

A Quick Overview of Dialectic 'Reasoning:' The Process of 'Change'

by Dean Gotcher

You won't get this, the truth about dialectic 'reasoning,' in any college class (it would cost you your job as a professor and your good grade as a student). Dialectic 'reasoning' is the use of [Genesis 3:1-6](#) (the *synthesis* of man with nature, i.e. unity becoming *thesis*, i.e. unrestrained unity with man and nature becoming the 'drive' and 'purpose' of life) to *negate* [Hebrews 12:5-11](#) (the Father, i.e. God as *thesis*, ruler over all things, restraining "human nature") to *negate* [Romans 7:14-25](#) (the condition of *antithesis*, the duality between spirit and flesh and the "guilty conscience" for disobeying God the Father). Dialectic 'reasoning' 'justifies' *sensuousness* ("human nature," man's "natural inclination" to relate with the world; emotions) over and against *righteousness* (doing the Father's will).

Those of dialectic 'reasoning,' who consider themselves "intellectuals," i.e. 'illuminated' or "enlightened," having tied "emotions" ("felt" needs) to the outcome of life, are in actuality emotionalist's, classifying or taxonomizing people according to a spectrum or continuum of emotional responses ("positive," "negative," or non-emotional) to a "given situation" (creating a particular situation or environment, i.e. a crisis, to evaluate a person's response and, if necessary, manipulate the environment so as to change their "emotional" response). As Bloom wrote: "... *ordering and relating the different kinds of affective [emotional] behavior.*" "... *we need to provide the range of emotion from neutrality through mild to strong emotion, probably of a positive, but possibly also of a negative, kind.*" "... *organized into value systems and philosophies of life.*" (David Krathwohl, Benjamin Bloom; *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Book II Affective Domain*) ". . . 'to expose the patient, under more favorable circumstances, to emotional situations which he could not handle in the past. ... undergo a corrective emotional experience suitable to repair the traumatic influence of pervious experience.' (Franz Alexander in Irwin Yalom, *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*) "*The only valuable things in psychic life are the emotions.*" (Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death*)

Dialectic 'reasoning' is using Genesis 3:1-6, i.e. the 'justification' of "human nature" over and against the authority of God: 'liberating' the child's (man's) "natural inclination" to relate with "all" that is in the world in the 'moment' over and against the Father's will (the emotions attending upon the Father, super-natural rather than upon the world, nature). "*And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.*" Galatians 5:24; 6:8s;

"For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet." "And even as they did not like to retain God in [their] knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents,

Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." Romans 1:26-32).

Dialectic 'reasoning,' is claiming for one's self (and for those of like mind in the 'moment') that which is not theirs to take, i.e. not of or for one's self (but is "naturally" desired). Karl Marx, as did Hegel, believed that the Kings horses were the peoples horses, following the same dialectic pattern of Genesis 3:1-6 where the woman 'justified' to herself that "God's tree was her tree," i.e. that God's garden was "their" or "Our garden" (when Adam joined in), which correlates with "'Your' property is 'Our' property," "'Your' business is 'Our' business," "'Your' children are 'Our' children," "'Your' body (as in 'health care') is 'Our' body (as in 'money')," all the preceding being the same in structure, system, paradigm, or way of thinking and acting, that is, of dialectic 'reasoning'. According to dialectic 'reasoning,' the pattern (*paradigm* or way of thinking and acting) of Genesis 3:1-6 ('justifying' unity, i.e. "oneness" with self and nature over and against God and His command, law, or will) must be used by man if he is to *negate* the condition of Romans 7:14-25, i.e. loving God and His law over nature, i.e. over "human nature," yet failing God by disobeying the law, i.e. followed after his own "natural inclination" to relate with or unite with the world, i.e. with nature as "one," in the pursuit of gratifying his "lust" ("natural desire") for "pleasure." Romans 7:14-25 is man doing that which he does not want to do, that is following after his own "human nature" to approach pleasure and avoid pain (pain being also the missing out on pleasure), thereby disobeying (and thus disappointing) God or the Father, and not doing that which he wants to do, that is obeying God or the Father and pleasing Him (instead of following after his "natural inclination" to relate with the world). His failure to obey (his disobedience) is all due to his "natural inclination" to relate with the world, "doing his own thing," following after his "human nature" to sin (disobey God or the Father in his pursuit of "enjoyment," i.e. happiness, i.e. pleasure, i.e. "oneness" with the world).

According to dialectic 'reasoning'—turning Romans 7:14-25 "upside down"— it is the Father's law which is "sin" (alienating man from himself and the world) and the flesh, "human nature," which is "righteous" (uniting man with himself and the world). *"Alienation has a long history. Its most radical sense already appears in the biblical expulsion from Eden." "God is thus the anthropological source of alienation."* (Stephen Eric Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and its Theorists*) *"Sin is the estrangement of man from man."* (Leonard Wheat, *Paul Tillich's Dialectical Humanism*) According to this way of thinking, "human reasoning" and "action" united ("human reasoning' not only being used to 'justify' "human nature," but also used to 'justify' putting it into action) in *negating* the condition of *righteousness*, having to do the Father's will, where man has to do that which is not according to (goes counter to) his own nature, i.e. having to do that which is not of "nature," not of his own "natural inclination" to relate with the world in pleasure, not allowing him to follow after his *urges and impulses* of the 'moment,' as well as not allowing him to do that which he wants to do in the 'moment,' i.e. not allow him to do that which will fulfill his own nature, preventing him from "discover his full potential," cutting off his 'drive,' his natural *impulses and urges* of the 'moment' to become "at-one-with" the world in pleasure.

We are to weigh our thoughts and our actions according to our Father's commands (according to the Word of God) not according to our feelings and thoughts of the *sensuous* 'moment' (according to the *opinions* of men), as dialectic 'reasoning' requires. *"Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth."* Colossians 3:2 Karl Marx, building upon dialectic 'reasoning,' demanded that man sets his affection only upon the things of the world, according to his carnal nature. That when man thinks and acts otherwise ("creating" a world of *righteousness*, subject to the will of the Father), he creates"

a world which is "alien and hostile" to his carnal nature and the carnal nature of others, "creating" a world which inhibits and blocks him from "creating" and sustaining a world *from* and *for* his own carnal "human nature," cutting of his "naturally inclination" to become at-one-with the world *in* and *for* the augmentation of pleasure. "*The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force.*" (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3) The word of God instructs us to put to death the "lusts" of our "human nature" "*for which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.*" "*Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them.*" Colossians 3:5-7 Our affections to this world ('justified' by our use of dialectic 'reasoning') does not lead us to "life," as those of dialectic 'reasoning' falsely claim, but instead lead us to death.

According to dialectic 'reasoning, to *negate* the condition of Romans 7:14-25 (the conflict between spirit and flesh, i.e. God and man, i.e. the Father and the child, i.e. *righteousness* and *sensuousness*) the condition of Hebrews 12:5-11 (the authority of the Father) must be *negated*. That is, the Father's authority to give commands to His children, commands to be obeyed without question, and his *chastening* of them when they disobey Him must be *negated* if the condition which engenders a "guilty conscience" (and thus sustains a "top-down" way of thinking and acting, i.e. the *Patriarchal Paradigm*, preventing 'change') is to be *negated*. By *negating* the condition which justifies the authority of the Father (Hebrews 12:5-11), the condition which engenders the "guilty conscience" (Romans 7:14-15) is *negated*. Man (and child) is then free ('liberated') to "be himself," thinking and acting according to his own "human nature." Without man's ability to evaluate the world according to his own "feelings" and "thoughts," i.e. 'justifying' himself as being the standard from which to determine what is right and what is wrong, what is "good" and what is "evil," *synthesizing* himself with nature (Genesis 3:1-6), i.e. making "human nature" the "new" *thesis*, the condition of the "old" *thesis*, i.e. the Father's authority over "human nature" (Hebrews 12:5-11) would continue to initiate and sustain the condition of *antithesis* (Romans 7:14-25), i.e. man caught between that which is of his own nature and that which is not (super-natural), in his life.

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' without the use of Genesis 3:1-6 (the self-'justification' of "human nature" and "human reasoning," the ability of man to evaluate and judge for himself what is good and what is evil, *negating* that which is spiritual, the Father's command by evaluating the Father's command through "human reasoning," 'justifying' to themselves that there was nothing wrong regarding the "forbidden tree," it was physically "good" for food, "pleasing" to the eyes, and "desirable" to make one wise, i.e. like God) the child (man) would forever remain subject to Hebrews 12:51 (to the Father's commands) and thereby always remain in a state of Romans 7:14-25 (in conflict between obeying his own human nature, his flesh, subjective truth, which is of the creation, which is of sight, or obeying God, objective truth, who is the creator, spirit, requiring faith). By getting man to focus upon *sensuousness* (man and his desire for pleasure, i.e. to eat of "God's tree," to become "like Him," in this case man creating himself in "his own image," creating a "new" world ordered after his own nature, according to the nature of man) as being equal with *righteousness* (doing God or the Father's will), *righteousness* becomes *circumvented* and is *negated* in the thoughts and actions of man, *sensuousness* becomes 'justified' over and against *righteousness* (it can never be equal). Jesus Christ then only becomes a figure in history fighting the establishment of his day, a social savior (a social worker), a Fatherless Christ, and not the savior of the world, who by his own blood, 'redeemed' man from the wrath of the Father upon "the children of disobedience," 'reconciling' him back to the Father. How you can tell the Christ and the anti-Christ apart is one obeys His Heavenly Father even unto death, the other is Fatherless, taking the Father's authority for himself (worshiping himself). We

are to be like Christ (in Christ), subject to the will of our Heavenly Father in all things, not subject to the will of our flesh seeking after the things of this world, including the "approval of or 'justification' by men." *"Casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."* 2 Corinthians 10:3-5 underline added.

Those of dialectic 'reasoning' not only can not accept the Father and His authority, they can not accept the Son who obeys His Heavenly Father in all things, and the Holy Spirit who reveals to man the will of the Father. God, all three as one, must "progressively" be redefined in man's mind (in his imagination, according to his own *opinion*, according to how he "feels" and what he "thinks") as being a God of "human nature" (of "human compassion") and of nature itself, if man is to *become* God himself (to become "at-one-with" the world, i.e. 'justified,' in himself, individually and collectively, and with all of nature as well). It is our Heavenly Father (His commands which require *faith, belief, and obedience*, and His *chastening* when we disobey) who is anathema to dialectic 'reasoning.' It is the Father's only begotten Son who, by his shed blood for our sins, in obedience to His Heavenly Father, can save us ('redeem' us from judgment and eternal death) and who, in His resurrection, 'reconcile' us back to the Father (to partake in the glory of His Heavenly Father). The Holy Spirit bearing witness with our spirit of both our Heavenly Father and His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ of Nazareth, confirming the Word of God (not the *opinions* of men). There is no other 'purpose' and 'drive' of dialectic 'reasoning' other than to *negate* the Father and His authority over His creation—like two in a garden in Eden did, Genesis 3:1-6, taking that which was not theirs to take, i.e. taking for their own pleasure (consuming it unto themselves) that which God created for His own glory (for His glory alone). Those of dialectic 'reasoning' seek to *negate* "This is mine, not yours." replacing it with "This is Ours, not just yours." making man "equal" with (over and against) God, making man God himself ('righteous' in his own eyes, worshiping the works of his own hands rather than God alone).

"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise [not needing God, able to 'reason' for themselves], they became fools, And changed the glory of the uncorruptible [unchangeable, righteous] God into an image made like to corruptible [changeable, sensuous] man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen." Romans 1:20-25

The dialectic "formula" is the child (man) using Genesis 3:1-6 (the 'justification' of his "human nature" as being "normal," i.e. rational) to *negate* Hebrews 12:5-11 (the right of the Father to give commands to and *chasten* his children when they disobey) to *negate* Romans 7:14-25, i.e. *negate* the *antithesis* condition between *righteousness* and *sensuousness*, *negate* the belief-action dichotomy between the spirit and the flesh, *negate* the duality of "I'm above, you are below" (*negating* the condition which engenders the "guilty conscience" for disobedience), thereby creating a purely human (child centered, "feelings" based, *sensuousness* seeking) world. It is the *dialoguing* of *opinions* (dialogic and dialectic thinking to oneself or to others what "seems" to be and what "ought" to be—there is no "guilty conscience" in the *dialoguing* of *opinions*) that is basic to the process of

'change,' where a person is no longer guided by faith, by the Father's directions, but by sight, by his own "sense perception" (Karl Marx) and 'reasoning' ability (George Hegel). *"Social action no less than physical action is steered by perception."* (Kurt Lewin) *"The words 'seem to' are significant; it is the perception which functions in guiding behavior."* (Carl Rogers) The scriptures warn us of dialectic 'reasoning' and its outcome: *"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."* Proverbs 16:25

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' without man's participation in dialectic 'reasoning,' without his participation in the *"scientific method"* of 'change' (which is "so called science" 1 Timothy 6:20, which is "observable and definable"—true science being "observable and repeatable") the "guilty conscience" will continue to prevent him from 'liberating' himself from the Father' authority, preventing him from being adaptable to the so called 'changing' times. While technology changes, according to man's wisdom, man's heart is not changed, being only changeable by the wisdom of God (by the *preaching* and *teaching* of His word), which dialectic 'reasoning' seeks to *negate* in the thoughts and actions, in the *"theory and practice"* of every man and child. "All children are at risk." and "We will leave no child behind." is all about 'liberating' the children from the Father's authority to give commands to his children, commands and therefore his authority which they are not to question, and chasten them when they disobey them, thus engendering a "guilty conscience," thus making the next generation inadaptable to 'change' (not easily giving in to the voice of the many). The conscience is of the one (tying man to the voice of the Father, to the spirit above, to "the approval of God"), the so called "super-ego" is of the many (tying man to "the village," to the collective "one," to the spirit of *community*, to "the approval of men").

Hegel wrote, regarding his use of dialectic 'reasoning': *"It is clear that no expositions can be regarded as scientific which do not follow the course of this method [first put into praxis in a garden in Eden, i.e. Genesis 3:1-6, where men's opinions or theories first superseded faith in, belief upon, and obedience to the Father and His command], and which are not conformable to its simple rhythm, for that is the course of the thing itself."* (Carl Friedrich, *The Philosophy of Hegel*) Carl Rogers, recognizing it's use in the 'changing' of culture (the 'changing' of *"cultural patterns"* or paradigms), wrote: *"Environmental changes [changes in leadership styles, from "top-down" to "equality," from "negative" to "positive," that is, "positive" according to the flesh, according to "human nature"] have always been the condition for the improvement of [the 'changing' of] cultural patterns, and we can hardly use the more effective methods of science [the dialectic method 'justifying' "human nature," i.e. sensuousness, over and against the Father's will, i.e. righteousness] without making changes on a grander scale [changes' in all institutions of society]."* (Carl Rogers, *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*) Have you heard the word 'change' recently. While God changes our heart according to His *righteousness* (initiating and sustaining "top-down" authority under Him), we can only 'change' the environment, "improve" it (through dialectic 'reasoning') to augment the *sensuousness* of pleasure and the "enjoyment" of this life, initiating and sustaining "equality," leaving our deceitful and wicked heart in place.

The Marxist Erick Fromm wrote: *"Work done by Horkheimer in the thirties identified 'neurosis [people accepting a "top-down" (patriarchal) system of authority which is not in harmony with "human nature"] as a social product, in which the family was seen as a primary agent of repressive socialization."* (Erich Fromm, *Marx's Concept of Man*, in Stephen Eric Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists*)

"Freud, Hegel, and Nietzsche are, like Marx, compelled to postulate external domination and its assertion by force in order to explain repression." (Normal O. Brown, *Life Against Death*)

Hegel wrote: *"The child, contrary to appearance, is the absolute, the rationality; he is what is enduring and everlasting, the totality."* *"On account of the absolute and natural oneness of the husband, the wife, and the child, where there is no antithesis of person to person or of subject to object [no top-down order], the surplus is not the property of one of them, since their indifference is not a formal or a legal one."* (George Hegel, System of Ethical Life)

Marx wrote: *"Thus, for instance, once the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the holy family, the former must itself be annihilated [vernichtet] theoretically and practically."* (Karl Marx, Feuerbach Thesis #4, Translated: by Cyril Smith 2002, based on work done jointly with Don Cuckson)

Freud wrote: *"It is not really a decisive matter whether one has killed one's father or abstained from the deed, if the function of the conflict and its consequences are the same."* (Sigmund Freud in Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*)

The Marxist Theodor Adorno, identifying the correlation between belief in God and the traditional family structure, wrote: *"God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority."* *"The conception of the ideal family situation for the child: 1) uncritical obedience to the father and elders, 2) pressures directed unilaterally from above to below, 3) inhibition of spontaneity, and 4) emphasis on conformity to externally imposed values."* *"The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem [the socialization of America and the world]."* (Theodor Adorno, *The Authoritarian Personality*)

"A new emphasis on civic participation and social interaction alone seemed capable of confronting the crisis. And, that is precisely what Fromm provided in his notion of 'communitarian socialism.'" (Stephen Eric Bronner, Of Critical Theory and its Theorists)

Dialectic 'reasoning' depends upon the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to *negate* "repression," i.e. the effect of the Father's *preaching* and *teaching* of commands to his children, commands to be obeyed without question (which requires *faith*, *belief*, and *chastening*, which engenders the "guilty conscience" when the child follows after his own "human nature," that which he has in common with all the world, instead of doing the Father's will). Without a "guilty conscience" the child can do as he wills, without a fear of God. This is the meaning of 'change,' of "paradigm 'shift'," where *sensuousness* and "human reasoning" supersede the *righteousness* of God (the will of the Father) as the standard or paradigm from which to determine "good and evil" from, i.e. from which to determine the worth and value of life (your own and others as well), from which to live by. With the *sensuousness* of pleasure and the "enjoyment" of this life being the measurement from which to determine what is "good," the *righteousness* of God (His restraining and judging of "human nature," according to His will) becomes "evil" (treated as being "irrational" and therefore "irrelevant" until it causes "controversy," i.e. gets in the way of "human nature," when it is then perceived and treated as being "hateful" or "evil"). "Mine, not yours," the nature of God (which gives us the right of private property) is *negated* through the *praxis* (social action) of dialectic 'reasoning,' "Ours, not just yours." *"Contemporary social science, especially in America, bears the impact of Hegelian thinking to an extraordinary degree. Cultural anthropology and social psychology, especially of the psychoanalytic and Gestalt variety, and much of present day sociology... are more Hegelian than they would like to admit, or do acknowledge."* (Carl Friedrich *The Philosophy of Hegel*, 1953) I would even go further saying that we are now "more Marxist than we would like to admit, or do acknowledge." Although that is changing with even ministers today say that "Marx was more right than wrong," when in truth he,

along with Hegel, Freud, etc, (all dialectic thinkers and doers) was dead wrong. All ministers advocating 'change' are dialectic thinkers. They are, as Karl Marx, dead wrong.

While ministers of 'change' might not know what they are doing, the big boys of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e. the masters of the art craft of the facilitation of 'change' do (though they refuse to humble themselves before God and accept it): *"If the 'restoring of life' of the world is to be conceived in terms of the Christian revelation, then Marx must collapse into a bottomless abyss."* (Jürgen Habermas, *Theory and Practice*) *"And he [Jesus Christ] said to them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away? For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels."* Luke 9:23-26 Those of the contemporary church have chosen the way of Karl Marx (dialectic 'reasoning': *seducing, deceiving, and manipulating* man through the *praxis* of social unity for the 'purpose' of "growth") and rejected the way of the Lord (which is *faith* in, *belief* upon, *obedience* toward, and *chastening* by our Heavenly Father, i.e. trusting in the Lord with all our heart), instead leaning unto its own understanding, even doing so in the name of the Lord, so as to deceive the many. When *righteousness* comes into the "contemporary" church it causes controversy. Therefore *righteousness* has to be removed from the church because controversy is bad for "business," i.e. "growing customers."

Don't be deceived: *"Trust in the LORD with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths. Be not wise in thine own eyes: fear the LORD, and depart from evil."* Proverbs 3:5-7

© *Institution for Authority Research*, Dean Gotcher 2012-2015