

---

---

# THE EPISTEMOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 'FILIOQUE'

By Pierre Beaudry, 8/31/2017

---

---

## INTRODUCTION

Four years ago, in November 2013, I wrote a paper titled ['HOMOIOUS'](#) (of the same substance) which discussed the epistemological significance of the consubstantiality of the Holy Trinity with reference to the consubstantiality of mind and matter and relating them to fusion processes in physics. The report was meant to show that the principles governing the human mind and those governing the physical universe of plasma physics were of the same nature. I have not abandoned that higher hypothesis since it can also be applied to economics, as I have recently demonstrated in **CHARLEMAGNE'S ECONOMICS OF 'AGAPE,'** which I dedicated to Lyndon LaRouche for his upcoming 95<sup>th</sup> birthday on September 8, 2017.

The present report on the "*Filioque*" is a continuation of that initial report written with the intention of studying more closely the significance of the paradox of the consubstantiality of the Trinity by using the historical context of the First Council of Nicea-Constantinople (325-382 A.D.) with respect to the idea that Jesus is Man-God; that is, consubstantial with the Father.

Some people have inquired about that relationship because they had difficulty relating Man created in the *cognitive* image of God to the idea of universal physical principles. The difficulty is located in the misunderstanding of the idea that Christ as Man-God is the exemplar for understanding the relationship between Man and God; and that the understanding of this problem and its

resolution does not lie in the domain of religion, but in the domain of epistemology.

## 1. THE EPISTEMOLOGICAL MEANINGS OF 'HOMOIOUSOUS,' 'FILIOQUE,' AND 'LOGOS.'

“By *the idea of the idea*, I mean the Classical Greek idea of *human nature*, as expressed best by Plato's dialogues, or, better, the Christian version of this Classical-Greek conception, or that of Moses Mendelssohn, among others, later. I mean, also, the distinct principle of Classical composition of sculpture, painting, poetry, music, and drama, which modern civilization has derived from the Classical Greek origins. We should mean, implicitly, and most essentially, the idea of man as made in the living *cognitive* image of the Creator of the universe.<sup>[15]</sup> *Cognitive*, as the term is employed here, should be recognized as signifying the Mind of the Creator, as distinct from idols which purport to represent God in the image of the mere mortal body which the mind of the person inhabits. Thus, Classical sculpture and Renaissance painting, as contrasted with Archaic and Romantic styles, locates the image of the personality in the idea whose existence must be adduced by the mind of the viewer, the idea which lies ontologically within the mid-motion ironically represented.” Lyndon LaRouche, [\*Jesus Christ and Civilization\*](#), EIR, October 6, 2000, p. 31.

The questions that has most divided the Christian Church since the fourth century A.D., and which were never resolved, were the difficult questions of ‘*Homoiousous*’ and of the ‘*Filioque*’. Those two questions are related, because they both concern the nature of the Holy Trinity. These are the most profound religious questions which have divided the East and the West for over two thousand years, and which must be resolved if there is going to be a lasting peace between those two parts of the world.

However, the issue of peace in the world does not require to be resolved from the standpoint of religion, but from the standpoint of knowledge of a common understanding of the human mind; that is, from the standpoint of epistemology. The issue should be addressed from a philosophical standpoint rather than from a theological one, or an ideological one. Therefore, it is necessary to accept the fact

that every human being has the potential to exercise his or her creative mind, and that this is what each human being has in common with every other human being on this planet. It is from this common heritage of mankind that this question of the *Filioque* ought to be resolved first and foremost.

I recall here the origin of this conflict, because it is important to see how sense perception of space and time profoundly influences how the human mind thinks about God. The public dispute over this issue began during the fourth century A.D., when an eloquent but stubborn Libyan preacher from Alexandria, Egypt, Arius (c. 256-336 A.D.) put into question the divinity of Christ. Arius opposed the Homoousian view of the divine nature of Christ; that is, those who believed in the consubstantiality between the Son and the Father, and therefore, put into question the nature of the Holy Trinity.

[Arianism](#) rejected the doctrine of the Trinity and based its doctrine on the belief that Christ was begotten by the Father at the beginning of time and that he was subordinated to the Father. This heretical question was resolved at the First Ecumenical Council of Nicea-Constantinople (325-382 A.D.) where [Arianism](#) was rejected and Homoousianism became the official doctrine of all Christians. As a result Arius and his followers were excommunicated and declared heretical.

The epistemological flaw in Arius's mind becomes obvious when one looks into the underlying assumptions of his thinking process. Authors McClintock and Strong established appropriately that Arius was "a man of subtle, but not profound mind."<sup>1</sup> The contention was that in the Christian belief, Christ is co-eternal, co-substantial (*homoousious*) with the Father. Arius opposed this because of the contradictions which appeared in the deductive logical process of his thinking. He argued that since Christ was born a man, there was a time when he did not exist; therefore, he cannot be co-eternal with the Father. However simplistic this logical reasoning may be, a lot of people believed him and followed his doctrine. As McClintock and Strong put it:

“...Since the Father who begot must be before the Son who was begotten, the latter, therefore, could not be eternal (Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 5).

---

<sup>1</sup> McClintock and Strong. [Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature](#). Search for Arianism.

Such is the account, by the early writers, of the origin of the controversy. But if it had not begun in this way, it must soon have begun in some other. The points in question had not arrived at scientific precision in the mind of the church; and it was only during the Arian controversy, and by means of the earnest struggles invoked by it, carried on through many years, causing the convocation of many synods, and employing some of the most acute and profound intellects the church has ever seen, that a definite and permanent form of truth was arrived at (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. 1, vol. 2, p. 227).<sup>2</sup>

In a letter to his opponent, Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, Arius made a slight change by writing: "We believe that there are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. God, the cause of all things, is alone without beginning. The Son, begotten of the Father before time, made before the ages were founded, was not before he was begotten. Nor is he eternal, or co-eternal, or begotten at the same time with the Father."<sup>3</sup>

Here, the false underlying assumption can be clearly identified by the fact that Arius attributed to God the same linear features of deductive logic that his own thinking process was following, as if Divine Knowledge required the same contradictory principle as deductive thinking. The simplistic argument that Arius used at the Council of Nicea was the following: "*The Father is a Father; the Son is a Son; therefore the Father must have existed before the Son; therefore once the Son was not; therefore he was made, like all creatures, of a substance that had not previously existed.*"<sup>4</sup>

The false underlying assumption that Arius based his thinking on is that reason and logic are the same thing. What he missed is the fact that universal ideas can be incorporated into single individual moments of time, as the "Word made Flesh" is, and be eternal in the simultaneity of eternity. That is how artistic creative reason works, as opposed to logic. In essence, Arius concluded that Christ was not God.

---

<sup>2</sup> McClintock and Strong, *Op. Cit.*, search for Arianism.

<sup>3</sup> Reported by McClintock and Strong from Epiphanius *Haeres.* 69, 7, and in Athanasius, *De Synod.* 16.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem.*, look for Arianism.

This Arian heresy was not the only problem to be solved at the Council. What remained questionable about the Creed between the Christians of the East and the Christians of the West, throughout history, was also the generative process of the Holy Spirit; that is, the question of καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ (*filioque*: and from the Son). To this day, the Eastern Church has rejected that notion and the Western Church has accepted it.

The crux of the epistemological problem, here, is that the conception behind the idea of generation, or creation, is in question. The difficulty lies in the fact that the process of “generation” follows an Aristotelian conception of space and time which implies that the past is the source cause of the future, and therefore, the direction of time must be entropic and the process of change in the universe must wind down like an unwinding spring. The underlying assumption is that there is always more in the past than in the future; therefore, there is more in the Father than there is in the Son. This is a logical argument similar to Arius’s fallacy.

However, from the standpoint of epistemology, this process of generation requires the answer to three crucial questions: first, how can a generative process include non-linear change; second, how can one account for non-entropic final causality; and third, can the future be made better than the past? If one assumes the possibility of these three questions, the whole matter of the *Filioque* becomes changed. However, this change can only happen under a fundamentally new condition: the matter must be taken out of its religious context.

Even though one may not be competent to discuss this matter of theology from the standpoint of religion, *per se*, everyone is perfectly capable of addressing the triple relationship of the Trinity as a matter of mind. But, watch out for the traps of deductive logic: the approach will require some important mental efforts on your part, and, most emphatically, the necessity that you discover what is essential about *time reversal*.

It is *time reversal* which authorizes me to ask the question about the Trinity in epistemological terms and in the following manner: *how must one single mind proceed to cause an axiomatic change in a relationship between two other minds, and resolve the discordance or opposition they might have with one another?* The

point to emphasize, here, as Karl Gauss has shown in his *Disquisitiones Arithmeticae*, is *congruence*. The solution to this three mind problem was also adopted by Cardinal Jules Mazarin at the Peace of Westphalia. For this action of causing an axiomatic change in another mind to be truly effective, it must be done in the presence of two other people and through the inversion process of *agapè*; that is to say, by providing a change exclusively *for the benefit of the other two*. Therefore, this is an intention which must proceed from the future back to the past, because its realization is not yet accomplished and is, therefore, still to come.

What happens in this process of transformation is, in reality, a causal transformation that takes place among three persons such that a consubstantial congruence among them becomes the purpose of bringing each other to a common purpose and to a higher degree of energy flux-density for the benefit of future mankind as a whole. **So, the purpose, here is not to find an equality of nature (*homoousious*) among the three persons, but a unanimity of thinking and of purpose among the three by acting from the same intention of improving what is still to come through understanding the *Filioque* as the performative modality of the creative process. Therefore, the question is: how does the *Filioque* reflect that creative process?**<sup>5</sup>

One might be able to resolve this difficult problem by reexamining the idea of *Logos* (*Λόγος*, word) in the manner that the Apostle John used the term in reference to the book of Genesis Chapter 1, 27; that is, as the law-giving creative process of God creating the universe and the creation of man in his own *cognitive* image. John said: “And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.”<sup>6</sup>

The point to be stressed is that *Logos* relates to creation originally in its *spirit* form: “And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” (*Genesis*, Chapter 1, 2.) Thus, the first creative act of God relates to the action of

---

<sup>5</sup> See, for instance, Alcuin's dialogue with Charlemagne in *Charlemagne's Economics of 'Agape.'*

<sup>6</sup> [The King James Bible Page](#), John, Chapter 1: 14.

connecting spirit to matter by giving to it its own manner of change. Therefore, if man is to be created in the *cognitive* image of God, the human spirit must also relate his mind to matter in a similar manner and transform physical processes by means of technological progress. The point to focus on being that *Logos* becoming “Word” is the materialization of the Spirit into discovering how to improve the universe: that is, a representation of the invisible God’s revelation to himself by speech. The trap to be avoided, here, is the formalist fallacy of Aristotelian hylemorphism.

Here, the creative idea of *Logos* used by John is in direct reference to the Platonic doctrine of Philo of Alexandria (c. 20 BCE - c. 50 CE). For Philo, *Logos* was the expression in physical space-time of the creative activity of God; that is, the application of his Spirit to matter. This is how John transposed the “Word becoming flesh” and the *Logos* becoming man in the person of Christ, as the spirit materializing itself as the Redeemer in the sense of Philo. For Philo, the *Logos* was essentially the principle of creative reason.

What Philo refers to as the *intelligible paradigm* of Plato (νοητὸν παράδειγμα) is precisely the creative process of causing change in the universe as the original “world-constructing reason” of God’s creative power. This is what man has the ability to discover in his own mind, which is created in the *cognitive* Image of God. Historian August Neander had an insightful idea of the *Logos* of Philo when he said that “it revealed a God communicating himself to mankind, and establishing a fellowship of life between Himself and them.”<sup>7</sup> And that was the gap that the idea of the *Filioque* came to fill throughout history by having the Holy Spirit proceed from both the Father and the Son, as a creative insight proceeds performatively from the mind to its physical realization. Such a process, however, may also be expressed geometrically by means of the “phase space” spherical Nurse “*Chora*,” which Plato described in his *Timaeus*.

## 2. SPHERICAL ACTION AS THE TRIPLY-CONNECTED PROCESS OF THE *FILIOQUE*

---

<sup>7</sup> August Neander, [\*History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles\*](#), Sheldon and Co., New York, 1865, p. 462.

The spherical action as a self-generating action finds its best expression in a Kepler-Gauss approach to the *principle congruence*, or what Leibnitz called *preestablished harmony* between reason and power.<sup>8</sup>

First, start with Kepler's sphere which represents a triply-connected process of constructive geometry whereby the central region is the core, the surface is its extended product, and the diameter is the unifying connection proceeding from the doubly-connected action of the other two.

The sphere comes into being when the action on the diameter proceeds from both the least-action of the central region of negative curvature and the isoperimetric-action of the surface region of positive curvature. Thus, the sphere is generated by a triply-connected action when the diameter rotates in all directions as the motivator (*Motivführung*) of a self-generating system.

A creative form of least-action is caused by the dissonant rotation of the diameter proceeding by time reversal from the future surface back to the center, isochronically. This form of inverted creative least-action generates lines, points, and surfaces by triply-folding circular action on itself, thus generating the Five Platonic Solids. The same least-action principle applies to classical artistic composition and to political organizing. The net result of the triple process is an increase in energy-flux-density in the human mind.

The secret of this least-action process lies in discovering how the diameter is able to rotate through the whole process in all directions without the convenience of sense perception. The question is: will mankind come to know that this process of the Filioque is the way to discover the truth of self-development?<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, [\*On the Establishment of a Society in Germany For the Promotion of the Arts and Sciences\*](#), The Schiller Institute, reprinted from Spring 1992 issue of FIDELIO MAGAZINE.

<sup>9</sup> See: [LANTERNLAND](#) under "Axiom Busting" for construction details.



### 3. THE SPHERICAL GENERATION OF THE FIVE PLATONIC SOLIDS



**Figure 1** Phase space of a sphere generating three of the Five Platonic Solids. See [LANTERNLAND](#) for construction.

How can the construction of the sphere help us understand the *Filioque* question? One of the most useful ways to express how God created the universe is as if it were a musical composition emanating from Plato's Cave, which generates itself as a "phase space of change" in the manner that Plato described in his *Timaeus* about the generation of the five regular solids; that is, through a "phase space" which is neither "this" nor "that," but "such" that it constantly changes and is never permanent.<sup>10</sup> See **Figure 1**.

<sup>10</sup> Plato, [The Timaeus](#), translated by Benjamin Jowett, (49, e)

However, the process that Plato describes must be in proportion with modeling the human mind in congruence with the intelligence in the heavens. As he said: “Thus much let me say however: God invented and gave us sight to the end that we might behold the courses of intelligence in the heaven, and apply them to the courses of our own intelligence which are akin to them, the unperturbed to the perturbed; and that we, learning them and partaking of the natural truth of reason, might imitate the absolutely unerring courses of God and regulate our own vagaries.”<sup>11</sup>

#### 4. THE *FILIOQUE* AND ANTI-ENTROPY

From the vantage point of epistemology, the *Filioque* is an expression of anti-entropy in the sense that Lyndon LaRouche developed that concept; because the *Filioque* expresses the creative power of the human mind when it develops new principles in science and artistic composition for the improvement and expansion of humanity in the universe.

When I first became familiarized with Vladimir Vernadsky's work, I realized that his higher hypothesis of the Noosphere, Biosphere, and Lithosphere was not only congruent with the principle of the Trinity, but also reflected the unique characteristic of anti-entropic progress of mankind that Lyn has developed throughout his life's work.

When you integrate the three levels of the cognitive, the living, and the non-living processes as the three degrees of perfectibility of our universe as a whole, as Vernadsky did, it becomes clear that not only is the universe well ordered from the top down, but that the noetic cannot come from the biotic, the biotic cannot come from the abiotic, and the three can only come from God's mind in the simultaneity of eternity. Therefore, the noetic, biotic, and abiotic are not three successive phases in the evolution of the universe; they are three integrated universal states progressing simultaneously, but on different time frames and at different rates of increases in energy-flux-densities within a single process of livingmatterofmind. The human mind, therefore, is the only creature in the universe capable of internalizing and replicating such a process in the *cognitive* image of the Trinity.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem, (47, b-2)

The difficulty in understanding how this process works, however, arises when people fail to understand that the progress of the universe as a whole is not generated from the past, but from the future by time reversal. The failure of understanding comes from the fact that people don't know how to get to where they are meant to go, unless they articulate together final and efficient causality. Let me give you an example.

Today, the world is in a precarious state of existence because two economic systems are in conflict: one is a unipolar world run by a British-American Imperialism, which is desperate to salvage its failed system of geopolitical rule of war; the other is an all-inclusive win-win world outlook as exemplified by the policy orientation of the BRICS nations led by China, which have already demonstrated that their system is based on peace and collaboration among all of the nations of the world with the purpose of eradicating poverty. Helga Zepp LaRouche made the point very clearly on this question in an interview with the China Daily<sup>12</sup> by calling for the Trump Presidency to adopt the Belt and Road Chinese initiative. The question is: *how do you go from the old to the new? How do you accomplish that axiomatic jump? What is the underlying principle that can cause a discontinuity to force a change in the continuum of the universe in an upward manner and moves it forward from the top down?*

When you look at how biogenic change took place on Earth during millions of years, you begin by being convinced that the key is to be found in chronological time; that is, from the bottom up. However, it is the opposite which actually takes place: biogenic causality proceeds from the future to the past. The traces of a biogenic process always lie in reverse order to when they have appeared in chronological time. This is also how the creative process of mind works.

If you stop for a moment and think about this, you will realize that you are confronted with an interesting epistemological paradox, which is: *how can you access the knowledge of a universal process which appears to have changed from the bottom up, when it actually progressed from the top down from time reversal?* This is the time of an axiomatic inversion.

---

<sup>12</sup> See the China Daily report [IDENTIFYING WITH CHINA](#) on Helga-Zepp-LaRouche, 8/25/2017.

This change requires an inversion where the “apparent real world of perception” is turned upside down because of the emergence of a “true real world of creative ideas.” The conflict between two world views gets resolved only when the shocking truth of one overrides the underlying assumption of the other. If this change does not take place in time, it is simply because the false hidden underlying assumption of the “apparent reality” has not been recognized. As Lyn put it:

“As the relevant chemistry of ‘energy-flux density’ demonstrates, human progress evolves along an evolutionary track of biochemistry: *that of higher rates of concentration of energy-flux density*. The evolution of the chemistry of the human evolution along such a track of roughly rising energy-flux density, has been, in turn, willfully driven by the absolutely essential role of the human noetic quality of will. Somewhat analogously, living processes generally, and also their evolution have the form of an expression of willful evolution of species. Contrary to all reductionist opinion respecting living processes, continued human existence is, most explicitly, *willfully* “upwardly” evolution-driven.” (Lyndon LaRouche, [ART, SCIENCE & SENSE PERCEPTION](#), LAPC, October 21, 2013)

Thus, the most common error of assumption on this matter is the one relying on sense certainty. Eliminate that false underlying assumption and you will have a better chance to see clearly that everything comes from the future by means of sheer will-power.

## **5. FILIOQUE: CONFUCIUS, BEN FRANKLIN, AND SAINT PAUL**

The idea of the *Filioque*, therefore, is not the perception of a thing in itself, but the transformation in the process of changing in space-time from what was into what is coming to be. Such a transformation, however, takes place in a non-linear self reflexive manner when the potential of the activation becomes transformed into the activation of the potential. That is the reason why the process conceived as “and from the Son” (*Filioque*) means “and from the future” because the sons are

the future from where new fathers will come into being. This epistemological issue represents the most profound difference which divides Europe and the United States, to this day.

How do you consider the future? That was the question that Benjamin Franklin attempted to solve when he opposed the creation of the Cincinnatus Society whose intention was to tie down the American descendents of the Revolutionary War heroes with the glories of the past as the determining factor of the future. This fallacy was insightfully restated recently by the managing librarian of the Queen's Library at Laurelton in Queens, New York City, Dr. Dave Wang, who spoke at a Schiller Conference in that city about Confucius and Benjamin Franklin. Wang said:

“In 1784, after the Revolution, some veterans hoped they could hand down their glories, their titles, to their descendants. They organized the Cincinnatus Society for this purpose. Franklin was not happy about the idea of handing down your title, your glory, to the next generation—that's the inheritance system, or the aristocratic system of the Europeans, which was just what our Revolution opposed. What's the meaning of the Revolution, if we restore the European aristocratic inheritance system? That's totally wrong. We should adopt the Chinese merit system, and people with talents will be selected to serve the public.”<sup>13</sup>

The point that Wang was making was precisely to emphasize the fact that the founding fathers had fought the War of Independence for the purpose of breaking with the Zeusian oligarchical system of Europe and replace aristocratic inheritance with a government where the citizens and public servants would be fundamentally oriented to the future.

The underlying axiomatic assumption, here, is that the commitment of mankind must be to the future, because it were better that the future be based on

---

<sup>13</sup> Dr. Dave Wang, Confucius and Benjamin Franklin, EIR, April 28, 2017, p. 33. See also Dr. Wang's blog at <http://foundingfathersandchina.blogspot.com/>

the improvement of the sons over the fathers. This is also the reason why it is natural for fathers to wish that their sons become better than they were. Where you wish to be tomorrow is therefore what determines what you are willing to do today.

Finally, the solution to this *Filioque* question can be found in the wise but difficult changing process advocated by the Apostle Paul, in Corinthian 1, 9-13:

<sup>9</sup>For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

<sup>10</sup>But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

<sup>11</sup>When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

<sup>12</sup>For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

<sup>13</sup>And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.”<sup>14</sup>

This extract from the New Testament is probably the most performative proof of the principle of how an increase in energy-flux-density comes about through an axiomatic change. This is how the *Filioque* works as an axiomatic change inside of the human mind.

Thus, the *cognitive* image of God creating man in His Mind is the most effective artistic rendition of the idea of the *Filioque* as a self-reflexive idea of Man-God generated from the future, because it is the image of how



“I shall know even as also I am known.” **Figure 2**

Lyn ended his famous paper on Riemann by concluding:

“The Greek *Prometheus*, “Foresight,” must triumph over the wicked oligarchical families who rule Zeus’s Olympus. Ideas, and the foresight inhering in the metaphorical process by means of which ideas are developed and transmitted into practice of present and future generations, are the essence of that which distinguishes man, as *Genesis* and the *New Testament* define man and woman.”<sup>15</sup>

**Figure 2** God having the forethought of creating man. Chartres Cathedral, France.

**FIN**

---

<sup>15</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, [Leibniz from Riemann's Standpoint](#), originally published on July 14, 1996, reprinted in EIR, August 18, 2017. p. 70.