



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN-SOCIAL SCIENCE: F
POLITICAL SCIENCE

Volume 14 Issue 2 Version 1.0 Year 2014

Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)

Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

A Comparison of Dual and Non-Dual Logic in a Dialectical Method of Analyzing Towards Transcending Intractable and Polarized Political Conflicts

By Andrew Bosworth

Introduction- This paper will found its claims in a philosophy emerging from the systems of phenomenology, moving through monism, pluralism and finding its fundamental assertion in transcendental nondualism. Non-duality is commonly found in Buddhist and Indian epistemological and ontological studies, however I assert that it converges with classical western phenomenological philosophy in a manner that provides fruitful dialectical understandings related to the synthesis of conflicting opposites in instances of political impasse. The underlying assumption on which the integral assertion is founded is that many challenges facing the evolution of a more unified global civilization is based on a single under-considered dialectic of dualism and non-dualism. The failure to adequately understand the implications of these dialectical opposites limits solutions, and limits insights into the conditions of each. The challenges of absolutism within monism, the difficulties of relativism within pluralism can each be aided by non-dualism, while the challenge of subjective ideology in transcendent non-dualism is aided by grounding in the pragmatic conditions created by monism and pluralism. If we apply the approach of which I argue for, to problems in social contexts, a pattern of balancing of oppositional synthesis emerges. To demonstrate the approaches integration of ideology and pragmatism, I will first describe its philosophical basis and then apply the pattern to political conflicts to give support to the assertion that this method can be effectively applied, toward peace or further conflict, as desired.

GJHSS-F Classification : FOR Code : 160699p, 369999



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



© 2014. Andrew Bosworth. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

A Comparison of Dual and Non-Dual Logic in a Dialectical Method of Analyzing Towards Transcending Intractable and Polarized Political Conflicts

Andrew Bosworth

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper will found its claims in a philosophy emerging from the systems of phenomenology, moving through monism, pluralism and finding its fundamental assertion in transcendental non-dualism. Non-duality is commonly found in Buddhist and Indian epistemological and ontological studies, however I assert that it converges with classical western phenomenological philosophy in a manner that provides fruitful dialectical understandings related to the synthesis of conflicting opposites in instances of political impasse. The underlying assumption on which the integral assertion is founded is that many challenges facing the evolution of a more unified global civilization is based on a single under-considered dialectic of dualism and non-dualism. The failure to adequately understand the implications of these dialectical opposites limits solutions, and limits insights into the conditions of each. The challenges of absolutism within monism, the difficulties of relativism within pluralism can each be aided by non-dualism, while the challenge of subjective ideology in transcendent non-dualism is aided by grounding in the pragmatic conditions created by monism and pluralism. If we apply the approach of which I argue for, to problems in social contexts, a pattern of balancing of oppositional synthesis emerges. To demonstrate the approaches integration of ideology and pragmatism, I will first describe its philosophical basis and then apply the pattern to political conflicts to give support to the assertion that this method can be effectively applied, toward peace or further conflict, as desired.

Following this introduction, section one contains discussion of the philosophy of phenomenology and the implications of non-dual perceptions. Section two contains discussion of case studies of social conflicts which give evidence for dialectical opposition. Section three contains a synthesis of the first two sections, bridging the analysis to provide support for the fundamental assertion of the paper and comprising the

conclusion summarizing the integral factors of the paper.

II. SECTION ONE: NON-DUAL TRANSCENDENTALISM – SYNTHESIZING WESTERN AND EASTERN PHENOMENOLOGY

This section will attempt to describe the dynamics of and between multiple phenomenological understandings of reality. Appropriately, we begin with an understanding which claims a single reality; this view carries the label of phenomenological monism. We continue with another claim of more than one reality, this is phenomenological pluralism; we will discuss several varieties of pluralism and several dynamics of epiphenomena and link them back to a dualistic monism. From there we will discuss the transcendental phenomenology of non-dual Jain logic and its inherent system of perceptions.

a) *Understanding Phenomenological Monism*

The perception of a single reality or single understanding of phenomena may be the most easily generalized correlated ideological factor to both peace and conflict. The claim of perceiving the one true understanding of reality or phenomena, for example of god, and the attempt to dominate those who have argued a different perception has arguably been the leading cause of war in human history. Ironically, and more importantly dualistically, the attempt to spread a single unifying theory has also been argued as an imperative of everlasting peace.

In an emergent dynamic this pattern repeats in a whole spectrum of social interactions, not only between the leaders of nations or those in control of armies. Politically, monism correlates to claims of authoritarianism, fascism, despotism, but inversely and dualistically it also correlates to singular virtuous, benevolent actors or imperatives. Monism in ideology leads to claims of absolutism and the negative connotations associated with such a viewpoint.

Monism is subscribed to with regularity within national judicial forums where single deterministic

Author: e-mail: a.bosworth@master.upeace.org

precedents rule. It occurs with regularity in the global monetary arena where zero-sum dynamics ensure that quantitative coherence is maintained. It seems that in finite contexts phenomenological monism exists readily.

Opposing the legal and monetary examples, modern history has largely demonstrated that monism in the public sphere is not wholly appropriate, and has been opposed by pluralism where subjectivity based imperatives, such as individual rights, are valued. It seems however, and we will discuss more, how monism merely led us as a civilization to pluralism, and pluralism to relativism and or epiphenomenal opposites and derivatives. I claim that monism may be usefully perceived as pluralism with a negative opposition, and therefore can be understood as dualistic.

b) *Understanding Phenomenological Pluralism*

Perhaps the least satisfying solution to overcoming monism has been the sojourn into pluralism. In the political arena pluralism in a positive sense has created a check on absolute power through an opposition party, while in another sense it has limited the ability to govern. In one sense it has given more choices for representation, and in another sense it has limited representation through a weakening of each choice. In a more pertinent comparison dualism and pluralism have directly caused polarization and intractable conflict.

In academia in the humanities pluralism has created space for an ever more increasing amount of theories, definitions and perspectives both to beneficial and negative effects. While perhaps most importantly in the natural sciences Kuhn's claim of an "essential tension" may be argued as evidence of a necessary dualism, despite the general understanding of predominate scientific monism and singular truths of a 'correct' or 'accepted' scientific theory.

Aside from the generalized examples put forth, pluralism itself needs to be further explored as mentioned in the introduction to this section. Pluralism denotes dualistic logic of either multiple absolute perspectives, as in a multiverse theory, or a relative pluralism involving no absolutes but only degrees. Examples of each view can be found in physics and as such neither of these solutions reconciles in a transcendental manner the problems created by each. Kuhn's argued vehemently that the dichotomy of "essential tension" is not relativistic, but could not adequately communicate just what it was (Kuhn, 1962). I claim that this is because he intuitively knew it was transcendental and non-dualistic but could not support such an argument in a manner he or others perceived as valid or acceptable. Regardless of my claim, it was not relativism.

Looking further at two types of pluralistic dynamics, the first being multiple absolute and the second being relative. There is a clear inverted dualism

between each dynamic of epiphenomenal relationships. The former dualism has absolute oppositional points while the latter absolutely lacks oppositional points and is described by the continuum between them. Given these choices, it is understandable why relativism and pluralism is so irreconcilable with monism views necessary to uphold truths as understood as scientifically acceptable.

c) *Understanding Phenomenological Non-Dualism (Without Using Definitively Dualistic Descriptions)*

Dualistically, pluralism leads back towards monism or further dualistic pluralism rather than to transcendental values. Evidence for this is the success of dialectical trends such as the Marxist historical dialectic or any wave theory. The desire for a transcendental phenomenology stems from the dissatisfaction with the dualistically limited dialectical synthesis comprising of monism or pluralism and their repetition *ad nauseum*. Whether we can actually perceive and demonstrate a transcendental value is a much more complex task.

In the social sphere the dialectic between monism and pluralism occurs with regularity in academia in both the natural sciences and the humanities during ideological discourse in the process of debating definitions used for qualitative analysis. If we extend this pattern into the future we will have an ever increasing amount of definitions each of which correlates to an ever increasing amount of contexts in the humanities, and if we are to use the last 70 years as an example the natural sciences will still be ignoring or failing to reconcile the examples of phenomena such as the wave/particle duality of light photons. This leads us to a lack of satisfaction if coherence is imperative, and perhaps helps grow the volition needed to overcome such paradoxes with novel solutions perhaps inexorable from an evolution of phenomenological awareness.

One transcendent option, of which I nominate in this paper, is of an understanding incorporating non-dualism into our conceptualization of reality. Defining non-dualism is a challenge, just ask Thomas Kuhn as the scientifically accepted paradigm of imperatives and theories based in the dualism of monism and pluralism, both oppositional and relative, are well established, while the definition of non-duality may be considered beyond the accepted paradigm. However, it is not merely bias for the status quo which makes non-duality indescribable. As discussed more comprehensively in the next section, non-dual perspectives may give phenomena a paradoxical appearance (hence its appropriateness for describing such paradoxes), it posits from the perspective similar to Wittgenstein that due to inherent inescapable tautologies of logic that anything but a qualified description results in potential fallacy, but in the modern positivist view that very qualification results in usually dismissed contextual half-truth. Non-

dual awareness has produced useable logic systems which we will elaborate upon to give a comparison to dualistic logic. As Wittgenstein demonstrated the systemically inherent and maximally general foundation of logic systems (Ogden, 1922) we must compare system against system to see which offers the most appropriate solutions. Unlike binary analytical logic, non-dualism we will find transcends at least classical dualistic logic, as it accounts for it within its more encompassing system¹.

The non-dual Jain logic predicates that each of these may be true of phenomena and gives a sevenfold predication: (1). *syād-asti*—in some ways, it is, (2). *syād-nāsti*—in some ways, it is not, (3). *syād-asti-nāsti*—in some ways, it is, and it is not, (4). *syād-asti-avaktavyaḥ*—in some ways, it is, and it is indescribable, (5). *syād-nāsti-avaktavyaḥ*—in some ways, it is not, and it is indescribable, (6). *syād-asti-nāsti-avaktavyaḥ*—in some ways, it is, it is not, and it is indescribable, (7). *syād-avaktavyaḥ*—in some ways, it is indescribable (Grimes, 1996).

The empirical evidence for the existence of a non-dual awareness, is based on new syntheses between anticorrelated structures in the brain and the ability to reorganize in more complex ways (Josipovic Z, 2012). It is appropriate that in this case the physical process parallels the ideological process of a myriad of potential syntheses.

d) A Dialectical Solution

The dysfunction of an incomplete understanding limited to perceptions of phenomenological monism and pluralism when compared to examples of observed phenomena lead us to the necessity of a transcendent understanding. We can chuff off the effort to do so for only so long before the complexity and chaos created by pluralism needs to be reconciled to survive as a species due to its manifestation of polarized conflicts, or simply when the ideological incoherence becomes too strong. We must adapt to our environment, in this case a society governed by structures and imperatives guided by monism and pluralism (and the resulting prevalence of conflict). Part of the reconciliation is identifying the integral patterns which we can use to overcome incoherence, while the deeper ideologically pure philosophical conundrums which have no practical value can be overlooked. This paper is an attempt to argue for a useable discernment of patterns described through phenomenological based philosophy and the dynamics between dualistic logic of monism and

pluralism and a type of non-dual awareness defined by the Jain logic system.

As it's already noted that non-dual logic doesn't allow for an explicit description (as the language used in the description would inherently be dualistic or it may simply be indescribable). The best foundational description of non-dualism may be through a comparison of the logical systems associated with each, or of the varied synthesis solutions created by applying the awareness to the same dialectical equations. As we have already discussed the logical systems, let's look at the difference between dualistic logical awareness and non-dualistic logical awareness applied to a Hegelian dialectical synthesis of monism, pluralism, and transcendentalism. Then we will look at the fundamental synthesis of dualism and non-dualism in relation to the previous syntheses.

i. Dualistic Synthesis 1:

(Thesis) Monism versus (Antithesis) non-monism = (Potential Synthesis) Monism or non-monism

If non-monism then pluralism or transcendentalism?

ii. Non-Dualistic Synthesis 1:

(Thesis) Monism versus (Antithesis) non-monism = (Potential Synthesis) Monism qualified (1) Non-monism qualified (2) both monism and non-monism qualified (3) monism indescribable and qualified (4) non-monism indescribable and qualified (5) both monism and non-monism indescribable and qualified (6) indescribable and qualified (7)

Analysis and anomalies: Noteworthy factors from a dualistic synthesis of monism and its antithesis is the anomalous concept of non-monism, which leads to an undefined alternative

iii. Dualistic Synthesis 2:

(Thesis) Pluralism versus (Antithesis) non-pluralism = (Potential Synthesis) Pluralism or Non-pluralism

If pluralism we have further dualism contained in a myriad of epiphenomenal dynamics.

Examples of types of epiphenomenal relationships in pluralism:

- Epiphenomenon as absolutes opposed
- Epiphenomenon as relative spectrum

If non-pluralism then monism or transcendentalism?

iv. Non-Dualistic Synthesis 2:

(Thesis) Pluralism versus (Antithesis) non-pluralism = (Potential Synthesis) Pluralism qualified (1) non-pluralism qualified (2) both pluralism and non-pluralism qualified (3) pluralism indescribable and qualified (4) non-pluralism indescribable and qualified (5)

¹ A characteristic of transcendence would be not only replacement of a previous system but its integration and repurposing into a more complex system which limits the contradiction of the transcended system, Jain Logic does this to the inherent dichotomous structure of analytical logic.

both pluralism and non-pluralism indescribable and qualified (6) indescribable and qualified (7)

The next two syntheses are of paramount importance to the assertion of the paper as it begins an attempt to lineate the defining differences between solutions offered by each dualism and non-dualism, the differences will be offered as the qualities necessary to define transcendental phenomena.

Analysis and anomalies:

v. *Dualistic Synthesis 3:*

(Thesis) Transcendentalism versus (Antithesis) non-transcendentalism = (Potential Synthesis) Transcendentalism or non-transcendentalism

vi. *Non-Dualistic Synthesis 3: (using the difference in conditions)*

(Thesis) Dualism versus (Antithesis) non-transcendentalism = (Potential Synthesis) Transcendentalism qualified (1) Non-transcendentalism qualified (2) both transcendentalism and non-transcendentalism qualified (3) indescribable transcendentalism qualified (4) non-transcendentalism indescribable and qualified (5) both transcendentalism and non-transcendentalism indescribable and qualified (6) indescribable and qualified (7)

Analysis and anomalies:

vii. *Dualistic Synthesis 4:*

(Thesis) Dualism versus (Antithesis) non-dualism = (Potential Synthesis) Dualism (T) or Non-dualism (F)

viii. *Non-Dualistic Synthesis 4: (using the difference in conditions)*

(Thesis) Dualism versus (Antithesis) non-dualism = (Potential Synthesis) Dualism (1) Non-dualism qualified (2) both dualism and non-dualism qualified (3) dualism indescribable and qualified (4) non-dualism indescribable and qualified (5) Both dualism and non-dualism indescribable and qualified (6) indescribable and qualified (7)

Analysis: The variety of potential synthesis within the dualistic logical awareness remains at two while the varieties from a non-dual awareness can be up to 7. The integral factors to consider in the comparison are the 5 which are not common to both. However, the 5 potential conditions do not themselves explicitly correlate to transcendentalism; rather it is an understanding of the dynamics which allow those conditions to arise as 'truthful' (defined in a dualistic sense) which offers insights into the transcendental nature. The obvious dynamics which are suggest by non-dual synthesis rather than dualism is that phenomena may be and may not be simultaneously, that phenomena may be indescribable (despite all efforts to do so), and the necessity to qualify phenomena do to a contextual perception (paradoxically despite the potential for monism and the other conditions of non-dualism to be simultaneously 'true').

ix. *Overall analysis of the 4 syntheses:*

If we are to suggest transcendental phenomena or perspectives, it is arguable that we must reconcile the anomalies present in the paradigm which is to be transcended.

The anomalous aspects of dualistic monism were the undefined dynamics surrounding non-monism, and a logical system which necessitates and denotes an antithesis of true to validate claims of what is true. Wittgenstein demonstrates this as tautological. The anomalous aspects of dualistic pluralism were the undefined dynamics of non-pluralism and the nested dualism within pluralism. The anomalous aspect of dualistic transcendentalism is the ignorance of the non-transcendental; as if it transcends something there must be a linking or linear aspect to denote what was transcended, not merely a replacement, this is perhaps where Kuhn got stuck. If transcendental has any evolutionary connotations then part of the denotation of transcendental is a synthesis or replacement which encompasses that which it replaces or simply put the characteristics of that which it replaces must be accounted for.

The synthesis of non-dualism and dualism demonstrates that they are not pure opposites, but rather dualism accounts for the qualities found through dualism, incorporates and transcends the anomalies created by the dualism.

The dualistic anomaly of the potential non-monism can be interpreted in different ways; however none is a true antithesis of monism and merely a creation to satisfy the inability to conceptualize non-monism. Through qualification, accepted indescribability or a simultaneity non-dualism offers a variety of syntheses which better satisfies such an abstraction, I would suggest the indescribability of non-monism is an integral solution. The dualistic anomaly of the potential nesting of dualism within pluralism as well as the abstraction of non-pluralism can each be solved respectively by the simultaneity and indescribability offered by non-dualism. While the dualistic transcendental anomaly, based on the failure to account for its antithesis in the transcended phenomena, has already been discussed, lets repeat that non-dual awareness offers the potential for that which is to be transcended to also be represented in a new synthesis.

While there are many other qualities and examples we can use to understand the power of non-dualism, I chose Hegelian synthesis because of the theories relationship to the social sciences and its ability to be used to understand patterns of political. The next section will look at instances of dualistic synthesis which have failed to end polarization or conflict.

III. SECTION TWO: CASE STUDIES – POLITICAL CONFLICT AS UNRESOLVED DIALECTICAL SYNTHESIS

In the last section we laid out various types of perceptions of reality and some of the dialectical synthesis which can be used to map dynamics between those perceptions. This section will take those dynamics and look at allegorical or literal manifestations of these perceptions in the political and geopolitical realm, especially where excessive polarization or conflict has occurred denoting unreconciled syntheses. The purpose of this analysis will be to demonstrate that dualistic logic leads to an unsatisfactory synthesis, and a further cycle of polarization or stalemate. We will then hypothesize and or give evidence of qualities of non-dual logic which may lead to a satisfactory synthesis.

It is assumed that a solution must be a common to all parties in a best case scenario, and as such this is an exercise to demonstrate that non-dual logic is better at distilling win-win or mutually acceptable solutions from seemingly intractable positions than is non-dual logic.

a) Political – Synthesis Solutions In Instances Of Abnormal Polarization Or Stalemate

i. Case Study 1: Russia – USA/Nato Geopolitical Polarization and Intractability

Synopsis: Mutually Assured Destruction is commonly credited with ending the cold war; this is a perception which has been thrust back to the front of consideration with the annexation of Crimea in 2014 by Russian forces. While this event needn't have been considered a re-instigation of an assumedly inished conflict, it is difficult to ignore the calls of renewed cold war. Let us consider that the conflict at the heart of the cold war never ended because the mechanism which ended it was flawed. Some will argue it was the negotiation process which followed that failed since the disarmament of the nuclear arsenals which underpinned the cold peace was never achieved. Perhaps this is correct, but even if this is true it only ensures that there is a vacuum for a new mechanism to ensure that the conflict is overcome. To rely only on the essential tension of MAD, in a world primed with the emergence of complex adaptive systems which reduces the rationality for assuming rational actors, if only because the ability to predict outcomes accurately decreases and hence incalculable and unpredictable actions increase giving the appearance of irrationality. Complex adaptive systems necessitate a new cooperative theory (Scott, 2008).

With the re-ignition of tensions, balancing mechanism must be ready. I offer a formulaic approach to aid in attempting to identify a win-win loosely termed Mutually Assured Non-Destruction (MAND) scenario by using the integral imperatives of the conflict in dualistic

and non-dualistic dialectical analysis then comparing the additional and perhaps transcendent qualities of the non-dual syntheses.

This exercise will identify the integral MAD imperatives and place them into parallel dialectical syntheses from each party's perspectives in both dualistic and non-dualistic logic.

Part 1: Identifying each parties Monism, survival is integral over the destruction of the opponent, hence the integral imperative is non-destruction of each owns country.

USA: (Thesis) Non-USA's Destruction versus (Antithesis) USA's Destruction = (Potential Syntheses) USA's Destruction or USA's Non-Destruction

Russia: (Thesis) Russia's Non-Destruction versus (Antithesis) Russia's Destruction = (Potential Syntheses) Russia's Destruction or Russia's Non-Destruction

Part 2: The synthesis of each parties' monism with the other in a dualistic synthesis, leads to a theoretical potential of 4 possible syntheses, however we will use only the 2 put forth and adopted by the MAD doctrine which after synthesis result in the 2 integral imperatives of, *Russia's Non-Destruction and USA's Non-Destruction*.

From here we can work backwards to arrive at the same conclusion without the necessity of first synthesizing the results against the dichotomy of mutual destruction. The question at the outset was how to replace the mechanism of essential tension created by mutual nuclear arsenals, with something more long lasting should disarmament ever occur. By once more starting from the beginning, but this time applying a non-dual logic to the synthesis of the monism's, we can hopefully examine the additional potential synthesis for a condition which matches the desired outcome.

First using the USA's monistic imperative of their non-destruction, we apply a non-dualistic synthesis to find all the potential synthesis which produce the integral imperative. We will then do the same for Russia and then compare the results in the hopes of commonality and reproducing a balance which may create a doctrine of mutually assured non-destruction.

1. USA's integral monistic imperative synthesized with non-dual logic:

(Thesis) USA's Non-Destruction versus (Antithesis) USA's Destruction = (Potential Syntheses) USA's Non-Destruction qualified (1) USA's Destruction qualified (2) Both USA's Non-Destruction and USA's Destruction qualified (3) USA's Non-Destruction indescribable and qualified (4) USA's Destruction indescribable and qualified (5) Both USA's Non-Destruction and USA's Destruction indescribable and qualified (6) indescribable and qualified (7)

2. *Russia's integral monistic imperative synthesized with non-dual logic:*

(Thesis) Russia's Non-Destruction versus (Antithesis) Russia's Destruction = (Potential Syntheses) and Russia's Non-Destruction qualified (1) Russia's Destruction qualified (2) Both Russia's Non-Destruction and Russia's Destruction qualified (3) Russia's Non-Destruction indescribable and qualified (4) Russia's Destruction indescribable and qualified (5) Both Russia's Non-Destruction and Russia's Destruction indescribable and qualified (6) indescribable and qualified (7)

Analysis: Do any of these syntheses provide an interpretable path to the solution of 'Mutually Assured Non-Destruction'? Each of these syntheses gives an option which can be compared directly or argued through qualification. The least preferable are the qualified destruction options (2) and (5). The indescribable options, (4), (5), (6), (7) are perhaps the next least preferable due to lack of clear variables on which to found a pragmatic solution. So the two options that may fit the necessary requirements are synthesis (1) *Non-Destruction qualified* and (3) *Both Non-Destruction and Destruction qualified*. The paradoxical destruction and non-destruction synthesis is a distinct alternative solution which is inherent to non-dual logic. The practicality of the paradoxical condition depends on how we interpret *destruction and non-destruction*, this could mean changing how we understand destruction or a type of simultaneity which is still undefined. This returns us to option (1) which is non-destruction qualified.

Non-dual logic applied to synthesis has provided the novel concept of the potential synthesis of a solution based on both the destruction and non-destruction. This is not the mutually assured non-destruction which would have been an absolute opposite of mutually assured destruction of which was proffered in the introduction section rather a more complex solution is suggested. The denoted importance of this synthesis, from this analysis is the question of whether the potential for some destruction versus an essential tension where absolute destruction is a potentiality is preferable. Would we rather a dualistic balance where the potential for MAD is real, but unexercised, or where geopolitical complexity allows for both destruction and non-destruction but neither totally?

ii. *Case Study 2: Thailand – National Politics*

Over the past 11 years Thailand's political arena has become largely divided into a highly polarized dynamic revolving around a succession of power (Montesano, 2014). The failure to balance power or create a working synthesis within an acceptable political framework has resulted in coups, a pattern of major protests and numerous incidences of violent conflicts, as well as appeals to the UN and third party groups and currently the inability to conduct accepted elections or even legal mechanism to begin needed reforms. In this

case all conventional legal options have been exhausted and currently only extreme or creative mechanisms are being invoked to try to end the stalemate.

To uncover a solution, we must assume that both parties must arrive at the same solution, in this case demonstrated by a synthesis of the parties' respective suggested solutions. In the Thai case, each party offers a monistic option (denoting a no-solution if there monism is denied):

Party 1: (Thesis) Reform before election versus (Antithesis) no solution = (Potential Syntheses) Reform before election or no solution.

Party 2: (Thesis) Election before reform versus (Antithesis) no-solution = (Potential Syntheses) Election before reform or no-solution

If we compare the results we have two options to further synthesize:

Option 1: (Thesis) Reform before election versus (Antithesis) election before reform = (Potential Syntheses) Reform before election or Election before reform.

Option 2: (Thesis) No solution versus (Antithesis) no-solution = (Potential Syntheses) no solution or no-solution

Due to the monistic perception of each solution, the only acceptable synthesis in the dynamics between all potential syntheses is no-solution.

However, if we insert a non-dual logic into the equation the potential syntheses allow for a large variety of potential solutions to emerge. (I will skip to Option 1, rather than redo each step with non-dual logic, as it's the basic allegorical equivalent of the solutions offered in actual political discourse and from there we can evaluate the potential for synthesis from the currently offered positions of each party).

(Thesis) Reform before election versus (Antithesis) election before reform = (Potential Syntheses) Reform before election qualified (1) Election before reform qualified (2) Both reform before election and election before reform qualified (3) Reform before election indescribable and qualified (4) Election before reform indescribable and qualified (5) Both reform before election and election before reform indescribable and qualified (6) indescribable and qualified (7)

Analysis: As we see above non-dual logic increase the number of potential syntheses from which we can distill practical solutions. If we know that the syntheses using dualistic logic lead to a no-solution or stalemate, we can ignore the qualified solutions (1) and (2) from the non-dual as they are pragmatically the same as the dualistic syntheses, as such let's look at the other syntheses for literal or metaphorical solutions. (3) Provides the option, if interpreted as such, of reform both before and after an election, this is perhaps a candidate for an appropriate solution. (4) (5) and (6) Are

difficult due the necessary imperatives of practicality and transparency, although it's worth noting that option (5) has been a position of the PDRC which has been roundly criticized. Synthesis (7) in this case and as always is indescribable, yet paradoxically this does not necessarily denote its invalid nature, simply its ineffability, I think of this as the unforeseeable variable, regardless of what one would think however it definitively couldn't be acted upon but only not acted upon².

The current political stalemate directly relates to the intransigence inherent to dualistic logic, the zero-sum monistic solution offered by the dialectically opposed parties does not allow for a mutually acceptable solution. The endgame here involved symmetrical power and each played to a draw. The best minds on each side have yet to offer a viable path out of the stalemate, while some of the absolute monists would rather engage in majority rule winner take all bloody brawls, division of the country or civil war to deem the 'winner'. Such solutions are wholly unacceptable to the peaceful-minded and those with hopes for transcending simple dualism, especially since there is no essential tension maintained by a policy similar to the function MAD provided in the conflict of the last case.

The potential solution stemming from the syntheses possible in non-dual Jain logic, were suggested as being (3) *both Reform before election and election before reform qualified*. This is open to interpretation due to its seemingly paradoxical inapplicable nature, but if we remove the contradicting temporal aspects (of both doing and not doing something before) and follow only what is practical, the solution may be reform before and after the election, something which leads us to an increase in complexity rather than more polarization.

IV. SECTION THREE: CONCLUSION AND SYNTHESIS

In both cases we discussed the potential synthesis based on the third condition of Jain Logic, seemingly paradoxical in nature, which provided what was argued as the best potential for overcoming the intractability and intransigence catalyzed by dualistic logic. It may be easy to argue against the value of the qualities in that synthesis due to inclination to dismiss paradoxical assertions, however with non-dual awareness we must not get trapped by the absoluteness of a truth, as it is the difference between monism, pluralism and their dualistic logic compared to the transcendent phenomenology which gives non-dual logic its comparative alternative value. There are multiple qualities we can identify within the different logics' syntheses, which

help us understand the comparative alternative (and perhaps transcendental but certainly transformative) value. In dualism we find only either/or zero-sum solutions, this leads to polarization and conflict. In non-dualism we have increased variability, qualification, and indefinability which don't create or manifest as dynamics of opposition. Parallelism and simultaneity are all acceptable mechanism in non-dual logic. If applied pragmatically in a finite circumstance, rather than only abstract ideology, the transformative ability of increasing complexity which is created by the additional variables allows us to transcend intractable dichotomies and even suggest direct solutions based on the integral imperatives at the core of conflicts.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Grimes, J. (1996). *A Concise Dictionary of Indian Philosophy: Sanskrit Terms Defined in English*. New York: SUNY Press.
2. Josipovic Z. (2012). Influence of meditation on anti-correlated networks in the brain. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*.
3. Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
4. Montesano, M. J. (2014). What is to Come in Thailand. *ISEAS Perspectives*, 2-12.
5. Ogden, C. K. (1922). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
6. Scott, J. J. (2008). INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN A COMPLEX ADAPTIVE SYSTEM. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 32(3), 339-366.

²In a rational manner we cannot act without knowledge, but paradoxically non-action is an option.



This page is intentionally left blank