, judgment and reflection. I argue that this same structure can be used as basis or standard for substantive due process. Thus, I assert that a three tier test for substantive due process, involving
experience, understanding, judgment and reflection should be utilized by the United States Supreme Court and other courts.

The first tier of substantive due process involves the requirement of experience or facts. For any law to be valid it should be based, in part, upon solid factual premises. In the legislative arena, there should be testimony at the hearing stages based upon first hand accounts of why the legislation is needed and what harm is intended to be stopped or good intended to be accomplished. Additionally, if statistical studies are used, studies which employ a standard deviation of more than 5 should be excluded as irrational.

The second tier of substantive due process involves the requirement of understanding or basic rationality. The general rules of logic should apply here. Illogical arguments for legislation are to be excluded as irrational. Also, at this level, a general theory as to why the legislation supports the good or truly worthwhile, should be developed. If the theory violates other constitutional provisions it is considered irrational then it should be excluded.

The third tier of substantive due process involves the requirement of judgment and reflection. At this level the Court must make a probability judgment as to whether or not the proposed legislation promotes the good or the truly worthwhile. For ordinary business legislation the Court must
make a probability judgment of at least 55%, that the legislation promotes the good or the truly worthwhile. For legislation that divides persons up into different groups and then treats them differently according to that group, the Court must make a probability judgment of at least 85%, that the legislation promotes the good or truly worthwhile. Finally, for legislation that impinges upon constitutionally protected rights such as freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of thought, freedom of spirituality, the Court must make a probability judgment of at least 95%, that the legislation promotes the good or the truly worthwhile.

I argue that the foregoing tests would withstand the assault of logical positivist or postmodernist critique and would be enforceable.
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Hans Georg Gadamer argues that understanding must be based upon hermeneutics. Hermeneutics is the philosophy of meaning. It is argued that all meaning takes place in a context and that it is the role of the hermeneutic philosopher to figure out the context and find the deeper meaning.

The problem with hermeneutics is that a certain circularity results. If meaning is based upon context and context is based upon meaning, then we have what is known as the hermeneutic circle.

I have argued previously that the hermeneutic circle is really more of a spiral. The hermeneutic spiral allows for intuitive judgment and reflection to supplement hermeneutic understanding and brings about a wisdom which places one in contact with reality in a different, better way.
I have also argued that given the existence of Immutable Platonic Forms, Substantial Forms, and Quantum Forms, that such forms form the basis for “forestructures of knowing” which are in some sense objective and independent of both the interpreter and the interpreted.

Here, however, I would like to argue for the Hermeneutic of Love. If one finds the arguments that I have presented above to be unpersuasive, at least I can argue that the feeling of Love can provide a hermeneutic context which posits a sort of objectivity. Love does not grasp, love lets be. Love allows people and things to be themselves. In this sense I argue that Love is a hermeneutic which provides a context which provides a better meaning than Hate. Hate is the opposite of Love. Hate is grasping, controlling, and selfish. Hate Destroys. The hermeneutic of Hate is irrational and totally non-objective. The hermeneutic of Love prevails.
Some religious fundamentalists, even some Catholics, argue that the holy scripture of the Bible has only one literal meaning. This very point was addressed by Thomas Aquinas, in the Summa Theologica, in Part 1, Question 1, Article 10.

Religious fundamentalists in the time of Thomas Aquinas argued that holy scripture had one and only one literal meaning. Aquinas disagreed, arguing that scripture has several different meanings, at the very least there is a spiritual meaning which transcends the literal meaning.

Aquinas argued that in addition to the literal or historical meaning of scripture, there is also an allegorical meaning, a moral meaning, and an analogical meaning. Aquinas argued that because aspects of the scripture involve the “Old Law,” rather than the “New Law” of Christ, that scripture
involving the Old Law must be interpreted allegorically. Similarly, I would argue that the Gospels themselves have an allegorical meaning whereby the cosmology of the ancient world must be interpreted allegorically in light of the modern world. For some, the scripture can only be understood allegorically, and not literally because of their modern scientific mindsets.

Aquinas also argues that holy scripture must be interpreted morally. I would argue that the scripture must not only be interpreted morally, that is, based upon values and valuative evaluation, but also ethically based upon reason, especially the ethical rule of reciprocity.

Finally, Aquinas argues that the holy scripture must be interpreted analogically. It is in the analogical sense that we come to know the Nature of God. It is argued then, that God can only be known analogically, and not literally. I would argue that God can be known through God’s Love, and through immediate spiritual experience of God through intuition. Just as it is possible to intuit Being, so it is also possible to intuit God.

In conclusion, then, it is clear that based upon the authority of the Summa Theologica, and the work of Thomas Aquinas, that a simplistic literalist interpretation of scripture which denies deeper spiritual and symbolic meaning is wrong.
Finally, as to the teaching authority of Thomas Aquinas and the Summa Theologica, Pope Leo the XIII, wrote an entire Papal Encyclical praising the work of Thomas Aquinas and the Summa Theologica. Additionally, the Code of Canon Law of 1917 specifically requires the teaching of Thomistic philosophy and theology to Catholic seminarians and religious. See Code of Canon Law Canon 1366 and Canon 589.
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When I was a kid we learned that there was a difference between the “Base Emotions,” and the “Higher Emotions.” Since then, psychology has done a lot to relativize this distinction, making it seem that all emotions are equally good, or at least neutral.

I would like to argue that there are “Basic Emotions” which can be contrasted with “Higher Emotions.” In so doing I will argue that the word Basic is not pejorative in the sense that the word Base, was, but that still, the Basic Emotions are not the Higher Emotions.

Ken Wilber, and others have argued that there are various levels of Human Consciousness. I argue that at the lower levels of consciousness the Basic emotions are more raw and unrefined than those emotions emanating from the higher levels of consciousness.
So, for example, I argue that the Basic Emotions of Level 1 Body consciousness are geared toward individual instinctual survival. The Basic Emotions of Level 1, include: lust-love, hate, anger, jealousy, avarice, selfishness, fear, greed, etc. When Level 2 is reached, instinctual motherly love develops. When Level 3 is reached, instinctual fatherly love develops. At Level 4 the Higher Emotions begin to manifest with empathy, compassion, and rational self interest. At Level 5 Creative Feeling manifests. At Level 6, Intuitive Feeling manifests. At Level 7 Higher Love manifests. At Level 8, Higher Reason manifests. At Level 9 a Higher Love which I call Abba love develops, which is dad or mom love rather than father or mother love.

What I have suggested is simply an overview. Doubtless, others could refine what I have said even further. However, the point is that for those persons who stay rooted in the Level 1 Basic Emotions, such persons, although they may have a great deal of political power, are really very emotionally immature, and are, from an adult point of view, psychotic.
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It has been argued by many spiritual people that one must try to get beyond the ego to the self. Some even argue that you should try to attain the no-self. I argue that it is possible to find both the self and the no-self without destroying the ego. Instead the ego is integrated.

I argue that the real only workable approach to “leaving the ego behind,” is to develop the transcendental ego. You can be the most arrogant, egoistic person in the world and I could work with you in spiritual direction to develop the transcendental ego or the self. The real Self is Spirit or Holy Spirit in you, deep in your heart. The real Self and the no-self are the same.

The type of exercises needed to develop the transcendental ego are easy and can be tailor made to your situation. The transcendental ego is the
ego oriented toward transcendence. The real ego is lazy, it really doesn’t like to work. If is does like to work it is only because it is all puffed up in the quest of controlling others to meet the person’s egoistic needs.

So, let’s try an exercise for your transcendental ego. First, say to yourself a number of times, “I have a transcendental ego of my own.” Next, pick out a task that can only be accomplished with some work and at some sacrifice.

Let us take going for a walk, as an example that most people could try. Set the goal for your self of walking one quarter of a mile. Before you start walking, let your ego feel laziness. Feel at your deepest depths that you really don’t want to go for a walk. Then, switch from your ego to your transcendental ego by saying to yourself, “I am switching from my ego to my transcendental ego.” Now, say to yourself, “As my transcendental ego I am walking one quarter of a mile.” Use your transcendental ego to will yourself to start walking. Ever time you feel tired or lazy, say to yourself, “I am using my ego to transcend tiredness, or laziness.” If you are crippled or handicapped and cannot walk, try doing finger exercises. Keep working on making your goal more demanding, requiring more personal ego transcendence. If you are in pain, try to transcend the pain. (Obviously, you may need to see a medical doctor if pain is chronic). If you have severe
knee pain, for example, it may be that you will need a shot of hydrocortisone in your knees in order for you to walk.

Once again, when you try, you will develop the habit of using the transcendental ego to accomplish a practical goal. The transcendental ego is the self, it is the Spirit or Holy Spirit in you, the Real You, the True You. Soon you can transfer many different life activities to the direction of the transcendental ego, or self. The self which is Spirit, or Holy Spirit, is the no-self of Buddhism.
In his book, “How to Know God” Deepak Choprah, M.D., discusses God as He unfolds at different levels of human consciousness. Choprah’s work parallels that of Fowler, Piaget, Kohlberg, Ken Wilber, and myself. Interestingly, Choprah argues that God, at the lower levels of consciousness, particularly at the limbic, reptilian brain stem level, unfolds in a way which many Christians would describe as being demonic. From the point of view of a Vatican II Catholic, the attributes that Choprah assigns to God at levels 1 and 2, seem to be the same attributes that we associated with the Devil or Satan. Of course, in the Gnostic literature it is argued that God, at some level, is “God the Creator,” or the Demiurge, who is in fact evil.
I argue that there is an alternative unfolding of God at the lower levels which avoids the problem of the “immature” or “evil” God. Bernard Lonergan argues in his work that God or Being, is an “Unrestricted Act of Understanding.” Since Lonergan’s epistemology places understanding at level 2 one can argue that the God of Being, Who is an Unrestricted Act of Understanding, manifests at level two rather than the immature, irrational God. I argue that God unfolds also at levels 1 and 3 using the Lonerganian schema. At level one God or Substance, is an Unrestricted Act of Experience. At level three God or Logos is an Unrestricted Act of Reason, or Judgment. This Unrestricted Act of Judgment is the Final and Last Judgment referred to in the Bible. It is a metaphysical Act of Judgment which occurs outside of Space-Time.
The foregoing can be illustrated by the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Metaphysics</th>
<th>God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. experience</td>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>Unrestricted Act of Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. understanding</td>
<td>Being</td>
<td>Unrestricted Act of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. judgment</td>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>Unrestricted Act of Reason or Judgment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, I argue that it is possible for God to unfold as I have suggested above, avoiding the “immature” or “evil” God of power, and control which Deepak Chopra describes in his book. Let us call my approach the “Mystical Bypass.”
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It has been argued that God is immutable, that is, unchanging. In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 9, Article 1, Thomas Aquinas argues that God is immutable and unchanging. Since God is the Unmoved Mover and First Cause, change cannot be caused in God.

If God cannot be moved, then, the question arises as to why it is that human beings pray. We think that God will be moved to act by reason of our prayers. I argue that God’s own Freewill and God’s own Unmoved Pure Act is able to use Illiteration and be “moved” outside of material causality and space-time and insided the Godhead. When God Acts, God moves Himself in relation to everything else without being moved in material space=time or causality. In other words, there is a type of movement in God which is not linear, materially caused movement. Thus,
God can Think, Act, and Relate, while still remaining immutable from the perspective of material causality.
I have argued that Substance is Immutable and that Substance is the Metaphysical Quiddity underlying God the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is God’s Substantial Universal Body. I also argue that each substantial form which participates in Substantial Form, is also immutable.

In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 9, Article 2, Thomas Aquinas essentially argues that Substance subsists. There is no potency in substance. Substance is real, and in a sense physical while at the same time being non-material. Substance is not matter. The physicality of substance is metaphysical.

Aquinas argues that every substantial form subsists. Additionally, every substantial form is incorporeal. Thus, the Immutable Platonic Forms, as well as the substantial forms, subsist in Being, as real, physical,
immutable, but non-material and non-corporeal. Thus, the Forms, which are composed of substance, as substantial forms, are immutable. Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 9, Article 2.

Thus, I have argued that the Immutable Platonic Forms, and the substantial forms can be “added to but not subtracted from, rearranged but not changed.” Any change in substance is not really linear in space-time change, but instead is a transmutation of infinite Substance, in part.
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Much has been written about the Justice of God. In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 21, Article 1, Thomas Aquinas argues that God does not enforce or support the justice of contract, but only he justice of distribution according to need. I argue that God supports both.

I have argued previously that contract law supports autonomy. Those intend Being, those who intuit Being are autonomous. They are self directed in Being. As Maslow puts it, they Self-Actualize.

Self Actualization and autonomy support the notion of the justice of contract. In an ideal world it makes sense that people exercise their freewill by entering into transactions which promote autonomy. It is simply not practical to have a central authority figure providing for the needs of
everyone. This promotes a type of inauthentic hierarchy which God does not approve of.

Distributive justice in equity must be subordinated to contract and property law in general. Without a palet the artist cannot paint. Without wood, the carpenter cannot build a table. Without farm land the farmer cannot grow food enough for himself and others. Ordinarily, the most efficient way of obtaining and keeping property is contract and property law.

The Old Testament rule of proportionality requires that a person be paid damages in the amount damaged. If a person breaches a contract, and the contract is not unconscionable in equity, then God supports the contract law which either enforces the contract with specific performance, or, support the payment of damages under the breach of the contract, if any.
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Often, Authority is associated with God the Father, and Reason is associated with God the Son. I would argue that Liberty based upon Truth and Love, is the principle associated with the Holy Spirit.

Many Christians have been martyred for the principle of religious Liberty. Such Christians were inspired by the Holy Spirit to lay down their lives for the truth of Liberty. Liberty is Freedom in Christ. When we are inspired by the Holy Spirit, an equitable exception is made from Law, and the person is not bound by Law but only by Equity. In Equity the needs, especially the genuine Spiritual needs of the person are taken into account first, and prioritized.

Following Equity, and the Law of Love, Jesus did not break the law when he and his followers ate unwashed food on the Sabbath, contrary to
Jewish law. Equity, the Law of the Holy Spirit, the exercise of genuine religious liberty, allowed the law to be “broken” without a penalty.

In the modern world, when a person is found to be a mystic or a saint, often with the label “manic depressive,” “schizo-affective” or even “schizophrenic,” that person is judicially incompetent to stand trial at Law, and can only be dealt with in Equity. The person has the power to contract in Equity, using the standard of “in quantum meruit.” Once a person has taken on the Liberty of the Holy Spirit, that person cannot be sued in civil court and cannot be prosecuted criminally. The person has judicial immunity.
In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 2, Article 3, Thomas Aquinas sets forth five proofs for God’s existence. I will be discussing three of those proofs now.

The first proof is a proof from motion. Aquinas notes that we can use common sense to see that in the ordinary world there are things in motion. So, we experience things in motion.

Second, Aquinas notes that if we observe that which is in motion we notice that it takes a mover to put something in motion. Thus, we understand that for every movement there must be a mover which causes the movement.

Third, Aquinas notes that if we analyze the world we can see that if we were to discover the mover of every movement that this would lead to an
infinite regression of moved movers. Aquinas points out that an infinite regression is illogical and impossible. Thus, there must be a starting point where there is and was an Unmoved Mover (God), in order to avoid an infinite regress. Thus, it is argued that God exists as a matter of reflection and judgment.

While I agree with the Thomistic argument set forth above, I would also argue that another proof for God’s existence is present. If an attribute of God is infinity, and I assert that it is, then one could argue that the immanent aspect of God in creation could be an infinite movement of moved movers. If God is infinite, then an infinite regress is not impossible and is not illogical. God’s infinity is the infinite regression of moved movers. I would argue that this type of movement is found in the Holy Spirit, as immanent, while the Unmoved Mover is God the Father.

A second proof for God’s existence that Aquinas sets forth in his work involves efficient causality. Common sense tells us that the world is full of effects which are caused by causes. We see caused effects all the time. This is true as a matter of experience.

Now, given the foregoing it is obvious that for every effect there must be a cause. We understand that for every effect there must be a cause. This is seen as a matter of efficient causality.
Now, if every effect requires a cause, then it makes sense that if we try to discover the chain of causality which involves a particular effect, then we would be starting the journey of an infinite regress of caused effects. Once again it is argued that such an infinite regress is impossible and irrational. So, it then would appear that a First Cause (God) is required to begin the ultimate causal sequence. The First Cause is Jesus Christ, God the Son.

Now, once again if an attribute of God is infinity, then it is possible that God, as Holy Spirit, and as infinity, could be the Infinite Source of Causation.

It should also be noted that Quantum Physics argues that certain subatomic particles can come into existence, ex nihilo, without a cause. I would argue that if this is true, and it does appear to be true as a scientific fact. Additionally, it is argued that an attribute of God is Creation ex nihilo, that is, Creation from nothing. Thus, Quantum Causality suggests that God is the uncaused cause, or First Cause of Quantum Physics.

The last proof that I wish to discuss is the Thomistic proof from necessity. If we look around, most things seem to be contingent and subject to change. This is true as a matter of experience.
It is apparent that if everything is contingent, then there is an infinite regress of contingencies, which seems illogical or impossible. This is true on the level of understanding.

Thus, if there is an infinite number of contingencies, it is argued that such an infinite regress is impossible or irrational. Thus a Necessary Cause (God) is required. This is true as a matter of reflection and judgment.

Once again, one could argue that God has the attribute of Infinity, and thus that God, as Holy Spirit, and infinity, could manifests as an infinite number of finite contingencies. This is another proof for God’s existence.
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I once was under the illusion that modern medicine, including psychiatry, was based upon medical science. Now, I know better. Now I know that psychiatry uses statistics in an irrational, unscientific way.

Now, the idea with scientific studies, including medical scientific studies, is that there is supposed to be some statistical correlation between the diagnosis and the alleged disease. In other words, every diagnosis is supposed to be supported by statistical evidence, if it is a valid scientific diagnosis.

I have been told by a psychologist that a standard psychological test for diagnosing such maladies as schizophrenia or bipolar disorder, utilizes a standard deviation of 10. Now, when I was a kid, I was taught that standard deviations which exceeded a standard deviation of 1, were scientifically questionable. How is it that psychiatry and psychology can
utilize a standard deviation of 10? I think that with a standard deviation of 10 that I might be able to prove that drinking water from a red glass causes schizophrenia. A standard deviation of 10 involves what Piaget refers to as magical thinking. It is psychotic. On information and belief, the Diagnostic, Statistical Manual for Psychiatric diagnosis utilizes a standard deviation which is also irrational. Psychiatry which is not scientific is Voodoo psychiatry and is wrong. Psychiatry is in need of reform.
As I have suggested before, psychiatry concerns itself with the unreal, or the psychotic. Many psychiatrists will diagnose a person who hears either “inner” or “outer” voices with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder. Medication is then used in an attempt to stop the voices from taking place. Interestingly, Zen Meditation has traditionally concerned itself with blocking out thoughts or even internal voices. I would like to argue that psychiatry use Zen Meditation as a replacement for medication or as a supplemental therapy to eliminate voices.

In Zen Meditation the student is taught to block out all internal mental phenomenon and find a place of inner stillness or silence. The student develops the mind or imagination is such a way that he or she is able to “jam” the reception of voices or thoughts in the mind. Sometimes
internal imagination or imagery techniques can be effectively used. I predict that such Zen Psychiatry will be commonplace in the future.
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Procedural Due Process is based on the idea that everyone is entitled to a fair hearing in court before some legal action is taken against him or her. I argue that the epistemology of Bernard Lonergan provides a basis for an objective standard for Procedural Due Process.

Lonergan starts with the level of experience. Experience means the data or the facts. Procedural Due Process requires that there be a fair and just method for obtaining the facts of the case. Witnesses must be allowed to testify as to their knowledge of the facts. Each lawyer must have the opportunity to ask questions of the appropriate witness.

I also argue that the Rules of Evidence should apply in every proceeding. Currently, some administrative proceedings do not apply the rules of evidence and allow hearsay to be introduced into evidence, for
example. It is wrong to allow hearsay testimony into evidence at a trial. It is too easy for evidence to be fabricated when referring to what someone else said outside the courtroom. Additionally, there is not opportunity to cross examine the real witness whose knowledge is being referred to in the hearsay statement.

Procedural Due Process also requires that Lonergan’s level of understanding be utilized. Once the facts are determined they must be placed in logical, legal, categories. For every crime, for every cause of action, the elements of the crime or the elements of the cause of action must be utilized and examined in order to determine if the facts fit into the criminal elements or the elements of the cause of action.

Finally, Lonergan’s judgment requires that the judge and/or jury exercise good judgment in an effort to ensure that a judgment based on both the logical law, and the facts, takes place.
Bernard Lonergan has argued that reality unfolds in accordance with interlocking schemes of reoccurrence. In other words reality is complex. There are interlocking schemes of reoccurrence which manifest everywhere, and all the time, which are not strictly speaking linear and logical. When seven or eight complex factors act to make an occurrence happen, then there simply is no one single linear cause which causes reality to manifest in a strictly linear way. Even if I ride my bike to the grocery store it is apparent that riding a bike is a complex task. I must stay balanced on the seat and pedals. I must be able to change gears. Finally, I must be able to apply the brakes. If riding a bike is complex, think how much more so some human decision making is complex.
Corporate decision making for example must take into account a wide variety of factors: law, shareholder interests, consumer interests, community interests, supply market, demand market, research and development, etc. Because reality is complex it is possible that at some times the decisionmaker will have to make an Equitable Exception from what appears to be required ethically, at law, in order to achieve the good, or truly worthwhile. Thus, corporate law recognizes the business judgment rule which gives a corporate decision maker wide latitude in making corporate decisions. Such latitude should be applied in other professions such as lawyering. There should be a “good judgment” rule allowing lawyers a wide latitude for their professional judgments.
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In the Summa Theologica, Part I, Question 47, Article 3, Thomas Aquinas argues that there is only one unitary world, not many worlds; that is, no Multidimensional World. Quantum Physics on the other hand argues that multidimensional worlds are not only possible, but probable, given the probabilistic nature of reality. Similarly, in the Seth Books, by Jane Roberts, Seth argues that not only is the nature of the world multidimensional, but that God is Multidimensional.

I argue that although the nature of reality is probabilistic, that a Perfectly Unitary God, in part, as well as a Probabilistically Unitary God and World both Exist, although strictly speaking such probabilistic unity is no more than a statistical congruence. Let us say that the Perfectly Unitary God manifests as a Multidimensional Unitary, Probable God, and let us say that the Unitary World is a Probable World. While in certain respects I
would argue that God is Changeless or Static, I also argue that God manifests Probabilistically.

As Aquinas argues, there is an aspect of God which is Perfect, Static, Changeless, and Perfectly Unitary. This aspect of God is composed of Perfect Mathematical Equations which never become obsolete.

Each of us, in some sense, has our own individual Probable God which we relate to individually. Sometimes a social compact of sorts is formed and then my Probable God and your Probable God may be the same except for statistically insignificant differences. Thus, there is a Highly Probable God Who seems to relate to a majority of the believing population. Perhaps, the Perfectly Static and Unitary God in His essential nature is the same for everyone, however, that God is so incomprehensible for us that we typically do not relate to Him. Instead, we relate to a probable God who in relating to each of us, and each of our religious congregations or churches God manifests probabilistically differently, rather than not all.

I argue that God in his essential nature has “hardwired” mathematical programs which are unchanging. It would seem, however, that God is quite capable of teaching us different religious doctrines as He manifests probabilistically for each of us. Such doctrines may be merely probable and contingent unless they flow directly from God’s Unchanging
Static Nature  Perhaps the most “authentic” God, the God of Being, has a relatively low probability for many believers. Perhaps the probable god of Power and Control is not even considered to be God by some of us who revere a different Probable God.

So, what I am suggesting is that a Unitary God Who is Unchanging and manifests Multidimensionally Exists, however, the unitary world is much more contingent. Perhaps the reality of the unitary world can probabilistically shift depending upon a variety of factors including religious, philosophical, and political beliefs. The Unitary World is merely probabilistic and shifts. The multidimensional world only seems unitary because it is characterized by say, 100 parallel worlds, all with only statistically insignificant differences relative to each other.
People think a lot about Heaven sometimes. You know, wondering what it will be like. Some people think of peace and rest. Some people think of listening to angelic music. Other people think Heaven is more like Paradise. They think Heaven will involve good food, good booze, and good sex with beautiful women (if men).

I argue that Heaven is multidimensional and is based to some degree upon Karma. As you sew, so you shall reap. As you Judge, so you will be judged. The standards you set for others will be the standards applied to you. So, if Multidimensional Heaven exists, so does multidimensional purgatory and multidimensional hell. If you are reasonable, loving, and wise, in how you order your life, then you will end up in Multidimensional Heaven. A sign that you may approaching Multidimensional Heaven is
how satisfied you are with your current life. If you had the Karma to get your current life reincarnationally, then there is no reason that a few adjustments might be made multidimensionally and a similar but better life be set up for you.

Let us say that in this life you were very happy with your body except for the fact that you would like to have been 3 inches taller than what you were. Such a change could easily be made for you. Say also you were generally happy with your early childhood, but don’t want to go through it again. There is no reason a parallel world or universe could not be set up where you shifted into yourself probabilistically at age 5, when you could still grow and extra 3 inches.

Now, it would probably also be nice in Multidimensional Heaven to do something nice for your parents. Say, one parent had diabetes, that could be eliminated. The nice thing about this system is that it does not require a perfect world. You are in the world but not of the world, as Jesus says. You just end up being one of those fortunate people who is spiritual, happy, and nothing ever goes wrong for you or your immediate family in a way that would negatively affect you. That is Multidimensional Heaven in the context of Multidimensional Reality.
I guess I am what you might call an Intuitive Mystic. A fair number of people have written about intuition. In his book, “Psychological Types,” Psychiatrist Carl Jung describes the “intuitive function.” Intuition sees or feels the big picture. While sensation, which involves the physical senses perceives reality as it is presented to the senses by the material world, the intuitive person typically experiences a different, more optimistic world. Intuitives find meaning in places that sensate persons do not. Additionally, there are cognitive capabilities which are intuitive, which sensate people just do not have.

Let us consider Bernard Lonergan’s schema for the cognitional structure, for example. Strictly speaking from an empiricist point of view, Lonergan’s schema unfolds as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Cognitive Capability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>sense data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>analytic understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>judgment/reflection</td>
<td>sensible judgment/ judgementalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Intuitive, or the Intuitive Mystic, on the other hand each cognitive capability unfolds with an intuitive function which complements its sensate counterpart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Cognitive Capability</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>intuitive experience</td>
<td>intuitively feel reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>intuitive understanding</td>
<td>sythetic/relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intuitive understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>intuitive judgment/reflection</td>
<td>intuitive good judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intuitive critical reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, it is possible I suppose for the Intuitive Mystic to develop intuition at the expense of sensation, but in the balanced Intuitive Mystic, this does not happen. Intuitive experience complements sense experience, intuitive understanding complements analytic understanding, and good judgment a critical reflection replace mere judgmentalism.

A little more about intuition. Intuition purports to give answers that mere analytic understanding cannot. Intuition, however, is not omniscience. Intuition puts you in the ball park, sometimes it only gives you a hunch. I argue that Intuition is never more than 90% accurate, as such, but instead is filled out and complemented by the imagination when it seems to give exact results.

Now, I also argue that Intuition is subject to bias. Intuition in some persons is overly optimistic and in other persons overly pessimistic. Intuition must be tuned so that it is realistic intuition, otherwise problems can result.

Finally, Intuition is the basis for Insight. Bernard Lonergan spends an entire book talking about Insight, but never discusses where it comes from. I argue that Insight is an Intuitive function or gift. When an idea simply pops into your head as an Insight, that idea proceeds and manifests from your Intuition.
I am an Intuitive Mystic. A very important part of my spiritual life comes from my Intuition. Intuition is both a natural gift and a gift of the Spirit. Meditation is said to be the best method for developing Intuition. It should also be noted that Intuition typically operates in conjunction with ordinary memory and analytic intelligence. When one studies material in a particular subject matter area then Intuition functions to help understand the subject matter and to fill in gaps and explain anomalies and paradoxes. Intuition works best complementing analytic understanding, not rejecting it.

The intellectual attitude is not one of mere analytic understanding, but instead involves a synthesis of analytic understanding and intuitive understanding, culminating in intuitive good judgment and intuitive reflection.

Also, intuitive experience helps a person to understand something without actually having to do it. Intuition and the imagination complement book learning to make it more meaningful. Intuition can also complement the viewing of a movie, helping one to understand the movie in a more real way, in depth.

People sometimes wonder how Intuition works. I argue that Intuition is a sort of curvilinear type of arational understanding. Some argue that Intuition is a right brain hemispheric function. I think that one aspect of
Intuition is the ability to Intuit Being, that is, Intuit An Unrestricted Act of Understanding. It is impossible to analyze Being, you can only understand Being by Intuiting Being.

Interestingly, Aristotle discusses intuition in several places, placing intuition on a sort of pedestal. For example, it is through intuition that “first principles” such as metaphysical principles are found. Aristotle’s Ethics, 1140b33-1141a19. Also, intuition apprehends definitions which cannot be logically demonstrated by mathematics or science. Aristotle’s Ethics, 1142a12-29.

Finally, Aristotle argues that perfect happiness is found in contemplation. Aristotle’s Ethics, 1178b7-29. I argue that the faculty which produces contemplation is Intuition. Thus, perfect happiness is only found in the Intuitive Person.
In the Declaration of Independence, incorporated by reference into the United States Constitution, it is stated that “all [persons] are created equal and are endowed by their Creator [God] with certain inalienable rights, including Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.”

I argue that perfect happiness is found in the intellectual or contemplative life involving intuition. As recognized by the Founding Fathers, it is only through an intuitive, intellectual life that happiness is found, and more, we each have a right to such happiness.

As noted previously, Aristotle discusses intuition in several places, placing intuition on a sort of pedestal. For example, it is through intuition that “first principles” such as metaphysical principles are found. Aristotle’s Ethics, 1140b33-1141a19. Also, intuition apprehends definitions which cannot be logically demonstrated by mathematics or science. Aristotle’s Ethics, 1142a12-29. For example, we know by intuition the geometric
postulate that a straight line is 180 degrees and it’s corollary that a right angle is 90 degrees.

Aristotle argues that perfect happiness is found in contemplation. Aristotle’s Ethics, 1178b7-29. I argue that the faculty which produces contemplation is Intuition. Thus, perfect happiness is only found in the Intuitive Person.

Similarly, Thomas Aquinas, in the Summa Theologica argues that happiness is found in the Perfect Good, or Being. Summa Theo, ligica, Part I-II, Question 5, Article 2. Once again, by intuiting Being we find the Perfect Good and Happiness.

Thus, I argue that metaphysics should be taught in all schools, including the public schools. I argue that metaphysics is philosophy and does not involve the establishment clause. I also argue that I have a right to a Happy Contemplative intellectual life, as guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence, and the United States Constitution, guaranteeing Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. The government is constitutionally required to provide state aid to higher education to help promote the contemplative life, and is required to provide an economy which can produce meaningful part-time employment which is sufficient to support a middle class lifestyle, for everyone.
THE END