

Faris AlShawy

Dr. Edward Glowienka

METAPHYSICS-310-A

Position Paper

02/21/2017

Aristotle's "first act of divine motion" in his Physics is a set of logical implications and applying his scientific method-rightfully so given he invented it. He justifies what he calls the "first mover" or "Divinity" by continuing the Aristotelian narrative of placing the mind or intellect as the ultimate objective; surpassing the soul. On the other hand, Plotinus refutes this claim and assumes a state of agnosticism, which he is content by to reach a deeper understanding. Although Aristotle induces plausible arguments for his first mover, they fail to ask questions in terms of what is beyond being. I'll be discussing why Plotinus's "One" drives a better metaphysical understanding of the self and being.

The "One" according to Plotinus isn't bound by we might know, but what we don't; similarly, this divinity isn't bound by birth or death so we can't ascribe these mortal forms to it. I prefer this method given it takes an approach of humility and the non-knowing agnostic approach. As oppose to Aristotle which assumes the act of actualizing or becoming, which ascribes divinity to his Physical motion. Moreover, both philosophers recognize intelligence and the idea of new ideas. However, Plotinus sees it as the ability to surpass relative logic, and contemplate the actual "One" to reach a higher state of understanding that has the freedom to become anything. Given that, Plotinus sees intelligence as an independent and distinct form, acting for itself, and part of what he calls the "One"; an analogy is the One doesn't serve a purpose, because it creates purpose. Consequently, nothing is, was, or can ever exist without it, and stars are born and eventually return to dust within the one. I find this interpretation less constricted, and compatible with what we he would consider "divine".

Duality and as well as sub having different functions. An example of having duality in thoughts is when a person is drinking coffee with a friend, he's simultaneously enjoying the coffee and the conversation. Moreover, he uses a multiplicity to try to escape the idea of dual thinking and initiates only a first

Faris AlShawy

Dr. Edward Glowienka

METAPHYSICS-310-A

Position Paper

02/21/2017

mover. While I understand that Aristotle believes he could apply the scientific method to everything, which he does by defining the first mover as a universal, he makes his conclusion early on by defining it to simple actions of Power and substance. He justifies this by placing a zero-sum argument, stating, thinking is a process in its own, and if you want to reach the higher level of intellect, nothing else can become a part of it, by individuating. Moreover, he premises this by telling us that since the first mover had given birth to us, we aren't allowed to think about what premised the creator due to its complexity.

Given he arrives at some contradictions and applies his universals, he still doesn't apply a healthy amount of skepticism. I find Plotinus's argument metaphysically healthier by ascertaining non-understanding. If it is independent and divine, why would you assume it obeys movement, or affecting change. I don't reject Aristotelian thoughts towards the first mover, however, I find less arguments in Plotinus which are comforting to me; given it has an applied mystical approach. As oppose to Aristotle which premises a universal first mover that is immortal and indefinite; Plotinus argues "The One" has always existed indefinitely. An analogy would be to how energy is a finite resource-relative to our ability to contain it-that reciprocates in an equal and opposite action of energy around the universe. Energy cannot be miraculously combusted out of nothingness or nonbeing; it however does transition and take different forms.

This would be an example of Aristotelian privilege. Here Aristotle doesn't need to explain his divine inception into what God is, he asserts it, and by asserting it he had made the mistake of being corrected-ironically from himself. To elaborate, Aristotle's Divine mover or God in his physics is unchanging, yet influences change in substances. The problem here is his assertion on a beginning. Here he arrives at multiple paradoxes; if his divine is in a state of self-contemplation, how did we access it, and find it? Why should his first mover be unique and exempt from any

Faris AlShawy

Dr. Edward Glowienka

METAPHYSICS-310-A

Position Paper

02/21/2017

causes that would precede or initiate it. His first mover influences change in other substances, but never changes—merely irradiates it to everything else. Aristotle indicates that his divine mover doesn't subscribe to time or space; consequently, leaving him at a paradox. Evidently, it shines a fallacious assertion, his mortal being will need both time and space to actualize and access his divine.

Even if we apply the Aristotelian modern scientific method to describe as his “Unmoved Mover”, his rhetoric begins to fall apart; because the Newtonian logical method clearly states that creating something from nothingness is impossible which presents a contradiction. Nevertheless, he didn't apply a healthy amount of skepticism. I find Plotinus's argument metaphysically healthier by ascertaining non-understanding and sticking to it. If it is independent and divine, why would you assume it obeys movement, or affects change. I actually apply Aristotelian thoughts towards logic and most subjects, however, stronger arguments in Plotinus's that had support—albeit metaphysically speaking—and that is a comforting mystical idea.