

A Précis of the Introduction to the Articles

by

Dean Gotcher

All bracketed information below, within the quotations or verses of this article, is not in the original quotation or verse.

It is information that has been added by me.

There is no Father's authority in the "dialoguing of opinions," only "equals."

Therefore, in the "dialoguing of opinions," no one has a "guilty conscience" in disobeying the Father, since in the "dialoguing of opinions," there is not Father's authority to disobey.

"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." Romans 1:21

The problem anyone faces, who attempts to explain the dialectic process, is its elusiveness, or better yet its commonality. Things can become so "common" that they are not noticeable ("too close to home to see, or if seen, wanted to be exposed"). What we all have in "common" is our tendency to resent things that prevent us from doing what "we" want to do, thinking that life would be "better" if they did not exist, not realizing that sometimes by getting rid of that which we resent, we can actually end up *negating* that which restrains us from destroying ourselves. Things that are pleasurable to us are "positive" because our nature is to "enjoy" things that are pleasurable to us physically, emotionally (mentally), and socially. Things that are painful to us are "negative" because our nature is to avoid that which is hurtful to us, physically, emotionally (mentally), and socially. If you base 'reality' upon "human nature" (the dialectic process) then you measure the worth of your day (the worth of life itself) upon how much

pleasure vs. how much pain the day has brought your way. Therefore, carnal man judges and values his life and the life of others only upon the pleasure-pain spectrum of "human nature," only upon the condition of 'changingness.'

It is not that we should seek after pain and avoid pleasure. It is that life is not based upon that which is of "nature" only, of "sense experience" only. Unless you have deceived yourself and think like a "humanist," like a "common-ist" aka a communists (a "communist with a smile"), a Transformational Marxist (a "user friendly" Marxist), a social-psychologist (Marx and Freud *synthesized*), a facilitator of 'change,' a "*communitarianist*" (all being the same), you know that there is more to life than Eros, that is more than the pleasure or "enjoyment" of this life only —being lovers of pleasure more than God (or in place of God, that is making pleasure or the "enjoyment" of this life God). [2 Timothy 3:1-8](#) With a world established upon the "approach pleasure - avoid pain" paradigm of 'change' only, with "human nature" subject only to the ever 'changing' conditions (temptations) of the world (living in and for the 'moment') and those who *manipulate* it (to their own end), that is *seducing*, *deceiving*, and *manipulating* man, that is "controlling" him through his own "natural inclination" to relate with the 'immediate' environment in the pursuit of pleasure and in the avoidance of pain only, there is no right of sovereignty, that is no right of a patriarch, no right of a Father, that is no right to protect (initiate and sustain) His "Mine not yours" way of thinking and acting.

In the *consensus* of "social harmony" and "world peace" (socialist harmony and worldly peace) "Mine not yours" (private) is *negated*, that is replaced with the "public-private" tyranny of "Ours, not just yours" —"We working for Us." While Jesus claimed "equality" with His Heavenly Father ("*I and my Father are one.*" John 10:30) being "fashioned as a man," He humbled Himself under His Father's authority, to show us we are not to claim "equality" with God, be as God(s) ourselves. "*And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.*" Philippians 2:8 "*He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me,*

except I drink it, thy will be done." Matthew 26:42 Then, when He ascended into Heaven, He did not take His Heavenly Father's place, demanding "equality" on His terms, that is "Father, Your seat is My seat, Not just Yours." He instead sat Himself down at His Heavenly Father's right hand, maintaining a "top-down" order. "Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Hebrews 12:2 It is His Father who placed all things in His only begotten Son's hands (the Son, who even today, is waiting for His Father's command to go get His bride). Not once has our Lord stepped out from under a "top-down" patriarchal order, out from under His Heavenly Father's commands. He has called us to be like Him, doing the same, even in our daily prayer to seek His will, regarding all things. *"After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven."* Matthew 6:9, 10 It is man, in *consensus* with himself (even in the "church" doing it in "the name of the Lord"), who refuses to humble himself before God, instead thinking and acting according to dialectic 'reasoning,' "leaning to his own understanding," 'justifying his carnal "human nature," who will be humbled on the day of judgment before both the Father and the Son. " *The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the LORD alone shall be exalted in that day.*" Isaiah 2:11 " *Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time:*" 1 Peter 5:6 This is something those of dialectic 'reasoning' can not do (humble themselves before God) and will not experience (being exalted by Him), instead (being exalted by men only) experiencing judgment and eternal damnation for their "pernicious" ways (2 Peter 2:1-22). See the article [Facilitators - Wells Without Water](#). Bold added to verses above.

After all is said and done the *thesis, antithesis, synthesis* of the dialectic process (the words most people associate with it) is all about the Father-children relationship. The *thesis* (position) represents the condition of the Father's authority, His *authority to author commands*, commands which his children must obey rather than follow after their "natural inclinations" to relate with the world (the natural environment around them or in their

imagination) in the 'moment,' as well as the Father's authority to chasten His children when His commands are not obeyed, thereby not only having the recognized right to *author* commands but also the recognized right to enforce them, initiating and sustaining his *authority* to rule over His children (rule over his home, his land, his business, where we get the right of property). His "Do what I say," His "Don't disobey or else," and His "Because I say so" represent his *authority* to *author* commands and his *authority* to enforce them, initiating and sustaining his position of *authority* over that which is His.

This way of thinking and acting is called a *patriarchal paradigm*, where right and wrong (good and evil) is determined not by the child's "natural inclination" to "approach pleasure and avoid pain" but according to the Father's will. This system (if I can call it that) is a system of *righteousness* in that God gives his children commands to be obeyed and *chastens* them when they disobey, with those children who refuse to accept His *chastening* (refusing to repent of their disobedience), that is the "children of disobedience" (refusing to be His children) receiving His wrath. (It is better to receive the Father's *chastening* and repent than His wrath and be condemned.) While the pattern or the system or the paradigm is the same for both the Heavenly Father and the earthly father the outcome is different in that the Heavenly Father *chastens* His children so that they "*might be partakers of His holiness*" while the earthly father chastens his children "*after his own pleasure.*" "*For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness.*" Hebrews 12:10 This *thesis* condition (not as those of dialectic 'reasoning' would define it) is defined in [Hebrews 12:5-11](#).

Those of dialectic 'reasoning' set out to *negate* this "top-down" *thesis* of *righteousness* by replacing it with their own "*thesis*" of *sensuousness*, that is of the "approach pleasure - avoid pain" spectrum or continuum of "human nature," so that they can initiate and sustain the system of 'change,' that is a system of heresy (why their paradigm or way of thinking and acting is called a *heresiarchal paradigm* of 'change'). Have you heard the word 'change' recently.

Antithesis represents, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' the condition of conflict or tension created by the desire of the child to obey his Father, receiving His approval and his natural inclination to relate with the environment, relate with the world in the 'moment,' in "enjoyment." For the child to obey the Father's will means that he can not do that which he "wants" to do or what he wills (do that which is "enjoyable" according to his "natural inclination" to relate with the world, in the 'moment') and yet to do that which he wants to do or wills to do (approach pleasure or "enjoy" the world) means that he will have to disobey the Father's will and "get into trouble," that is be *chastened* by the Father, that is experience pain, which he wants to avoid (why children scheme how they can avoid being caught and lie when they are —both manifestations of dialectic 'reasoning'). According to dialectic 'reasoning,' *antithesis* is only the condition of conflict or tension between approaching pleasure and avoiding pain, the child desiring to "enjoy" the pleasure which comes from relating with that which is gratifying to him in the environment and the pleasure which comes from the Father's approval, but "restrained" by the fear of pain he will receive from the Father if he fulfills that which is of his own "human nature." (I am explaining all the works of philosophy here, that is man's effort to know himself as he "is," according to his own nature and the world he finds himself in. Without the Father, that is God revealing Himself to the children, that is man, all man can know is what he "is," like children, carnal, which he can only "senses perceive" as being "normal," perceiving himself as being "good," that is righteous in his own eyes.) This is the trickery, trap, and tyranny of dialectic 'reasoning.'

By focusing upon the pleasure-pain spectrum or continuum ('changingness') of nature (*plurality*) rather than the Father's authority ('unchangingness,' rigidity, or "fixity") to restrain his children from thinking and acting according to it (*duality*), 'justifies,' to those of dialectic 'reasoning,' the potential of *synthesis* (explained below). The child, approaching pleasure (doing that which is natural, that is "doing his own thing") when it goes against his Father's will, incurs not only external pain from the Father (His *chastening*) but internal pain as well (not receiving the Father's approval). Yet, for the child, not being able to do that which is natural, that is approach pleasure, that is participate with the world in its

"enjoyment" (receiving "its" approval), is to incur internal pain as well as external pain, that is the pain of alienation from his own "natural inclination" to relate with the world (not being able to be "himself") as well as the pain of alienation from the world itself (not being able to be with others of like mind, of common carnal desires). By embracing the Father's commands, and himself *preaching* and *teaching* them to others, he experiences alienation from those who do not hold to or do not want to hear of his Father's commands, incurring their rejection and wrath. While separating himself from others or others separating themselves from him, even doing harm to him he does not use force to bring others under his way of thinking and acting (which is according to the Father's will —it is the Father who is to judge, chastening His own children, having wrath upon those who are not, according to His time and place), the believer only using force to *protect* those who are under his authority.

Nowhere in the annals of history have *true believers* persecuted or killed others for their faith (you can not defend your faith, it defends you) while they have defended their families, their property, their business, that is their liberty and even their very own lives, with some choosing not to (as every man has that, God given, right to do). While "Christians," believing the world is their kingdom under God have used (and continue to use) violence to "help" God in creating His kingdom," believers of God's Word, who know Him and His Word, know that the work is the Lords, not theirs, His kingdom is not of man's making but of His own making alone, according to His power alone, for His glory alone. The standard of duality (or established right and wrong) is upon the Father, the children only being able to (in themselves) engender a world of plurality (of diversity), a world 'driven' by and 'purpose' in fulfilling their own "felt" needs of the 'moment.' That is why those of dialectic 'reasoning' focus upon the children (*sensuousness*), refusing to focus upon the authority of the Father (*righteousness*), other than to *negate* it. To *synthesis* it, that is to make *righteousness* "equal" with *sensuousness*, or rather *sensuousness* "equal" with *righteousness* that is to make the Father "equal" with the children and the children "equal" with the Father, making both subject only to "human nature" is to *negate righteousness*, is to *negate* the Father's authority to

give commands and chasten those who are under His authority when they disobey, in the thoughts and actions of men.

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' the duality condition of *antithesis* is engendered when the "top-down" condition of the *patriarchal paradigm*, where the Father's *authority* to give *commands* to his children and *chasten* them when they disobey Him supersedes and thereby "represses" the child's natural inclination to relate with the world in the 'moment,' preventing him from initiating and sustaining peace, unity, "oneness," harmony, not only with himself (becoming at-one-with his own nature) but with the the nature of the world as well, living according to his "human nature," doing that which is natural. Therefore the conflict condition of *antithesis*, according to dialectic 'reasoning' is not between *righteousness* and *sensuousness* (which would sustain a "top-down" order) but between the Father's unnatural use of commands and His unnatural use of *chasten* (pain) upon the child to initiate and sustain His position of authority (his "top-down" order) over and against nature, that is over and against the world and the child's nature to be-at-one with the world (his desire to approach the pleasures of the world, to naturally initiate and sustain "oneness" and "equality" with the world over and against the Father's authority), the Father preventing the child from becoming "normal." Normal meaning at-one-with or "equal" within the world. The father, who gives commands which restrain his child's natural inclination and *chastens* him when he carries them out, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' that is according to nature, is "irrational" because all fathers are only of the earth and are therefore themselves naturally inclined to approach the pleasures of the world, that is seeking to be at-one-with their own nature and the nature of the world they live within. By 'shifting' man's focus from *righteousness* ("top-down") to *sensuousness* ("equality," both the nature of the father and the children are the same), through the *consensus* process (the dialectic process), man has only *sensuousness*, his carnal "human nature," to stand upon. The trickery of dialectic 'reasoning' is to catch all the *righteous* in their trap of *sensuousness*, through their use of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is through our "human nature" of self-'justification,' just as Satan did to two in a garden in Eden ([Genesis 3:1-6](#)).

With this "logic," by man (individually and collectively) focusing upon the errors (and therefore the "irrationality") of their earthly father's authority (which is the dialectic intent), he can 'justify' his "human nature" as being "normal," he can *negate* (treat as "irrelevant") in his thoughts and in his actions, the truth of our Heavenly Father, who is perfect. *"And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your father, which is in heaven."* Matthew 23:9 The 'justification' of "human nature," man's "sense experience" (which is the bases of all philosophy, psychology, sociology, etc.) over and against (it can not be equal with) God the Father is the agenda of dialectic 'reasoning,' *negating* all the earthly father's their God given right of authority, under God. [Hegel](#), [Marx](#)', [Freud](#), [Rousseau](#), and with those preceding and following (all following after the same pattern begun in Genesis 3:1-6) had this in common, the *negation* of the father's authority (as in God's authority) to declare "This is mine and not yours" and enforce it. The earthly father is not perfect, that is he is not 'justified' in his own carnal nature, but his office is justified, under God—God's desiring that he serve in his office of authority under Him, with him (the earthly father) and all under his authority coming to know Him (God) as their true and only Father (who is perfect) through His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, who is also perfect (His *righteousness* manifested through His obedience to His Heavenly Father in all things commanded, unto death). *"Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."* Matthew 5:48

Our "human nature," our "natural inclination" to relate with the world around us, over and against obeying God the Father, engenders our imperfect, that we are not God (that the the child is not "equal" with the father —which, if accepted, that is that the child is "equal" with the father, would *negate* the "top-down" authority of the father, that is *negate* the father, *negate* the system of *righteousness* and therefore *negate* *righteousness* itself, at least in the thoughts and actions of the child), the law of God simply exposing our sinful nature, that is our "human nature" as sinful. ([Romans 7:14-25](#)) The only begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, loving and obeying His Heavenly Father, in all things commanded (even unto death), came to 'redeem' us from His Father's wrath upon us (because we are not perfect or *righteous* in and of ourselves, that we are only able to

determine good from evil according to our love for the things of this world, that is according to own "human nature," according to *sensuousness*), and 'reconcile' us to His Heavenly Father (making us perfect in Himself), through His blood. This is the message of the gospel, a message of the Father's love for His children, a message of *righteousness*. Those of dialectic 'reasoning,' 'justifying' "human nature," *negate* this message, making man's love for himself (individually and collectively) the focus of life, leaving him imperfect, unrighteous, and condemned. The same is true for all religions. While exonerating the father system (to a certain point), basing themselves upon the "top-down" system of *righteousness*, they do not know the Heavenly Father, who is only knowable through His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, alone, obeying Him according to His Word—above all things created, whether on earth or in the heaven.

"Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12 ([Matthew 7:21-23](#))

In all of this above I have not once step outside of exposing the dialectic process (dialectic 'reasoning') for what it is, the sinful *praxis* of man 'justifying' his "human nature" as being "normal," that is the method whereby he is able to establish his carnal nature as being the "norm." Yet not once (that I know of) is the dialectic process studied and exposed in our schools (including in the church—we are not to be ignorant of Satan's devices) for what it is, abomination, that is the establishing of "human relationship" (which is based upon our carnal *sensuousness* and our 'reasoning' abilities) over and against (it can not be "equal" with) our relationship with God (which is based only upon His *righteousness*, His *righteousness alone*). None would dare. They would lose their jobs and thereby lose not only their income but also their respect "in the eyes of men."

The *thesis* condition of the Father's authority is a condition of *righteousness*, in that right and wrong (good and evil) is determined by the Father, not by the child with his "natural inclination" to relate with the world in the 'moment,' living according to his own nature to approach

pleasure and avoid pain, which is a spectrum of 'changingness,' which is of *sensuousness*, of nature only. The Father's right - wrong is a condition of unchangingness, changing only according to what He wills alone, not 'changing' according to ("controlled" by) the natural inclinations of the child to relate with the world in the 'moment,' that is 'changing' according to the 'changing' world. Therefore, the conflict (duality) between the Father and His child is a conflict between *righteousness* and *sensuousness*, not a conflict between approach pleasure - avoid pain, as those of dialectic 'reasoning' would like you to believe (the crisis of the 'moment,' man's "felt" needs of the 'moment,' *negating*, in the minds of men, the crisis of judgment which is coming upon all men, for disobeying the Father's commands —those not in Christ, "*There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.*" Romans 8:1). It is only in this 'shift' or 'change' from *righteousness* (the will of the Father) to *sensuousness*, ("human nature," the will of the child) that the spectrum (plurality, diversity, ambiguity) of 'changingness' can supersede the duality of *righteousness* and *sensuousness*, the duality of spirit and flesh, the duality of the Father and the children, the duality of God and man, the duality of right and wrong, *negating* the authority of the Father to author commands to His children and *chasten* them when they disobey, *negating* the right of the Father to initiate and sustain in His children His way of thinking and acting, as He wills, doing that which is right, that is of *righteousness* rather than doing that which is wrong, that is of *sensuousness* only, inhibiting or preventing that which is of the world (unrighteousness) from controlling their lives. I speak of our Heavenly Father although the pattern is represented in our earthly fathers as well. The *consensus* process is, in the end, only about removing the Father's will in the children (*negate* the issue of *righteousness*), as they work together to actualize their "common" "felt" needs.

Those of dialectic 'reasoning' understand that by *negating* the pattern of the earthly ('liberating' the children from the father's authority, that is 'liberating' them to have the 'right' to "question authority," with impunity, getting them to focus upon their own *sensuousness*, their own "human nature," how they "feel" and what they "think," over and against

righteousness, over and against the Father's will) they can *negate*, in the thoughts and actions of men, the Heavenly Father (the words may be spoken but their heart is not there). This 'shift' in focus, from *righteousness* to *sensuousness*, that is from God's will to man's will (correlated, by those of dialectic 'reasoning,' with a 'shift' in focus from the Father's will to the child's will —the child's "natural inclination" to relate with the world in the 'moment, that is his "human nature" 'justifying,' according to those of dialectic 'reasoning,' the "need" to *negate* the Father's right to author commands and *chasten* His children when they disobey Him if man is to become united as one, in *consensus*), affects every part of our lives today (common "human nature" by sight *negating* "common salvation" by faith). *"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ."* Jude 1:3-4 This 'shift' in focus makes *synthesis*, which is an illusion, which is a deception, a "reality" to *sensuous* man. Take note: while on the day of judgment there are many (plurality, that is many people with different points of view or *opinions*), in truth what matters to you (and to each one of them) is that there is only one, you before God (duality, that is with his "point of view," like a Father, being all that matters, yours not counting). Plurality (your *opinion* amongst *opinions*, engendered from your "approach pleasure - avoid pain" continuum, that is your "human nature" and your 'reasoning' abilities to 'justify it, that is lusting after the things of the world) is not going to save you. It will only leave you condemned, in your sin. "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." John 3:19-21 See also 2 Peter 2:1-22. *"For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned:*

but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." John 3:17-18

The "plurality" or diversity of the pleasure-pain spectrum of *sensuousness* (the "ground" upon which *synthesis*, that is "oneness" is built), when it becomes the focus of life, *negates* the duality (the *antithesis*) of *righteousness-unrighteousness* (the Father's will) as the issue of life and death, that is when the plurality of the children (the diversity of "felt" needs) become the focus of life (social issues), the issue of obedience to authority, of the "top-down" duality of the Father's authority and the children's obedience is *negated* as the issue of life (individual issue), other than as an issue to be *negated*, that is individual rights under God's authority (reflected in the child's obedience to parental authority) is to be negated through the "right of the child." With a world established upon the "pleasure-pain spectrum" of "human nature" there are no inalienable rights to protect the citizens, that is no right of the Father to protect his family—to protect his wife, his daughters, his sons, his property, his business, and even his very own life—from the tyranny of "human rights," that is from "the children of disobedience," from the *heresiarchal* paradigm of 'change,' from abomination (as in Sodom), that is that for which those of dialectic 'reasoning' stand. The *antithesis* of "Mine, not yours," which is of God, that is of the Father, the dualism (*antithesis*) of "I'm above, You are below," the conflict (*antithesis*) between Spirit and flesh, that is the tension between the Father's will ("Obey my commands or else," "Because I said so"—of the "top-down" system of *righteousness*, where we get "inalienable rights" from, which no man, singularly or collectively, can put a lien upon) and the child's will (following after his "natural inclination" to relate with the world in pleasure, living in the 'moment,' trying to get what he "wants" by getting the Father into *dialogue* with the question "Why?" in response to the Father's command, that is attempting to *negate* the duality of *righteousness-unrighteousness*, "obey me or else," through the use of "human reasoning," that is through getting the Father into the *dialoguing* of *opinions*, into the synthesis of dialectic 'reasoning, the "plurality" of "Their are many different ways of looking at the issue" circumventing that is cutting off, that is *negating* his "Because I said so"—engendering the "equality" system of *sensuousness*, that is that which is "common" to all

men aka "common-ism," which 'justifies' communism, socialism, democracy, *communitarianism*, *democratization*, *conscientization*, *synergism*, etc, "Ours, not just yours," all being the same, all engendered through the use of dialectic 'reasoning'), can only be *negated*, according to those of dialectic 'reasoning,' by making the child's will (through the use of *dialogue*) "equal" to, and thereby greater than (over and against) the Father's will, that is 'liberating' the child and his carnal nature from the Father's authority, 'liberating' *sensuousness* from the restraints of *righteousness*.

The tension between the child and the Father (duality, *antithesis*) is thus thus 'shifted' to the tension between the children caused by the spectrum or diversity or continuum of tensions between those who are totally loyal to the Father (the *bourgeoisie*) to those who are totally loyal to the children (the *proletariat*). In the church this would correlate to the tension between God and man (the issue of *righteousness*, based upon God's word *preached* and *taught* as is) being 'shifted' to the tension between the leadership doing 'change' (based upon the issue of *sensuousness*, upon men's *opinions dialogued*) and those in the fellowship not wanting it (based upon the issue of *righteousness*), those not wanting 'change' deceived in thinking that by resolving the tension between them and the leadership, between men (based upon "feelings," that is *sensuousness*, thinking that the leaderships *reasoning* is tied to the issue of *righteousness*, that is subject to the word of God when in fact it is tied to the issue of *sensuousness*, subject to the *opinions* of men), they can then focus upon the tension between God and man (the issue of *righteousness*), not realizing that they have *negating righteousness* as the issue of life by simply setting it aside for the 'moment,' for the sake of maintaining the "respect of men" (initiating and sustaining human relationship with the leadership for the sake of unity, based upon *sensuousness*), therefore making *sensuousness*, not *righteousness* the issue not only for the 'moment,' but for life, that is for the sake of "growing" the "church," resolving the tension between men through the use of dialectic 'reasoning.'

An illustration (which I don't like doing, but since this is heady stuff and people ask me to make it easier to understand here goes): Those of

dialectic 'reasoning,' are like alligators telling frogs that it is safe to cross the river on their back, that they are there to "help" them with their "felt" needs. Trusting in alligators, frogs soon discovered that alligators, like wolves in sheep skin, lie when they say "Trust us. We care about you," having their own "felt" needs (their own "best" interests) in mind. Like alligators and wolves, those of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is facilitators of 'change' have their own meaning for "a 'consumer' driven society" —the *seduced, deceived, and manipulated* only coming to realize that when it is too late. The story of [the spider and the fly](#) was required memorization in the public schools some 60 plus years ago to warn the children of those of dialectic 'reasoning.' It was removed from the classroom by those of dialectic 'reasoning' so that they could do their dialectic 'thing,' that is "convert" the children to dialectic 'reasoning,' so that they could "participate" in "a *consumer* driven society," that is "pay the pig," the wolf, the alligator, the spider, etc. These are only secular responses to a spiritual problem and therefore do not resolve the issue of "Who are we to trust?"

The duality (*antithesis*) of trust is *negated* with the plurality (*synthesis*) of trust. We are to trust in the Lord (above, holy, *righteous*, not of the world) and not in man (below, common, unrighteous, of the world) " *Trust in the Lord with all thine heart, and lean not unto thine own understanding*" Proverb. 3: 5 Those of dialectic 'reasoning,' those who push "plurality," simply deceiving us into thinking that we can do both at the same time, when in truth it is still only trusting in man, that is trusting in our own reasoning ("leaning to our own understanding"), 'justifying' ourselves and are carnal, *sensuous*, approach pleasure - avoid pain, consume it unto ourselves, unrighteous "human nature." "*Cursed is the man who trust in man.*" Jeremiah 17:5

History, for those of dialectic 'reasoning,' is not about lessons of the "past" learned (memorized) by those in the present, so they can do what is right and not doing wrong (not be *seduced, deceived, and manipulated*), that is not repeat the wrongs of the "past," that is not repeat history. Instead, history, for those of dialectic 'reasoning' is the past experiences (the home experiences) of those in the present, that is about those in the present having been made subject to those of the "past" (having learned obedience

to their Father's will in all things), thus preventing them from 'changing' with the present, that is 'changing' with the 'changing times,' so that they can, with the "help" of facilitators of 'change,' create a "new" and "better" future, a future void of the restraints (warnings) of those of the "past." The same can be said for the "church." The doctrines of the "past" preventing the "church" from fitting in with the 'changing' times of the present. For those of dialectic 'reasoning, the issue of "history" is a person's life experience (their condition or environment of upbringing which engenders dissatisfaction), that is their dissatisfaction with the conditions of the "past," their dissatisfaction with the Father's commands, commands which sustain the "past," thereby 'justifying,' according to those of dialectic 'reasoning,' the need for 'change,' the need to *negate* (treat as "irrational" and therefore as "irrelevant") the lessons of the past which initiate and sustain, that is which justify the Father's authority. The only meaning of "history" for those of dialectic reasoning,' is to study your life history (your upbringing, that is your home life experience) to be better able to undo the effects of history (the "negative" effects of your parents, their heritage) upon your life, thereby being able to undoing the "negative" effects your life has upon society, that is preventing 'change.'

It is the *negation* of history, the lessons of the past which restrain the present (which prevent 'change'), for which dialectic 'reasoning' struggles. *"By dialectic, I mean an activity of conscious [the child "rationally" (dialectically), through his 'reasoning' ability, 'discovering' (becoming aware of his dissatisfaction with his Father's authority) that he has another 'choice,' the "right" to "do his own thing," to disobey his Father's commands with impunity (with the "help" of the "councilor," that is the facilitator of 'change'), 'justifying' not only his "feelings" of dissatisfaction with the Father's authority but also 'justifying' "human nature" over and against the Father's "top-down" authority, 'justifying' 'changingness' over and against unchangingness] , struggling to circumvent, the limitations imposed by the formal-logical law of contradiction ["struggling" to overcome the "guilty conscience," that is overcome the Father's voice of "Obey me or else" within himself] ."* (Norman A. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*) Bracketed information and bolding added. The *"limitations imposed by the formal-logical law of*

contradiction" are the standards of the parents, inculcated into the hearts and minds of the next generation, engendering a guilty conscience when they do wrong. Consider this: you can not have a truly representative form of government when your representatives do not how have a "guilty conscience" when they vote counter to their constitutes position (who voted them into office to "re-present" their position). Their participation in dialectic 'reasoning,' that is in the *consensus* process, undermines the voice and the liberties of their constituents. Those of dialectic 'reasoning' want it that way, desiring that all would perceive those with a strong conscience as "holding up the ship of progress." *"We must develop persons who see non-influenceability of private convictions [those of strong conscience] in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue."* (Kenneth Benne, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*)

The lessons of history teach us that once dialectic 'reasoning' becomes the basis for deciding and carrying out governmental policies, anyone exposing it as treasonous will be first treated as a "conspiracy nut" (portrayed by those in the media, in education, at the work place, in the neighborhood, in government, and even in the church as being "irrational" and therefore "irrelevant") and then, if they persist, accused of being a "patriot extremist," that is stirring upon discontent (potentially inciting "riots"), and then, if they persist, regarded as a potential "terrorist," and then, if they persist, tried (if they are tried at all) and punished for treason. (I've taken lots of history classes in college, all having clearly exposed this pattern although many of my professors did not see it as clearly). For example: The Federal government was set up to be limited, to allow states' rights, with the greatest right being of the family, under God (which engenders the conscience), restraining the hearts of the next generation, teaching them to evaluate their heart (their affections) from the Father's commands (from God's word) and not to evaluate the Father's commands (God's word) from their deceitful and wicked heart (something neither the State nor the Federal government could do in and of itself). The issue of the "freedom of the conscience" (engendered by the Father's authority) initiated the need to limit the power of Federal (National) government (prevent its encroachment upon the right of the Father and his authority to engender the conscience —I know what I am speaking of, with quotations

by dialectic thinkers backing me up, given in following articles). George Washington, understanding this, warned us: *"The spirit of encroachment [of "oneness"] tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal [welt, sting, wound, mark, etc. from chastening] against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them."* (George Washington in his Farwell Address) Bold added. *"Can the annals of mankind exhibit one single example, where rulers overcharged with power, willingly let go the oppressed, though solicited and requested most earnestly?" "Shew me that age and country where the rights and liberties of the people were placed on the sole chance of their rulers being good men, without a consequent loss of liberty?"* (Patrick Henry, Of the Virginia Convention of 1788) Bold added. The force of government must be in the Father's hands (and thereby in the citizens hands) or force will be used by the government to *negate* the right of the Father, under God, to develop the conscience in the next generation, thereby *negating* "freedom of the conscience" and liberty (making it "freedom *from* the conscience" and liberty of abomination).

The family was left in tact, recognized as the seedbed of stability, of civil society, in early America. Those of dialectic 'reasoning' know that they must *negate* that condition if they are to initiate and sustain their condition of instability and 'change.' *"The movement of the progressive societies has been uniform in one respect. Through all its course it has been distinguished by the gradual dissolution of family dependency and the growth of individual obligations in its place. The individual is steadily substituted for the family as the unit for which civil laws take account."* (Sir Henry Sumner Main, *Freedom of Expression and Dissent in the Soviet Union*)

Those of dialectic 'reasoning' know that for them to succeed they must divide the family (come between the children and the Father, *negating* the Father's authority) and conquer "the people" (gather the children) and make them theirs (of one carnal mind, via. the *consensus* process), that is if they are to control the world. " *Bypassing the traditional channels of top-down decision making, our objective centers upon transform public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics.* " *Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common interests and ultimately to world interests [thereby] transforming public consensus into one favorable to the emergence of a stable and humanistic world order.* " *Consensus is both a personal and a political step. It is a precondition of all future steps...* " [Ervin Laszlo](#), *A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World Order*. Bold and bracketed information added. The "group grade" experience in the classroom imprints (programs) this pattern in the next generation's mind, shaping their present and future actions (*praxis*). The "top-down decision making" system, Laszlo wrote of is the traditional family system which Lenin also sought to eliminate (what he labeled as the *bourgeois*). He stated: "*We must learn how to eradicate all bourgeois habits, customs and traditions everywhere.*" (Vladimir Lenin, *Left-Wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder An Essential Condition of the Bolsheviks' Success* May 12, 1920) According to György Lukács, it is only through "*The workers' council*" [the *consensus* process] that "the people" would be able to "*eliminate the bourgeois separation of the legislature, administration, and judiciary.*" (György Lukács, *History & Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?*) Working through the departments under each branch of government, uniting as one through the *consensus* process, that is united upon "common cause," the process of 'change' would be able to circumvent the checks and balances of the separate branches of government. The spectrum of 'change' (augmenting pleasure, that is 'liberating' abomination by attenuating pain —*negating* the restraint of *righteousness*) for those of dialectic 'reasoning' (who progressively take position of government as the people progressively abdicate it into their hands) is a progression from simply being irritated (but "patient") with those who refuse to 'change' to eventually the outright heavy hand of oppression, that is of despotism and abomination.

By 'discovering,' through *dialogue*, from where we get the word *dialectic*, where two or more can come together and agree upon what they have in common, for the 'moment' putting aside what they disagree on so as to maintain *dialogue*, that is coming to a *consensus*, that is to a "feeling" of "oneness" by focusing upon only that which unites, putting aside, that is *negating* that which they do not hold in common (*negating* that which inhibits or prevents "common-ism"), that is *negating* that which prevents the "*sensuous experience*" of oneness of the 'moment' and therefore is not common to all men, *negating* by putting aside that which causes division, dissention, discrimination, duality, conflict, controversy, etc., by 'discovering,' through *dialogue*, what both the Father and the child have in common, that is their "human nature" (that which is of the flesh, the desire to be at-one-with the world in pleasure), makes "human nature" the "new" *thesis*, *negating antithesis* (the conflict or tension, which is engendered by the "top-down" system of the Father). Through dialectic 'reasoning' (by man 'rationally justifying' his own "human nature," that is his carnal nature, that is his "natural inclination" to be at-one-with the world, as being "normal," that is as being "common" to all men and therefore 'justifiable,' 'rational'), man establishes "human nature," that is the "child nature," that is "the child within" over and against the authority of the Father, men's *opinions over* and against the *preaching* and *teaching* of doctrine ("equal with" means over and against the Word of God), *sensuousness over* and against *righteousness*. Dialectic 'reasoning' finds what men and God have in "common," that is "love" (ours, a feeling of "oneness," a "feeling" of acceptance and approval, that is a "feeling" of "affirmation," in man) and *negates* that which makes them different (*antithesis*, "Mine, not yours," "I'm above, you are below," according to Karl Marx that which engenders a "feeling" of *repression* and *alienation*, that which creates division between men, separating man from man, that is separating man from nature, according to Sigmund Freud that which engenders "neurosis," that which creates division within man, separating him from his own nature —by merging Marx and Freud, social-psychologist were able to take control of the next generations thoughts and actions, getting them to focus upon the cause of social discord, that is the traditional family system. Through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' they were able to *negate* "neurosis," repression, and alienation, by *negating* its source, the traditional family system; "If

society imposes repression, and repression causes the universal neurosis of man, . . . there is an intrinsic connection between social organization and neurosis." (Normal O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*).

Redefining God (*righteousness*), that is reinterpreting His Word through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is through "human reasoning," that is through the "sense perception" of man (defining God through man's eyes, that is according to his "feelings" and his "thoughts," according to his collectivized *opinion* —*consensus*) makes God and man both the same, that is "common" (through *synthesis* making Jesus "*Green*," that is "positive," that is at-one-with nature, with the "Greens," like Jesus, coming to save the world), thereafter making the nature of man ("human nature," that is approach pleasure - avoid pain) the standard whereby to measure both man and God, making "human nature," that is man's "felt" needs (*sensuousness*), the "new" *thesis* (the "new" 'righteousness'), engendering the "new" world order of "equality," *negating* the "old" "top-down" world order of *righteousness*, thus making the world a "better" (a more "enjoyable") place for "all" to live within (that is "all" who are dissatisfied with *righteousness*, including, that is and especially the perverse, that is those of abomination), according to the "feelings" and "thoughts" of "the children of disobedience" that is. "Tolerance of ambiguity" (tolerance of abomination) engenders a culture of abomination (a culture of hate against *righteousness*, classifying those *preaching* and *teaching* the *righteousness* of God and the unrighteousness of man as being "hateful," as committing a "hate crime"), with abomination becoming the standard by which the culture (as all in Sodom) must abide. [The scriptures warn us!](#)

While those who hate sin and love *righteousness*, that is those made *righteous* in Christ, *preach* and *teach* the *righteousness* of God and the unrighteousness of man, that man might repent of his sin, those who love sin and hate *righteousness*, that is those of dialectic 'reasoning' must prevent the *preaching* and *teaching* of the *righteousness* of God and the unrighteousness of man (labeling it as being "hateful"), so that they can 'justify' ("feel" comfortable in) their sin, that is in their "human nature." It is only through dialectic 'reasoning' (self-'justification,' that is "boys will be

boys") that man can *negate* the *antithesis* of the *righteousness* of God and the unrighteousness of man. It is only through the *praxis* of *synthesis* (through *dialogue*, man 'rationally discovering' that which he has in common with all men through *dialogue*, that is his "human nature," thereby 'justifying' his "human nature" as being "normal" and then acting upon it only) that *antithesis* is *negated*, that is that unrighteousness ("negativity") is *negated* by making *sensuousness* 'righteousness' ("human nature" becoming "positive," the 'driving' force behind life) and 'righteousness' *sensuousness* (the 'purpose' of life being the augmentation of the "positive," of "human nature," liberating' "human nature" from the restraints, that is from the "negativity" of *righteousness*), that is making both God and man the same, that is "positive," that is affirmative of "human nature." As George Hegel put it: "*When a man has finally reached the point where he does not think he knows it better than others, that is when he has become indifferent to what they have done badly and he is interested only in what they have done right, then peace and affirmation have come to him.*" (G. F. W. Hegel, in one of the casual notes preserved at Widener)

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' if you can get rid of the "negative" (the "guilty conscience" for "doing your own thing"), in regards to "human nature," you can get rid of the issue of the *righteousness* of God and the unrighteousness of man, the approaching pleasure and avoiding pain spectrum of "human nature, that is the augmentation of pleasure and the attenuation of pain, that is the individual and social issues of life thereafter becoming the only issues of concern for the day. By making "human nature" right ('righteous' or "positive"), then anyone who restrains or inhibits it (judges it as being unrighteous) is wrong (is "negative"). As Elvis Presley, who died of a drug overdose, sang: "*Cause baby, if it feels so right How can it be wrong?*" in his pop song of the 60's, "*If it feels so right.*" as the Transformational Marxist, Herbert Marcuse wrote: "*If it feels good, just do it,*" in his pop book of the 60's, *Eros and Civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud* (one of the two bibles for the liberals in the 60's), dialectic 'reasoning' has taken over the thoughts and actions of the American public. The leadership it puts into office reflecting its use of

dialectic 'reasoning,' being "positive" (read being "human," that is being "normal," that is being unrighteous) as the only way of life.

The tyranny of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is of *synthesis negating antithesis* (by *synthesis* becoming *thesis* itself) goes like this: the *thesis* of the Father's authority (position) to give commands and, through the use of chastening (for disobedience), restrain the child from following after his "human nature," that is to relate with the world, and the *antithesis* of the child's "guilty conscience" (the feeling of guilt) for disobeying the Father (disobey His command), having done "his own thing" according to his own nature (approach pleasure - avoid pain), that is followed after his "natural inclination" to be "at-one-with" the world, are both *negated* as the *synthesis* of 'justified' "human nature" takes the place of the Father's authority (takes over the Father's position of authority, becomes *thesis* itself, that is the child's "natural inclination" to relate with the world, his own "feeling" and "thoughts," his *opinion* becoming the *thesis*, the subject of importance, rather than the Father's commands), that is 'rationally justifying' disobedience thereby *negates* the "guilty conscience," that is *negates* the Father's authority to give commands along with his right to chasten his children when they disobey —"human nature" (approach pleasure - avoid pain —*sensuousness*), through the use of "human reasoning" (dialectic 'reasoning'), having replaced the Father's authority (do what I command or else) as the way of life. An adulterous generation sins with a "guilty conscience," that is with a sense of guilt (*antithesis* —*righteousness* restraining *sensuousness* on an individual bases) while a culture of abomination sins without a "guilty conscience," that is with no sense of guilt (*synthesis*), dialectic 'reasoning' (*consensus*—collective sinning) having liberated "human nature" (*sensuousness*) from the restraints of the Father's authority to give commands and chasten those who disobey (*righteousness*) by *negating righteousness* (the right of the Father to have authority—the awareness of the Father and His authority) in the thoughts and actions of carnal man as he "does his own thing" (as in the days of Noah).

We are instead to deny ourselves (set aside the seeking after pleasure as the 'purpose' of life, being 'driven' by our "lusts," that is the physical, mental,

and social pleasures of this world), and pick up our cross (endure the pain of rejection —physical, mental, and social pain—which comes from the world because of our faith), and follow after Jesus Christ, who obeyed His (in Christ our) Heavenly Father in all things unto death ([Titus 2:11-14](#); Luke 9:23). We are to put on the whole armor of God and stand ([Ephesians 6:10-18](#)). To put on the whole armor of God and stand, means not to run from pain (compromise when pain comes our way because of our faith) or run after pleasure (compromise when pleasure tempts us to be at peace, that is to be at one with the world) but instead to stand, that is to remain steadfast, *unchanging*, faithful in the Lord, [obedient to His \(in Christ our\) Heavenly Father above all things](#), no matter what comes our way.

*" No class of civil society can play this role [facilitators of 'change,' that is "stakeholders" taking "ownership" of the earth when the earth is the Lords and the fulness thereof (like Karl Marx, who encouraged people, who foolishly listened to him, to take "ownership" of that which was not theirs to take, saying the kings horses were the peoples horses, like a woman in a garden in Eden took "ownership" of that which was not hers to take, eating of "the tree of knowledge of good and evil" —[Genesis 3:1-6](#)), emancipating society from the Father's "top-down" authority] unless it arouses in itself and in the masses a moment of enthusiasm, a moment in which it associates, fuses, and identifies itself with society in general [experiences *consensus* with man and nature alone, that is according to "human nature." that is *sensuousness*, along with dialectic 'reasoning ("human reasoning") being able to 'justify' "human nature" over and against the restraints of *righteousness*, *negating* the system of *righteousness*, *negating* those who are patriarchal in paradigm, *negating* the resisters of 'change' (those obedient to their Father's will in all things, maintaining the "past")] , and is felt and recognized to be society's general representative [possessed by a spirit (a *sensation* or "feeling") of "oneness," "whole-ness," "all-ness," etc. perceived by "the people" to have its "best" interest, that is its "wellbeing" in mind] , a moment in which its demands and rights are truly those of society itself [of the collective, that is of the commonality, that is of the "community," of the "world" ('discovered' through the use of polls, surveys, etc. that is through *opinions* being exposed through *dialogue*), where *righteousness* is no longer of God*

only (above) but is only of man (below), that is of man working for, that is 'liberating' the "goodness" (the 'righteousness') of man] , *of which it is the social [sacred] head and heart* ["Without 'We working for Us,' that is working together for 'change,' a 'better' life for all of mankind, that is a life freed from the restraints and the divisiveness of and the "guilty conscience" engendered by *righteousness*, a "new" world order can not be actualized, can not come into fruition"] . " (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*) Bracketed information added for clarity. This is the platform upon which those of dialectic 'reasoning' stand —abomination.

Having merged [Marx](#) (sociology) with [Freud](#) (psychology), both of which were dialectic in 'reasoning,' Transformational Marxists, that is that is social-psychologists, that is facilitators of 'change' have made the pleasure-pain spectrum, that is the *sensuousness* of man (the augmentation of pleasure and the attenuation of pain) the measuring stick for the worth or value of life. They have rejecting the Father's need to train up his children in His image, doing that which is right (righteous) and not doing that which is wrong (unrighteous), according to His will. They, as "children of disobedience," 'driven' by the "approach pleasure - avoid pain" spectrum of "human nature," have *negating righteousness* as the way of life, perceiving it, that is the Father's restraint of man's (or the child's) carnal "human nature" as engendering "neurosis" —those of the "past" engendering "neurosis" in those in the "present," that is in the 'moment' (initiating and sustaining a tension between *sensuousness*, that is "human nature" and *righteousness*, that is the commands of the Father restraining *sensuousness*, restraining "human nature" from 'discovering its "full potential," from "actualizing" itself according to nature), that is the "past" restraining the "present," (the Father restraining the child's "natural inclination" to relate with the environment, that is with nature, that is with the world in the 'moment') preventing the "present," that is the next generation, from creating its own "future" in its own image (according to it own nature seeking and actualizing unity, that is "oneness" with "nature"), that is from creating a "new" world order built upon "human nature," established upon man's own *sensuousness*, 'purposed' in the augmentation of pleasure (augmenting the "enjoyment" of this life for "all," that is augmenting the system of *sensuousness*, that is which is "approach pleasure-avoid pain,"

through the use of dialectic 'reasoning', that is by self-social-environmental 'justification,' that is through *human reasoning*) and the attenuation of pain (including *negating* the pain of a "guilty conscience," which is augmented by the system of *righteousness*, which is *faith* in, *belief* upon, *obedience* toward, and acceptance of *chastening* for *disobedience* by a higher authority than "human nature," that is greater and higher than nature itself). Without dialectic 'reasoning' being used to 'justify' the augmentation of "human nature" (focusing man upon the way of the "present," that is man's "lusting" after the pleasure or "enjoyment" of the 'moment'), that is the 'justification' for the *negation* of *righteousness* (the way of the "past"), the way of the "future" would remain subject to the way of the "past," that is subject to the conditions of *righteousness* (man would remain subject to the authority of God, children to the authority of their Fathers). Therefore those of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is facilitators of 'change' have made man's carnal "human behavior," his "natural inclination" to relate with the world, that is his deceitful and wicked heart, his propensity to sin, the standard of life. "Parental discipline, religious denunciation of bodily pleasure, . . . have all left man overly docile, but secretly in his unconscious unconvinced, and therefore neurotic." "The bondage of all cultures to their cultural heritage is a neurotic construction." "Neurotic symptoms, with their fixations on perversions and obscenities, demonstrate the refusal of the unconscious essence of our being to acquiesce in the dualism of flesh and spirit, higher and lower." (Norman O. Brown , *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*)

The scriptures tell us of a different battle, of the true battle between our *sensuousness*, doing what we "want" to do, following after our "human nature," walking in the flesh (living by sight), and the *righteousness* of Christ, doing the Father's will, walking in the spirit (living by faith). As the Apostle Paul wrote (given below): it is not that the law of God, that is the commands of the Father, can save us from our "natural inclination" to "lust" after the things of this world, that is from our "human nature," to love the world more than Him. The law of God can only expose our propensity toward *sensuousness*, that is our love of this world, that is our sinful "human nature," that is our being "*sold under sin*," which is only overcome "through" the *righteousness* of "*Jesus Christ our Lord*," that is

the obedience of Jesus Christ to His Heavenly Father, even unto death, 'redeeming' us from judgment, through his blood, which was shed for us because of our "*captivity to the law of sin which is in (our) members,*" 'redeeming' us from our propensity to follow after "*the flesh,*" that is that which makes us captive to "*the law of sin,*" delivering us from "*the body of this death,*" 'reconciling' us, through His *righteousness*, to inherit eternal life, spending it with Himself and His Heavenly Father along with all the saints (according to His Grace, that is His love for us, His Word, that is revealing Himself to us, His Work, 'redeeming' us from condemnation, and our Faith, trusting in Him with all our heart, no longer leaning to our own understanding, that is no longer 'justifying' ourselves, which leads to eternal death, being instead 'justified' in Him, who is eternal life). "*For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.*" "*For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.*" "*O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.*" [Romans 7:14-25](#).

The two, *sensuousness* and *righteousness*, that is man's will of *sensuousness* (depending on his own "sense perception" and his own *reasoning* 'ability' to know how to think and act, with man 'justifying' himself according to his own "human nature" and nature itself, that is only by sight) and God's will of *righteousness* (with man depending upon His Word and His Holy Spirit to know how to think and act, with man being 'justified' only through the works of God, that is according to His word, of His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, and by His grace, that is only through

faith) can never be synthesized, that is made as "one", as is deceitfully being marketed in the "post-modern church" today ("church growth," "emergent church," "contemplative church," etc.), making man 'righteous' in his own eyes, that is following after the law of sin and death (even doing so in the name of the Lord, not only deceiving himself but taking pleasure in deceiving all who follow after him in his deceitful ways). The question to be asked of all who propose a program of 'change' is: by what authority are you proposing this program of 'change.' It if is not of God, that is, if it is not according to His Word and by His Spirit, that is according to the will of the Heavenly Father only, then it is of the world. If it is of both God and man, it is of the wolf and is the worst of all (it is of the *seducer, deceiver,* and *manipulator* of men, that is it is of the father of lies).

The hallmark of dialectic 'reasoning,' in its corrupting of the fellowship, is in the "fellowship" trusting men ("human relationship," that is "the approval of men" over and against the Word of God (putting aside the Word of God, when it interferes with the "feeling" of unity in the church, for the 'purpose' of "growth"). Instead of the leadership's thoughts and actions being weighed by the Word of God, according to their love of the [Scriptures](#) (above all things) and their fear of God (above of things), they are instead followed by "the people" because of their "positive" attitude towards (and expertise in and association with others who are "successful" in) programs of 'change,' "programs" that can be used to "grow" the "church," that is with man putting his hope in his own work, which is temporal, rather than the work of God, which is spiritual (deceiving himself by perceiving his work for man, peace and unity, as being the same as God's work for man, peace and 'reconciliation'— "*Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you.*" John 14:26). Instead of change being the heart of man toward God, through conviction, contrition, and repentance (through the hearing of the Word), that is the focus being upon the *righteousness* of God and the wickedness of man's heart, it has 'shifted' to the 'changing' of the church and its "programs" ("how it does business") for the 'purpose' of so called "evangelization," that is "growing the church," that is 'changing' (humanizing) the "church" to keep it in step (contemporary) with the 'changing' (carnal) world that is "*concern for man* [who seeks 'change']

*replaces concern about pleasing God [who is unchanging] . " (Lenard Wheat, Paul Tillich's Dialectic Humanism: Unmasking the God above God) 'Change' being the operative word, that is following after the doctrine of Karl Marx: " The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways [in other words, there is no one right way of looking at or doing things] ; the point is to change it [so lets put aside our differences, that is our battles over doctrine, and unite upon a common cause, upon what we have in common, that is our "human nature" and our desire for acceptance, working together in the augmentation of pleasure and the attenuation of pain for all mankind] . " (Karl Marx, Thesis on Feuerbach #11) Bracketed information added. When "ministers" take "ownership" of the word of God, redefinition it to relate it to the carnal nature of man, that is taking that which is not theirs to take and using it for their own carnal end, they are no longer ministers of the Word of God but rather ministers of the words (*opinions*) of men.*

To 'change' the environment *from* the *preaching* and *teaching* of the Word of God, that is from what God' commands (from what He wills), to the *dialoguing* of men's *opinions*, that is how he "feels" and what he "thinks," that is, to 'change' *from* building the church upon sound biblical doctrine (according to the *righteousness* of God) to "growing" the church upon human relationship building skills (according to the *sensuousness* of man)—to 'change' the thoughts and actions of man through programs which seek to build uniting upon what man has in common with the world—is of Marxist ideology, that is of dialectic 'reasoning' being put into social action (called *praxis*). But to change the heart of man, through the *preaching* and *teaching* of the Word of God ("as given by God," that is refusing to 'change' it, that is refusing to compromise it or set it aside, that is refusing to bring the world into the church or 'justify' the world in the church, that is refusing to 'change' God and His Word so He and it will no longer "offend" the world) changes the environment, that is, the Word being *preached* and *taught* "as is" (only), bringing man under conviction, into contrition, and to repentance before God, changes the world, and is of God. While "church growth" type ministers will usually or occasionally preach a "traditional" sermon from the pulpit (to silence any resisters to 'change') they will move the church into a social 'agenda' (socialism), that

is "human relationship" building (socialist) type activities, that is "How do you feel" and "What do you think," displacing the *teaching* of sound doctrine (putting aside or reinterpreting scripture, that is using heresy sources, that is translations based upon Metzger, Aland, and Nestle sources, that is Origin and Alexandrian, that is *Vaticanus B*, *Sinaiticus* & *Codex X* Greek sources that cause confusion, that is engender uncertainty in regards to the Word of God, thereby engendering the *dialoguing* of men's *opinions* and 'change' in the church) or not bringing up doctrine or not recognizing it or chaffing at it when it is brought up, that is any "Thus saith the Lord," or "The word of God says" which causes division) with the building of social networking in and through church functions, as well as joining (networking) with other churches who are doing the same. ([more below](#))

Instead of fighting against the "church," Satan (via Marx and Freud, that is sociology and psychology, society and man, social needs and individual needs, united as one upon dialectic 'reasoning,' that is the process of 'change') decided to join it, that is join the department of administration to "help" it "grow the church" through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is through the process of 'change.' The dialectic ideology being, instead of the "church" dividing (separating, that is alienating) itself from the world (and thus causing division, separation, and alienation in the world) because of doctrine (basing itself upon the *righteousness* of Christ, that is the "church" being build upon the authority of God and His Word alone, *preached* and *taught* as is) let it instead unite with the world, using dialectic 'reasoning' (focusing upon human relationship building skills, via. youth groups, cells groups, teamwork, humanitarian works, community activities, etc. with people *dialoguing* their *opinions* to a common agreed upon solution regarding social and environmental concerns—*consensus*) to resolving common "felt" needs (basing 'change' upon *sensuousness*, that is: 1) uniting the "church" upon the *dialoguing* of *opinions*, with the *opinions* of men being used to help the "church" 'discover' and then unit upon the "common ground" of "human nature," 2) through the use of polls, serves, and feasibility studies "discover" the "right path" to take and then 3) through the use of "human reasoning"—called "enlightenment"— "light" its pathway to "growth"), all the while not "offending" the unbeliever so

that he to can, without a sense of guilt, work within the fellowship for the cause of humanity, that is work with all members for the "common good" AKA "common"-ism. The Word of God declares that we "*Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.*" 2 Corinthians 6:14-18 There is no "*let's agree to disagree*" or "*tolerance of ambiguity*" in these verses, that is with God, or in the fellowship of the saints. Patience yes (that one would repent of their sins), tolerance no (we are not to approve of sin, that is look the other way to "save" face, that is so as not to "offend" the sinner, that is hurt his "feelings"—in the act of *chastening*, if he repents of his sins, a soul has been won to eternal life, *righteousness* prevails, but if not, he has chosen death, deciding to remain in the way of the world, *sensuousness* having prevailed). Satan creates controversy (focusing upon the issues of sensuousness, that is upon man's "felt" needs of the 'moment') to *negate* controversy (*negate righteousness*, perceiving it as the source of controversy as in "We would not have a problem here if it weren't for those who refuse to see things in a different 'light,' that is who refuse to 'change'). "Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness." Luke 11:35

As we, as a nation, become more dialectic in 'reasoning,' including and especially in the "church," this verse and other like it will become (have become) a hate crime. To hate sin (God hates sin), to expose it, and to separate yourself from those who *praxis* it (those who 'justify' it individually and socially) is now a hate crime. "Human nature," man's sinful nature, has now become the foundation upon which the world (and the church) "grows" itself (creating itself in its own image), creating a "new" world order of abomination, treating man's carnal nature as though

it were 'righteous.' Even the "church" is now building itself upon men 'justifying' themselves before themselves, though their use of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is through their use of the *consensus* process, that is being *seduced, deceived, and manipulated* by facilitators of 'change.' At the end of the day it is not about whether we got what we or others wanted (based upon our own *sensuousness* and *reasoning* 'abilities,' that is 'justifying abilities') but whether we did what was right before God (according to His will, that is in His *righteousness*).

Abomination is now upon us, not because of the government, but because of the "contemporary church" engendering "Christians" who are ashamed of the gospel, refusing to unceasingly proclaim the truth of the gospel, in love Love is not tolerant of unrighteousness (it is not "tolerant of ambiguity") but calls sin what it is, sin. God chastens those He loves and if a person refuses to accept His chastening then he is not a child of God. To proclaim the truth of the gospel is to warn man of the "wrath" of God upon "the children of disobedience," upon those who refuse His *chastening*, upon those who refuse to repent of their sin's, that is repent of their love of pleasure (the "approval of men" being one of the most intoxicating of all pleasures, why so many "minster" are blind to where they are going, taking those who admire and follow them into the process of 'change'), that is repent of their love of this world, who, because of their love of the broad path of the pleasures of this life, which leads to death, refuse to even seek after the straight and narrow path that leads to eternal life, who refuse to humble themselves before God and seek His face, who refuse to be redeemed from judgment and eternal death, that is redeemed by the blood of "the Lamb of God," that is by Christ who obeyed His Heavenly Father in all things, even unto death, that is 'reconciling' us to the Father and bringing us into eternal life. The "contemporary 'Christian'" is not only not capable of *preaching* and *teaching* (proclaiming) the truth of the gospel at home, in the "village," in the classroom, at work, in government, he is not even able to do it in the "church," because it would condemn him (the gospel exposing and condemning his deceitful and wicked heart and the "church" condemning him for exposing its deceitful and wicked heart, if he tried). *"In all your ways to acknowledge him and he will direct your paths."* Proverbs 3:6 It is not that God has called anyone to pull up the

tares in the wheat field, He warned us against it, but that we are to proclaim the truth of the gospel till the time of harvest, that those who will hear the voice of the Lord (His sheep hear his voice) will be harvested into His glory, the tares cast out and burned. God has not called us to 'change' the world so that the hearts of man can be changed, it is to the changing of hearts, by the hearing of the word, that the world is changed (turned upside down). Satan knows that if the word is 'changed' (to be in harmony with "human nature") then the world will not be changed, glorifying God for His works, but will instead glorify itself, in its works for Him. *"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity."* Matthew 7:21-23

What is being preached and dialogued today is a user-friendly, non-offensive, readily adaptable to 'change,' humanized (dialectic) Christ, a "positive" Christ, a Christ of man's own making, that is made in the image of "human nature," therefore acceptable to unrepentant man, leaving him in his sin. The same can be said of those who seek to fulfill the kingdom of God according to their own cunning and strength. Changing the gospel message into the works of men, working "for" or "with" God in building His Kingdom, even using (twisting) scriptures (the gospel message) to 'justify' themselves, that is 'justify' their thoughts and their actions, that is 'justify' their "pride of life." In the end it is God's work and His work alone that fulfills His Kingdom: it is His Kingdom, His Power, and His Glory, that no man can boast "Lord look what *we* have done for you, in your name," thinking that he fulfilled it "with" God's help and God fulfilled it "with" his help. If you think God can not fulfill His will without your "help," consider the next breath you take. Where did it come from? It is not that the Lord needs you. It is that you need Him. There is no "We" (man's pride of life) in God's Kingdom, only "He" (Christ) and the redeemed, made *righteous* because of Him and Him alone. His Kingdom is made up of those who are dead to themselves, who have been made alive, not in their will (not in their pride), not in their works, but in Him and His will (in

Him and His will alone), in His works alone, doing the Father's will. It is when we can do nothing to change the world, to rescue ourselves from the "situation" in our own strength and "wisdom," that we turn to the Lord, giving Him our lives to do with as He wills, that He receives the glory.

What rescues us from our use of dialectic 'reasoning' to 'justify' our carnal nature (which leads to abomination and condemnation), is *faith* in God, *belief* in His Word, *obedience* to His will, and acceptance of His *chastening* when we do wrong, that is when we sin. "*Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.*" Hebrew 12:11 When it comes to what I want to do, 'driven' by my carnal nature, and what my Father wants me to do, that is to think and act according to His will (both earthly and Heavenly Father's), dialectic 'reasoning' sides with me, sides with my carnal nature over and against my Father's will. As we progress more and more onto the side of dialectic 'reasoning, that is seeking after the "approval of men" (*consensus*), which engenders *sensuousness*, that is which is our "lusting" after the pleasures and "enjoyments" of this life, that is living for the 'moment,' we move away from the "approval of God" (*righteousness*), who is our hope of eternal life. When the "there-and-then" (the Father, his commands, his chastening, and his promises, all according to His *righteousness*) conflict with our desire for the "here-and-now" (our "lust" for the things of this life, seeking after the pleasures of this world, that is all according to our *sensuousness*), dialectic 'reasoning' ("*human reasoning*") comes to our aid, that is *negating* the "there-and-then" so that we can "enjoy" the "here-and-now." "*For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?*" Mark 8:36

The key to understanding the dialectic process (the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' "*human reasoning*," that is self-'justification,' that is the 'justification' of "human nature") is the issue of *chastening*, that is *negating* the acceptance of it as a means for man to know right from wrong, initiating and sustaining a "top-down" system known as a Patriarchal Paradigm, with one, that is the Father as the final authority, above, that is

ruling over man's personal "feelings" and "thoughts" below, directing his steps, that is 'restraining' his "natural inclinations," that is preventing him from fulfilling his carnal desires, that is, finding "oneness" (unity) with the world in pleasure (through what all men have in common, their "lust" for pleasure, that is the "human nature" of approaching pleasure and avoiding pain). *"O LORD, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."* Jeremiah 10:23b With God it (His chastening of us) is essential. *"For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."* Hebrews 12:6 Since God is Spirit, and determines what is right and wrong according to His *righteousness*, and we are *sensual*, that is of the flesh, and, left to ourselves, determine what is right and wrong according to our "human nature" (approaching pleasure and avoiding pain), *chastening* is imperative if we are to be "*sons*" of His (as adopted sons) and not "*bastards*." *"If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons."* Hebrews 12:7, 8

Without our Father giving commands and chastening us when we disobey, there is no condition of *righteousness*, that is we just do what comes "naturally." Get rid of the Father's right to give commands and chasten and the issue of *righteousness* (and of sin) is *negated*. That is dialectic 'reasoning.' While hard line communists killed the father, along with those who believed in his way of thinking and acting, the *consensus* process is more "human," encouraging him to do it himself (to abdicate his God given position of authority for the sake of the world). Whether the father is dead or he is still alive—but no longer functioning as a father figure—in the end it is the same, the *negation* of the *Patriarchal Paradigm* and the way of *righteousness*. While the Father chastens His children, that is chastens those who submit to His authority, those who refuse to accept his chastening, those who refuse to submit to His authority, those who refuse to be His children, being instead "the children of disobedience," He condemns. Jesus came to redeem us, 'reconcile' us to His Father for two reasons: 1) so that we would be no longer condemned and 2) so that we could come to know His Father as He knows His Father, a Father of love, mercy, grace, and forgiveness—that is, to all who repent of their sins, that

is repent of their dialectic, self-'justifying' way of thinking and acting, that is repentant of their disobedience to the Father. Like the hymn *Praise the Lord* (which, like so many other hymns, is no longer sung in the church today, for obvious reasons) says "*Come to the Father, through Jesus the Son.*" Without the Father's commands and His chastening there would be no Father-son ("above-below") relationship. There would be no issue of *righteousness*.

Our "human nature" is to get up in the morning looking for pleasure. We, by nature do not get up thinking that we need restraint from pleasure, that is restraint of our "human nature," that is *chastening*. Therefore by focusing upon pleasure, that is the "enjoyment" of life, not only for ourselves but for all others (in other words being "positive"), the issue of *righteousness* and therefore the need for *chastening*, that is restraint of our "human nature" is *negated*. If the communists (those of dialectic 'reasoning') understand this (getting rid of the Father's threat of chastening, that is getting rid of that which is "negative," gets rid of the Father's command, gets rid of the Father and His authority, gets rid of the issue of *righteousness* in the persons private as well as his public life, that is in his thoughts and in his actions), what is wrong with the American people. "Where have all the fathers gone. Off to *consensus* everyone. When will they ever learn. When will they ever learn." They have all sacrificed their children to the fires of Moloch, given them over to the beast, that is to the ways of the world, for their own "good" pleasure (for the "enjoyment" of the 'moment'), that is for "the approval of men." What is of concern is that while the Father chastens (but does not destroy) those who are His, that they might partake of His glory, Moloch, the beast, the world (those of dialectic 'reasoning,' like a child having a tantrum), kills, tears down, and destroys all that which is its at the end of the day, for its own "glory," for the *sensation* of 'control' and 'power,' for "the 'moment.'" For that which is of the world, unlike God, must destroy whenever it wants to "create." This is why every institution, including the "church," which builds or "grows" itself upon dialectic 'reasoning, *negate* its history, *destroy* that which is of the "past," so that none can go back to the way it was, since there is nothing to go back to. All they have is the *sensuousness* of the present, being now servants to a future based only upon "human nature," that is

slaves to a world of 'change,' that is surrounded by a world of abomination, a "new" world order of man's (of their) own making.

If you think this process has no relevance to your life, the life of your children, and the world you live in, then consider this, kindergarten was designed to give the children their first experience of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is an experience of social life without the authority of the Father (a collective life experienced by the children, being "themselves," freed from the commands of a voice of authority above them as well as freed from the fear of chastening and judgment which comes from disobeying that voice of authority above them, for being "themselves"). Kindergarten was and is built upon the foundation of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is for the augmentation of "human relationships," that is for "democracy," that is socialism, that is "common"-ism AKA communism, as most of education is today.

"Education Nation" is the culmination of decades of dialectic 'reasoning' infiltrating the education system of this nation (through the use of "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)") and is now in total control, all based upon dialectic 'reasoning,' that is the 'justification' of *sensuousness* ("human nature" and the will of "the people") over and against *righteousness* (the will of the Father). It is the foundation, that is the 'drive' behind and the 'purpose' for counseling (the facilitated meeting), used not only in education but in all areas of life today. *"What better way to help the patient [the student, the teacher, the parent, the worker, the civil authority, the minister, etc.] recapture the past than to allow him to re-experience and reenact ancient feelings [his frustration with and resentment] toward parents in his current relationship to the therapist? The therapist is the living personification of all parental images. Group therapists refuse to fill the traditional authority role: they do not lead in the ordinary manner, they do not provide answers and solutions [they do not preach and teach right from wrong] , they urge the group to explore and to employ its own resources [to employ it's own "feelings" and "thoughts," that is its own opinions] . The group [must] feel free to confront the therapist [to question and challenge authority] , who must not only permit, but encourage, such confrontation. He [the student, the teacher, the parent, the worker, the civil authority, the minister, etc.]*

reenacts early family scripts in the group [role-plays] and, if therapy is successful, is able to experiment with new behavior, to break free from the locked family role he once occupied [negate his obedience to higher authority, that is negate a "top-down" way of thinking and acting] the patient changes the past ['changes' his paradigm] by reconstituting it." (Irvin Yalom, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*) Bracketed information added for clarity.

Even the "church" is now built upon this foundation, placing "human relationship" and the environment "equal" with God, which makes them over and against God the Father, His Word, that is His only begotten son, that is the Lord, and His true bride, that is the εκκλησια, ecclesia, that is the "called out ones," that is called out of the world of darkness, that is called out of a world of the flesh, that is a world based upon the "wisdom" (dialectic 'reasoning') of men 'justifying' their flesh ('justifying' "human nature"), into the light of His glory. *"For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."* Titus 2:11-14 The "good works" being the result of a changed heart, seeking to do the will of the Father, not the works of the flesh, that is of and for self and the world, seeking after "the approval of men." The word "church" coming from the world, meaning a meeting of people in a circle in a "cave," in a building of some kind, therefore subject to the state, while εκκλησια "the called out ones" means an assembly, a congregating separated from the world, that is man separated from the will of the flesh by the Spirit of God, subject only to the will of the Father, though Jesus Christ His only begotten Son. *"For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."* Matthew 18:20

Dialectic 'reasoning' rejects "*chastening*" (classifying it as not only engendering physical pain but also engendering the mental pain of "repression" and especially engendering the social pain of "alienation,"

which are to be identified, confronted, and *negated* through human *reasoning*, that is through "counseling") which therefore places everyone who uses it (dialectic 'reasoning' that is) on the "bastard" side of God's scale. As Abraham Maslow stated it, (reversing the order, that is referring to those who accept *faith, belief, obedience, and chastening* as the way of life as "authoritarians" and therefore as "bastards"): "*The correct thing to do with authoritarians is to take them realistically for the bastards they are and then behave toward them as if they were bastards.*" "*I have found whenever I ran across authoritarian students that the best thing for me to do was to break their backs immediately.*" (Abraham Maslow, *Maslow on Management*) This kind of statement makes it very clear where those who use dialectic 'reasoning' stand on the Father's authority and the issue of *righteousness*.

Dialectic 'reasoning' unites man upon what he has in common with the world, *sensuousness*. The *righteousness* of Christ, that is his obedience to His Heavenly Father, even unto death, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' makes a man who trusts in Him, that is having *faith* in, *believing* upon, *obeying*, and accepting His *chastening*, peculiar —no longer at-one-with the world, that is separated from the "whole" —a person no longer fit for social participation, especially for a position in leadership, that is making him and his way of thinking a barrier to (an enemy of) the "new" world order. When Immanuel Kant made *reason* (*Critique of Pure Reason*) equal with faith, he in essence set "human reasoning" (which is bound to "human nature") over and against the *righteousness* of God, which for man requires faith. He set the course for man to hate *righteousness*, disguising it as being love for humanity. Statements (given below) by Hegel, Marx, Freud, and others confirm this dialectic attitude of contempt for and hatred of *righteousness* (against *faith, belief, obedience, and chastening*), disguised as "caring," that is "caring" for humanity.

What gets lost in all this "caring for humanity" is the consequences of following after and 'justifying' "human nature," that is sin —hell. Jesus explained "caring for humanity" with the rich man, in the torments of hell, wanting someone to go back and warn his brothers of the consequences of sin. The response being, even if one rose from the dead they would not

believe. That is the power of the pleasures of this life, of *sensuousness*, of the approval of men, of the approach pleasure-avoid pain spectrum of "human nature" and the 'reasoning' ability of man to "control" his own life, that is to augment pleasure and attenuate pain, to 'change' the world so that all can live the "good life," thereby *negating righteousness* (the will of the Father) and eternal life (blessing and eternal glory) and unrighteousness (the will of "the children of disobedience") and eternal death (damnation and eternal torment) as the issue of life and death. It is not that we are not to "care," it is that there is more to life than "caring" about the flesh and the pleasures of this life. *"Man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the God."* Jesus quoting Deuteronomy 8:3 redeeming man from "And when the woman saw that it was good for food, ... she did eat." Through "human reasoning," that is dialectic 'reasoning,' she 'justified' her "natural inclination" to relate with the world, Genesis 3:6, bringing all who followed, that is Adam, and all since, into sin. She was deceived, Adam was not, placing the guilt of sin upon him, who knew better. Therefore, the issue before all mankind is the issue of the soul of man and eternity, that is where he will spend it. In heaven or in hell. The gospel (the "good news") is *negated* in the thoughts and actions of men without chastening and judgment, only becoming a social gospel, a tool of and for the augmentation of dialectic 'reasoning' and abomination.

Dialectic 'reasoning' goes like this: *"If the guilt accumulated in the civilized domination of man by man can ever be redeemed by freedom, then the 'original sin' must be committed again: 'We must again eat from the tree of knowledge in order to fall back into the state of innocence."* (Marcuse) *"To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit."* (Brown) *"In the process of history man gives birth to himself. He becomes what he potentially is, and he attains what the serpent—the symbol of wisdom and rebellion—promised, and what the patriarchal, jealous God of Adam did not wish: that man would become like God himself."* (Fromm) When church leadership brings dialectic 'reasoning' into the fellowship to "grow" the "church," it brings this spirit into the church. Beware of smiling lizards (wolves) who cover themselves with sheep skin, saying they "care about you." Beware of those of dialectic 'reasoning,' who are two faced, promoting what you perceive to be the right path, because of their

occasional preaching and teaching of scripture (deceiving you), when in truth , for the sake of "unity," are promoting the wrong path, 'justifying' man's fallen "human nature through the *dialoguing* of men's *opinions* to *consensus*.

If "force," which is the summation of government, is 'shifted' from the Father (with God or the Father ruling over what is His, directing the steps of His children) to the children (to "the children of disobedience," that is with man or child "controlling" the environment, that is *seducing*, *deceiving*, and *manipulating* "the people" for their "good" pleasure) then the children, who now perceive themselves as being over (equal to, therefore greater than) the Father, will use force against the Father and anyone who supports His way of thinking and acting, *negating* the system of *righteousness* (*faith* in, *belief* upon, *obedience* toward the Father, and acceptance of His *chastening*), classifying and treating it, that is the *preaching* and *teaching* of *righteousness* in a dialectic world seeking 'change,' that is in a world seeking after a "feeling" of "oneness" (acceptance), as "inappropriate" behavior (psychological, "neurotic," maladjusted, negative, divisive, hateful, "lower order thinking," etc). This is how believers are treated in a *consensus* environment : *neutralized* by everyone's input, that is their position therefore being perceived as just another *opinion* amongst *opinions*, *marginalized* when their 'unchangingness' is perceived as being hateful, intolerant, maladjusted behavior. Therefore believers (fundamentalists) are perceived as being "irrational" and thus "irrelevant" when it comes to matters of importance, even in the church, that is they must either be converted, that is succumb to dialectic 'reasoning' or be removed from the environment for the sake of the institution, especially if and when they persist in their "old fashioned" way of thinking and acting. This effects every area of government, from the home, where parent's set policies, to the nations of the world, who seek to resolve conflicts. It includes the "church," that is who and what it turns to for identity, as well as for direction in resolving differences.

Because we all come into this world based upon a system of *sensuousness* (approaching pleasure and avoiding pain), that is our carnal nature, and dialectic 'reasoning' is based upon what all men have in common, that is

our "human nature," it is referred to a *Heresiarchal Paradigm*, that is an "equality" paradigm of 'change,' in that every person's "feeling" and "thoughts" naturally moves in the direction of 'change,' that is 'changing' with the 'changing' environment ('changing' with the 'changing' times), as the world pulls us into "oneness" with it. As children following after their "natural inclinations," we are, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' to all be "adaptable to 'change.'" When we are prevented from relating with the environment, that is prevented from becoming at-one-with the world "in the 'moment,'" 'changing' with it as it 'changes,' we "naturally" become frustrated with and resentful towards, that is even strike out against, that which goes against our nature, if we are able. When an authority (an "authoritarian," according to dialectic 'reasoning'), who is not sympathetic with our "feelings" and our "thoughts" of the 'moment' (our opinion of the 'moment'), keeps us from relating with the world according to our "natural inclinations," doing so through the use of commands, threats of chastening, and/or of judgment, that system of believing and acting (a system of *righteousness*) is called a *Patriarchal Paradigm*, that is a "top-down" paradigm of "fixity" (as Carl Roger's called it). "*Individuals move not from a fixity through change to a new fixity [a Patriarchal Paradigm of "fixity"] , though such a process is indeed possible. But [through a] continuum from fixity to changingness, from rigid structure to flow, from stasis to process [a Heresiarchal Paradigm of "changingness"] .*" (Carl Rogers, *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*) Bracketed information added

Dialectic 'reasoning' is not about changing a persons belief. It is about 'changing' a persons paradigm, his way of thinking and acting. It is about *negating* the system of belief itself, treating it as a theory or an *opinion* amongst *opinions* (where all behavior is subject to the environment of a persons upbringing, that is his "history") where man is 'driven' by the 'changingness' of his own nature, that is his own *sensuousness*, and the environment he finds himself in, 'purposed' in the *praxis* of 'change,' that is in the augmentation of his own "human nature" (permissiveness and pleasure) over and against the *righteousness* of God (the source of restraint, that is of physical, mental, and social pain).

What dialectic 'reasoning' does not include, in regards to what we come into this world with, is the conscience. Even in young children there is a

sense of wrong in doing certain things, without being told so. It is called the conscience. Without faith, that is trusting in someone other than one's own approach pleasure-avoid pain spectrum of *sensuousness* of the 'moment,' there would be no conscience, that is a "feeling" of "guilt" for disobeying someone greater than the approach pleasure -avoid pain spectrum of the *sensuousness* of the 'moment.' In other words, man is made up of more than the stimulus-response, approach pleasure-avoid pain spectrum, materialistic ideologues preach and teach, that is cram down everyone's throat. God has given us all a "measure of faith," so that we would be aware of a higher authority than our own carnal nature and the temporal world around him. *"For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith."* Romans 12:3 While the *Patriarchal Paradigm* augments, through *chastening*, the development of the conscience ("fixity," that is faith), for the sake of doing right and not doing wrong, dialectic 'reasoning' seeks to *negate* it, supplanting it with the "super-ego" ("changingness," that is sight), for the sake of "equality" (basing 'reality' upon man's carnal nature only). "If the individual complies merely from fear of punishment [where the will of the Father restrains the child's will, that is restrains his natural inclination to follow after his own *sensuousness*] rather than through the dictates of his free will and conscience [where the will of the child, to follow after his own *sensuousness*, superseding the will of the Father] , the new set of values he is expected to accept does not assume in him the position of super-ego, and his re-education [socialist indoctrination] therefore remains unrealized." (Kurt Lewin as quoted in Kenneth Benne, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*) Bracketed information added. *"What we call 'conscience' perpetuates inside of us our bondage to past objects now part of ourselves [the will of the Father ruling over our will, that is our will is to do his will, to have faith in Him] : the super-ego 'unites in itself the influences of the present and of the past [the sensuousness of the 'moment' determines the worth or value of the standards of the "past," that is the commands of the Father, that is faith is based upon sight which negates faith, that is man only having a semblance of faith, that is faith in himself] .'"* (Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*)

Bracketed information added. While the Father, with his use of chastening, engenders the conscience, initiating and sustaining a "top-down" system of *righteousness* (augments faith), dialectic 'reasoning,' that is the "voice of the 'village' of diversity" with its "tolerance of ambiguity," that is its love of *sensuousness*, engenders the permissive, adaptable to 'change,' "equality" system of the super-ego (augmenting sight over and against faith). "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith." Romans 1:17 "*For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.*" 1 John 5:4 "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:" Philippians 3:9 "But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Hebrews 11:6 "*That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.*" 1 Corinthians 2:5 "... *nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?*" Luke 18:8b The implied answer is NO. The reason being: man's use of dialectic 'reasoning' to 'justify' himself as being 'righteous' in his own "human nature," that is 'justifying' himself according his own works, having put faith in his own 'reasoning' abilities, that is in the *wisdom* of men rather than in God, thereby *negating* faith and the issue of *righteousness* (in his thoughts and in his actions).

Dialectic 'reasoning' is used to *negate* the one (the *Patriarchal Paradigm*, that is the "top-down," "I'm above, your below" way of thinking and acting, that is the Father's authority to give commands and enforce them by chastening or threat of chastening, thus augmenting the conscience, that is developing the "guilty conscience," that is initiating and sustaining a system of *righteousness* in that the Father determines what is right and what is wrong, not basing right and wrong upon what is right and what is wrong according to the child's "feeling" and "thoughts" of the 'moment' but according to himself, according to his nature, according to his knowledge) while 'liberating' the other (the *Heresiarchal Paradigm*, that is the child along with his "natural inclination" to do what comes "naturally," that is to be himself, that is of his own *sensuousness* and 'reasoning,' that is self-

'justifying' ability (determining for himself, that is determining according to the pleasure-pain spectrum of nature, according to that which is common to all men, what is good and what is not, what is right and what is wrong, in the 'moment'). Dialectic 'reasoning' therefore is a system of *patricide* (in that the Father's authority, along with the Father if necessary, is *negated*) and *incest* (in that the child's "natural inclinations" are 'liberated,' freed to relate with all that is of the world, uninhibited by anything other than the need to initiate and sustain that which is of nature itself). Dialectic 'reasoning' *negates righteousness* as it 'liberates' *sensuousness*. It destroys the "old" "top-down" world order, based upon *righteousness*, that is the Father's authority, as it "creates" the "new" world order of "equality," based upon *sensuousness*, that is the nature of "the children of disobedience" and *human reasoning* —dialectic 'reasoning' being used to 'liberate' it. It is a system of *abomination*, which we now see manifesting itself ("emerging") all around us. It has now come to the point that even "Christians" will avoid the issue of *righteousness* (or redefine it, that is make it an *opinion* amongst *opinions*, so that it won't offend carnal man, that is including themselves) so that they can maintain a semblance of "relevance" in a "'rapidly changing' world." Even the [Scriptures](#) themselves have come under such attack, that is redefined by "enlightened scholars" so that they can "growing" the "church" upon the foundation of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is upon "changingness," that is upon the *opinions* (the "feelings" and "thoughts") of men.

The nature of the world (*sensuousness*, and *reasoning* used to 'justify' it, that is self 'justification' —dialectic 'reasoning' is the 'justification' of *sensuousness*, that is "human nature" over and against *righteousness*, that is *negating* the authority of the father to restrain his children, that is "forcing" the children to think and act according to *his* will, that is according to his "top-down" way of thinking and acting) is to resent *chastening* since it can only be understand from a carnal perspective (via. "sense perception"), with the child easily finding fault in the earthly father who expects a behavior of *righteousness* from the child, that is obedience, that is the father is right (*righteous*) and the child is wrong (*sensuous*), so do what the father says (or else). The truth being, the earthly (carnal) father *chastens* for "his own pleasure" (for the 'purpose' of his own

sensuousness), that is so that he can do what he wants to do (since he is 'driven' by *sensuousness* as well) —(I describe the earthly father who has not subjected his will to our Heavenly Father's will). While the system of *righteousness* (demanding *faith, belief, obedience*, and using *chastening*) is the same for both the earthly father and our Heavenly Father, the latter *chastens* us "for our profit," so that we might partake "of His holiness," in His *righteousness* which has to be *imputed* by Him to us according to faith. "For they [our earthly father's] verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he [our Heavenly Father] for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness." Hebrews 12:10 Bracketed information added. Through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' by *negating* the former, that is *negating* the authority of the earthly father, the latter, the authority of the Heavenly Father, is likewise *negated*, 'liberating' man ("the child within") so that he can be "himself" again, living *only* according to his own carnal nature —'liberating' the children so that they can be "themselves," living only according to their carnal nature —subject only to the pleasure-pain spectrum of "human nature," and therefore subject to those who can manipulate man (the children), manipulating him to become at-one-with the environment so that they can then manipulate the environment (and therefore man) for their own *sensuous* pleasures.

There is more to life than just the pleasure-pain spectrum of "human nature," that is engendering men's *opinions*. There is right and wrong, established by God (who is greater than, that is not bound by our "human nature," that is not taken captive by our *sensuousness* of the 'moment' and "human reasoning" —*reasoning* we use to 'justify' our carnal "human nature"). God, unlike man, is *righteousness* in and of himself. When man takes on the role of God, he becomes 'righteous' in and of himself, deceiving himself that he is God, when all he is is carnal man being controlled by "human nature," that is controlled by the pleasure-pain spectrum of the world, 'justifying' himself, that is 'justifying' his carnal "nature" through his use of dialectic 'reasoning.' It is what every child tries to do when caught "doing his own thing" (doing that which comes "naturally") in disobeying his father's will, that is 'justify' himself. While you thought philosophy and the dialectic process was something just studied in ivy covered halls of "higher learning," it is closer to home than

you think, or maybe even want to know. It is what is 'driving' the "new" world order, the "contemporary church," and maybe even 'driving' you today.

"It may be said that Philosophy first commences when ... a gulf has arisen between inward strivings [sensuous desires, that is the child's natural inclination to relate with that which, at or in the 'moment,' is gratifying to him in the environment] and external reality [external authority, that is the Father's restraint, that is commands and threat of chastening for doing wrong, that is for disobedience, that is for relating with that which, at or in the 'moment,' is gratifying to the child in the environment instead of obeying the father's command "not" to relate with it] , and the old forms of Religion [to do what is right and not do what is wrong, according to a higher authorities standards] , &c., are no longer satisfying; when Mind manifests indifference to its living existence or rests unsatisfied therein [manifests contempt for higher authority and its restraint] , and moral life becomes dissolved [the desire to obey the Father's will becomes disengaged from the child's will] ." "Philosophy is a free and not self-seeking activity, ... This activity [dialectic 'reasoning'] contains the essential element of a negation, because to produce is also to destroy; ... as Mind passes on from its natural form, it also proceeds from its exact code of morals and the robustness [rigidity] of life to reflection and conception ['changingness'] . The result of this is that it lays hold of and troubles this real, substantial kind of existence, this morality and faith [the Father's authority] , and thus the period of destruction commences [the negation of righteousness, that is no longer obeying the Father as a way of life] ." (Hegel's Lectures on the History of Philosophy, Introduction B. Relation of Philosophy to Other Departments of Knowledge) Bracketed information added.

When you become *dissatisfied* with the way things are ("is") and "commence" to thinking about how they "ought" to be, you become a "philosopher." According to dialectic 'reasoning,' it is not the "is" that is the problem (the parent's authority, regarding what you "can" do), it is the "not" (the parents' authority, regarding what you "can not" do, that is the "Thou shalt not"), the parent's command, *restraining* you on what you "can" do, using force to prevent you from doing it, *restraining* you from

being "normal," preventing you from discovering your true nature.

*"Discovering one's real nature is simultaneously an ought quest and an is quest [void the "not"] . "We have to study the conditions which maximize ought-perceptiveness [an environment where the child is freed of the Father's authority, that is 'liberated' from the voice and force of "negativity"] ." (Abraham Maslow, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*) Bracketed information added.*

Dialectic 'reasoning' is an object, that is you (an "is," "I am") moving in the direction of another object, something in the environment (of the world) which is desired (an "ought"), using *reasoning* to overcome (to circumvent or *negate*) any barrier (*negate* any "not" as in "Thou shalt not," that is *negate* the Father, his command, and use of chastening) which attempts to prevent the two (you and the world) from becoming united as one in "pleasure." Dialectic 'reasoning' is the way of the world, a way that is antithetical to the Father, it is man (and child) 'justifying' his carnal nature, that is 'justifying' his carnal "human nature" being drawn to and seeking unity with the world, that is his "natural inclination" to "lust" after the things that are of the world, it is the way of sin and death. *"For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world."* 1 John 2:16 *"But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."* James 1:14, 15 It is where the "is" (man or child) and the "ought" (the world, the object of gratification) are unite as "one" that dialectic 'reasoning' manifests itself, in the act, that is the *praxis* of *negating* the Father and His authority, *negating righteousness*. It is where unrighteousness and abomination abound. You may not realize this but when, in a meeting striving for *consensus*, (a room full of people being "encouraged" to *dialogue* their *opinions* to a common *consensus*—to a "feeling" of "oneness") you insistence upon doing things a particular way (*preaching* and *teaching* you and your Father's way of thinking and doing things), and only that way (since according to you it is the only right way), you are forcing your parent's values, that is their "old" way of thinking, that is that right is right and wrong is wrong, with there being eternal consequence for doing wrong, upon the "group," you are *propagating*

"negativity" upon "society." You are sustaining the "old" world order, that is preventing the "new" world order ("human nature," that is "human relationship") from becoming actualized, from becoming recognized as the "new" way, that is the only way of "doing business" from here on out.

While it may appear benign, "the people" supporting the child in his quest to be at one with the world around him, it is not. It is "the people" reporting the parent to the "authorities," for *chastening* his (according to their "feelings" and their "thoughts," that is according to those of dialectic 'reasoning,' their) child at the restaurant, where dialectic 'reasoning' manifests itself in social (public) action. The child striking out at the parent, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' is the precursor of humanity 'liberating' itself from the restraints of the Father and His authority, that is humanity 'actualizing' itself, that is *negating* the restraints of *righteousness*. While the child is too weak to carry out the deed, with government support, that is with "the mass," that is "the people" indoctrinated in dialectic 'reasoning,' that is 'justifying' "human nature" over and against the *righteousness* of God, the traditional authority structure, that is the authority of the Father to train up His children in His image, will, by force, through intimidation, or in abdication, be removed from the environment for the sake, that is the "safety," that is the "health" of "the people." This is what the "health care package" is all about, creating "healthy" families, "healthy" communities, "healthy" churches, "healthy" schools, "healthy" nations, with "the masses," the "grass roots" creating, through *consensus* with themselves (voiding the Father's authority and a "guilty conscience"), a "healthy" world, a world void of the restraints of *righteousness*, a "healthy" world "tolerating ambiguity," that is 'justifying' unrighteousness as an acceptable (the only) way of life, a "healthy" world of abomination (a world "purged" of the issue of *righteousness* and of a "guilty conscience").

It is what "counseling" or "therapy for 'normal's,'" that is psychology and sociology, is all about—with "psychologist, sociologists, and anthropologists, that is the facilitators of 'change,' being the "high priests" of the "new" world order, with none dare questioning their "authority" if they want to remain "rational" and "relevant" in the eyes of "the people," including in the "church." Psychology in the church is the confessional in

the Catholic Church, helping "the people" feel "good" about themselves so that they will come back for more, that is supporting the institution which helped them 'discover' their "potential," that is helped them actualize their "goodness" through their participation in working as "one," that is united with the *brotherhood of humanity* working for the "common good."

When two or more people come together and *dialogue* their *opinions*, that is how *they* "feel" and what *they* "think," theorizing how things "ought" to be, the direction of action is over and against that which is (whatever it is they are dissatisfied with that engendered the event, that is the event being the coming together and the internally *reasoning*, that is *opinion* now being outwardly expressed for the 'purpose' of 'change'). What began inside you (we can *dialogue* with ourselves our dissatisfaction with the way things are that go against our "natural inclinations," restraining our "human nature") is now materialized in social expression (self is actualized), with another or others of the same dissatisfaction or dissatisfactions ('discovered' through *dialogue*), with the potential for social action being taken to *negate* that condition which is (or person who is) engendering the dissatisfaction (who is inhibiting "human nature"). This is dialectic 'reasoning' (philosophy) being put into social action, known as *praxis*. According to dialectic 'reasoning,' since 'liberty' from higher authority is begun in internal social action, that is with "me talking to myself," it must end in external social action, with "We working for us," overcoming any condition which inhibits "human nature" and dialectic 'reasoning.' Therefore, discontentment (man's love of pleasure more than God) is the dynamo which 'drives' dialectic 'reasoning.' Dialectic 'reasoning' is thus antithetical to *faith* in, *belief* upon, and *obedience* toward God. With carnal man's *contentment* being in himself (with his flesh, which is never satisfied, always wanting "more," demanding 'change') rather than the Lord (who satisfies the soul), dialectic 'reasoning' sets man over and against the *righteousness* of Christ.

Discontentment (carnality, that is *sensuousness*) must *negate* contentment (*righteousness*) if those of dialectic 'reasoning' are to 'justify' themselves, that is 'justify' their carnal thoughts and carnal actions. The focus of dialectic 'reasoning' can only be upon the "feelings" and "thoughts" of men. It can not be upon the *righteousness* of Christ and the wickedness and deceitfulness of men's hearts —why man can not fulfill God's demand for *righteousness*, that is why *righteousness* is only *imputed* by God to men of

faith in Him alone. As the gospel songs says *"Only Jesus can satisfy your soul."* *"Not that I speak in respect of want: for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: every where and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need."* Philippians 4:11, 12 If there is any discontentment in a believer it is in his disappointing the Lord because of his carnal thoughts and carnal actions, that is in his yielding to the "human behavior" of unrighteousness. *"Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me."* Psalms 51:10

Philosophy, that is which is our "ought," that is is of our flesh, our mind and the world being drawn to "oneness," ties us to a generalized *sensation* of universality with that which is *not* of the particular, not of the specific, that is not of the Father and his commands regarding right and wrong, that is not of our soul and of our conscience. For instance, the Ten commandments are specific, dealing with the soul of man (dealing with every man on an individual bases). To lie has no age discrimination (or location discrimination). Whether three, thirty-three, or ninety-three (or in "communist" China, "democratic" America, or "socialist" England—all three being the same, that is dialectic in structure or order), the awareness of "wrong" (conviction) is associated with lying (as long as the person is not a product of dialectic 'reasoning' where lying, renamed "appropriate information," is considered "good" when used for the 'purpose' of social 'change,' a generalized perception of life which is necessary for the procedure of "mediation," that is finding "common" ground through the *dialoguing of opinions to a consensus*). What Karl Marx called the *"ether of the brain"* (*The Holy Family*) allows us to generalize things ("tolerate ambiguity") so that we can circumvent the specifics (the conscience) which brings judgment upon our thoughts and actions, dividing us from ourselves (from our carnal nature) and from others (from the world) according to established rights and wrongs (established for all times and for all places), that is rules and commands which we have embraced as the right way of thinking and acting, according to dialectic 'reasoning, the "negative" condition of *righteousness* which is engendered through the Father's

authority to use "chastening," used to initiate and sustain His "top-down" order, his "old fashioned" way of "doing business."

"To whom shall I speak, and give warning, that they may hear? behold, their ear is uncircumcised, and they cannot hearken: behold, the word of the LORD is unto them a reproach; they have no delight in it. For from the least of them even unto the greatest of them every one is given to covetousness; and from the prophet even unto the priest every one dealeth falsely.

They have healed also the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace; when there is no peace. Were they ashamed when they had committed abomination? nay, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush: therefore they shall fall among them that fall: at the time that I visit them they shall be cast down, saith the LORD.

Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein. Also I set watchmen over you, saying, Hearken to the sound of the trumpet. But they said, We will not hearken. Therefore hear, ye nations, and know, O congregation, what is among them. Hear, O earth: behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto my words, nor to my law, but rejected it." Jeremiah 6:10, 13-19

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' it is in the action of philosophy, that is in our "oughtiness" that we can circumvent, that is "negate" the "negativity" of our conscience, that is negate the voice of the Father and His authority within us—His speaking to our soul, dividing us from our "human nature" and the world, using *chastening* to inhibit or block (cut off) our generalizing (and generalized) *sensuousness* of the 'moment.' Feelings, like "repression" or "alienation," are generalized sensations we experience as the result of specific conditions, like commands and rules, which "restrain" our carnal desires, that is our "natural inclinations," that is our "human nature," that is our "child within." The dialectic theme is: *sensuousness* (generalization, that which we all have in common) unites, *righteousness*

(specificity, that which is of our Father's) divides. The Lord would agree, admitting he came not to bring peace, that is unite the world upon its nature, that is according to its own *sensuousness* and 'reasoning' abilities, but rather he came to bring a sword, that is His Word, dividing the world between the condemned and the redeemed, according to His Father's will and His *righteousness*. Our Lord came, not to *negate* His Heavenly Father's authority but rather to 'reconcile' man back to it, that is not circumventing or *negating* the law (making God equal with man) but fulfilling it (making man "equal" with Christ, that is as a son of God, that is dead to himself and alive in Christ, that is an adopted son) in His *righteousness*, in His name only, *"to the glory of God the Father."* *"That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."* Philippians 2:9-11 *"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven."* Matthew 10:32 *"For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together."* Romans 8:13-17 With the individualization of man, that is each soul being personally accountable before God, the dialectic process is "overthrown." This is why *righteousness* is at the heart of the dialectic process, that is the *negation* of it. The Transformational Marxists György Lukács wrote: *"The dialectical method was overthrown ...; the parts were prevented from finding their definition within the whole ..."* (György Lukács, *History & Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?*) Dialectic 'reasoning', for the 'purpose' of unity, must circumvent the specific, that is circumvent focusing upon right and wrong based upon the conscience, that is circumvent the voice of the father within (circumvent the issue of *righteousness*). It must get man to focus upon himself through the use of generalization, through focusing upon his thoughts (his *opinions*, that is *reasoning*) which are engendered by his feelings (*sensuousness*) of

dissatisfaction with the restraints of *righteousness* upon his "natural inclinations." Man's (the child's) dissatisfaction with the conditions of *righteousness*, that is *faith, belief, obedience, and chastening*, restraining "human nature," is the dynamo of dialectic 'reasoning,' is the engenderer of *reasoning* and the "new" world order.

Thus, through dialectic 'reasoning,' man is 'liberated' from any authority who is higher than his "human nature," including his conscience. All must be generalized (made "ambiguous," theoretical, an *opinion*) if man (the flesh of man) is to be 'liberated' from the specifics of right and wrong, "redeeming" man from having to deal with his soul, God's law, that is revealing his sin and his condemnation, God's Grace alone, that is redeeming him from condemnation through Christ Jesus only, 'reconciling' him to the Father, and eternity— *"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul:"* Psalms 19:7. *"By 'dialectical' I mean an activity of consciousness ["human reasoning" or "sensuous reasoning," that is "how do you feel" and "what do you think"] struggling to circumvent the limitations imposed by the formal-logical law of contradiction [the commands regarding good and evil, right and wrong accepted and obeyed "as given" by the Father] ."* *"Formal logic and the law of contradiction [right and wrong established by the Father, initiating and sustain the conscience] are the rules whereby the mind submits to operate under general conditions of repression ["feelings" of "negativity" experienced by "the child within"] ."* *"Human consciousness ["human nature" and "human reasoning" become united as one, that is "positivity"] can be liberated from the parental (Oedipal) complex [from the Father authority restraining the child's sensuous urge to be at-one with the mother, that is "mother earth," that is incest—abomination] only be being liberated from its cultural derivatives, the paternalistic state and the patriarchal God [local and national recognition of the father's authority to rule over his children, under God's authority] ."* *"The abolition of repression [read "incest"] would only threaten patriarchal domination [read "patricide"] ."* *"Freud, Hegel, and Nietzsche are, like Marx, compelled to postulate external domination and its assertion by force in order to explain repression."* (Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*) Bracketed information added.

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' by *negating* (getting rid of) the "negative" and augmenting (accentuating) the "positive" man can have the "good" life. According to dialectic 'reasoning,' he can either accept the conditions of the "negative," that is submit himself to a higher authority than "human nature," that is an authority who restrains his "natural inclinations," and remain "repressed" (how the carnal man can only perceive it), or he can attempt to run away from that which is "negative" in his effort to find and "enjoy" the "positive" (but get caught and be punished or fear getting caught, that is ending up with a "guilty conscience"), or he can accumulate things (or people) to fight against the "negative," so that he can do that which is "positive," or he can find ways to "rationally" overcome the "negative" by 'changing' (manipulating and controlling) the environment in such a way so as to attenuate (reduce) the conditions which engender the "negative" (pain), by augmenting (increasing) the conditions which engender the "positive" (pleasure). This entails the "willful" participation of the "negative" in the process of 'change,' "willfully" 'changing' themselves from being "negative" to being "positive," that is no longer making *righteousness*, that is the Father's will the issue of life, that is the only issue of *life*.

Anyone who has studied the dialectic process, that is Hegel, Marx, Freud, etc. have heard the words *thesis*, *antithesis*, and *synthesis* and have no doubt learned many other philosophical words, stretching the brain to the limit of its abilities. Yet it is all very simple when explained correctly. *Synthesis* is the *negation* of the *thesis* position, that is the Father's authority, which caused the condition of *antithesis*, that is conflict between the child's "natural inclination" to relate with the environment (by the child having to obey the Father or be chastened) and the child's desire to relate with the Father (restraining his "natural inclinations" to relate with the Father). The Father's authority is *negated* and *synthesis* ("human nature" and *only* "human nature") is actualized through the *praxis* of *reasoning*, where both Father and child finding "common ground" (create together a new *thesis* position, which is now based upon "human nature," which is therefore adaptable to 'change'), based upon their common desire for unity (the "feeling" of peace between the two), which is achieved through the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus*, that is to a "feeling" of "oneness"

discovered by sharing how they "feel" and what they "think" in the 'moment.' In truth, 'reconciliation' is not an issue of there being peace between the Father and the child at the expense of the Father's authority, that is because the Father abdicated His office of authority, it is an issue of there being peace between the Father and the child because the child remained faithful to the Father's authority. Dialectic 'reasoning' makes harmony (*synthesis*) between the Father and the child an issue of *sensuousness* by focusing upon "feelings," thereby superseding the issue of *righteousness*, which focuses upon the child obeying the Father, that is doing right and not wrong according to Father's will.

When "ministers" bring up the agenda of 'change' they know that it will create tension in the "church," causing those who resist, that is those who are Word based, that is the "fundamentalists," to focus upon maintaining relationship with the "minister" (and thereby maintain respect in the eyes of the fellowship) in hopes of the "minister" (and the congregation) hearing their "complaints," and "stopping" the 'change' process. But in doing so, the issue of *sensuousness* supersedes the issue of *righteousness* —maintaining "human relationship," that is focusing upon "feelings" (to stop the process of "feelings") supplants doing God's will, that is focusing upon His Word. God's word (*thesis*) is therefore sacrificed for the sake of unity and "growth" (*synthesis*), with unity and "growth" becoming the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of the "church." With "man's" effort to remove the tension between men, especially when that tension is caused by the issue of *righteousness*, by man resolving the tension between man, the tension between God and man is resolved —*negated*. *Righteousness* is *negated* through the *praxis* of dialectic 'reasoning.' "Human relationship," that is *sensuousness* having superseded man's relationship with God, that is *righteousness* as the issue at hand. All "ministers" of 'change' must convert (consume) or scatter the sheep (chase off the resisters of 'change'), if they are to maintain their position of "control" over the "church." By getting the congregation focusing upon (hoping in) "growth," resisters to 'change' (those focusing upon the Word) are perceived as being divisive, that is disloyal to the minister and the fellowship, that is causing church disunity —the 'justification' of "human relationship" from then on supplanting

'justification' in Christ alone, as the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of the "church."

"Ministers" of 'change' will do the Marxist waltz with the congregation. By presenting 'change' (taking two steps forward) to the point where "traditionalists" (fundamentalists) will resist (go to the "minister" in private first, to convince him, through the use of scriptures, the error of his way), the "minister" will be able to know the source and strength of resistance within the congregation, regarding the program of 'change' With him, calmly "listening" to their "felt" needs, promising to "consider" their concerns, he gives them the appearance that he is willing to back up (take one step back), to where they will "feel" they might be listened to, that is with him dropping the 'change' agenda. Then he will present more programs for 'change' (take two more steps forward), until there is resistance again (this time "fundamentalists," in private, sharing their concerns with the "membership," with those who they think they can trust or they think will listen to their "complaint"), but this time those desiring 'change' will put pressure on the "fundamentalists," with the "minister" expressing concern about divisiveness, that is that "some people" are causing dissention within the church." They will from then on be treating as being uncaring, "irrational," and/or misinformed, being influenced by "outsiders." The desire for unity in the church will from now outweighing the authority of God's word. It is now the "fundamentalists" who will take one step back, hoping that they have shared enough (or will be able to share in the future) for the "church" to wake up and return to its "old" ways. With unity now being based upon compromise, no longer based upon the authority of God's word, 'change' (compromise of the Word of God for the sake of unity in the church) becomes not only the 'drive' but also the 'purpose' of the church. The "old" way of doing things (unity based upon doctrine, "fixity") is now *negated* with the "new" way of doing things (unity based upon "human relationship building," upon programs of 'changingness'). *Synthesis negates antithesis* by becoming *thesis* itself—"human relationship" *negates* the conflict between doctrine (the Word of God, with the Lord adding to the church) and unity (the quest for approval and the "growth" of the church) by "human relationship building skills" becoming itself the 'drive' and 'purpose' of the church. "The children

of disobedience" *negate* the conflict between the authority of the Father and the "felt" needs of the children, because the "felt" need for unity, that is "can't we all just get along," has taken over the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of the family, that is the facilitators of 'change' having now taken over the fellowship by resolving the conflict between the authority of God's Word and "the approval of men," by making "human relationship" (humanism) the gospel message itself. "Why are you doing what you are doing?" is no longer "Because my Father told me to." but "For the sake of unity." In other words, *sensuousness*, doing the will of man (seeking "the approval of man"), has supplanted *righteousness*, doing the Father's will (having "the approval of God," through Christ, according to His Word), as the issue of life. The tension between man and God (flesh and spirit) which is resolved in Christ, that is the gospel message, that is 'reconciling' us to the Father, has been 'shifted' to the tension between man and man (flesh and flesh), which is resolved in compromise, that is in the process of 'change,' for the sake of unity in the church.

The use of 'crisis,' that is concern for "preserving" self, family, and business (as well as the church), seems to be the easiest way of baiting the father, his family, and his business (as well as the fellowship), etc., that is the "negative," into "willful" participation in the process of 'change' (changing his paradigm, that is his way of thinking and acting). *"The eclipse of a way thinking cannot take place without a crisis."* (Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*) Thus through the father's (and his family's and business's) participation in resolving the "crises," he (along with them) becomes subject to the process of dialectic 'reasoning' ("positivity," that is *"civic participation and social interaction"* engendering an "egalitarian" way of thinking and acting), not knowing the crisis was his way of thinking ("negativity," parental authority engendering a "top-down" way of thinking and acting in the next generation) rather than the issues he thought was at hand (a natural or man-made crisis). *"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*) Fromm was a Transformational Marxist, whose writings were popular with the "new left"

in the 60's in America —now the democratic and much, if not most, of the republican party today. The dialectic agenda is not to stop crisis (to stop crime, to stop conflicts, to stop fires, to stop disasters, to stop divorce, to stop wars, etc. as it might claim) but rather to "control" the crisis, that is to use the crisis to initiate and sustain the use of dialectic 'reasoning' to maintain in its encroachment upon, that is its "control" of the affairs of men.

The problem that man faces in his use of dialectic 'reasoning' (self-'justification') is that in his use of it, to "liberate" himself from the "repression" of the "negative," he becomes a slave to the "positive," a slave to his own carnal "nature" and those who can manipulate the environment to control it and use it to manipulate, control, and use him to their own end. *"We can choose to use our growing knowledge to enslave people in ways never dreamed of before, depersonalizing them, controlling them by means so carefully selected that they will perhaps never be aware of their loss of personhood."* (Carl Rogers, quoted in Vance Parker, *People Shapers*) *"Now that we know how positive reinforcement works, and why negative doesn't" ... 'we can be more deliberate and hence more successful in our cultural design.'" "We can achieve a sort of control under which the controlled, though they are following a code much more scrupulously than was ever the case under the old system, nevertheless feel free. They are doing what they want to do, not what they are forced to do. That's the source of the tremendous power of positive reinforcement—there's no restraint and no revolt. By a careful design, we control not the final behavior, but the inclination to behavior—the motives, the desires, the wishes. The curious thing is that in that case the question of freedom never arises. . . .we will inevitably find ourselves moving toward the chosen goal, and probably thinking that we ourselves desired it. ...it appears that some form of completely controlled society ... is coming."* (Carl Rogers, *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*)

Roger's and those of dialectic 'reasoning' were concerned about a "totalitarian" takeover of the country, with families turning to government to save the family from communism (socialism, democracy, that is globalism), that is how they perceived (incorrectly) Hitler came into

power. Any resistant to 'change' is therefore correlated with the "potentially" of Fascism, cutting off globalism and the "new" world order. Therefore, in their effort to bring the world into globalism, the traditional family and its influence upon society had to be undermined and *negated* (through its 'willful' participation in the process of 'change') if Fascism was to be prevented " *What The Authoritarian Personality was really studying was the character type of a totalitarian rather than an authoritarian society — fostered by a familial crisis in which traditional parental authority was under fire.*" (Theodor Adorno, *The Authoritarian Personality*) *Again* : the dialectic fear being that traditional minded parents would react to any encroachment upon their rights as parents to rule over their families by seeking government help (turn to nationalism) to stop the government of 'change' (globalism) from destroying their "way of life," falsely equated (by those of dialectic 'reasoning') as "fascism."

How a meeting was being handled in solving a crisis (including in the home) was critical to the outcome. In the public realm, Robert's Rules of Order and an honest chairman, along with a majority vote and a representative form of government (a constitutional republic form of government, limiting the power of government, retaining most power in the family) would initiate and sustain an "authoritarian" outcome (individual right's, that is inalienable rights), while the *consensus* process, led by a facilitator of 'change,' that is a "democratic" form of government (bipartisanship), would initiate and sustain totalitarian, Oops! globalism (one for all and all for one) outcome (social rights, that is "human rights"). According to dialectic 'reasoning,' it was therefore imperative that government involve (invest) itself in the life of the children (take "ownership" of the family, via. "women's rights," "children rights," "*abomination rights*," etc.), thus *negating* (cutting off) the power structure of the "old" world order, negating the authority structure of the traditional home, that is the authority of the Father in setting private policy and therefore influencing public policy. ". . . *any intervention between parent and child tend to produce familial democracy regardless of its intent.*" (Warren Bennis, *The Temporary Society*)

According to dialectic 'reasoning' (according to the "*spirit of the world*"), the Father, His law, and His use of chastening to restrain "human nature," restrain "normal" human behavior, that is restrain that which is "positive," can only be "negative." Carnal man, because he does not have the Spirit of God, can not comprehend a higher authority than his "human nature" (restraining his "carnal nature") as being anything but "negative." Thus, in "negating" that which is "negative," that is "negating" his attachment to the Father, His law, and His use of chastening to restrain his carnal "nature," man becomes addicted to and therefore subject to only that which is of his own carnal "nature," he becomes a slave to "the spirit of the world," that is at-one-with the "new" world order of Godlessness, Fatherlessness, lawlessness, that is unrighteousness —abomination.

talk of "faith" (by those of dialectic 'reasoning') is in a Son without the Father, that is a son delivering man *from* the Father, creating a so called "faith" in the "positive," refusing to recognize and accept the "negative," the depravity (deceitfulness and wickedness) of man's own sinful carnal nature and therefore his need for a savior to 'reconcile' (reunite) him *to* the Father, delivering him from judgment and eternal damnation—"*the world by wisdom [by dialectic 'reasoning'] knew not God*" having only "*the wisdom of this world*" which is "*foolishness with God.*" "*Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*" 1 Corinthians 2:12-14 "*For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.*" 1 Corinthians 1:21 "*Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness. And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.*" 1 Corinthians 3:18-20

Since dialectic 'reasoning' deals with "human relationship" (with "human nature" only) that means a process has to be used which 'changes' a person who is "negative" (who engenders pain upon others, not just physical pain, that is chastisement for doing that which is "normal," but emotional pain, that is engendering the fear of judgment or fear of chastisement for wanting to do or doing that which is "normal," that is wanting to do what others are getting to do or wanting to have what others are having," and social pain, that is engendering "estrangement," "alienation," or "the rejection of men" for holding to a "negative" way of thinking and acting and demanding others do what you are doing—or rather not doing, that is not being "normal"—as well) into a person who is "positive" (who engenders pleasure upon others, not just physical pleasure, freedom to "enjoy" the 'moment,' but emotional pleasure, that is engendering approval, "esteem," and a sense of "wellness," and social pleasure, that is "the approval of men" for "helping" others become "normal," doing what they want to do as well, "as long as it does not hurt others," whatever that means in the 'moment'). According to dialectic 'reasoning,' those conditions in a person's life which engender "negativity" must be 'changed' into conditions which engender "positivity," thus *"negating the negative."* (Remember that dialectic 'reasoning' initiates and sustains itself upon the premise that man is basically "good," or that he can become "good," "good" being based upon his "natural," that is carnal way of thinking and acting.) *"But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away."* Isaiah 64:6 *"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;"* *"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:"* Romans 3:23; 5:12 *"And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, that is, God."* Luke 18:19

The dialectic objective is therefore to 'rationally' (scientifically) identify those conditions which are "negative" (the attributes of the [Father](#)—who requires *faith, belief, and obedience* and uses *chastisement* or threat thereof to initiate and sustain a "top-down," patriarchal order of stability, that is the "old" world order of "fixity," of *righteousness*, where the Father is *righteous* in and of himself, that is to be obeyed without anyone

questioning his authority) and those conditions which are "positive" (the attributes of carnal man —which requires permissiveness, freedom to question "authoritarians" and their commands, "tolerance of ambiguity," etc. to initiate and sustain an "egalitarian," that is "equality," Heresiarchal order of instability, that is the "new" world order of 'change,' of *sensuousness*, where man is 'righteous' in and of himself, according to his own nature) in "human relationships," that is in man seeking "the approval of men" (being "'open ended' and 'non-directive'") instead of "the approval of the Father" (being "'closed minded' and 'directive'"). The idea being: if the "right" environmental conditions can be scientifically 'discovered' and then initiated and sustained whereby the "negative" person can be *seduced*, *deceived*, and then *manipulated*, that is like "natural resource," in such a way that he is "willing" to embrace the "positive" (accept himself as being "human resource," that is needing to be *manipulated* to become "good," that is to become something of value, of worth, useful for the 'moment'), "negativity" can be "negated" within the person who was "negative," without having to "negate" the person himself —this is the difference between Traditional Marxist's, who use bullets and blood to 'change' the world, that is to "negate the negative," and Transformational Marxists, who use facilitated meetings of diverse people dialoguing to consensus over social issues to a pre-determined outcome to 'change' the world, that is the pre-determined outcome being that all policies (private and public) must be made through the use of the *consensus* (soviet) process —through the use of dialectic 'reasoning' being put into praxis (action) by all "the people," "negating the negative." "*The institutions in socialist society which act as the facilitators between the public and private realms are the Soviets.*" (Norman Levine, in preface to György Lukács, *Process of Democratization*) The soviet (the *consensus* process) is used to "purge" the policy making environment and its outcome of *righteousness*, that is *negate*, that is *neutralize*, *marginalize*, and *remove* that which is not of "human nature."

According to dialectic 'reasoning' the greatest engenderer of "*negativity*" is found within the traditional patriarchal home environment. According to dialectic 'reasoning,' the initiator and sustainer of "negativity" is the patriarchal Father who gives commands to those under this authority, to be

obeyed without question, *preaching and teaching categorical imperatives*, that is "*Because I said so*," commands which go against or counter to "human nature"—his position not being based upon the child's "feelings" or "thoughts" of the 'moment,' revealed by the Father's refusal to respond "positively" to the child's "*Why?*" used by the child to get the Father into the *dialoguing of opinions*, that is both sharing how they "*feel*" and what they "*think*," making both "*equal*," that is "positive" in nature. Instead, the Father "restrains" the child's natural inclinations, using chastisement (pain) when his will is not obeyed (engendering "negativity" in those under his authority, that is training them up in "negativity" as they learn to accept his way of "doing business"). "*Authoritarian submission was conceived of as a very general attitude that would be evoked in relation to a variety of authority figures—parents, older people, leaders, supernatural power, and so forth.*" "*God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority.*" (Theodor Adorno, *The Authoritarian Personality*)

As you will come to understand, all of Hegel's, Marx's, Freud's, etc. 'drive' and 'purpose' was upon the *negation* of the traditional patriarchal family environment (an environment or system or structure or order which was first rebelled against in [a garden in Eden](#)). According to dialectic 'reasoning,' four conditions must therefore be "*negated*" if the world (and the "contemporary church") is to become a "positive" place, that is a "good" or "better" place to live within: 1) the Father's *threat*, 2) His authority and *commands* which are to be obeyed and not to be questioned, 3) the "*guilty conscience*," and 4) the people accepting and respecting the father's *authority* to give commands without question (which engenders *faith* and *belief*) and his use of *chastening* (pain) to create and maintain (initiate and sustain) obedience, that is initiate and sustain his position of authority (known, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' as the "top-down," "authoritarian," patriarchal, "old" world order). In all of this, that is through the use of *reasoning*, that is dialectic reasoning' (the *dialoguing of opinions* of the 'moment' to a *common* agreed upon position for the 'moment,' that is the *consensus* process, that is "common-ism" AKA communism—now called by different names, that is *communitarianism*, *conscientization*, *democratization*, *synergism*, etc.), *righteousness* (the Father's will, that is

"negativity," according to dialectic 'reasoning') is *negated*, *sensuousness* ("human nature," that is the child's will or in this case "the children of disobedience" will, that is "positivity") and *reasoning* ("human reasoning," that is 'self-justification') having taken its place. Blinded by his use of dialectic 'reasoning' (self-'justification'), man is not able to understand that the Father's law exposes man as not being capable of being or becoming as God, *righteous* in and of himself. Not being able to fulfill the law, it is therefore necessary for a savior to fulfill the law in man's stead, providing a way back to the Father, a way back, that is 'reconciliation,' by faith and not by works, that no man (of carnality, of "human nature") could boast. *"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast."* Ephesians 2:8, 9

Our Lord responded to dialectic 'reasoning' (attempts to circumvent and *negate* the Father's will) not only in the temptations in the wilderness, with *"It is written ..."* but also to Peter when Peter wanted to "glorify" God through the methods or works of men, that is according to "human reasoning," according to sight (*sensuousness*) rather than according to faith (*righteousness*): *"But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men."* Matthew 16:23 As you will come to understand, if you don't already, that the Lord's ministry was all about the Father, that is His Heavenly Father, reconciling man to His Father, not "negating" His authority. *"I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me."* John 5:30 *"For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father who sent me, he gave me commandment what I should say, and what I should speak."* John 12:49 *"And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your father, which is in heaven."* Matthew 23:9 (As [Hebrews 12:5-11](#) makes clear: while all earthly fathers, biological or figurative, born of the flesh, chasten us for their own pleasure, our Heavenly Father does it so that we might partake of His glory, which no man can impart, that is that no man is to come between God the Father and man except Jesus Christ alone, who redeems us of from our condemnation, covering our sins through His atoning blood, 'reconciling' us to His Heavenly Father alone —which is made clear, for those who have ears and

can hear, in Matthew 23:9 cited above.) *"For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."* Matthew 12:50 *"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my father which is in heaven."* Matthew 7:21

Dialectic 'reasoning' is the *"negation of negation:"* 1) the *"negation"* of the father's *threat*—"You will die" or "You will be chastened if you disobey MY commands," 2) thereby the *"negation"* of the father's *commands*—"Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not," 3) thereby the *"negation"* of the *"guilty conscience"*—the fear of punishment, that is judgment for disobeying or wanting to disobey the father's commands, 4) thereby the *"negation"* of the *father's authority* to give commands—his authority to say "Because 'I' say said," and support it with force. Dialectic 'reasoning' is the *negation* of that which stands in the way of man *becoming* "himself," thinking and acting according to his own carnal nature. Dialectic 'reasoning,' (man's ability to 'rationally' "justify" his carnal feelings, his carnal thoughts, and his carnal actions in his own eyes—making his *opinion*, that is how "he" *feels* and what "he" *thinks* in the 'moment,' the basis for 'reality', determining what is right and what is wrong in the 'moment' according to "his" *perception* of the world, according to the "situation" he finds himself in) put into social action (*praxis*), is man re-experiencing ("re-inventing") himself (re-'discovering' his "human nature") as being at-one-with the world "again," before the first command and threat of punishment (or punishment) came from the father—*chastening* him for disobeying "His" command, that is according to dialectic 'reasoning,' *chastening* him for being "normal." The biggest "bully" in a dialectic world (in the so called "new" world order) is the patriarchal Father, that is the Father who chastens his children when they (doing what is "normal," doing that which comes "naturally") disobey his will.

Dialectic 'reasoning' is the use of *reason* ("human reasoning") to 'justify' the child's carnal nature (*sensuousness*, that is his natural inclinations), 'liberating' him out from under the Father's authority (*righteousness*), placing *sensuousness* ("human nature") over and against *righteousness* ("parental restraint"), *negating* the Father's authority in the thoughts and

the actions of the next generation. Just to give you a taste of dialectic 'reasonin g I will give you a few quotations from a major source for teacher education. [James Coleman](#), who was a major source for education research in the 50's and 60's (Paul Lazarsfeld, a Marxist professor at Columbia, was his advisor for his doctorate), who's research was a major source for Supreme Court decisions regarding education, who's material is still heavily used in the undergraduate, masters, and doctorate level's of Education today, wrote: *"Parents are 'out of touch with the times,' and unable to understand, much less inculcate, the standards of a social order that has changed since they were young." "The family has little to offer the child in the way of training for his place in the community." "In the traditional society each child is at the mercy of his parents. The 'natural processes' by which they socialize him makes him a replica of them." "Mass media, and an ever-increasing range of personal experiences, gives an adolescent social sophistication at an early age, making him unfit for the obedient role of the child in the family." "One of the consequence of the increasing social liberation of adolescents is the increasing inability of parents to enforce norms, a greater and greater tendency for the adolescent community to disregard adult dictates, and to consider itself no longer subject to the demands of parents and teachers." "Rather than bringing the father back to play with his son, this strategy would recognize that society has changed, and attempt to improve those institutions designed to educate the adolescent toward adulthood." "In the industrial society, committed to equality of opportunity, adults cannot afford to shape their children in their own image." "Equality of Opportunity becomes ever greater with the weakening of family power." (James Coleman, *The Adolescent Society: the Social Life of the Teenager and its Impact on Education*) Anyone can see what direction James Coleman was taking the children in the classroom, away from the family and the father's authority towards a "new" world order of lawlessness and abomination. Regarding the Marxist takeover of Education in the 60's, that is how to prevent the public from becoming awareness of it, Coleman wrote: *" In school controversies, the issue of Communist subversion in the schools is one-sided; as long as it occupies the attention of the community, it is to the advantage of school critics. In contrast, the issue 'progressive education vs. traditional education' offers no differential advantage to either side**

(unless, of course, progressive education can be identified by its opponents as 'Communitistic' [which was not successfully done because the Traditional and Transformational Marxist differences were not recognized by the conservatives until recently, that is the Traditional Marxist shoot you if you say "Get off 'My' land," the Transformational Marxist, that is social-psychologists, that is facilitators of 'change,' convince you, through the *consensus* process, that it is "Our land" instead])... " (James Coleman, *Community Conflict*) Bracketed information added. Maximilien Francois Robespierre, head of the directorate of the French Revolution, made the following statement: "*On ne peut pas faire d'omelette sans casser des oeufs,*" that is "*Omelettes are not made without breaking eggs.*" He understood the principles of dialectic 'reasoning': the "*omelette*" being society unified, the unified family system being the individual "*eggs*" which had to be broken up and assimilated. Otto Von Bismarck unified Germany on this principle. The European nations are unified on this principle. World unity is based upon this principle.

The principles of dialectic 'reasoning' are explained in the scriptures. Dialectic 'reasoning' is Genesis 3:1-6 (*reasoning*, that is "human reasoning," which was first put into *praxis*, that is into action in a garden in Eden) being used to overcome Romans 7:14-25 (overcome the conflict between the child's will, that is "human nature," that is *sensuousness* and the Father's will, that is *righteousness*—a child doing what he does not want to do, that is disobey his parents, and not doing what he wants to do, obey his parents, all because of his "human nature," that is doing that which is natural, that is being "normal" is, through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' a child doing what is right, that is being "normal," and not doing what is wrong, that is obeying his parent's when it goes against being "normal") by *negating* Hebrews 12:5-11 (*negate* the Father's right to chasten—which engenders *righteousness*—forcing the Father to be tolerant of the child's carnal nature, forcing him to tolerate unrighteousness, that is forcing the Father's will to now be subject to the child's will). The "forbidden" tree (God's tree, that is "Mine not yours," the basis of private property, that is "My land. Not your land.") became everybody's tree ("Our tree," "Our property," "Our land") through the use of dialectic 'reasoning. Dialectic 'reasoning' *negates* respect for other peoples private property, that

is "There land, Not my land," "Their children, Not my children," etc., making all property social, that is that is "Our land," "Our children," etc. thus property rights and sovereignty are *negated*. Dialectic 'reasoning' is *synthesis negating antithesis* by making *thesis* subject to *synthesis* (*reasoning negating the righteousness-sensuousness* conflict by making 'righteousness' subject to *sensuousness*—*negating* the Father over child, God over man, that is "above-below" conflict by making the Father's will subject to the child's will, the Father's thoughts and actions subject to the child's feelings and the child's thoughts, God's will subject to man's will, God's Word subject to man's feelings, thoughts, and actions, that is subject to men's *opinions* and *behavior*, engendering "equality"). By accentuating (focusing upon) the general, the nature of children to approach pleasure and avoid pain, that is being drawn by the environment to "*know* themselves" (to be at-one-with nature), that is "human nature" (man's propensity to "be himself" that is to "be normal"), the issue of *sensuousness* ("felt" needs), you *negate* the specific, the child's disobedience to the Father's command (man's propensity to "sin"), the issue of *righteousness*.

Dialectic 'reasoning,' does not recognize "*sin*" as being the result of man in disobedience to God's will (the children in disobedience to the Father's commands), but instead as being the result of man in disobedience to his own nature (the child in denial of his own true nature, that is still living according to his Father's will, thus alienating himself not only from his own nature but from nature itself, that is from the way of the world itself). According to dialectic 'reasoning,' "*Sin* is the estrangement of man from man." (Leonard F. Wheat, *Paul Tillich's Dialectical Humanism*) According to dialectic 'reasoning,' sin is *not* the estrangement of man from God but instead it is the *preaching and teaching* of the estrangement of man from God—causing alienation, that is causing division between a man and his own nature as well as causing division between the man of *sensuousness* ("human nature," that is the will of the child) and the man of *righteousness* (Godliness, that is doing the will of the Father). Dialectic 'logic' is: if "*[a]lienation is the experience of 'estrangement,'*" then "*[a]lienation has a long history. Its most radical sense already appear[ing] in the biblical expulsion from Eden.*" Therefore, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' God,

that is the Father's authority, that is *righteousness* is "*the anthropological source of alienation.*" (Stephen Eric Bronner, *Of Critical Theory And Its Theorists*) If man is to overcome the cause of alienation and attain "world peace," then the Father's authority and the issue of *righteousness* must be dealt with, that is *negated* in the thoughts and actions of mankind (no longer ruling over "human nature").

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' without man's use of Genesis 3:-16 (dialectic 'reasoning' being put into social action —*praxis*), that is "human reasoning" 'liberating' the "child" out from under the Father's authority, placing him (his feelings and his thoughts, that is his *opinion*) over the Father's authority, and then uniting his *opinion* with the *opinions* of others of like feelings and thoughts (like *opinions*, united in *consensus*) against the "Father's authority," all man has is Hebrews 12:5-11, that is the child's nature ("human nature") being "repressed" by the Father's authority (carnality being restrained by *righteousness*), with man remaining subject to Romans 7:14-25, that is the children remaining subject to the Father's will, alienated from his own nature and the nature of the world. The dialectic ideology is: through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is "*human reasoning*" (Genesis 3:1-6), man can 'justify' himself in his own eyes ('justify' *sensuousness*, that is 'justify' his "felt" needs) and thereby *negate* Hebrews 12:5-11 (*negate righteousness*), resolving the *antithesis* condition of Romans 7:14-15 (*negate* the belief-action dichotomy, that is spirit-flesh conflict and overcome "neurosis" where man is caught between doing either his will and having a "guilty conscience" or doing his Father's will and not "enjoying" life). Through man's use of dialectic 'reasoning,' his conscience is seared (the Father's authority is *negated*), thus making all things that come to his imagination (the imagination of his heart) possible—abomination. In this way, through man's use of dialectic 'reasoning,' "the pursuit of happiness" (carnality) determines the value or worth of "life," defining the meaning of "liberty."

Dialectic 'reasoning,' put into *praxis* (social action is made the "law" of the land, that is the way "business is done"), is mankind having no "guilty conscience" in *negating* the father and *his* authority to have and enforce *his* commands, *restraining* the child's *sensuous* and *spontaneous* 'moment,'

restraining "human nature." The difference between the American and the French revolutions was that the American revolution was over the freedom *of* the conscience, the French was freedom *from* the conscience. One limited the power of government so that the father could rule over his family "well," under God, which engenders the "guilty conscience," and thereby engenders "civil government." The other empowered the government to *negate* the father's authority to rule over his family "well," under God, which *negates* the "guilty conscience," and thereby *negates* "civil government," instead, engendering "totalitarian government." "*We must develop persons who see non-influenceability of private convictions in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue.*" (Kenneth Benne, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*) In other words, we must "develop" (re-educate) the "citizens" to perceive candidates who hold to principles of absolutes, that is who are therefore subject to a "guilty conscience" (when they abandon or vote counter to the platform their constituents put them into office to represent, that is "re-present" in their stead —warning: there is no "re-presentation" or "guilty conscience" in the *consensus* process), as being barriers to social 'change,' that is obstacles to progress. "*We must return to Freud and say that incest guilt created the familial organization.*" (Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*) In other words, not until the government has the authority, and the power, to *negate* the traditional family, with its patriarchal father figure who engenders a "guilty conscience," can we have a nation of abomination. "*Freud noted that ... patricide and incest ... are part of man's deepest nature.*" (Irvin D. Yalom *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*) In other words, government "guided" by departments using the *consensus* process (facilitated by social-psychology) must engender a "new" world order based upon "human nature," 'justifying' "*patricide*" (the *negation* of the father's authority to give commands restraining "human nature" and chasten those under this authority when they disobey him) and "*incest*" (propagating "tolerance of ambiguity," 'justifying' abomination). As the family is 'changed,' the heart of the people are 'changed,' the nation is 'changed,' that is as the family goes the nation goes. If those of dialectic 'reasoning' understand this, what is wrong with the American public? Are they blinded by dialectic 'reasoning,' 'justifying' their deceitful and wicked

hearts as well? The leadership of the nation reflect the heart of the people. God looks at the heart of the people to determine what to do with the nation, judging them and their nation accordingly.

It was through *dialogue*, that is two coming together as "equals," that is man and the world (in this case the woman, "the prince of the power of the air," and "all" the trees in a garden in Eden, the "Father's" tree being the focal point) coming together as "one" in *sensual* understanding (through "*human reasoning*," that is through "self-justification"), that Satan was able to *seduce, deceive, and manipulate* the woman in a garden in Eden, and thereby every man since (all have since followed the same pattern of dialectic 'reasoning,' justifying themselves, that is 'justifying' their carnal desires over and against the Father's will). [Genesis 3:1-6](#) In *dialogue* you *negate* the *threat*, you *negate* the *command*, you *negate* the "*guilty conscience*," and you *negate* the *Father and His authority*. (*Dialogue* is not the same as [discussion](#), which is explained later on, that is in the continuation of this article.)

Jesus would not *dialogue* with the devil, instead he *preached and taught* the words of His Father, "It is written" ("as given" by His Heavenly Father).

He calls all who are His to do the same: to deny themselves (to quit *dialoguing* with themselves to 'justify' their carnal thoughts and carnal actions), to pick up their cross (to quick *dialoguing* with others to find what carnal thoughts they have in common with others and others with them, thereby 'justifying' their carnal nature with men, that is seeking after "the approval of men" but instead, having received "the approval of God" through faith in His only begotten Son Jesus Christ, they are to *preach and teach* the truth as is, even unto death), and follow Him (*preaching and teaching* the truth in His *righteousness*, in His obedience to His Heavenly Father, even unto death). If you 'change' the Word of God, to make it understandable (*reasonable*) to the world, it is no longer the Word of God, it is your *opinion* of God's Word, having no convicting power, having circumvented the conscience. "*Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of*

God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; Persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." 2 Corinthians 4:1-11

Although dialectic 'reasoning' focuses upon the *negation* of *negation*, that is the *negation* of the father and his authority, it also affects the husband wife relationship. While Jesus himself said he came *not* to bring peace but rather to bring a sword, dividing the family ('reconciling' individual souls to His Heavenly Father, above their earthly father, mother, siblings, other, etc. that is all that is of the world), he did not include the husband wife relationship in that division. Instead the scriptures are clear that the husband's body is the wife's and the wife's body is the husband's, that the two become one, with the husband as the head and the desire of the heart of the wife being to her husband (maintaining a top-down authority structure in the family, under God). Through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' that relationship is *negated* as well . It is clear that the husband wife relationship must be strong if the father's authority over the home is to properly function, under God. It is clear as well (or will become clear) why both the husband wife relationship and the father (parent) children relationship is destroyed through their use of dialectic 'reasoning.' This will be explained later on in this article, explained according to the scriptures.

A short example might help make this easier to understand. When an atom is divided (as in a nuclear explosion or in a nuclear reactor) it is not because an electron, proton, or neutron comes in and knocks the atom apart, as a billiard ball (cue ball) does to a rack of balls, it is because it attaches itself to the atom, making the atom unstable (atomically out of balance) and thereby causes it to fly apart. The "nuclear family" is made unstable and will fall apart when the husband brings another woman into the relationship or the wife brings another man into the relationship or the children bring another child or relative (who is deviant, divisive, not respectful of the authority of the father or parents) into the relationship (or the desire of the wife's heart is to herself or to the children instead of to her husband, etc.). In this way, through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' the heart grows cold towards the one in authority. Dialectic 'reasoning' brings the world into the family (or 'liberates' the world in the members of the family), making all "equal" (with everyone "lusting" after the things of the world), *negating* the authority structure of the traditional family. Or as Karl Marx put it, *annihilates* it (which was his intent). Statements by Hegel, Marx, Freud, quoted below, will make this very clear.

If you don't understand the above, you don't understand the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of those possessed by ("*blinded by*") dialectic 'reasoning,' (including those 'driven' by and 'purposed' in propagating the "purpose driven church," "emergent church," "contemplative church," etc), that is men "emerging" out from under ('liberated' themselves from) the restraints of *righteousness*, *becoming* themselves "as they are," 'righteous' in their own eyes —Abomination. Those of dialectic 'reasoning' are not intellectuals, they are emotionalists, and will do whatever it takes to keep that which is theirs, that is their carnal nature.

*While dad is not perfect, the office of authority he serves in is.
It is an office given to him by God, to serve in, under His
authority.*

*It is an office given for the sake of the children,
blessing them, not only by providing for their physical needs
but also*

*by directing them in the ways of righteousness
and restraining them from their own demise.*

*If the "the people" negate the office, they negate themselves,
having given themselves over to tyrants, who will use them for
their own pleasures.*

Abomination.

*"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." Proverb. 3: 5-6*

*"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*

*"And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before
men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly
esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." Luke
16:5*

The dialectic process is now being accepted and used in almost all areas of our lives: in education, in the workplace, in government, in entertainment, in the media, and even in the church (all for the 'purpose' of 'change'). It is the backbone (mindset) of the so called "new" world order. In that "new" order of the world, no one can leave home (buy, sell, or have a home) without it. It is all about 'change,' that is 'changing' the order of things. If you 'change' the "order" you 'change' the *paradigm*. If you 'change' the *paradigm* you 'change' the way people think and act. All three are the same. How you "think and act" is a *paradigm*, and your *paradigm* is revealed in how you order things, that is how you prioritize things—either according to your own feelings of the 'moment' (*impulsive*), according to "human reasoning" (a *subtle* and *complex* process of self 'justifying' of your feelings), or according to faith in God, that is according to the *righteousness* of Christ, that is the Word of God (in the *simplicity* of faith in Christ and in obedience to His Father). *"But I fear, lest by any means, as*

the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." 2 Corinthians 11:3 "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth." Colossians 3:1 "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; 6:8 "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." "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, despiteful, 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 1:25-32 "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; ..." 2 Corinthians 5:10-11 "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." 2 Corinthians 4:16-18

The following paragraphs are the formula for dialectic 'reasoning.' They give a general overview of *how* those of dialectic 'reasoning' see the world and you, as well as *why* they want to 'change' it and you, and *how* they are able to 'change' it and you. Though it may take some mental "wading through" to get to the other side of the swamp of dialectic 'reasoning,' once through you should be able to look back and see from where you have come, being able to better understand where the process wants to take you, is taking you, and has taken you.

According to dialectic 'reasoning': since feelings are ever 'changing,' with man's natural inclinations being to *respond* according to the 'changing' 'moments' of life, then for man to keep in harmony with his feelings (to be at peace with himself and the 'changing' world) the position he holds must be ever 'changing,' that is adaptable to 'change' as well. Truth and knowledge are therefore relative to a persons situation, that is to his life experience, that is to his feelings and thoughts in any given 'moment.' That is why we read such statements, as the following, in education material, material teachers must learn and apply not only on themselves but also in their classrooms, that is upon their students as well. "... *we recognize the point of view that truth and knowledge are only relative and that there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all time and places.*" (Benjamin S. Bloom *Taxonomy of Educational Objective Book 1: Cognitive Domain*) Man's ever 'changing' position being therefore his *praxis* (act) of *spontaneity*, his natural responding to the 'moment' in the 'moment,' and his *praxis* of *sensuousness* being his "affections" or feelings (nervous system) stimulated by something in the environment (the world), engendered his awareness of the world in the 'moment' as well. Man's nature therefore is to respond to the natural stimulations (situations) of life, responding according to *his* own nature, *approaching* that which engenders pleasure (approving the "positive") and avoiding that which engenders pain (disapproving the "negative"), with *reasoning* being used to augment that which engenders pleasure, that is *promoting* that which is "positive," and attenuate that which engenders pain, that is *negating* that which is "negative."

According to dialectic 'reasoning' there are three *paradigms* or ways of thinking and acting: *thesis* or "fixed" position, *antithesis* or feelings (which are changing) that conflict with the *thesis* or "fixed" position (which is unchanging), and *synthesis*, where, through *reasoning*, a person's position and feelings can be united, that is making position feelings and feelings position (making position, "your" position in the 'moment'), that is uniting *your* feelings with *your* thoughts and uniting *your* thoughts with *your* feelings. The dialectic idea being: if you "can not" attach *your* feelings and *your* thoughts to your position, it is not *your* position, it is someone else's position, you have embraced by faith. And then put *your* feelings and thoughts, united as "one," that is as *your* position, into action. Uniting your feelings and thoughts, making them "one," creates *your* position, a position which is adaptable to 'change,' 'changeable' to the 'changing' environment, that is 'changeable' to the 'changing' situations of life. "*Your*" *opinion* (how *you* feel and what *you* think in the 'moment'), and therefore the *opinions* of men, becomes the basis for 'reality.'

Therefore, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' 'reality' is only found in a person's own feelings (what the scriptures call "*the lust of the flesh*," what social-psychologist call consciousness or the "cognitive domain," or Karl Marx called "*sensuous needs*"), in a person's own thoughts (what the scriptures call "*the lust of the eyes*," that is the "*imagination of the heart*," what social-psychologists call self-consciousness or the "affective domain," or as Marx called "*sense perception*"), and in his own actions (his ability to control his own life according to *reason*, what the scriptures call "*the pride of life*," what social-psychologist call *praxis* or human behavior or "psycho-motor domain," that is his ability to make decisions or thinking for himself, all according to his own nature and nature itself, and act upon it, or as Marx called "*sense experience*"), all united as "one" (a person's own nature and nature itself united as one, as the scriptures state "*all that is of the world*," or as Marx stated "*only when it proceeds from Nature*"), removing from his feelings, his thoughts, and his actions anything which (or anyone who) is not of "human nature," that is what Marx called "*praxis*" (therapy or counseling put into social action called the "*consensus*" process).

By *seducing* those of a *thesis* position (people with a fixed position) into participating in a *synthesis* engendering environment (an environment of ever 'changing' "positions," where "positions" are "readily adaptable to 'change'"), an environment supposedly (which "seems to be") used to "help" them overcome an *antithesis* condition (a crisis or a conflict between positions, whether man made or from nature), then by *deceiving* them into believing that the *synthesis* engendering environment (an environment of *mediation*—not *representation*) is being used to solve their crisis (when in fact it is being used to *negate* their *thesis* position, that is 'change' their *paradigm*), those of a *thesis* position can be *manipulated* into a *synthesis* outcome simply by their 'willful' participation within the *synthesis* engendering environment. Thereby *synthesis* based laws or conditions ("ambiguous" laws, readily adaptable to 'change' laws, laws which serve social interests over and against personal values, that is "mission statements") can thereby be engendered from "the people," that is initiated and sustained by "the people," 'changing' how the people of the world are to "do business," that is how they are to feel, think, and act according to 'changing' times. The worth or value of a person (his having a "family," being in business, in government, in education, in the church, etc) is thereafter weighted according to his participation (or his refusal to participate) in dialectic 'reasoning,' that is his "adaptability to 'change'" in a so called "rapidly changing world" being the hallmark (or benchmark) of his worth or value in a so called "new" world order. The *consensus* meeting is being sold (marketed) as a meeting to "help" you fix a problem, when in truth it is a meeting being used to "fix" you instead, that is being used to 'change' your *paradigm*. It is what 'change' (the 'change' process, that is the dialectic process) is all about.

I am not making this up. I have a [bibliography](#) of over 100 books, major publications (out of 600 plus) which I have read and studied on the subject. With the Lord revealing to me, through His Word and by His Holy Spirit, the *seductive*, *deceptive*, and *manipulative* ways of social-psychologists ('change' agents or Transformational Marxists), used to "*get an advantage of us*," I write these articles to expose the "*devices*" used by the enemy of our souls (and our children's souls). "... *Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices.*" 2 Corinthians 2:11

Thesis: If you prioritize things (order or organize things) according to a *patriarchal paradigm* of absolutes or established facts and truth (having to learn and follow rules and commands given by a higher authority, without questioning, obeying them out of fear of judgment and/or chastisement), you prioritize the "past" over (and against) your present experiencing—according to dialectic 'reasoning,' since "life" is only *known* in the 'moment,' commands given by God or the Father are of the "past" holding man to the "past," inhibiting him from the "enjoyment" of the present—that the standards and rules of the "past," guiding you in your present thoughts and actions, are actually restraining you from becoming "yourself," living according to your carnal nature. Reality is therefore determined by someone outside of your present experience. Reality is objective, in an object independent of and greater than your present feelings and thoughts, that is outside of your understanding of the 'moment.' Reality is in a sovereign, that is in someone greater than (stronger than) or above (higher than) your "*sensuous experiences*" of the 'moment,' determining *for* you what is right and what is wrong, what is good and what is evil, therefore ruling over your thoughts and your actions (directing your behavior). This is a condition (system or environment) known as *righteousness*, in that the higher authority is right, that is is reality, that is is first cause ("Because I said so.") in and of himself, determining what is right and wrong, what is good and what is evil for all who are under his authority. The *patriarchal paradigm* is a father initiating and sustaining authority over his children.

Although there are many father's today (biological fathers, that is many with dead children, who they allowed or encouraged their wife to abort), few are *patriarchal in paradigm*, more are acting like children in men's bodies (self-seeking, chasing after the "toys" of the world) than men (self-controlled, ruling over their families well, under God). Most are simply following after their feelings of the 'moment' (*matriarchal in paradigm*) or 'driven' and 'purpose' in getting rid of the father's authority (*negating the patriarchal paradigm*), removing it from the face of the earth in the name of "world peace," "social harmony," and "equality," engendering a "new" world order of 'change' (initiating and sustaining the *heresiarchal paradigm* of 'change').

Antithesis: If you prioritize things according to a *matriarchal paradigm* of "feelings" or of *sensuousness* (your thoughts and your actions are guided by your own nature to approach pleasure and the avoid pain), you prioritize your present experiencing over (and against) the "past" and the future, that is the "past" and the future having no relevance to your present thoughts and actions unless they contribute to your present pleasure or "enjoyment." 'Reality' is therefore subjective, only in you living in and for the 'moment,' that is avoiding pain and pursuing pleasure, determining what is right or wrong, what is good or evil according to the pleasure or the pain it brings you in the 'moment.' This is a condition (system or environment) known as *sensuousness* in that your feelings of the 'moment' are right, that is your feelings of the 'moment' are "reality" in and of themselves, telling you what is right and what is wrong, what is good and what is evil (for the 'moment'). The *antithesis* condition comes into play because of the influence of the *patriarchal paradigm*, that is his chastening, or threat of it, thus engendering a "guilty conscience" when the children remember the father (and his threat) or see the father approaching as they are "doing their own thing."

Synthesis (Take a big breath, paragraph sentences coming): But if you prioritize things according to a *heresiarchal paradigm* of 'change' (where your thoughts and actions are adaptable to 'change,' are subject to the 'changing' conditions or environment around you, where your feelings and your thoughts, which are subjective, are ever 'changing' to initiate and sustain relationship with the ever 'changing' world of the feelings and thoughts of others around you—which are objective when detached from your feelings and thoughts—*synthesizing* the two, your feelings with their feeling and their feelings with your feelings and your thoughts with their thoughts and their thoughts with your thoughts) 'reality' is in the 'moment' where you are uniting with others who are doing the same *evaluation* as you, getting on the "same page" with you, that is with you uniting with them and them uniting with you upon what you and they have in common, that is the *sensuousness* of "your" present feelings and thoughts of the 'moment' and the *sensuousness* of "their" present feelings and thoughts of the 'moment' (to approach pleasure and avoid pain), becoming "one" in the 'moment.' 'Reality' is where all individuals, dialectically detached from the

controlling influences of their families, that is 'liberated' from their father's *patriarchal* authority which "alienates" them from their own nature and from the nature of others (from nature itself), are now *becoming* united as "one," in a society or community of "feelings" and "thoughts," "impulses and urges," *becoming* united through their use of *reasoning* or *human reasoning*, that is dialectic 'reasoning. 'Reality' is everyone prioritize their present experience of the 'moment' as being there *in* past (consciousness), *of* the present being 'discovered' (self-consciousness), and *for* the future being created through dialectic 'reasoning.'

'Reality' is in the 'moment' (in pleasure or in the pleasure of augmenting pleasure, that is in the *affirmation* of the "positive," and in the *negation* of pain or the attenuation of pain, that is in the *negation* of the "negative"—where the phrase "*negation of negation*" comes from, that is the *negation* of the father's authority) with man uniting with man, with human relationship ("the approval of men," that is the pleasure of social approval) being now the highest priority, thus moving all men, united in the 'moment' as "one" in *sensuousness* and *reasoning* (in *consensus*), into the future, into a 'reality' which was there in the "past," (the desire or "sensuous need" to relate with that which is of the world of pleasure in the 'moment,' as a child) but "repressed," that is restrained by the *patriarchal paradigm*, that is by the father, now being 'discover' and 'liberated' through everyone's use of dialectic 'reasoning' (overcome the crisis created by the father-children conflict). According to dialectic 'reasoning,' *reasoning* which is now being used to 'liberate' *sensuousness* (the pleasure, love—Eros of the 'moment') from the restraints of *righteousness* (from the pain, "non-sensuous" love—agape of the "past") was always there in the 'past," only now being 'discovered' and 'liberated' (known or experienced, that is as *Gnosis*) and now being used to *negate* the restraints of the "past" in the present, for the sake of the future, that is a future of "love," that is experiential love, *sensual* love, that is the *sensation* of being 'loved,' receiving pleasure, in the 'moment.' Therefore, *reasoning* (the reasoning of "Why," which was silenced by the father's authority, "Because I said so.", that is the fear of judgment and chastening, causing you to obey his reasoning in the "past") instead of "repressing" you ("What is the reason you do what you do? Because my Father said to do it His way 'or else.'"),

that is fighting against your present feelings, thoughts, and actions, that is "repressing" your natural inclination to relate with the world around you, preventing you from thinking and acting according to your own carnal nature, that is your own *sensuousness*, is now re-attached to your feelings, your *sensuousness*, your carnal human nature, *your understanding* ("enlightenment") is now being used to 'liberate' your thoughts and your action from the restraints of the Father and His authority, from obeying His commands and rules through the fear of His chastening. Dialectic 'reasoning' 'liberates' man from the "past," from the Father's authority.

Therefore, according to dialectic 'reasoning:' the "old" world order of reasoning was: "The reason you think and act the way you do (unnaturally, not according to your own nature) is because God or your Father told you to think and act His way 'or else' He would bring pain into our life." Cause and effect are therefore established above you, above your natural impulses and urges of the 'moment,' judging and restraining them, that is keeping you from becoming at-one-with the world in pleasure, in *sensuousness*. Thus the standards of God or your Father are "repressing" your present thoughts and actions through His use of, or threat of use of pain, that is chastening (engendering a "guilty conscience"). And the "new" world order of *reasoning* is: By *negating* the conditions of the "past," that is by *negating* God's or the Father' effect upon you, His restraining of your thoughts upon and your pursuit of pleasure in the 'moment,' that is "repressing" your natural inclinations to be at-one-with the world of pleasure in the present, by uniting your natural feelings, thoughts, and actions with the natural feelings, thoughts, and actions of the others (with others of like feelings, thoughts, and actions which are, by nature, common to all men), the world *around you, within you, and now with you*, can create a "new" future, a "new" world order void of the restrains and the restrainers of the "past," restraining the present, that is a "new" world order void the "guilty conscience" (engendered by the father) now replaced with the "super-ego" (engendered by "the village"). Explained further down in this article.

Thus mankind, united in the *praxis of consensus, rationally* 'discovering' and building upon the ground which they have in common, that is the

common ground of "human nature," can collectively void the "old" world order, the patriarchal paradigm or top-down way of thinking and acting which prevented the "new" world order from *becoming*. Therefore 'reality' is: you in the world and the world in you, united in the 'moment,' united as "one" in the *praxis* of augmenting pleasure, that is the foundation for a "new" world, with all men 'driven' by human nature, united as one, 'purposed' in creating a world of peace built upon human nature (unrighteousness 'liberated' from the "guilty conscience"). 'Reality' is only in the present world of "*sense experience*" (Karl Marx), that is in the 'moment,' with (and this is the key difference between the *matriarchal* and the *heresiarchal paradigms*) *all men of like feelings, thoughts, and actions*, feeling, thinking, and acting together, that is *sensuously* and *rationally* working together as "one," for a "better" future (in a 'moment' of uninhibited pleasure—not that the future will ever arrive, since it is all about the present 'moment' of pleasure in which a person, or in this case, the collective experiences the pleasure of augmenting pleasure for all of mankind, creating a "new" environment, a "new" order for the world, that is an order of so called "equality" whereby *every* man can 'discover' and put dialectic 'reasoning' into practice, that is into social action (*praxis*) 'justifying' his carnal nature—abomination—uniting all mankind as "one" through putting man's carnal nature into action, acting as "one" *negating* all that is not of the "one," that is *negating* that which is not of human nature—this is the *praxis* of Sodom and the Tower of Babel *synthesized* , that is "*theory and practice*" united upon "human nature" only.

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' 'reality' has three aspects. 1) 'Reality' is the *praxis* of *negating* the restraints (restrainers) of the "past," *negating* the fear of the "restrainer" in man's mind and removing any social heritage of His that is left in the present ("recycling" what is of the "past" so that it can be recreated according to the "sensuous needs" of the present, for the "sense perceived needs" or imagined needs of the "future"). 2) 'Reality' is also the *praxis* of you along with the world *negating* the restraints (restrainers) in the present, those of the "past" in your presence in the present. 3) And 'reality' is "We working for Us." *negating* the condition (system, environment, or *paradigm*) which might engender (recreate) the restraints (restrainers) in the "future." In a "new" world order there can be

no restraints (restrainers) of the "past," inhibiting the present, or in the present, preventing the future. Thus in a "new" world order there must be continuous "counseling" of all its "citizens" through the *consensus* process, that is through their participation in dialectic 'reasoning,' if the world is to be freed of *righteousness*, that is "purged" of the "old" world order of the *patriarchal paradigm* maintaining its affects upon present, and the future world. " *It is necessary, in other words, artificially to create an experiential chasm between parents and children—to insulate the children in order that they can more easily be indoctrinated with new ideas. If one wishes to mold children in order to achieve some future goal, one must begin to view them as superior. One must teach them not to respect their tradition-bound elders, who are tied to the past and know only what is irrelevant.* " (Warren Bennis, *The Temporary Society*)

I placed quotation marks around the word past since according to dialectic 'reasoning' there is no "living God," Spirit or Father of authority, who's position of authority is never changing, outside of the human "experience" of the 'moment' (outside the human spirit of "sensation"), who's standards apply to all times and places, that is not only in the past, but also in the present and the future—which is a condition of *righteousness*. According to dialectical 'reasoning' there is no reality outside of the "here-and-now," that is beyond the child with his natural inclinations, responds to the current situation (approaching whatever in nature engenders pleasure and avoiding whatever in nature engenders pain). Reality is in the 'moment,' in the *sensation* of being and *becoming*, where man is ever 'changing' in his response to the ever 'changing' environment which he lives within, where man, in the 'moment' is doing what comes natural, getting to know, that is unite with the things of the world. Anything or anyone outside of this experience—outside of man's common desire to know himself as being at-one-with the world (man seeking pleasure from the world) and the world being at-one-with him (man receiving pleasure from the world)—restraining or blocking his 'moment' of experiencing, that is his 'moment' of pleasure, that is preventing him from knowing, that is being at-one-with his own nature and the nature of the world in the 'moment,' is an illusion, and according to dialectic 'reason' is a condition that must be treated as reality (to the person under the Father's authority a reality of

"neurosis") and overcome through proper "health care" methods. Therefore, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' "good" health resides in man's adaptability to 'change, that is to his ability to *rationally* 'change' with the 'changing' times in the "present." It does not reside in his faith in what or who is of the "past," unchangeable in the "past" and/or the future. The scriptures declare that dialectic 'reasoning' as anathema, as the spirit of antichrist, as abomination, for "[e]very good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." James 1:17 We serve a living God (and a living savior) who is *in* the world today. He is not *of* the world. That is the god of the world, "*the prince of the power of the air*" "helping" man unite his carnal nature with the carnal world he lives within, like a drug addict, living only in and only for the *sensuous* 'moment,' his thoughts and his actions 'driven' by and 'purposed' in the augmentation of pleasure (the 'liberation' of licentiousness and abomination in the present) and the attenuation of pain (the *negation* of the restraints of *righteousness* of the "past").

The dialectic trickery of the facilitator of 'change' is not to attack the restrainer ("the resistor of 'change,'" the father and his authority) outright, but rather to try to "convert" him first, that is *seduce, deceive, and manipulate* him and those who follow him (as he did his children) into participation in the process first. But, if that does not work, if he maintains his faith in the "'old' way of doing things," then "the people," that is the "grass roots," that is his children who have become "converted," those addicted to the pleasures (their "new" found "freedom") engendered through their participation in the process, those addicted to the "here-and-now" unencumbered by the rules and commands of the "past," will remove him (consider him "irrational" and therefore "irrelevant")—deriving pleasure, like "scientists" do when they work on projects that are personal to them, in *negating* the "barriers" that gets in the way of pleasure, that is *negating* the "pain" of *righteousness* (which comes through chastening), that is *negating* the father's authority, not only in themselves, that is in their thoughts and actions but also in the thoughts and actions of all "the people" of the world. "The people" thus derive pleasure through the laws of the land they "helped" pass, that is the laws of lawlessness, that is laws of

ambiguity (tolerating ambiguity), laws which are engendered through the *consensus* process, where "all" "the people," or so it seems, 'willingly' participated in the dialectic process of 'change,' that is in the *praxis* of *negating righteousness* in their private thoughts and in their public actions—what "public-private partnership" is really all about. History has warned us of such *praxis*. But then, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' history does not repeat itself, it just *progressively negates* the father's authority, so that man can move ever closer to a "new" world order, a world of "*loosely defined rules*" and "*spontaneous changes in rules to best*" serve the process of 'change.' "*Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state* [to best serve the interest of 'change'] ." (R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, *Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law*) Bracketed information added. "*The movement of the progressive societies has been uniform in one respect. Through all its course it has been distinguished by the gradual dissolution of family dependency and the growth of individual obligations in its place. The individual is steadily substituted for the family as the unit for which civil laws take account.*" (Sir Henry Sumner Main, *Freedom of Expression and Dissent in the Soviet Union*) You must detach "the people" (the children) from their conscience (from their fathers) and remove the conscience (the fathers) from "the people" (from the children) if you are to use them for social cause, that is for social 'change.'

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' *sensuousness*, that is time and space—*approach pleasure-avoid pain*—is the only domain (the "affective domain") that man can comprehend, that *righteousness* ("I'm above, ruling over you below, directing your steps, with you obeying me whether I make *sense* (it is pleasurable) to you or not in the 'moment.' Whether you like it or not, you are to walk in faith, that is according to My *righteousness*"), that is that *righteousness* (being told what is right and what is wrong, what is good and what is evil), that is that which is only in and of God alone, that is outside of man's *reasoning* (dialectic 'reasoning') abilities, who can only *reason* according to his own *sensuousness*, according to his own nature, according to his own "life experiences," thinking and acting according to sight, that is according to his own "*sensuous needs*" and

"sense perception." (Karl Marx) As you will see, by using the dialectic process, by using dialectic 'reasoning,' that is the so called "scientific method" on man (as in "behavior science"), you can only define man according to his own carnal nature, that is according to "the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes," and "the pride of life," according to the law of sin—where his reasoning ability, that is his "wisdom" is wrapped around the augmentation of pleasure (and the attenuation of pain), that is "wisdom" being man's ability to initiate and sustain a world of pleasure, according to dialectic 'reasoning', not only for himself but for all of mankind. The *praxis* of using "science" (the dialectic process) on man, defining him according to his own nature, *negates* anything outside of his "sense experience" of the 'moment,' *negates* faith (the *preaching and teaching*, that is the inculcating of truth). *"Science is only genuine science when it proceeds from sense experience, in the two forms of sense perception and sensuous need, that is, only when it proceeds from Nature."* Karl Marx MEGA I/3 By defining man, prioritizing his life, according to the "scientific" method, man is materialized, made at-one-with the creation only, that is *negating* the creator, that is *negating* God, that is *negating* the Father's authority.

If you 'change' the way people think and act, if you 'change' the "order" from the "old" to the so called "new," if you 'change' the *paradigm from a patriarchal pattern*, where the Father rules, that is a Father centered environment where the children say "What will dad (or God) say?" that is a "top-down," "above-below" system, *to a heresiarchal pattern*, where the children (*their* feelings and *their* thoughts) rule, that is child centered, "If it feels good, do it.", that is an "equality" system, you 'change' the world—you 'change' the condition or standard whereby not only the worth or value of your home or business is determined but also the worth or value of your very own life is determined. In other word, if you don't participate in the process of 'change,' if you don't 'change' your *paradigm*, if you don't change the way you think and act, since "everyone else is doing it," you will be classified as being "irrational." Therefore you will be treated as being "irrelevant" if you keep holding onto your "old fashioned" way of thinking and acting, your "old" paradigm, your "old" unchangingness, your faith, that is you will become worthless and of no

value. Once you get past all the philosophers philosophical verbiage, used to cover their tracks (to remove the conscience from the mind), it all comes down to the Father-children relationship, either the Father is in authority, restraining the children, the Father is absent for a while (and the children are "doing their own thing" hoping not to get caught, that is still having a "guilty conscience"), or the children rule, unrestrained except by their hope for more carnal pleasure, ruling in anarchy, that is in lawlessness, living according to their ever-changing "felt" needs of the 'moment.'

Carl Rogers believed in and propagated a dialectical "new" world order. He wrote: "*Life, at its best, is a flowing, changing process in which nothing is fixed.*" "*The good life is not any fixed state. The good life is a process. The direction which constitutes the good life is psychological freedom to move in any direction [where] the general qualities of this selected direction appears to have a certain universality.*" "*Consciousness, instead of being the watchman over a dangerous and unpredictable lot of impulses, becomes the comfortable inhabitant of a society of impulses and feelings and thoughts.*" (Carl Rogers, *on becoming a person*) We paid him well (with our tax dollars), and others like him, so that he could show our teachers and ministers how to use the dialectic process on us and on our children.

As you will come to understand, psychology serves only one purpose, and one purpose only, the *negation* of the father's authority in the lives of the children. When the *opinions* of the children, that is expressed in the language of "*I feel,*" and "*I think,*" become the foundation of communication in the home, then the father's authority to give commands without question (to *preach and teach*), that is expressed in the language "You can" and "You can not," "Because I said so" and the use chastising when he is disobeyed or his command is not carried out, is *negated*. Language is a product of culture, that is culture engenders a particular language. Thus, the language of a *patriarchal* culture (where the father rules) is a language of *preaching and teaching*, a language of "Thou shalt not ... or else." But the language of a *heresiarchal* culture (where the children rule) is a language of *dialogue*, a language of "Well, I feel" and "Well, I think" While both cultures (and languages) can intermingle for a period, only one can maintain a position of authority or influence, that is

one culture having to submit or succumb to the other. For example: when the child responds with a "Why?" (to engender *dialogue*, to free himself from the father's authority) and the father responds with "Because I said so." to retain his position of authority, two cultures have become manifest, the culture of permissiveness and the culture of authority. If the culture of authority goes into *dialogue*, in response to the "Why?" it must abdicate the "Because I say so." And if the other culture accepts the "Because I said so" it must accept the authority of the father and abdicate its "Why?" All I have to do is bring both cultures together over a "crisis" and move the language in the meeting from *preaching and teaching* ("Because I say so") to *dialogue* ("Why?") and I will *negate* the one culture, replacing it with the other.

The answers (the *paradigm*) is in the questions. By asking "How did you feel ...?" and "How do your feel ...?" or "What did you thing ...?" or "What do you think ...?" type questions, you engender a world of *dialogue* and *opinions*, you *negate* a world of "It is written." and "Because I said so.", that is a world of the *preaching and teaching* of facts and truths to be learned, memorized, and obeyed without question, you *negate* a *patriarchal paradigm* engendering environment. The 'preaching and teaching' done in a dialectic world (the "new" world order) is done to 'encourage' all to participate in the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus*, so as to *negate* the world of the *preaching and teaching* of truth (the "old" world order of the *patriarchal paradigm*).

Psychology, based upon dialectic 'reasoning,' that is based upon the language of the child, that is the language of *sensuousness* and 'self-justification' for the child's carnal behavior, that is the language of "I feel" and "I think," *negates* the language of the father, *negates* the fathers authority over the child, *negates* the language of *righteousness*, that is *negates* the language of God ("It is written"), that is "I am above you, that is the creator in authority, and you are below me, that is the created subject to my will, therefore do what I say or else, ... because I said so." Just reading that makes the flesh, that is the carnal "child within," rise up in rebellion, wanting his way. That spirit of the "child within" is the spirit of "the children of disobedience," it is the stirring of dialectic 'reasoning'

waiting to be "birthed," that is 'discovered,' 'liberated,' and used , that is it is "the way" of the so called "new" world order, *negating* the authority of the father and "redeeming" the child so that man can be himself "again." I write "again" because according to Gnostic 'reasoning,' that is dialectic 'reasoning,' knowing is not being told to do something you are not able to understand, that is not sensually relate with yourself, yet doing it in obedience, it is experiencing something in life for yourself and then deciding (like a scientist) whether it is a good thing to do or not, approach pleasure-avoid pain being the tool of measurement (with pleasure and pain meaning different things to different people). That is why "tolerance of ambiguity" is such a popular phrase today. It means accepting uncertain, that is 'change,' as a way of life, with no one "directing your steps" (no father or "standard bearer"), with only the "sense experience" of the 'moment' to guide you, that is man experiencing himself as he is in the 'moment,' in the 'situation,' This is the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of psychology. It has had more effect upon the families of this nation than any other "ology," that is *negating* the father's authority in the home, in the name of "family harmony," for the 'purpose' of "social harmony," for the 'purpose' of a "new" world order.

According to those of dialectic 'reasoning,' to have the "new" you must *negate* (get rid of) the "old." When the father's rule over the children (the "old" *paradigm*), the children "can not" do what they want to do, that which comes naturally. If the children are to do what comes naturally, they must unite as one upon what they have in common, that is what they do naturally (the "new" *paradigm*) and *negate* the father and his authority (*negate* the "old" paradigm), that is doing a so called "paradigm 'shift.'" Run that through the history books, that is all the communist, socialist, and democratic revolutions, and see if that doesn't "jell." The *proletariat* being the children and the *bourgeoisie* being the parent or those who support them in their way of thinking and acting. The American Revolution was a revolution to establish authority in the conscience of the people, a product, as you will come to understand if you don't already, that can only come from a father's authority. The Constitution (particularly the Bill of Rights) presented us with a "Constitutional Republic." It established the father, the head of the home, as king, limiting the power of government, giving him

the power and authority to develop a conscience in the next generation of citizens. A Constitutional Republic form of government, which limits the power of government, serves and protects the traditional family, and thereby perpetuates the *patriarchal paradigm* which initiates and sustains the "old" way of thinking and acting within the next generation, keeping the next generation of children subject to their father's authority. A direct attack upon the family, by an outside force or from the child within, would fail because of the determination and strength of the fathers, united as one to maintain their position of authority. Therefore the "old" world order, where the fathers who rule, preventing the children from doing what comes naturally, must be *negated* by the children, united as "one," united with a "can to" attitude against their fathers "can not" position, creating within themselves and eventually all the world the "new" world order. Without the authorization of laws and the power of government to "serve and protect the children" in their *negating* of the Father's authority, there can be no "new" world order, for the very act (*praxis*) of *negating* the father's authority, so that the children (man's carnal nature unrestrained by *righteousness*) can rule, is the "new" world order itself. It is the theme of counseling: *"Prior to therapy the person is prone to ask himself 'What would my parents want me to do?' During the process of therapy the individual comes to ask himself 'What does it mean to me?'"* (Carl Rogers, *On Becoming a Person*) It is the theme of psychology: *"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 [the father no longer 'rules' over his family] ."* (Sigmund Freud in Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*) It is the theme of Sociology: *"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, Thesis on Feuerbach #4) And it was the theme used in a garden in Eden: [Genesis 3:1-6](#)

Without the Father and his authority (a top-down system), all you have are the children (an "equality" system), evaluation themselves, the world, and the father, from their own perspective, from their carnal (Fatherless, that is Godless) nature. Thus, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' only through the

children can all become "equal" (read *totalitarianism*). According to George Hegel, equality can only come through the children *negating* the authority of the Father, that is that it is only through the child (void the Father's unquestioned direction or restraint) that "rationality" resides. 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, 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*) This is the foundation of dialectic 'reasoning,' "*the child within*" being freed from the image (the authority structure) of the Father, so that all that is, can become the property of "all" mankind (read *communism*, that is *globalism*, that is the so called "*new*" world order). The role of the facilitator, during a *consensus* meeting, is to *neutralize*, *marginalize*, and *remove*, if necessary, the father's authority from the policy setting environment, preventing him from maintaining a patriarchal paradigm within the community, affecting "the peoples" thoughts and their actions—preventing 'change,' preventing the *praxis* of the dialectic process, preventing "*the children of disobedience*" from *negating* his authority over his family, his property, and his life, preventing social-psychologist, that is Transformational Marxists—Marx, sociology and Freud, psychology synthesized—from taking control over the development of the citizens of the future, preventing 'change agents' from destroying "civil society."

You read me right, "civil society" is the enemy of dialectic 'reasoning.' Jean-Jacques Rousseau put it this way: "*The first man who, having fenced in a piece of land, said 'This is mine,' and found people naive enough to believe him, that man was the true founder of civil society. From how many crimes, wars, and murders, from how many horrors and misfortunes might not any one have saved mankind, by pulling up the stakes, or filling up the ditch, and crying to his fellows: Beware of listening to this impostor; you are undone if you once forget that the fruits of the earth belong to us all, and the earth itself to nobody.*" (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on Inequality*) Emphasis added. Freud, along the same line of thought as Rousseau, believed that the "guilty conscience," the residue of the Father's

authority within the child, was the main cause for the "*neurosis of civilization*," that is that a "civil society," a citizenry under the influence of their Father's commands and threat of punishment for disobedience (thus subject to a "guilty conscience," that is wanting to take that which is "not theirs" to take but not being able to because the Father told them it was "not theirs" to take, that is "It is mine," or "someone else's" property, or wanting to do that which is natural, but is wrong according to the Father's standards, that is standards which restrain their natural inclinations of the 'moment') is a society of "neurotics" (not being able to do what "they" want to do in the 'moment,' That is, satisfying their "felt" needs, that is satisfy the "lust" of their "flesh" and their "eyes"). According to dialectic 'reasoning' (the method of *reasoning* which both Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud had in mind), man can *only* get rid of the "neurosis," (according to Marx the "repression" and "alienation") and become "normal" again (as he was before the Father's first command and threat of judgment) is by getting rid of the Father's (God's) authority (in their mind and in their behavior, that is in their thoughts and in their actions—"*theory and practice*," where men's *opinions*, that is *reasoning*, and their natural inclinations, that is *human nature*, are re-united as "one," making mankind God and the earth theirs, collectively). The scriptures declare it otherwise, that is that the earth is the Lord's and that we, likewise, are under His (and His Heavenly Father's) authority: "*For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.*" 1 Corinthians 10:26 Regarding our biological fathers, the Lord goes even further by declaring that they are also under His Heavenly Father's authority, making His Heavenly Father our Father, first and foremost. "*And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your father, which is in heaven.*" Matthew 23:9 "*For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.*" Matthew 12:50 "*Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my father which is in heaven.*" Matthew 7:21 Therefore, a "society" under the "influence" of the Father, that is under God, is a "civil society" and, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' must be *negated* if man is to become "normal."

The transformational Marxist, Erick Fromm, clearly explained the 'drive' (the "driver") behind and the 'purpose' (his intended outcome) of dialectic

'reasoning,' that is the *negation* of God (the Father figure) so that "*man would become like God himself*" (become like the Father himself), 'righteous' in and of himself (with no one above him "bossing" him around, that is directing his steps). He wrote: "*In the process of history man gives birth to himself* [through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' he delivers himself from God, from the Father, creating himself in his own image] . *He becomes what he potentially is* [a human being, that is only man] , *and he attains what the serpent —the symbol of wisdom and rebellion —promised, and what the patriarchal, jealous God of Adam did not wish: that man would become like God himself* ['righteous' in and of himself] ." (Erick Fromm, *You shall be as gods*;) Bracketed information added. Genesis 3:1-6 is how "new" the so called "new" world order is. The only difference being, other than the time of the Tower Babel, which was *local*, but still with mankind united as one, without God, that is without the Father directing their steps, that is "make a name for 'ourselves,'" "ourselves" being plural, that is collective being the operative word), it is now, for the first time *global*—"Think local, act global." being the dialectic theme of the day.

Without man's ability to 'justify' himself before man (through his use of dialectic 'reasoning' being able to 'justify' his human nature as being "normal"), all he has is faith in God (the Father) and a "guilty conscience" (for being "normal," that is for doing his will, that is following after his own *sensuousness*, doing that which is "natural,' according to "human nature," that which is of the world, instead of doing the Father's will, that is following after His *righteousness*, obeying God, who is not of the world). "Salvation" for the "humanist" is through man's ability to 'justify' himself before the world, comparing himself with that which is of nature, that is his ability to think dialectically. We are all born with this ability. But not until a facilitator of 'change,' that is like the serpent in a garden in Eden, comes along and (in a "non-hostile," "non-judgmental," "You will not die," environment) shows us how to use it (the dialectic process, that is *human reasoning* , that is self-justification, by comparing ourselves with the world, coming to know the world which lies within us) can we 'discover' and know (*Gnosis*) a "new" world order and 'liberate' ourselves from the

"old" world order, where we were subject to faith in and obedience to our fathers, that is especially our Heavenly Father.

The seeds of our own condemnation lie within us. As the Apostle Paul wrote: "*O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?*" Romans 7: 25a The *thesis-antithesis* of life and death is between the flesh and the Spirit, life and death determined upon where or whom our mind is established. "*For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.*" (Romans 8:5-8) Through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' through man's ability to deceive himself and 'justify' his wicked heart by *synthesizing* the two, that is *synthesis* the Spirit and the flesh (through dialectic 'reasoning,' that is through "human understanding," that is through man's carnal perception, observing and defining what he and God have in common as attributes, that is "love," which is the *praxis* of *sensitizing righteousness*, that is humanizing God), the mind after the Spirit is *negated* (the Spirit being redefined as a "cosmic spirit," that is the mind of man 'discovering' that he is "one," that is *becoming* "one" with himself and the "community," that is through *dialogue becoming* at-one-with the world outside himself, 'discovering' what he has in common with all men, and then through community service, through *communitization*, *becoming* "one," that is one spirit in *praxis* with the world, *negating* the Father who commands, His laws which condemn, the Son of God who redeems, and the Spirit who brings us life and peace, all who *only work alone together*, that is not in need of human partnership and understanding to 'discover' and know, that is *Gnosis* themselves). Paul continued in Romans 7:25b and 26 with the only right response: "*I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.*" He then went on to explain that the law can not save us, that it can only expose our carnal nature, that is condemning us as sinners. That it is through the law of faith, through faith in Christ alone, that we are freed from condemnation, that we are

redeemed, our mind then, being after the Spirit, being set upon things above, being led by the Spirit, overcoming our carnal nature (daily).

Where then can we go, or to whom can we turn, to get away from our use of dialectic 'reasoning?' *"But to the Lord,"* the only begotten Son of God—who was, and is, obedient to His Heavenly Father in all things, even unto death, and has called us to do the same, that is *to follow him, thereby walking in his way, thinking and acting according to His paradigm (in obedience to His Heavenly Father in all things)*, denying ourselves, accepting the rejection of men, that is rejecting "the approval of 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 10:5, that is refusing to participate in dialectic 'reasoning,' refusing to go the way of the so called "new" world order, *refusing to follow after the way of "the children of disobedience," refusing to participating in the heresiarchal paradigm of 'change.'* We are to instead, *"put on the whole armour of God"* and *"stand"* in Him, *"withstand[ing] in the evil day,"* that is standing with Him in the evil day. [Ephesians 6:10-18](#). With the "church" having embraced dialectic 'reasoning' to "grow itself" (becoming "one" with the world) the believer has only the Lord Jesus Christ to turn to for direction (as it should be, that is turning to His Word, lead by the Holy Spirit, making his requests be known unto His Heavenly Father) during these evil days, that is days of abomination.

The following information, while possibly being hard to understand by a "traditionalist" (a "fundamentalist," that is one who always believed that right is always right and wrong is always wrong) will sound familiar to anyone involved in the "contemporary," that is so called "rapidly changing" social setting. Yet it is the "traditionalist" I hope to inform on what is happening around us (as well as to us and our loved ones). I will get into the "academics" of the process (statements by Hegel, Marx, Freud, Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, Theodor Adorno, etc.) but first some scriptures to expose the so called "new" world order, that is a world initiated by and sustained through the use of dialectic 'reasoning.' I realize that by doing so, that is turning to the scriptures to expose the dialectic

process, the "*enlightened*," those of dialectic 'reasoning' (be they "Christian" or not) will dismiss the following articles as being "irrational," and therefore "irrelevant," especially when it comes to their lives. But without the Word of God all we have is our *opinions*, theories, speculations, and conjectures, that is that which is the basis of dialectic 'reasoning'. All I have to do is convince you (*seduce, deceive, and manipulate* you) into believing that the Word of God is "your opinion," and I have succeeded in taking you captive to dialectic 'reasoning.'

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' before man can be himself, he must first *negate* the "top-down" system which engenders a *thesis-antitheist* condition (I'm above, You're below, system). Without the dialectic process, that is without the concept of *synthesis*, man can not overcome the *thesis-antithesis* conflict (and the "guilty conscience"). With God there is only *thesis* (His love of *righteousness*) and antithesis (our love of *sensuousness*, that is unrighteousness). There is no *synthesis*, that is no merging of the two, that is no merging of *righteousness* with *sensuousness* and *sensuousness* with *righteousness* to make them one, that is the same, or equal. Without dialectic 'reasoning,' that is without *reasoning negating* the differences between the two (overcoming that which separates man from God and God from man), the "new" world order can not be actualized. Therefore, *reasoning* must be "realized" and "liberated" (accomplished through the use of a 'crisis,' that is through the "need" to resolve a *thesis-antithesis*—deadlocked—conflict), so that man can observe and define what man and God, what the Father and the children, have in "common." Without *negating* the "top-down" way of thinking and acting (the *preaching and teaching* of pre-established, that is unchanging and unchangeable positions), without dialectically 'discovering' (through the *dialoguing of opinions*) that man is in God and God is in man (the universal and the particular 'discovering' that they are "one," that is both wanting to be restored to an at-one-ness with the other), world unity is not possible. Only through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' the theory goes, can both God and man 'discovering' themselves as always having been "one," only for a time separated by the demands of *righteousness* (according to the Marxist, Theodor Adorno, under the rule of an "the authoritarian personality," that is the earthly father, who according to Adorno, engenders

the Heavenly Father). But now, through 'dialectic' *reasoning*, that is mankind, *reasoning* together, 'discovering' and uniting upon what he has in common, as God, can *become* "one" again, 'righteous' in and of himself, that is collectively speaking. Since, according to dialectic 'reasoning, there is no "one" above him, setting standards that restrain his nature, that is *sensuousness* and 'righteousness, mankind and God, 'driven' by the desire for and 'purposed' in the sharing of "love," can be reunited as "one." 'Righteousness' is man now "purified" of all that is not of his nature, now able to "love" others as he desires to be "loved" ("love" based upon human nature being "approved" that is tolerated by men), that is his 'righteousness' (his desire for "oneness," based upon human nature only, that which is common to all men) now "observable" to all *human eyes*, "understandable" to all *human ears*, and "definable" through *human reasoning*. This is the number of "a man" (measurable), the "mark of the beast" (definable and classifiable) which all must have if they are to be a part of the "community" (common-unity, as in, "It is *only* in what we all have in common, that is our carnal human nature, that is that which we can all 'discover' and 'liberate' through our use of dialectic 'reasoning,' we can build world unite upon."). Therefore, every one *must* develop "*human relationship building skills*," that is learn how to use "*higher order thinking skills*" in initiating and sustaining morals and ethics ("democratic ethics"), if mankind is to become a "community," that is if he is to be of any worth or have any value in the "new" world order.

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' it is only in the "experiencing" of *common-ism* ('discovering,' focusing upon, and uniting upon that which we all have in common—*sensuousness*, with *reasoning* 'liberating' it from the restraints of *righteousness*, the children no longer having to do the Father's will when it goes against their nature), that the divisiveness of *righteousness* (the thesis-antithesis condition) can be overcome and man and God (God loving the world and man loving the world) can be united as one again, that is with the God above, ruling over and judging man below "withering away" in the thoughts and actions of men. As the Father "withers away," the Son "withers way," and then all you have is man as God. Without the *reasoning*, without the *synthesis*, without focusing upon what we have in common, that is being "positive," that is "loving," and no

longer focusing upon what makes us different, that is being "negative," that is being "hateful," without the children of *sensuousness* uniting as "one" through the *consensus* process (*consensus* means "*with sensuousness*"), apprehending through *reasoning* and 'changing' the world according to their own "human nature," the "new" world order of "equality" can not *negate* the "old" world order of "higher authority," that is of *righteousness*, that is of the Father ruling over His creation, that is of the father's ruling over their families, their properties, and their businesses, causing division amongst men. Without the *reasoning*, that is dialectic 'reasoning, that is without the ability and the opportunity to 'justify' your carnal human thoughts and your carnal human actions before men, a world of unity built upon "human nature" can not become actualized.

Some might want you to accept the idea that this process is "academics." But in truth it is spiritual. "*Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints;*" Ephesians 6:10-18 Emphasis added.

The Apostle Paul warned Timothy of the effects of the dialectic process, that is the effects of the *consensus* process upon faith (*negating* it), a process of *sensuousness* and *reasoning* (of *human reasoning* being used to 'justify *human nature*, that is 'justifying' our *sensuousness* over and against the *righteousness* of God), that is a process of "*questioning authority*," that is of "*questioning everything*," a process of "*profane and vain babblings*,

and oppositions of science falsely so called," a process of 'change' and instability, a process of unrighteousness, lawlessness, and abomination, a process of *seduction, deception, and manipulation*, a process of sight, that is of men's *opinions negating* faith, that is *negating* God's Word, by making faith subject to sight, that is *righteousness* subject to *sensuousness*, His Word subject to human experience and understanding (subject to human "wisdom"), a process being used by man to make the world a "better" place for him to live within, that is creating a "new" world order uninhibited by the demands of *righteousness*, freeing man from a "guilty conscience," 'liberated' him from the fear of judgment carried out by a higher authority than nature, a process *negating* God's condemnation of man for his willful disobedience, that is for his sin, that is for being "human." The same warning Paul gave Timothy is true for believers today: "*O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: Which some professing have erred concerning the faith.*" 1 Timothy 6:20, 21

The word "*oppositions*" (as used by Paul) is the Greek word *antithesis*. Except, in this case it is not the *antithesis* of true science, which means truth is a *categorical imperative*, that is universal and unquestionable, established once and for all, for all times and all places, as in "*two plus two is four*" (is a *thesis* statement, that is is an *a-prior*), and therefore any other number, answer, *opinion*, theory, speculation, conjecture, etc. is an *antithesis*, that is is an error, that is is wrong (the *thesis* position being established forever that "*two plus two is four and can not be any other number,*" judging all other responses from then on, whether they be true, that is "*two*" or false, that is "*any other number*"). In other words, any response or conclusion other than the *thesis* position, is an *antithesis*, that is is in opposition of (*over and against*) the truth. In true science you are either right or you are wrong, whereas in an *opinion* or a *theory* there is no certainty of right or wrong in the 'moment,' as all is up in the air, subject to conjecture or speculation, subject to 'change.'

This is the "*antithesis*" of which the Apostle Paul speaks of, the "*science falsely so called,*" that is the "*science*" of dialectic 'reasoning' where men's *opinions* or *theories* are treated as though they are "truth," that is tested in

the *consensus* process to see if they are accurate, that is "observable and definable" regarding the human experience of the 'moment' and then carried out in *praxis* (put into social action) to see if they are "true," all in defiance to the truth (treating established truth as being "irrational" in the 'moment' of 'change,' in the 'changing' times, and therefore regarding anyone who insists upon "inalienable" truth, that is unchangeable truth, as being "irrelevant")—an anarchistic and revolutionary attitude expressed today in the language of "*question authority*," "*question everything*," where human "*perception*" and human *reasoning*, based upon a person's own "*sense experience*" of the 'moment' (subjectivity) becomes the bases, that is the *only* bases, for knowing 'truth,' with man 'driven' by the *sensuousness* of pleasure and 'purposed' in its augmentation (whether real or imagined), that is the "enjoyment" of this life being the end of all things.

A major workbook used to 'change' this nation, detailing how to initiate and sustain the dialectic process of 'change,' explained its so called "scientific" project this way: "*No hypothesis in this body of writings has been fully tested. Nor will it be tested fully until it has been used widely in thoughtful experimentation with actual social changes. The school offers an important potential laboratory for the development of a truly experimental social science. Experimentally minded school workers can develop and improve the hypotheses suggested in these readings as they put them to the test in planning and evaluating changes in the school program.*" (Kenneth Benne, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*) Emphasis in original. The author of that workbook later published a work entitled: *The Laboratory Method of Changing and Learning, Theory, and Practice*. Ed. Benne He made the following comment a few years later: "*If the school does not claim the authority to distinguish between science and religion, it loses control of the curriculum and surrenders it to the will of the electorate.*" (*Society as Educator in an Age of Transition*, Ed. Kenneth Benne, Eighty-sixth Year of the National Society for the Study of Education.) Emphasis added, that is Who are the electorate? The author of another major workbook (referred to as "Bloom's Taxonomy"), a workbook of the 50's still being used to train teachers in college today, defined his teacher training manual, in this way: "*Certainly the Taxonomy was unproven at the time it was developed and may well be 'unprovable.'*"

(Benjamin S. Bloom, *Bloom's Taxonomy: A Forty Year Retrospect*) Bloom even referred to his "*special project*" (that we are all now subject to as a culture) as the opening up of "*Pandora's Box,*" that is a box full of evil, which, once opened, can never be closed. You might question whether someone has the right to 'change' a culture without their being asked or forewarned, but to question the "experts" on "human nature," would only result in you being labeled as being "irrational," making you "irrelevant" when it comes to the matters of your life or your grandchildren's life. They will have to determine your worth or value when you get old, that is when you are a burden on society as well as your grandchildren's life, as they decide their personal-social worth or value, after they are conceived, "*don't touch my 'pleasure,'*" now being the theme of the day.

By using the methods of "science" on human behavior, you automatically make human behavior (man's "lust" for pleasure) the standard from which to measure human behavior. Therefore, from then on, any behavior which is not supported by (or supportive of) your observations (your "sense perception") can not be considered credible, that is becomes "irrelevant." Bloom knew that by using the methods of true science on human nature, thereafter, the outcome would *negate righteousness* from the laboratory experience, that is from the classroom experience, that is *righteousness* (the authority of God, reflected in the father figure) from then would have now credibility in regards to "academics," that is in regards to acceptable behavior, in regards to the appropriate way of thinking and acting in a dialectic 'reasoning' world. Bloom wrote (remember that all teachers in the public and private schools are being inculcated with this ideology today, it being the basis of their teacher certification and the schools accreditation): "*It has been pointed out that we are attempting to classify phenomena which could not be observed or manipulated in the same concrete form as the phenomena of such fields as the physical and biological sciences.*" "*It was the view of the group that educational objectives stated in the behavior form have their counterparts in the behavior of individuals, observable and describable therefore classifiable.*" "*Only those educational programs which can be specified in terms of intended student behaviors [how the student will react in a particular situation, within a particular environment] can be classified.*" "*What we are classifying is the intended behavior of*

students —the ways in which individuals are to act, think, or feel as the result of participating in some unit of instruction. " " *Educational procedures are intended to develop the more desirable rather than the more customary types of behavior.* " " *The student must feel free to say he disliked . . . and not have to worry about being punished for his reaction.* " (Benjamin S. Bloom *Taxonomy of Education Objectives Book 1 Cognitive Domain*) Bracketed information and emphasis added. From then on, *only* the child's "natural inclinations" (for 'change') would be evaluated, that is would be of any worth. Any standards from the home, from the Father, would become "inappropriate information," unless, of course, it was used to show the child how to identify and *negate* it (purge it from or disregard it) in his experiment (in his classroom experience, that is in his life). Thus the child's "affective domain," his natural inclination toward pleasure would be 'liberated,' freeing him from the affects of his home experience, that is from his father's authority. Intoxicated with the acceptance, that is with the pleasure (pressure) of group approval, he would from then on, know himself as he "is," no longer as someone his Father wanted him to be. When restrained at home by his Father, he would respond, as one on a drug confronted with someone wanting to take it from him, with animosity and even violence. Bloom wrote in his second Taxonomy, that is the Affective Domain: *There are many stores of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children.* " (David Krathwohl, Benjamin Bloom, et al. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*) That was and still is the 'drive' and the intended 'purpose' of those possessed by the spirit of the "new" world order, that is by dialectic 'reasoning.'

We now live in a nation on a drug, a people seeking after the pleasure of the 'moment' (imagined, real, or promised), loosing their liberty and their life, following after men who have usurped positions of authority (actually the citizens have abdicated their position of authority, given to them by God, as Adam did in a garden in Eden, for the pleasures of this life, giving their position of authority to another spirit, a spirit who is antithetical to God and hates *righteousness*), who (like drug pushers) promise to giving them what they want in the 'moment,' give them what the father's won't, that is unrestrained pleasure, thus leading them into slavery (bondage),

abomination, judgment, and death (eternal death). "The people," like drug addicts, will now turn on (turn and rend) anyone who attempts to deliver them from death (restore them to life), rescue them from bondage (restore them to liberty), try to get them off the drug (restore them to self-control). Without the Father's restraint all we have is a nation of unrestrained children (in adult bodies), practicing abomination. But that is the way those of dialectic 'reasoning' would want it.

It is not that God is against pleasure. He created it. It is that it, by its very nature (being ever changing, that is never satisfied), is against Him, that is is against God, that is is against the Father who restrains it (God the Father being established forever, unchanging, that is satisfied)—satisfaction restraining un-satisfaction, *righteousness* restraining *sensuousness*, that is like the Father restraining the child's natural inclinations, that is restraining his propensity to approach pleasure (without considering the consequences), teaching him to be like him, restraining his own natural inclination (learning self-control), which, if left to himself, like a dog chasing its tail, will never be satisfied, going where the 'moment' takes him (changing), yet going nowhere in particular (yet never changing), just "enjoying" the 'moment'—becoming consumer rather than producer driven, that is become pleasure driven rather than doing what is right and not doing what is wrong driven (weighing the consequences of his thoughts and actions, that is how they effect him and others in matters of life and death). "How far are we into debt today? Only a consumer driven, pleasure seeking, dialectic 'reasoning,' people end up where we are today. Not only financially bankrupt but also morally bankrupt, living on the "hope" (Immanuel Kant's understanding of *pure reason*) that the augmentation of pleasure and "enjoyment" will 'redeem' us, that is bring us all together as "one"—dead in our sins. We are now a nation of "dead men walking," pushing death, that is human nature, calling it "life." " *And he said unto them, Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world. I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.*" John 8:23-24

Thus all (and I mean all, that is including every law) becomes materialistic, that is *sensuous* based, that is worldly, in the so called "new" world order

of dialectic 'reasoning,' in a world built upon the dialectic process of *consensus*, where "truth" is established upon human nature alone, that is upon *human sensuousness* and *human reasoning* alone (subject to the ever changing 'moment'). Side note: The so called Health Care Package, is not only about physical health, it is also about mental health and social health. It is a totalitarian form of government, a dialectic 'reasoning' form of government, which by its very nature *negates* the concept of "inalienable rights"—rights which were not 'changeable,' which are not subject to the 'changing' times, which are not subject to the whims ("wisdom") of those in government (or the departments which "guide" them in their thoughts and actions—"guiding" them according to dialectic 'reasoning,' engendering a "new" world order built upon the foundation of "human rights," a "new" world order where unrighteousness becomes 'righteousness' and abomination becomes the "norm").

While true science discovers and recognizes laws of nature already established (fixed) by God, "*science falsely so called*" only recognizes the process whereby man 'discovers' those laws through the process of speculation, *theory*, and the *dialoguing* of men's *opinions* to a *consensus*, that is to an agreement (with the testing of the nature of something, to 'discover' what of it is that is only "*observable and repeatable*," that is what is certain, only that in the case of dialectic 'reasoning' the scientific process is redefined to mean what is "*observable and definable*" (Bloom), that is what is still not certain but describable in the 'moment,' which is not the same thing—to be "tolerant of ambiguity," that is not knowing for certain but accepting it as fact, will drive a true scientist crazy, building bridges or airplanes on an "I feel" and "I think" is nuts, that is it is mad, that is fly in an airplane designed and built on those words and see how you "feel" at 30,000 feet in a storm) making men's *opinions* (manifested through *dialogue*) the only means whereby he can come to know the "truth"—makes man's carnal nature "truth" itself. When it comes to "morals and ethics," that is how a person is to feel, think, and act in a given situation, the dialectic process therefore frees man from the *righteousness*, that is frees man from the judgment of God (*negates* man of a "guilty conscience"), that is humanizes him, that is materializes him, that is makes him a number (something which can be from then on manipulatable—if

your not manipulatable you are of no worth or have no value in a dialectic world other than something to be removed or destroyed).

The Apostle Paul explains that after understanding the laws of nature, that they are established and unchanging, that is not "ever changing" but fixed forever, man foolishly makes them subject to his *opinions, theories, or speculations* of the 'moment,' that is subject to the emotive "situation," that is 'changeable.' Refusing to recognize that the laws of nature reflecting the very nature of God, that is spiritual, established and unchanging (yet God himself not bound by the laws of nature, being Himself merciful and full of grace toward those who repent of their sins and turn from their wicked ways), man turns to the process whereby he came to know the laws of nature, making it, the process of *opinions, theories, and speculations*, that is dialectic '*reasoning*' "truth," basing the 'discovering' of the "truth" of his own nature upon his own nature, that is a nature of vanity and pride, that is of *sensuousness* and "self-justification," making all men subject to their heart of deceit and wickedness, making "human nature" itself established and unchangeable forever (anyone who condemns it or wants to change it, that is redeem man from his nature, from his sin, from then on becomes the enemy of man), that is making it the standard whereby to measure all that is in the creation (as well as the creator Himself), thereby worshiping the creation, that is worshiping himself, that is worshiping the *sensuousness* of the pleasures of this life, rather than God. (See [Romans 1:14-32](#))

Regarding his use of the "*scientific method*," that is the dialectic process, George Hegel wrote: "*I could not of course imagine that the method which in the system of logic I have followed is not capable of much elaboration in detail, but at the same time I know that it is the only true method.*" "*It is clear that no expositions can be regarded as scientific which do not follow the course of this method, and which are not conformable to its simple rhythm, for that is the course of the thing itself.*" (George Hegel in Carl Friedrich, *The Philosophy of Hegel*) The dialectic idea being, if "the scientific method" lies within man* so that he can use it 'discover' and know the laws of nature, that is to free himself from faith, that is so that he can manipulate nature (natural resources) for the "betterment" of his own life as well as for the world, it lies within man so that he can 'discover' and

come know himself as he is as well, that is to free himself from faith, so that, as he can manipulate the natural things of the world, 'changing' them for the "betterment" of life, he can also manipulate mankind himself (just like natural resources) for the "betterment" of life as well.

*According to dialectic 'reasoning,' the object of "inquiry" is understandable to man because the process is in man himself, that is in all men, helping man coming to know himself as he really is, not only as he is in his own nature but in the other objects of the world as well (able to come to know himself in the other as he comes to know the other in himself), that is making it possible for him to know the object as himself, as it is in his own nature, as it is in him, (making it possible for all men to become as one in their nature, that is in their nature only, mankind uniting upon the *sensation* of, that is desire for "belongingness," finding identity and 'purpose' in the "other" in himself, as he finds identity and 'purpose' of himself in the "other") as Hegel put it, *"the Method is no-way different from its object and content;—for it is the content in itself; the dialectic it has in itself, that move it on."* (George Hegel, *Reading Hegel, The Introduction*) Emphasis in original.

For a person to *praxis* dialectic 'reasoning' on himself is one thing (he simply pays for his foolishness). But for him to treat others as "human resource," *seducing, deceiving, and manipulating* them into joining him in his foolishness is another. Though he may persuade those who are foolish enough to listen to his foolishness that the dialectic process is a process of "love," the truth is, in the end it is a process of hate, that is hate of the truth, hate of *righteousness*, and hate of the soul of man (and hate of God), making all men subject to the *sensuousness* (consciousness) and the *sensuous reasoning* ("cosmic consciousness") of his own nature, calling it, and his use of dialectic 'reasoning' which delivers him, that is human nature from God and from the authority of the father (so that man can use it for the "betterment" of the world), *"good,"* when in truth it is evil, that is the way of unrighteousness (and abomination). *"The transgression of the wicked saith within my heart, that there is no fear of God before his eyes. For he flattereth himself in his own eyes, until his iniquity be found to be hateful. The words of his mouth are iniquity and deceit: he hath left off to be wise, and to do good. He deviseth mischief upon his bed; he setteth himself in a way that is not good; he abhorreth not evil."* Psalms 36:1-4

Dialectic 'reasoning' begins with the premise that man is basically "good" or has the potential of becoming "good" through "right" *praxis* (through the "right" social experiences, that is the "right" educational experience), that the "goodness" of man will manifest itself through man's "willful" participation in "right" thoughts and "right" social action, thereby, from then on, measuring himself with himself, that is with his carnal nature, that

is with that which he has in common with all men around the world, defining what is "good" and what is "evil" (including God and His Word) thereby. Thus those of dialectic 'reasoning, as willful "children of disobedience," call their carnal nature, that is the nature of "the child within" (before the Father's act of "repression") "good," and the Father's restraint of *human nature* and *human reasoning* "evil." Yet "It is written": "*Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!* [to gain understanding or come to know the truth according to their own sight] " Isaiah 5:20, 21 Bracketed information added

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' good and evil has to be "*sense experienced*" by man, and "rationally" weighted according to his pain-pleasure spectrum (his carnal nature, that is according to that which is of his own *sensuousness*—which is to "avoid pain-approach pleasure," with the *sensation* of pleasure being the highest "good") before it is known (*Gnosis*) as good or evil (rationally understood), making all things material, that is all things bound to man's own nature of *sensuousness*—where "cosmic consciousness" is simply man's love for himself and the world, united as "one," all "working together" for the universal "good," united as one in creating a "better" world for "all," *becoming* "one" in a world of "pleasure," that is in love, that is in Eros (call it agape all you want, agape being a fruit of the Spirit not a "fruit" of the flesh, that is of human nature in love with itself), that is dialectically 'discovering' a world that was there all the time (only being repressed for a time by the restraints of *righteousness*, that is by the Father's commands to do "good" and not do "evil" according to His will so that *reasoning* itself, that is the "divine spirit" could be 'discovered' and known to man, becoming his "savior") that is only inhibited by a time of faith before *reason* came along and 'liberated' "love," that is Eros from *righteousness*, and man's will (to be himself, made in his image) from the will of the Father (to be like Him, made in His image). Thereby, through the deceitfulness and wickedness of dialectic 'reasoning, *righteousness* (in the thoughts and actions of men) is *negated*. Man's soul is thus "*sense perceived*" by those of dialectic 'reasoning,' as being only of the creation,

sensuous, of nature *only*, that is of the "spirit" of the world, that is having a *sense* of and desire for "oneness" with the world, that is with the cosmos, with the souls of all men coming together as "one" cosmic soul through the *praxis* of dialectic 'reasoning,' that is through the *consensus* process being put into social action, delivering man from the Father, from God, from *righteousness* so that man can be himself again (before God gave him His first command and threatened to judge him if he disobeyed, that is becoming like God himself, that is coming to know "good" and "evil" according to his own 'righteousness,' according to his own carnal nature, perceiving himself to be 'righteous' in his own eyes).

The truth is: "... *the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.*" Genesis 2:7 God sees us as individual souls, judging each one of us individually, according to our own thoughts and actions, holding us individually accountable to His will. Apart from this *thesis*, there can only be a position antithetical to (over and against) *righteousness*. Those of dialectic 'reasoning' see our soul (as Marx called it, through the "ether of the brain," that is through *human reasoning*) as of "one soul" (social in nature), our soul only having worth or value through our collective *experience* of *consensus*, that is through our "*sense experience*" of *becoming* at-one-with the world, that is *becoming* as "one" below, that is as God in the collective sense (the plural "We" becoming as "one," as "Us"). Instead of worshiping and obeying the one above (God, who is over all), through our use of dialectic 'reasoning' we worship and obey the "one" below (God, that is the "spirit" of man united as "one," the *sensation* of "oneness" in *praxis*, *human sensuousness* and *human reasoning* united as one in social action, etc. ruling over all). It is only in this way that individual man can escape the issue of sin. By finding that sin is common to all men and by calling it "human nature" he can 'justifying' himself as being "normal." Thus, through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' man is able to make sin sin (sin being the estrangement of man from God, because of the nature of man, that is because of his love of *sensuousness*, declared by God as sin, through dialectic 'reasoning' becomes the estrangement of man from man, because of the nature of God, that is because of His love of *righteousness*, declared by man as sin, thus making *righteousness* 'sin' and

sin 'righteousness'), good evil, light dark, unrighteousness good and righteousness evil.

Like a drug, the dialectic process is intoxicating and addictive. It is a process of pleasure, *seducing, deceiving, and manipulating* all who turn to it and participate. It is a process with an intended outcome, the *negation* of "the fear of the Lord" and the knowledge of God and thereby, the death of the soul of man. *"The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction."* Proverbs 1:7 *"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children."* Hosea 4:6 Although Hosea's warning was spoken to Israel of old, it is true for all believers in Christ Jesus today (Jesus having fulfilled the law, that is not *negating* it, the Holy Spirit fulfilling it in us daily as we daily walk in Him). The rejection of the "fear of God" is the rejection of knowledge, that is rejection of that knowledge which is everlasting (which is unchanging). To be a child you must have a Father. To have a Father you must have *one* in authority over you (commanding you, that is giving laws to be obeyed and chastening you, that is judging you when you breaking them), you must be a children. To reject the Father is to reject his laws, is to reject his office of authority, is to reject your position of authority under him (a position of authority given to you by him to rule over your nature according to His will), is to reject knowledge, is to be destroyed, is for your children to be forgotten (with no hope of a Father's mercy or grace, that is being left to the ways of the world and death, a world which will use them, abuse them, consume them, and destroy them, that is *seducing, deceiving, and manipulating* them for its own pleasure and then abandon them, that is reject them when they no longer provide for or serve its own pleasure—like what a pimp does with a prostitute: promise her the world, that is sustenance, pleasure, and safety, so that he can use her for his own pleasure and gain, only to cast her out, that is betray her in the end, that is if you reject your Heavenly Father and his love for you, love that chastens, all you have is Satan and his "love" for you, a "love" that will use you up for his own pleasure, that is which is to detach you from your Heavenly Father and His love, and destroy you in the end, that is all you have).

What is it for you to gain the world (to reject *righteousness*, reject the will of the Father, in your pursuit of the *sensuousness* of the pleasures of this life) and in the process (in your use of dialectic 'reasoning,' 'justifying' yourself, that is 'justifying' your carnal thoughts and carnal actions before carnal men) lose your soul (lose eternal life and gain eternal death, for your "lusting" after the *sensuous*, that is the fleeting 'moments' of pleasure of this life, inheriting eternal damnation in the end—after you having taken your last breath, that is the last breath of all the breaths that God gave you, to acknowledge Him who created you, to thank Him for sending His only begotten Son to redeem you from eternal death, and to worship Him who truly loves you, with). *"For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels."* Mark 8:36-38 What has happened to the children of the father's of the past? Where are the "father's" of the present. They have all become as their children (in the name of "equality"), "lusting" after the things of the present, that is chasing after the things of pleasure, that is in hot pursuit of the things of the world, that is living in the 'moment,' losing their souls, as they come together as "one," that is as "children of disobedience."

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." John 3: 16, 17 Life, love, the soul of man, and *righteousness* therefore is of God alone (the creator) and not of man (the created). Through the use of dialectic 'reasoning' man filters the authority of the Father from his thoughts and his actions, "purging" himself of the *righteousness* and grace of God, leaving himself with no hope of eternal life, only a life of the "here-and-now," life only having meaning in the *sensuous* 'moment,' engendering a "dog eat dog" world (looking for an alpha dog to lead the pack, that is to lead the horde, that is to guide the masses, that is to "facilitate" the group), that is a world following after smiling faces and their promises of a "better" life "if we all work together" (a phrase used only to *seduce*, *deceive*, and *manipulate* the ignorant), a

world of hearts full of deceit and wickedness, full of vanity and pride, coveting, envying, 'driving' by "lust," 'purposed' in apprehending, augmenting, and controlling all that is pleasurable (*sensuous*) in sight, yet never being "*satisfied*." "*Hell and destruction are never full; so the eyes of man are never satisfied.*" Proverbs 27:20 That is why government (controlling the people through the *consensus* process, that is initiating and sustaining unity through *sensuousness*, that is through what we all have in common, and *sensuous reasoning*, that is what we can all identify with and agree upon in the 'moment,' through their "willful," that is "lustful" participation in dialectic 'reasoning,' making them all "stake holders," participants in the process of 'change) will not be satisfied until it has control over everything and every one on the face of the earth. What it see's (even in its mind) it possesses, and in its actions (in its *praxis*) it takes. Anyone standing in its way, claiming that it is theirs instead (like God, or the father ruling over his family property, and business), will be *annihilated* (borrowing one of Karl Marx's favorite words *vernichten*, meaning, like a child with a tantrum, to destroy, annihilate, crush, kill, exterminate, obliterate, to have it his way). "*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, Thesis on Feuerbach #4) What he is saying is: once the earthly family (with the father chastening his children, teaching them to obey him) is discovered to be the same method used by the Heavenly Family (with God the Father chastening those who are His, teaching them to obey Him), the earthly father, who engenders the practice first, must be *negated* in the thoughts and actions of the next generation, if the Heavenly Father is to be *negated* in the "*theory and practice*" of men. The *consensus* process, with its use of dialectic 'reasoning,' does both, that is *negating* the earthly and the Heavenly Father in the thoughts and actions of all participants, at the same time.

Apart from God (even in the 'moment'), all man has to measure himself with is himself, that is his own "*sense experience*," lusting after the pleasures and the "enjoyments" of this life only, even "enjoying" his suffering for making the world a "better" place for the "enjoyment" of others, which, to him might seem to be wisdom and life, that is calling his

praxis "good," but is instead foolishness and death (eternal death to the "living soul" who God created). Apart from God, who is life (who is *righteous* in and of himself alone), there is no life for the "living soul," only death (unrighteousness), that is eternal death, as the soul lives on forever (not only apart from the glory of the Father and the Son but also in the torments of hell—Luke 12:2-5 ; 2 Peter 2:1-22). "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Romans 6:23 "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Romans 5:21

All those who *praxis* dialectic 'reasoning,' those 'justifying' themselves before themselves ('justifying' themselves according to their own nature, that is according to "human nature"), travel down the pathway of condemnation and death. "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Romans 5:18, 21 The "offence of one," that is Adam's disobedience to God (the Father), that is "doing his own thing," condemned all. "The righteousness of one," that is the obedience of Christ (the Father's only begotten Son) to His Heavenly Father, even unto death, saving all (giving life, that is eternal life unto all) who believe in His name, "in the name of the only begotten Son of God," redeemed "all men unto justification of life." "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." John 3:17-18

Jesus is the *thesis* (the position), the only *thesis* (the only position), that is life. Any other answer, that is *opinion*, speculation, conjecture, *theory*, etc. is an *antithesis*, that is is wrong, and leads to death. The *praxis* of *synthesis* (of dialectic 'reasoning'), that is the merging of the work of Christ (who is *righteous*) with the work of the world (which is of and for *sensuousness*) through the use of *human reasoning*, voids Christ of His *righteousness* (in the thoughts and actions of men in the 'moment') and deceives all who

participate into traveling down the pathway of death which is called (and seems to be in the 'moment') "life," even doing so "in the name of the Lord." Thus through dialectic 'reasoning,' instead of the person sinning alone (yet retaining a "guilty conscience"), he sins along with the collective (with no sense of a "guilty conscience"—"the approval of men" has that affect upon us). In this way, through "group approval," that is through "the approval of men," *human nature*, that is the *sensuousness* of man, can "join" *with the righteousness* of Christ, voiding man of a "guilty conscience" and Christ of His *righteousness* (which can only be *imputed* to man by God through faith in Him—not by works that any man can boast). *"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast."* Ephesians 2:8, 9

When we boast in the things we do, we receive glory unto ourselves. Taken captive by our own "*wisdom*," we, for vanity sake (for the pleasures of this life alone), seek after that glory which is only due our creator, who created all that is, including the *sensation* of the pleasure which we "lust" after, engendering disobedience and the "need" for "self-justification," that is dialectic 'reasoning' 'justifying' *sensuousness* (disobedience of the Father's will) over and against *righteousness* (obedience of the Father's will). *"Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness."* 1 Corinthians 3:18-19 Bold added.

It is through dialectic 'reasoning,' that is man living according to his own "wisdom," that is man 'justifying' himself, that is 'justifying' his own nature of "lust" (his "enjoyment" of the things of this world only) before himself and others, that the "pride of life" is made manifest on the earth, for which *"the wrath of God is revealed from heaven."* The "pride of life" is man's ability to "control" the things of pleasure of this world, not only for himself but for others as well. The truth is, it is the things of pleasure of this world which "controls" man, that is controls his thoughts and his actions of the 'moment,' engendering *"ungodliness and unrighteousness,"* making the "lust" of his flesh (unrighteousness) the standard for knowing "truth." *"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because*

*that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. 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, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible 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 [where there is not restraint to pleasure, pleasure being the end, that is the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of all things, the object taking on meaning or value only in the *praxis*, that is in the *sensuous* 'moment' of "enjoyment," in the augmentation of pleasure without restraint] : who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen."* Romans 1:18-25 Bold added and bracketed information added.

The works of Brian McLaren are an example of dialectic 'reasoning' being put into *praxis* in the church today (his thoughts are typical of all dialectic thinkers, that is God and man working together as one for the "common" good). He writes: "*Scripture is something God had 'let be,' and so it is at once God's creation and the creation of the dozens of people and communities and cultures who produced it.*" [This is a Gnostic construct in reasoning, that is God and man are "one" in spirit, both *becoming* as "one" as they, *enlightened* through dialectic 'reasoning,' 'discover' themselves as actually always having been "one."] "*We constantly emerge from what we were and are into what we can become—not just as individuals, but as participants in the emerging realities of families, communities, cultures, and worlds.*" (Brian McLaren, [A Generous Orthodoxy](#), p. 162, 284) A promo of Greg Garret's works, a compañero of McLaren's, states: "*According to recent surveys, many Americans associate the label 'Christian' with judgmental attitudes, hypocrisy, fear of hell, and a commitment to right-wing politics. Author Greg Garrett suggests another way, arguing that a faith that focuses solely on personal morality and the*

afterlife misses much of the point of Jesus' message. The other way of following Christ is not concerned with an array of commandments or with holding the "right" beliefs. Rather it is centered on loving each other and loving God, or as Garrett puts it, 'love, where the rubber meets the road, where faith meets [works with instead of confronts] the world.'"

(<http://www.thethoughtfulchristian.com/Products/0664234046/the-other-jesus.aspx>) Bracketed information added for clarity. It is in the *praxis* of dialectic 'reasoning' that the words love and faith take on new meaning, defining them and Christ Himself through human eyes and human ears, synthesizes the *righteousness* of Christ and the *sensuousness* of man (uniting the *righteous*, those made *righteous* in Christ, along with the unrighteous, those of the world, upon a "common" cause, that is even for the cause of promoting the gospel) through *human reasoning*, creating another Christ, an anti-thesis Christ, an Antichrist —a Fatherless (or lawless) Christ, one who identifies himself only with man's human nature and his social cause, helping him "create" a "better" world for all. Without the Father (who demands perfection, that is *righteousness*) there is no Son (in obedience to His Father, fulfilling *righteousness*), there is no *righteousness imputed* to man (perfection fulfilled, that is *righteousness imputed* to 'reconcile' man to the Father), only an ensample of a man at his "best," living and dying for social cause. "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." 1 John 2:22 You have got to have the Father if you are going to have the Son, that is there is no Son without the Father. The hope is in the glory of both. In the Father who sent His only begotten Son to die for our sins and in the Son who obeyed His Heavenly Father in all things commanded, even to the death, covering our sins. Apart from (or adding to) this, there is no blessed hope of His glory. "*For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.*" Titus 2:11-14 The "good works" being in Him, not in us "working" for His approval, which is, in actuality, us working for "the approval of men." God can not "approve" us until we are

dead, that is dead to ourselves, that is dead to the glory of man (man's "glory" comes through and for his own flesh and reasoning 'ability,' which 'justifies' it, thereby exalting himself, that is 'justifying' his carnal nature even while doing "wonderful things" in the name of the Lord), that is dead to dialectic 'reasoning,' that God would receive all the glory from His work (from *His* work alone) for us, on us, in us, and through us. Otherwise (in another "wisdom") we serve (work together with) another Christ, doing "wonderful things in his name," making a name for "ourselves."

© *Institution for Authority Research*, Dean Gotcher 2012-2015, 2024