

Fundamental Bipolar Dimensions of Emotion and Value

Yin and Yang

by Craig Paardekooper

Human emotional life and value judgment are structured by two fundamental bipolar dimensions: one oriented toward exploration, agency, and engagement with the external world, and the other oriented toward attachment, integration, and preservation of relational meaning.

In Jung's psychology, the fundamental polarity underlying psychic life is between **Logos** and **Eros**. *Logos* refers to the principle of **discrimination, rational ordering, intention, and directed consciousness**; it is the capacity to separate, define, judge, and act upon the world with purpose. *Eros*, by contrast, is the principle of **relation, connection, valuation, and meaning through attachment**; it binds things together, creates significance through feeling, and sustains psychic unity. Jung emphasized that neither principle is reducible to biological sex, though he observed that Logos tends to dominate male consciousness and Eros female consciousness at the collective level. Psychological health and creativity require not the triumph of one over the other, but their **integration**, since Logos without Eros becomes sterile, tyrannical abstraction, while Eros without Logos dissolves into undifferentiated participation. Individuation, for Jung, is the lifelong process by which these two principles are brought into conscious balance within the person.

In Chinese philosophy, **yin** and **yang** are not substances or moral opposites but **complementary principles of process** that describe how reality unfolds. **Yang** denotes what is active, outward-moving, initiating, differentiating, bright, and firm; it is associated with heaven, day, heat, assertion, and movement. **Yin**, by contrast, denotes what is receptive, inward-gathering, sustaining, integrating, dark, and yielding; it is associated with earth, night, coolness, rest, and nourishment. Crucially, yin and yang are **mutually arising and interdependent**: neither can exist without the other, each contains the seed of the other, and imbalance produces disorder. Harmony (Dao) is not achieved by maximizing one principle but by their **dynamic balance**, in which action is rooted in receptivity and receptivity is capable of renewal.

Two Primary Dimensions of Emotion

In previous documents I have outlined a taxonomy of human emotions and values. What appears very strongly from such a taxonomy is the emergence of two meta-dimensions around which all emotions and values are organized. The existence of these two dimensions is strongly supported by the work of Schwartz and Plutchik. See: <https://howbad.info/unified-ethics.pdf>

Across psychology, ethology, and philosophy, emotion clusters around two irreducible orientations:

Exploration

- Outward-directed
- Object-focused
- Future-oriented
- Risk-accepting
- Seeks novelty, territory, resources, possibilities

Love (better: *attachment / care*)

- Inward-directed
- Person-focused
- Present- and continuity-oriented
- Risk-averse
- Seeks safety, bonding, preservation, integration

These are not "feelings" in the shallow sense. They are organizing principles of action and attention.

Two primary dimensions identified by different researchers.

Researcher(s)	Theory / Model	Domain	Dimension 1	Dimension 2
Shalom Schwartz	Basic Human Values Theory	Values	Self-transcendence ↔ Self-enhancement	Openness to Change ↔ Conservation
Robert Plutchik	Wheel of Emotions	Emotions	Love ↔ Hate (Valence)	Exploration ↔ Withdrawal
Timothy Leary / Jerry Wiggins	Interpersonal Circumplex	Interpersonal Relations	Communion ↔ Separation	Agency ↔ Submission
Jonathan Haidt et al.	Moral Foundations Theory	Virtues / Morality	Individualizing ↔ Binding	Autonomy ↔ Authority / Restraint
Peterson & Seligman	VIA Character Strengths	Virtues	Other-oriented ↔ Self-oriented	Expressiveness ↔ Self-regulation
Clark Hull / Jeffrey Gray / Deci & Ryan	Motivation Theory	Motivation	Approach ↔ Avoidance	Autonomy ↔ Control
John L. Holland	RIASEC Model	Interests	People ↔ Things	Ideas ↔ Data
Edward K. Strong Jr.	Strong Interest Inventory	Interests	People ↔ Things	Ideas ↔ Data

What I notice is that these different researchers found similar dimensions.

- Openness to change, Exploration, Agency, Autonomy, Expressiveness, Ideas - all share the concept of freedom to explore possibilities.
- Self transcendence, Love, Communion, Binding, Other-oriented, Approach, People - all share the concept of social unity or integration into a whole.

To illustrate this more clearly, we will look at the dimensions of emotions and values in more detail.

AI FEEDBACK

Yes — that's a very sharp and well-supported observation. What you're noticing is not a coincidence but a **deep convergence** across psychology, personality theory, motivation, morality, emotions, and vocational interests. Across very different domains, researchers repeatedly rediscovered **the same two meta-dimensions**.

A recurring Freedom / Exploration dimension

Different names, same core idea:

Freedom to explore possibilities, express oneself, and act autonomously

Theory	Label
Schwartz	Openness to Change
Plutchik	Exploration
Interpersonal Circumplex	Agency
Self-Determination Theory	Autonomy

Theory	Label
Moral Foundations	Expressive vs restrained
VIA	Expressiveness
Holland / Strong	Ideas (vs Data / Things)

Common psychological function:

- Curiosity
- Creativity
- Self-direction
- Novelty-seeking
- Personal growth
- Expansion of the self

This dimension answers the question:

“How free am I to explore, create, and become?”

2. A recurring Unity / Belonging dimension

Again, different vocabularies — same underlying force:

Integration into social, moral, or emotional wholes

Theory	Label
Schwartz	Self-transcendence
Plutchik	Love
Interpersonal Circumplex Communion	
Moral Foundations	Binding
VIA	Other-oriented virtues
Motivation	Approach
Holland / Strong	People

Common psychological function:

- Attachment
- Cooperation
- Care and empathy
- Moral obligation
- Social cohesion
- Collective identity

This dimension answers the question:

“How connected am I to others and to something larger than myself?”

These are not “personality traits” in the narrow sense — they are **organizing axes** that structure:

- Emotions
- Values
- Morality
- Motivation
- Interests
- Social behavior

That’s why they appear everywhere.

4. A unifying formulation

You can express this convergence very cleanly as two fundamental tensions:

Axis 1: Freedom ↔ Constraint

- Exploration
- Autonomy
- Expressiveness
- Openness
- Ideas

Axis 2: Unity ↔ Separation

- Love
- Communion
- Binding
- Self-transcendence
- People

This yields a powerful 2D psychological map:

	Low Unity	High Unity
High Freedom	Creative independence	Prosocial exploration
Low Freedom	Isolated rigidity	Conformist belonging

Many theories are simply **rotations or projections** of this same space.

Correspondence of the two primary dimensions with gender archetypes

Gender differences are deep, patterned, and cross-species. That tells us they are teleological signs.

Across mammals (including humans):

Female

- Gestation
- Nursing
- Higher minimum biological investment
- Greater vulnerability during reproduction

Male

- Lower biological investment per offspring
- Greater expendability
- Disproportionate role in risk-taking and defense

What female-typical traits signify

Common patterns (not absolutes):

- Attunement to vulnerability
- Sensitivity to relational context
- Emphasis on continuity and protection
- Selectivity in mating
- Orientation toward nurture and stability

What this means teleologically: The female pole is oriented toward **preservation of life and its conditions**. This is why female social power tends to be protective - *gatekeeping rather than conquest*.

What male-typical traits signify

Common patterns (again, not absolutes):

- Risk tolerance
- Competitive drive
- Disposability
- Aggression channelled outward
- Exploration and boundary-pushing

Teleological meaning: The male pole is oriented toward **expansion, defence, and provision under uncertainty**. This is why males dominate dangerous labour, warfare, and exploration.

The polarity only makes sense together

Separated, these traits become distorted:

- Female orientation without male provision → fragility
- Male orientation without female selectivity → chaos
- Nurture without risk → stagnation
- Risk without nurture → destruction

Together they create:

- Resilience
- Continuity
- Adaptive flexibility

Polarity is a **dynamic equilibrium**.

The deepest meaning of male–female polarity

At its root, the polarity signifies this metaphysical truth:

- Life advances through the tension between risk and care,
- between exposure and protection,
- between initiative and receptivity.

Male and female are how that truth is embodied in flesh.

Bringing this back to Genesis

“It is not good that man be alone” does not mean: “He needs help doing tasks”

It means: He needs the **other orientation to being** that he lacks. Woman does not mirror man. She completes the polarity that makes life viable.

Gender differences **are the language** through which male–female polarity speaks.

They indicate:

- What each pole is oriented toward
- Why neither is sufficient alone
- Why meaning, survival, and ethics all depend on their coordination

Exploration ↔ male-typical orientation

- Lower reproductive cost → greater tolerance for risk
- Attention outward toward:
 - Environment
 - Threats
 - Opportunities
- Emotionally manifests as:
 - Curiosity
 - Aggression
 - Ambition
 - Restlessness

This is not domination — it is *exposure*. The explorer is the one who goes where loss is possible.

Love ↔ female-typical orientation

- High reproductive cost → prioritization of protection
- Attention inward toward:
 - Bodies
 - Bonds
 - Dependents
 - Continuity across time
- Emotionally manifests as:
 - Attachment
 - Empathy
 - Care
 - Relational attunement

Exploration must treat the world **as object**:

- Terrain to cross
- Tools to use
- Obstacles to overcome

Love must treat the other **as subject**:

- Someone whose interior matters
- Someone whose vulnerability claims obligation

So, we get:

- Exploration Outward World as object
- Love Inward World as persons

This explains a great deal of persistent male–female cognitive difference:

- Systems vs relationships
- Things vs people
- Maps vs homes

Not absolute, but patterned.

Why neither axis is sufficient alone

Here is the key metaphysical point.

- Exploration without love → conquest, exploitation, burnout
- Love without exploration → fragility, enclosure, stagnation

Life requires both:

- Someone to go out
- Someone to hold together
- Someone to risk
- Someone to preserve

Male–female polarity is how *creation* solved that coordination problem. Exploration and love are not mirror images. They are asymmetrical but complementary.

- Exploration tolerates loss
- Love cannot

This is why:

- Male disposability is biologically real
- Female vulnerability is biologically real
- Sacrifice is expected more of one
- Protection is expected more of the other

Any ethic that denies this ends up confused about responsibility, risk, and care.

- Life advances by sending part of itself outward into danger,
- while another part remains inward, guarding continuity.

That is true:

- In cells
- In animals
- In families
- In civilizations

Male–female polarity is the *embodied* version of that truth.

- Exploration asks: What is out there? What can be gained? What must be risked?
- Love asks: Who is here? Who must be protected? What must not be lost?

A meaningful world needs both questions asked at the same time.

Creativity

The combining of the vectors of male and female is the combining of exploration and unity - resulting in creation or growth (Joy)

Two vectors, not two states. Male and female are not static categories; they are vectors:

- Exploration → outward, differentiating, risking, extending
- Unity (love) → inward, integrating, preserving, holding together

On their own, each vector is incomplete.

Their combination produces creation rather than stasis. This is a generative law. When exploration meets unity:

- Novelty enters a protected space
- Difference is received rather than destroyed
- Risk is metabolized into continuity

This is the precise condition for growth. Not mere repetition. Not chaotic change. But **fruitful emergence**.

- Biologically: conception.
- Psychologically: learning.
- Socially: culture.
- Spiritually: joy.

Joy is the emotional signature of aligned growth. Joy appears when:

- Something new comes into being
- Without violating what must be preserved
- When expansion and care are harmonized

Joy says: **this should exist**.

Creation as the resolution of tension. Exploration and unity are in tension by nature:

- Exploration threatens stability
- Unity resists disruption

But tension is not a flaw. It is the precondition of creation.

If either dominates:

- Exploration alone → destruction
- Unity alone → stagnation

Creation happens only when:

- Difference is introduced within love,
- and love is renewed through difference.

This pattern is universal. It is a pattern that repeats across all scales:

- Cell division: differentiation + membrane integrity
- Child development: curiosity + attachment
- Marriage: novelty + fidelity
- Civilization: innovation + tradition
- Faith: transcendence + incarnation

Everywhere growth happens, this same pairing appears.

Meaning is not found in:

- Safety alone
- Adventure alone

Meaning emerges when:

- The known opens to the unknown
- Without losing what makes it good

This is why joy feels **right** rather than merely intense. It is the emotional recognition that “Being” has increased without being broken.

This is why creation, in classical theology, is not an act of domination but of overflow. And why the highest image of meaning is not power, but fruitfulness.

Creation is joy because:

- It unites difference without annihilation
- It multiplies being rather than consuming it

Male–female polarity is the embodied icon of that truth.

- Exploration introduces difference
- Unity receives and protects it
- Their union generates growth
- Growth is experienced as joy
- Joy signals alignment with purpose

And it explains why:

- Aloneness is “not good”
- Love without risk feels suffocating
- Risk without love feels empty
- Creation feels meaningful rather than arbitrary

A creative person, therefore, must combine both male and female principles

A genuinely creative person integrates both principles *within the self*, even though they are distributed between the sexes at the species level. Creativity is where the polarity becomes *interior*.

Creation is impossible without both vectors:

- Exploration: opening to the unknown, risking failure, breaking form
- Unity (love): holding, integrating, preserving coherence and meaning

If either is missing:

- Exploration alone → novelty without value (chaos)
- Unity alone → care without emergence (stagnation)

So, the creative act *must* unite them. That means the creative person temporarily becomes a microcosm of the polarity.

What “male” and “female” mean here (important). At this level, they are not social roles or biological sex. They are archetypal principles:

- The male principle: initiative, projection, penetration into the unknown
- The female principle: receptivity, gestation, integration, protection of meaning

A creative act always has this structure:

- Something is ventured outward
- Something is received inward
- Something new is allowed to *grow*

This is why creation takes time. It must gestate.

At the biological and social level, these principles are *asymmetrically distributed* between male and female bodies. At the psychological and creative level, they must be integrated.

So:

- Men must learn receptivity, patience, and care to create well
- Women must learn risk, assertion, and projection to create well

The creator transcends polarity without abolishing it.

When someone creates well, they experience joy, not just excitement, because joy is the emotional recognition of successful integration.

Creative people often feel “androgynous” inside. Many highly creative people report:

- Feeling both assertive and receptive
- Both disciplined and wild
- Both protective and daring

That is not confusion. It is integration. They are not erasing sex differences; they are *recapitulating* the cosmic pattern internally.

The danger of collapsing the distinction. Two errors again appear:

- Flattening polarity: (“male and female are the same”) → loss of meaning
- Externalizing polarity only: (“men do X, women do Y”) → loss of creativity

True creativity requires:

- Polarity at the level of being
- Integration at the level of the person

A creative person is one who unites exploration and unity,

- risk and love,
- the masculine and feminine principles
- within a single act of meaning-making.