

Diaprax

The dialectic process put into praxis—*theory* put into *practice*, your opinion put into action as 'truth,' replacing truth with opinions—is simply reasoning made subject to *sensuousness* 'negating' *righteousness*.

Coming between the Father and that which is His.

subtitles

Taking that which is not yours to take (usurping God's authority). Letting sensuousness come between you and God. Justifying sensuousness (your feelings, thoughts, and actions) as being equal with or more important than righteousness (God and His Word), thereby placing sensuousness (your will) over and against righteousness (the will of God). Instead of God (who is righteous) defining good and evil, you (being sensuous) define good and evil, making you as a god (unrighteous, in sin).

"Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."

1 Corinthians 15:50

by

Dean Gotcher

[All bracketed information and quotations placed within quotations are added by me and are not a part of the original quotation. Apply this general rule to all quotations which have bracketed information.

Forward

"There is none righteous, no, not one: There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they

are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Romans 3:10-20

"For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the housetops. And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him." Luke 12:2-5

Sensuousness must always be subject to righteousness—Your will must always be subject to God's will. Righteousness, that which is Spiritual, can not be equal with nor subject to sensuousness, that which is of your flesh (God and His Word can not be made equal with nor made subject to your reasoning) or your reasoning will be used (by you) to 'justify' sensuousness. If reasoning is not made subject to righteousness, it will be used to 'justify' sensuousness. If reasoning is not made subject to God's will, it will be used to 'justify' your carnal nature. Then, if reasoning is made subject to sensuousness, it will be used to negate (treat as irrelevant) righteousness. If reasoning is made subject to your will, it will be used to negate (treat as irrelevant) God's will.

If reasoning is not made subject to the Father's will (a system of righteousness, [Hebrews 12:6-11](#)), it will be used to 'justify' the child's will (a system of sensuousness, [Romans 7:22-25](#)). Then, if reasoning is used to 'justify' the child's will (sensuousness), it will be used to negate (treat as irrelevant) the Father's will (righteousness). That which is above or greater

than the child's will, above his flesh, i.e. above or greater than his system of *sensuousness*, is dialectically perceived (and correlated) as being 'spiritual,' i.e. the will of the Father, i.e. the system of *righteousness*. [Genesis 3:1-6](#) was the first *praxis* of the dialectical process, i.e. the use of human reasoning to evaluate (judging the worth of) the system of *righteousness* (God and His Word *preached* and *taught*) according to the system of *sensuousness* (human opinions *dialogued*), *negating* evaluating (and thus restraining) *sensuousness* according to God and His Word (according to His *righteousness*). Genesis 3:1-6 is the *praxis* of children evaluating (judging the worth of) their parents commands (and thus evaluating the 'right' of parents to give commands which inhibit or block the child's *sensuous* nature) via. their own *sensuousness* and understanding (a *heresiarchal paradigm*), *negating* the evaluating (judging) of their own *sensuousness* via. their parents commands (a *patriarchal paradigm*). Genesis 3:1-6 was the first use of the system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation* upon mankind (by the first *facilitator* of 'change').

God's way (*righteousness*) is not man's way (*sensuousness*). [Isaiah 55:8, 9](#). God's way is a system of *righteousness*. Man's way is a system of *sensuousness*, subject to the system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation*. I am not saying that God is a system (like a scientific formula), only that those who lean upon the dialectical process ("the scientific method") to "know" reality (basing "reality" upon their nature, i.e. the system of *sensuousness*) do. Thus, to those who *praxis* (practice) the dialectical process, that which is above must take on the identity of that which is below (be *sensuous* and 'rational') so that that which is below can take on the identity (via. *enlightenment*) of that which is above (now described as being *sensuous* and 'rational') to accomplish oneness (*consensus* via. *sensual-intellectual assent*), *negating* that which is above (*righteousness* via. faith in God) which does not correlate with that which is below (*sensuousness*; "*sensuous need*," "*sense perception*," and "*sense experience*").

What God initiated in the garden in Eden was a system of *righteousness*, i.e. faith, belief, obedience, a [closed system](#) of 'fixity,' (since man was flesh, of a system of *sensuousness*, capable of following after the system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation* all reasoning would have to

be subject to God's standards—deductive reasoning was to be used where pre-established right and wrong, i.e. premises, were to be used to determine what is right and what is wrong in thought and in action—the *if-then* outcome therefore being certain, i.e. unchanging). Satan introduced his system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation* so as to 'liberate' the system of *sensuousness* in man from the system of *righteousness* of God, i.e. doubt, questioning, disobedience, an open system of 'change,' which both the woman and Adam 'shifted' to (doing a *paradigm* 'shift,' where reasoning would be subject to human feelings and perceptions, i.e. *sensuousness*—changing his reasoning from a *patriarchal paradigm*, a *top-down* system, to a *Heresiarchal paradigm*, a system of *equality*, where reasoning is *inductive*, based upon "valid" experiential *sensations* of life, making right and wrong *sensual*, situational, theoretical, speculative in nature—the *if-then* outcome therefore being uncertain, i.e. ever 'changing'). "*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.*" "*But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.*" "*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.*" Romans 8:5, 9, 13 "*But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.*" Matthew 5:28

Therefore, if reasoning is not made subject to the system of righteousness (the Fathers will, correlated secularly, dialectically, as the *patriarchal paradigm* of unchangingness, i.e. [the bourgeoisie](#)), it will be used to 'justify' the system of sensuousness (the child's will, correlated secularly, dialectically, as the *Heresiarchal paradigm* of 'changingness,' i.e. the *proletariat*). Then, if reasoning is made subject to the system of sensuousness ('changingness'), it will be used to negate (treat as irrelevant) the system of righteousness (unchangingness). *Sensuousness*, liberated from *righteousness* through human reasoning, will be put into social action (*praxis*) *annihilating* the father figure, i.e. *annihilating* the *patriarchal paradigm*, i.e. *annihilating* the *bourgeoisie*). *Diaprax* is the *praxis* of *patricide* via. *incest* 'justified' (*consensus*). "*But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now.*" "*This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of*

the flesh." Galatians 4:29, 5:16

Since those who live by the dialectical process looks at everything through systems (*systems analysis*), i.e. the way man feels, thinks and acts. A man's feelings, thoughts, and actions (his way of thinking and acting) is graded along a spectrum of 'changeability,' according to his 'changingness,' his adaptability to 'change,' while under pressure, i.e. his 'changingness' of system or *paradigm*, i.e. progressing (*progressivism*) from a system of stability (absolutes) to a system of 'change' (relativism), i.e. along a spectrum or continuum, from a *Patriarchal paradigm* (obedience to higher authority which restrains *sensuousness*, i.e. inhibiting or blocking 'change') through a *Matriarchal paradigm* (which is *sensuous* in nature, i.e. initiating and sustaining individual 'change') to a *Heresiarchal paradigm* (which initiates and sustains social 'change' via. "[the ether of the brain](#)," i.e. the deceitful and manipulative use of *sensuousness*). A persons history is manifested by where along this spectrum he is at any given 'moment.' This is reflected in the development of curriculum for the classroom, according to "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)," from "*lower order thinking*" to "*higher order thinking*," in a progression from *translation* (literal), *interpretation* (opinion), to *extrapolation* (relative, conditional, situational¹), progressing from *facts* which restrain 'change,' through *feelings* which cry out for 'change,' to "*rational- sensual justification*" of 'changingness.' Man (human nature, the basis of "human rights") is the system of *sensuousness* (carnal, of the flesh, worldly, of below) which requires 'change' since "*peace*" (the feeling of satisfaction or contentment, i.e. "all is well") is always *momentary* (temporary, i.e. temporal, only found in the 'moment' since the body, i.e. the flesh, and the mind set upon it, can only experience pleasure—[Dopamine emancipation](#)—which fades with time, i.e. becomes satiated and then dissolves, which needs new environmental or mental stimulation at an ever increasing level to renew its sensation of pleasure again, resulting in [a spiraling process of 'changingness'](#)—thus the natural 'drive' to control (and [augment](#)) the environment which stimulates pleasure, and the 'drive' to *negate* anything or anyone who inhibits or blocks the pursuit of sensual pleasure, i.e. the sensation of "peace," as the world understands peace), hope being founded upon happiness, happiness being founded upon pleasure, pleasure being

founded upon the mind (awareness upon what in the natural environment is stimulating a sensation of pleasure), and the mind being founded upon the body stimulated from environmental conditions which engender the *sensuousness* of pleasure. "Peace" is therefore the liberation of *lust* via. the *negation* of the condition (*righteousness*) which exposes and condemns human nature, "*lust*," as being evil. God the Father, Christ the Son, and the Holy Spirit are all the system of *righteousness* (Holy, Spiritual, heavenly, from above, the basis of "inalienable rights"), which is not sensual (carnal) in nature, thus never changing—God's peace not needing 'change,' not dependent upon *sensuousness*.

While man may use the system of *righteousness* he can never be *righteous* in and of himself, only using the office of top-down authority, the system of *righteousness* (having a form of Godliness), using the office for his own gain (for his own *sensuousness*, i.e. for his own pleasure; "*Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: ... For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure;*" Hebrews 12:9a, 10b), therefore only having temporal power (the power of the sword, i.e. the "*rod of correction*," having power over only the flesh) but having no spiritual power (no power over the soul), no *righteousness* in and of himself (*righteousness* only being found in God). In Diaprax, man is *deceived* and *manipulated* into accepting *righteousness* as being equal with, subject to, or irrelevant to the system of *sensuousness*, thereby handing his soul over to the system of *sensuousness* (to attain or retain the *sensuous* pleasures of this world). While Abel loved God, who is *righteous*, Cane loved the praises (or blessings) of God, which is *sensuous*. It is a subtle difference but with major consequences.

Diaprax is man, the system of *sensuousness*, claiming equality with and therefore usurping the system of *righteousness* (as was first done in [Genesis 3:1-6](#)) via. *praxis* of the system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation*. Diaprax is man usurping the authority of God, taking that which is not his to take, gaining the world (momentarily) but losing his soul (permanently). "*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 6:8 Diaprax is the system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation* (man's kingdom, the children ruling, the lawless ruling, i.e. the laws of the flesh ruling, a system of 'change,' an

open system of relativity with 'grace' and 'mercy' according to man's will) attempting to *negate* the system of *righteousness* (God's kingdom, the Father ruling, the lawful, i.e. the Law, the Word, and the Spirit from above ruling, a system of 'fixity,' a closed system of absolutes with grace and mercy according to the Father's will) by making God's kingdom (the kingdom of *righteousness*, "It is written," '*categorical imperatives*'² *preached and taught*) subject to the kingdom of man (the kingdom of *sensuousness*, "I think," "I feel" '*opinions*' *dialogued*). Dialectical thought has an *absolute*, i.e. "*the mind*" freeing (liberating) itself from any absolute which is not in harmony with nature (liberating man from anything alienating him from self-nature-social *consciousness*, *annihilating* the system of *righteousness* from preventing his self-actualization with the world experience of one-ness *becoming*; [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)).

In Diaprax, the system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation* can not successfully 'liberate' itself from the system of *righteousness* without the assistance of the system of *sensuousness*, that is, without people become subject to the influence and control of 'change agents,' facilitators, etc., (Satan) who are properly train in the art craft of initiating and sustaining an environment which engenders and sustains the 'change' process (liberating the mind from the fear of God so that it can be free to 'question everything'—"critical theory"—and become at-one with human nature), i.e. the dialectical process put into social practice (*praxis*). I will retain the system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation* within the system of *sensuousness* throughout this article so as keep the article from being to burdensome in terms. Just understand that the system of *righteousness* (God and His Word) restrains the system of *sensuousness* (human nature) while the system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation* (human reasoning, i.e. human relationship 'justification' by consensus) must liberate the system of *sensuousness* (human nature) from the system of *righteousness* (fear of God, i.e. threat of punishment) if it is to be utilize for the 'purpose' of social change (*praxis*), which is the *annihilation* of the system of *righteousness*, the *negation* of Love of God and His Word (which are not sensuous based), or secularly the *negation* of non-*sensual* restraints upon children, workers, government—non-*sensual* restraints made possible by the [freedom of the conscience](#) of the citizens.

Government (the group) must fear the citizen (the individual) who has a conscience, not the citizens (the individual) fear the government (the group) which can not have a conscience, if the citizen (the individual) is to have liberty, i.e. freedom of the conscience. If the citizen or individual fears the group (goes along with the group for social approval, i.e. fears group rejection) within the *consensus* (socialist, democratic, common-ist) process, when the group *annihilates* (*negates*) a citizen or an individual in the *consensus* group setting and they are silent for fear of it happening to them, they will fear the *consensus* (socialist, democratic, common-ist) government when it *annihilates* a citizen or individual in the public setting and stand by in silence as well. Silence and "cooperation" in the group setting guarantees silence and "cooperation" in the social setting. Its called conditioning (common-ist conditioning). That's why the "learning" environment is called a *laboratory*, where the fear of receiving pain (chastening) is replaced with the fear of losing out on pleasure (social rejection), where people are "reprogrammed" in a controlled environment. For example: preaching or teaching a message of *righteousness* (presenting good and evil as proclaimed from above when moved by God to do so) in an environment or system of *sensuousness*, yet 'willingly' putting aside your position (doctrine or belief) when asked to do so for the 'moment,' for the 'betterment' of all (doing so for the cause of the 'good' of all, for the 'betterment' and approval of mankind), you do so for the fear of rejection by the group and the fear of losing what the group promises to offer you, the system of *deception* and *manipulation* is successful in teaching everyone present "*the truth in unrighteousness.*" Romans 1:18 By *trusting* in 'leadership' which promises 'a better life for all' if they 'trustingly' followed them (without weighing their thoughts and actions from the Word of God, taking their every thought "captive to the obedience of Christ"), people are *deceived* into *participating* in the system of *sensuousness*, and *manipulated* into putting aside absolutes, suspend the conscience, 'changing' the conscience into a super-ego. The *sensation* of 'change,' for the sake of initiating and sustaining human relationships (fear of loosing out, fear of becoming an outcast, fear of alienation) therefore becomes the 'driving' force and 'purpose' for 'change.' After this type of conditioning, having made truth subject to the system of *sensuousness* (human relationships and prosperity), some may 'momentarily' hear the truth you

share with them (if you can get them past the 'glassed over look') but will not continue to grow in it, or, like the rocky and thorn infested soils of Mark 4:1-20, will abandon the truth for the things of this world when difficult times come upon them or old temptations reappear (they become fearful of losing the *sensuousness* which they are still holding onto or *sensuousness* entices them and they follow it). This is where we find the 'church' today with its leadership trained in the system of *deception* and *manipulation*, i.e. church 'leaders' skilled in the use of the dialectical process to "grow" the church, i.e. 'growing' it upon the system of *sensuousness*.

The two, *sensuousness* and *righteousness* (the system of *sensuousness* and the system of *righteousness*) can never become one since they are *anathema* toward one another. "*For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.*" Galatians 5:17 Diaprax is the system of *sensuousness* 'driven' with the 'purpose' of *negating* the system of *righteousness* by taking its place as '*righteousness*,' (the dialectical error—Hegel's error—is to start with the premise that man is either basically good or neither good nor evil, i.e. that his environmental upbringing or influences, i.e. how he thinks and acts, helps determine a good or evil outcome, that law and purpose are not found in any particular object, i.e. God or parent, but are a quality, i.e. a "-ness," a *sensation* relevant to the 'moment'), having a form of '*righteousness*' (perceiving himself or his way of thinking or acting as being 'good'), but denying its power (rejecting absolute dependence upon God above, who is the only source of good or *righteousness*) by depending upon *sensuousness* below to 'know' the truth (good from evil), therefore ever learning but never understanding, ever experiencing but unable to comprehend the truth since the person in Diaprax is looking for truth in the wrong places (in the creation, in the stars, in man, in angels, etc., in that which is *sensuous*), through the wrong thing (through man, i.e. by his reasoning through or yielding to that which is deceitful and wicked, i.e. reasoning through his unrepentant, unregenerate, *sensuous* 'driven' heart—reasoning for that which he falsely perceives as being good, thus categorizing the "*heartless world*" system, the system of *righteousness*, which "*oppresses*" it or has to "*clean*" it, as being evil or corrupt—as was espoused by Karl Marx.

"Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people." Marx, *Critique*), [2 Timothy 3](#).

Introduction:

Diaprax is being applied to make you a "world class citizen." How it is being applied in your particular life is up to you to figure out. Knowing the dialectical process (from pre-Hegel to post-Hegel —from Genesis 3:1-6 to Armageddon), how it works, and how it is being used to make you at-one-with the world (Diaprax), does not solve the problem, it only makes it more clear what the problem is. The problem is you, your love for the things of this world and your fear of losing them. That is what Diaprax depends upon. Putting Proverbs 3:5, 6 into practice in your life is the only solution to the problem. *"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

Our heart (subject to the system of *sensuousness*, our fleshy mind) is both *wicked and deceitful*. *"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?"* Jeremiah 17:9 It is impossible for us to clean our own heart (make it *righteous*). *"Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?"* Proverbs 20:9 It is only God himself who can clean our heart and bring us into right relationship with him (cover us with his *righteousness*, bringing us into the system of *righteousness*, in *righteousness*). *"Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me."* Psalms 51:10

I will get *heavy* in the next few pages, so trudge through. The rest of the article, regarding the apostate church and the world system, will be more clearly understood if you do.

Those of Diaprax (the "new" world order) foolishly turn to the heart of man (that which is wicked and deceitful) for the solution to this worlds problems (determining what is right and what is wrong according to man's hearts desires, through the use of "human eyes and human ears" and "human reasoning"). *"He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool: but whoso walketh wisely, he shall be delivered."* Proverbs 28:26 When the hearts of

the foolish children (a heart of *sensuousness*; a system of ambiguity and tolerance, not established upon, nor understanding of absolute right and wrong; "postmodernism" simply means "the children ruling" with no 'fixed' reference point, i.e. no Father authority, except their own feelings, thoughts, and actions of the 'moment') are united in the 'purpose' of *annihilating* the Father (the system of *righteousness*, i.e. a system or right and wrong not establish upon, nor dependent upon *sensuousness*, i.e. not guided and controlled by the children's feelings, thoughts, and actions of the 'moment') and his wisdom (with human reasoning used to 'justify' the system of *sensuousness* thus *negating*, making *irrelevant*, the system of *righteousness* and the wisdom which comes from it, i.e. *negating* that which is above the *sensuous* 'moment'), *unrighteousness* rules the world (the beast system, the Antichrist system rules the world, where man's '*righteousness*'—based upon his *sensuousness*—is loved, and God's *righteousness*—based upon His Holiness—is hated; the children—*sensuousness* loved, the fathers—*righteousness* hated; the *sensitized* person, perceiving his *sensuousness* as being 'righteousness', is not conscious of his hate of *righteousness*). It is not that the system of *righteousness* produces *righteousness*, that can only come from God, but that the system itself prepares man to understand the way of God (trust and obey, i.e. faith, belief, obedience, and *chastening*—which produces a "*peaceful fruit of righteousness*") that he might repent of his use of the system of *sensuousness* in determining right from wrong and come into God's system of *righteousness*, in His *righteousness*, when he hears the Word of God and repents of his use of the system of *sensuousness* to know the 'truth.' Knowing begins with the fear of God, not from the loving of the flesh.

What is meant by the system of *righteousness* is that parents rule as a higher authority with children obeying their commands (children making their will, naturally subject to their own *sensuousness*, subject to the parents will which is more than likely subject to their own *sensuousness* or pleasure—see [Hebrews 12:6-11](#)). Even when done in a traditional home which does not know God, it will still produce a generation that accepts that they are accountable to a higher authority, thereby knowing that they are (or will be in the future) accountability to a higher authority (God being the highest authority) for their thoughts and actions. Whether they

accept God or not, the system is a system of *righteousness* since the system itself produces a 'guilty' conscience when a person is thinking about doing wrong or is doing wrong or has done wrong (having the parent's 'brain' in their brain; "*The new guilt complex appears to be historically connected with the rise of patriarchal religion (for the Western development the Hebrews are decisive).*" "*The guilty conscience is formed in childhood by the incorporation of the parents and the wish to be father of oneself.*"

Brown). The person will weigh decisions from what they have learned in the past, lessons learned from parents, God, teachers, etc. who chastened them when they were wrong, thus not *spontaneously* following after their feelings or the feelings of others in the moment (*sensuousness* therefore is not in control, or total control, of thought and action) knowing that acting without weighing all the consequences is what has gotten them into trouble in the past. But do *spontaneity* of *sensuousness* in a group setting and the effects of the group, the *desire* of respect from others—called group dynamics if the group approves of and participates in the *sensuousness*—will diminish, if not void, the weighing of the consequences of ones actions in the light of higher authority, i.e. the fear of higher authority is abated as higher authority loses their preeminence in the thoughts and actions of the one under authority, in the 'light' of the *sensuous* 'moment' of 'actualizing' their *oneness* with the group (achieving *consensus*).

While we see *righteousness* for what it is, being right before God, we do not realize it is also a system (a way of thinking and acting), a top-down way of thinking and acting where we make decisions according to our Heavenly Father's will (known as a *patriarchal paradigm*, respect of the office of higher authority and obedience to higher authority, i.e. caring out their commands without questioning the office), being able to do so through the Son's willing obedience to His Father's will, even to death (covering our sins by His blood, saving us from His Fathers wrath toward us for not doing the Fathers will), being able to fulfill the Father and Son's will, both in agreement, through the power of His Holy Spirit, all requiring faith, belief, obedience, and chastening (the attributes of a system of *righteousness*).

Sensuousness is also a system (a way of thinking and acting, called a paradigm, in this case either a *matriarchal paradigm* or a *heresiarchal*

paradigm depending upon whether it is just *sensuousness* in *spontaneous* play or 'rationally' justified as the way of life itself) where our "*sensuous needs*" (the lust or desire of our flesh for the things of this world—our body), our "*sense perception*" (the lust of our eyes for the things of this world—our heart), and "*sense experiences*" (the pride of our life—our mind, our 'rational' ability to attain and control the things of this world for our own carnal pleasures, all come together in satisfying our "*sensuous needs*" and "*sense perceptions*," all of which bind us to the world—bringing us under the system of the "new" world order, an anti-patriarchal order—which is not new, i.e. Genesis 3:1-6). The attributes of the system of *sensuousness* are freedom to have feelings of doubt, to openly share opinions through dialogue, to question all things, to be permissive (called 'openness'), i.e. freedom to think and act "outside the box," i.e. to be "yourself," all requiring 'tolerance of ambiguity,' i.e. anti-judgmental-ism (anti-*righteousness* suppressing *sensuousness*).

The Antichrist is a *sensuous* Christ, freeing man from the Heavenly Father's will, liberating man from obedience to the Heavenly Father in all things, trusting in man (his feelings, his thoughts, and his actions) instead of God (his promises, commands, and leading), or trusting in man along with God (making both sense based) for all things 'good,' emancipating man's flesh nature so he can perceive himself as working 'with' God (or mankind) in making this a 'better' world (through collective *speculation*, *consensus*, and *praxis*) for all of mankind, doing it in the name of Jesus, if or when 'necessary,' so as to deceive the innocent (it is a subtle change but the results are deadly). For Diaprax to work, man had to be 'detoxified' of the patriarchal paradigm, the system of the Father, the system of *righteousness* (removing the "negative" aspects of God, i.e. his prejudiced, discriminatory, and judgmental attitude toward disobedience—sin, restraining man from being natural in his thoughts and his actions, to make him a "positive" God, 'loving' and 'caring' of man "as he is"), before the 'new' world order 'Christ' could take his seat. (See the article [The Cognitive, Affective, and Psychomotor Domains and the dialectical process](#) for the 'detoxification' method—be forewarned the article is about 109 pages long.)

The Word of God destroys Satan, the Antichrist—what Jesus did to Satan in the wilderness temptations, saying "It is written" judged him—so, for

the Antichrist to rule, Satan had to change the church *from* "[The Word of God](#) says" ("What dad says goes") *to* where the opinions of men—"What 'I feel' or 'I think' God means in the light of what is acceptable or rational to me and beneficial to the world"—men's books, their seminars, their ministries defining the meaning and 'purpose' of God and His Word and the meaning and 'purpose' of life of mankind to bring the Word of God and the Church into harmony with the system of *sensuousness* (marketing the church), i.e. for the 'purpose' of pleasure and money for all in the system, i.e. prosperity becoming the message of the gospel (thus merchandising, i.e. buying and selling souls "in the name of Jesus"—you can only market, buy, and sell, i.e. "make customers" with that which is sensual, even if it is done in the name of the spiritual—doing works for '*righteousness*' sake). In this way the Antichrist, Satan incarnate, can rule—without hearing judgmental statements ("the *wrath* of God upon the children of disobedient" quoted from the Word of God itself, Colossians 3:1-11 and Romans 1:18) coming from the Christian and the Church, i.e. he is not condemned for his carnal actions since man's *opinion* of God's word has no conviction or condemning power. There is no accountability for failing to obey, no mandatory faith required, no *categorical imperative* in an opinion—unless it is an opinion of opinions arrived at through *consensus*. Making truth equal with opinions *negates* the truth, thus making all who participate in Diaprax (making reasoning subject to *sensuousness* in the process of discovering the '*righteousness*' of the 'moment,' i.e. *Zeitgeist*, and then putting the collective opinion, i.e. *consensus*, into social action—*praxis*) blind and deaf to the truth; [Isaiah 6](#).

I won't explain in detail the method of the soviet system in this article, I have covered that in prior articles, other than to say that this is the same 'purpose' for the soviet councils (*consensus* groups), that being the eradication of spiritual (top-down, *righteous*, *categorical imperative*) judgment upon man's carnal (*sensual*) thoughts and actions through the use of a system which attains and maintains *consensus* through *dialogue* over *social* issues in a *facilitated* meeting by a *diverse group* of people to a *predetermined* outcome, that being all participants would follow the same soviet system (which I just described) in the *praxis* of *negating* the system of *righteousness* while setting policy for the 'moment,' whether it be in the home, in the workplace, in the government, in all social activates, and even

in the state recognized church. The "geniusness" of the system, it you want to call it that, is that instead of attacking *righteousness* or the system of *righteousness* outright, i.e. declaring it as being "wrong," giving it significance or importance and thus relevance, it—and therefore the person promoting it—is treated as being irrelevant, as being "inappropriate" information for the 'moment,' i.e. as being "information" not 'helpful' to the policy making environment. That any "information" being introduced in the meeting must not be a 'personal' attack upon another person or their way of thinking or "lifestyle," that any 'information' introduced must not be preached or taught as absolute truth, to be accepted "as is," and therefore judgmental, "negative," or *righteous*, i.e. being dualistic or divisive in nature, but rather it must be presented as an opinion, and therefore "tolerant," "positive," social, or *sensual* in nature, that is, if "we" are to arrive at a *consensus*—so that all can participate within the policy making environment. From then on, for the *righteous* to participate within the policy setting environment, they must corrupt themselves, they must 'willingly' *negate* the system of *righteousness* so that they to can participate within the system of *sensuousness*, . From then on, human relationship, participation within the 'group,' the reason they detaching themselves from the system of *righteousness*, is 'driving' the 'purpose' of their life. Having detached themselves from God and His *righteousness* for the 'purpose' of the 'institution,' i.e. social 'change,' they have become at one with the process of 'change.' By their willful participation within the soviet system, i.e. the dialectical process put into social practice, they, from then on, must treat the Word of God (or anything presented as an absolute) as irrelevant ('glassing' over when they hear "*it is written*," or "this is the way it has always been done in the past" being preached and taught 'at' them, as if it were the only right way). From then on, for the sake of social (Christian, Church) unity, they treat the truth as just another opinion (no longer fearing God and loving His Word).

This is the same system being used to silence the believer from preaching and teaching the word of God in the workplace, marketplace, family reunions, church, etc. today, (silencing the ears of others who now treat truth as just being another opinion, who then rend those who persist in proclaiming the truth, i.e. who are now perceived as being enemies, i.e. obstacles and barriers to *necessary* 'change' for the sake of the survivability

of the institution in a 'rapidly changing world'). To inhibit or block the 'change' process (the dialectical process) is to do so at the peril of loosing job, respect with the relatives, neighbors, or any accepted or recognized position within the church, etc. or someday even your own life. This is the 'purpose' of the soviet system. *"Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ; As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance: But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy."* 1 Peter 1: 13-16

The networking of all institutional leaders (and potential leaders), those willingly facilitating and participating in the soviet structured (*consensus*) meetings in their own institution, upon a larger grid compiled of all other social institutions using the same soviet system, for the sake of assisting local, state, nationally and international (UN) officials in setting policy, results in the Politburo system, where duly elected officials are 'assisted' in making decisions by the same departments which 'assist' the people ("the grass roots") in applying their policies in their own lives and the lives of others for the sake of the 'institution' and its members (for the sake of the earth). All people therefore come under the influence of the soviet system, *negating* the system of *righteousness* (dialectically perceived as 'divisiveness') for the sake of or 'purpose' of 'growing' the institution (keeping it 'contemporary'). From then on every policy setting environment (setting policies for others to abide by) become *sensuous* in nature, including the Church, thus affecting every Christian who seeks to continue relationships (significance) within it.

The harlot, the system of *sensuousness*, had to join the church (Satan had to join the Church), 'helping' it (thought administration or organizational management) *reach* the world "for Christ," so that the beast could rule it (uniting it, the world, and us, if we join in, in the *consensus* of *sensuousness*, blinding all from Godly *righteousness*, keeping all in the darkness of *sensuousness*), ruling the world according to his will, that being the *negation* of the system of *righteousness* in making decisions on how to live. When *righteousness* becomes at-one-with *sensuousness* (an act of deception via. "*sensuous need*," and "*sense perception*," i.e. when what the flesh feels and what the eye sees 'seems to be good'), then the

system of *sensuousness* "seems to be" *righteousness* in the eyes of men, being deceived themselves and taking pleasure in deceiving others—all united with the system of *self-social-'righteousness,'* all united, through their own *vain* glory, in 'Christian love.' The Antichrist was thus able to initiate and sustain the 'new' church, the *contemporary* church, 'driven' with the 'purpose of persecuting the *righteous* (perceiving and treating the religious *fundamentalist* as being irrelevant and worthless) in the name of Christ through its use of the system of *sensuousness*, i.e. focusing upon human needs (approval, meaning, and purpose) and not the need of repentance before God—repenting of our sins to him, daily dying to our flesh nature and the world, i.e. dying to our use of the system of *sensuousness* internally and externally, our dependence upon *sensuousness* and not God's Word to determine what is good and what is evil, and following after Christ, willingly suffering with him as He was willing to suffer for us in obedience to His Heavenly Fathers will, (now our Heavenly Father through Him). *"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. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us."* Romans 8:16-18 *"Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."* 2 Titus 3:12 While persecution does not make you *righteous*, the *righteous* in Christ will suffer persecution at the hands of the unrighteous, not only from the world but also from the apostate church. The Bible is a book of suffering. Try to market that and see how far you will get in a world and a church built upon the foundation of *sensuousness*.

True believers in Christ refuse to justify the use of human nature with the 'purpose' of build human relationships, with man receiving the glory for 'his' works, worshiping the works of his own hands, serving the gods of his fleshy mind thus persecuting the *righteous*, persecuting those who are doing the will of the Heavenly Father, though Christ, by the power of His Holy Spirit, persecuting those who are willing to receive social rejection, persecuting those who do not seek the approval of men nor fear man but fear God and Love Him and His Word, persecuting those who do not accept *consensus* with men and reject the works of the flesh (reject

conformity with *sensuousness*) that God would receiving all the glory (any time we take praise for *our* creations, for the works of our mind and hands, whether singularly or in a group, we take the place of God, taking his praise and glory which is not ours to take). *"For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God:"* Exodus 34:14 *"For the LORD thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God."* Deuteronomy 4:24 *"To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen."* Jude 1:25 *"Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample. (For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: Whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.)"* Philippians 3:17-19 Marx wrote: *"No class of civil society can play this role ['emancipators of society' from the Father's authority and His righteousness] unless it arouses in itself and in the masses a moment of enthusiasm [a consensus, a 'moment' of collaborative *sensuousness* ready to be put into social action], a moment in which it associates, fuses, and identifies itself with society in general [aware of the *sensuousness* that is common to all men, focusing upon and then acting upon that which men have in common, a system of *sensuousness* which destroys a top-down system of *righteousness* —the moment we focus upon and act upon what we have in common with one another and the world we *negate* (treat as irrelevant) *righteousness*], and is felt and recognized to be society's general representative [felt by the flesh and recognized by the eyes as the liberators working for the system of *sensuousness*, *emancipating* man from the system of *righteousness*], a moment in which its demands and rights are truly those of society itself, of which it is the social head and heart." (Karl Marx, *Critique*) (Marx described, unfortunately, the leadership of the contemporary church.) Freud believed: *"... the hatred against patriarchal suppression [the Father's system of authority demanding *righteousness*]—a 'barrier to incest' [a barrier to the children's nature of *spontaneity* and *sensuousness*]... the desire (for the sons) to return to the mother [the permissive mother who is tolerant of *sensuousness*, the mothers whose heart is not toward her husband but toward herself and her children]—culminates in the rebellion of the exiled sons, the collective killing and devouring of the father, and the**

establishment of the brother clan [fraternity—bipartisanship and consensus uniting upon the system of sensuousness—all united upon the sensuousness of human nature]. "The overthrow of the king-father is a crime, but so is his restoration [the restoration of government by representation (not mediation, i.e. uniting upon common ground), i.e. a system of right and wrong, as a result of the 'guilty' conscience].... The crime against the reality principle [against the Father —the system of righteousness] is redeemed [undone] by the crime against the pleasure principle [against the children —the system of sensuousness]: redemption thus cancels itself [the system of sensuousness is thwarted because of the 'guilty' conscience, the remnants of the system of righteousness]." "... according to Freud, the drive toward ever larger unities belongs to the biological-organic nature of Eros [of sensuousness] itself." (Marcuse)

Marx set out to *negate* the external Father figure through society (sociology) put into action, Freud set out to *negate* the internal Father figure through psychology. Both, united in social-psychology, are facilitated in meetings today to put into *praxis* the *annihilation* of the Father system, i.e. the traditional home, and its residue, i.e. the conscience. Marx (sociology) and Freud (psychology) both had the same agenda, the *negation* of the system of righteousness (God and His Word) through the use of the system of sensuousness (human nature and men's opinions; the use of innovation and the focus upon human relationship as the 'purpose' of life). Total Quality Management, Total Quality Leadership, School To Work, Outcome based education, Church Growth, Emergent Church, etc. are all built upon the use of the dialectical process with the agenda of *negating* the patriarchal paradigm (with the 'purpose' of "*disrupting*" the way traditional business and society operate), *annihilating* the system of righteousness (*negating* 'authoritative,' top-down commands) by solving 'crisis' (conflicts in which the way it was done in the past doesn't 'seem to' have a satisfactory solution) through the use of a system of sensuousness (questioning "Is," as in "This is the way I want it done" or "This is the way it has always been done" with a "Why?"; *negating* "Because I say so" by demanding an "understanding 'Why?' first"—the basis of the "Education Nation" (understanding "Why" first, learning by doing) system—for all participants, forcing the answers *away from* a system of righteousness, a top-down, spiritual system, to a system of sensuous, a common-istic,

humanistic system. The agenda is to replace *situational relationship* with *sustainable relationship*, that is produce relationships which are based upon values which are common to man's nature—discoverable by "walking in each others shoes"—thus building and sustaining uniting with mankind based upon behavior which is common to all mankind—bypassing faith, religion, nationalism, etc., bypassing anything which divides humanity not by directly attacking it as wrong but "going beyond it," treating it as being irrelevant, inappropriate, detrimental to the solution of the crisis, if we are all to come to an agreement upon the solution. Truth is thus based upon human nature and not anything which is anathematic toward human nature. Trust is found between those who recognize human nature and who seek to sustain relationships based upon it. Transparency or openness is in regards to understanding ones own nature and the nature of others and revealing to all your failure to sustain commonly shared values (if you believe this is carried out you are truly gullible). And honesty between all parties regarding human desires and hopes for a 'better' world, seeking to produce a world of harmony, built upon human nature. In this way, though the system of *sensuousness*, all participants lose their system of *righteousness*, i.e. lose their property, their sovereignty, their conscience, and their hope of eternal life even though they thought they could use the system *sensuousness* for 'good,' use it to produce 'good' in the workplace, in business, in the military, in education, in government, even for the kingdom of God.

By turning the meeting into a system of *sensuousness* (collaborative *dialoguing* opinions into a collective *consensus*, with that "*collective creativity*" then being put into social *praxis*), the system of *righteousness* (*preaching* and *teaching* truth, i.e. revelation) is thwarted, without anyone becoming aware that the meeting was a direct attack upon the system of *righteousness*, an attack upon religion itself. Marx wrote: "*The abolition of religion [righteousness from above], as the illusory happiness of men, is a demand for their real happiness [sensuousness from below]. The call to abandon their illusions about their condition [as wicked, unrighteous sinners; a 'guilty' conscience] is a call to abandon a condition which requires illusions [the need for a holy, righteous God; a higher authority].*" (Marx MEGA I/1/1) Carl Rogers wrote: "*Religion, especially the Protestant Christian tradition, has permeated our culture with the concept*

that man is basically sinful, and only by something approaching a miracle can his sinful nature be negated." "I have little sympathy with the rather prevalent concept that man is basically irrational [wicked], and that his impulses [sensuousness], if not controlled, will lead to destruction of others and self." (Rogers) Thus the cry for the sensuousness in righteousness to prevail over non-sensuous righteousness demanded a system whereby a 'rational,' speculative, enlightened, dialectical process could prevail over an 'irrational,' unspeculative, unenlightened, didactic system (an environment of preaching and teaching had to be replaced with an environment of dialogue, specific truth from above had to be replaced with general 'truth' from below, black and white had to be replaced with gray). "...The ideas of the Enlightenment taught man that he could trust his own reason as a guide to establishing valid ethical norms and that he could rely on himself, needing neither revelation [the Word of God] nor that authority of the church [the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit] in order to know good and evil." (Bronner) Abraham Maslow wrote: "The more enlightened [sensual] the religious institutions get, that is to say, the more liberal [dialectical] they get, the greater will be the advantage for an enterprise run in an enlightened way." "Enlightened economics must assume as a prerequisite synergic institutions set up in such a way that what benefits one benefits all." "Enlightenment management and humanistic supervision can be a brotherhood situation." (Maslow, Maslow) Theodor Adorno wrote: "The Christian religion has been deeply affected by the process of Enlightenment and the conquest of the scientific spirit." (Adorno)

Diaprax is a direct attack upon religion (religion is that which is sacred and sacred is that which you will not question). Diaprax is a direct attack upon religion which is built upon a system of righteousness (the patriarchal paradigm) by a 'religion' which is hostile toward the system of righteousness (the heresiarchal paradigm) and righteousness itself (which can only come from God, i.e. imputed through Christ). While the religions of the world may 'use' the patriarchal paradigm, a top-down system, without God's Word they can only speak men's opinions to the flesh of man. It is only the Moslem, Jewish, and Christian religion which have a patriarchal base, due to their common connection with the law and prophets, but only the gospel itself which remains patriarchal, the Moslem,

Jewish, and apostate Christian religions going dialectical in structure, bound to speculations and human reasoning. It is only God and His Word, who (which) speaks to the soul of man. Diaprax is a 'religion' which is built upon the system of *sensuousness*, a humanistic 'religion' using the 'scientific' method, the dialectical process (treating it as sacred and not to be questioned) to define truth (Remember: Whoever defines terms for you controls your life). Abraham Maslow wrote: *"Science can be the religion of the nonreligious."* (Maslow, *Maslow*) Karl Marx wrote: *"The critique of religion [the system of *sensuousness* evaluating the system of *righteousness* (the children evaluating the parents in the light of the children's *sensuous* desires); an "ought" evaluating "can not" *negates* the "not" in "can not," producing a common "can," thus negating sin, lust, wickedness, etc., as defined by God, and wrong as defined by the parent, liberating man from God, the children from the parents, the *proletariat* from the *bourgeoisie* for the cause of global harmony in worldliness] ends with the categorical imperative to overthrow all conditions in which man is a debased, enslaved, neglected, contemptible being." "Philosophy as theory . . . establishes the basis of its reality as praxis [the system of *sensuousness* religiously put into social practice (*praxis*); the process is not to be questioned —the group will first treat you as irrelevant and then attack you when you question, inhibit, or block the *consensus* process]; it serves to distinguish it from religion [the system of *righteousness*], the wisdom of the other world." (Marx, *Critique*) J. L. Moreno wrote: *"As I tried the sociometric system first on the universe and on the concept of God, its first manifesto was a revolutionary religion [a religion of human *sensuousness*], a change of the idea of the universe and the idea of God. The god of Jesus was further extended, the son 'withered away' until nothing was left except the universal creativity of the Godhead and only one commandment: To each according to what he is (an all-inclusive acceptance of the individual 'as he is')." (Moreno)* Freud wrote: *"It is not really a decisive matter whether one has killed one's father or abstained from the deed,' if the function of the conflict and its consequences are the same [as long as the Father no longer rule as the Father]." (Marcuse quoting Freud) "Freud noted that patricide [the resistance against and *hatred* toward and the *annihilation* of the Father because of his demands upon the home for *righteousness*] and incest [the**

spontaneity of sensuousness, the lust of the flesh and eyes and the pride of life of the children for the sensuous things, gratifying things, i.e. the mother, of the home and world] are part of man's deepest nature." (Yalom) Marx wrote: *"Thus, for instance, once the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the holy family [once both are recognized as being the system of righteousness suppressing the system of sensuousness, suppressing the children's lusts for the mother, i.e. 'mother earth'], the former [the system of righteousness] must itself be annihilated [vernichtet] *theoretically and practically* [by everybody sharing their opinions, finding a common opinion that all can agree upon and acting upon it, thereby *negating* the system of righteousness]."* (Marx, *Feuerbach Theses #4*) Diaprax (social-psychology, Marx and Freud synthesized) is the *praxis* of Genesis 3:1-6 in setting policy in the home, in government, in the workplace, in education, and in the church which is not top-down based (*righteous* in system). *"If the guilt accumulated in the civilized domination of man by man [by top-down authority, such as God or parents, demanding righteousness] can ever be redeemed by freedom [spontaneity of sensuousness], 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 [chose the system of sensuousness—"questioning authority," over and against the system of righteousness—obeying authority]."* (Marcuse) *"To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit."* (Brown) All counseling is the *praxis* of Genesis 3:1-6. Fromm wrote: *"In the process of history man gives birth to himself [through human reasoning progressively being freed from the system of righteousness (freed from the lessons of the past, i.e. lessons not relevant to the sensuousness of the moment of the child, which had to be remembered and carried out without question in obedience to the parent), man is progressively becoming conscious of his own humanity (class consciousness; with the help of psychology and sociology he is rediscovering his human history, i.e. the sensuousness of his youth, when he was seeking liberation of his true impulses and nature but was unable to do so because of parental restraints, i.e. the history of the parents being forced upon him)]. He becomes what he potentially is [sensuous, fleshy, natural, worldly], 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 [evaluating good from evil not from God's Word, i.e. the past, but from his own *sensuous, carnal* nature in the present, in the 'moment,' refusing to (or unable to) go back to the past, i.e. admit his sin and seek after *righteousness*, i.e. seek after God again, i.e. return home, as the prodigal son, to the loving but 'authoritative' father (unable to do so having *annihilated* him and the past, having written the past out of history, i.e. inappropriate facts, truths, or information of the past canceled by the willful acceptance of only the 'facts,' 'truths,' or information which are *appropriate* to the present and potential future conditions of life)]." (Fromm, *as gods*) The dialectical process is the only way for man to filter (liberate) the history of the present (*sensuousness*, dialogue) out from under the influences of the history of the past (*righteousness*, truths of the past preached and taught), through social dialogue, focusing upon *sensuousness* (human relationships), not *righteousness* (rightness with God or parent), as the pathway to the future. "We are proud that in his conduct of life man has become free from external authorities, which tell him what to do and what not to do." "Man is free from all ties binding him to spiritual authorities [making him subject to the system of *righteousness*], but this very freedom leaves him alone and anxious, overwhelms him with a feeling of his own individual insignificance and powerlessness." "All that matters is that the opportunity for genuine activity be restored to the individual; that the purposes of society and of his own become identical [via. the *praxis* of collective *sensuousness* —*consensus* put into social action]." (Fromm, *Escape*) Unless you are truly (not just giving lip service but truly) dead to yourself (dead to your *sensuousness* 'driving' you in your every thought and action, dead to the wanting of gratifying objects of this world, "What can I get out of this person or thing for myself?" including God), alive in Christ (alive in Him and His *righteousness*, alive in Him, the Lamb of God, who was obedient to his Heavenly Father in all things, even dying to cover your sins, i.e. your '*righteousness*'—your former lusting after *sensuousness* —with his blood), and filled with the Holy Spirit (Christ in you via. the Spirit of God, directing you in all things), some of this article will be too difficult to handle. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin [dead to *sensuousness*, it no longer controlling your thoughts and actions], but alive unto God [his *righteousness* imputed by Christ to you through

your faith in Him] *through Jesus Christ our Lord.*" Romans 6:11
 Otherwise you might say, as a Diaprax-ed ("*Church Growth*," "*Emergent Church*," *contemporary Church*) 'minister' once told me (every time I quoted the Word of God, treating it "as is"), "*Now you have just gone to far.*"

I apologize for my articles always becoming so lengthy and heavy (requiring concentrated thought, i.e. I realize that many will stop reading this article, if they have not already, because of its technicality and lengthiness —knowing that if they managed to stay with it to the end it would help them, especially if they are thinking about college, ministry, government, business, family, etc.), but it is due to the nature of the subject of which I am exposing, which is subtle and complex. While there is much redundancy in this article, it is done to make clear the designed confusion which comes with the process, which has even come into the church with its 'use' of scriptures, or rather the extrapolation of , the perversion of, and the lack of scriptures used in the 'contemporary' *emergent* church today —which affects everything else in life.

(For anyone wanting to get a good handle on the subject of this article I would suggest printing it out or saving it to file and reading it at least two if not three times, top to bottom, the first read being a quick one, underlining or noting areas of question or interest to come back to on the next read. I read social-psychology books two or more times, some portions a dozen times to make sure I 'know' what they are meaning to say, so as not to let my 'bias' misinterpret the foolishness of their way. When I can have a good bible study reading *their* material, God's word exposing mans carnal 'justifications,' I know I have a handle on their deceiving arguments.)

It is the gospel and its simplicity which brings joy to the soul. Joy comes from God and not from man. If you put any man, ideology, institution, or thing, between God and you, making them or it your access to God, you will lose your Joy (the Joy of the Holy Spirit in you).

Yet we must not be ignorant of Satan's devices, exposing them for what they are, evil. "*Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had*

our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Ephesians 2:2,3

This stuff (satan's devices and man's love of them) is grievous to the soul (the grieving comes after warning those who you know and love, but who continue to believe in man's way, which is death, and *refuse* to know God's way, which is life, no matter what scriptures you share with them or what you do for them in love, i.e. to warn them by turning them to the word of God is to be labeled by the contemporary minded religious leadership as being divisive, causing dissention within the fellowship; accusing you of being 'hateful' when you persist in holding them accountable to the whole word of God). Jesus was acquainted with grief, seeing the multitudes reject him as the way, the truth, and the life, accepting Diaprax (*sensuousness*) instead, as their way, their truth, and their life. The Apostle Paul addressed Diaprax in this way: *"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. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him."* 2 Corinthians 11:3-4

Diaprax has entered the church, being used to 'grow' it into the 'kingdom of God,' building it upon the *sensuousness* of man rather than upon the *righteousness* of God. The kingdom of God is simply "doing the Fathers will," something which could not be done until the messiah came to redeem man back to the Father and the work of the Holy Spirit in the redeemed, producing the fruit of *righteousness* in those of faith, belief, obedience. *"Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven"* is not the will of man (the system of *sensuousness*) doing "good works," in God's name, on earth, it is God's will being done on earth by men of faith, by those in the system of *righteousness*, by those who are in *righteousness*, i.e. those in Christ, dead to their will, no longer serving their vain desires (even doing so in the name of Jesus, deceiving themselves as well as *"the hearts of the simple"*), and alive in Christ, simply submitting, daily, to the will of the Heavenly Father, obedient to the Father's will, through Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit, in all things

(something man can not do in and of himself). *"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."* Romans 16:17, 18

Diaprax was first used in the garden in Eden, as recorded in [Genesis 3:1-6](#), and will continue to be used by the world in all activities, the home, education, entertainment, business, government, the church, etc. until Christ returns to judge the world for using it as its way, its truth, and its life. Only he who is dead to this world (dead to himself) and alive in Christ, who has chosen Christ over this world, who has denied himself (and continues to do so; "giving up early," as James Borchert would say, to his will, knowing he can not do God's will, which God will agree with, that only God can do His will thru those who "give up" to him in all things, that God might receive all the glory), picked up his cross (and continues to do so), and follows Christ (no longer living according to Diaprax and the way of the world but living in Christ) is free from the judgment of God upon the world, i.e. his former tie with it, with its use of Diaprax. *"And if it seem evil unto you to serve the LORD, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD."* Joshua 24:15

Sigmund Freud had idols of the gods of the Amorites on his desk, which should tell you something about where psychology came from and what it is all about. There is no such thing as a "[Christian psychiatrist](#)," i.e. *"what concord hath Christ with Belial?"* Did I just go to far?

Since the system of *sensuousness*, via. psychological and sociological methods (Diaprax), has entered the church and is being used to market it, I have a word of warning. When you think God can not do his work without you, your ministry, or your institution you have just hired the devil as your administrator. He will market you, your ministry, your institution any day of the week, even doing it in the name of Jesus. Freud, like Marx, was dialectical in thought and action, 'driven' with the 'purpose' of emancipating or liberating the system of *sensuousness* (world driven) over and against the system of *righteousness* (Father directed). *"The basic structure of Freud's thought is committed to dialectics."* *"His finest insights*

*are incurably 'dialectical.'" (Brown) "The entry into Freud cannot avoid being a plunge into a strange world and a strange language—a world of sick men,It is a shattering experience for anyone seriously committed to the Western traditions of morality and rationality to take a steadfast, unflinching look at what Freud has to say." "Our real choice is between holy and unholy madness: open your eyes and look around you—madness is in the saddle anyhow." "It is possible to be mad and to be unblest, but it is not possible to get the blessing without the madness; it is not possible to get the illuminations without the derangement," "I wagered my intellectual life on the idea of finding in Freud what was missing in Marx." (Mike Connor quoting Brown, from the March 23-30, 2005 issue of Metro Santa Cruz) Therefore neither his methods, nor Marx's methods, must be used by a Christian unless they "want" to *negate* a patriarchal Father and a patriarchal obedient Son and turn God's *righteousness* into human *sensuousness* as the way, the truth, and the life, i.e. for the 'purpose' of initiating and sustaining individual-social harmony, even calling it "church growth." A filthy rag by any other name, i.e. ' *righteousness*,' smells just as rancid. "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*

There are many who are being deceived within the Church, thinking they can serve both Christ and the system of Diaprax (*righteousness* and *sensuousness* at the same time, which is the system of *sensuousness*, i.e. *unrighteousness*). Don't be one of them. You can not be in Christ (*righteousness*) and *of* the world (*unrighteousness*). You can not believe in and use the system of Diaprax and believe in and walk in Christ at the same time (any attempt to even mingle them is to reject Christ and his *righteousness* for the 'purpose' of your *sensuousness*). "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 The Apostle Paul is clear about us living in the world, with Diaprax being all around us, but we are not to be of the world, participating in the Diaprax (the dialectical process put into *praxis*, justifying our *sensuous* thoughts and actions —using "theory and practice" to make the world a 'better' place for all to live in).

Diaprax is the *negation* of the father system (a top-down, closed system —the *patriarchal paradigm*). The patriarchal paradigm is a way of thinking and acting which is built upon faith, obedience, chastening, and love. Chastening and love go hand in hand with faith and obedience (a condition which restrains Diaprax —Diaprax hates restraint and therefore hates the condition which uses chastening to produce *righteousness*, the idea being: to get rid of *righteousness* as the 'purpose' of life and chastening as a practice of life, you must *negate* the father system, i.e. destroy the patriarchal home—and then with *sensuousness* and licentiousness liberated, the Lawless one—Satan, can rule in the name of Christ, God and man both working for the brotherhood of mankind—Antichrist). *"And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. 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. Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? 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. 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 12:5-11 It is chastening which *"yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness."* *"My son, despise not the chastening of the LORD; neither be weary of his correction: For whom the LORD loveth he correcteth; even as a father the son in whom he delighteth."* Proverbs 3:11, 12 Although the Apostle Paul is addressing communion in particular in the next verse, his warning applies

to all things in our lives. *"For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world."* 1 Corinthians 11:31, 32 Christ obeyed His Father in all things. We are to be as the Son of God, *"bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of the"* Son, the obedience of the Son to the Father. *"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 Anyone hating the Father (the father system of *righteousness*) hates Christ and anyone hating Christ (who was obedient to his Heavenly Father, remaining in the father system —the patriarchal paradigm, even when it lead to his death) hates the Father. *"He that hateth me hateth my Father also."* John 15:23 Anyone who loves Diaprax hates both [the Father and the Son](#) even if they claim to be 'serving' God. You can not use Diaprax (the system of the world and of the Antichrist) and serve God. You can not love the world system and love God.

When Diaprax (the world system of *"righteousness,"* which is really *unrighteousness*) is used by those in the Church "to grow the Church," the church always ends up being used by the world system to persecute the *righteous*, its members convinced in themselves (therefore deceived into believing) that what they are doing is for the advancement of the Kingdom of God here on earth. *"They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service."* John 16:2 In fact once the Church identifies itself as having a common connection with the world system, a system of 'self preservation,' the use of physical force, which is used to 'preserve' the world system's position of power, is used to 'preserve' the Church's position of power in the world. As long as the Church and the state are working towards a common end, 'self' preservation, that is, working towards the preservation of the '*righteousness*' of *sensuousness*, they work together in persecuting the *righteous*, i.e. persecuting those who expose both the church and the state for the evilness of their way of thinking and acting, i.e. exposing them for their *praxis* of the *dialectical process*, i.e. their self justification of *sensuousness*, perceiving it, defending it, and promoting it as though it were *righteousness*, 'driven' by *sensuousness* for the 'purpose' of *sensuousness*. Social harmony (teamwork and 'group think' for the

common cause) is always based upon *sensuousness*, and always comes from and supports a [self-environment](#) 'righteousness,' a feeling of 'righteousness' which is not *righteous* before God. This is what I call the tower of Babel syndrome, i.e. man making a collective name for himself, working on a group project so as not to be divided amongst himself, i.e. individualized, alienated, and scattered, i.e. fighting amongst himself because of a right and wrong system, or way or thinking, which prevents him from forming an environment of "*equality of opportunity*" where all men can discover a common *sensuous* identity and overcome a *righteousness* which is greater than human *righteousness*, i.e. overcoming a system which prevented humanism from joining with the church, making it less inhuman, making it less judgmental towards the wickedness of man's heart by focusing upon the human heart and not God and His Word, thus defining God's Word through human reasoning (*sensuousness*), defining God's heart (and love) with human reasoning, making it more human, i.e. making it sense based, thus defining God and man as working together for the common 'good' of mankind, i.e. 'driven' with the 'purpose' of creating a world of brotherly love based upon human *sensuousness*. By redefining Christ, defining him as in common with human *sensuousness*, Satan himself can join forces with 'Christ,' i.e. an antichrist made in his own image, uniting the world upon a common cause, that of removing the *righteous*, removing those not made in the image of man, removing those who are not in harmony with and therefore expose the 'righteousness' of man as sin (silencing those who exposing man's worship of his human nature for what it is, wicked, i.e. an abomination before God).

"*Equality of opportunity*" is not a neutral condition. It is a *hostile* condition. It is *hatred* in disguise. (Because the heart of man it not changed by God, since His patriarchal paradigm is the condition which must be *negated*, the unregenerate heart of man sees its work of *annihilation* as 'good.')

It is a condition which must *annihilate* the condition (and the people who initiate and sustaine the condition or system of *righteousness*) which is perceived as the "oppressor" of the system of *sensuousness* in the past, and therefore 'justified' in *negating* it in the present for the sake of the preventing its reappearance in the future (manifesting a ['just dues'](#) mentality and practice against any who oppressed it in the past, with a *sense* of 'righteousness,' i.e. justice, in doing so). Many people have

suffered in the past, are suffering today, and will suffer in the future, a horrible '*negation*' at the alter of "*equality of opportunity*." Its pathway has always been strewn with death and destruction, poverty, slavery, and oppression by, for, and against those who embraced its mantra. Many have experienced, are experiencing, and will experience, their own '*negation*' at the hands of those who helped them hoist its banner. Despite the "rising expectations" (the 'driving' sense of liberation), which gives its adherence 'purpose' (and hope) at the onset of its *praxis*, it always results in their own or someone else's slavery and death. The hands of those who *praxis* the dialectical process, for the 'purpose' of "*equality of opportunity*" (dopamine emancipation for "*the 'All'*"), are bloody hands. Despite the deceitful cry that they are hands of compassion and caring, they are hands of hate, using theft, destruction, and death to further their vain cause. Those utilizing the system of *deceit* and *manipulation* for the 'purpose' of "*equality of opportunity*," are simply utilizing the system of *sensuousness* for their own gain. They are the deceived gaining pleasure in giving the deceived the appearance that what they are doing it is for the 'good' of all. All who *praxis* the dialectical process, turning good into evil and evil into good, 'justify' to themselves and others that they are 'good,' when in truth they are evil. (Have I gone to far?)

Yet the scriptures encourage us, that no matter what the world says and does to us (even when it comes from the 'church'), we are to *endure* to the end in Christ. "*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.*" 2 Corinthians 4:8-10 "*And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.*" Mark 13:13 "*And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death.*"

Revelation 12:11

Endure means to be *patient*, waiting upon the Lord in all things, while the word *tolerance* means to participate (not to warn others of God's judgment upon *unrighteousness* is to participate) in the system of Diaprax, i.e. the system of *sensuousness*, *deceitfulness*, and *manipulation*. Patience and tolerance are not the same thing. One does not participate in

unrighteousness while the other one does. God is patient, waiting for man to repent of his *unrighteousness* but God does not tolerate *unrighteousness*. He does not accept it as a way of life, as a "life style," as another option for thinking and acting. *"For thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness: neither shall evil dwell with thee."* Psalms 5:4 *"That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."* 2Thesalonians 2:12 *"But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth."* 1Timothy 5:6 *"For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord GOD: wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye."* Ezekiel 18:32 *"The LORD taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy."* Psalms 147:11 If man's hope rests in happiness, pleasure, and therefore in *sensuousness* (as Kant taught in his book *Critique of Pure Reason*), then man has no true and lasting hope (as the Words of God explains). *"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; And patience, experience; and experience, hope: And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us."* Romans 5:1-5 Only having hope in what God gives us (his mercy) affords us true and lasting hope. It is only in Christ that tribulation works patience and patience experience (in enduring), and experience working hope, a hope that is not found in us (for we would not have endured the tribulation but would have compromised our faith to escape the pain of rejection and afflictions or tribulation from the world) but rather having a hope which everlasting, found in Him and His work in us. It is in His mercy alone that we find true and lasting hope, i.e. receiving *what we do not deserve* —*eternal life*, having already received his grace, i.e. not receiving *what we do deserved* —*eternal death*. *"In every thing give thanks: for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you."* 1 Thessalonians 5:21 Therefore God is patient (unchanging from his position, waiting for man to repent and come to His position as he warns him of ensuing judgment) and not tolerant (God is not changeable from his position, He is not approving or accepting of any who differs from his position). Those who serve Satan would want to deceive you into believing that "traditional Christianity" is

tolerant of man's *unrighteousness* when in truth it is not (*transformational* Christianity, i.e. the "contemporary church," i.e. the church which tries not to be "religious," is tolerant of man's *unrighteousness* but the true church is not, while it does not condemn any man it exposes *unrighteousness* that man would repent and escape, in Christ, from condemnation). "*The traditional Christian values of tolerance, brotherhood, and equality are more firmly held by people who do not affiliate with any religious group.*" (Adorno) Adorno defined the 'tolerant' church upon the worldly, philosophical principles of the French Revolution, *liberty* or the tolerance of ambiguity, *fraternity* or the brotherhood of mankind, and *equality* or equality of opportunity, none of which are scriptural, i.e. not from God but only proceeding from man.

God did not tolerate sin in the garden in Eden (he drove Adam and Eve out of the garden when they *praxis*-ed the dialectical process —did Diaprax). He does not tolerate it today, all are condemned except those who are 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 Nor will he tolerate it in the future (judging the world for its use of Diaprax). By redefining *righteousness*, removing its negative elements (by justifying man's sinful nature—by evaluating his actions as being good when they are in fact evil, and by regarding God's judgment upon man's sinful thoughts and actions as being irrelevant), and focusing instead upon what man has done 'right,' man can liberate himself (his conscience) from judgment, alienation, and war through the practice of dialectically *synthesizing righteousness* with *sensuousness* (thereby deceiving himself in believing that 'driven' by his *sensuous* nature—human respect and approval, his 'good' works he can 'save' himself and the world or at least make the world a 'better' place to live in). Hegel wrote: "*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)

Diaprax is a way of thinking where truth is not found *above* the human experience but is found *within* the human experience. Diaprax a way of thinking where truth (and life) is found within *sensuousness*, i.e. found

within the human *praxis* of the *negation* of pain (including any condition which is a barrier to the acquisition of pleasure, i.e. any condition which is a barrier to the acquisition of the objects in space and time which engender pleasure) by the *actualization* of pleasure (where the value of life, or justification for death, is based upon the degree of pleasure vs. pain the person experiences). Diaprax is where truth (and life) is not found in *righteousness* (in Christ who is our *righteousness*) but rather in *unrighteousness* which 'seems to' be *righteousness*. Diaprax begins with the idea that man is basically 'good' in nature (since pleasure always appears to be good in the 'moment'), that man can become truly good based upon his being raised within the 'right' environment or 'healthy' living conditions which produce freedom of or the liberalization of pleasure 'for all' since it is our nature to experience pleasure as being a good thing, as a good 'moment' in our lives—since it, the [dopamine moment](#), is an ever passing moment in time and needs an environment which promises to provide a continuous re-experiencing of its emancipation, i.e. the pleasure 'moment' is experienced as being practical, realistic, pragmatic, or reasonable and any unnatural barrier or restraint to the experiencing of the pleasurable 'moment' is experienced, i.e. perceived as being impractical, unrealistic, idealistic, or unreasonable, unless such restraint is perceived as being necessary only for the 'moment,' with the purpose of producing a future condition which promises or 'guarantees' the liberation or emancipation of pleasurable 'moments,' experienced not only for one's self and but also for all others; i.e. as in the dialectical system, or dopamine driven, "'felt' needs" moments, of Sodom and Gomorra, where the laws of human nature were liberated from any restraining laws above human nature—for a moment in history that is.

History, for Diaprax is the persons experiencing of life along the spectrum of pleasure and pain, with the conditions causing pain (the inhibition or blocking of pleasure—natural, mental, and social) being the least desired and the conditions causing pleasure (negation of pain—natural, mental, and social) the most desired, i.e. situational ethics thus is based upon the augmentation of pleasure in all situations, *negating* any issue of *righteousness* which inhibits or blocks *sensuousness*. History, for Diaprax is not the lessons learned from past generations, lessons which they pass on to the next generation, lessons which cause a barrier to the experiencing

of pleasure for the present generation (as they apply the lessons of history learned from the past generation to their lives and the lives of their children, restraining social experiences which open up the possibilities of future experiences of pleasure; large families cover three generation, maintaining traditional history, thus they had to be perceived as abnormal and no longer encouraged or supported as they restrain the possibilities of social 'change,' i.e. 'change' meaning the augmentation of pleasure—individually and socially). For Diaprax, the lessons learned by the children of Israel, learned from their wilderness experiences and their parents wilderness experiences (lessons taught them by God) and passed down to their children (keeping them subject to God) would not be considered proper history since they would reinforce restraints against *sensuousness*. Such history (taking the scriptures literally and not making them allegorical and subject to sensual analysis and change) would inhibit finding *sensual* harmony with the Canaanites (and the rest of the world), i.e. preventing social harmony and global unity.

Diaprax justifies wars ('change'). Diaprax 'uses' war ([uses crime](#), i.e. uses *crisis* and the "*community of sin*" to gain access to the "*community*") for the 'purpose' of 'change,' i.e. on the basis that wars destroy past history, they destroy items of the past, items which would continue to remind people of the past as well as destroy the people who hold the present and future conditions subject to past conditions (and thus continue to maintain a strong support for resistance to 'change' in the present generation, resistance which would be passed on to the next generation). Diaprax 'uses' war, which was meant to keep things as they are, to destroy things as they are (to destroy the patriarchal paradigm). Diaprax then rewrites history for the next generation to justify its perception of history marching man to a better world as man washes from his brain the restraining lessons taught by the past generations (taught by non- *sensuous* parents as well as a non-*sensuous* God). *"The current generation is the first in the history of the world which has nothing to learn from grandparents;"* (Yalom) *"Capital' ... is, according to Marx, 'not a thing but a social relation between persons mediated through things.' 'These relations,' Marx states, 'are not those between one individual and another, but between worker and capitalist, tenant and landlord, etc. Eliminate these relations [top-down, patriarchal system] and you abolish the whole of society; a scientifically*

*acceptable solution does exist [socialist, heresiarchal paradigm]... For to accept that solution, even in theory, would be tantamount to observing society from a class standpoint [have's - have not's] other than that of the bourgeoisie [right - wrong]. And no class can do that-unless it is willing to abdicate its power freely. '... the ideological history of the bourgeoisie was nothing but a desperate resistance to every insight into the true nature of the society it had created and thus to a real understanding of its class situation.'... the Communist Manifesto makes the point that the bourgeoisie produces its own grave-diggers [their own children, liberated (liberalized) by social engineers (disguised as teachers, ministers, etc.), will be used to destroy them]." (Lukács, *History*) "History, almost universally, has dichotomized this higher & lower [righteousness-wickedness], but it is now clear that they are on the same continuum [sensuous pleasure-sensuous pain], in a hierarchical-integration of prepotency & postpotency [augmentation of pleasure]." (Maslow, *Journals*) "Without exception, patients enter group therapy with the history of a highly unsatisfactory experience in their first and most important group —their primary family." ". . . 'to expose the patient, under more favorable circumstances, to emotional situations which he could not handle in the past. ... undergo a corrective emotional experience suitable to repair the traumatic influence of pervious experience.' " (Franz Alexander in Yalom) "Through the therapist's continued willingness to verbalize and to confront the calamity calmly, patients gradually realize the irrationality of the feared calamity [judgment by God or punishment by parents for disobeying commands, now perceived as non- sensuous, 'irrational']." "The therapist assists the patient to clarify the nature of the imagined danger and then ... to detoxify, to disconfirm the reality of this danger." "He reenacts early family scripts in the group and, if therapy is successful, is able to experiment with new behavior, to break free from the locked family role he once occupied. ... the patient changes the past by reconstituting it." (Yalom) By 'shifting' the environment of communication from dichotomy (duality—preaching and teaching *righteousness*) to spectrum (diversity—dialoguing *sensuousness*) the traditional family, capitalism, and religion could be "*detoxified*" of their "*negative*" (ridged) aspects and united "*positively*" (*sensuously*) within the process of change, resulting in "*positive social change*." The idea being, don't openly fight against the family, the capitalist, the fundamental*

religious extremist (keeping duality in place), but rather, through the use of *crisis* and *dialogue*, seduce them into finding common ground with themselves and others and then help them to liberate themselves from that which divides (alienates) themselves from others, i.e. their family, their capital, and their religion. Attach them to their 'opposite' via. *sensuousness* and they will *negate righteousness* themselves.

Diaprax is man, working along with a *sensuous*, loving 'God' (a 'caring' facilitator), 'driven' with the 'purpose' of creating a 'better world' for himself and others. Diaprax is a 'new' world order (based upon the system Satan used in Genesis 3:1-6), where the value or worth of life is measured not by *righteousness* (where God sets the standards for life and death, good and evil—where 'purpose' is found within *righteousness* which is above human nature, restraining *sensuousness*, i.e. where Spirit is above the 'spirits' of mankind), but rather the value or worth of life is measured by human *sensuousness* (where man sets the standards for life and death, good and evil—where 'purpose' is found within the *sensuousness* of mankind himself, i.e. the practical, where the temporal nature of man, driving man towards an every greater unity with himself and the world, is perceived as '*righteousness*,' i.e. where 'spirit' is of, by, and for 'spirits,' whose 'justification' necessitates the *negation* or replacing of any condition which limits or restrains its liberation within man—a Gnostic construct or paradigm). "*Humanism asserts that the test of human conduct must be found in human experience; concern for man replaces concern about pleasing God.*" (Wheat)

By merging *righteousness*, i.e. God and his word, i.e. his Spirit speaking to the *soul* of man, with *sensuousness*, i.e. the environment stimulating the *flesh* of man, *righteousness*, that which speaks to the soul of man, becomes subject to, and therefore *negated* by the *praxis* of *sensuousness*, that which speaks to the flesh of man. That which speaks to the soul of man (the Word and Spirit of God proclaiming *righteousness*) is made irrelevant by that which speaks to the flesh of man (the words of men dialoguing *sensuousness*—where mans *thoughts* and *actions*, uniting in *consensus*, cancel out *righteousness*). By bringing philosophy (human thought *driven* by *sensual* dissatisfaction with what "is," i.e. dissatisfaction with "is" dictating what "is" and "is not," human thought which is always vain, i.e. subjective in nature) into the spiritual realm, psychology (human nature)

and sociology (collective justification of human nature) take captive the thoughts and actions of men to the cause of augmenting the *sensuousness* of pleasure, thereby redefining *righteousness* as the *praxis* of social *sensuousness*. "One reason Tillich is unwilling to openly disavow religion is that he must be accepted as a theologian in order to formulate and gain acceptance of an imaginative Grand Synthesis of theology and philosophy." (Wheat) *Psychoanalysis is the heir to a mystical tradition which it must affirm (the 'magical' body of occidental mysticism, and the 'diamond' body of oriental mysticisms, and, in psychoanalysis, the polymorphously perverse body of childhood.) Psychoanalysis, mysticism, poetry, the philosophy of organism [the many parts become as one, i.e. becoming alive as one, united into one 'spirit' while fighting against 'unrighteousness,' a common cause bringing all together assisted by a nature common to all—Avatar, the pathway to oneness is 'through' nature (the power of nature), negating that which seeks to dominate nature, i.e. is not of or not seeking to be at-one-with nature, i.e. is not mystical, demonic, etc.], Feuerbach, and Marx – the unseen harmony is stronger than the seen. Whitehead constantly draws attention to the dialectical patterns in mystical thought [the 'quest' of oneness, wholism, unity, etc, i.e. peace.]."*

(Brown) (Marx tried to demythologize Hegel who tried to demythologize Gnosticism, but could not negate the system, remaining captive to the Gnostic 'call' to one-ness or all-ness.) In this way mystical thought (*sensual* 'righteousness') replaces *righteousness* (from God) as the driving ('divine') force for justification, justification for ones thoughts and actions no longer being from above, by faith in God and His Word, but now guided by that which is below, by human nature and social relationships, via a 'rational' (dialectical, Gnostic) 'quest' for one-ness.

If all men knew of their wickedness, none would be justified in using the dialectical process in judging another man, but since man embraces his nature, his *sensuousness* as though it were *righteous* he is able to judge others who do not measure up to, i.e. are not able to initiate and sustain his conditions of *righteousness* ("If you produce pain in my life," i.e. perceived as being an act of *unrighteousness*, "then I will produce pain in yours," i.e. perceived as being an act of *righteousness*—any person who brings in the conditions which produce alienation—inhibits or blocks one-ness or all-ness, perceived as an act of *unrighteousness*, must either negate

the conditions which produce *unrighteousness* or be treated as unrighteous, alienated, i.e. excluded from the all, the one). By the *righteousness* of God all men are condemned, therefore only by faith in Christ Jesus, who is the *righteousness* of God, is *righteousness* imputed to man by God, redeeming man from his condemnation by God. The dialectical process, with the premise that man is, by his own nature, 'good' or 'righteous,' sets in motion the *praxis* of man's *sensuousness* as the means to *righteousness*, thereby condemning all men to judgment by God. In contrast to human reasoning being used to justify social *praxis* as *righteousness*, that is if it produces pleasure or offers a hope in producing pleasure, God does not justify either man or his social *praxis* as having any attributes of *righteousness*. God's *righteousness* exposes man's *righteousness* as evil. The use of Diaprax (human reasoning justifying human nature) negates the *righteousness* of God (in the mind of man), thus justifying man, in his own eyes, as being *righteous*. In this way of thinking (the heresiarchal paradigm, i.e. the paradigm of heresy or 'change'), the more a person does for society and society does for the justification of the nature of man, the more 'righteous' the person and society become in the eyes of man. *"Persons are, therefore, to be taken as ends in the sense that all the ways of a society, its institutions, its practices and its faiths, are to be judged ultimately by their services to the development of each member-person."* (Benne) *"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."* 2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12

As the Apostle Paul warned Timothy of Diaprax, we to must not yield to the temptation of mixing (justify our) faith with "human reasoning" (the dialectical process, 'the scientific method') which is really justifying *sensuousness* (justifying his vanity). *"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. Grace be with thee. Amen."* 1 Timothy 6:20-21 Science (human reasoning, "higher order thinking skills," etc.), which can only be used on that which is sensual (temporal), when applied to man only results in materializing him, thus justifying his vanity. *"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." (Marx, MEGA I/3). Science, when applied to man, is no longer true science since man, unlike anything else God created, is a *living* soul —is eternal and destined for eternal life through faith and belief in Christ or eternal death through lack of faith and not believing in Christ. Science questions, faith does not. It is impossible to please God without faith (Hebrews 11:6). Science, since it is sense (worldly) based, when applied to man 'demythologizes' man, i.e. "*spoils*" faith. The woman in the garden in Eden, coming to "the knowledge of good and evil" via. *sensuousness* (using "the scientific method" in questioning what "is"), rejected faith in God, His Word, and his *righteousness* (with Adam following). 'Behavior science' is thus *antithesis* to faith. "*Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.*" Colossians 2:8 > "*The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.*" 1 Corinthians 3:18-20 > "*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,*" Romans 1:21, 22

Diaprax *negates* holiness by placing man's hope in himself, in his carnal nature and his temporal works which can not produce holiness (which are not of God who is holy) but instead is man focusing upon himself (his carnal nature and his works —even when done for God) as the foundation of reality. > "*Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ; As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance: But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy. And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear: Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you, Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God.*" 1

Peter 1:13-21 Without holiness (which only comes from God) man can not escape God's wrath upon the world, wrath against man because of his love of *sensuousness* (the world) instead of *righteousness* (God). "*But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons out ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless.*" 2 Peter 3:10-14

Filtering *righteousness* through human *sensuousness* (human reasoning—situational), *negates righteousness* (faith—absolute). Filtering that which is of the spirit (eternal) through the flesh (temporal) *negates* that which is of the spirit (eternal life). That is, making *sensuousness* (approach pleasure-avoid pain) the evaluator of *righteousness* *negates righteousness*, i.e. makes *righteousness* *unrighteousness* ("*negative*," i.e. a pain and therefore unattractive, i.e. undesirable, i.e. to be avoided) and *unrighteousness* *righteousness* ("*positive*," i.e. a pleasure and therefore attractive, i.e. desirable, i.e. to be approached). In this way the 'church' can be 'grown' upon the foundation of human relationship (*sensuousness*), while using the name of God (having a form of Godliness, having a *sense* of 'love' for one another, what 'seems to' be love—*sensuousness*), but without the power (not having God's love, which is only knowable by His Spirit via the *righteousness* of Christ, His *righteousness* imputed to us through our faith and belief in Him, his love which is not vain nor philosophical, i.e. his love is not bound to nor understandable by human reasoning). Simply by a person's consent or willful participate in the approach pleasure-avoid pain continuum "seems to" make life (in the person's eyes) a righteous>-unrighteous duality, *righteousness* is then based upon *sensuousness*, pleasure overcoming pain displacing *righteousness* (*righteousness*, that which is not subject to or influenced by the world, is displaced by *sensuousness*, that which is subject to and

influenced by the world), the flesh of man displacing the soul of man (man made in the image of God now is made in his own image), "concern about pleasing God" is replaced with "concern about pleasing man." As a little leaven leavens the whole lump, a little flesh (which "seems to" be good at the time) grows to envelop a persons every thought and action, Good then no longer resides above man, being greater than his nature, but is now resident within the nature of man and the world. Good is therefore based upon the scale (spectrum or continuum) of *sensuousness*, the amount of pleasure (or lack of pain) the environment is making available or promises to provide, the amount of pleasure (or liberation from pain) it has the potential for producing in the future or the 'moment' of pleasure (or lack of pain) it is now providing. Faith is then accepted as long as it is attractive to man and does not lead to pain, i.e. physical or mental pain and/or social rejection, i.e. alienation.

It is along this spectrum of sensuousness (which makes man measurable) that the worth of a person, their thoughts and their actions (their works), are from then on measured. It is here that the ideology of Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud unite, *sensuousness* becoming the measuring tool for good and evil, life and death, *righteousness* ("religion") identified as an "opiate," the root cause of "neurosis," i.e. the initiator and sustainer of social disharmony. "*Psychoanalysis must treat religion as a neurosis.*" (Brown>) By finding the area between the two (where they are willing to compromise your belief with it only slightly bothering their conscience for the sake of human relationship), between a persons belief and their actions, their submission to *righteousness* and lust for *sensuousness*, the area of *sensuousness*, already enjoyed within the persons *righteousness* (a "positive" subconscious religion, i.e. desire for human relationship and tolerances, i.e. justifying exceptions to the rules for personal *sensuous* reasons, of the system of *sensuousness*), can be taped into and used to farther 'deliver' the person from the system of *righteousness* (from "negative" imposed religion, i.e. producing personal and social alienation, "neurosis"), bring him into greater harmony with his natural system of *sensuousness*, where he is now 'driven' by human relationship as the 'purpose' in life, now 'driven' by that which is below, his own nature, rather than being lead by He who is above, God (not even being fully aware of what has happened to him, i.e. being deceived into believing that what he

is doing is 'good' for himself, others, and even the furtherance of the kingdom of God). See the articles, [Diaprax: the spiraling process of 'changingness,'](#) [The Dialectical Formula](#), and [The Dialectical process is sin](#) for more on "systems analysis."

"The pattern of history exhibits a dialectic of neurosis. The core of the neurosis of individuals lay in the 'memory-traces of the experiences of former generations.'" "Adult sexuality, restricted by rules, to maintain family and society, is a clear instance of repression; and therefore leads to neurosis." (Brown)

"My work on motivations come from the clinic, from a study of neurotic people. This carry-over from the study of neurosis to the study of labor in factories is legitimate. The main support of this theory has come mostly from psychotherapists like Rogers and Fromm. Work is not about paying the rent anymore —it is about self-fulfillment ['rent' correlated to the system of righteousness, i.e. accountability to higher authority, the love of parent, God, etc, 'self-fulfillment' correlated to the system of sensuousness, i.e. Dopamine emancipation, the love of pleasure]. The United States is changing into a managerial society. The evidence upon which Theory X management is based [patriarchal paradigm, top-down, private business, of the 'closed' system of righteousness] is practically nil [in other words according to Maslow's humanistic, anti-patriarch bias he considered it not worthy of knowing, his hatred toward higher authority already determining his observations and desired outcome]. In our democratic society, any enterprise —any individual —has its obligations to the whole. Any company that restricts its goals purely to its own profits, its own production, and its own sales is getting a kind of a free ride from me and other taxpayers. Tax credits would be given to the company [and church] that helps to improve the whole society, and helps to improve democracy by helping to create democratic individuals. [The] goal is simply to build group companies [and churches] where people can self-actualize."
(Maslow, Maslow) emphasis added

With psychological profiling, all are being measured along this spectrum, those at the lower end of the spectrum, the *righteous*, the "intolerant of ambiguity" (not easily influenced and controlled by *sensuousness*, who are

willing to live and die in *righteousness*) and therefore are not easily influenced by the tyranny of the masses and controllable by the tyrant (those not 'driven' by the fear of the lose of pleasure, the things of this world, since they have given them, along with their lives, to the Lord), being the least worthy of all. These are the ones who are to be most mistrusted and feared (labeled, dialectically, as terrorists, potential fascists, trouble makers, divisive, heartless, authoritarians, antisocial, negative, prejudice, etc). Thus all must be identified and tracked along the spectrum of *sensuousness*, used to identify the sheep from the goats (the sheep in this case being those of this world, the goats being those who are not subject to the things of this world), for the sake of initiating and sustaining ' *righteousness*' (world, peace, social justice and harmony) which is not *righteousness*. The Apostle Paul addressed the deception of Diaprax this way. *"But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion [sensuousness]; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we [in God's righteousness]. For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works."* 2 Corinthians 11:12-15

In true *righteousness*, works are no longer the product of a man's relationship with men but rather as a result of a man's relationship with God, i.e. the result of God's work of *righteousness* (covering our sins), through Christ Jesus, *imputed* to man by faith, the works being spiritual (by God's leading) and no longer temporal (for vain glory), as King David acknowledge to God concerning his sin: *"Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest."* Psalms 51:4 The focus of *righteousness* is not upon the work or lack thereof but rather upon man's walk with the Lord, the work no longer pain or pleasure 'driven' (social or sensual in 'purpose,' i.e. "What can I get out of this for me.") but rather *righteousness* based (no longer between the human nature of man and man but between the soul of man and God, the *want* in man being spiritual rather than temporal, above rather than below, man desiring relationship with God, seeking to being pleasing to God rather than man).

Sensuousness comes between God and man (the *wantonness* found in man's nature being the driving force in life, the desire of relationship with gratifying objects found within the environment being the 'purpose' in life, i.e. the 'drive' to be at-one-with the world, i.e. seeking for the approved or respect of man to gain from them whatever it is a person *wants* in the environment, be it the pleasure of relationship itself), taking God's place, making work a social spirit work (a 'quest' for *sensuousness*, man's work, even for God, through sight, i.e. human reasoning) and not a Holy Spirit work (an outcome of *righteousness*, God's work in man through faith).

"This role [bringing the biological nature of man into union with social life] played by action (or by praxis) has been abundantly emphasized by Marx, who quite rightly went so far as to consider perception itself as an 'activity' of the sense organs." (Piaget) When *sensuousness* rules, a man's work is for human relationship, the common-unity, 'people group,' yet can be perceived by man as man being at-one-with God, i.e. 'experiencing God,' when he is actually experiencing the collective *sensuous* human 'moment' as being of God, thus ending up worshiping the *sensuous* 'moment,' defining it as the *praxis* of 'righteousness' (an all is well with man and the world feeling, thus producing another "I can't wait to come back and get more 'love'" customer for the 'Church'). Work is therefore *sensuous* driven (measurable and manipulatable), social work becoming the 'purpose' of life (man 'born again' in the spirit of the group, subject to the feelings and thoughts of men). Work is thus no longer a byproduct of *righteousness*, a result of walking in the Holy Spirit (a man born again of the Spirit of God, a man directed by, i.e. lead by God, and no longer 'driven' by the 'influences' of man and the world around him). *"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."* John 3:8

When 'Christians' tolerate *unrighteousness*, they are in Diaprax and are not living according to God's will (they tolerate the *unrighteousness* of others so as to tolerate the *unrighteousness* which resides within themselves).

When the 'church' tolerates *unrighteousness*, it is in Diaprax and is not of God. *"For when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them*

liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." 2 Peter 2:18-22

In the tergiversation of Diaprax reigns tyranny (in the secular realm) and apostasy (in the sacred realm), both the secular and the sacred becoming one in Diaprax (one becoming the beast while the other becomes the harlot —without the harlot the beast can not rule, i.e. without apostasy, tyranny can not reign, i.e. the Antichrist, the lawless one, can not rule without both the sacred and the secular —the church and the state —uniting in partnership, finding their common-unity in their use of Diaprax, basing their collective 'purpose' upon the *sensuousness* of man).

Diaprax is Genesis 3:1-6, the way, the truth, and the life of sinful man justifying himself (united in *consensus* — united "*with sensuousness,*" "*hand joined in hand*" upon common cause). "*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 16:15 "*Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the LORD: though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished.*" Proverbs 16:5 *Righteousness* is of God, *sensuousness* is of man. *Righteousness* is justified in the works of God (by His Word and His Spirit), *sensuousness* is justified in the works of man (by his understanding and his flesh). Without the *righteousness* of God being revealed through His Word and His Spirit, the heart of man remains hopelessly bound to the *sensuousness* of his own flesh (his hope being bound to the temporary pleasures of the world and not in the eternal God of glory). "*This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the*

works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Galatians 5:16-24 *"I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness."* Romans 6:19 Diaprax is man justifying his *sensuousness* as if it were *righteousness*, putting it into *praxis* even for God 'work,' treating God's warnings from heaven as thought they are irrelevant in the 'light' of his own 'wisdom' and self-justification, yielding himself to his own sinful nature and the ways of the world and not unto God. *"Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God."* Romans 6:13

While Hegel may have popularized the dialectical process, making it an academic form of Gnosticism (oneness or the quest for unity, i.e. the *negation* of conditions which perpetuate alienation), Marx may have secularized it (demythologized it, i.e. materialized it —via. Feuerbach, and regenerated it —via. social action, revolution, or *praxis*), John Dewey may have applied it to the education system, the Frankfurt School, Kurt Lewin, J. L. Moreno may have applied it to society, Benjamin Bloom may have applied it to the development of curriculum, making it secularized Satanism, intellectualized witchcraft, it is still the *praxis* of Genesis 3:1-6. *"Personal relations between men have this character of alienation. Hegel and Marx have laid the foundations for the understanding of the problem of alienation."* (Fromm) *"Alienation is the experience of 'estrangement' (Verfremdung) from others, . . ."* *"Alienation has a long history. Its most radical sense already appears in the biblical expulsion from Eden."* *"God is thus the anthropological source of alienation . . ."* (Bronner) *"The immediate task is to unmask human alienation in its secular form, now that*

it has been unmasked in the sacred form." (Karl Marx in Bottomore)
 You can not understand Hegel, Marx, Freud, the "new" world order (the way of man since the garden in Eden "*sense experience*") without understanding Genesis 3:1-6. *Sensual* human nature (living for the "here-and-now" 'moment' in the life of the flesh, finding identity and seeking unity with the world which gratifies the flesh) is therefore the basis of reality to the dialectical process. Anything outside of "here-and-now" *sensuality*, is illusionary, i.e. "*from religious and transcendentalist thought.*" "*The basic innovation introduced by the philosophy of praxis is the demonstration that there is no abstract 'human nature', fixed and immutable (a concept which derives from religious and transcendentalist thought), but that human nature is the totality of historically determined social relations.*" (Gramsci) Without the sensual there would be not social relations and without social relations there would be no dialectical process. And without the dialectical process in social action there would be no escape from anti-social forces, i.e. escape from religion ("abstract 'human nature'"), i.e. that which is spiritual, restraining that which is sensual (and therefore real) in nature. Reality is therefore "*the totality of historically determined social relations.*"

The dialectical premise is: since your environmental upbringing (your "*sense experienced*" 'history') shaped how you make decisions, how you think and how you act, by changing the environment in which you make decisions ('change' your "*sense experiences*" from learning in an environment which initiates and sustains submission to higher authority to an environment which liberates or emancipates you from higher authority so you can justify to yourself the praxis of annihilating the conditions which initiate and sustain higher authority), how you think and how you act can be 'changed' as well, i.e. the "*providential*" work of God in a man's life can be replaced with the nature of man himself being the only means to justice, harmony, and peace among men, if the learning environment is made 'practical' (subject to human nature and human reasoning, i.e. *sense* based understanding depending upon "*social relationships*"—engendering *human rights*) rather than 'idealistic' (greater than human reasoning and human understanding, i.e. man depending upon "*divine providence*"—engendering *inalienable rights*). "*The norms and standards by which a person thinks and judges are learned in the processes by which*

he is acculturated. Human rights and duties are grounded in the institutions and ideologies of a culture, not in a nature independent of man's social relationships. If human rights are to be guaranteed, they must be guaranteed by appropriate social, political, and economic controls of human behavior, not by opposition to these." "If the realization of this value is blocked by certain social arrangements, as undoubtedly it often is today, the task is to change these social arrangements. And such change today requires collective planning and action, not reliance upon 'providential' processes of natural or historical selection which have ceased to be providential under conditions of advancing industrialization or upon blind resistance to all collective action as inherently opposed to individuality." "The methodological correlate of individualism which democratic ideology leads us to oppose is the elevation of unchecked private, individual judgment as an ultimate arbiter in the control of human conduct." "But the determination of the proper boundaries of these areas must, in an interdependent society, be based on a collective judgment. The rights of private judgment can be defensibly defined and enforced on a democratic basis only by processes of collaborative planning. They cannot be guaranteed by dogmas concerning the nature of man." (Benne)

Diaprax is the dialectical process (the process of 'change,' the continues liberation of human *sensuousness* from 'arbitrary' *righteousness*) being put into *praxis*. Diaprax is the way of thinking which we have all used to 'justify' our fleshly desires, i.e. our love of this world, justifying the lust of *our* flesh, the lust of *our* eyes, and the pride of *our* life. While the first two can fairly easily be detected, it is the latter one (the pride of *our* life, our ability to justify our feelings, thoughts, and actions, i.e. *our* ability to evaluate our nature as being common to all men and thereby justify the lust of *our* flesh and *our* eyes as if they and we were *righteous*) which comes in the back door and "gets us" without us being fully aware of what is happening to us. *"There is first the theorem that 'there is nothing in the id [our sensuousness] which can be compared to negation,' and that the law of contradiction [righteousness vs. wickedness, good and evil outside of our nature to approach pleasure and avoid pain] does not hold in the id."*

"The true life of the body is also the life of the id." "The key to the nature of dialectical thinking may lie in psychoanalysis, more specifically in Freud's psychoanalysis of negation." "Freud saw that in the id there is no negation,

only affirmation and eternity." (Benne) Dia-prax is our use of the *dialectical process* in justifying our human nature (our lusts). By our ability to 'rationally' justifying the lust of our flesh and eyes, the pride of our *sensuous* life is justified. In our able to justify, in social *praxis* (mankind united in initiating and sustaining), the cause of "human rights," *sensuousness*, over and against *righteousness*, *negates* our need for *righteousness*, (negates in the minds and actions of men that *righteousness* which can only come from God). *"And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted."* Matthew 23:12 *"Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall. Better it is to be of an humble spirit with the lowly, than to divide the spoil with the proud."* Proverbs 16:18, 19

While Diaprax is supposedly used to prevent war (between people and nations), used to bring peace and harmony to the world (including the 'church'), it is the way of war against God and His *righteousness*. [James 4:1-10](#) While it promises peace, it cannot deliver. It can only bring deceit, confusion, manipulation, and pain (*"to steal, and to kill, and to destroy"*). Only God can bring peace into your life. *"Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid."* John 14:27 Only God can save you from your use of Diaprax (*your use of it to justify your way—justifying your feelings, your thoughts, and your actions*) and His judgment upon you for using it. *"For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."* Luke 9:56 *"I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture. The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."* John 10:9, 10

Diaprax is the way of the world. It is now becoming the only acceptable way of thinking and acting. All will be judged in the "new" world order according to their participation (or non participation) in Diaprax. But God will judge the world according to *His righteousness*, judging it for its use of Diaprax, for its *praxis* of justifying its own '*righteousness*,' that is, justifying its *sensuousness* as being *righteous*. *"For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."* Romans

10:30

God's *righteousness* is imputed unto all who believe upon Christ (since it is spiritual). It is only in Him, the obedient and *righteous* Son of God, with which we have love, joy, and peace in this life and hope of eternal life after death. *"In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him."*

1 John 4:9

Though a man, through his participation in Diaprax, may gain the pleasures of this world, including the respect of men, he will lose all, including his own life, in the end. *"He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."* John 12:25 The question is then, "Why is the leadership in the church using Diaprax to 'promote' and 'grow' the 'kingdom of God?'" It is one thing for the leaders of the world to use it to unite the world, it is another for the leaders of the church to use it to unite the church with the world system. The reason being, the world cannot unite as one, without the church uniting as one with it, both uniting upon their use of Diaprax, using the system of Genesis 3:1-6 (Satan's Genesis project of all mankind '*justifying*' *sensuousness*), as *their* way, *their* truth, and *their* life.

DIAPRAX

"Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." [Genesis 3:1-6](#)

*"According to the philosopher Hegel, truth is not found in the thesis, nor the antithesis, but in the emerging synthesis which reconciles the two."
(Martin Luther King Jr. Strength to Love)*

The idea being: 'truth' is not found above man, in God himself, but in the man, in his human 'moment' with himself, in the praxis of interpersonal relationship, freed from Godly restraints of good and evil, right and wrong, which cause social disharmony amongst men. *"And the LORD God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him."* Genesis 2:18 While the aloneness can be helped in the husband-wife relationship, on the temporal level, it can only be resolved in Christ, on the spiritual level, with the husband ruling, *"doing those things that are pleasing the Heavenly Father,"* and the desire of the heart of the wife being to her husband, *"doing those things that are pleasing the Heavenly Father,"* and the children obey their parents, *"doing those things that pleasing to the Heavenly Father"* as well—as the Heavenly Father rules, with the desire of the Son being to please Him, and Christ rules with the desire of the bride to please Him. Thus as Christ is in the Father, we are in him, and he is in us, all to the glory of God. *"And yet if I judge, my judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me." "And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him." John 8:16, 29 "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." John 14:20*

While man seeks to resolve his aloneness sensually, with relationship to the world, it can only be resolved spiritually, in his relationship with God (without God we are stuck with only the sensual). Man's 'truth,' as you will see, is to destroy the husband-wife relationship under God (a top-down hierarchy under God), i.e. the husband is to rule, in the Lord, the desire of the wife is to her husband, in the Lord, and the children are to obey their parents, in the Lord, i.e. a patriarchal paradigm under God, by first removing "in the Lord," and replacing it "in the earthy father's name," and then replacing the family relationship, under the father's name with a top-down hierarchy in the companies name, nation's name, etc., i.e. the fathers interests being not to God but to his own invested interests, sensuously based, then replacing "in the father and nations name" with "in the name of society," with human relationship (in the name of the community, the

environment, the global community, etc.) with men-women-children 'driven' by societies interests, i.e. a heresiarchal paradigm under Satan, cutting off man's relationship with God (and God's relationship with man) and replacing it with man's relationship with himself (individually and collectively, i.e. a men-women-children-society-sensual-partnership) along with the creation (and Satan, who for now rules over the kingdoms of the world), as was done in Genesis 3:1-6 (which is Diaprax), the first environment-human relationship experience outside of God's will. Was not the woman having a pleasant relationship with the serpent and the 'forbidden tree,' and an unpleasant relationship with God afterwards? With Adam following. Notice that Satan went to the woman first while God went to the man first. Therein lies the difference in paradigms. One paradigm is from above (top-down, spiritual, righteous), the other is from below (equality, temporal, sensual).

The sin in the garden was not from the fruit of the 'forbidden tree' but was the changing of paradigms. The change in paradigm being from patriarchal to heresiarchal, from trusting in God, demanding faith, to trusting in one's own senses (with Satan's help), demanding sight. The change being from simply obeying God's will to a complex and subtle process of self-justification, where 1) the lust (or intense desire) of the flesh —the subconscious senses which trigger a "sensuous need" to re-experience the pleasure produced by a "gratifying object in the environment", to have what it is in the environment which is gratifying to the flesh, over and against any restraint which limits or prevents such experiences, i.e. through punishment or the fear of punishment, i.e. God's will being done via. the threat of punishment utilized in restraining the will of the flesh, 2) the lust (or intense desire) of the eyes —the semi-conscious sense of sight, "sense perception," to look for whatever it is in the environment which stimulated the pleasure in the first place, in order to continue the "sense experience" of pleasure, and 3) the pride of life (the intense desire of life in the 'moment,' in the 'here-and-now'), the "sense experience" of 'rationally' evaluating the environment so as to manipulate, i.e. control the environment in order to have power over the object in the environment which stimulates pleasure —the ability to identify the object of pleasure and liberate or emancipate it from any limiting or restraining conditions in the environment which prevents or controls access to the gratifying object.

To enjoy the gratifying object requires the justification of 'changing' the conditions of the environment which limit or block access to the objects which are gratifying to the flesh of man, i.e. the conditions of who or what it is that defines what is good or what is evil must be 'changed,' or else the liberation or emancipation of pleasure (access to the gratifying object which attracts the person) will be prevented or limited by the conditions of restraint. 'Change' (the practice of continual change) must triumph over the conditions of Godly restraint or else a higher authority than man's nature will 'rule' the day and the will of man (and Satan) will not be realized. As in the garden so it is in the world today, that is until the Lord returns to judge the "'new' world order"—an 'order' which is not "new" but was begun in the garden in Eden. An 'order' which is recorded in Genesis 3:1-6 so that we might not be ignorant of Satan's devices.

Thus, according to the process and praxis of Diaprax, truth, regarding good and evil and reality, is not found in any given position, i.e. is found neither in a thesis, nor in its opposing position, the antithesis, but rather is found within the process of "change" (neither person is negated, only their negation, that which divides them, is negated, thus making them one in nature, i.e. liberated from the patriarchal paradigm, the system of righteousness). In Diaprax, truth is found in man's liberation or emancipation from any given position, in life experienced only of, by, and for man and his nature, 'driven' with the 'purpose' of experiencing the sensuousness of becoming at-one-with self and others, i.e. the world. Thus the objective of Diaprax is 'truth,' or the knowledge of good and evil, via. consensus in praxis.

Diaprax is the dialectical process (Genesis 3:1-6) being put into praxis. Praxis is the Greek word for practice, (to act in a particular way; Praxis Apostles or the "actions of the Apostles," the way the Apostles acted). The Apostles praxis is not man's praxis. There are different ways of thinking and acting (paradigms) which can be put into praxis. God makes it clear. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." Isaiah 55:8-9 God's way of thinking (which he requires of man) is believing and acting (acting according to his belief), having and maintaining a thesis

position in all things, a thesis position which can only be founded upon and fulfilled in Him (a patriarchal paradigm of unchangingness). "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." Ephesians 6:11

The dialectical process is man's way of thinking (a heresiarchal paradigm of 'changingness' and sensuousness) which is put into practice (praxis) to destroy the thesis way of thinking and acting (a patriarchal paradigm of 'unchangingness' and righteousness —not that a thesis position makes man righteous but that righteousness, in Christ, is a thesis position). "Then said Jesus unto them again, Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them. I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture. The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep. I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep." John 10:7-15

Man's ways of thinking (which is common to all men) is 'driven' by his feelings of self-preservation, even if it be in name only (hoping he is remembered for his actions, i.e. for his 'works'). His way of thinking is as along a spectrum or continuum (progressing 'upward' from feelings being suppress, to feelings being liberated, to feelings and thoughts becoming united in action against any system restraining sensuous feelings and thoughts) —from feeling and acting (acting according to his feelings without thinking, impulsive), thinking and acting (having feelings but only putting thoughts into action, academic), having feelings and thought but putting neither into action (acting according to some one else's feelings and

thoughts, submissive, antithesis), thinking with feelings, putting opinions into action, with the latter being done either for another person, for self, or for a group of people. What the dialectical process does, when used in its 'true' form, is bring not just one person into participation in the process—in the last of the prior ways of thinking, but encourages everyone to participate in thinking with their feelings and feeling with their thinking (thinking and acting not only for themselves but with and for everyone else, i.e. to be in synthesis with others regarding the restraining and liberating systems) and putting the condition which liberates sensuousness while negating righteousness into social action (praxis).

With his use of the dialectical process, a person progresses from submitting to authority, resenting it because of its restraints against his impulsive nature, i.e. suppressing his feelings (repression being suppressed feeling which results in an internal antithesis condition, not being able to do what you want to do), then rebelling against authority, manifesting antithesis condition against authority, but just following their feelings without thinking it through (and "getting into trouble"), then thinking it through, identifying where the antithesis condition is coming from (thereby justifying their actions of rebellion against authority, willing to be 'kicked out' if necessary, to be in harmony with their wants), but doing so just for themselves (overcoming individual antithesis but not overcoming the social antithesis condition which represses all others) and eventually, with assistance from others who are trained in the craft of revolution, i.e. 'the techniques of producing social, not just individual 'change' (facilitators, councilors, 'change agents,' coaches, and guides), helping the rebellious to think in regards to everyone's feelings with the intent of liberating all from the restraints of higher authority (overcoming the thesis condition via. revolution or synthesis or "liberty, fraternity, and equality" for all). Without getting rid of the parent of restraint, the children can not do what they want to do. Parental authority brings barriers into the lives of children who want to play. Negate the condition which justifies the placing of restraints upon children, then all the children can have liberty to play together as one, without the fear of parental restraint (restraints, when carried out in the lives of the children, pit child against child, resulting in social disharmony—the Diaprax idea is, rather than getting rid of the ideals which parents inculcate to their children, get rid of the method, system, paradigm, etc. of

inculcating itself).

Diaprax is a subtle and complex process. When antithesis (tension or conflict) is under a thesis environment, opposing thesis positions cause division or conflict between one another, one position or thesis position perceives themselves as being right, the other position or thesis position therefore is treated as being wrong, according to each thesis position (tension or conflict is perceived as being external to a persons feelings, i.e. seen as differences in belief), whereas when antithesis (tension or conflict) is under a synthesis environment (which perceives feelings as being separated from thought and action, thereby causing conflict between a person and their own nature and the nature of the other person, the tension or conflict is perceived as being internal as well as external), unlike the thesis environment (with its right and wrong thinking and acting, insisting upon one absolute thesis position as being right), according to the synthesis condition holding onto an absolute, 'unchanging,' thesis position, holding onto a right and wrong way of thinking and acting, is itself wrong. Thus antithesis in a thesis environment is conflict or tension caused by an opposing position or thesis, while antithesis in a synthesis environment is conflict caused by the thesis environment suppressing human feelings. The thesis condition tries to limit the effect of the antithesis condition through force or threat of force, i.e. corporal punishment, while the synthesis condition tries to initiate and sustain the antithesis condition in an effort to use it negate the thesis condition, thus liberating feelings, thoughts, and actions from any restraining higher authority. "Higher order thinking skills" (which incorporate personal feelings in solving problems, personal evaluation being instrumental in making decisions) therefore negates "lower order thinking skills" (which demands that feelings must always be subject to the will of higher authority, parental or Godly evaluation directing the person in his thoughts and actions).

In the world of Diaprax when we think someone else is wrong and we are right, we are thinking and acting wrong and need to 'change' our way of thinking and acting. Thus 'truth' is no longer found in an absolute, in a thesis position outside of man's common human nature (external to his feelings or senses), but is found within the "emerging" moment (in consensus) when right and wrong thinking is negated by the praxis of "reconciliation," (the uniting of feelings in common action negating the

division caused by opposing positions) but truth is found within the synthesis of the opposing parties, founded upon the feelings which they both have in common, i.e. their feelings of resentment or dissatisfaction toward the thesis environment, i.e. resentment toward the thesis environment which restrains their human nature now being the 'driving' force for uniting both the individual and social 'purpose,' making both the same in 'purpose.' Without gaining access to a person's dissatisfaction toward the thesis environment or condition, the synthesis process can not function properly. Therefore it is imperative to gain access to every person's feelings of resentment toward being told what to do when it goes against their 'normal' human nature. "The individual may have 'secret' thoughts which he will under no circumstances reveal to anyone else if he can help it. To gain access is particularly important, for precisely here may lie the individual's potential for democratic or antidemocratic thought and action in crucial situations." (Adorno)

While facts and truths do not change, feelings do —thus if you structure your life on feelings, wrapping your thinking and actions around them, the environment around you must become an environment of feelings, i.e. the environment must be tolerant of 'change,' (tolerant of ambiguity and adaptable to change) or become your enemy. "In the eyes of the dialectical philosophy, nothing is established for all time, nothing is absolute or sacred." (Karl Marx) Diaprax is the combination of two words, dialectic and praxis. It follows the same method used by the Marxists to come up with diamat from dialectical materialism or histomat for historical materialism, the difference between the two being: in diamat the emphasis is upon the material being of all things, tying man to the material world (remove the restrainer —the thesis condition, and man will be free to be himself naturally) while histomat emphasizes the history or the upbringing of the person, the environmental 'press' which shaped their way of thinking and acting (that only through proper environmental conditions can "citizens" undue the effects of the thesis condition upon themselves as well as others, that they must experience for themselves the removal of the restrainer within —converting the conscience into a super-ego, and learn how to remove the restrainer outside —treat the restrainer and his way of thinking and acting as irrelevant to the changing times, thereby making it easier to remove the thesis condition with little of any opposition—not

only does the the citizen become knowledgeable on how to remove the restrainer himself, his is also able to help others in freeing themselves from the thesis condition as well). Traditional Marxist line up with diamat while Transformational Marxist line up with histomat, focusing more on the "environmental" conditions in which a person or a group of people reside, developing "social environmental control" through the use of psycho-social techniques to help the culture 'change' its own social structure (that way you don't have to destroy the infrastructure of society as you purge society of the restrainers of change, as Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov (Lenin) did in Russia (all the bloodshed was necessary, according to his words, for "the common good"). Given the authority to educate the next generation, with "willful" citizen participation, you can change society from within, through educating the next generation to "think for themselves"). "(1) They attempt to focus the resources of various social sciences, including psychology, upon the problems of inducing and controlling changes in social systems, including the face-to-face group. The principles and concepts involved thus represent a fusion of resources from several social sciences. (2) They involve the collaboration of social scientists and social practitioners, including educators, in their formulation and testing." "Educators or other change agents must, however, be trained in ways of stimulating and guiding change which incorporate the democratic norms as basic elements of their operating methodology. ... [that educators] basic training be focused in a methodology of planned change which unites the norms of democratic operation, relevant understandings of change processes and social structures, and skills in stimulating, inducing and stabilizing changes in persons and groups." " (Bennie) "Concerning the changing of circumstances by men, the educator must himself be educated. The changing of circumstances and of self can only be grasped and rationally understood as revolutionary practice." (Marx, Thesis on Feuerbach #3) "Educational procedures are intended to develop the more desirable rather than the more customary types of behavior." "The public-private status of cognitive vs. affective behaviors is deeply rooted in the Judaeo-Christian religion and is a value highly cherished in the democratic traditions of the Western world." "Perhaps a reopening of the entire question would help us to see more clearly the boundaries between education and indoctrination, and the simple dichotomy expressed above

between cognitive and affective behavior would no longer seem as real as the rather glib separation of the two suggests." "Education opens up possibilities for free choice and individual decisions." "Indoctrination, on the other hand, is viewed as reducing the possibilities of free choice and decision." (Bloom, Krathwohl, Cognitive, Affective) Without sensuousness becoming a part of education, social change by "consensus" can not take place.

The objective of Diaprax is to replace an "unhealthy" environmental condition, one dependent upon a thesis position (indoctrination, righteousness), with a "healthy" environmental condition ('change,' sensuousness), one initiating and sustaining a synthesis condition. In his journals, Abraham Maslow wrote about these "good" (synthesis) and "bad" (thesis) social conditions" in this way: "Third-Force psychology is also epi-Marxian in these senses, i.e., including the most basic scheme as true-good social conditions are necessary for personal growth, bad social conditions stunt human nature, material conditions are pre-potent over spiritual ones, & SA [Self-Actualized] potentials, religious, laws philosophy, ideology, are in fact all by-products of basic social & economic conditions, while cutting out the dogmatic Marxian a priori crap. This is to say, one could reinterpret Marx into a self-actualization-fostering Third- and Fourth-Force psychology-philosophy. And my impression is anyway that this is the direction in which they are going now." (Maslow, Journal) The economic and religious environments find their common element in the alienating of the person from his own personal desires (sensuousness) through the inculcating of (thesis) values higher than the sensual desires of the person both in the person's personal way of thinking, submitting to higher authority without question, and in its correlation with money (accepting stored up sensuousness, i.e. money in the bank, as being under someone else's conditions and control). "Marx had compared the money complex with the religious complex, as two forms of human self-alienation." (Brown)

Maslow structured his "hierarchy of 'felt' needs" along the same dialectical continuum as did Benjamin Bloom in his "taxonomy" of educational objectives. The lowest order of needs, "lower order thinking skills," being the basic needs of water, food, exercise, and sleep, which are essential for the continuation of life, with need for order and rules to guide life

following in suite. For the traditional home the basics of life are dependent upon higher authority and following the rules which proceed from them, i.e. knowing and comprehension. Commands and the consequences for either obeying or disobeying them are key to the sustentation of the thesis, patriarchal paradigm. Application and analysis, (valuing in the affective domain) correlate to the antithesis condition in that the feelings of doubt, by those under authority, may cause them to question the commands of higher authority as not being in their best interest. What Maslow would call love, affection, belongingness, freedom from fear are essential elements to the relationship between the one under authority and the one in authority. If these conditions are called into question, i.e. there is an increasing desire for sensuousness (pleasure) over and against righteousness (obedience) or a fear of the lose of pleasure in the act of obedience, then a tension arises within the one under authority. Isolated, in an environment under the control of higher authority the child or person simply suppresses his desires by 'projecting' their satisfaction in the act of obedience to higher authority, finding what pleasure is available in doing their will. Without the social element, the commonality of resentment toward higher authority and its realization through 'uncoerced' dialogue, society would remain in tension (in a state of antithesis, i.e. caught between the structure of righteousness and sensuousness) remaining subject to higher authority. Without the help of agents of change, i.e. facilitators of change, and their ability of initiating and sustaining environments of experimentation of change, where self-esteem, self respect and esteem from others in regards to their sensuous desires could be experienced, society would remain under the influence of the top-down system of righteousness. Through the sense experience of application and analysis, trial and error, experimentation with new ways of thinking and doing (as was done in the garden in Eden, Genesis 3:1-6) man could recognizes his sensual connectedness with the world around him. Aided in overcoming the fear of the unknown (overcoming that which is sensually unreasonable), through finding commonality, i.e. synthesis with the environment (using "higher order thinking skills" in individual-social issues), and then actively participating within it, in experiencing of common-unity, the sensuousness of the person could be actualized in the sensuousness of the world (according to Marx, society) which initiated it.

From then on, sustainability of human relationship, and relationship with the world, depended upon the persons ability to maintain the system of sensuousness, i.e. within his relationship with himself as well his relationship with others (the fulfillment of individual abilities), and for others to do the same with themselves and with him. In this way alienation and reification, (and the system of righteousness) would have about as much chance in surviving as a fly in a room full of hungry frogs (from their point of view).

Since both Marx and Freud saw pleasure (freedom from 'alienation' and 'reification,' freedom from 'substitute gratification,' i.e. freedom from patriarchal paradigm) as [the key agent for human happiness](#) (freedom to socially-personally pleasure), without control over the environment, which defined it's use (God or parent's definition redefined by self, by society, i.e. social engineers), social-individual 'change' (liberation of sensuousness) could not be possible. Traditional Marxist tried to change the social (and thus the individual) by using outright force, thus maintaining the patriarchal form or top-down system of righteousness, something the Transformational Marxist understood would always lead to failure (failure to their 'cause' that is). They knew both the individual and society had to be liberated from the system of righteousness concurrently and 'willingly' if they were to be successful in creating a world of 'change.' Thus a proper environmental condition was essential for success. Social engineers, change agents, facilitators, human resource personnel, councilors, etc. would be necessary (properly trained) to guide all policy making institutions, from the home, businesses, education, to leaders of the land, especially the church, into participation within the system of sensuousness, i.e. into the heresiarchal paradigm of 'change' (the system of deceitfulness and manipulation), if there was to be a successful negation of the system of righteousness, i.e. the annihilation of the patriarchal paradigm and its top-down "way of doing business." The use of 'crisis,' would help move all people (society) into participation within the "healthy" system of sensuousness. The use of religion and money would thus change from a top-down (capitalist) structure to a "we," equality of opportunity, common-istic, common-unity (socialist) structure, 'driven' and 'purposed' in the negation of 'alienation' and 'repression,' and the system of righteousness, i.e. the patriarchal paradigm.

Like children asking their father for money, so they can go do what they desire to do and the father saying yes or no based upon his standards and not their desires (to go around or attempt to go around the father's standards resulting in chastening), religion and money both alienate man from his own sensual desires, forcing him to submit his will to the will of a sacred higher authority and a secular higher authority, both thereby alienating himself from himself (both requiring him to control and discipline himself, deny and humble himself in serving a higher authority's will, restraining his human nature for a higher cause than human nature itself—God and parents in the sacred realm and money and property in the secular realm, all connected in structure to righteousness, i.e. initiated by and supportive of the system of righteousness). "One of the primary value systems underlying conservative ideology is concerned with practicality, ambition, and upward class mobility. These values are reflected in the raising and indoctrination of children, who 'should learn early in life the value of a dollar.'" (Adorno) The thesis condition produces an alienation condition between men. "Personal relations between men have this character of alienation. Hegel and Marx have laid the foundations for the understanding of the problem of alienation." (Fromm) "Every form of objectification ... results in alienation. Transcending alienation involves transcending objectification.;" (Bronner) "The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force." (Marx, MEGA I/3) "Alienation is the experience of 'estrangement' (Verfremdung) from others, . . ." "Alienation has a long history. Its most radical sense already appears in the biblical expulsion from Eden." "Alienation, according to Feuerbach, derives from the externalization (Entausserung) of human powers and possibilities upon a non-existent entity: God. . ." "God is thus the anthropological source of alienation . . ." "Alienation will continue so long as the subject engages in an externalization (Entausserung) of his or her subjectivity." (Bronner) While the Traditional Marxists held to a hard line of forced removal of the thesis personality from society (violent revolution), Transformational Marxists understood it was an environmental condition rather than just a personality which was the barrier to 'change,' that without a changing of the social environment (the human experience), the personality could not be changed ("velvet revolution"). Yet both recognized the source of

alienation which necessitated the use of revolution (overt and covert) and the necessity of negating of the thesis way of thinking if 'change' was to be attainable (the theme being: "When parents rule the children are repressed," i.e. "When the bourgeois rule the proletariat are repressed," i.e. "When God rules man and Satan are repressed," i.e. "When righteousness rules sensuousness is repressed," "When the patriarch rules the heresiarch is repressed," "When absolutes rule 'change' is repressed," etc.).

"Revolutionary violence reconciles the disunited parties by abolishing the alienation of class antagonism that set in with the repression of initial morality. ... the revolution that must occur is the reaction of suppressed life, which will visit the causality of fate upon the rulers. It is those who establish such domination and defend positions of power of this sort who set in motion the causality of fate, divide society into social classes, suppress justified interests, call forth the reactions of suppressed life, and finally experience their just fate in revolution." (Habermas, Knowledge)

"Alienation and reification destroy both the dialectical interrelation of being and consciousness and, as a necessary consequence, the dialectical interrelation of theory and practice [carnal thoughts and carnal actions need to be united in social praxis for man to be "healthy"]. Revolution would now seek to transform the everyday life of the 'establishment.' ... a new environmental consciousness ... a new dignity to a complex concept alien to American pragmatism." (Jay)

Karl Marx understood the power of the sensual nature of man and its importance in bringing religion into participation within and therefore under the control of the secular domination, which had to itself be purged of the thesis condition as well (the influence of the traditional fundamentalist Christian church upon the citizens and therefore government and society as well). "The immediate task is to unmask human alienation in its secular form, now that it has been unmasked in the sacred form." (Marx in Bottomore). By identifying the sensual nature of religion and then uniting (synthesizing) it with the sensual nature of the secular world, the "mystical" (thesis) nature of religion is negated by making it "practical" [sensual thought and sensual action synthesized in sensual play/work] "'Religious sentiment' is itself a social product, a particular form of society." "All social life is essentially practical. All the mysteries which lead theory toward mysticism find their rational solution in human

practice and in the comprehension of this practice." (Marx, Thesis on Feuerbach #7, # 8) According to dialectical reasoning, organized religion, with its thesis condition, is the initiator and sustainer of prejudice (a biased socialist "observation," which has been proven false but continues to be preached by socialist as being truth, to keep the process alive). "Subjects who profess to some religious affiliation express more prejudice than those who do not.... people who reject organized religion are less prejudiced than those who accept it." "Prejudiced subjects tend to report a relatively harsh and more threatening type of home discipline which was experienced as arbitrary by the child.... The status-anxiety so often found in families of prejudiced subjects is reflected in the adoption of a rigid and externalized set of values:.... [The purpose of Adorno's research, which is used by education (the NEA and other educational organization like it) and the UN, was] to explain prejudice in order to eradicate it. Eradication means re-education." (Adorno) Re-education means washing from the brain any way of thinking (the thesis way of thinking) which inhibits or blocks the synthesis way of thinking, i.e. the dialectical process from being put into practice (praxis) —Diaprax.

The thesis structure of 'prejudice' is therefore perceived, dialectically, as the initiator and sustainer of nationalism and therefore social (global) disharmony. This condition can only be overcome by bringing religion into "convergence" with synthesis based fields of thought (to "grow" the church upon a synthesis foundation of sensuousness and human reasoning).

"Religion finds itself peculiarly tailored to the nationalistic, class, and ethnic cleavages and outlooks that sustain the prevailing social order. We can hope that this convergence of theological, sociological, and psychological analysis will lead to a further cooperation between behavior and religious disciplines. Here lies the pastor's task, his opportunity, and his challenge." (The Person in Psychology, Selected Essays by Gordon Allport)

I realize there are those who would not accept the three levels of the dialectic, noting that Hegel did not use the words thesis, antithesis, synthesis, himself. Yet, to make the process of deceit easier to understand, I will use them since they correlate to the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains, steps which are used in education to move all participants from a thesis position (thinking and acting for God or the

family, under God's or parents authority, accountable to God or parents for ones thoughts and actions) through an antithesis condition (thinking and acting for oneself, under personal authority, accountable to no one) to arrive at a synthesis condition (thinking and acting for humanity, under socialist authority, accountable to the social cause, to humanity), i.e. from facts, to feelings which counter facts, to justification of feelings which question the facts, i.e., from what I "can" and "can not" do (because God and parent "said so"), to what I "ought" to be able to do, to what I 'can do' if I negate the 'can not' by finding unity in thought (unity with others with the same 'ought') resulting in a common 'we ought to be able to' and then putting that collective ought-thought into social praxis against any authority which initiates and sustains the 'can not,' thereby initiating and sustaining the 'can to' of humanity (the "can to," "can do" attitude can negate the "can not" of God and parent only if "We are working for Us"), i.e. from being under authority, to individuality, to socialism, i.e. from being obedient, to being rebellious, to being revolutionary, i.e. from being righteous minded, to being sensuous minded, to being 'rational' minded, i.e. from being "negative," to being neutral, to being "positive," i.e. from faith, to feelings, to sight, i.e. from conscience, to confusion, to consensus, etc., all of which will be explained later as well.

The main thing to remember about the dialectical process is its demand upon the use of the sensuous nature of man, the use of 'here-and-now' experiences of life to guide man away from righteousness as being a way of thinking and acting, guiding man away from any 'there-and-then' control over that which is common to mankind, his 'here-and-now' sensual nature. (The fear of lose of that which is sensual or lose of that which produces sensuousness thus 'drives' a person in their decision unless they are lead by that which is greater than this world and sensuousness, God and righteousness. If you gave anything in this life that you are afraid of losing, then you fear man. If you fear losing anything after this life, then you fear God. One fear is towards the material world, sensuousness, the other its toward the spiritual world, righteousness.) "Marx urged us to understand 'the sensuous world,' the object, reality, as human sensuous activity." (Lukács) The children of Israel were to inculcate to their children the "there-and-then" history of God leading their parents out of Egypt into the wilderness, their children making it through the wilderness to the promised

Land (only two of the original number leaving Egypt, because of their faith in God, made it to the promised land, the rest dying in the wilderness due to their unfaithfulness to God, i.e. only their children making it to the promised land), to help them and their children, and their children's children, etc. overcome the temptations of the "here-and-now" promised land. We are to do the same today with our children and the Word of God. The scriptures tell us: "Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth." (Colossians 3:2) while the dialectical process influences us to set our affections on things below, "on the things of the earth," in the 'here-and-now' "sensuous world," for the betterment of mankind. (More on thesis, antithesis, synthesis, later.)

Without the sensual, sensitization, communitization, democratization, conscientization, habitualization, socialization, socialist control of humanity could not become a reality (the Antichrist could not rule the world). "The dialectic will go on until we reach the absolute whole, that which includes everything within itself, and so cannot possibly depend upon anything outside itself." (Beiser) "We know how to change the opinions of an individual in a selected direction, without his ever becoming aware of the stimuli which changed his opinion." "We can predict, from the way individuals perceive the movement of a spot of light in a dark room, whether they tend to be prejudiced or unprejudiced." "We know how to influence the buying behavior of individuals by setting up conditions which provide satisfaction for needs of which they are unconscious, but which we have been able to determine." [With our knowledge of human behavior, i.e. the manipulability of human feelings, we have the] "potential ability to influence or control the behavior of groups. If we have the power or authority to establish the necessary conditions, the predicted behaviors will follow." (Rogers)

"Before effective plans for change can be made the present state of affairs must be defined as accurately as possible." With this information, the person's resentment toward Godly or parental restraint upon his sensuality, the proper environment can be prepared with which to liberate the individual from his submission to authority, help him to think for himself, and then help re-educate him (program him) into a socialist (dialectical) mindset. All this being done with his inclination towards sensual satisfaction. "1. All human behavior is directed toward the satisfaction of

needs, 2. the individual will change his established ways of behaving for one of two reasons: to gain increased need satisfaction or to avoid decreased need satisfaction, and 3. 'augmentation' in the possibilities of needs satisfaction." (McGregor in Benne) "The more the group members become converted to democracy [developed toward their common-ism of sensual satisfaction and their questioning of authority] and learn to play the roles of democracy as followers or leaders [facilitate the 'change process' in themselves and others in the praxis of attaining collective sensual satisfaction in questioning authority through role-playing democracy, i.e. experiencing common-ism in common sensuous experience to where the emotions become attached to (and liberated by) "group" experience and no longer subject to (and suppressed by) "higher authority"], the more can the power of the democratic leader shift to other ends than converting the group members [to helping the group members to put their common quest for further development and improvement of (the augmentation of) sensual satisfaction and the negation of any authority condition which restrains human nature into social action, i.e. putting their thoughts (now driven by their feelings) into social action, i.e. their theories (opinions) into social practice, all three being the same, i.e. acting out spontaneously their sensual nature only limited by their desire not to limit farther experiences for themselves and others, i.e. social praxis]." "Groups and organizations should be helped to define and redefine those areas of life in which common values and standards are necessary and where efforts to build common out of contrasting beliefs and practices are required." (Benne) By simply uniting sensuously motivated thought and spontaneous action, any "anti-democratic," patriarchal way of thinking and acting is momentarily negated. When a persons internal sensuousness or wanting is liberated to respond naturally to the external gratifying object in the environment which stimulated the wanting, given freedom to relate with the object which stirred the wanting in the first place, a natural reaction to approach and relate with the gratifying object is put into motion. Whatever the object of gratification—the object which triggered the desire is, when present within the environment, it automatically triggers a reaction to approach it so as to continue the pleasure it liberates within the person. When this is done without the person having to think about any judgment for his actions, the mind naturally cuts off, by treating as irrelevant, any

restraint upon the stimulus-response cycle. The consequence of behavior being negated in the sensual object-sensual pleasure relationship of the moment—the authority condition not coming into the mind in the sensual moment, being overshadowed by the unifying of theory and practice. "This voice which really isn't you but tells you the way the world works is a direct attack on creativity. We have to work to remove it." "When we learn to silence the inner voice that judges yourself and others, there is no limit to what we can accomplish, individually and as part of a team. Absence of judgment makes you more receptive to innovative ideas." (Michael Ray in Maslow, Maslow) "During the period of innovation, an environment is invisible. The present is always invisible because the whole field of attention is so saturated with it. It becomes visible only when it has been superseded by a new environment." (BSTEP: Behavior Science in Teacher Education Program, Federal Education Grant, Dec. 1969) As in the garden in Eden, not until after you have eaten the 'forbidden fruit,' having enjoyed the dialectical 'moment,' do you realize that something has 'changed.' Righteousness has been spoiled with sensuousness, sensuousness having become the standard with which to evaluate good from evil from. But then there is the conscience. What do you do about the conscience? In Diaprax that has to be negated as well. Consensus, i.e. social praxis ("If it makes sense—if it is senses based, and there is no perceived or noticeable harm in doing it, and everybody is in agreement—willing and wanting—to do it, then it must be OK.") will do the job quite well. We are all made in the image of God with the ability to evaluate, we can either evaluate with God' righteousness or evaluate with our sensuousness, that is our choice. We can choose either life or death, giving our life to Christ, accepting and walking in his righteousness, dying daily to our sensuous nature and live, or continuing to live in our sensuous nature, keeping it as our standard of life, and die. "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." Proverbs 16:25 Diaprax is the "ways of death ... that seemeth right," it is our human nature put into social praxis. When man perceives himself to be right in his own eyes he is dead in his sins. "A logical connection emerges with the anthropological perspective of the young Marx wherein 'the eye becomes the human eye, the ear the human ear.'" (Erich Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man)

Without the commonality of sensuousness, from which to build upon,

righteousness will continue to divide man with an above-below, good-evil, right-wrong, spirit-flesh, God-man, Creator-created, dualistic structure of thought and action and the dialectical process will remain suppressed or even negated, sensuousness isolated to individual thought only, with no social action or praxis to unite mankind upon in the cause of negating righteousness as the only approved way of thinking and acting. For the process to be successful, its use of human sensuousness must come between the above-below way of thinking and acting, come between God and man, come between the father and his family, come between the husband and his wife, come between the parents and their children, come between the citizens and their representative, come between the citizens and the constitution which limits the power of government, come between the citizen and the police, etc. turning the latter against the former (turning man, his family, his wife, his children, his representative, the police, etc. against the patriarchal system).

I am not necessarily pro-constitution, knowing the history of its making and the Masonic overtones dispersed within it. For example "We the people" (a dialectic concept) which even Patrick Henry saw as treasonous, should have been "We the States," and "a more perfect union" (dialectic concept which Karl Marx advocated) was used by Abraham Lincoln to justify war against the Southern States for their actions to restore States rights, rights which were being usurped by the Federal government.

Lincoln stated in his inaugural address: "I hold that in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination...."

Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that in legal contemplation the Union is perpetual confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed, in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured, and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was 'to form a more perfect Union.' It follows

from these views that no State upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union; that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void, and that acts of violence within any State or States against the authority of the United States are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances." (Abraham Lincoln , first Inaugural address. Monday, March 4, 1861). "... according to Freud, the drive toward ever larger unities belongs to the biological-organic nature of Eros itself." (Marcuse) In effect Lincoln negated the right of the colonies to declare their independence from England (since any social contract in the past, which binds people together, is binding for life, since it sustains the cause of human relationships), thereby effectively removing any right of the colonies to succeed from England, based upon the freedom of the conscience. Since governments do not have "a provision in its organic law for its own termination," any such action would go against "the fundamental law of all national governments" and therefore be considered "insurrectionary or revolutionary."

Therefore, in harmony with dialectical thinking, no union among men (be it covenant or contract made through consensus, whether in the community, the church, the county, the state, the nation, and eventually the global community) can be terminated, not even if it is done to restore the citizens inalienable rights (the need for socialist unity being greater than the right of the individual to have freedom of the conscience), 'human rights' (sensual based unity) superseding all other rights. (Remember, most original states had State Churches up until 1833, Massachusetts being the last State to hold onto the original colonial practice. Religious freedom and freedom of the conscience were the driving force to the founding of this nation, not socialist unity; the re-writing of history is now negating the original intent of the framers of the Constitution, i.e. liberty (under God, i.e. not by fraternity), i.e. freedom from governmental control over the conscience).

All union with the world is mans effort to be god. "The answer to man's predicament lies in the realization by individual man, that all men are essentially one and that the one is God. This self-realization is a 'return' to union: potential becomes actual." (Wheat) Even the Transformational Marxist, Max Horkheimer noted that the true source for the framing of the constituent (despite dialectical influences) was a "religious source" (from

God who is greater than human nature, i.e. thus inalienable rights—righteousness) rather than a secular source (from man as god, i.e. human rights—sensuousness). "For the men who made the Constitution there was no principle that did not derive its authority from a religious source." (Horkheimer, Eclipse)

But reality always exposes the dialectical process for what it is, evil (unrighteousness). As Freud noted: "... The conflict between civilization and sexuality is caused by the circumstance that sexual love is a relationship between two people,... whereas civilization is founded on relations between large groups of persons.... In no other case does Eros so plainly betray the core of his being, his aim of making one out of many; but when he has achieved it in the proverbial way through the love of two human beings, he is not willing to go further." (Freud Civilization and Its Discontents) "Dionysus does not observe the limit, but overflows; for him the road of excess leads to the palace of wisdom." "Dionysus affirms the dialectical unity of the great instinctual opposites: reunifies male and female, Self and Others, life and death." "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." (Brown) Engels wrote: 'that an indissoluble marriage between one man and one woman for their entire life times is, of all forms of sexual relationship, the one that corresponds least to our "natural inclination."' "... 'the elimination of the need to hide sexual relations of an unusual character is one of the first preconditions for a healthy sex life and a healthy sexual morality'." (Drucker) There is always a dark and sinister current flowing just below the surface of the dialectical process. It is called "abomination."

It is the bill of rights which rescues the citizens from Governmental tyranny. It is those rights and the limiting of the power of government by breaking it up into three distinct and separate parts, giving the family the greatest amount of freedom in which to raise the next generation, which I defend. It is those rights which the dialectical process must negate with the praxis of 'human rights' if world unity is to become a reality, i.e. the system of righteousness and chastening negated by the praxis of sensuousness and permissiveness. "To deny rights to 'democratic' leadership in influencing the course of current change is, in effect, to sell out control of required changes to non-democratic leadership." (Benne) "The best way to destroy democratic society would be by way of industrial authoritarianism, which

is anti-democratic in the deepest sense." (Maslow, Maslow) Private business, i.e. free market enterprise, negates socialism.

Washington warned of the dangers which consolidation of powers would bring: "The spirit of encroachment 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 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, Farewell Speech) Unity for the sake of sensual unity results in the despotism of social-ism, common-ism, global-ism (consensus replacing true representation, departments replacing true representation, unaccountability replacing true representation, sensuousness replacing true representation, which results in an unrestrained government of sensuousness replacing a restrained government limited by the conscience of the representative and those he represents).

Abraham Maslow's works exude this common-ist ideology. He believed the role of man was "to identify with more and more of the world, moving toward the ultimate of mysticism, a fusion with the world, or peak experience, cosmic consciousness, etc." (Maslow, Maslow) He wrote: "Self-actualizing people have to a large extent transcended the values of their culture. They are not so much merely Americans as they are world citizens, members of the human species first and foremost." (Maslow, Further) In his journals he wrote: "Only a world government with world-shared values could be trusted or permitted to take such powers. If only for such a reason a world government is necessary. It too would have to evolve. I suppose it would be weak or lousy or even corrupt at first—it certainly doesn't amount to much now & won't until sovereignty is given up little by little by 'nations.'" "The whole discussion becomes species-wide, One World, at least so far as the guiding goal is concerned. To get to that goal is politics & is in time and space & will take a long time & cost much blood." ". . . A caretaker government could immediately start

training for democracy & self-government & give it little by little, as deserved." "This is a realistic combination of the Marxian version & the humanistic. (Better add to definition of "humanistic" that it also means one species, One World.)" "The new Zeitgeist is value-full (value-directed, value-vectorial), human-need & meta-need centered (or based), moving toward basic-need gratification & meta-need meta-gratification —that is, toward full-humanness, SA, psychological health, full-functioning human fulfillment, i.e., toward human perfection as the limit & as the direction." "It revolves around a new image of man, a new conception or definition, containing both the Freudian-style depts & a higher nature, higher possibilities, which can be actualized under the proper life-history and social milieu & conative history." "For Marx, man's being & consciousness are determined by the structure of his society." "For Freud, society only influences his being by greater or lesser repression of his innate biology." "Marxian theory needs Freudian-type instinct theory to round it out. And of course, vice versa." "How can we teach everyone to have the "scientific" or empirical attitude about everything." " So it looks as if nudism is the first step toward ultimate fee-animality-humanness. It's the easiest to take. Must encourage it. Only trouble is, I feel uneasy allying myself with nuts, fringe people, borderline characters, e.g. as in this number of ANKH; the tipoff—there are only young, shapely, & beautiful bodies." " Yet nakedness is absolutely right. So is the attack on antieroticism, the Christian & Jewish foundations. Must move in the direction of the Reichian orgasm." " This movement can be dignified and Apollonian & can avoid pornography & neurosis & ugliness. I must put as much of this as is possible & usable in my education book, & more & more in succeeding writings." (Maslow, Journals) After speaking at a Catholic School in Southern California in 1962, Abraham Maslow wrote in his journal: "They shouldn't applaud me. They should attack me. If they were fully aware of what I was doing, they would attack." *ibid.* Only with the collective sensuousness of the 'grass roots,' "the soul of the people" (the sensual psyche of the people), can the 'closed' system or righteousness be overcome. "Every class lacks the breadth of soul which identifies it with the soul of the people, that revolutionary boldness which flings at its adversary ['flings' at God, the parent, i.e. any authority figure who demands righteousness which restrains sensuousness] the defiant

phrase; "I am nothing and I should be everything." (Marx, Critique)

"Theory becomes a material force when it grips the masses." "Marx clearly defined the conditions in which a relation between theory and practice becomes possible." "It is not enough that thought ['sensuousness'] should seek to realize itself; reality [action] must also strive towards thought ['sensuousness']." (Introduction to Marx, Critique) "The relation between theory and practice becomes even closer the more the conception is vitally and radically innovatory ['revolutionary'] and opposed to old ways of thinking." (Gramsci) The more the persons feelings toward restraint is liberated and given freedom of expression the more he will work for the cause of all in the liberation of mankind from parental and Godly restraint, liberating mankind from a life subject to righteousness to a life of sensuousness, i.e. a life where man can be himself. "Marx reproached Hegel (and, in even stronger terms, Hegel's successors who had reverted to Kant and Fichte) with his failure to overcome the duality of thought and being, of theory and practice, of subject and object [keeping thought and action divided by not acting upon thought and not thinking about why one acts the way they do —a subtle and complex process]." (Lukács) It is not enough to make human reasoning equal to faith (as Kant did), human reasoning must be put into social action in the annihilation of faith (sensuousness must negate 'non-sensuousness'). The sensuous person perceives faith as "non- sensuousness," as [foolishness](#). Jesus Christ warned us of the last days and the effect this process would have upon the souls of men. "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Matthew 24:9-13: "... nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke 18:8b

"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

A lengthy but important explanation is needed here concerning "collaboration ... across lines of 'theory and practice'" (which is necessary if American is to be debase under the dialectical curse), the source being a training manual from the [National Training Laboratories](#). There are 10 Federally funded Marxist training camps in America today (the first one was started in 1947). They are the result of Transformational Marxist's, men like Kurt Lewin who's work on group dynamics, force field analysis, unfreezing, moving, and refreezing, etc. His work is key to the process of change. These "training" camps are centered around Kurt Lewin's 'change' methods (along with Moreno role-playing as well as other psycho-socialists) which he developed during the 30's and the 40's after coming to America from Germany in 1933, coming as a Marxist social-engineer fleeing Fascism in Germany to continue his grand Marxist-socialist project on American housewives and children—using human feelings (sensitivity training) in producing and sustaining 'change' (common-ism, social-ism, common-unity-ism), helping make America what it is today, all being done for the 'purpose' of social harmony and world peace (equality and justice) based upon sensual unity (unity of, by, and for sensuality —consensus). Back in 1970, Jane Howard wrote about the effects these men were already having on the institutional church: "One could make a life work of visiting

all the churches that have been affected by sensitivity training." (Howard) Kenneth Benne wrote: "... the need for collaboration across lines of divergent action interests in a given situation requiring change, individuals and groups must be helped to see that the task is to discover and construct a common interest out of the conflicting interests which they bring to the interpretation of the situation and to the direction of changes in it." "... collaboration required is across lines of 'theory' and 'practice'." "Neither of these modes of collaboration, between persons and groups with different interests in change and between 'theorists' and 'practitioners', comes 'naturally' to people." "Every change operation must, in this sense, be conceived as an educational enterprise. It is important that this educational requirement of democratic engineering be interpreted dynamically instead of statically [with feelings and not facts, sensuously not righteously]." "... all who collaborate must be trained toward an experimental attitude and a 'research' approach toward social problems." "... all educational practitioners, children and laymen participating in educational change become experimental in their attitude toward relationship problems faced and 'research-minded' in their search for and evaluation of solutions ..." "... democratic change must be anti-authoritarian." "Democratic persons must become skilled in inhibiting their tendencies to defend and promote ideas which are in need of objective [sensual-rational] evaluation and reformulation. It is important that persons achieve sensitivity in assessing the sources of influence upon themselves and to differentiate between dependence upon status figures and dependence upon fact-oriented and task-oriented influences." (Benne)

The theme of common interest (sensual interests) is the theme of the dialectical process. Henry Nelson Wieman believed that "... the greatest good for all people could be achieved if the many individual interests could be creatively organized so as to function as a single interest. This creative interest is not to fulfill any end or desire that we already possess, but to expand our consciousness and understanding." "Religious experience teaches that this is not a nice world, and that God is not a nice God. And God is too awful and too terrible and too destructive to our foolish little plans to be nice." (Wieman) Wieman believed that "It is impossible to gain knowledge of the total cosmos or to have any understanding of the infinity transcending the cosmos. Consequently,

beliefs about these matters are illusions, cherished for their utility in producing desired states of mind. . . . Nothing can transform man unless it operates in human life. Therefore, in human life, in the actual processes of human existence, must be found the saving and transforming power which religious inquiry seeks and which faith must apprehend." (Nugent) Paul Tillich wrote: "A stranger, even if his name were God, who imposes commands upon us must be resisted, he must be killed because nobody can stand him." (Wheat) [Martin Luther King Jr.](#) who compared and contrasted Wieman and Tillich concluded that neither men carried the dialectical process to it ultimate conclusion —synthesis . "Wieman's ultimate pluralism fails to satisfy the rational demand for unity. Tillich's ultimate monism swallows up finite individuality in the unity of being. A more adequate view is to hold a quantitative pluralism and a qualitative monism [different facts, opinions, beliefs, and viewpoints but same feelings of resentment toward restraints upon ones carnal nature — "giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh"]. In this way both oneness and manyness are preserved." (King, Abstract) "Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities." Jude 7, 8

It is the inclusion of sensuousness, the inclusion of affective domain in the learning experience, where feelings ("sensuous needs," "sense perception," and "sense experience") become the foundation from which to determine the value or worth of life (where human deviance and depravity coming into conflict with righteousness makes the whole process "come to life"). "The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box' [a box full of evils]." "It is in this 'box' that the most influential controls are to be found." "The affective domain contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people" "In fact, a large part of what we call 'good teaching' is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives through challenging the student's fixed beliefs and getting them to discuss issues." "We are not entirely sure that opening our 'box' is necessarily a good thing; we are certain that it is not likely to be a source of peace and harmony among the members of a school staff."

(Krathwohl, Bloom, Affective) All certified educators are trained on how to use this book in the classroom "to develop attitudes and values toward learning which are not shared by the parents and guardians" which produces "conflict and tension between parents and children" when the children are "separated from earlier environmental conditions" where the "peer group has a greater effect on the students than do ... parents."

(Krathwohl, Bloom, Affective)

It is through the use of the affective domain, the sensuousness of human nature (which is limited in the thesis environment), that rapid social 'change' can be initiated and sustained. Only in the synthesis environment can permanent 'change' (sustainable development, continue improvement, etc.) become reality for both the individual and society, where feelings, not facts rule the day, where sensuousness, not righteousness, directs the individual and society in making life decisions (in thoughts and in action, in theory and in practice). Only in the synthesis environment can the thesis condition and its effects upon the individual and society be negated (washed from the brain). "In order to effect rapid change, . . . [one] must mount a vigorous attack on the family lest the traditions of present generations be preserved. 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.

Through everyone's participation within the synthesis environment, socialism is liberated from the restraints of capitalism, as sensuousness is liberated from the restraints of righteousness. (Not that capitalism is of itself righteous. Capitulation, the backbone of capitalism, simply means, being subject to another's will. I am writing here of systems, not how it is used. There is a difference in means and outcomes. Man, when he uses God's system (capitulation) still uses it for his own gain since he is by his sensuous nature vain. He can not help but be this way since his nature is dialectical. This is why the process works when man takes his affections off of God. Man, being temporal and sensual, can therefore be tempted while God, being spiritual and righteous, can not be tempted (we can only

attempt to tempt him by using his word for our own vain purpose, expecting him to bless our actions because of his love for us). Only by living in faith in Christ is man able to live by God's system, God's Spirit, in agreement with His Word, directing man and God's righteousness being imputed to man by God so that no man can boast —no man can systemize God and then by reasoning become equal with him.) Without the revolutionary condition in the classroom, without the experience of sensual justification (the uniting of theory and social action—praxis), the thesis condition could not be overcome, i.e. without the sensuousness, the thesis condition could not be negated, and the 'purpose' of humanity could not be realized. "The goal of revolutionary activity was understood as the unifying of theory and praxis." (Jay) It was understood that once the revolutionary condition is experienced by the next generation, the process of 'change' would be difficult if not impossible to stop. "The consequences of family democratization take a long time to make themselves felt—but it would be difficult to reverse the process once begun." (Bennis)

Diaprax is the dialectical process put into praxis, where common, or natural feelings and thoughts against human restraints, discovered through dialogue (everyone participating in sharing their feelings and thoughts, i.e. their opinions), are put into social action (when a common opinion and practice is 'scientifically discovered' from the many opinions and practices, as a theory and practice, and is then put into social action: praxis) against the condition (the "unnatural environment") which 'initiates' and sustains the system of higher authority which restrains human feelings, thoughts, and actions. One way of thinking is 'closed' in that a higher authority makes decisions on what is right and wrong, the rest of the ways of thinking are 'open' in that feelings and thoughts are progressively used in 'liberating' (or attempting to 'liberate') a person from the 'closed' system and its restraints against the 'open' system of opinions, i.e. thoughts with feelings and feelings with thoughts (theories). "Individuals move not from a fixity through change to a new 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." (Rogers) "Re-education must be clever enough in manipulating the subjects to have them think that they are running the show." "The objective sought will not be reached so long as the new set of values is not experienced by the individual as

something freely chosen." "An outright enforcement of the new set of values and beliefs is simply the introduction of a new god who has to fight with the old god, now regarded as a devil." "A feeling of complete freedom and a heightened group identification are frequently more important at a particular stage of re-education than learning not to break specific rules." (Kurt Lewin and Paul Grabbe "Conduct, Knowledge, and Acceptance of New Values" The Journal of Social Issues, 1:3:56-65 August, 1945, in Benne) This is reflected in the words used by dialectical minded people such as community, human reasoning, consensus, etc. Thus "the groups provide the right gemeinschaft for the angsts of our zeitgeist." (Moreno in Howard) Gemeinschaft (community) differs from Gesellschaft (civic) as Verstand (understanding by command) differs from Vernunft (understanding by reasoning). "'Vernunft' must regain the field from which it had been driven by the triumph of 'Verstand.'" (Jay) In other words, man's ever changing spectrum of feelings (the temporal) must triumph over the restraining commands (the spiritual) of parents. Thus, while there is no 'continuum' or spectrum of 'changingness' in God's way of thinking (no gray zone; "Every 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), there is in man's way of thinking and acting. Therefore, before the 'closed' system of God, since all have participated in the 'open' system of 'change,' following after their own lusts, "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;" (Romans 3:23). Period.

In man's way of thinking he finds what he has in common with the environment around him, i.e. looking for that which is similar with the world around him and his nature, so that he can justify his nature, not understanding that he can not justify himself, i.e. he can not justify his nature (period!), thus he perceives contrast (anything counter to his nature) as being antithesis to his nature, while with God, contrast between right and wrong is what separates God from man (man being created, becomes only sensually 'driven' when separated from God, spiritually dead, only of the earth) and man from God (God being the creator, the provider of life, not only in body, but in spirit and mind and soul and heart, i.e. making man a living soul, dependent upon God for all good things, good and righteousness coming from God and not from man). But man can not fully

understand the contrast between spirit and flesh, righteousness and wickedness, by his own reasoning abilities (his justifying of the spiritual limited to his senses), therefore he turns to that which he has in common with the world, he turns to his own nature, sensuousness to gain understanding of the spiritual to 'serve it' or to annihilate it based upon what he can gain from it, i.e. filtering everything through the sensual, even his efforts to escape the sensual, adding human feelings to God to make him sensual so that he can worship God with his carnal sensuality. Man is trapped in the sensual, i.e. his own vanity, without God's imputation (God's love is not vain since God has nothing to gain from man), man's love which is vain (man is always 'driven' by what he can gain from the situation, his love, being sensually based, is not able to be anything else but vain, even in his best moments or with his best motives; for example J. L. Moreno, the "father" of role-playing—which you have more than likely participated in sometime in your life—makes man's love, when carried to its dialectical end, very clear: "I could well imagine a world of a reversed order, opposite to ours, in which ethical suicide of people after 30 or 35 as a religious technique or countering overpopulation is just as natural as birth control has become in our culture. In that society the love of life would be carried to its extreme. 'Make space for the unborn, make space for the newborn, for everyone born, Every time a new baby is born make space for him by taking the life of an old man or an old woman.'"

[Moreno](#)—just make sure that if you are over 35 you are of social worth, i.e. a socialist of importance as Moreno viewed himself when he preached and taught this ideology while in his 60's). "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 In contrast, God's love is revealed in his righteousness. "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law [which only exposes mans vanity and wickedness, mans love being sensual, temporal, and therefore vain, turning God's law into man's laws for personal gain], but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:" Philippians 3:9. God's love is spiritual, eternal, merciful, and gracious. Man's love takes that which is God's and uses it for his own gain, breaking the first commandment by breaking any or all of the rest by making himself god, directing his own steps according to his own

understanding, engraving an image of God (sensual) which is not the image of God (whom no man has seen—spiritual) and worshiping the works of his own mind and hands and not giving his worship to God, taking that (praise and worship which is due to God for himself) which is not his to take, using the Lords name for your own purpose, which is not his to use as he pleases for his own gain, using the rest which comes from God for his own gain, dishonoring the office of his parents, which is given by God, for his own gain, taking a life which is not his to take for his own gain, having sexual relationship with another (even in the mind) for his own gain, which is not his to take, taking from another that which is not his to take, for his own gain, taking the reputation of another, by bearing false witness, for his own gain, which is not his to take, etc. In all things, man's love is based upon sensual pleasure, always taking that which is not his to take, for his own gain (in himself, he can not understand any other way). Man, in himself, is depraved and can not feel, think, or behave any other way. Apart from God's righteousness (imputed by Christ upon all who believe upon Him) man can not escape his own depravity, his sensuousness, i.e. his love of pleasure and the things of this world, even though he might try to disguise it in his 'service' to God and the church. "And Samuel said, Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." 1 Samuel 15:22 Apart from God's love, mercy and grace, man has no hope in escaping his sensual nature and his love for the things of this world and therefore God's judgment upon him.

It is here (within man's vanity, masquerading as love) that the dialectical process becomes man's only tool for defining and justifying his behavior—justifying his feelings, his thoughts, and his actions, according to his "sensuous needs," "sense perception," and "sense experience," (Karl Marx), even 'helping' him turn God's words into a tool (interpreting it and extrapolating it) for his own self justification (via. human reasoning and human works, i.e. "Look what 'We' have done for you, even doing it in your name."). God's contrast is between righteousness and wickedness (spiritual), while man's contrast is between pain and pleasure (sensual), which can not comprehend God's contrast, righteousness being perceived as 'pain' to the sensual (perceived as being non-sensual and therefore

irrational, i.e. perceiving those who intentionally live in righteousness as living counter to pleasure, not being 'driven' by the sensual they are therefore perceived as living in a life of pain—a life void of pleasure—perceived as being masochistic, i.e. and therefore the God who they serve as being sadistic; "Both the sadistic and the masochistic trends are caused by the inability of the isolated individual to stand alone and his need for a symbiotic relationship to overcome this aloneness." [Man could] "not take the last logical step, to give up 'God' and to establish a concept of man as a being who is alone in the world, but who can feel at home in it if he achieves union with his fellow man and with nature [a union not based upon 'sin,' since according to humanists, sin is a transcendental idea (beyond human experience and knowledge and therefore 'negative' to nature), but unity based upon human nature, and therefore 'positive' to nature —thus Karl Marx's concept of creating at home or in the home a sinful world, i.e. bringing the world system into the home and making it a 'normal' home, i.e. a socialist home; "Not feeling at home in the sinful world, Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home." Marx, The Holy Family; before going any farther I must explain that Marx's "Critical Criticism" is today's "Question everything," with the social 'purpose' of negating the traditional home environment and its faith, obedience, chastening, and righteousness, in "hand-to-hand combat." "Criticism is now simply a means. Indignation is its essential pathos, denunciation its principle task. Criticism is criticism in hand-to-hand combat. Criticism proceeds on to praxis." Marx, Critique; if it does not become social in praxis it can not be successful; Marx wrote: "If the 1789 French Revolution was a failure it was because the most numerous part of the mass, the part distinct from the bourgeoisie, did not have its real interest in the principle of the Revolution [the annihilation of the "bourgeoisie," the negation of traditional patriarchal family], did not have a revolutionary principle of its own [had not become "stakeholders" in the social praxis of replacing the patriarchal, 'ridged,' 'closed' system with the heresiarchal, 'change,' 'open' system], but only an 'idea', and hence only an object of momentary enthusiasm and only seeming uplift." Marx, The Holy Family)]." Fromm, Escape —Our dictionaries carry the influence of this Freudian ideology: Masochism being defined as "a sexual perversion characterized by pleasure in being subjected to pain or humiliation

especially by a love object;" Sadism "a sexual perversion in which gratification is obtained by the infliction of physical or mental pain on ... a love object" Merriam-Webster Dictionary (emphasis added) In other words, by a dialectical definition, a masochist is anyone who willfully obeys the commands of their parent, God, etc., even when the commands interfere with their natural, carnal (sexual) desire (according to Freud all desires, including children's desires, are sexual), and a sadist is anyone, i.e. a parent, God, etc., who places a commands upon another person, commands which block their satisfying of a natural, carnal (sexual) desire). "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." John 1:5 "And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not." John 1:5 "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." John 3:19 "For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light:" Ephesians 5:8

"Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness." Luke 11:35 In other words make sure that it is God who is directing your steps and not your own sensual nature, your own carnal desires. Not until man has no hope, can he have hope. Not until he can no longer justify himself, justify his feelings, his thoughts, and his actions, can he find justification. Not until he is dead to himself, can he find life. Not until he gives up all that he has, can he receive all that is good. In God. But he can not give up on hope, no longer justify himself, die to himself, give up all that he has without first receiving his hope from God, receive his justification from God, finding life in God, receiving all that is good from God. Not until man has no hope (sensual), can he have hope (spiritual). Not until he can no longer justify himself: justify his feelings, his thoughts, and his actions (sensual), can he find justification (spiritual). Not until he is dead to himself (sensual), can he find life (spiritual). Not until he gives up all that he has (sensual), can he receive all that is good (spiritual). "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and

bring glad tidings of good things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Romans 10:13-17 In other words, not until man gives up evaluating what God says, evaluating by his understanding according to sight (sensually), and accepts what God says, by faith, can he have hope, justification, and life that is eternal, evaluating what man says and does (temporal) by God's Spirit and His Word (spiritually). "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." Romans 8:5 "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. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ." 1 Corinthians 2: 12-16 But this all begins with childlike faith. "And said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." Matthew 18: 3, 4 Like standing at an open door, looking out from a well lit room into total darkness, fearful that the next step will plummet you to your death, can you take that step, unless you believe God who calls you to take it, is a good God, and will not harm you. Then you will know that the "well lit room" was the darkness of the world, and the "total darkness" was the light of life and the fear was the fear of loss of the pleasures of this life and the "goodness" of God is the joy unspeakable and the peace that no man can understand, which can only come from God. Not until you are converted, and as a humble child obeying his loving father, can you know true life, God's peace and joy. "But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." 1 Corinthians 2:9 I "For since the beginning of the world men have not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye seen, O God, beside thee, what he hath prepared for

him that waiteth for him." Isaiah 64:4

As a note of precaution, trusting in man is a major concern. "Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD." Jeremiah 17:5; It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man. Psalms 118:8 But trusting in God is not a concern, except for the carnal. "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" "Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." Matthew 6:25, 31-33 Without God, man is only accountable for his actions to himself, based upon what he thinks is of value to himself. Therefore the value of life is cheapened, being only sensually based and measured by personal gain (increased or sustained pleasure or avoidance of pain). Pain or the absence of pleasure, along the spectrum of worth and not of worth, then justifies the taking of life, his own or someone else's, when pain makes life unbearable (even though he may say it would be too painful for the other person, i.e. life would not be of any worth to themselves or the other person—the value of life becoming subjective, they are really removing life for their own gain in pleasure, call it for social cause all they want, that is just an act of denial, it is actually just for themselves). This is where trust fails, when avoiding pain and approaching pleasure becomes the end itself (whether individually or socially). Dreams and violence are united on this spectrum of hope and despair. A person's life having little or no value when preventing pleasure or the imagined potential for pleasure (in other words producing pain or potential pain—emotional pain) in others. Therefore trusting in man is a dangerous proposition. Your life could depend upon your vigilance for life itself, yours, and everybody else's (including the unborn, the elderly, the weak, and the thesis minded, the antithesis minded, and the synthesis minded person as well). Someone has to rescue man from his own demise. Its like trying to stop rebellious children from destroying everything around them while they try to destroy you so they can have their way, who can't

understand, because of the sensuousness, their blindness to the truth, that what they are really doing is destroying themselves. But being intoxicated with the sensuousness of the dialectical 'moment' they can not understand. "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." 2 Corinthians 4:4 Any truth you tell those who have sold their soul to the system of Diaprax will simply be trampled under foot as they turn to rend you. "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you." Matthew 7:6

Yet even with man's best effort to serve or not to serve 'God' (or gods) above him, he can not shake his praxis of making a god or god's out of his own imagination, using the dialectical process to justify himself (as being god) in doing so (philosophy only leads man to another god of his own making, the god of his sensual desires fighting against his dissatisfactions toward what is). Whether carved in stone or worshiped in the mind (in the imagination) the first commandment is broken with the use of the second. Any god, be it mankind himself (society), he 'makes,' he makes. The very praxis of evaluating, putting into praxis, and justification makes him god. Therefore, no matter what he does or how he does it, in the end, he is god, deciding for himself what is good and what is evil. By creating and worshiping god's out of his own imagination, whether of his own nature or not, he can only worship his own sensual, carnal nature, deceived into believing he serves another god or no god at all. Without God revealing himself to man there is not true knowledge of God, only a desire to know "Who or what created this world we live in and who or what created us?" While all men have this desire, including the atheist, humanists, communist (though they would deny it, their actions betray them, i.e. they worship something, be it Marx, Freud, Darwin, society, evolution, 'change,' the dialectical system, etc. all leading to sensuousness in thought and in action, in theory and in practice). Without God revealing himself, all that man has going for him is his sensuousness and imagination. (But if Diaprax turns people off when they hear preaching and teaching, how can they hear the word of God, which comes by preaching, when they have accepted Diaprax as their way, their truth, and their life?) With the God of light revealed, condemning man's way of thinking and acting as darkness,

all that man has left is the act of justifying himself, his nature, his thoughts, and his actions as being the light, i.e. defining whatever brings him pleasure as being good, thus justifying his use of the dialectical process ("enlightenment") in justifying his fallen nature. "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." 2 Corinthians 11:14 Once you place your feelings and thoughts (and the feelings and thoughts of man, i.e. trusting in the opinions of men) as being equal with faith in God, you have lost your faith in God. Immanuel Kant, in Critique of Pure Reason, did exactly this. His separate but 'equal' concept of faith and human 'reasoning' justified to the socialist their thoughts and actions in the negation of any faith which is not 'reasonable.' When you place your feelings and thoughts or another man's feelings and thoughts between you and God, God is no longer the light to your path, directing your steps, although, being deceived by Satan, you might 'feel' or 'think' he is. "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 Left to his own nature, mankind always follows the pathway which leads to Sodom and Gomorrah (where the "contemporary" church always finds itself). "Hear the word of the LORD, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah. To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the LORD: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood." Isaiah 1:10- 15

Diaprax is simply the act of worship of the creation. Diaprax is the praxis of man worshiping humanity, man and nature united as one. Consensus being the worship of the human sensuous experience of 'oneness,' i.e. completeness of self in the world (self-actualization), i.e. man making a name for himself (as at the tower of Babel), which is sin. Even those who would say "It is not about self, but about others, or all of us working

together for God/mankind," deceive themselves, and all who listen to and follow them in the praxis of their deceit and lies. "And they will deceive every one his neighbour, and will not speak the truth: they have taught their tongue to speak lies, and weary themselves to commit iniquity." Jeremiah 9:5 "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds [the Greek word for "deeds" is praxis]; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." Colossians 3:9 , 10 "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; And be renewed in the spirit of your mind; And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Ephesians 4:22-24 . Diaprax is the spirit of darkness 'helping' man to 'justify' himself as being a god (which is Gnosticism), working the works of god (the giver of pleasure, all that is good, thereby receiving pleasure from those who are doing good, i.e. those giving pleasure to others), even 'in the name of Jesus.' Unless you are dead to self (in all things, which you can not do in yourself nor with the 'help' of others) and alive in Christ (His work of redemption, His righteousness, His Word, and His Holy Spirit in you), you are god (religion only making the deceit greater). Being dead to self (as a minister friend, James Borchert, puts it, "dead psychologically," dead to your "vanity") and alive in Christ (giving your life, all that you have and desire to have to God) is the only way you can be saved from the worship of self (sensuousness) and judgment by God (Spirit). There is no other way. "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 Until you daily, first thing, confess that you can not not sin (and receive God's approval, i.e. that you can not not sin) and die to your ideas, dreams, wishes and hopes and ask him for direction in all feelings, thoughts, and actions, giving him your day, i.e. the day he has made, giving him praise and thanksgiving, you can not not sin, doing your own 'thing' even "in the name of Jesus." "This is the day which the LORD hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." Psalm 118:24 (The carnal mind, under Satan's influence, winces at that verse and can not speak it with certainty.)

Instead of sensuousness 'driving' us (us in the individual not collective sense), even doing "amazing works" for God, we are led by God in all

things (setting our mind on things above, walking by His Spirit, and not setting our mind on the things of the world, walking by our flesh). We no longer live life with sensuousness as a 'necessity' but now live through God's Spirit of love, power, and sound mind, our love of sensuousness, lusting after the pleasures of this life, having been put to death through God's righteousness ("imputed by Christ to all who believe), now living a life of peace and joy which only He can provide. This is something the world can never understand or come to know on its own ("Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." 2 Timothy 3:7 because learning, dialectically, is always found in the process of 'change'; "To study something means to study it in the process of change; that is the dialectical method's basic demand." Vygotsky), because it is 'driven' by the sensuousness (pleasures) of the flesh, blinded by its temporal perception (not able to see the truth external to sense experience, i.e. not able to see the full picture, but thinking, i.e. feeling that it does), and fooled by its own wisdom (dialectical wisdom, comparing itself with itself, thereby justifying itself) which is the pride of life (as the preacher said, "Vanity, vanity, all is vanity." Ecclesiastes).

Thinking dialectically, man's only avenue from evil to good is via 'good' works (social action), where human action becomes the only means of salvation. Where man's duty is to serve himself or mankind, i.e. the god of his own making. The following speech by the Transformational Marxist, Jürgen Habermas (with excerpts from other writings and other sources added within brackets), exposes the twisted, sick, depraved, etc. mind (the subtlety, complexity, deceitfulness, and wickedness) of those in the process. (In his speech he is defining what it means, dialectically, to be made "in the image of God." It shocks me every time I read it, especially the outcome he arrives at, although it shouldn't surprise me. The subtleness in arriving at the outcome is breathtaking, in how wicked it is, i.e. the 'justified' use of human embryos for the good of mankind, i.e. whatever action is perceived as being 'good' for mankind is, through dialectical reasoning, 'justifiable.')

>"Religious communities are entitled to be called 'reasonable' only if they renounce the use of violence as a means of propagating the truths of their faith. [Violence, dialectically perceived, is any action which prevents

another person from natural inquiry. Therefore chastening a child for an act of disobedience toward a parent's command, (questioning, as in, challenging parental authority), when he was simply 'doing his thing,' 'discovering himself and the world,' i.e. "discovering his potential," would be considered an act of violence.] They must translate their religious convictions ["It is written" or belief] into a secular language [human feelings and thoughts or opinions] before their arguments have the prospect of being accepted by a majority ... to translate the 'in the image of God' character of the human creature into the secular language of constitutional law [dialectical moral duty of, by, and for mankind]." "In Kant we find the authority of divine command reestablished in the unconditional validity of moral duty. In this we hear an unmistakable resonance. With his conception of autonomy, Kant certainly destroyed the traditional conception of being 'a child of God.' Something was lost when sin became guilt ... The lost hope of resurrection has left behind a palpable emptiness." (Habermas, speech) continued below

[What I call "boarder language," the using of ambiguous words (fuzzy words) which can mean different things to different people, have the potential of allowing communication between people from deferring jurisdictions of control. "Fusion words" can be used to overcome differences of positions (righteousness) by allowing relationships to develop (sensuousness) which would otherwise be inhibited or blocked. In this way a top-down system, based upon established rules (righteousness) which limits or blocks communication, can be circumvented by a system of equality, based upon personal feelings and thoughts (sensuousness), i.e. confrontation and division (righteousness) circumvented by focusing upon words which can be used to unite people upon equality of personal desires (sensuousness). The dialectical process can not gain a foothold without the utilization of ambiguity ("Thou shalt not surely die", "die" had two different meanings, sensuous, i.e. death from the tree itself —scientifically evaluated, or righteous, i.e. death from God himself, i.e. removing you from having access to the tree of life —spiritually evaluated, the former understanding, i.e. a half truth, negates, cuts off, i.e. circumvents the latter understanding).

Words being forced to a clear definition frustrate, inhibit, and even block

the dialectical process, a process which needs the confusion which is created by using words which can be used in both a sacred arena (righteous paradigm, truths preached and taught) and a secular arena (sensuous paradigm, opinions dialogued), where, when properly facilitated, "seems to" (opinion, sight) can prevail over "is" (belief, faith) in making decisions. (This is why meetings must be pressure cooker environments, moving all to consensus with feelings of expediency and urgency, when it comes to definitions, while providing 'appropriate' time to develop feelings of relationship.) "The words 'seem to' are significant; it is the perception which functions in guiding behavior." (Rogers) "To transform existing conditions into conditions that are desired.... involves the fusion of fact and desire, of present and future, of existing means and projected ends... the fusion of the ideal and existent in a program of action." (Benne) "Fusion-words' . . . to solve the 'is' and 'ought' problem [righteousness and sensuousness problem]." "Here the fusion comes not so much from an improvement of actuality, the 'is,' but from a scaling down of the 'ought,' from a redefining of expectations [thus preventing the creating of another righteous position, i.e. continuing a thesis-antithesis situation] so that they [righteousness and sensuousness] come closer and closer to actuality and therefore to attainability." (Maslow, Further) By getting the "is" and the "ought" communicating with fusion words, both can become one in 'purpose,' uniting upon sensuousness (becoming 'sensible' in thought and action). "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof [are] the ways of death." Proverbs 14:12]

[The dialectical meaning of salvation, which is the foundation of the 'contemporary' 'emergent' churches, is found in mans moral duty to mankind: "... the moral point of view can only be realized under conditions of communication that ensure that everyone tests the acceptability of a norm, implemented in a general practice, also from the perspective of his own understanding of himself and of the world, in this way the categorical imperative receives a discourse-theoretical interpretation in which its place is taken by the discourse principle (D), according to which only those norms can claim validity that could meet with the agreement of all those concerned in their capacity as participants in a practical discourse. ...[resulting in] the collapse of the persons

religious foundation ... " (Habermas, Communicative Ethics)

"With the devaluation of the epistemic authority of the God's eye view, moral commands lose their religious as well as their metaphysical foundation." "The fact that moral practice is no longer tied to the individual's expectation of salvation and an exemplary conduct of life through the person of a redemptive God and the divine plan for salvation [remember this is a Marxist writing this] has two unwelcome consequences. On the one hand, moral knowledge becomes detached from moral motivation, and on the other, the concept of morally right action becomes differentiated from the conception of a good or godly life. ... uncoupling morality from questions of the good life leads to a motivational deficit. Because there is no profane substitute for the hope of personal salvation, we lose the strongest motive for obeying moral commands."

"With the loss of its foundation in the religious promise of salvation, the meaning of normative obligation also changes. The differentiation between strict duties and less binding values, between what is morally right and what is ethically worth striving for, already sharpens moral validity into a normativity to which impartial judgment alone is adequate [resulting in a] shift in perspective from God to human beings..." (Habermas, Communicative Ethics)

Humanity becomes man's concern, not pleasing God. "Tillichian salvation is a symbol, a symbol for becoming ultimately concerned about humanity —salvation in an 'eternal' present. " (Wheat) "But there is no other salvation for him, he cannot regain his humanity, his substance, other than by thoroughly overcoming all religious ideas and returning firmly and honestly, not to 'God', but to himself." (Engels) "Salvation is a byproduct of Self-Actualization Duty." "In self-actualizing people, the work they do might be better be called 'mission,' 'calling,' 'duty,' 'vocation,' in the priest's sense." "Meaningful work comes very close to the religious quest in the humanistic sense." "Meaningful work comes very close to the religious quest in the humanistic sense." (Maslow, Maslow) "Seeking for personal salvation is anyway the wrong road to salvation. The only path was the Ikiru path —salvation via hard work & total commitment to doing well the job fate or personal task destiny called you to—an important job that 'called for ' doing." (Maslow, Journals)

"Therefore the dialectic of the moral life must repeat itself until the

materialist spell that is cast upon the reproduction of social life, the Biblical curse of necessary labor, is broken technologically." (Habermas, Knowledge) "Necessary labor" under God (which is unbiblical since there is no works salvation) is replaced with "necessary labor" for the salvation of humanity, as a popular saying today goes: "We working for Us." "Citizens are obliged to concern themselves with the upbringing of children, to train them for socially useful work, and to raise them as worthy members of socialist society." "Socially useful work and its results determine a person's status in society." "former" USSR constitution. The Holy Scriptures instruct us instead to do whatever we do as unto the Lord and not to men. "And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons." Colossians 3:23-25]

"Allow me to close by illustrating the concept of non-annihilating secularization with an example. In the controversy over the use of human embryos, many voices still allude to Genesis 1:27: 'So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him.' It is not necessary to believe that God, who is Love, created Adam and Eve as free beings like Himself in order to understand what 'in His own image' means. Love cannot exist without knowledge of another, nor can freedom exist without mutual recognition." (Habermas, speech) continued below

[The underlying assumption being that the unborn are not a part of the formula of freedom, i.e. of "self-determination," since he or she does not have "mutual recognition" with the mother, the father, the other siblings, or society, not even being conscious of himself or herself, in other words, not being self-conscious it can not be "self-determining." His error begins in his making of man a "free being" like God, having "self-determination," which is not the case. If Habermas was true to the word of God and not thinking according to his dialectical agenda of freeing man from God (who directs man's steps instead of letting him direct them himself) he would not have made this deceptive statement. What man is free to do, as created in the image of God, is to evaluate his life and the world around him

according to God's word (as Jesus explained in the first temptation to the master facilitator of 'change') but which neither the woman nor Adam did, thereby sinning against God by becoming 'like God,' using their God-given ability of evaluation, i.e. to know the difference between good and evil, but this time evaluating God's word itself, defining it as evil, according to their own sensuous nature. From being wrong before God, today, anyone who holds to the sacredness of life under God is considered as being controversial to "the right of self-determination." (As explained in other articles, since the environment affects man's decisions, anyone controlling the environment, controls man, therefore there is no true "self-determination," only manipulation by those who preach a message of "self-determination." It provides them a pay check and a 'good' life. Psycho-socialists have no other 'purpose' than liberating your daughter or son from Godly restraints, so that they can "be their own person" and they can then be used in the future, if not in the present, for the psycho-socialists and their followers sensual pleasures. "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?'" Rogers)

Therefore, according to those using the dialectical process, man can believe in God (a "God of free men" meaning a man creating God who is created in man's own image —a man created super being, created in the image of man, a God of "self-determination" and "mutual recognition" with man, a sensual, common-unity god) and obey his word as long as he and God do not hinder "man's right of self-determination." "Right" meaning no judgment or condemnation can be placed upon the "self determined" praxis (the social-sensual praxis) of mankind. Thus God (spirit) can not prevent man (temporal) from being "like god" since man has defined God as having come from his imagination in the first place. It is the "otherness" of God which becomes the focal point in dialectical thinking (the "significant other"). By finding the common-reality of the one —man, and the other —god (or society, both man and god being "divine"; as expressed in [a dissertation by George Russell Seay, Jr.](#), Seay writing: "King contends that human salvation on a social level can only come with God and humanity working together. God and humanity are not collapsed into a single unity, but they are united in 'purpose.'" Seay; Seay

stated that Martin Luther King Jr. preached: "Evil in the world will not be eradicated through human effort or divine intervention alone, but through human effort and divine power." M. L. K. Jr. Strength to Love), man (dialectically) comes to know his universal 'purpose,' distinguishing good from evil, right from wrong according to his sensual nature, putting his sensual nature into collective action against that which is not "divine," against a non-sensual, 'legalistic,' self-righteous, social disharmony God. The difference between traditional and transformational Marxism being on this very point. The traditionalist rejecting God, the transformationists, going back to early Marx, redefining him to be at-one-with man (united in 'purpose'), created from man's imagining another world as a result of improper social structure. In the end, God must either be "changeable" in the thoughts and actions of men, become at-one-with man (sensual and tolerant of ambiguity) or else be negated in the thoughts and actions of men. While traditional Marxist believe upon the latter (the negation of God) both forms of Marxism end up making mankind god. "The 'more divine', in other words, the more inhuman, something is, the less we shall be able to admire it. The more 'godly' they are, the more inhuman, the more bestial. We lay claim to the meaning of history; but we see in history not the revelation of 'God' but of man and only of man. Our Christian opponents are guilty of immorality when they make the world and man dependent on the grace of a God. For that reason we have once and for all declared war on religion. We want to sweep away everything that claims to be supernatural and superhuman. Our liberation from the present Christian state of the world and the liberation of the world from it are ultimately our sole occupation;" "Man has only to understand himself, to take himself as the measure of all aspects of life, to judge according to his being, to organise the world in a truly human manner according to the demands of his own nature, and he will have solved the riddle of our time. But there is no other salvation for him, he cannot regain his humanity, his substance, other than by thoroughly overcoming all religious ideas and returning firmly and honestly, not to 'God', but to himself." (Engels) "Religion, especially the Protestant Christian tradition, has permeated our culture with the concept that man is basically sinful, and only by something approaching a miracle can his sinful nature be negated." "I have little sympathy with the rather prevalent concept that man is basically irrational,

and that his impulses, if not controlled, will lead to destruction of others and self." (Rogers) The transformational Marxist view of "divine" meaning "man's right of self-determination" frees man from the righteousness of God, making God, and those who believe upon him, subject to "human rights," 'righteousness' being based upon human sensuousness.

The freedom of the conscience (the voice of the father, restraining human behavior and humanity with his demand for righteousness, i.e. right behavior, and the consequence of unrighteousness) replaced with the freedom of the super-ego (the voice of humanity, i.e. the voice of the "village," the voice of the "common-unity," with its demand for sensuousness, i.e. 'sensible' behavior, the voice of humanity liberating human behavior from the voice of the father, "social cause" liberating the soul from the "Because I said so"; while [the conscience and the super-ego](#) both require external, environmental input for their development, the conscience requires input from parents, God, neighbors, teachers, etc. incorporating the use of punishment or the fear of it, while the super-ego requires input from society, the latter including "emotional impulses" and the "dictates of free will" as a part of the conscience, i.e. making the conscience a "healthy" super-ego when it is adaptable to change, changeable according to the "influences of the present and the past," "influence" meaning having a sensually "positive" experience with the environment, which requires the exclusion of the "fear of punishment" from something or someone of the past, a condition which is essential to the development of the conscience, now perceived as an "unhealthy" or damaged super-ego —this is what "health care" is all about, every facilitated meeting you have attending has been a therapy session to make you a "healthy" member of society).

The difference between the conscience and the super-ego can determine whether a person has the right of property or not, the court being the final determinate. If the jury votes according to their conscience, that is according to what is right vs. what is wrong for the individual juror, despite what society might think or feel (or without social considerations), then a man is innocent or guilty of a crime, based upon his own actions against another citizen (two or more witnesses being required to find him guilty), the citizen therefore has the right to his own property without social considerations (he has the right of property for personal 'purpose' as

long as he does not infringe upon another citizen with those same rights), but if the jury votes according to their super-ego, that is according to their opinions (how they feel or what they think on how others feel or think), basing value or worth upon their perception of current social "needs," considering, in their decision, what is good or bad for society, then a man is innocent or guilty of a crime based upon the social worth or value of his actions (satisfying the "felt needs" of others therefore becomes a part of the decision of innocence or guilt —Abraham Maslow's attitude toward taxes serves as a good example of individual worth in the eyes of super-ego development: "In our democratic society, any enterprise —any individual —has its obligations to the whole." "Any company that restricts its goals purely to its own profits, its own production, and its own sales is getting a kind of a free ride from me and other taxpayers." "Tax credits would be given to the company that helps to improve the whole society, and helps to improve the democracy by helping to create democratic individuals." "[The] goal is simply to build group companies where people can self-actualize." "[Businesses] and the not-for-profits have a much greater role to play in shaping the good society than any institution I can think of." "The best way to destroy democratic society would be by way of industrial authoritarianism [private business], which is anti-democratic in the deepest sense." Maslow, Management), i.e. if found guilty, his crime would be against society (human perception, i.e. imagination, opinion, and circumstantial evidence being enough to find him guilty), the citizen therefore has no individual "inalienable right" to us property for his own gain, having only the social "human right" to use property for the good of society (for common-unity 'purpose'). "Man's right of self-determination" depends upon his "mutual recognition" of others with the same right, makes private right subject to public right (anyone can take your goods if they have a "felt" need which needs satisfying, in the name of society). Instead of the individual man being made in the image of God (righteous), i.e. private ownership of land being a right (under God the earth is made for man's pleasure, man being made for God's pleasure), mankind itself becomes God (sensuous), therefore, according to the "logic" of Diaprax, all private land (the use of property in a way which limits the potential for others to attain "self-determination," i.e. infringing upon their "right of self-determination," i.e. hindering their right to satisfy their "sensuous

needs") must become public land in 'purpose.' When "Mine, not yours" "hinders" "Ours" then "Mine, not yours" must give way to "Ours," as in our feelings, thoughts, and actions (theory and practice) This in essence, is the 'justification' for common-ism. Government can use your property for its 'purpose' and you have little or no say in the matter, i.e. if you "hinder" its "right of self determination" you will pay the price, you will be judged as one who is refusing to recognize that man is made in the image of God as "a divine form of man" with "self-determination" —a Gnostic structure of thought. Parents therefore must not "hinder" their child's "right of self-determination." Everything has to be viewed through the lens of "humanity." If it is perceivable it is of worth, if not, it is of no worth. This is the twisted, evil way of thinking which is being pushing upon citizens through "group theory," facilitated meetings.]

"Consequently, the 'opposite stance' inherent in the nature of humanity must remain free to repay this gift of God. Despite his nature as a creature 'in the image of God,' this 'otherness' can itself be considered a creation of God. The created nature of 'in His own image' expresses an intuition that has something to say even to those who have no ear for religion, among whom I count myself. God remains a 'God of free men' only as long as we do not erase the absolute difference between the Creator and the created [the difference between the 'imagined' god and the real nature of man]. In other words, only as long as the gift of a divine form to man is taken to mean that no hindrance be placed on man's right of self-determination." (Habermas, speech)

[This 'logic' is the first step which must be taken in the praxis of Gnosticism, from which sociology, psychology, anthropology, etc. i.e. countless socially structured organizations, secret and not so secret, derive their structure of thought and action from. Unlike the freedom of the conscience (individual man's accountability to a higher authority, for his thoughts and actions —incorporating the fear of God), which blessed this nation, the freedom of "self-determination" is based upon a collective notion of man (man's accountability to humanity, i.e. including his feelings, his thoughts, and his actions —incorporating the fear of man), which now curses this nation. People can not think or act (buy or sell)

without socialist oversight and "suggestions," i.e. the villages approval, i.e. "What will the village think?" now in their brain. All for the 'good' of humanity. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matthew 10:28]

God's way of thinking is a "closed" system of everlasting truth, man's way of thinking, being sense based (ever changing according to ever changing "felt" needs) is not. The dialectical process is man's way of thinking. The dialectic process is a procedure which is used to negate a 'closed' system (a system which is run according to absolutes: where things are determined, evaluated, and judged by categorical imperatives¹ external to self, making truth objective instead of subjective, feelings based). The dialectical process is used to negate a 'closed' system by the praxis of initiating and sustaining an 'open' system (a system which is run according to what is relative —relevant to the 'moment': where things are determined, evaluated, and judged according to our 'perception' of the situation², making truth subjective instead of objective, secular and material instead of sacred and spiritual). Since the laws of nature are established by God there is no 'open' system in nature, the 'open' system only resides in man's impulses and imagination, which are 'driven' by his own sensuousness (see [dopamine](#) for example), leading to thought and action which loves 'openness,' i.e. any situation where he can be both sensuous and spontaneous (producing consciousness, where feeling, thought, and action —the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor domains are all three united in the 'moment,' a 'moment' which can not happen without being void of the 'closed' system, without its negation, thereby negating faith, which is action not dependent upon, nor driven by sensuousness and spontaneity, i.e. faith does not find its 'purpose' in human praxis but in God —the two can not be mingled or merged, to attempt to do so only negates faith in God). "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 "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Mathew

6:24

Our nervous system is designed to convey the external conditions of the world around us and the internal conditions of our body to our brain. It is there that we set our mind upon whatever it is that "disturbed" us for reasons of pleasure or for pain (within or without or body). There are gaps between the nerves which convey this information to and within our brain. It is in these gaps that chemicals are released (emancipated, liberated), traveling from one nerve ending to the next nerve ending to continue the transmission of information to and within the brain. Some chemicals (neurotransmitters) convey conditions of pain, some of pleasure, others of other conditions both internal and external to the body. It is these chemicals with which our brain derives the sensation of pleasure, pain, etc. It is therefore our nature to approach pleasure and avoid pain. Therefore any object in the environment or any condition in the body which produces pleasure we want to approach for the sake of continuation, the key word being want (setting our mind upon, imagining, responding to in favorable 'positive' thought) and our action would be to approach it (without fear of pain). The same would be true for any object which produced pain, only in this case the key words would be not want (in thought) and our action would be to avoid it. There are many other stimulus-response conditions as well. Therefore, anything in the environment which produces a liberation of neurotransmitters which are associated to pleasures we would desire to have (want) and anything in the environment which produces a liberation of neurotransmitters which are associated to pain we would desire not to have (we would avoid). We actually desire the pleasure chemicals our body naturally produces and liberates into the gap (synaptic gap) as a result to making contact with or becoming aware of an object in the environment which stimulated their liberation (this is why people who take drugs, bypassing the nervous system being stimulated by the environment itself, often end up 'live' in such appalling conditions without caring, only lusting for the next 'fix').

Thus the child is not in love with the toy. He is in love with the pleasure neurotransmitters (the drug), contact with the toy naturally liberates within his body. His natural reaction is to continue relationship with the object to continue the liberation of the pleasure neurotransmitters (to continue the liberating of neurotransmitters such as dopamine which produces the

wanting of a gratifying object in the environment). If the object loses its dopamine emancipating attraction to him, he loses interest in it (he no longer desires —wants to relation with it, since the want for it has been satiated or something in the environment produces more pleasure, i.e. becomes the gratifying object of want). This is why new toys are necessary to keep the pleasure driven (lustful) children happy (the environment must be a 'changeable' environment for dopamine emancipation to be perpetuated, dopamine craving being the driving force for 'change'). Once hooked, the child will strike back at whatever inhibits or blocks his habit, interferes with his contact with the stimulant of pleasure (those on artificial stimulants stealing and even killing to continue their habit of pleasure). Stored up money is nothing other than drug money (pleasure money, i.e. you take trips, fix up the house, buy certain cars, etc. to attain pleasure in you life), that is, if it is not under God's control. But to the socialist, with their perception of god as being humanity, means that socialist, globalist, government control of your life, your life —your work life, becomes the same as money, your 'purpose' is for the pleasure of humanity, i.e. for the pleasure of psycho-socialist's, and their 'comrades,' pay check and retirement be a big part of the pleasure you provide them). The scriptures warn us to "Flee also youthful lusts...." [Epithumia - desire, craving, longing, desire for what is forbidden] 2 Titus 2:22a The dialectical process encourages us to initiate and sustain the conditions which produce lust. "Feelings, joy, and pleasure [German words used: Empfindung, Lust und Genuss] are sanctioned and justified so that nature and freedom, sensuousness and reason, find their unity their right and their gratification." (Hegel, Vorlesungen)

To be human then is to be pleasure 'driven' (dopamine 'driven'), environment driven (who ever controls the environment, whoever controls the world, controls man). The liberation of the sensuousness of pleasure becoming the 'purpose' in life. Dialectically, liberation from or the annihilation of the condition which inhibits or blocks pleasures liberation, becoming the 'purpose' in life, not for just a few but for all —which the few want the many to think, supporting the few in their world of pleasure. Why use cash to build your castle, creating your "new" world order by forcing people to work, not having lust in the workplace—when you can use people for effectively, 'driven' by their lust instead. Put lust in the

workplace and the laborers just can't wait to come to work. "Men ... work in alienation labor time is painful time, for alienated labor is absence of gratification, negation of the pleasure principle." (Marcuse) "First, that the work is external to the worker, that it is not a part of his nature, that consequently he does not fulfill himself in his work but denies himself." (Karl Marx) "Marx defines the essence of man as labor and traces the dialectic of labor in history till labor abolishes itself." "Freud suggests that beyond labor at the end of history is love." "Love has always been there from the beginning . . . the hidden force supplying the energy devoted to labor and to making history." "Repressed Eros is the energy of history and labor must be seen as sublimated Eros." (Brown) "This carry-over from the study of neurosis to the study of labor in factories is legitimate." "Work is not about paying the rent anymore--it is about self-fulfillment." "Enlightenment management and humanistic supervision can be a brotherhood situation." "Partnership is the same as synergy." "The United States is changing into a managerial society." (Maslow, Maslow) "The more gratifying one's sexual life is, the more fulfilling and pleasurable is one's work." "It is necessary to establish not only the best external conditions of work, but also to create the inner biologic preconditions to allow the fullest unfolding of the biologic urge for activity." "Hence, the safeguarding of a completely satisfying sexual life for the working masses is the most important precondition of pleasurable work." "Sex-economy sociology was born from the effort to harmonize Freud's depth psychology with Marx's economic theory." "Since work and sexuality (in both the strict and broad senses of the word) are intermately interwoven, man's relationship to work is also a question of the sex-economy of masses of people." Sexually awakened women, affirmed and recognized as such, would mean the complete collapse of the authoritarian ideology." "the right of the woman to her own body." "The termination of pregnancy is at variance with the meaning of the family, whose task it precisely the education of the coming generation – apart from the fact that the termination of pregnancy would mean the final destruction of the large family." "The preservation of the already existing large families is a matter of social feeling; . . the large family is preserved because national morality and national culture find their strongest support in it." (Reich) "... the modifications and deflections of instinctual energy necessitated by the

perpetuation of the monogamic-patriarchal family, or by a hierarchical division of labor, or by public control of the individuals private existence are instances of surplus- repression ..." (Marcuse)

Therefore when a parent chastens or trainings up their child (using pain or fear of pain or forcing them to sit still and not squirm around, i.e. give up looking for an environment of pleasure to chase after), they are getting their child off a drug (getting their thoughts off of the environment of pleasure around them, cutting off their carnal actions, restraining their chasing after worldly pleasures and thereby cutting of their susceptibility to the marketers of enslavement to drugs, i.e. socialists). Once off the drug, they can have pleasure while not being controlled by it, knowing how to control themselves by not letting whatever it is in the environment which stimulates pleasure control them (they are more able to weigh their actions and the actions of others and make right decisions). A self-governing (self-controlled) people are a free people (having a conscience —having their father's will in them, being civil —knowing right from wrong, and willing to suffer pain to gain and retain their freedom, fighting against those who would use the environment to control people, i.e. those who would use the fear of loss of life's pleasures to control them). Socialists (psycho-socialists), tyrants, and, despots know this, hating the person or people who are self-controlled, who are self-governing (who can think outside the social-sensual 'moment'), under God. It is the socialists 'purpose' to annihilate the condition, and if necessary, the people who initiate and sustain a self-controlled, self-governing generation. (Today, the measuring stick for proper human action, regarding hate and love, is anyone who is intolerant of worldly pleasure. They are perceived as being hateful, man's carnal nature no longer regarded as being evil. Anybody who is tolerant of worldly pleasure is perceived as being loving since man's carnal nature is now perceived as being good ("basically' good, only needing a good social environment to facilitate its goodness for the 'good' of all).

With the focus on sensuousness (this worldliness), on how a person 'feels' and what he thinks (opinions and imaginations), and not on righteousness (other worldliness), on what God says (not of human opinions and imaginations), those who inhibit or block pleasure are hated for their preaching and teaching of worldly pleasures as being evil —the wicked hating their wickedness being wickedly spoken of. Even the church is now

hateful toward those who bring up contrasting scriptures, i.e. what God says—especially when they expose those who are tolerant of man's sinful behavior in the church, exposing the programs and material which the church leadership is bringing into the church as being evil, and the leadership's actions in doing so (or tolerating it) as being therefore wicked (as long as contrast is limited to expounding the blessings of God and of human fellowship and briefly, if at all mentioning, in passing, the wickedness of man, so as not to disturb the wicked and destabilize the church 'community' (gemeinschaft). The church now treats those who place righteousness over sensuousness as being irrelevant at the least, accusing some of being divisive, i.e. those who persist in exposing the wickedness of the sensuous (of human relationship) based programs being brought into the church to "keep it up with the times," i.e. keeping it "contemporary," to keep the youth coming back, accusing others of causing dissension in the Church by their "gossiping" against the church programs and the leadership who are bringing them in or at least tolerating their introduction. Love is now being tolerant of man's sinful nature, so that all can unite upon the 'purpose' of the "contemporary" church, i.e. meeting human needs, the "work" being done "in the name of Jesus." When the church tolerates evil, the wickedness of the world is in the church. The church then becomes the same as the world (at-one-with the world). The righteousness of God is negated with the wickedness of man, and thus the righteous must be hated (accused of being intolerant, narrow minded, judgmental, irrational, and therefore hateful). This is always the result when the dialectical process —human justification, becomes the praxis of the church. Those within the contemporary church, blinded by their hate of wickedness being exposed, can not comprehend that they hate righteousness (their sensual love for humanity becoming equal to their sensual love of God blinding them to the truth that they do not love God but rather love their opinion of him which is sensual). The dialectical church hates contrast —good and evil based upon righteousness and loves contrast based upon sensuousness, basing good and evil upon sensuousness (upon human nature) and not upon righteousness (God) —as was begun in the garden in Eden, Adam's children following. "For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore

slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous. Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you." 1 John 3:11-13 The worlds love, which is sensuous, is wicked (any good is for the here-and-now only, having no eternal value). God's love, which is spiritual, is righteous (good for the here-and-now and the there-and-then, having eternal value).

It is the 'closed' system of the restraint of the sensual which the 'open' system of the sensual seeks to overcome. Dopamine emancipation for all, drugs of pleasure for all, be it internal or external —environmental conditions can be intoxication, the annihilation of the patriarchal paradigm is liberating to the revolutionary —liberation from Godly (and parental) restraints being the banner of humanity, and carnal hope its staff). (For more on this see the article [The Cognitive, Affective, and Psycho-motor domains and the dialectical process](#), specifically its bookmarks: [Our body naturally produces chemicals](#) and [Pleasure is a natural product of the body](#)).

Man's system is an 'open' system and God's system is a 'closed' system. Each system is a different way of thinking and acting, called a paradigm. "I like to think of paradigm as a total system of believing, perceiving, acting, and interpreting that is used to define and justify how something is." (Spady) Man's paradigm uses his own senses (sensation as a result of touch, taste, sight, smell, and sound, being his connection with the world around him) as the basis for defining and justifying his thoughts and actions (associating good with the sensation of pleasure and evil with the sensation of pain) while God's paradigm is his own goodness (his goodness is eternal, measuring good with his righteousness and that which is not in agreement with his righteousness as evil, as wickedness) and is justified in Himself ("I AM that I AM") which means man, God's creation, must find his justification in God (spiritual-eternal- righteousness) by faith, and not in himself (carnal-temporal-sensual) by sight, as the Apostle Paul explained in [Romans 4:1-25](#). By uniting paradigm with science and science with paradigm (making them inter-related), science, which has to be observable and repeatable (therefore the laws of nature are pre-established) is merged with the dialectic process of 'change' (sensual and situational) resulting in a materialistic-relativistic definition of the laws of nature (including man, i.e. the "new" element on the periodic chart being

Hu for Human —as presented in a commercial, i.e. almost all commercials reflect dialectical thinking today), producing a way of thinking which predominates today in 'science' (falsely so called), now supporting the 'open' system theory.

Thomas Kuhn is most noted for this definition (basing all science upon the dialectical process, which, as already noted above, does not work, breaking down under true scientific examination, i.e. two plus two will always equal four and will never be another number, despite how much some math professors might want to believe, i.e. feel or think, that it could or might 'change' given enough time). "Thomas S Kuhn spent the year 1958-1959 at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavior Sciences, directed by Ralph Tyler, where he finalized his 'paradigm shift' concept of 'Pre- and Post-paradigm periods.'" [Where facts, restraining feelings of 'change,' must be 'changeable' to '[changing facts](#)' (hyperlink is to a short audio of Shirley McCune) where facts must be adaptable to 'change,' i.e. all facts must be continually subjected to theoretical inquiry, i.e. must have meaning to the situation or the 'moment' to be relevant and if not perceived as relevant can be considered as irrelevant, other 'facts' ('changeable facts') taking precedence in making decisions. This is the 'role' of psycho-socialists: to help people imagine the future, then evaluate the present in the "light" of the imagined future, then initiate and sustain present thought and actions which support the imagined future, negating thoughts and actions which inhibit or block the imagined future, and thereby help everyone in creating the imagined future.] "Kuhn admitted problems with the schemata of his socio-psychological theory yet continued to urge its application into the scientific fields of astronomy, physics, chemistry and biology." "Kuhn states 'If a paradigm is ever to triumph it must gain some first supporters, men who will develop it to the point where hardheaded arguments can be produced and multiplied . . . (which eventuates in) an increasing shift in the distribution of professional allegiances (where upon) the man who continues to resist after his whole profession has been converted is ipso facto ceased to be a scientist [becomes 'irrelevant' in the eyes of the world].'" "When paradigms change, the world itself changes with them." "Successive transition from one paradigm to another via revolution is the usual developmental pattern of mature science." (Kuhn) Kuhn saw that scientists could not be locked into a 'rigid' paradigm but that

the process of 'change,' a paradigm 'shift' must be applied to all sciences so that any 'change' in 'facts' can be more readily adapted to (the issue is that when scientists discovered 'new' laws of nature —laws which have always existed without our understanding or knowledge —many scientists would not accept the 'new' laws of nature as fact) any laws which are incomplete or erroneous are often adhered to by scientists. The problem was how to 'bring them up to speed,' in a dialogue environment (the issue was not so much the laws themselves but how people perceived their relevance to any given situation, i.e. were they able to dismiss them for the sake of 'progress'). While the use of education in the old fashion way of thinking would work, the dialectical environment would not allow someone to inculcate facts (treating people like a child under authority; "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it." Proverbs 22:6 correcting them for their attitude) but must encourage everyone to treat opinions as though they are facts and facts as though they are just another opinion, i.e. putting theory into practice to discover, initiate, and sustain 'practicality.' "... in all metaphysics the object remains untouched and unaltered so that thought remains contemplative and fails to become practical; while for the dialectical method the central problem is to change reality.... reality with its 'obedience to laws, is impenetrable, fatalistic and immutable." (Lukács) Since the dialectical process is not from nature itself, but finds its 'purpose' in human nature, when applied to the scientific study of nature it breaks down, while bringing everyone under its sway experientially, i.e. liberating man from restraints against human nature which come from the past or from above, so that man can live "openly and freely in relation to others, guiding his behavior on the basis of his immediate experiencing – he has become an integrated process of changingness." (Rogers)

Thus good and evil can only be knowable through human experience, though human sensuousness, i.e. through conscientization ("The process in which men, not as recipients, but as knowing subjects, achieve a deepening awareness both of the socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives and their capacity to transform that reality." Paulo Freire cited in Schubeck) "When the dialectical method destroys the fiction of the immortality of the categories [destroys God's authority over man and destroys parent's authority over child (along with their laws of restraint upon human nature),

etc.] it also destroys their reified character [destroys man's fear of God and destroys the child's fear of the parents (fear of judgment for breaking laws, i.e. fear of judgment for being a normal human being), etc.] and clears the way to a knowledge of reality [reality being only that which is rational (sensual or 'sensible') to man]." (Lukács) "Philosophy as theory . . . establishes the basis of its reality as praxis; it serves to distinguish it from religion, the wisdom of the other world." (Marx, Critique) "Praxis becomes the form of action appropriate to the isolated individual, it becomes his ethics." "Marx urged us to understand 'the sensuous world,' the object, reality, as human sensuous activity." (Lukács) Therefore, according to dialectical thinking, it is only in human experience (in human sensuousness) that reality can be known. For Marx, it was not enough to just think about reality, how the world 'ought to be' (Hegel), but a person must be willing to create it through social action (praxis). "It may be said that Philosophy first commences when ... a gulf has arisen between inward strivings and external reality, and the old forms of Religion, &c., are no longer satisfying; when Mind manifests indifference to its living existence or rests unsatisfied therein, and moral life becomes dissolved." (Hegel's Lectures) "... the bourgeoisie [the parent with his restraint upon the child] fighting on its own ground will prove superior to the proletariat [superior to the child] ... it is self-evident that the bourgeoisie [the parent with his force of power over the child] fighting on its own ground will be both more experienced and more expert... the superiority of the proletariat [the child with his resentment toward being restrained against his human nature] must lie exclusively in its ability to see society from the centre as a coherent whole [the child understanding that he is not alone in his hate toward restraint but a part of a society with the same feelings —the purpose of teaching children right and wrong through inductive reasoning, experientially, i.e. using the affective domain in the classroom]. This means that it [the common-unity of the children] is able to act in such a way [to act revolutionary] as to change reality [to change reality from being righteousness based to being sensuousness based —the 'new' generation is now founded in the annihilation of obedience toward authority and righteousness through the praxis of social equality and sensuousness]; in the class consciousness [realization of a common-collective contempt toward parental authority, i.e. resentment toward the

restraint of human nature] of the proletariat [the children aware of their oneness in identity and 'purpose'] theory and practice coincide [the realization that their carnal thoughts and carnal desires, which, when in the past restrained by higher authority, are one and the same, and now understood to be common to all humanity, can with confidence be put united in social action] ... The proletariat [the child] cannot liberate itself as a class [being subject to parental authority] without simultaneously abolishing class society [eliminating the parent-child, teacher-student, owner-worker, etc. top-down hierarchy in its own mind; "For equality of opportunity to exist the family as a unit must be weakened." ([Coleman](#))] as such. For that reason its consciousness [the sensual experience of a society, a commonness with others in joint action, using inductively (sensual, dialectical) reasoning to free itself from the deductive (logical, formal, a priori, didactic) reasoning of God and parents], the last class consciousness in the history of mankind, must both lay bare the nature of society [the sensual nature of social man and the social nature of sensual man is liberated from the limitations of "religion" and righteousness] and achieve an increasingly inward fusion of theory and practice ["If it feels good, just do it." (Marcuse)]. The bourgeoisie [the parent] automatically obtains the upper hand when its opponents [the children] abandon their own position [abandon their position of having equality with the parent by succumbing to the fear of judgment (fear of chastening and have a 'guilty conscience') and respect for parental authority, obeying a top-down system]....destroy this unity [destroy the child's will to 'power,' i.e. his willingness to think in accordance to his desired actions and his acting in accordance to his desired thinking, sensuous desire being at the heart of it all] they cut the nerve that binds proletarian theory [that nerve being the children's common experience of sensuousness and reasoning, sensuousness justifying their reasoning and their reasoning justifying their sensuousness, where both sensuousness and reasoning become the basis of reality] to proletarian action [the children's "group think" sensuous (consensus) experiences being put into social action —praxis]. They reduce theory to the 'scientific' treatment of the symptoms ...and as for practice they are themselves reduced to being buffeted about aimlessly and uncontrollably [the children might still resent parental restraint but no longer have the internal courage and the external social support (the education system and government

programs) necessary to overthrow the patriarchal paradigm, despite their momentary attempts to liberate themselves from it]." (Lukács) Jürgen Habermas wrote on how to determine the amount of repression which is necessary for man to work together as apposed to how much repression a patriarchal paradigm must use in "forcing" man to work. Knowing the difference between the two provides the amount of force (human relationship building through the liberation of sensuousness) necessary to overthrow the patriarchal domination of society and negate its effect upon the individual, both being necessary at the same time, while still getting the work done (preventing society from exploding, what Freud feared and what Marx did, by supplying the right amount of Eros in the workplace to make it work, i.e. making all workers "happy little workers," working for the cause of humanity , that of setting in motion the negation of constraints upon social norms which are established by the patriarchal paradigm—as a little candy making the medicine go down easier, a little Eros makes the work go down easier as well). By using the pent up resentment toward carnal restraint (institutional restrains of the home, workplace, church, or government) while providing sensual pleasures in the classroom and the workplace, the church and the government, the revolution can be sustained and further developed (preventing Thermidor). "Through the repression of needs and wishes, it translates this constraint into a compulsion of internal nature, in other words into the constraint of social norms. That is why the relative destruction of the moral relation can be measured only by the difference between the actual degree of institutionally demanded repression and the degree of repression that is necessary at a given level of the forces of production. This difference is a measure of objectively superfluous domination. It is those who establish such domination and defend positions of power of this sort who set in motion the causality of fate, divide society into social classes, suppress justified interests, call forth the reactions of suppressed life, and finally experience their just fate in revolution." (Habermas, Knowledge)

Consider all this in light of the educational material all teachers must incorporate in their classrooms, that is "Bloom's Taxonomies." Bloom wrote: "It is to be hoped that the taxonomy's analysis of problem solving methods will facilitate the exploration of new methods of teaching for high-level problem solving and assist in evaluating these methods." "The

objectives to be finally included should be related to the school's view of the 'good life for the individual in the good society.'" "What are the important values?" "What is the proper relation between man and society?" "What are the proper relations between man and man?" "It is recognized that unless the individual can do his own problem solving he cannot maintain his integrity as an independent personality." "Closely allied to this concept of maturity and integrity is the concept of the individual as member of a democracy." "Individuals in a democracy are responsible for the conduct of a democratic political system as well as a democratic way of life." "Knowledge is of little value if it cannot be utilized in new situations or in a form very different from that in which it was originally encountered." "To a large extent knowledge, as taught in American schools, depends upon some external authority; some expert or group of experts is the arbiter of knowledge." "...knowledge is always partial and relative rather than inclusive and fixed." "But, as has been pointed out before, 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." "... with the increase of knowledge of information there is a development of one's acquaintance with reality." "... the more useful way of organizing a field... in a philosophical sense, correspond[ing] to 'reality.'" "...to help him develop intellectual abilities and skills which will enable him to adapt knowledge to the new situation." "Philosophical . . . Emphasize personal expression as against passive participation, and independence of thought and action as against dependence." "Democratic societies thrives best when its citizens are able to arrive at their own decisions rather than when someone in authority does the thinking for them." "We can not survive unless we develop and draw upon the creative potentialities of the entire population." "the interrelation of outcomes — multi-objective efficiency . . . the Eight-Year Study of the Progressive Education Association." "not rigorously predetermined . . . flows from the person . . . determines it worth." "educational psychology – categorizing teacher-pupil interaction during classroom discussions." "Freedom from excessive tension and from pressures to adopt a particular viewpoint." "His efforts need not conform to the views of authority." "Freedom to determine his own purposes." "Too much control and too detailed instructions, seem to stifle productivity." "Synthesis tasks require far more time than an hour

or two. . . . Days and weeks instead of hours To represent the student's ability." " . . . require a high degree of stimulation, mood, fluency . . ." "Such conditions tend to make performance rather variable if not downright unstable." "Skills and abilities may thus be rather unstable and unpredictable." " . . . reveals language usage, attitudes toward issues, feelings about the self" "Think of some time in your life when you were up against a difficulty, something that stood in your way and had to be overcome. Make up a story around this difficulty and tell it to the class." " . . . must be an argument." "Educational procedures are intended to develop the more desirable rather than the more customary types of behavior." " . . . one major purpose of education is to broaden the foundation on which judgments are based." " . . . consideration of the ends to be served and the appropriateness of specific means for achieving these ends." (Bloom)

It is not that parents do not want their children to think for themselves, but that they have a basis from which to make their decisions. "Postmodernity . . . describes a world where people have to make their way without fixed referents and traditional anchoring points. It is a world of rapid change, of bewildering instability..." (Edward Usher in Sarv) Bloom and those who think like him choose sensuousness as their basis for reality, (Bloom refers to two Marxists, Theodor Adorno and Erick Fromm, as his world view in Book II, the Affective Domain, while declaring in Book I, the Cognitive Domain that it was a tool to do psychological evaluation of students, teachers, parents, and community using "contemporary psychological" methods, those methods being the Transformational Marxists social-psychology of the day, i.e. Adorno, Fromm, Allport, Dressell, Maslow, Rogers, etc.) Those who believe in God, choose righteousness as their basis for reality.

Anyone who believes in God yet puts their children in the paradigm of sensuousness have sacrificed their children upon the fires of Moloch. Rogers wrote: "'Have you merely released the beast, the id, in man?' There is no beast in man. There is only man in man, and this we have been able to release." "In psychology, Freud and his followers have presented convincing arguments that the id, man's basic and unconscious nature, is primarily made up of instincts which would, if permitted expression, result in incest, murder, and other crimes." "The whole problem of therapy, as seen by this group, is how to hold these untamed forces in check in a

wholesome and constructive manner, rather than in the costly fashion of the neurotic." (Rogers) Social-psychology is built upon one belief: "Parental discipline, religious denunciation of bodily pleasure, ... have all left man overly docile, but secretly in his unconscious unconvinced, and therefore neurotic." (Brown) "Some of the formal properties of religion, such as the rigid antithesis of good and evil, ... still exercise considerable power." "... unconscious trends such as expressed in idea of the crucifix and the sacrifice of blood. Although these latter ideas have been more or less successfully replaced by 'Christian Humanism,' their deeper psychological roots have still be to reckoned with." (Adorno) "The abolition of religion, as the illusory happiness of men, is a demand for their real happiness. The call to abandon their illusions about their condition is a call to abandon a condition which requires illusions." (Marx, MEGA I/1/1) "Freud saw that in the id there is no negation, only affirmation and eternity. The instinctual reality is Dionysian drunkenness 'We can come nearer to the id with images, and call it a chaos, a cauldron of seething excitement.'" (Brown) "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." (Rogers) "The 'dialectical' consciousness ... a manifestation of Eros." "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." "In the words of Thoreau: 'We need pray for no higher heaven than the pure senses can furnish, a purely sensuous life. Our present senses are but rudiments of what they are destined to become.'" (Brown) "... Eros belongs mainly to democracy." (Adorno) The Apostle Paul explains the battle between man's nature and God's will, the battle between two paradigms, the flesh and the spirit. "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 7:22-25

The idea of 'change' is not in regards to hard facts themselves but rather in the way of thinking which reveals them (the way they are introduced determines their relevance, i.e. truth is to be 'discovered' experientially, truth is therefore subjective in nature and not to be 'revealed,' 'accepted' "as

given," the person therefore becoming subject to objective truth, external to nature). The issue was not the changing of facts or the learning of more facts (quantity), but rather how facts were dealt with in relation to other people's feelings and thoughts (sensuousness), in the light of changing times (quality), i.e. time of "reflection" on feelings being as important if not more important than the memorization of facts (quantity), in that facts now have to be personal, experiential (subjective) to be 'true' or of worth to the human 'moment.' "The moment of reflection, however, is itself interwoven with experience. 'The work of art,' Marcuse can write, 'is both a process and an instant.' Subjectivity experiences itself in that moment." (Bronner) Without sensuousness becoming a part of deliberation and action, the facts of the 'past' will keep man subject to objective truth, truths external (higher than) to his own human experience.

Regarding the use of the classroom as an environment with which to re-educate (re-experience) the next generation into a "new" world order (change their paradigm): Ralph Tyler (who, regarding education and the need for social change, 'advised' six of our Presidents during the 50's and 60's, his influence lingering on) wrote: "In the recent period of rapid social change, the educational roles of the home, the community, the religious institutions, and employment have been greatly changed. Generally, they have been reduced." "The school can encourage students to reflect on the problem situations they encounter, to analyze these situations, to try to predict the consequences of several possible courses of action, to compare their thinking with what they actually did, and to note the consequences they experienced [all being done outside of the patriarchal paradigm]." "The school can also continue its long-accepted role of providing within its environment a democratic society closer to the ideal than the adult community has yet been able to achieve. It can provide a setting in which young people can experience concretely the meaning of our democratic ideals. It is crucially important for children to see firsthand a society that encourages and supports democratic values" "Educational philosophies in a democratic society are likely to emphasize strongly democratic values.... Faith in intelligence rather than authority." "Should the school develop young people to fit into the present society as it is or does the school have a revolutionary mission to develop young people who will seek to improve the society?" "Perhaps a modern school would include in its statement

[that] it believes that the high ideals of a good society are not adequately realized in our present society and that through the education of young people it hopes to improve society." (Ralph Tyler in Brown emphasis added) Bloom's Cognitive Taxonomy was dedicated to Ralph Tyler: ". . . adopted Ralph W. Tyler's idea of an educational objective as a change in behavior; ways of acting, thinking, and feeling, [which included] covert as well as overt states and responses." (Bloom, Retrospect; Bloom also wrote, concerning his Taxonomy, which all certified teachers are trained to use in developing curriculum in the classroom, curriculum which determines the paradigm of the next generation, how they will think and act as a result of their participation in or refusal to participate in the curriculum: "Certainly the Taxonomy was unproven at the time it was developed and may well be 'unprovable.'") According to Kurt Lewin, without the person personally experiencing for himself the 'freedom' of reflecting upon the futile squabbles for "their own rights," while under the control of the "old" ("closed") system of right and wrong, and the freedom of evaluating their 'prior' experiences in the light of their own feelings and thoughts, along with the freedom to role-play, to experience for themselves through their own emotional, mental, verbal and physical expressions of resentment toward the restraints of patriarchal authority, without reprimand, the object of social change can not be achieved, that "physical" participation in "the new set of values" is essential if the change process is to become a permanent part of the persons way of thinking and acting. "Physical experiences cause a change in our theories and concepts about the physical world." (Lewin, Principles) Experiencing the 'moment' of 'change' in a group experiencing the 'moment' of 'change' being the most effective means of producing lasting change (change in system or paradigm) in the individual. "It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately." "The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group." (Lewin in Benne) You can apply this method to the 'modern' church. Was the heart really changed (where the person can stand alone, standing in the righteousness of Christ, standing against the temptations of his own sensuous nature, his flesh, and the temptation of the masses, calling him to participate in their 'moment' of sensuousness) or did the person simply respond to the sensuous 'moment' of group 'change,'

following others in the 'moment' of 'change,' his heart remaining unchanged, still subject to the sensuousness of the world.

The "objective sought," through the use of Diaprax, is that people willingly 'change' from answering the call (from God) to righteousness over sensuousness, to accepting their call (from man and the Devil) to total commitment to sensuousness, making righteousness subjective to sensuousness (making sensuousness synonymous with righteousness).

"The objective sought will not be reached so long as the new set of values is not experienced by the individual as something freely chosen." "Man-made experiences, so-called experiments, which grew out of the systematic search for the truth were necessary to bring about a change from less adequate to more adequate concepts." "Re-education aims to change the system of values and beliefs of an individual or a group." "The basic task of re-education is to change the individual's social perception, thereby changing the individual's social action." (Benne) "There is evidence in our data that once a change in behavior has occurred, a change in beliefs is likely to follow." (Leon Festinger in Benne) Carl Rogers wrote:

"Experience is, for me, the highest authority." "Neither the Bible nor the prophets, neither the revelations of God can take precedence over my own direct experience." (Rogers) ... the central problem of democracy is not the discovery of some optimal solution or standard for ranking incommensurate values; ... The central problem of democracy is instead the formation of a somewhat vaguely defined 'postconventional' consensus through which everyone affected by a decision must be able to participate in reaching it." (Bronner) Without the social-ist, common-ist practice (praxis) of consensus in the classroom, the workplace, the church, the government, the city, county, state and nation, etc., social change remains only emotional or a thought and therefore remains unattainable except by the use of outright physical force, which still keep the top-down system in place (as was evidenced in the social-ist, common-ist takeover of Russia, China, Cuba, and other nations and cultures around the world —it always ends up being top-down, eventually with Antichrist and Satan at the top, for a 'moment').

The environment itself (and a persons submissive presence within —tolerance of —acceptance of, and 'willful' participation within) changes the person. This was the method Satan, the first "therapist," used in the

garden in Eden, only this time with social-sensual support. "What better way to help the patient recapture the past than to allow him to re-experience and reenact ancient feelings 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 urge the group to explore and to employ its own resources. The group [must] feel free to confront the therapist, who must not only permit, but encourage, such confrontation. He [the patient] reenacts early family scripts in the group and, if therapy is successful, is able to experiment with new behavior, to break free from the locked family role he once occupied. ... the patient changes the past by reconstituting it." (Yalom) "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." "Strengthening the family to draw the adolescent back into it faces serious problems, as well as some questions about its desirability." "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 order to [improve those institutions], one must know how adolescent societies function, and beyond that, how their directions may be changed." "The family has little to offer the child in the way of training for his place in the community." (Coleman) "The current generation is the first in the history of the world which has nothing to learn from grandparents;" (Yalom).

Coleman earned his Dr. in education at Columbia University, earning it under the tutelage of the famous Transformational Marxist, Paul Lazersfeld. Eventually Coleman on to became a key advisor to the highest court of our land, the United States Supreme Court, advising them on issues concerning education. In Public School-Private School, Coleman wrote: "Public schools represent an orientation that sees the school as an instrument of the society to free the child from constraints imposed by accident of birth." Coleman saw the need to use the public school system "as society's [social-ist] instrument for releasing a child from the blinders imposed by accident of birth into this family or that family." The "blinders" being the child's belief in parental authority. While most parents saw the

school as a means to prepare their children to succeed in life they did not grasp the evil intent of those gaining control of the education system as a means to destroy the traditional (patriarchal) home, turning the next generation (the parents own children) against their traditional way of thinking and acting.

Skilled in double-speak, saying one thing meaning another, Coleman re-defined (and restructured) the education system and its 'purpose' along a socialist agenda, using it to produce "a common[ist] American identity," changing the identity of America to no longer be under parental control (no longer being "in loco parentis" but "freeing children from the poverty of their parents," i.e. "freeing" them not just economically and socially but also "freeing" them from the "poverty" of their patriarchal upbringing).

"Schools transcend the limitations of the parents' disparate cultural backgrounds." "They have been a major element in social mobility, freeing children from the poverty of their parents and the low status of their social origins. They have been means of stripping away identities of ethnicity and social origin and implanting a common American identity." "The young are seriously at risk because of the decline in strength of the family and those institutions that spring from it. It is important that government policy be made in full recognition of this risk and of potential ways of reducing it." (Coleman, Public) In [Public School-Private School](#) Coleman explained how the private school (including Christian schools) are brought into line with (made subject to) the public school socialist paradigm, showing how, through the qualifications of physical, mental, and social capital the individual, the family, and the private and the public schools are all subject to a socialist way of thinking, a heresiarchal paradigm of 'change' (change not being just in a persons income or knowledge of a subject or trade but also including 'change' in their way of thinking and acting —the 'change' being fatal to their traditional way of life).

The memorizing of facts presents a problem to the dialectical process, in that it produces an attitude of introducing "inappropriate" information , not that the information itself is necessarily wrong, but that the way it is introduced is wrong, introducing information to be accepted "as given" is wrong—therefore any information not sensitive to the present wishes, desires, and opinions of others (or the sensual situation) is perceived as being irrelevant, inhibiting, or blocking information, perceived by others as

information from the 'past' which is being carried into the present environment, inhibiting or blocking those who want 'change' from the past to the present through developing a common experience of feelings and thoughts —creating a common imagined future based upon the human nature of sensuousness, i.e. what "can be" if only we can negate the "can not's" of the past, the "democratic" ideal being: if its not sensual, experiential, material, relevant, tangible to all, it is not real (in Diaprax: reality does not lie in the past or above man, restraining his nature, but lies within him, within his common nature, reality is his sensuousness put into collective human action negating any condition which might restrain it). The issue was the changing of systems (system change of quality and quantity from being fixed to "there-and-then" space and time, i.e. the product and the producer, i.e. their longevity —objective truth which is not affected by changing time and space, changing feelings and situations, to where quality and quantity are unified in space and in time in the "here-and-now," i.e. the consumer or customer and the current environment, i.e. his sensuous experience within the sensual environment—subjective truth which only has meaning in the present time, in the "contemporary moment"). The issue was how people think about facts and truth (are they rigid or changeable) and how people related to on another in practice (the 'rigid,' facts-based person would be intolerant of ambiguity, certain, clear, demanding, while the 'changeable,' sensual based person would be tolerant of ambiguity, uncertain, vague, self-possessed). Thus the need to break down the 'rigid' way of thinking to 'help' them in 'understanding' the 'changes' which have taken place (or need to take place) in science (some of it extremely flawed, errors which have been exposed by true scientists, which/who are dismissed as being irrelevant, both the errors created by the use of the process in science, which they are exposing and the true scientists themselves, who expose the errors, because they do not 'fit' with the 'program' of 'progress' —they are not willing to work within the framework of the imagined future. This is a case where those who do not have all the facts, those who use inductive reasoning to 'discover' the truth from the present situation, i.e. in the sensual 'moment' negating those who have the facts or information from the past, i.e. above the sensual 'moment,' yet are perceived as being 'inappropriate' to the present situation, the sensual 'moment,' and are negating the future with their use of

deductive reasoning — to know how to respond to the present based upon facts and truths learned in the past, i.e. restraining, inhibiting, or blocking the sensual humanistic 'moment'). Thus the move from Newtonian mechanics (what is, is, and everything is disintegrating —while mass can never be increased nor decreased in the universe, it can become less accessible and usable), to Einstein's relativity (where the speed of light reveals a relativistic relationship between space and time, i.e. a space-time continuum where mass, 'rigid,' also has energy, 'change' —which is actually stable, unchanging, in that everything does what it is supposed to do, as God created it to behave). There I "just went to far" again. An atomic bomb is stable, every electron, proton, neutron, quark, jiffy, etc. doing exactly what it was designed by God to do, while the paradigm is 'rigid,' everything doing what it is designed to do, being predictable, all 'change' taking place as God established it, all behaving according to the laws of nature, with man being the only thing created by God who can think—analyze and evaluate—and thereby produce 'change' outside of the stimulus-response cycle of the creation, his heart being the changing factor, man being the only thing in the creation able to 'change' the creation, that is change the environment, i.e. how it is to be perceived, experienced, and re-designed (the choice being his heart set upon doing things according to his will or God's will). By changing himself and his environment from being objective (righteous) to being subjective (sensual), in thought and in action, i.e. in theory and in practice, he changes from faith to sight, he changes his system of thought and action from He who is above, to that which is below. Which is exactly what happened in the garden in Eden.

While the process of questioning, evaluating, and experimenting is essential to the discovering of the laws of rocks, plants and animals, when it is applied to man himself (other than his physical body) it materializes him (making him subject only to the sensuous, only to this world, only to nature), and then, when re-applied back to science (having incorporated sensuousness, i.e. relativity and 'changingness' to science), it makes the field of science subject to the opinions of men, thus 'scientists' (so called scientists) end up treating facts as though they are theories and treating theories as though they are facts, controlling the thoughts and actions of the world based upon their humanistic opinions (any true scientist who

interferes with the hopes of the psycho-scientists is regarded as irrelevant and treated with contempt). This is the avenue on which the dialectical process takes everyone down, at least all who participate in the process. Once dialectical minded laws are established, all must travel down the same avenue if they are to be 'relevant' in a 'rapidly changing world.' When God breathed the breath of life into the nostrils of man, man became a living soul, he became "negative" to (no longer just of) the dust of the earth he was formed from. Therefore in the "negation of negation" of the dialectical process, the negation of that which is made in the image of God, in human thought and action, the soul of man is negated, making him subject only to the dust of the ground from which he was formed, making him material and no longer spiritual, sensual and no longer subject to righteous, temporal and no longer eternal, no longer accountable, other than to the social moment, for his thoughts and actions, his soul now buyable and sellable as the dust of the ground, as a material of the earth, i.e. as a commodity, as a resource, being 'driven' by his sensual nature, bound only to the creation and eternal death, and no longer directed by the Spirit of God but freed to be himself, no longer bound to the God of love and eternal life.)

Anathema to the 'open' system is a 'closed' system. And anathema to the 'closed' system is an 'open' system. Therefore, to an 'open' system (feelings and thoughts), a 'closed' system (facts and truth) is a paradigm which engenders opposing positions because it insists upon absolute right and absolute wrong, restraining a "sensuous" world, restraining a world of discovery and 'change,' restraining a world based upon human nature, from praxis (making man's feelings and thoughts the basis for action, individual and social action). The 'closed' system or paradigm is referred to as a patriarchal paradigm, a paradigm of 'rigidity' ('unchangingness'). It is not that change can not take place, but that change is limited by established, unchanging laws (animals can change within their kind, but are limited to the laws which pre-determine their kind and the laws which pre-determine change within their kind.)

The patriarchal paradigm blesses the righteous and condemns the wicked, rewarding those who do right and punishing those who do wrong, i.e. punishing those who deviate from that which is right (Deuteronomy 31:15-20). Therefore the purpose of life is doing what is right and not doing

wrong. When right and wrong (or good and evil) are pre-determined, they are established by an authority which is greater than the situation—greater than, higher than, and not 'driven' by the human 'moment' (the sensuousness of the situation). Therefore right and wrong (being pre-determined and therefore not re-determined or 'changed' by the situation) are not to be evaluated "in the light of," nor to be judged according to the situation, by those under authority (exactly what the woman did in the garden in Eden, with Adam following; Genesis 3:1-6). The situation can not determine whether right or wrong, good and evil (established by higher authority) are of worth or not of worth, can not evaluate and judge whether they are relevant or irrelevant according to the situation (the sensuous 'moment' can not determine, evaluate, or judge the worth or relevance of right and wrong, or good and evil; I am writing here of God and the laws he has placed in nature and the laws which he has established for man, laws which no man can 'change' according to his feelings and thoughts and actions, i.e. using his sensual nature to determine whether God's good and evil is right or wrong, i.e. if, according to man's perception, according to his opinion, God's evil (spiritually determined as evil) is wrong or not relevant, then to punish a person for doing evil (temporally determined as good) is wrong, this is the 'justification' for humanism, where man's sensuousness becomes the measurement for all things, i.e. turning good into evil and evil into good, good being that which is sensually defined as good and evil (pleasure being good and pain being evil), and evil being that which spiritually defined as good and evil (righteousness being good and wickedness being evil), sensually determined good and evil negating spiritually determined good and evil, good and evil being defined according to whether they repress or liberate the sensual nature of man, and therefore liberating all mankind from that which is spiritual, i.e. negating the parents of the traditional home, patterned after God's system, and eventually God himself, from the thoughts and actions of men). "God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority." (Adorno) As written about in other articles, we are not aware (cognizant) of the paradigm change which is taking place in the environment of 'change.' Since our nature is so easily captivated by the situation we are participating in, the changing of our way of thinking and acting is not apparent

(perceived) until it is too late (we find ourselves having participated, being 'driven' by our sensuousness uniting with the sensuousness of the moment, to only afterwards have our conscience bother us—our eyes toward sensuousness, drawing us into participation with the 'moment,' are stronger than our ears toward the conscience, warning us of the consequence of our participation with the 'moment'). We have to 'repent' of our praxis in the 'open' system, but more than likely we will not because of the pleasures which came through participation in the 'moment' with the 'open' system and the fear of judgment and condemnation for our wickedness, expected from the 'closed' system, keeping our participation with the 'moment' and therefore the 'moment' secret, thus keeping the "open" system from being exposed as evil. In some way, shape, or form, like Adam and Eve in the garden in Eden, we justify our actions (and the 'open' system, the process of 'change') and the action of others, to ourselves, thereby weakening our stance upon the 'closed' system while insuring the 'open' system goes on unchecked.

Only the one in authority, the one who establishes right and wrong (good and evil), can have mercy and grace upon the one with wrong behavior (at his discretion, according to His will and according to His established conditions; for example: God already had a way for man to be redeemed from His wrath against man's sin (his wrath upon the children of disobedience), before he created man, therefore God did not negate the law and the prophets by creating a new law in response to a changing situation, but in Christ's fulfillment of the law and prophets, he redeemed man from the curse which came with his breaking of the law and abuse of the prophets—through the law of righteousness, found in Christ, and by our faith and belief in the Son of the living God, we receive grace and mercy, already determined, by God the Father, all established before the creation of man). The situation can not determine the mercy or grace, it must be imputed by higher authority. The guilty can not declare mercy upon themselves, superseding the judge's decision. A car, for example, can not change itself according to its will because of a changing situation, i.e. a changing condition. Only the designer or the mechanic (the one in authority over the 'closed' system) can change the car to compensate for the changing situation. Therefore the system is 'closed' in all situations, the object (the car, or man's life) being subject to the will of higher authority

(the car mechanic or auto engineer, the giver of life) and not subject to the situation (for example: Jesus in the temptations and before the cross did His Father's will despite the situation, i.e. he did not let the situation determine whether he would listen to or obey the Father's will or question it, i.e. 'change' it). The object (car, man) is subject to the right and wrong established by higher authority (the laws of nature, the giver of the laws for life and death). Therefore mercy and grace are subject to the established conditions (if-then) of higher authority, with the laws of right and wrong never changing ('rigid'). The law of Christ, did not negate the laws of the Father, he fulfilled the Father's laws, which we could never do (despite God saying "be ye perfect as I am perfect" it is an impossibility for man to be perfect in himself), Christ paid our debt for breaking the law (breaking one law you broke them all, it was not a particular law which was broken that brought judgment, i.e. grading on the curve being therefore possible, it was the paradigm change which brought judgment), thereby, Christ imputing his righteousness unto us, establishing his law of righteousness upon all who believe upon him, God's paradigm of righteousness giving us life, a life directed by a spiritual paradigm of faith negating the sensual paradigm of sight, Gods grace and mercy toward us resulting from our faith in Christ Jesus and not of our works (which can only be sensual in 'purpose'), i.e. by grace are you saved and not of yourself. "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

Therefore those who hold to an 'open' system (the system Satan brought into the garden in Eden with him and used on the woman, Genesis 3:1-6, with Adam following) perceive those of the 'closed' system as being wrong in their way of thinking, thus engendering opposing paradigms or opposing ways of thinking (producing "controversy," i.e. bringing truth into the ambiguity, thereby preventing manipulation from taking place, i.e. bringing thesis into the antithesis, thereby preventing synthesis from taking place), the 'closed' system being a barrier to the sensuousness of man (perceived as being 'rigid,' limiting, and judgmental of the human situation), the 'open' system being subject to (driven by) the sensuousness of man ('changeability,' 'influenceable" by the human situation). The 'closed' system is based upon God's system of righteousness (where righteousness is imputed to man by God, through faith in the one who is

greater than the human situation, one who is not of the situation, i.e. not of the world, i.e. not of the 'open' system, but, while in the situation, while in the world, while in the 'open' system was subject to the will of God the Father in all things (not participating in the 'open' system, i.e. don't you do it either). I am writing here of Jesus the Christ, the obedient Son who shows us the patriarchal paradigm, not once stepping outside of it, obedient even to death, abiding in a 'closed' system where, when the Father commanded, the Son obeyed—while in the flesh, while in the 'open' system he was always subject to the will of the Father, lead by the Spirit and "It is written,,," and not once submitting to the will of the flesh, as in lust of the flesh, i.e. sensuousness, the 'justification' for those in the 'open' system). "Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." John 5:19, 12:49; "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) The 'open' system is wicked. No matter how 'righteous' or 'good' those in the 'open' system might think they are, or seek to be, they can never be righteous before God—they can only believe in works salvation, where man determines, evaluates, and judges 'righteous' in his own eyes, i.e. determining, evaluating, and judging worth or 'righteousness' based upon his own efforts (according to his own life experiences), driven by his "sense perception"—thereby rejecting that righteousness which can only be imputed by God, the one and only Living, Holy, Pure, and, Righteous God of a "closed" system of right and wrong, mercy and grace, a system of Law, Word, and Spirit, all three manifesting God's Love, the Father revealing the Law (exposing man's sins that he might repent of his works), the Son revealing the Word (revealing God's redemption from the curse of the law, through faith), and the Spirit revealing the love of the Father and the Son in our hearts and minds, all three being one, i.e. "closed." Don't tempt God by making him choose between His law, a 'closed' system, and his love for you (his love, a 'closed' system, in agreement with his law, and you wanting his love to be an 'open' system, subject to your carnal desires, the law of sin; "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may

consume it upon your lusts." James 4:3), when you treat His Law as irrelevant, when you treat His Word as irrelevant, when you treat His Spirit as irrelevant in any situation, making his 'closed' system subject to your 'open' system, subject to your 'feelings' driven behavior, subject to your opinions, you will be judged as being evil (the Law, the Word, and the Spirit of God are not subject to your reasoning, your legalism, nor your licentiousness. God will always side with His Law, His Word, and His Spirit). His Law reveals his Love, and His Love for you is revealed in His Law, not in its absence (the law is spiritual), without it you would never know your wickedness. God chastens those he loves. The very act of chastening needs law or else it is sadistic for the one doing the chastening and masochistic for the one receiving it. Some examples of dialectical thought upon obedience to authority and chastening for disobedience are: "In *Escape from Freedom*, Fromm offered the sado-masochistic character as the core of the authoritarian personality." Jay ; "... definition of religious experience as experience of absolute dependence is the definition of the masochistic experience in general." Fromm, *Escape*). God's law reveals your need for His righteousness, otherwise your "open" system would determine, evaluate, and judge you as being righteous (or good, or "OK," or whatever) in your own eyes and therefore you would not be aware that you needed salvation and a savior (Jesus Christ The Word who came, not to negate the law, as man in the 'open' system would have it, but to fulfill it, being righteous, being obedient to His Heavenly Father's will in all things, obeying His Heavenly Father in dying for our sins, taking upon himself God's judgment against us, judgment due us because of the sins we committed in the 'open' system against Him, i.e. His Law directed us to the Word, to He who redeemed us from God's wrath upon us, His Holy Spirit now directing us in the 'closed' system of righteousness, instead of our sensuousness directing us in the 'open' system of wickedness).

The Word of God declares that all have sinned, that there are none righteous, and that the heart of man is desperately wicked. Those who use the dialectical process reject all three declarations (if not in word, at least in practice, using the dialectical process, in some cases cloaking it with selected scripture, cut and pasted—extrapolated, to deceive the naive, for gain). The dialectical person, wanting his brain washed of system of righteousness, uses human reasoning and self-social justification to free

himself from his guilty conscience and the fear of God (defining the Word of God according to his discretion, but not loving God and His Word with all his heart, soul, mind, and might). Deceived into measuring himself by his own heart, therefore believing that he is basically 'good' he refuses to have his heart washed of its wickedness, washed by the blood of the Lamb, redeeming him from the guilt of his sins and God's wrath upon him.

"Professing themselves to be wise," mingling the word of God with their reasoning abilities and human sensuousness (even to promote "the kingdom of God," a kingdom which can only be inherited, by faith, the scriptures, Christ, and grace alone), "they have become fools." Romans 1:22 (For greater detail on the "shift" from faith in God to the human perspective of man see the Diaprax Article, [Jürgen Habermas](#).)

An 'open' system is a paradigm which engenders common position . It is a heresiarchal paradigm of 'change,' focusing upon the building of human relationships as the 'purpose' of life. It is a system which builds human relationship upon sensuousness (instead of established truths or facts), uniting one another upon that nature which is common with all men (a method used in the business world to 'create' customers, called "general systems theory"). "Partnership is the same as synergy [general systems theory]. The problem for the accountants is to work out some way of putting on the balance sheet the amount of synergy in the organization, the amount of time and money and effort that has been invested in getting groups to work together." (Maslow, Maslow) For example: Peter Drucker helped Rick Warren build his church upon the 'open' system of "general systems theory." Another Peter Drucker, of Europe, wrote the following paper in defense of homosexuality (human means homo-man; "homo sum: humani nil a me alienum puto" which means "I am a human being: I regard nothing of human concern as foreign to my interests." Merriam-Webster's Dictionary). Drucker wrote: "In the socialist future monogamy would 'completely disappear' "...'the elimination of the need to hide sexual relations of an unusual character is one of the first preconditions for a healthy sex life and a healthy sexual morality'." (Drucker of Europe) Homosexuality is part of the tapestry of the "contemporary church movement" because it, the "contemporary church" is built upon the dialectical process of human emancipation from the law and judgment (and therefore grace and mercy) of God. (For those in the process, I just went

"to far.")

The situation of sensuousness and the sensuousness of the situation 'drives' us into worrying about how people 'feel' about us or what they 'think' about us. We, by nature, are concerned about what we might gain if they feel or think well of us, even the feeling of approval is a gain, or what we might lose if they feel or think the worse of us, even the feeling of disapproval is a loss to us. Jesus despised the shame of the cross (shaming is a people thing, the cross being human disapproval at the extreme end of disapproval) but it did not stop him from doing what was right. In other words, the person of the patriarchal paradigm uses the pre-established definitions of right and wrong of the 'closed' system to determine who to relate with and what to do and who not to relate with and what not to do. Basing relationships upon right or wrong behavior engenders social disharmony, especially when relationships are broken off with those who refuse to think and act the right way (when you speak evil of their way, John 8:31-59, and they speak evil of your way, Acts 17:8, 9). The heresiarchal paradigm uses the sensuousness of the situation, the desire for human approval (for whatever reason), to seduce all people into participation in the "open" system of 'change.' It is in this system that all are encouraged to think and act 'openly,' behaving (expressing themselves) according to their own feelings and thoughts (and accepting of other people's feelings and thoughts as well). Anyone behaving according to the 'dictates' of the 'closed' system is viewed with suspicion and contempt. The traditional way of thinking (the patriarchal paradigm) initiates and sustains 'rigidity,' i.e. a top-down, hierarchical, 'closed' system of right and wrong which is intolerant of ambiguity (intolerant of ambiguity means demanding certainty, correctness, confidence, stability, etc. which produces clarity and specificity, for the purpose of order). The transformational way of thinking and acting (those who use the heresiarchal paradigm) initiates and sustains 'change,' i.e. a sensual, democratic, 'open' system of deviancy and permissiveness which is tolerant of ambiguity (tolerant of ambiguity means permissive of uncertainty, vagueness, insecurity, confusion, et., which gives opening for the facilitators of 'change' to use "double-speak" and generalization for the purpose of deception and manipulation of people; "Tillich's elusiveness reflects a calculated effort to remain esoteric. He keeps his deepest meanings hidden from all but a few who are prepared

to receive it." "By redefining terms, Tillich cultivates a 'double-speak' designed to convey opposing messages to different groups. He refuses to define terms to which he obviously attaches definite meanings." (Wheat) Karl Marx, in his work *The Holy Family* details the method of turning specifics into general and then back to specifics again, but this time the specific is viewed, through "the ether of the brain," as "oneness as allness, as 'totality,'" as he used the example of fruit: pears, apples, almonds, strawberries, raisins becoming "the Fruit," and then, speculatively, back into "the real natural fruit" again, "creating those fruits out of his own abstract reason" seeing the individual fruit in its "unity" with all fruit, its "mystical interconnection" with all fruit now perceived in each fruit (since all men are basically 'good,' by creating the 'right' conditions the 'goodness' of man can be recognized, liberated, and then used to create a 'good' world). Thus the 'open' system does not hate man, it hates the 'closed' system which man puts his trust in, that system which makes him accountable to a higher authority than his own human nature, judging his human nature (and the nature of the world) as evil, thus keeping man from finding unity within himself and with the world. Jesus stated it this way: "The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil." John 7:7 The world does not hate you, it hates Christ being in you, in your "every" thought and action (not leaving room for 'self' justification, i.e. human justification), it hates you taking "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." (2 Corinthians 10:5), thereby, judging them as evil, if not in word at least in your actions, refusing to participate in their praxis (if you are not with us, you are against us, at least suspect and need to be watched and your 'motives' exposed to see if they are evil, i.e. if they are anti-social, a-social, .fill in the blank: ____ social, causing or having the potential of creating social disharmony, as in "We can't having any loose bricks around for people to trip and fall on or feel uncomfortable about" since the whole, i.e. the feeling of pleasure which comes from the harmony of bricks in the sidewalk or wall, is greater than the sum of the bricks in a pile). Karl Marx clearly defined the Christian so as to explain how to destroy him. "The unspeculative Christian also recognizes sensuality as long as it does not assert itself at the expense of true reason, i.e., of faith, of true love, i.e., of love of God, of true will-power, i.e., of will in Christ. Not for

the sake of sensual love, not for the lust of the flesh, but because the Lord said: Increase and multiply. It is not sensuality which is presented ..., but mysteries, adventures, obstacles, fears, dangers, and especially the attraction of what is forbidden." (Karl Marx The Holy Family)

By recognizing the sensuousness which lies within the Christian and then creating an environment wherein the Christian can feel free to speculate upon his own sensuousness (his own desires) and the sensuousness of others (their own desires made known through dialogue), finding a common element (awareness of desires which are common, i.e. a common 'ought') between himself and others, he can move the Christian from rigidity in thought and action (righteousness) to fluidity, i.e. 'change,' based upon him finding within himself that which he has in common with the world around him (sensuousness), thereby 'helping' (liberating) the 'Christian' to weigh his thoughts and actions and the thoughts and actions of others upon this 'newly discovered' "mystical interconnectedness." From then on the 'Christian' evaluates thoughts and action (his own and others), no longer on righteousness (from God and his Words), but rather upon sensuousness (from man and his 'felt' needs), even basing 'righteousness' upon sensuousness. That is why you get the 'deer in the headlight' look from people today when you try to warn them of what is happening to them and the world around them. If your warning is not couched in sensuousness then they have no ability (or desire) to receive any warning which calls them to repent of their sins and receive that righteousness which can only come from God above, since their 'righteousness' is now grounded upon only that which is from below, i.e. their own sensuous nature and the sensuous nature of others, blinding them, blocking them from hearing the truth, i.e. they are no longer able to fear God and love of His Word since both require the denial of human sensuousness as the 'driving' force of righteousness). "But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you. But they hearkened not, nor inclined their ear, but walked in the counsels and in the imagination of their evil heart, and went backward, and not forward. Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day I have even sent unto you all my servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them: Yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear,

but hardened their neck: they did worse than their fathers. Therefore thou shalt speak all these words unto them; but they will not hearken to thee: thou shalt also call unto them; but they will not answer thee. But thou shalt say unto them, This is a nation that obeyeth not the voice of the LORD their God, nor receiveth correction: truth is perished, and is cut off from their mouth." Jeremiah 7:23-28

The heresiarchal paradigm uses the dialectical process to initiate and sustain sensual union or harmony with nature (union with that which is temporal, carnal), where the desire for sensual union 'drives' the 'purpose' of life, where the sensation of oneness, the want of being at-one-with the gratifying objects of nature, without and within, i.e. [Narcissus](#) and [Orpheus](#) (key structures of thought for Freud and therefore for psychology), worldly love cherished and worldly love expressed, brings meaning, determination, and resolution to life. The dialectical process is used to 'help' everyone 'rationally' find what they have in common with one another (how everyone feels, thinks, and acts when they are uninhibited by the pre-set standards and the threat of punishment of the 'closed' system). "Then both parties recognize their rigidified position in relation to each other as the result of detachment and abstraction from their common life context." (Habermas, Social Theory) By everyone using the dialectical process to 'discover' their common ground (only possible through the dialoguing of opinions in a "non-hostile," non-judgmental, non-patriarch environment, i.e. free to share how they feel or think; "I feel..." "I think"), they 'discover' that their common feelings, thoughts, and actions are not in harmony with the pre-set standards which they were taught and chastened into obeying, i.e. they can not 'rationally' define their position to everyone's understanding, since it did not come from "them," it did not come from their human nature. The group then becomes the reference point of right and wrong rather than the 'past' authority figure. "The group to which an individual belongs is the ground for his perceptions, his feelings, and his actions" (Lewin, Resolving) In the dialectical way of thinking, right behavior is 'willful' participation in the dialectical process, where everyone is 'discovering' their human identity through the building of human relationships, uniting with others upon that which they all have in common, the sensuousness of being at one with nature, theirs and others (self-esteem comes from group-esteem, which comes from finding what

you have in common with others as far as feelings and thoughts are concerned), thereby engendering social harmony (common-ism with sensual equality, i.e. no above-below system depriving the person of sensuousness, producing inequity-inequality). While parents 'deprive' their children of sensuous experiences, which they are having, the same is not true of God since God is a Spirit and not temporal (sensual) in nature. This is where the earthly father and the Heavenly Father part ways (one is born into sin because of his flesh and 'open' minded ways which he learned to limit as he matured, the other is not able to sin, be 'open' minded, since He is Spirit and can not be tempted), despite them both maintaining a patriarchal paradigm (one having learned it, the other being it). As you will see, Karl Marx understood the 'need' to destroy (annihilate) the patriarchal paradigm (destroy the way of thinking which preached and taught obedience to authority and used chastening to reinforce it). Man needs the patriarchal paradigm in his life for him to understand God's way of thinking. Destroy the patriarchal paradigm in man and you destroy his faith in God. In other words by 'liberating' man from the patriarchal paradigm, helping him dialectically to replace it with the heresiarchal paradigm of 'change,' you can help him put his "trust" in man and the institutions of men. "Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD." Jeremiah 17:5 "Trust in the LORD with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding." Proverbs 3:5

The dialectical agenda is not social harmony. The agenda is that everyone embraces the dialectical process as their way of thinking and acting, accepting it as the only right way of thinking and acting. Social harmony is the byproduct of the process, the result of everyone's 'willful' participation in the process itself (experiencing the process of 'change' for themselves, eating of the "forbidden" fruit for themselves —reading about it is not enough, feeling like doing it is not enough, thinking about doing it is not enough, everyone must "just do it." Marcuse). Sensuousness is the 'drive,' and everyone's 'willful' participation in the dialectical process is the 'purpose.' Thereafter right and wrong (what is real and not real or of worth and not of worth) must only be determined, evaluated, and judged through "sense experiences" (experiencing for oneself), self consciousness (conscientization) being the only truth (right or good) which is real (or of

worth), the only truth which can be known (Gnosis-where the truth is liberated through the proper experience; where that knowledge, γνῶσις, gnosis, which comes through "sense experience" is the only way, truth, and life). Wrong behavior is willful refusal to participate in the dialectical process, insisting upon staying with pre-established standards of right-wrong, good-evil (with "self-denial," self-control, self-government ruling over sensuousness, 'repressing' it, according to the 'open' system and thereby 'repressing' the 'truth' by believing that it, the truth resides in a person who claims to be the way and life, i.e. that believing in a higher authority than your own life experience can set you free; "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." " And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not." John 8:32, 36, 45 emphasis added; read John 8:31-45). Thus wrong or evil behavior is behavior which inhibits or blocks 'discovering' common ground, refusing to 'discover' "the truth" through your own common experiences with others (thus judging your behavior and their behavior according to pre-established standards, commands, or laws of right and wrong), thereby engendering social disharmony. It is the rejection of the dialectical process as the right way of thinking and acting, the refusal to participate in it yourself and the inhibit or block of others from participating in it, which produces the by-product of social disharmony. You are now perceived as the barrier to everybody else's wants. While they might want everyone to 'like each other' while building a bridge you don't need it to build the bridge. It will cost you more time and money and the loss of your independence to build the bridge with their wants than with your need.

According to some people who use the process, the denial of dialectical participation is an "act of violence." When "men prevent others from" participating in the process of questioning higher authority and their established truths they prevent them from 'discovering' 'truth' through "inquiry," and thereby prevent them from coming to the knowledge of what is good and what is evil for themselves, through their own experiences ("human rights" meaning that all men must be free to eat the "forbidden" fruit, experience it, sensually, for themselves, without judgment or restraint, "As long as no one is 'hurt,'" whatever that might mean). "An act of violence is any situation in which some men prevent

others from the process of inquiry. Any attempt to prevent human freedom is an 'act of violence.' Any system which deliberately tries to discourage critical consciousness is guilty of oppressive violence. Any school which does not foster students' capacity for critical inquiry is guilty of violent oppression." (Freire) The 'purpose' of school today is the negation of parental authority (and its 'acts of violence') in the life of the next generation. The agenda is fatal to parental authority. "Can the student accept the fact that the traditional family might be changed and might possibly disappear?" (Dressell) The 'shift' in education, for example, was from an authoritarian condition, with teachers teaching, to a totalitarian condition with teachers and students in partnership attacking "traditional parental authority." The concern was how the traditional parent would respond and how best to neutralize that response before it happened, i.e. the parents took control of the educational system again, closing it down if necessary, i.e. taking their children home. "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." (Adorno) The solution was found in education, media, and political actions which would be in favor of 'change,' putting pressure upon the parents to conform to the 'changing times,' directly affecting their relationship toward their own children. "Using social environment forces to change the parents behavior toward the child." (Adorno) "Once the parent can in any way imagine his own orientation to be a possible liability to the child in the world approaching the authoritarian family is moribund, regardless of whatever countermeasures may be taken." (Bennis)

The heresiarchal paradigm of "critical consciousness," i.e. consciously seeking 'change' from the truth which says "Is" (as in "I AM" or "It is written..."), seeks only that 'truth' which is from below (seeking sensual truth, experiential truth, non-judgmental 'truth' —being judgmental only of judgmental truth) and seeking to remove that truth which is from above (removing that truth which judges as evil those who seek to discover for themselves the 'truth' which is from below, removing that truth which judging as evil those who do not believe in the truth from above, removing that truth which judging as evil those who question, counter, and curse that truth which is from above), uses the dialectical process to "help" people

"discover" the 'driving force' which all men have in common (the common-ism of sensuousness). Therefore the truth is only knowable through the senses (touch, taste, sight, smell, sound), truth being itself sensuous, only proceeding from nature. Doctrine and the teaching of facts are not truth, only the sensuous 'moment' (time) discovering itself in the moment of sensuousness (space) is truth (truth being time and space united in sensation, "something" being 'discovered' in sensation). "Any time we teach a child something, we keep him from discovering it himself." (Jean Piaget)

The use of the dialectical process also 'helps' men put their common-ism of sensuousness into praxis, 'purposed' in the negation of the patriarchal paradigm of 'rigidity' (dialectically classify as non- sensuous, as nonsense , an environment where sensuousness is suspended in the learning and teaching of facts, conversely dialectically, facts are suspended in the 'discovering' of sensuousness). In a dialectical world belief is first treated as being just another opinion, until you refuse to bite, and then truth is responded to by indifference (that glassed over look), for the good of all, and then if necessary, because you still refused to bite, it is treated with contempt and you are confronted with hostility or removed, having no right to preach and teach the truth, belief being a system, a way of thinking and acting, which is damaging others, including your own children (the supreme court called it "dangerous" in the Jaffrey case, i.e. the prayer in school case). You preach and teach truth (which is from above). You dialogue opinions (which are from below). With man, all truth, which he can know (discover) on his own, through his perspective, is from below (including his beliefs). With God, all truth is from above. Thus The Word of Truth must be revealed by God to man (by His Spirit), preached and taught by man to man (made understandable by His Spirit), if man is to become aware of the truth (that truth which is from above exposing and condemning that 'truth' which is from below). True science only discovers those truths in nature which God created. Man was not created to be subject only to those truths but the truths which come from God. Dialectical men seek to use the methods which are used in discovering truth in nature on man, deceiving himself and others into believing that man is 'only' of nature, thereby destroying his faith in God. "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. Grace be with thee. Amen." 1 Timothy 6:20-21 "Oppositions" is antithesis in the Greek.

"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 The wisdom of God is made known to man only by the spirit of God (the Word being "God breathed"), therefore having to be believed when heard (the truth being made known only through the "foolishness of preaching," "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Romans 10:17), while the wisdom of the world is knowable only by the flesh of men (the wisdom of the world being sensuous or carnal consciousness and 'reasoning' justifying sensual pleasure). Thus 'truth,' being knowable only through man's own "sense experiences," i.e. through his "sensuous needs" and his "sense perception," it has to be at-one with the senses to be 'true.' Human 'reasoning' can only know the 'truth' (what is right and wrong, good and evil) through human sensuousness and therefore gravitates all things into one sensual commonism (one method for arriving at truth based upon sensuousness; made manifest in graven images and the imagination). Therefore the truth can only be made known through the 'reasonable' dialoguing of opinions until a common sensuous experience emerges. Therein resides the "emergent church." "It can't be wrong when it seems (feels or is perceived as being) so right." Polls, surveys, and feasibility studies first reveal, then esteem and set free, and then build upon man's human nature (man's wanting of objects which produce "positive" sensuous experiences), that which is common to all mankind, from which the apostate Church is "grown." (Making customers is all about the sensuous 'moment' for which the customer will come back for more, i.e. different products but same sensation, i.e. pleasure. The 'quality' of the product no longer means durability but rather the degree of pleasure (personal sensuousness) it produces; 'ergonomics' i.e. incorporating "the human factor"). The word of God warns: "There is a way that seems to be right unto man but the ends thereof are the ways of death." Proverbs 14:12.

Psychological counseling is created and sustained through the use of the dialectical process. Psychology's 'purpose' is the negation of the patriarchal paradigm of 'rigidity,' i.e. replacing righteousness with sensuousness,

replacing 'fixity' with 'changingness,' by making sensuousness the 'driving force' in the individuals life and 'changingness' the 'purpose' of life, making the process of change (the dialectical process itself) the determining, evaluating, and judging factor in the social order of life (where 'purpose' is not established above human nature but is found within human nature; 'discovered' and liberated by man's participation in the dialectical process, and put into praxis through the use of the dialectical process upon others, the way, truth, and life residing within its liberating power, liberating nature (sensuousness) from that which is not of nature, i.e. liberating man from God, the God who created nature, so man could worship nature, the creation, instead of God, the creator; worshiping it in his sensuous 'moment,' in "his immediate experiencing" with it if not in his imagination). Carl Rogers, in his book on becoming a person, wrote: "In this process the individual becomes more open to his experience. It is the opposite of defensiveness or rigidity. His beliefs are not rigid, he can tolerate ambiguity." The person "lives openly and freely in relation to others, guiding his behavior on the basis of his immediate experiencing – he has become an integrated process of changingness." "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." "Individuals move not from a fixity through change to a new 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." (Rogers) In other words, right, good, and truth are not eternally established outside of human nature but is human nature being liberated by, in, and for the process (sensation) of 'change.'

For those who are possessed by the dialectical process, the 'changing' of paradigms is the 'purpose' of life. "But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus." Philippians 4:19 is 'changed' to "We shall supply all our needs (wants) according to our wealth and abilities, by our common collective power (our compassion for peace through unity, "We working for us"), 'in the name of Jesus.'" Common collective power is knowable only by polls, surveys, and feasibility studies and is put into praxis through common-unity (community) participation. The idea being: outside of the group, community, or society, life has no meaning or 'purpose,' it is the fellowship which gives Christ meaning or

'purpose' (sensual-temporal) and no longer Christ alone who gives the fellowship meaning or 'purpose' (spiritual-eternal). Many would deny this separation of the two, believing the two are inter-dependent (dependent upon each other; "Without man God can do nothing on the earth." Just say that in God's face and see what happens, i.e. "God you could not have done it without us." Talk about a bug zapper. I want to be in another place when it goes off. There is no "we" and "us" in heaven. There is just Him. You and I are there just because of Him.). By embracing the first power (the collective power of man, a generalized sensation of oneness) they have negated the power of our Heavenly Father, He who created us by His Spirit, He who sent his Son, Jesus Christ to redeem us by his own blood, His righteousness bringing us into right—read righteous —relationship with the Father. All is based upon His righteousness, His righteousness having to be imputed. With man's use of the dialectical process, he has replaced God and His Love with the community and the sensation of common-unity, which 'seems' to makes all things right (righteous). Many are deceived into believing that man's common collective power, when used for good, has eternal value, especially if it is done in the name of Jesus. "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 Notice the emphasis Jesus places upon "the will of my Father" and the singular person and the emphasis the workers of "iniquity" place upon the "we," the plural, having done "many wonderful works" in Jesus name. On the day of judgment there is no "we," just you and "He." Just like no one can be born for you, breathe for you, eat for you, drink for you, sleep for you, die for you, no one can be judged for you and spend eternity in heaven or hell for you. It's just you and God, with a lot of other people going through the same horror or joy as you. There is also no 'group' grade. Your opinion might be "There is no hell so there is no judgment." Not believing in hell or in judgment is like not believing in gravity, as long as you are falling you are all right. It's when you meet an object that you come to know how unimportant your opinions are, if you have time to

think about it, and in hell you will. "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. 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 reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." John 3:17-21 "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

"Change in organization [change in paradigm] can be derived from the overlapping between play [sensuousness] and barrier [righteousness] behavior. To be governed by two strong goals [being righteous in Christ, right before God and being esteemed by men, 'right' before man] is equivalent to the existence of two conflicting controlling heads within the organism. The forces under the control of one head have to counteract the forces of the other before they are effective [the fear of God or man must be greater than the internal drive of sensuousness or conversely the internal drive of sensuousness must be greater than fear of man or God for one or the other to be 'effective']." (Kurt Lewin as quoted in Benne) The love and fear of men has to "counteract" the love and fear of God. The love of men being sensuous, the love of God being spiritual. The fear of men is expressed by 'How do they (whoever they are) feel about me?' or 'What do they think of me?' 'How can I get anything out of this situation for myself, including the esteem of men, if I act in a way that will cause them to reject me.' However, the fear of God is 'What will God say or do?' ('to me' is understood.) "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: 15 The very praxis of the heresiarchal paradigm negates the patriarchal paradigm. To participate in the paradigm of 'change' is to justify the paradigm of 'change.' For example: during the temptations in the wilderness, Jesus refused to participate in the paradigm of 'change,' refusing to change from the spiritual, being lead by that which is from

above, to the temporal-sensual, 'driven' that which is below, while Adam and Eve, in the garden in Eden, participated in the paradigm of 'change,' refusing to obey God, they followed after their sensuous nature, justifying to themselves their praxis of sin, i.e. It was not my fault, i.e. something in the environment got me to do it. All men have participated in the heresiarchal paradigm of 'change,' including the religious . All men are religious, even though some men do not want to recognize it or admit it—even humanism is a religion, evolution is a religion, those who follow after and advance the 'process' follow it as a religion no matter how hard they try to overcome it (for example: "negative dialectics" and "chaos theory" are religions which seek to deliver man from religion). Anything which gives man stability, consistence, order, and identity is a religion (unstable men find stability in their instability, we all need walls and can go insane without them). The only true and everlasting religion is found in those whose sins are covered by the blood of the Lamb (call it an opinion all you want, but one of these days you are going to meet the truth, for better or for worse).

The same two paradigms are present today. The one has been within you from birth, the other waiting for you to receive it, if you have not already. Choose today which one you will use to know right and wrong, good and evil with. The one is by faith-spiritual, eternal, revealed. The other is by sight-sensual, temporal, experiential. With the one, truth is everlasting, established for all times, while with the other, truth is temporal, knowable only in the human 'moment' of 'change,' (the sensation which comes from experiencing 'change'). When you gave your life to the Lord, if you have, you also experienced the sensation of change (changing from sight to faith). I hope that your are not following after sensation, as many are in the church today. By following after sensation (sensuousness) they have "falling away" from faith (spiritual, God's approval). By merging faith with sight (sensual, human approval) they have "put Christ to an open shame" having joined with the "masses" (joined with the common-unity) in crucifying Him who walks by faith alone, having placed their hope in man's approval rather than in God). "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, If they shall fall away, to renew them

again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Hebrews 6:4-6

The 'driving purpose' of the heresiarchal paradigm is to negate the patriarchal paradigm. There is no other 'purpose.' Social harmony is not the 'purpose.' The very practice of finding what we all have in common only (being "positive," as in "Don't be so negative, let's be positive") and making what we have in common the basis for determining right behavior only (making what we have in common the basis for initiating and sustaining relationship with others) negates that way of thinking and acting which insists that there are pre-established laws of right and wrong, good and evil behavior, negates the making of pre-established right and wrong, good and evil behavior the basis for initiating and sustaining or inhibiting and blocking relationships with others. Living by pre-established laws is dialectically perceived as being "negative," hateful, and even criminal since pre-established laws engender social disharmony in a world of 'diversity.'

The idea, by those using the dialectical process, is to use the social disharmony (the antithesis condition) created by the patriarchal paradigm, i.e. its 'rigidity,' to negate the patriarchal paradigm (negate the thesis condition) through the creation of a synthesis condition (the quest for harmony via. the consensus process, the dialectical process). Although Hegel is noted for the words thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, they are really Fichte's words. The Marxist historian, John Lewis explained the use of these words and their founder this way: "In the process of self-actualization, the ego creates an objective, resistant world over against itself. This implies an obstacle whose resistance has to be overcome. We realize our liberty and independence through the successful overcoming of this resistance. It is in this process of the ego bringing into existence a world over against itself and then overcoming the limitations with which it is confronted that Fichte finds the sequence of thesis-antithesis-synthesis. This is of course a Fichtean, not an Hegelian, formula." (Lewis) Anyone familiar with Gnosticism should notice a similarity (God comes to know himself as man comes to know himself —"As above, so below"—by "bringing into existence a world over against" his nature and then by "overcoming the limitations with which [his nature] is confronted" he becomes cognizant of who he really is, i.e. he becomes cognizant of reality

(reality being found within the process of 'change,' the overcoming of the resistance to change, the senses gaining liberation from 'rigidity'). Social disharmony is an antithesis condition, a conflict condition involving 'feelings' of uncomforted, dislike, resentment or hate toward restraint, produced by a thesis way of thinking (a way of thinking which inhibits human impulse, i.e. spontaneity of sensuousness in thought and in action). "Universal Reconciliation relies on a reason that is before reason-mimesis or 'impulse.'" (Habermas) "Impulse, the primary fact, back of which, psychically we cannot go." (Dewey) "Marcuse thus could write that 'the realm of freedom lies beyond mimesis.'" (Bronner) The 'reason' behind sensuousness and spontaneity (mimesis or impulse), according to dialectical thought, is our original sensual experience with nature as a child (being at-one with nature until higher authority came along and broke up the union, placing "unnatural restrictions" upon us, "repressing" our innate friendship with the world around us). "What the child knows consciously and the adult unconsciously, is that we are nothing but body." "Our repressed desires are the desires we had unrepressed, in childhood; and they are sexual desires." "Infants have a richer sexual life than adults." "Infantile sexuality is the pursuit of pleasure obtained through the activity of any and all organs of the human body." "Sexual instincts seeks union with objects in the world." "Normal adult sexuality, judged by the standard of infantile sexuality, is an unnatural restriction of the erotic potentialities of the human body." "In man, infantile sexuality is repressed and never outgrown;" "The repression of normal adult sexuality is required only by cultures which are based on patriarchal domination." "Capitulation enforced by parental authority under the threat of loss of parental love . . . can be accomplished only by repression." "Therefore the question confronting mankind is the abolition of repression - in traditional Christian language, the resurrection of the body." "Freud takes with absolute seriousness the proposition of Jesus: 'Except ye become as little children, ye can in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven.'" "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." "Eros is the foundation of morality." (Brown) (The scriptures warn us of the consequence of having friendship with the world: James 4:4, quoted below)

Social disharmony correlates to bodily disharmony. Therefore any condition which inhibits social harmony, inhibits bodily harmony and visa

versa. Righteousness over bodily-social pleasure being the greatest inhibitor. "While adult sexuality serves the socially useful purpose of breeding children, it is for the individual in some sense an end in itself as a source of pleasure – according to Freud, the highest pleasure." (Brown) "Every effort must be made and all means employed to guard future generations against the influence of the biologic rigidity of the old generation." "The principle weapon on the arsenal of freedom is each new generation's tremendous urge to be free." "The child's and adolescent's natural love of life must be protected by clearly defined laws." "Those forces in the individual and in the society that are natural and vial must be clearly separated from all the obstacles that operate against the spontaneous functioning of this natural vitality." "It is the elimination of all obstacles to freedom that has to be achieved." (Reich) "Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness." Proverbs 30:20

Any antithesis condition is the result of one person holding to a thesis position which conflicts with another person's thesis position (both insisting that their thesis position is right or good and the other's thesis position is wrong or evil). Despite both persons initiating and sustaining "formal logical laws of contradiction" (a system which makes feelings or impulses subordinate to established facts or truths, a system which makes feelings, which are ever-changing, subject to facts, which are everlasting, a system or a way of thinking which they both have in common) they still produce social disharmony because the "absolute" facts and truths they hold to (the right and wrong, the good and evil which differs between them), produces an "I'm right and you're wrong" way of thinking within both parties, thus producing the antithesis condition (if they didn't have "feelings" for approval from one another or others it would not be an issue, i.e. "You go your way and I'll go mine."). Since both parties have the desire for approval from some one, an internal tension results from the confrontation. The dialectical thinking is, the reason they originally adhered to the thesis condition in the first place was due to their desire for approval from higher authority, along with the desire to avoid chastening. Yet when both parties are forced to represent their thesis position against each other in an environment which heightens their desire to initiate or sustain relationship with the other party, the situation is changed into one

where the desire for approval is the same for both parties i.e. what they have in common, called the Matriarchal paradigm (the mother's heart seeking for peace and harmony between the siblings in the home, now carried over into the community—common-unity; by finding the line which the patriarch draws in the sand, in regards to his wife, children, home, etc, and the line, more than likely a blurred line, which the matriarch draws in the sand, then focusing in on that area of dissatisfaction and compromise between the father and mother—the father's being "negative" toward 'change,' the mother's and/or children being "positive" toward 'change,' making it the area of evaluation through dialogue, especially within a group of mothers and/or children, the community of women and/or children can be used to change the home system, i.e. "a new community is in control over families" significantly disrupting "the old way of doing things"). When pre-established right and wrong, good and evil, truths and facts supersede sensuousness (restrain feelings or "felt" needs which both parties have in common) the only way to 'change' the other person's position or thesis is by means of persuasion, i.e. physically by chastening, mentally by preaching and teaching or inculcating (formal, logical), socially through the act of rejection—by physical force (through the use of corporal punishment), mental force (through the utilization of indoctrination and the development of the conscience), and social force (through the use of excommunication).

To overcome these features of the patriarchal paradigm (obedience to higher authority and chastening for disobedience), specific methods used to produce 'change,' have been developed by social-psychologists, i.e. "change agents." Thus the use of "force field analysis" in the dialectical process (explained below). The one system being labeled "negative," the other "positive," i.e. in reference to the amount of freedom allotted sensuousness and spontaneity. "Before effective plans for change can be made the present state of affairs must be defined as accurately as possible . . . [in other words] what are the forces which are keeping our methods in the present 'groove'?" "Driving forces are those forces or factors affecting a situation which are "pushing" in a particular direction; they tend to initiate a change and keep it going. Restraining forces may be likened to walls or barriers. They only prevent or retard movement toward them [note here that the "prevented or retarded movement" is not toward the object of

desire but toward the higher authority who is restraining the person from the object of desire, a very important distinction, critical to understanding the dialectical process, whose objective is not to acquire the object of desire itself but to destroy any 'unreasonable,' non-sensible system which prevents its acquisition]." "When we have determined the nature of forces which are affecting the present state of affairs we can think more clearly in selecting the forces or factors which should be modified if the conditions are to change in the direction we desire . . . our task then becomes either to increase the total strength of the driving forces for change [increase the conditions for social approval, sensuousness and tolerance] or to decrease the total strength of forces opposing change [decrease the conditions for authority approval, law and obedience] or both." "The component forces can be modified in the following way: (1) reducing or removing the forces [diminish the means by which the patriarch supports his position or prevent them from being used in the meeting—negate preaching and teaching, i.e. "put downs," judgmentalism, Roberts Rules of Order as they were intended, etc.]; (2) strengthening or adding forces [augment the means by which the heresiarch support their position or add them to the meeting—advance dialogue and the sharing of opinions, i.e. "I think ...," "I feel ..." striving for agreement upon a consensus of opinions and not just a majority of one point of view]; (3) changing the direction of the forces [seduce the patriarch into dialogue, getting him to suspend his preaching and teaching attitude for a 'moment,' for the sake of social unity]." "We might select, as a first step, for instance, getting parents interested in having more pupil participation in planning in the classroom ["pupil participation in planning in the classroom" may "sound good" at first but to do so in the classroom is to negate the top-down patriarchal paradigm in the classroom and when done with the parents' support, it is also the negation of the patriarchal paradigm in the home, i.e. the parents have not only succumb to the seduction of the 'siren song' of the dialectical process, weakening their stance on a patriarchal way of thinking and acting (while giving the "change agents" power to program their children in socialism in the classroom) the process will now come back into the home with the children who will attempt to fulfill the negation of the patriarchal home by their 'independent' thinking and their questioning and challenging of parental authority (with social programs in support of the children if the

parents "go to far" by chasten their children, especially while in the public eye); "Meyers in his study emphasizing group think, Higher Horizons 1961, stated that 'to develop attitudes and values toward learning which are not shared by the parents and guardians or by the peer group in the neighborhood' produces 'conflict and tension between parents and children, between students, and peer groups who are not participating in the special opportunities." "... objectives can best be attained where the individual is separated from earlier environmental conditions and when he is in association with a group of peers who are changing in much the same direction and who thus tend to reinforce each other." Krathwohl, Book 2: Affective Domain , i.e. challenging not only the parents but the very system of parental authority itself, not only in the home but also in the neighborhood]. With increased skill [in the student's ability to negate of the effects of the patriarchal paradigm in his own life through the tools learned in the classroom, tools on how to negate parental authority in the home and the neighborhood] and increased parent interest [parents who naively support the use of the process in the classroom, marching under the banner of "quality education," thinking it will help their child getting a "better" job] two important forces in the situation have been modified and the level of equilibrium of forces should move upward toward more teacher-pupil planning [moving the classroom into a socialist programming laboratory where not only the students but also the teachers join in partnership in the negation of the traditional, top-down method of education, replacing facts with "facts with, through, and by feelings," replacing righteousness with relationships]." "Whenever change is planned one must make sure that the new condition will be stable." [Thus the need for consensus on group projects and the groups 'willing' participation in initiating and sustaining it in social action (the use of the dialectical process in identifying and resolving the problems of social disharmony, social labor being the implementation of the process via. praxis within the community, via. volunteerism, task forces, community projects, etc.).

The project itself is not the objective, the 'changing' of group behavior or the way a group thinks and acts while working on a project is. The agenda is to change the group from an autocratic, top-down, "belief in a superbeing" way of thinking and acting into a "group think," common-istic, common-unity, common-sensuous way of thinking and acting. "Freud

referred to ... the group's 'need to be governed by unrestricted force . . . it's extreme passion for authority . . . it's thirst for obedience.' Among the strongest of these is man's need for an omnipotent, omniscient, omniscaring parent, which together with his infinite capacity for self-deception creates a yearning for and a belief in a superbeing." (Freud quoted in Yalom)]

"The method which we have discussed here is a general method which can be applied to any problem of changing human behavior [G. F. 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." (Friedrich)

The dialectical process is referred to as "the scientific method."] It supplies a framework for problem solving . . . the method can be applied to problems of changing the curriculum, changing pupil behavior school-community relations, administrative problems, etc." (David H Jenkins ' application of Kurt Lewin Force Field Analysis in Benne; note: several statements/quotations were embedded [contained within brackets] in the previous quotations of Benne) If the parents, those in the school system or in the neighborhood refuse to participate in the dialectical process, refuse to move from their God given patriarchal way of doing things (often labeled by those under the influence of the dialectical process as being against education, community, and their own children's potential for success, i.e. not only damaging their own children's future but the future of all the children of the community and the community's future as well), then the dialectical process can not be advance effectively. By retaining the autonomy (and sanctity) of the traditional home and the freedom of the conscience (which the traditional home initiates and sustains) in education and in the workplace, the dialectical process is limited in its ability to gain a foothold in the neighborhood, the city, the county, the state, and the nation. "The dialectical method was overthrown —the parts were prevented from finding their definition within the whole." (Lukács, History) "The overthrow of the king-father is a crime, but so is his restoration.... The crime against the reality principle is redeemed by the crime against the pleasure principle: redemption thus cancels itself."

(Marcuse) In other words, the patriarchal paradigm was beheaded ("the crime against the reality principle" was accomplished), but due to the guilty conscience (the "freedom of the conscience" against sensuousness, the guilty conscience making the beheading "a crime") redemption from the patriarchal paradigm was negated by the re-suppression of sensuousness by the conscience ("the crime against the pleasure principle" was accomplished) and "redemption" from the patriarchal paradigm was canceled out. You can force a 'change' upon the people, freeing them from the higher authority, but without the negation of the conscience, in particular, without the negation of the "freedom of the conscience," the "parts" can not "find their definition within the whole" the 'citizens' can not find their identity (realize their citizenship) within the praxis of common-unity (where citizen and common-ism become one and the same).

The patriarchal paradigm places liberty in laws which are greater than the sensuous desires of the moment. Liberty in law is manifest where self-government guides man's behavior, where behavior is developed by training in doing what is right, according to law, and reinforced by the conscience. The word "human" is not found in scripture and is used in this article to convey the carnal nature of man (not nature itself and its laws which were established by God at the creation: See [Romans 1:16-](#) regarding man's rejection of the laws of nature, and the God of nature, and the consequence of turning to his own carnal human nature to find law, making human nature the law to be obeyed instead, where man's fallen nature becomes a law unto itself, i.e. man becomes a law unto himself; "another law in my members ... bringing me into the law of sin which is my members"), as the Apostle Paul wrote: "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 "justification" for the use of the dialectical process, by those who use it, is the element of sensuousness (the law of sin, i.e. the lust of the flesh as well as the lust of the eyes and the pride of life—"Look at what 'I,' 'you,' or 'We' have done, am doing, or can do for, with, or to you or us because, if, or when 'I,' 'You,' or 'We'", i.e. "'You,' 'We,' or even God could not have done it, can not do it, or will not be able to do it without 'me,' 'you,' or 'us.'" i.e. "'I,' 'You,' or 'We' can do whatever 'I,' 'You,' or 'we' imagine 'I,' 'You,' or 'we' can do, because, if, or when") which both parties have in common (the objective being to move the "God or parent will," to "I want," to "We can"). It is the only foundation upon which the "new world order" can be build. The "old world order" being built upon position, thesis, overt top-down authority, righteousness, as in "'I'm right and you are wrong' because I am the one in authority and I say so" is an order of absolutes and 'arbitrary' laws to man's sensuous nature (if it's not experiential in nature it is not understandable), producing commands which 'repress' carnal human nature, which results in conflict, antithesis—opposing positions, and tension—wars, etc. So by focusing upon what men have in common, i.e. their sensuousness, in the midst of the chaos, crisis 'created' by man's quest for righteousness, a "new world order" can be synthesized, created. By 'shifting' mans quest to the sensuousness of his carnality nature, through focusing upon human relationship building, mankind can reject God above man, judging sensuous man by His righteousness, and become god himself, justifying his sensuous human nature as being righteous; the quest for position leads to chaos which leads to the quest for relationship, or put another way, righteousness over sensuousness results in chaos or conflict between righteousness, i.e. belief in God, and sensuousness, i.e. the 'normal' behavior of man, which, through the use of Diaprax, becomes the 'righteousness' of human sensuousness; human relationship (the sensuousness of man) not Godliness (righteousness in Christ) becomes the only acceptable way of thinking and acting, the only way, truth, and life for a man living in a world built upon his own nature.

"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

This process is not only in you, it is in every living soul on the face of the earth. That being the case, the world would say, 'then lets not fight it, lets call it normal or 'good' and just do it, 'If it feels good, just do it.' (Marcuse)

"Our real choice is between holy and unholy madness: open your eyes and look around you —madness is in the saddle anyhow." "It is possible to be mad and to be unblest, but it is not possible to get the blessing without the madness; it is not possible to get the illuminations without the derangement," "I wagered my intellectual life on the idea of finding in Freud what was missing in Marx." (Brown , writing about Freud and Marx and the 'purpose' of psychology and sociology, all promoting the law of sin; To which Brown added: "The entry into Freud cannot avoid being a plunge into a strange world and a strange language —a world of sick men,It is a shattering experience for anyone seriously committed to the Western traditions of morality and rationality to take a steadfast, unflinching look at what Freud has to say. To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit; and this book cannot without sinning communicate that experience to the reader." Brown)

The heresiarchal paradigm places liberty in sensual license (sensuousness and spontaneity within "reason," that is, according to "human reasoning," i.e. "As long as no one is 'hurt,'" whatever that means), where men seek and receive approval from one another for their sensual thoughts and actions. "Sensible" or sensual," rational," practical, reasonable, etc. thought and action is behavior all parties can come to consensus upon;, consensus meaning "with sensuousness," when all participants agree upon "sensuousness," at least in tolerating it in others (as being perceived as being 'good' in the other person's eyes). Thus human perception, "sense perception," and human needs, "sensuous needs," become the judge of what is good and what is evil in the world. The heresiarchal paradigm liberates a man from the ways of God above to the ways of the world below (sensuality emancipated by doubting, questioning, and license or permissiveness which initiates and sustains disobedience to unnatural restraints upon the temporal—"changingness," where liberty is found in the praxis of human nature, man freeing himself from Godly restraint through the praxis of becoming himself, thus the reason for Carl Rogers to

name his book, on becoming a person).

By means of creating an environmental condition which engenders liberation of the sensual (and spontaneous) nature of man below from the restraining righteous (and spiritual) nature of God above, the heresiarchal paradigm is able to 'help' a person 'change' his paradigm, 'change' his way of thinking and acting from living according to that which is above (and therefore live counter to) his carnal nature to living in accordance with that which is below (and therefore live in harmony) with his carnal nature.

While God gives man (for a period of time) the 'right' to choose between the two natures (sensuousness, i.e. man "doing his own thing" or righteousness which is imputed to man through faith in Christ), the carnal nature of man can not, it must negate righteousness, God's nature, since it produces a guilty conscience and the fear of judgment upon man's carnal behavior and thoughts (unless he can create in his mind a sensuous God who is working in partnership with man for the cause of humanity he can not escape the God of the Holy Scriptures, the Living God of Righteousness, Mercy, and Grace—the last two man can handle as long as the first attribute of God is not 'overly' emphasized). By encouraging participants to [role-play](#) their "true" nature (the spontaneous expression of their sensual nature in response toward the patriarch), by creating an environment where they are liberated from patriarchal restraint (liberated from the the fear of chastening, i.e. "negative feelings," what Kurt Lewin called the "negative valence," a foreboding feeling regarding relationship with or contact with a desired but "forbidden object"; "The negative valence of a forbidden object which in itself attracts the child thus usually derives from an induced field of force of an adult." Lewin, Dynamic), the person is able to openly express his own feelings and thoughts, since he has no sense of fear (the internal environment is liberated, i.e. "positive feelings," are produced as a result of a non-judgmental, non-hostile environment; "If this field of force loses its psychological existence for the child (e.g., if the adult goes away or loses his authority) the negative valence also disappears." Lewin, Dynamic). If the parent or God is the "negative field of force," i.e. the source of pain, then by simply removing of the source of pain (at least in the mind of the one under authority, the authority is out of sight and out of mind or the one under authority as the one under authority is given the opportunity to perceive that he is now

equal with if not greater than the one in authority—which effectively negates or neutralizes the power of the authority figure in the mind of the one under authority), the fear of pain "disappears," that is, the feeling of judgment, i.e. the conscience (intolerance of ambiguity—holiness and purity), is negated as the "positive field of force," i.e. human-relationship (the field of sensuousness) becomes equal to or greater than the parent or God (the field of righteousness) and the super-ego (tolerance of ambiguity—abomination) is "liberated." With the negation of the patriarchal, 'ridged' condition the heresiarchal, 'change' nature of man is "liberated." Without the external environment being changed, in a controlled situation (such as a classroom or workforce meeting), the internal environment of the person could not be liberated and then the person 'used' to negate the "negative force fields" in the home, the workplace, government, the church, etc, for the 'purpose' of liberating society (sensuousness) from the effects of the patriarchal paradigm (righteousness). Preaching and teaching (the restraining of the sensual via the righteousness of faith and obedience) had to be replaced with dialogue (the liberation of sensuality and spontaneity—within 'reason') before the person could feel free enough to abandon (or at least step out of total dependence upon) religion and God and become "human" again. Role-playing produces that environment, the environment where "negative" feelings (doing what is right before parent and God) can be changed into "positive" feelings ("doing your own carnal thing" without fear of reprimand). J. L. Moreno wrote, concerning role-playing: "Religion and science [the righteous nature of God and the sensual nature of man—the spiritual and the temporal, i.e. God's way of thinking and acting and man's way of thinking and acting, i.e. the 'autocracy' spirit of the parents and the democratic spirit of the child, i.e. the restraining of the flesh and the liberating of the flesh] can be kept apart, indeed, one is able to do conscientious screening and not let one activity impede the other—in short, it is an exercise in 'role playing.'" (Moreno) "Those forces in the individual and in the society that are natural and vital must be clearly separated from all the obstacles that operate against the spontaneous functioning of this natural vitality." "It is the elimination of all obstacles to freedom that has to be achieved." "Natural sociability and morality are present in men and women. What has to be eliminated is the disgusting

moralizing which thwarts natural morality and then points to the criminal impulses, which it itself has brought into being." (Reich) (For a detailed critiquing of the 'roles' in role-playing, which accentuate the nature of man (placing them in a "positive" connotation) vs. those which accentuate the nature of God (placing them in a "negative" connotation) see the articles [A Cookbook for Humans](#) and [Deductive-Inductive Reasoning Part III](#).)

The patriarchal paradigm liberates a man from the ways of the world below to the ways of God above (spiritual: taught by that which is above and learned by faith and trust in that which is above, where belief in and chastening by higher authority produces or leads to obedience, producing a "peaceful fruit of righteousness," Hebrews 12:11—"unchangingness," where liberty is found in God's laws of restraint upon the depravity and despotism of human nature). I am making a broad statement here for most people, but for those "in the know," the socialist agenda is to negate the patriarchal paradigm of the traditional home (which is not righteous in and of itself, but uses the tools which promote the idea of righteousness, as in "Do what I tell you or else." or "Do things right or else," i.e. "... or else get punished.") and thereby negate the fear of God and the love of His Word from having any control over social action (praxis). It is what many in our government have understood, supported, and used for decades. It is about time the general public knew. The "contemporary" churches use the same system, if you haven't figured that out yet.

The following is a lengthy quotation (explained in greater detail in other articles) that is inserted here because of its importance. It explains why the uniting of the world is dependent upon the destruction of the traditional home, and the destruction of traditional business which proceeds from it (the structure of the home environment and the economic environment go hand in hand; read Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov's (Lenin's) speech below if you don't believe me). It also explains the effect government has had upon both the home and business when it intervenes, even for what appears to be 'good.' Warren Bennis, in his award winning book on business, wrote: "In order to effect rapid change, . . . [one] must mount a vigorous attack on the family lest the traditions of present generations be preserved. 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.

... any intervention between parent and child tend to produce familial democracy regardless of its intent. The consequences of family democratization take a long time to make themselves felt—but it would be difficult to reverse the process once begun. ... once the parent can in any way imagine his own orientation to be a possible liability to the child in the world approaching ... once uncertainty is created in the parent how best to prepare the child for the future, the authoritarian family is moribund, regardless of whatever countermeasures may be taken. The state, by its very interference in the life of its citizens, must necessarily undermine a parental authority which it attempts to restore.

Any non-family-based collectivity that intervenes between parent and child and attempts to regulate and modify the parent-child relationship will have a democratizing impact on that relationship. For however much the state or community may wish to inculcate obedience and submission in the child, its intervention betrays a lack of confidence in the only objects from whom a small child can learn authoritarian submission, an overweening interest in the future development of the child-- in other words, a child centered orientation." (Bennis) emphasis added

Have you noticed how many political 'conservatives' use the platform of "better" education and governmental help for the home and private business. Remember the old saying "Liar, liar, pants" In that line of thought, the old poem "Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall and all the king's horses and all the king's men could not put Humpty Dumpty back together again" was about the beheading of the King of France, and anyone else who thought patriarchal in paradigm. Once the head of the home is "beheaded," i.e. dethroned or the father abandons his office of authority, giving it over to the common-unity, the traditional home is "moribund." Freedom of patriarchal religion is negated in the heresiarchal religion of social-ism, in the "new" world order of things. "In a democratic society a patriarchal culture should make us depressed instead of glad; it is an argument against the higher possibilities of human nature, of self actualization." (Maslow, Maslow) "Human consciousness can be liberated from the parental complex only by being liberated from its cultural

derivatives, the paternalistic state and the patriarchal God." (Brown) Kenneth Benne wrote about the importance of keeping religion separated from science in the classroom (why role-playing, and "sensitivity training" which proceeds from it, is so important to the socialists—it is not that religion is negated it is just redefined through secular eyes, i.e. scientifically making it sensual and therefore 'human', i.e. the religion of human-ism). If the school system is to be used as a socialist laboratory and gain control over the electorate, the curriculum has to be under the control of the social engineers, they have to be in control of the school system (Bloom's Taxonomies are being used in the school systems today instead of the traditional teacher's "facts based" type of curriculum because of that very reason, i.e. socialists are in control of education, not the "electorate"—the electorate are so socialist today it does not matter, i.e. get out, i.e. home school, i.e. yet Diaprax has that covered also, i.e. read the article on [Home Schooling](#)). "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." (Benne, Society) The type of curriculum used in the classroom determines the type of paradigm the children will learn, the paradigm learned will be used by the next generation to set policy, how they will police themselves and others (their use of "sight based management" brings police state to mind), how they will identify and solve problems (how the next generation of citizens will think and act—determining worth or value of life, either by righteousness/spiritual or by pleasure/temporal, Bloom's Taxonomies have created the latter, being used in classrooms all around the world). The 'quest' for those who praxis the dialectical process is to produce the synthesis condition whereby both parties can be "persuaded" to 'change' from an "I'm right, your wrong" way of thinking, i.e. where both continue to embrace the patriarchal paradigm of 'rigidity' (with its [deductive](#) way of thinking, making decisions upon a priori commands and laws—principle based). The 'purpose' of the dialectical process is 'help encourage' opposing, antitheist parties to 'change' to a "What do we all have in common" way of thinking, i.e. where both parties embrace the heresiarchal paradigm of 'change' (with its [inductive](#) way of thinking, extrapolating from the environment only that information which is relevant to the 'moment' and in line with the hopes of the imagined future—interest

based). The rejection of the "closed" systems type of persuasion, which is intolerant of ambiguity, i.e. which uses physical force, inculcation, and/or withdrawal of "love" or fellowship when a person is openly disobedient, in an effort to produce right behavior (as in righteousness), must be "consciously" 'changed,' to the "open" system, by both parties 'willful' participation in the type of "persuasion" which uses tolerance of ambiguity, i.e. permissiveness of deviancy, the unrestrained and undirected dialoguing of opinions and theories (which means being socially directed and restrained), and "love," (as in an Eros-Agape, secular-sacred, private-public partnership which negates the individuals "freedom of the conscience" and his inalienable rights, dialectically replaced with the "super-ego" and "human rights"). Otherwise a social-ist, common-ist, common-unity behavior can not be produced. Socialism, communism, communitarianism, are all three somewhat different in application and manifestation but are all the same in their use of the dialectical process and in their outcome (totalitarianism).

The very praxis or act of participation within the dialectical environment changes the person's paradigm or way of thinking and acting. "By dialectic, I mean an activity of conscious, struggling to circumvent, the limitations imposed by the formal-logical law of contradiction." (Brown) The objective is not to take the patriarchal paradigm head on, that would keep the "I'm right, Your wrong" structure in place (a win-lose outcome, besides it might be stronger than you and might therefore defeat you, resulting in the parent chasing the rebellious child down and whopping him, thereby maintaining his office of authority and a system of "formal-logical laws of contradiction") but rather to seduce it into participation (in dialogue) within the dialectical environment through the use of crisis, facilitated meetings, and the consensus process (a win-win, socialist outcome where all lose their soul to the process, the individual soul, created by God, for God—righteousness, is sacrificed to the god of this world, the collective soul of humanity—sensuousness). Then, once the patriarch has become weakened by his participation, those once in support of the patriarch now turning against and those who were once under the patriarch, now liberated from the fear of, the heresiarchal can behead the patriarchal, with public approval or at least silence (fear of "What might happen to me if I speak up"), to keep from being next (that is why most

people won't support you in meetings, they see what's coming your way and they don't want to be next—the "freedom of the conscience" being negated by their fear of social rejection). As Ervin Laszlo, the "kingpin" for the environmentalist movement (the "greens," who in actuality are the "reds" in disguise; they are more 'user friendly,' non offensive, readily adaptable to 'change,' i.e. more deceptive than traditional Marxist but of the same family, i.e. dialectic) and the globalist tax on the environment, i.e. ozone, carbon footprint, overpopulation (for example: he believes that for the world to be healthy it should only have five hundred million people, seriously, consider that the next time you hear of national and world health care programs), which, in some way shape or form, you are now paying taxes to support (like being forced to buy your own rope to be hung with and being forced to dig your own grave to be buried in, that is if they bother to bury all of you, some body parts might still be usable, if they do it to the unborn, why not you, expedite, expedite, expedite), wrote: "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.... 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..." (Laszlo) This is a spiritual battle fought against "principalities, powers, rulers of darkness, and spiritual wickedness in high places" who use your flesh to war against your soul (they don't move you off your thesis position, you move yourself off by not taking and keeping on the whole armour of God (Ephesians 6:10-18). The battle is not yours to win, it is the Lords, you are simply to stand, and having done all to keep standing. Instead of preaching and teaching God's word, you got caught up in sharing your own opinions about it, you got caught up in dialogue (like Satan go Eve to do in the garden in Eden, Genesis 3:1-6), dialogue about your feelings of resentment toward being told what to do, being told what to say and how to feel as a child, now as an adult your resentment toward authority and restraint being put into practice as you are liberated by being "positive" toward your "fellow man" (that is all that consensus is all about). "Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which

war against the soul;" 1 Peter 2:11 "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."

Ephesians 6:12

But when both parties continue to use their thesis position to define and therefore determine what is of value or worth, refusing to change their values or position within "joint deliberation," when their "non-influencability of private convictions" (non-influencability meaning not 'driven' by sensuousness, i.e. human feelings) inhibit or block social harmony (forcing majority vote, or top-down decisions, and the limiting of government, i.e. providing there is "liberty of conscience" or a conscience to have liberty with), they must be perceived as a "vice" (perceived as being the enemy of 'change') and either be 'converted' with their 'willful' participation in the process of 'change' or be "extruded" from the meeting (the fellowship being 'right sized'). It is therefore up to those who think dialectically, those who are "struggling to circumvent the limitations imposed" by those using the patriarchal paradigm (circumventing those who are calling for righteousness)—those who are "struggling" are working for social harmony, "struggling" to overcome the "limitations imposed" by those who use the thesis condition to determine right from wrong, by using the antithesis condition, using the crisis and the tension of the conflict or "controversy" caused by the "irrational" thesis minded person, to initiate and sustain a dialectical environment, whereby the opposing parties (the frozen) can be manipulated into focusing upon their feelings, and others feelings (be unfrozen; "This term [unfreezing], also adopted from Lewinian change theory, refers to the process of disconfirming an individual's former belief system." Yalom; "In brief, unfreezing is the breaking down of the mores, customs and traditions of an individual – the old ways of doing things – so that he is ready to accept new alternatives." Schein), and thereby be more easily moved (changing) into a consensus (synthesis) outcome (be refrozen, but this time with the "shifting sands" of feelings to guide him in making future decisions, now adaptable to 'change,' able to be blown by the winds of 'change,' subject to the "prince of the power of the air" (Ephesians 2:2); "A successful change includes, therefore, three aspects: unfreezing the present level, moving to the new level, and freezing group life on the new level." Kurt Lewin). "We

must develop persons who see non-influenceability of private convictions in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue." (Benne) The scriptures warn: "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Timothy 3, 4 "Fables," i.e. men's opinions or feelings (polls, surveys, feasibility studies, etc.) 'driving' them in their thoughts and in their actions.

The thesis person, "the individual who uses fundamentalist religious views in the service of denial," in denial of his carnal nature ("refusing to be who he really is," according to dialectical reasoning) and thereby feels free in condemning the carnal nature of others, in a synthesis environment, is perceived as being a "deviant," (personally I am in "denial" every day. That is: denying myself, picking up my cross, and following Jesus daily —Luke 9:3, and if deviant means peculiar then I am that also —Titus 2:4). Irvin Yalom wrote, concerning counseling the "deviant" who is in "denial" (refusing to know himself for who he really is, i.e. a 'good' person if given the 'right' opportunity, placed in the 'right' environment): "It is important that the therapist attempt to screen out patients [students, committee members, employees, parents, legislatures, judges, etc. with absolutes, i.e. who demonstrate "non-influenceability of private convictions"] who will become marked deviants, deviants because of their interpersonal behavior [rigidity in principle] in the group sessions [those who put principles before pleasure, God's law above man's nature, righteousness above human relationships, Christ above men] and not because of a deviant life style or past history [homosexual can help the group develop in a 'healthy' way, as he later explained in his book]." "There is no type of past behavior too deviant for a group to accept once therapeutic group norms are established [once man has become the measure of all things, accepting of his feelings in guiding him]." "the deviant [the religious]... correlates very highly with negative outcome: a member deemed by the others ... to be 'out' of the group has virtually no chance of benefiting from the group and a strong chance of suffering harm." "The successful leader ... reinforces each member's activity ... escort the deviant back into the group, and he discourages the development of scapegoating and judgmentalism." "One of the most difficult patients for me to work with in groups is the individual

who employs fundamentalist religious views in the service of denial." "Communication toward a deviant is very great initially and then drops off sharply as the group rejects the deviant. Eventually, the group will extrude the deviant. They may smile at one another when he speaks or behaves irrelevantly; they will mascot him, they will ignore him rather than invest the necessary time to understand his interventions." (Yalom) The scriptures warn us: "For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves: but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise." II Corinthians 10:12 and encourage us: "Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake." Luke 6:22

In dialectical thinking, the way of thinking (or environmental condition or paradigm or system) which initiates and sustains opposing positions —antithesis ("I'm right, your wrong")—is negated by creating an environment (usually utilizing a crisis) whereby opposing parties, attempting to hold onto their thesis position (their belief) can be facilitated into consensus, where both parties, insisting that their position is right and therefore that their opponent's position is wrong, i.e. where both parties, basing their thoughts, feelings, and actions upon pre-established principles, i.e. rules, standards, and laws which were established by a higher authority than their nature (carnal behavior), where both parties, obeying laws which go against or limit their human nature (that nature which is common to mankind), "create" an authority figure higher than human nature (remember this is dialectical thinking), "create" an authority figure which is not sensually based, "create" an authority figure not carnal in nature, "create" an authority figure and a way of thinking which is not in harmony with man's sensual needs, "create" an authority figure who is hostile to a person's feelings of the moment, indifferent to his sensual perceptions, and limiting of his sensual experiences (an authority figure who is antagonistic toward attributes which are common to all of mankind). (The idea is, if you "created" a particular way of thinking by your participation in the repression of your nature, then by your refusal to participate in the repression of your nature you can "un-create" it.) "The more of himself man attributes to God, the less he has left in himself." (Karl Marx in

Bottomore) "Man has only to understand himself, to take himself as the measure of all aspects of life, to judge according to his being, to organise the world in a truly human manner according to the demands of his own nature, and he will have solved the riddle of our time." (Engels,) "The only practically possible emancipation is the unique theory which holds that man is the supreme being for man." (Marx, Critique) Leonard Wheat wrote of Paul Tillich's—man is god—dialectical form of Christianity (Gnostic christianity—where all men are perceived as being gods, "divine sparks' of god" waiting to be reunited, "teamed up" as one, and thus god is all men becoming as one, i.e. god is becoming as one as men are becoming as one; "As above, so below" in theory and in practice, becoming one not only in thought but also in action, both initiated and sustained by their sensuous bond to nature,—'driven' by that which is positive, the pleasures which nature arouses, which is common to all men, he finds his 'purpose' in the praxis of unity, uniting the individual and society upon the pleasures of man's sensuous nature, creating a "new world order" of "equality," built upon the liberation of the pleasures of this world by the negation of the "old world order" with its negative, inequality, judgmental, "top-down" system, the negation of the restrainers and their restraints upon human nature, not just for a few but for all; "Equality of Opportunity becomes ever greater with the weakening of family power." Coleman "A new world is not built by changing the 'old' to the 'old' ..., but ... by freeing the child to build his generation from his new blueprint." Brookover "Every effort must be made and all means employed to guard future generations against the influence of the rigidity of the old generation." "The principle weapon on the arsenal of freedom is each new generation's tremendous urge to be free. The possibility of social freedom rests essentially upon this weapon and not upon anything else." Reich): "Tillich is actually directing an apologetic humanistic message to a Christian audience. He is telling those Christians who can hear that they can accept humanism without relinquishing Christianity if they will accept man as the true meaning of God." (Wheat) The human desire (sensuousness) for unity and harmony "amongst men" (so you can get whatever it is you want from the environment, after all is said and done, its as the preacher said, vanity) is dialectically perceived as being similar to God's desire for unity and harmony with man, the desire for unity being the 'driving' force and unity.

being the 'purpose,' the unity is initiated and sustained in the desire (the sensuousness) and the 'purpose' is initiated and sustained in the 'drive,' the desire, that desire which is from the heart of man is guiding the mind in discovering the 'purpose' (the dialectical justification) of man, i.e. "the imagination of the heart of man" (which is deceitful and wicked) put into praxis; "... the aesthetic dimension and the corresponding feeling of pleasure ... is the center of the mind linking the 'lower' faculties of sensuousness, (Sinnlichkeit) to morality ... – the two poles of human existence." "In the aesthetic imagination, sensuousness generates universally valid principles for an objective order. The two main categories defining this order are 'purposiveness without purpose' — i.e. beauty, 'lawfulness without law' — i.e. freedom. 'Zweckmässigkeit ohne Zweck; Gesetzmässigkeit ohne Gesetz'" "Whatever the object may be (thing or flower, animal or man), it is represented and judged not in terms of its usefulness, not according to any purpose it may possible serve, and also not in view of its 'internal' finality and completeness." (Marcuse) The 'purpose' is not found in God, i.e. or in any object, but is found in the 'drive' itself (in the "beauty" of sensuousness and the "freedom" of spontaneity), in the 'lust' itself, 'discovering' itself in its 'quest' for union with the world (all the sensuousness and spontaneity of human nature becoming one in praxis — like Sodom and Gomorrha , even God's Holy angels have to participate in the praxis of abomination if the feeling of oneness, the feeling of peace and harmony, is to be attained or retained). Instead of "demons" fighting against the kingdom of God they now inhibiting or blocking the kingdom of mankind (renamed the kingdom of God to deceive those ignorant of Satan's devices), those who serve in righteousness now being perceived as being "demons"]." "Demonism concerns man's attitude toward others. Estrangement describes the condition of man which results from the Demonism of his fellow man. Humanism asserts that the test of human conduct must be found in human experience; concern for man replaces concern about pleasing God. Humanism elevates man to the rank of God." "Tillich's message is that God is man, mankind, humanity." "Sin is the estrangement of man from man." (Wheat) "Alienation is the experience of 'estrangement' (Verfremdung) from others, . . ." "Alienation has a long history. Its most radical sense already appears in the biblical expulsion from Eden."

"Alienation, according to Feuerbach, derives from the externalization (Entausserung) of human powers and possibilities upon a non-existent entity: God. . ." "God is thus the anthropological source of alienation . . ." (Bronner)

Dialectically, any authority which is not carnal in nature (therefore is not measurable by polls, surveys, and feasibility studies and therefore is not able to be manipulated or influenced by nature—not synergistically viable), any thought or action which is not determining or creating value or worth based upon the sensual nature of man—that of man approaching pleasure and avoiding pain (the liberation of that which is natural to man is found in pleasure or license, which is positive and the restraining of that which is natural to man is found in pain or tension, which is negative, "angst")—must be considered spiritual in nature (anything restraining the nature must be perceived as being non-sensual, non-natural, "other worldly" in character; "Philosophy as theory . . . establishes the basis of its reality as praxis [the human sensual experience of oneness]; it serves to distinguish it from religion, the wisdom of the other world." Marx, Critique) and therefore is not rationally understandable (not experiential) and not applicable (not practical) to all parties who are concerned about and involved in solving (through praxis) the personal-social issue or crisis of life (all of which is perceived, dialectically, as proceeding only from nature, being sensual). Spiritual authority initiates and sustains a top-down system or way of thinking which inhibits or blocks human nature, and therefore, in dialectical thinking, must be negated in both the thoughts and the actions of all mankind, negated through the application of the dialectical process in all issues of personal and social life.

The dialectical logic is: social experience gives human life meaning, thus life is social, i.e. sensual, in nature. If all issues of life are social in nature then any thoughts or actions which inhibit or block social life, sensual life, must be recognized and responded to as an enemy to life. Therefore all anti-social thoughts and actions must be negated by everyone's participation in the praxis of the dialectical process. When all are working together, as one, in the annihilation of the patriarchal paradigm, which is perceived as the initiator and sustainer of social disharmony, then peace and affirmation has come to all men. It is in the praxis of destroying the old that the new is created, that that which was new at conception, i.e.

peace, affirmation, and growth, is liberated in the destruction of the old, liberated from that which is of the past (for an explanation see Diaprax Article explaining Freud's "[primal horde and the deformation of civilization](#)"). Jesus preached and taught of a way of thinking and acting which is higher than social harmony. "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me." Matthew 10:32-38 While the home is important in scripture, honoring father and mother having the first promise given by God, it is not equal with or greater than God, i.e. children are to obey their parents, in the Lord (all are under God: the father, the mother, and the children). It is the patriarchal structure of the home, under God, which is of issue today. The new world order can not function with it still in place, "spewing out" patriarchal children (future parents, businessmen, legislators, educators, and voters) placing their trust in and obeying God rather than trusting in and serving a society of men (even doing "wonderful things" for God).

By "encouraging" both parties to focus upon that which they have in common, in regards to personal interest (those interests which all parties concerned have in common), their common interest ("their common ground of existence") being "discovered" through the praxis of dialogue (and the dialogue of praxis —dialoguing dialogue, dialoguing our "sense experiences" which are moving us to dialogue within ourselves, "Why are we asking why?" as in "Why can't I ...?" to someone else while murmuring to ourselves "I ought to be able to", with the desire of negating the "not" in the "can not" so that we "can" have what it is that we naturally desire to have or do what we naturally want to do), all parties can "openly" and in an "uncoerced" fashion (in a non-judgmental, non right-wrong, non "can not, must not, 'thou shalt not,'" non-patriarchal environment), i.e. can

"rationally" (sensually and spontaneously) discuss their personal thoughts, feelings, and natural actions (impulses) concerning the issue of life, i.e. exposing their personal thoughts, feelings, and life experiences concerning resentment toward authoritarian restraints, which others can identify and relate to — "In the dialogic relation of recognizing oneself in the other, they experience the common ground of their existence." (Habermas, Knowledge) "Only by bringing out the [persons] own ideas in dialogical and dialectical settings can the [person] begin to reconstruct and progressively transcend concepts ["transcend" a top-down, right-wrong, "negative," patriarchal way of thinking]." (Paul) In the collective voice of "can to," the voice of "can not" is more easily negated. "It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately." (Kurt Lewin in Bennie) The common identity (that which is identifiable by all in the group), is the individual's resentment toward higher authority when higher authority restrains his natural or normal human desires (the common human 'ought' being identified by all in the group) is the key to controlling the individual and society for the purpose of 'change,' i.e. the 'change' being the change of paradigms. It is therefore imperative that those who praxis the dialectical process are free to initiate and sustain an environment where all participants can "feel" free (have a "safe zone") to expose their dissatisfactions toward the patriarchal paradigm. "What is particularly important here is that recognition of one's own individuality is the basis for recognition of the individuality of everyone, and for the democratic concept of the dignity of man. The individual may have 'secret' thoughts which he will under no circumstances reveal to anyone else if he can help it. To gain access is particularly important, for here may lie the individual's potential." (Adorno) By getting all parties to participate in "joint deliberation," incorporating, through dialogue, their personal feelings and thoughts, not only on the social issue at hand but also regarding their feelings and thoughts toward one another (up to the point of severance), it is possible to unite opposing parties upon the personal feelings and thoughts which they have in common (common-ism), resulting in a condition known as "synthesis." "The desired condition is synthesis, the elimination of contradiction and conflict between thesis and antithesis. Conflict between thesis and antithesis bring about a restructuring that reduces or eliminates

(negates) the conflict [that is eliminates the source of the conflict, the patriarchal paradigm]." (Richardson, George P., Feedback Thought in Social Science and Systems Theory as quoted in Judy McLemore, The Architects of Total Quality Management General Systems Theory and Marxist [Theory-Praxis](https://authorityresearch.com/Sources/Total Quality Management - General Systems Theory - Marxist Theory-Praxis by JudyMcLemore.pdf); authorityresearch.com/Sources/Total Quality Management - General Systems Theory - Marxist Theory-Praxis by JudyMcLemore.pdf)

Thus truth is no longer found in some pre-established dictum or person which or who is not in harmony with the common human experience (truth is no longer found in the "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 14:6 person, since no one is interested in "coming to the Father," i.e. no one is concerned about doing his will on earth as it is done in Heaven, obeying him without question, even when it goes against their nature, especially when it results in the loss of human relationships and the pleasures of this life, i.e. involving the lost esteem from others and the pleasures of the world), but truth is instead dialectically discovered as lying within each person, waiting to be liberated, "knowable" only within the peace and harmony ("peace and affirmation") of the collaborative "moment." As the famous Italian Transformational Marxist, Antonio Gramsci put it: "Truth is a moment in correct praxis." (Gramsci) Truth and facts, therefore, can only become manifest through the praxis of the dialectical process (not "as given" by God, making them "absolute or sacred," but as discovered through "dialectical examination" and knowable by human experience, making them "relative" to human experience which is dialectically liberated from Godly restraint), the same process Satan used on the woman in the garden in Eden (Genesis 3:1-6), the same process she 'willingly' participated in, with Adam following. "In order to progress from these 'facts' to facts in the true meaning of the word it is necessary to perceive their historical conditioning as such and to abandon the point of view that would see them as immediately given: they must themselves be subjected to a historical and dialectical examination." (Lukács', History) Bloom, paraphrasing Karl Marx, wrote: "But, as has been pointed out before, 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." (Bloom, Book 1: Cognitive Domain) Karl Marx wrote: "In the eyes of the dialectical

philosophy, nothing is established for all time, nothing is absolute or sacred." Diaprax is the praxis of dialectically building a world which is united upon the common thoughts and actions of, by, and for the human "moment," where truth is no longer found in pre-established conditions but within the collective moment of consensus, where human thoughts and actions recreate man in his own image (imagination), where man, becoming himself as he unites within the consensus 'moment,' discovers that it is in the 'sensuous moment' of oneness with himself and mankind (with nature and the world) where truth resides, to which the scriptures respond: "... let God be true, but every man a liar; ..." Romans 3:4 "The lip of truth shall be established for ever: but a lying tongue is but for a moment." Proverbs 12:19).

The philosopher Hegel wrote, concerning man's "quest" for "peace and affirmation": "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 in Friedrich) This is the ideology of the social sciences, i.e. psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc., i.e. "the contemporary, "church growth," "emergent church," etc., which is based upon human "sense experience." i.e. "sensuous feelings," and "sense perception." This the humanistic process of cutting off the head of righteousness (preaching and teaching) and replacing it with the head of sensuousness (dialogue), then calling it the head of 'righteousness,' blinding the person from that righteousness which can only come from God above. According to Hegel, the antithesis condition is simply two 'rights' waiting to be discover through speculation and dialogue (the negation of the system of righteousness, faith in "things as given") as being one 'right,' both becoming one ('righteous,' i.e. "positive") in the speculative, dialogical 'moment' of discovering their oneness. While Kant attempted to separated reasoning from righteousness, i.e. 'purify' reasoning, and Hegel attempted to make righteousness subject to reasoning, i.e. reasoning subject to the spirit of rational 'righteousness' liberating reasoning from 'irrational' (non-sensual, non-speculative) righteousness, i.e. judgmental righteousness, Marx set out to negate righteousness once and for all by putting reasoning (the system of

sensuousness 'justified') into praxis against righteousness, making all things, i.e. 'reality,' subject to sensuousness, i.e. subject to the 'scientific' process, the dialectical process (putting speculation, i.e. thought into action). Karl Marx wrote: "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." (Marx, MEGA I/3) Science, when applied to the "felt needs" of the flesh, the perception of the eyes, and the pride of man's 'reasoning' abilities i.e. human 'reasoning' can only justify carnal human behavior, justify its lusts, justify that behavior which is "only" of nature, that nature which can be scientifically analyzed and manipulated, i.e. that nature which is "observable and describable," and therefore manipulatable, that nature which is common to all men—that which is sensuous and spontaneous, when it is uninhibited by unsympathetic, non-sensual, judgmental, threatening, "negating," etc. restrainers from above, i.e. God over man, parents over children, business owners over employees, teachers over the students, etc. Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud are united upon the "science" of human behavior, in the field of individual and social behavior (both seen as one) and man's ability to 'justify' behavior based upon human sensuousness. "Freud saw that in the id there is no negation [no God or parent above restraining it], only affirmation and eternity. The instinctual reality is Dionysian drunkenness 'We can come nearer to the id with images, and call it a chaos, a cauldron of seething excitement.'" (Brown) "In psychology, Freud and his followers have presented convincing arguments that the id, man's basic and unconscious nature, is primarily made up of instincts which would, if permitted expression, result in incest, murder, and other crimes." "The whole problem of therapy, as seen by this group, is how to hold these untamed forces in check in a wholesome and constructive manner, rather than in the costly fashion of the neurotic." (Rogers) "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." (Brown) "Every neurosis is an example of dynamic adaptation;

it is essentially an adaptation to such external conditions as are in themselves irrational and, generally speaking, unfavorable to the growth of the child." ". . . Definition of religious experience as experience of absolute dependence is the definition of the masochistic experience in general." (Fromm) "Religion, especially the Protestant Christian tradition, has permeated our culture with the concept that man is basically sinful, and only by something approaching a miracle can his sinful nature be negated." (Rogers) "Work done by Horkheimer in the thirties identified 'neurosis as a social product, in which the family was seen as a primary agent of repressive socialization.'" (Bronner) Horkheimer headed up the Institute for Social Research while it was here in the States. Adorno and Fromm were members of that institution. Adorno and Fromm both were the Weltanschauung or paradigm of what are called "Bloom's Taxonomies," which every certified teacher is trained to apply in the classroom and every school must use to be accredited.

It is the affirmation of the sensual nature of man (his "Id," the "child within") which moves all of philosophy ("human reasoning," "higher order thinking skills" in morals and ethics), keeping alive man's effort, as begun in the garden in Eden, to free himself from Godly restraint (attempting to free himself from God's wrath upon the children of disobedience —dialectically minded children attempting to justify their sinful nature by 'scientifically' redefining it as normal). "There is, in this tradition, a strong affirmation of a common morality, one rooted in the Enlightenment ["The ideas of the Enlightenment taught man that he could trust his own reason as a guide to establishing valid ethical norms and that he could rely on himself, needing neither revelation nor that authority of the church in order to know good and evil." "All concepts that are irreducible to facts [concepts which are imperceptible, i.e. non-sensual to and judgmental of human nature] are meaningless." "Everything that is not reducible to number becomes illusion for the Enlightenment." (Bronner) "Enlightenment is man's release from his self-incurred tutelage. Tutelage is man's inability to make use of his understanding without direction from another. Self-incurred is this tutelage when its cause lies not in lack of reason but in lack of resolution and courage to use it without direction from another. Sapere Aude! Dare to know! 'Have courage to use your own reason!'- that is the motto of enlightenment." (Immanuel Kant, Konigsberg

in Prussia, 30 September 1784) In other words, have courage to question (critique) authority and counter its demands when they inhibit or block your human ability, and therefore your human 'right,' to reason for yourself in regards to what is good and what is evil; to critique higher authority is to negate higher authority (is to negate faith in higher authority); to critique is to evaluate another person's thesis (or God's thesis, as was done in the garden in Eden), to see whether it is 'true' or not (to see whether it is rational or not) from your own perspective, i.e. basing 'truth' upon your own "sensuous needs," your own "sense perception," i.e. your own "sense experiences," and then acting upon only that which is in agreement with your nature, only that which is perceived as being 'rational,' disregarding the rest as being irrelevant to the situation at hand, being perceived as being 'irrational'—situation ethics, "A tradition, ... rooted in the Enlightenment"] and then applied in the United States through our commitments to liberal democracy." (Alan Wolfe, *Religious Diversity and the Common Cause*) Wolfe writes, regarding those who think dialectically, "that because good citizens ought to be thoughtful and deliberative ones, public schools can legitimately turn down requests by fundamentalist parents not to have their children exposed to literature they consider irreligious or immoral. (Macedo goes further and suggests that liberal democracies ought to prevent fundamentalist parents from enrolling their children in private schools that teach from a fundamentalist perspective.)" *ibid.* Benjamin Bloom wrote in his "Taxonomy," which is used to certify teachers and accredit schools: "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 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." (Bloom, *Book I: Cognitive Domain*) In other words, basing outcome upon the

classroom environment (how it was developed by the curriculum used), did the traditional classroom environment (using "lower order thinking skills" in morals and ethics, teaching facts and respect for authority) produce the intended student behavior of respect toward higher authority and obedience (the patriarchal paradigm it was aiming to develop) and did the transformational, dialectical classroom environment (using "higher order thinking skills" in morals and ethics, dialoguing opinions) produce the intended student behavior of questioning authority and 'change' (the heresiarchal paradigm it was aiming to develop). If not, then the curriculum, the application of it, or some other element (the school staff, the students' associations, or the parent/parents) inhibited or blocked the paradigm desired. Many traditional minded teachers unwittingly use the "Taxonomy" not knowing that by their use of it in their classrooms they destroy the traditional-minded student's way of thinking, freeing him from the "customary type of behavior," enlightening him to "think for himself," manipulating him, like elements in a laboratory, into becoming a citizen of a "new world order." Fulfilling what both Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud desired, the negation of the patriarchal paradigm in the hope of a "better world," a human/humane world.

Rather than focusing upon that which divides (a right-wrong, above-below, "negative" way of looking at things, i.e. where a thesis position produces an antithesis condition within a diverse society, i.e. dialectically, the issue is not whether the person's thesis is right or wrong, it is that the thesis system itself is wrong) people are instead to be "encouraged" (pressured by the social environmental forces of the meeting, where all parties are "encouraged" to work together in solving the crisis through the praxis of consensus and not by majority vote, i.e. where all are being "driven" by their human nature and not by some pre-established principle, i.e. "driven" by the desire or "felt" need for approval by others and not by the desire to be pleasing to God or parent, i.e. "driven" by the fear of losing respect in the eyes of others and not the fear of God, driven by the fear of losing what you "need" or "want" as the result of losing the respect they need or want from others who can satisfy those needs or wants, trusting upon man rather than trusting upon God) to be "positive" (applying their energy in attacking the crisis as "one" people, where all are 'driven' by one common interest, united upon a common 'purpose,' so that all parties are perceived as being

"right" or affirmative in their collaborative actions, i.e. engendering a synthesis condition and outcome) and not "negative" (applying their energy in attacking one another's position to maintain their position as being a categorically imperative —unquestionable and universally right—and therefore maintaining for themselves—and submitting others—under "their" higher authority, a higher authority than human nature, an authority forever established as the source for solving crisis, i.e. "This is the way we have always done it." whether it be God or a parent, i.e. maintaining a thesis condition which limits or blocks the human experience). As Carl Rogers put it, concerning the process's affect upon people: "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?'" "Neither the Bible nor the prophets, neither the revelations of God can take precedence over my own direct experience." "Experience is, for me, the highest authority." "The individual in such a moment, is coming to be what he is. He has experienced himself. He has become what he is." "Existential living is to say that the self and personality emerge from experience. It means that one becomes a participant in and an observer of the ongoing process of organismic experience." (Rogers) To which can be added Abraham Maslow statement: "The person at the peak experience is godlike . . . complete, loving, uncondemning, compassionate and accept[ing] of the world and of the person." (Maslow, Being)

As all parties "willingly" put into practice (praxis) that which they have in common (united upon their feelings of acceptance toward and affirmation from one another) against the crisis, they initiate and sustain a "positive" outcome, creating "positive social change" as they neutralize, marginalize, and convert, silence, or remove a "negative" outcome, i.e. as they negate or destroy the "negative" right-wrong, above-below, thesis way of thinking and acting by getting the party with the thesis position to participate in the synthesis way of thinking and acting. To create is to destroy. The act of philosophy, the act of creating a "new" world order, is an act of destruction, the act of destroying the "old" world order. Philosophy is being dissatisfied with the way things are and thinking about how the world 'ought' to be. Abraham Maslow wrote on the necessity of 'ought' in the act of philosophy: "We have to study the conditions which maximize

ought-perceptiveness." "Oughtness is itself a fact to be perceived." "If we wish to permit the facts to tell us their oughtness, we must learn to listen to them in a very specific way which can be called Taoistic." (Maslow, Human Nature) Philosophy is the person seeking to negate the restraints, i.e. the can not's of life (the "thou shalt not's" of the Father, which expose man's sinful nature and therefore condemn him), i.e. restraints to the natural way of doing things, limiting life, forbidding things in his life which he perceives as being 'good.' Not produces ought which leads to thought. A not from the parent or God which limits "life," preventing us from pursuing and fulfilling our natural human desires, produces an ought within us, as in how the parent or God ought to be in harmony with our worldly desires, which is the action of thought within us (the parent or God must change with man's "felt" needs if the world is to be the way it "ought" to be, i.e. human). This is the necessary condition for initiation and sustentation of philosophy. As Hegel explained it: "Philosophy is a free and not self-seeking activity, ... This activity 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 of life to reflection and conception. The result of this is that it lays hold of and troubles this real, substantial kind of existence, this morality and faith, and thus the period of destruction commences." "It may be said that Philosophy first commences when a race for the most part has left its concrete life, when separation and change of class have begun, and the people approach toward their fall; when a gulf has arisen between inward strivings and external reality, and the old forms of Religion, &c., are no longer satisfying; when Mind manifests indifference to its living existence or rests unsatisfied therein, and moral life becomes dissolved." "Then it is that Mind takes refuge in the clear space of thought to create for itself a kingdom of thought in opposition to the world of actuality, and Philosophy is the reconciliation following upon the destruction of that real world which thought has begun." (Hegel's Lectures on the History of Philosophy Introduction B. Relation of Philosophy to Other Departments of Knowledge) The person must be freed from the restraints of the condition he seeks to be freed from, he must be at least free to question (destroy) it not only in his imagination and thoughts but also in his actions, if he is to "reorganize his personal beliefs and attitudes." "To create

effectively a new set of attitudes and values, the individual must undergo great reorganization of his personal beliefs and attitudes and he must be involved in an environment which in many ways is separated from the previous environment in which he was developed." (Krathwohl, Book 2: Affective Domain) Instead of belief controlling (inhibiting or blocking the satisfaction of) the person's "sensuous needs" and "sense perception," "sensuous needs" and "sense perception" ("sense experience" or a person's carnal nature and the world) influences his belief. The objective is to negate the thesis condition, a condition which initiates and sustains an antithesis condition, a condition where people perceive things differently (because of their limited "sense experiences," due to the controlling factor of belief upon their lives, they quickly judge others according to their belief and attempt to continue the limitation of their own "sense experiences," by controlling, inhibiting or blocking, the "sense experiences" of the other person), not by attacking the thesis position directly (attacking the belief) but rather by attacking the antithesis condition instead (attacking the "negative attitude" of the person, which is producing tension and "controversy," i.e. social disharmony). To suspend belief for the "moment," to be tolerant of ambiguity, i.e. tolerant of confusion, affectively negates the thesis condition, especially when all participants focus upon what they have in common and come into synthesis —consensus. Diaprax creates a condition called "the negation of negation," the annihilation of the patriarchal paradigm, or patricide (all three being the same). "Working through the resistances to change is the key to the production of change" (Yalom) Only by bringing the thesis minded person into participation in the synthesis process can he be helped in overcoming (helped in "negating") his "resistance to change." If he did not 'willingly' participate, it's not done.

It is important to note that the word "moment" can be used both as a time in space and a space in time. Thus when you think that you are suspending your belief for a moment of time, thinking that you are simply being courteous for a period of time, you are also suspending your belief for a moment in space, suspending your belief for the experiencing of a moment of pleasure (the absence of tension), a tangible "moment," a "quality moment," where you are enjoying, or hope to enjoy, the affirmation of others and peace. Why did you suspend your belief? For the approval of

others? Thinking that then they then might listen to your belief? The truth is, the approval of others, for whatever reason, was more important to you than your belief. You can not suspend your belief and be a witness of it at the same time. You can not suspend your thesis position for the sake of removing the antithesis condition, even for a moment in time, and keep your thesis position. By suspending your thesis position for the "moment," you are producing a synthesis "moment," a space in time where you are experiencing social harmony at the expense of your belief (you are no longer denying yourself, nor picking up your cross and following Jesus, even though you think that what you are doing is being done for him. You think? The truth being you are denying him "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." 1 Peter 2:24)

Once a person contemplates setting aside his belief for the 'purpose' of social harmony he goes into a condition known as cognitive dissonance. Cognitive dissonance is a situation (a space in time) where belief (desire to do what is right, right according to a higher authority than carnal nature, i.e. restraining impulses, natural desires, or lusts) and behavior (impulses, natural desire or lust for things of this world, i.e. human approval) come into conflict; cognitive dissonance is "the lack of harmony between what one does and what one believes." "The pressure to change either one's behavior or one's belief." (Hilgard) Cognitive dissonance is where the there-and-then belief (cognition of established truth —belief, which gives a person stability in a "rapidly 'changing,' unstable world") is destabilized by his here-and-now desires (desires which are brought into motion, being sensitized through the situation). To resolve this dilemma he must either return to his belief (deny himself and follow Jesus) and accept social rejection (pick up his cross and follow Jesus, despising the shame of the cross, not the gospel) or go in the direction of social approval and compromise his belief system (esteeming himself, consenting to social approval and not follow Jesus, putting down the cross to save his life —of sensuousness, despising the gospel), making belief less important than human relationship (making faith less important than human reasoning). He is not compromising just his belief, which he is aware of (emotionally if not cognitively), he is also compromising the very system of belief itself, i.e. faith, which he may not be aware of until it is too late. Group pressure

appears to be more effective in producing cognitive dissonance than individual events. "... few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity [their belief] in the face of apparent group unanimity; and the individual rejects critical feelings toward the group at this time to avoid a state of cognitive dissonance. To question the value or activities of the group, would be to thrust himself into a state of dissonance. Long cherished but self-defeating beliefs and attitudes may waver and decompose in the face of a dissenting majority." (Yalom)

After encounters with group pressure and cognitive dissonance, (where people have moved against their belief, their identity, their morals and their constituents, i.e. those of like mind in principles who put their trust in them to represent those principles and therefore betrayed them at the facilitated consensus meeting), some have contemplated or even committed suicide, like Judas Iscariot who betrayed Jesus and then "Repented" (repenting only to himself and not before God), after these meetings when they did not receive 'proper' counseling —deprogramming —during and after the meetings, i.e. were not properly affixed to the group, i.e. not accepting of the group concept and its project (while not choosing Rome, the community, over Jesus, they did not return to Jesus, repenting, "Godly sorrow," before Him)—not having developed hope in the group and its 'purpose' and projects, while losing faith in God and His Word, i.e. not just losing faith in their belief but also losing faith in the system of belief itself (the system of self now in place, they are like a stalled plane, spiraling out of control, being tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine while on their way to destruction, still hoping that all is OK, or at least that the problems of life will work themselves out, without life in Christ, it is the only hope you have, i.e. hope in yourself or hope in the community, i.e. both of the world, it just depends on whether you want company or not on the way to destruction). "Hope for a better world depends upon how successfully people find common grounds when they are needed." "These three phases are: (1) the formulation of purpose—forming a desired end, a desired state of affairs, a preferred and chosen goal; (2) the description of existing conditions—getting the facts, defining relationships, noting possibilities; and (3) the formation of a plan of action—steps which promise best to transform existing conditions into conditions that are desired." (Benne) All this being done to undermine the patriarchal way of making decisions and

solving problems.

Imagine it, design it, and then apply it, this is the praxis of the "imagination of the heart" of man creating a "better world" for himself. The truth is there is no "better world" of man's own making. "More perfect union" is the banner over the broad path which leads to destruction. The process is possible because of the belief-action dichotomy which resides within all of us, what the Apostle Paul explained in Romans 7, where our desires (affective wanting) of the flesh war against our desire (cognitive wanting) to do God's will. The difference being, belief-action dichotomy (where we don't always act according to our belief, our action driven by the temptations of the world around us and our participation in it), is not done with the intention of destroying our belief system (we keep our affective domain subject to the cognitive domain, keeping them separated, thereby keeping the psychomotor domain predominately subject to the cognitive domain while following after the affective domain when we 'feel' like or think we won't get caught—the conscience staying intact, making us feel guilty afterward) while the other (cognitive-dissonance) is orchestrated by facilitators with the evil intent of destroying our belief system (destroying the system of faith —righteousness) through the use of social pressure, the desire for social approval (group dynamics; approach social approval —pleasure and avoid social disapproval —pain), to get us to 'willingly' participate in the social action system, the praxis system (the system of sight —sensuousness), i.e. to choose humanity over God, i.e. the heresiarchal paradigm of 'change' (sensuousness and spontaneity) not just over and against the patriarchal paradigm (faith, belief, obedience, and chastening) but in the praxis of annihilating the patriarchal paradigm through the praxis of dialectically, 'rationally,' uniting our affective, cognitive, and psychomotor domains in social action, wiping the patriarchal paradigm off the earth, once and for all, i.e. putting God and his 'closed' system to death (treating it as "irrelevant" in feelings, thought, and action) by bringing the 'open' system into social life ("out of the closet") through the consensus process ('discovering' and doing, theory and practice, only by consensus). The one system (faith, scripture, Christ, and grace —righteousness) is anathema to the other (sight, wisdom, humanity, and self-social justification —sensuousness). By the church's use of polls and surveys (sight), consensus (human wisdom), community (humanity),

and social projects (self-social justification) it becomes anathema to the gospel (sight replaces faith, human opinions replaces scripture, human needs and community replaces Christ, and social works replaces God's grace —sensuousness replaces righteousness in knowing purpose. In the one Christ is purpose, while in the other man initiates and sustains 'purpose,' making it in his image, thereby his nature 'driving' 'purpose,' even doing it "in the name of Jesus" to deceive all into participation in the dialectical process).

"Self-perfection of the human individual is fulfilled in union with the world in pleasure." (Brown) The "self-perfection of the human individual" (his "self actualization" Abraham Maslow) can not be "fulfilled" without the removal or negation of the thesis condition, the negation of the "negative," judgmental system of restraint (the negation of the patriarchal paradigm, i.e. the negation of a top-down hierarchy or "peck order," "the negation of negation"). Kenneth Benne explained the steps which were necessary if negation (the "Negative" environment of righteousness, according to the flesh, i.e. sensuousness) was to be effectively negated. 1. "In the first phase various members of the group quickly attempt to establish their customary places in the leadership hierarchy." 2. "Next comes a period of frustration and conflict brought about by the leader's steadfast rejection of the concept of peck order and the authoritarian atmosphere in which the concept of peck order is rooted." 3. "The third phase sees the development of cohesiveness among the members of the group, accompanied by a certain amount of complacency and smugness." [In other words, a room full of amalgamated Machiavellian anarchist.] 4. "In the fourth phase the members retain the group-centeredness and sensitivities which characterized the third phase, but they develop also a sense of purpose and urgency which makes the group potentially an effective social instrument." [Life a room full of bank robbers after the "job," despite the euphoria and camaraderie, the 'purpose' of life becomes cohesiveness or else.] (Benne) The idea being, if the group is not freed from the fear of judgment for its thoughts and actions, i.e. liberated from the fear of getting caught, i.e. jointly perceives higher authority as being irrelevant and an obstacle to the 'good life,' it can not be effectively tied to a "collaborative" work project (it will not be able to put collective feelings into collective action), it will not be able to experience the "warmth" of

human relationships in joint deliberation and action ("the matriarchal ethic of warmth, acceptance, and love") and will not learn how to put its newly discovered freedom from an "authoritarian atmosphere" (freedom from "the prevailing order") into 'practical' social action (praxis), i.e. into the praxis of negating the "Old" World Order. "In fact, children learned to obey the prevailing order at their mother's knee, despite the potential for an alternative social system implicit in the traditional matriarchal ethic of warmth, acceptance, and love." (Jay) The 'purpose' of 'Purpose' for the individual and the group is not just thinking and acting for the cause of socialism but becoming a thinking and acting socialist ("Don't just study Marx, be Marx." "Don't just study Freud, be Freud." "Don't just study God, be God." etc.). Sigmund Freud, according to Herbert Marcuse, saw the fulfillment of individual in the "collective killing and devouring of the father" (in the social action or praxis of patricide, i.e. the group project put into social action—it's not about fixing the bridge, it's about "fixing" the people who are fixing the bridge, about them become one in the praxis of "incest," i.e. "Coming out of the 'closet,'" while fixing the bridge, i.e. negating those who 'put them into the closet') along with the "establishment of the brother clan" (in the social action or praxis of incest or the social collective 'moment' of Eros called consensus; "Freud noted that patricide and incest are part of man's deepest nature." (Yalom) "... the hatred against patriarchal suppression—a 'barrier to incest,' ... the desire (for the sons) to return to the mother—culminates in the rebellion of the exiled sons, the collective killing and devouring of the father, and the establishment of the brother clan, ..." (Marcuse) Until these conditions, the negating of the patriarchal paradigm (the removing of the bourgeoisie, the removing of the top-down system with its "pecking order," upper-lower class system, the beheading of the King or the butchering of the Tsar and his family) are put into collective action (praxis), mankind will remain anti-socialist (socially un-connected), anti-democratic in thought and action, mankind will not become proletariat, "brother clan" in mind and body.

The problem was two fold. The first obstacle which had to be overcome was the removal of the father figure himself—"the field of force of an adult," i.e. the removal of the "negative" attitude of right vs. wrong, "mine not yours," with the power to use force to "have things his way or else,"

from the environment, dialectically perceived as a "hate" attitude. The second obstacle was to overcome the father figure's lasting effect upon the individual and society—"the negative valance," the conscience, i.e. the fear of "getting caught," the need to 'shift' the "guilty" conscience, i.e. the inflexible conscience, steadfastly subject to the father's will (righteousness), into the "super-ego," i.e. the conscience no longer feeling "guilty" in the act of "incest" (sensuousness and spontaneity), since it is now subject to the person's "free will" (his Ego), his will now subject to his own Id, where his want of a gratifying object in the environment is no longer inhibited by the the father figure (external force producing accountability to higher authority) and the conscience (internal force producing accountability to higher authorities standards), neither his will nor his 'conscience' are subject to the Father's will when his 'conscience' is working in 'harmony' with his Ego and his impulses (spontaneity), his Ego now 'freed' to carry out (free to be in bondage to, i.e. be 'driven' by) the impulses of his Id (sensuousness), (restrained only by the natural, sensual, "rational," environment around him), making his 'conscience' now adaptable to 'change,' now a "healthy" super-ego (conscientization). The "super-ego" is actually a seared conscience, seared by the 'liberation' ("justification") of sensuousness: conscientização, i.e. consciousness that higher authority, i.e. God, parent, etc. is the 'oppressor' of humanity (sensuousness)—that the consciousness of a God or parent who judges (has the final say so for) man, regarding his natural thoughts and actions, is the source of physical, mental, and social oppression and must be negated in thought and action if man to be healthy, physically, mentally, and socially—thus liberated in the perception that human nature itself (sensuousness), united in 'purpose,' is 'righteousness' and higher authority (the restrainer of sensuousness) is 'unrighteousness.' "What we call 'conscience' perpetuates inside of us our bondage to past objects now part of ourselves: the super-ego 'unites in itself the influences of the present and of the past.'" (Brown) "It is a function of the ego to make peace with conscience, to create a larger synthesis within which conscience, emotional impulses, and self operate in relative harmony. When this synthesis is not achieved, the superego has somewhat the role of a foreign body within the personality, and it exhibits those rigid, automatic, and unstable aspects discussed above." (Adorno). "If the individual complies merely from fear

of punishment rather than through the dictates of his free will and conscience, the new set of values he is expected to accept does not assume in him the position of super-ego, and his re-education therefore remains unrealized." (Kurt Lewin in Benne). Thus education, through curriculum development in the classroom, was key to the negation of the conscience through "goal setting appropriate to superego development." (Bloom)

When psychology entered the classroom, via progressive education and Bloom's Taxonomies, sensuousness supplanted righteousness as an outcome, i.e. the Ten Commandments, prayer, the Holy Bible, and chastening were removed from the classroom for the sake of a humanistic outcome (sensuousness). "The superego is conceived in psychoanalysis as functioning substantially in the same way as the conscience" [Both the conscience and the super-ego are developed by environmental conditions, the conscience is developed in a traditional environment, i.e. preaching and teaching by God, parents, etc.—explained by Dr. Trojanowicz: "Social control is most effective at the individual level. The personal conscience is the key element in ensuring self-control, refraining from deviant behavior even when it can be easily perpetrated." "The family, the next most important unit affecting social control, is obviously instrumental in the initial formation of the conscience and in the continued reinforcement of the values that encourage law abiding behavior." Trojanowicz—while the super-ego is developed in a social environment, i.e. facilitation, dialogue, consensus manipulated by facilitators, "change agents," counselors, etc.]

Superego development is conceived as the incorporation of the moral standards of society. Therefore the levels of the Taxonomy should describe successive levels of goal setting appropriate to superego development." Krathwohl, Bloom, Book 2: Affective Domain emphasis added) The new guilt complex appears to be historically connected with the rise of patriarchal religion (for the Western development the Hebrews are decisive)." "The guilty conscience is formed in childhood by the incorporation of the parents and the wish to be father of oneself." "We must return to Freud and say that incest guilt created the familial organization." (Brown) In other words, when children felt guilty for their "polymorphously perverse behavior," they exonerated (honored) the parents' position in the family and thereby "created the family organization" and, according to Freud, produced the "neurosis of society."

"Family organization is the nucleus of all social organization." (Brown) It is the traditional family's role in the development of the conscience which, since the 50's, the public school system has worked to overcome, both in weakening the traditional family and its influences upon the next generation and therefore "social organization." As James Coleman, a source for our Supreme Court in making decisions concerning education, wrote: "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." "Strengthening the family to draw the adolescent back into it faces serious problems, as well as some questions about its desirability." "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 order to [improve those institutions], one must know how adolescent societies function [driven by sensual impulse, self-will, and desire for approval in carnal human behavior], and beyond that, how their directions may be changed." "The family has little to offer the child in the way of training for his place in the community." (Coleman)

According to dialectical thinking, if a man is to be forever freed from God, the traditional family, capitalism, nationalism, etc. and be freed to be himself, i.e. to dialectically know his 'purpose' in life—united in a one world system of peace and social harmony—both conditions have to be met (the negation of the father without, by silencing or 'killing' the father—"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." Marcuse, quoting Sigmund Freud —and the negation of the effects of the father within, by 'devouring' him or removing him from social consciousness, removing any residue of his existence which might bother the mind, which might reactivate the conscience within; locked). By incorporating human desires (the affective domain) as part of 'purpose,' that is, the 'purpose' for developing the super-ego, guilty feelings for disobeying higher authority is negated, being replaced with the super-ego, where good and evil are no longer measured by good and evil established by some "foreign body," i.e. God or the parent, but is now measured by the pleasures of "positive" feelings which comes from being at one with one's own human nature and the human nature of others, i.e.

the building of personally identity upon interpersonal relationships; "A meeting of two: eye to eye, face to face. And when you are near I will tear your eyes out and place them inside of mine, and you will tear my eyes out and will place them inside of yours, then I will look at you with your eyes and you will look at me with mine." (Moreno) . The idea being, children can freely play together, without parental values separating them, when parents no longer have the right to preach and teach and hold children accountable to values which discriminate between good and evil behavior, based the children values upon values set by a higher authority who is not in harmony with the children's human nature—thereby negating the right to say "Evil company corrupts good morals" unless by "evil company" they mean believers. Dialectically, the children are defined in history as the proletariat struggling to transcend not only the parents, the bourgeoisie, but also struggling to transcend the effects which the bourgeoisie , the parents, have upon their own mind. Dialectically, getting the children out of the traditional home (negating the traditional home) is only half the problem, you must also get the traditional home out of the children's mind (negating the conscience).

This is the reason for the rewriting of history, making it relevant only to the changing times, removing any elements of the past which might support those of the past in their effort to retain the past, pull those in the present back into their past. Wars help melt down the 'relics' of the past, recycling them into the 'moments' of the present. "In our society it appears that the irrationality of the arrangement of this society is manifesting itself in countless moments... in certain forms of production ... especially in small and medium-sized farms. It can be said that a permanent agrarian crisis has existed for perhaps 150 years, and has merely been interrupted by the 'blessing' of periodic wars and famines." (Adorno, Introduction) Therapy, like war, does the same thing, melting down the 'relics' of the past, recycling them into the 'moments' of the present, only this time the war is not fought for national pride, sustaining the traditional family for the purpose of national unity, but is fought for humanity, annihilating the traditional family for the purpose of social 'change.' "What better way to help the patient re-capture the past than to allow him to re-experience and re-enact ancient feelings 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 urge the group to explore and to employ its own resources. The group [must] feel free to confront the therapist, who must not only permit, but encourage, such confrontation. He [the patient] reenacts early family scripts in the group and, if therapy is successful, is able to experiment with new behavior, to break free from the locked family role he once occupied. ... the patient changes the past by reconstituting it."

"The proletariat only perfects itself by annihilating and transcending itself, by creating the classless society through the successful conclusion of its own class struggle [by the negation of the top-down, "upper-lower class" system (I AM from above and you are from below, Spirit vs. world, parent vs. child) first by creating class consciousness, the children's awareness of parents and their way of thinking as being the oppressors/oppression of life and secondly the 'human right' to remove them and their effect upon their lives and the lives of others, thereby creating a classless society]. The struggle for this society, in which the dictatorship of the proletariat is merely a phase, is not just a battle waged against an external enemy, the bourgeoisie. It is equally the struggle of the proletariat against itself, against the devastating and degrading effects of the capitalist system upon its class consciousness [everybody must be "washed" of the effects of the Patriarchal Paradigm upon their brains (instead of their sins being washed away by faith in God the Father and belief in the lamb of God, i.e. the son of God, who was slain for the sins of the world), righteousness (and therefore sin) must be washed away (washed from the mind) by the justification and praxis of human nature, "I'm OK, your OK"]. The proletariat will only have won the real victory when it has overcome these effects within itself ." (Lukács, History) "We may call this new order by the name of democratic socialism but the name does not matter; all that matters is that we establish a rational economic system serving the purposes of the people. Only in a planned economy in which the whole nation has rationally mastered the economic and social forces can the individual share responsibility and use creative intelligence in his work. All that matters is that the opportunity for genuine activity be restored to the individual; that the purposes of society and of his own become identical." (Fromm)

Carl Friedrich, back in 1953, wrote about Hegel's influence upon America: "Contemporary social science, especially in America, bears the impact of Hegelian thinking to an extraordinary degree. Cultural anthropology and social psychology, especially of the psychoanalytic and Gestalt variety, and much of present day sociology... are more Hegelian than they would like to admit, or do acknowledge." (Friedrich) Karl Marx's name could be substituted for Hegel today, where we, as a nation, now look at things through a neo-Marxist lens, having replaced righteousness with relationship (Godly righteousness with human relationships—sensuousness). We are now more concerned about feelings, i.e. how other people feel about us (if we hurt their feelings they will turn and hurt our feelings occupies our thoughts and our actions) more than or rather than righteousness (not that those who preach and teach righteousness are "out" to 'hurt' people's feelings, they are preaching the word of God that men might become aware of their sins before God, become aware of God's wrath upon them because of their sins, and become aware of God's love for them, having sent his only begotten Son to redeem them from his wrath if only they would believe upon him—contrition and repentance being the proper words). Concern about doing God's will, concern about doing things right before God, our parents, the boss, our neighbors, etc. no longer occupies our thoughts and actions, being replaced with "What can I get out of this situation or this person for me." We have now replaced doctrine with dialogue, certainty with uncertainty, facts and truth with feelings and opinions, not only in our thoughts but also in our actions. The fear of man (driven by our love for this world and its pleasures and the fear of losing the things of this world and its pleasures, and the fear of reprisal from man against our "judgmental" thoughts and actions against their love of this world, thus blocking their love toward us) now rules over our thoughts and actions instead of the fear of God (driven by God and his love, our Heavenly Father, His Word, and the Holy Spirit and the consequences of our unrighteous thoughts and actions, i.e. our love of this world, inhibiting or blocking His love from being in us, making us an enemy of his; "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1 John 2:15; "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of

the world is the enemy of God." James 4:4).

"For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." 2 Timothy 1:7 The power is not for us to rule over others, manipulating them into meeting our "felt" needs through our position or ability to meet their "felt" needs. The power is given to us by God for us, in "the obedience of Christ," to rule over ourselves as we humble ourselves before God and let Him direct our steps. The love is not for us to manipulate (seduce) others into loving us through our love for them. The love is for us to be able to love others as God loves them (in spirit not flesh). And the mind is not our confused, dialectical, "theory" and opinions, tossed to and fro, self-seeking mind (a mind seeking power to manipulate others into loving us as we satisfy their love, along with our love, for the things of this world) but a clear and confident mind grounded in God, His Word (the truth), and His love, knowing His love and will for us. "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."

Romans 18:15

What the world perceives as "negative" is God's righteousness. What the world perceives as "positive" is its love for the things of this world. By the world's use of God's love, attempting to make man and God one in purpose (perceived as being "positive"), without including God's demand for righteousness, i.e. righteousness which can only be imputed through the shed blood and resurrection of Christ (perceived by the world as being "negative," judgmental, Christ being the "only way," not holding hands with the world, his bride refusing to do the same as well), the world is blinded to the truth of the gospel. By its rejection of sin and God's judgment upon it, (perceived as being "negative," i.e. anti-social in nature), while using the "gospel" of God's love for man (perceived as being "positive") for its social 'purpose,' it is able to create in its mind a user friendly, non-offensive, readily adaptable to change Jesus, i.e. another Christ, i.e. an Anti-Christ (a Fatherless Christ; Jesus did not come to destroy the law but rather to fulfill it, He did not come to overthrow His Heavenly Father's will but to obey it; thus we are to do as he did "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 which in dialectical thinking and

acting would be a very "negative" thing to do, negating the dialectical process itself and man's hope of achieving carnal peace on earth and carnal good will to men).

The "positive" outcome can only be created by the negation of, or annihilation of the "negative" outcome (the negation of the thesis condition, i.e. identifying and negating the restraining conditions which inhibit or block the creation of a "better world," negating the Father's authority to rule, through the praxis of create a "better world," a world made in the image of man, i.e. a world created in the image of disobedient children for the children of disobedience). Dependent upon the structure of the environment utilized in solving the crisis (the one system, a "closed" system, i.e. the thesis system, being the preaching and teaching of absolute truth as given by God, i.e. a higher authority than human nature teaching truth as being unchanging, i.e. established from above and therefore not changeable by that which is below—"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 2:14; "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." "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 2:21 , 3:18-20, all being condemned except those who believe; "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already." John 3:18 , promoting a "win-lose," i.e. an antithesis, above-below, good-evil, heaven-heal, there-and-then, "in-group, out-group," etc. situation—dialectically perceived as being "negative," is always at odds with the other system, the "open" system of dialoguing opinions to a consensus, i.e. a synthesis, tolerant of ambiguity, i.e. tolerant of permissiveness situation, dialectically perceived as being "positive," since there can be no condemnation, contrition, "guilty conscience," demand for repentance, etc. from an "open-ended," "non-directed" dialogue situation), one outcome displaces ('shifts') the other (the person must be willing to abdicate their former system or way of thinking and acting, i.e. their thesis position, by finding something

of interest in the latter system, i.e. in the synthesis system, if 'change' is to take place). "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Matthew 6:24

A person can not have (or keep) faith in God while participating within the dialectical process. Nor can they uphold any pre-established contract. To do so would be equivalent to the praxis of tyranny against the dialectical process. Thesis and synthesis can not comprehend one another, they can not occupy the same space at the same time (see 2 Corinthians 5:14-18 above), they can only oppose one another in 'purpose.' Therefore a person can not keep a thesis position with God, or even with their spouse, in the act (praxis) of synthesis, unless God, or the spouse, is willing to 'change' (are willing to become depraved, i.e. adulteress or abominable) to maintain relationships. "...a patient might, with further change, outgrow his spouse unless concomitant changes occur in the spouse." (Yalom). (The Church in the dialectical process simply "outgrows" being just the bride of Christ, learning how to hold hands with the world. When Christ rejects it, it no longer being spotless and without wrinkle, it will perceive him as being unfaithful and hateful.) Collective 'change,' (synthesis or consensus) in the dialectical process, always follows with a momentary experience of stability (oneness or thesis), which then passes on into another antithesis, synthesis cycle ... ad nauseam.

Without all participants 'willingly' 'changing' from a rigid, right-wrong, above-below, "judgmental" ("preachy") attitude to a tolerance of ambiguity (dialoguing of opinions, i.e. the kingdom of uncertainties), for the sake of unity (synthesis), the process becomes inhibited or blocked and man's carnal nature becomes suppressed, i.e. repressed (hope in man and his carnal pleasures becoming spoiled in the act of faith in God). Faith in God and hope (or trust) in human nature can never come into harmony. Human nature (that which is of this world) can never comprehend the Spirit of God (that which is from above), therefore faith in God makes it impossible for a person to please the world, since his faith in God, who never changes, makes him an adversary to those who are in love with the things of this world, i.e. in love with human nature which is ever changing (never satisfied with what is) while never changing (forever seeking to justify its sinful nature as being normal human behavior, resisting and willing to

destroy unhealthy, i.e. religious, environmental conditions —herein lies the 'purpose' of the government's 'health' program). Both conditions (dissatisfaction with God and His Word and self-justification —as found in the Garden in Eden, as recorded in Genesis 3, i.e. Adam's dialectical attitude of self justification—'It was not my fault, it was the woman's fault, who you, by the way, created for me,' and Eve's dialectical attitude of self justification—'It was not my fault, it was the serpent's fault, who, by the way, you created) simply exposes man's carnal nature, i.e. his lack of faith in God, i.e. his sinful nature. "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 "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 "Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." Matthew 13:13-15 If you do not come to the Lord in faith, i.e. you do not received him as one who is proclaiming the truth, you can not hear his words. "... nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke 18:8b Man instead goes his own ways because he chooses the same pathway which Karl Marx recognized as man's nature and advocated, i.e. that man can only be free when he "has eyes which are human eyes, and ears which are human ears." (Karl Marx) For Marx, and the world system, human freedom is founded upon man's freedom to sin (his 'right' to be human), whereas God's freedom is founded upon freedom from sin and condemnation (by being dead to ones self-nature and alive in Christ, Christ's righteousness being imputed to 'whosoever' believe upon him). "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John 8:36

In this way of thinking (dialectical thinking), faith, which is a noun (a person, place or thing which we put faith in) follows hope (which is a

desire we seek to fulfill from relationship with the person, place, or thing we put our faith in). Hope, which is a verb, (to cherish a desire), when placed before faith makes faith subject to hope (making our faith driven by our human desires), i.e. making man subject to his desires, putting his faith in the person or persons, the thing or things, or the event or events which promise to fulfill his earthly desires. Instead of following God in faith he is driven' by his earthly desires, making his faith subject to his hopes (making God subject to human desires). Immanuel Kant (in Critique of Pure Reason) elevated human reasoning (which comes from hope and not faith), purging it of faith, by placing it upon the logic of hope, that man hopes for the things of this world, things which his senses recognize (thus making hope 'reasonable,' rational, within human reasoning, and therefore able to be actualized only within the realm of the tangible). He wrote that hope (the cherishing of a desire) is found in happiness (our desire is to be happy), that happiness is found in pleasure (we naturally approach pleasure), and that pleasure is found in the mind, and we now know that the mind is influenced ("positively") toward the chemical pleasures (pressures toward gratification) which our body naturally produces, such as dopamine, which is emancipated within the nervous system (the synaptic gap) whenever it is excited from having made contact with gratifying objects found within the environment, i.e. come into contact with those things which our body naturally responds to in a wanting or craving after. Thus hope (the verb or motion, e-motion, of desire) when it is placed in front of faith (evidence of things, persons, places, or things not seen or experienced as, for example proclaimed by God, parent, or a traditional teacher) makes man's faith subject to human hopes (faith guided by the influences of the world toward world peace, i.e. safety, pleasure, and justice, and social harmony, i.e. approval or love from others) rather than faith in God, i.e. placing hope in those things which are not of this world (which have to be revealed by God and accepted by faith first), i.e. things not of the temporal (the substance of things desired being subject to the evidence of things not of this world, things not perceivable, i.e. things preached and taught). You can only dialogue hope (an opinion, subject to human reasoning which is tied to human desires, when not proceeding from faith in God and His Word). You can only preach and teach faith (belief in God and His Word), which gives us eternal hope.

The dialectic mind always makes faith subject to hope (making faith subject to or "positive" toward the world system which is craving for "oneness" or unity), negating the hope which is based upon faith in God, hope based upon the things God reveals to us by His word and promises to fulfill to those who put faith in Him, pleasing him by our faith. Therefore, faith preceding hope is perceived, dialectically, as being "negative" (rigid) since diversity of faiths (belief in that which is not of this world offers no potential—potential being only that which can proceed from nature, sensual—in unifying man upon that which is common with the world, even when applied in the secular realm, i.e. faith in one's own ideas inhibits or blocks the necessity of change which is required to overcome the rigidity of belief or faith, belief in one's position, as being the only right position, causes diversity of "opinions" and therefore results in discrimination, prejudice, and religious divisions, if belief can not be 'changed' into an opinion amongst opinions; "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, the objective however, is to change it." (Marx, Feuerbach #11) In other words, dissatisfied people, dissatisfied with the way things are, often perceive how the world 'ought' to be and then make their opinion the only right opinion, continuing social divisions based upon their rigid ideas, i.e. their 'belief' which blocks or inhibits the hope of a world of oneness, i.e. a one world system based upon that which man has in common with the world, his carnal, temporal nature which wants or craves unity with the object or objects of gratification which are only found within the world of sense experience (in the "here-and-now") which is ever "changing" ("evolving," i.e. moving to a higher state of being, at least that is what the hope is, i.e. the augmentation of worldly pleasure as man works together to remove anti-social, "anti-pleasure" barriers, working to create a world of leisure and guaranteed sustenance for all, those in the process getting more, those not in the process getting less or none despite what those in the process preach—equality, fraternity, liberty—wanting to create a world as was once found within the Garden in Eden before man sinned, the idea being, by negating the condition of sin itself, i.e. negate faith in, belief upon, and obedience toward higher authority, man can liberate that which is natural and common to all of mankind, his carnal nature, thereby becoming free to use his Eros as the 'driving' force for, and the 'purpose' of, social harmony; "What the great

world needs, of course, is a little more Eros and less strife." "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." "Eros is the foundation of morality." (Brown) "The irreconcilable conflict is not between work and Eros, but between alienated labor [man begrudgingly having to work for someone else's pleasures without being free to satisfy his own at the same time, i.e. capitalism] and Eros." [Like having to suppress the flesh to please God, or the boss, or the parent, etc.] "... the liberation of Eros could create new and durable work relations." (Marcuse) [Putting women in the workplace was not just about the liberation of the woman from the traditional home environment, i.e. empowering them (making them bitter toward the patriarchal paradigm), but was also the initiation and sustentation of Eros in the workplace, i.e. carnal men could hardly wait to get there to build relationships with the women and righteous men were tempted into do so as well (remember sex does not have to be just physical, mental sex serves Diaprax quite well, the physical being by con-sensuousness through touch, taste, sight, smell, and sound, the last three filling the sensuous mind of the "happy little workers" as well, even 'volunteering' to do more common-unity work after work; soccer moms not going to the game just to watch the kids and volunteering fathers not doing community work just to "get the job done," both knowing they had better keep their "righteousness" to themselves if sensuousness, i.e. social harmony, is going to be given a chance to grow].

Opinions (even about God) tie us to this world of sense experiences (Eros), belief in God ties us to that kingdom which is above our 'here-and-now,' sense experience based world. You can not preach and teach an opinion and you can not dialogue a belief, unless you 'purpose' to confuse others, create doubt, and praxis lies (evolutionists preach and teach theory as if it were truth, thus they must use confusion, bringing those with the truth into dialogue, treating truth as an opinion, to cover their lies, remove the confusion and the theory of evolution dies, revealing "the old man" covered in lies; evolution is only about the negating of sin as the real issue of life and death). "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. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. Mortify therefore your members

which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence [desires], and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them. But now ye also put off all these: anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds [praxis]; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." Colossians 3:1-11 These verses are negated in the lives of all who praxis the dialectical process even though they might dialogue them —"How did you feel when ...?" or "What did you think when ...?"—in the sense experience of "growing" or "creating" social unity, i.e. Church Growth, emergent church, etc. "It is written ..." and "I feel ..." or "I think" are two opposing paradigms, when the church uses the latter, i.e. human opinions which are sense experience based, it rejects the former, i.e. revelation from God. "If the 'restoring of life' of the world is to be conceived in terms of the Christian revelation, then Marx must collapse into a bottomless abyss." (Habermas, Theory) In the former one is willing to live in the world but not of the world and gain his soul, in the latter he is willing to lose his soul and gain the world. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness;" Rom 1:18

According to diaprax, by focusing upon and putting into practice that which divides, that which inhibits or blocks human relationships (determining relationship based upon belief and focusing upon, i.e. preaching and teaching, uncommon principles, principles which are not "sensible," perceivable, and understandable by all parties concerned, i.e. principles which do not come by means of human nature and therefore are not in harmony with human nature and thus offer no potential in initiating and sustaining human relationships, i.e. initiating and sustaining the condition which inhibits or blocks the engendering of social unity), a higher authority retains control over man, directing his steps (directing him not according to the world system, thus inhibiting or block world "peace" and social harmony and, as would be expected, the world will turn against him once given the 'right' opportune moment, i.e. persecuting him to "bring him around" to the worlds way of thinking concerning peace and harmony,

or persecuting him to put the fear of man in others who might be going his way; but God says: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." John 14:27). But by focusing upon and putting into practice that which man has in common (mankind identifying and then uniting and acting upon his common human interests, even for the "purpose" of "growing" the church), that person or condition which inhibits or blocks human nature and/or human relationships is negated or annihilated (it is not that the spiritual condition, i.e. faith in the above human nature or above human condition is openly opposed —thus retaining a "We are right and you are wrong," antithesis condition—it is simply that the person or persons who continually insists upon thinking and acting outside of, or counter to, the human sensuous "moment," refuses to go into dialogue, is perceived as being irrational and therefore is treated as being irrelevant in the deciding outcome —in the consensus moment, a moment where faith in God and His Word is trumped by common human hopes or desires pursued through the use of human abilities—like the ten spies and the children of Israel who came to consensus based upon their perception of God's irrationality, desiring to reach the promised land, but without faith in God coming first, trumped God's command to take it by first murmuring against God's command to take it, and then trying to take it in the arm of their own flesh, according to their own strength and reasoning abilities, rebelling against God as they had done in the past; "But they and our fathers dealt proudly, and hardened their necks, and hearkened not to thy commandments, And refused to obey, neither were mindful of thy wonders that thou didst among them; but hardened their necks, and in their rebellion appointed a captain to return to their bondage:" Nehemiah 9:16-17—none of that generation, except Joshua and Caleb, the two men who put faith in God first, made it into the promised land).

As man dialectically ("scientifically," "rationally") perceives higher authority as being irrational (higher authority, dialectically, regarded as being the same as a spiritual authority, since both inhibit or block, restrain or divert the temporal human moment of desires, i.e. hopes, which cry out for fulfillment, i.e. the desire or hope for oneness being "diverted" from being found within man's nature, the sense experience —the 'good'

feeling—of social unity, created in the moment of discovering and working for common cause, to being found in that which is above or counter to nature, requiring faith first, i.e. the desire or hope for recognition and acceptance from human nature to that which is above or counter to human nature—that of human nature being the wanting to be wanted by others or being recognized by others with respect—to wanting to be wanted by that which is above, greater, and/or counter to human nature, which can only precede from faith, and therefore inhibits or blocks the natural wanting of a gratifying object which proceeds from nature itself which counters, i.e. negates the desire which is toward that which is above nature—an object perceived by the one under authority as being natural and 'good' for him in the moment and, and with the help of a facilitator, i.e. the dialectical process being put into praxis, an object perceived as being natural and 'good' for all mankind in the moment as well, i.e. 'good' or right being perceived and defined of, by, and for mankind in the moment; the scriptures warn us "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof [are] the ways of death." Proverbs 14:12), and therefore he "feels" free (with the help of others) to perceive and treat higher authority as irrelevant (he can not even understand him, like the deer in the headlights look), he, along with all others who are participating in the process, is dialectically being freed to direct his own steps (he is taking the same steps as were taken in the Garden in Eden, i.e. Genesis 3:1-6 and taking the same steps the children of Israel took when they attempted to 'take' the promised land in their own strength, under their own direction, because, like lawless children, it made "sense" to them at the moment.) While bread is good for all of mankind, being necessary for his physical, mental, and even social health, Jesus, quoting scriptures, pointed out that man must also live by every word which comes from God, even when it inhibits or blocks that which is perceived, in the moment, to be 'good' for man (bread is for the flesh, which is temporal, while the word of God is for the soul, which is eternal). The dialectical process counters the word of God by making it subordinate to man and his perceived "needs." It places the emphasis upon human needs over God and His Word (or emphasizes human or temporal needs as being equal with God and His Word). It emphasizes that the 'purpose' for the individual and society can only be found within the praxis of everyone working together for a common cause

(we working for us), that man must collectively address human needs (temporal needs or "felt" needs as in Maslow's Hierarchy of "felt" needs) if he is to know and fulfill his 'purpose' in this life. By using the dialectical process in making decisions about life, defining the 'purpose' for life based upon man's commonly "felt" needs it cuts God's head off and places man's head on in its place, i.e. the king's, the parent's, the bourgeoisie', i.e. the middle class 's—"characterized by a high material standard of living, sexual morality, and respect for property" (Merriam-Webster's Dictionary) head is cut off and the "people's," the adolescent's, the proletariat's, i.e. the "grass root's," the rabble's, the mass's, the mob's, the canaille 's (Merriam-Webster's Thesaurus) head is put on in its place, the spiritual (that which is eternally established by God) is replaced with the temporal (the contemporary, which is momentary established in, by, and for the world), the promised blessings of the future, in the there-and-then, is replaced with the pleasures of this life in the moment, in the here-and-now, He who is above is replaced with that which is below, God's will, revealed by His Word and the Holy Spirit is replaced with man's will, known only through his sensual experience of the moment, manifested in the praxis of consensus, the collective voice of "the people," i.e. Nietzsche's "will to power" being put into practice (even in the name of Jesus), i.e. "God is dead" humanistic mentality—which may not be so boldly stated or realized by contemporary Christians but certainly practiced in their taking of polls and surveys, and their reliance upon feasibility studies and feedback loops to "detect" and keep up with "the winds of 'change'"—"change' being 'driven' by "the prince of the power of the air"; "Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Ephesians 2:2, 3—the sermon from the pulpit may not be the problem, it is the administration of the church which is, for they may preach truth from the pulpit but refuse to practice it in making decisions, relaying instead upon the "will" of men). As the Transformational Marxists, Erick Fromm put it: "We are proud that in his conduct of life man has become free from external authorities, which tell him what to do

and what not to do." "Man is free from all ties binding him to spiritual authorities, but this very freedom leaves him alone and anxious, overwhelms him with a feeling of his own individual insignificance and powerlessness." "All that matters is that the opportunity for genuine activity be restored to the individual; that the purposes of society and of his own become identical." (Fromm, *Escape*)

"O LORD, are not thine eyes upon the truth? thou hast stricken them, but they have not grieved; thou hast consumed them, but they have refused to receive correction: they have made their faces harder than a rock; they have refused to return. Therefore I said, Surely these are poor; they are foolish: for they know not the way of the LORD, nor the judgment of their God. I will get me unto the great men, and will speak unto them; for they have known the way of the LORD, and the judgment of their God: but these have altogether broken the yoke, and burst the bonds. Wherefore a lion out of the forest shall slay them, and a wolf of the evenings shall spoil them, a leopard shall watch over their cities: every one that goeth out thence shall be torn in pieces: because their transgressions are many, and their backslidings are increased. How shall I pardon thee for this? thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by them that are no gods: when I had fed them to the full, they then committed adultery, and assembled themselves by troops in the harlots' houses. They were as fed horses in the morning: every one neighed after his neighbour's wife. Shall I not visit for these things? saith the LORD: and shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" Jeremiah 5:3-9

By the praxis of consensus man replaces the history of the past, that history which restrains the present, with the history of his own life experiences, that history which seeks to liberate the present from the restraints of the past. By liberating the present from the restraints of the past, hope or potential for 'change' in the present and the future is given birth (history is no longer written, to be studied so as not to repeat it, i.e. repeating the errors of the past, but history is to be discovered, man discovering himself, creating a new world united upon and working within the process of 'change,' initiating and sustaining a world freed from unnatural restraints of the past, i.e. Godly restraints upon the carnal nature of man as written in

the past to be carried into the present and thus "limit" the future potential of man becoming himself). In the dialectical praxis of consensus man "gives birth to himself." Erick Fromm put it this way, regarding the dialectical process, its effects, its purpose, and its founder: "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, as gods) This is the theme (rebellion against God) which runs throughout the fields of psychology and sociology (it is the only foundation upon which counselors can build, even though some may claim to be Christians—they are actually Gnostic Christians, dialectical Christians role-playing Lucifer as he helped man to become "at-one" with God, i.e. equal with God, like a god; "One reason Tillich is unwilling to openly disavow religion is that he must be accepted as a theologian in order to formulate and gain acceptance of an imaginative Grand Synthesis of theology and philosophy." Wheat). "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; and this book cannot without sinning communicate that experience to the reader." (Brown) The praxis of consensus "frees" man from the guilt of sin, revealing his contempt for God and His Word, revealing the absence in his life of the fear of God. But, according to dialectical thinking, without filling the void created, when man is detached from the relationship he had with that which is above his nature (relationship with that which restrained his nature), without reattaching the individual to society (relationship with that which is common with his nature), i.e. attaching him to the "sense experiences" he has (or has the potential of having) in common with the world (for the 'purpose' of giving him a 'human' identity and 'purpose'), he will become either "maladjusted," (he will remain self-focused and self-seeking and become socially unstable, his 'ought's' controlling himself and others) or embrace "a philosophy of life developed by others," (he submits his 'ought's' to a higher authority who is socialist in 'purpose,' but only for personal gain, considered by dialectical thinkers, i.e. Transformational

Marxists'/social-psychologists, to be synonymous with Nationalism, i.e. Fascism —dialectically perceived as potential becoming global socialism but along the way became stillborn at a nationalist level of development, i.e. Traditional Marxism, where the individual and therefore society becomes dependent upon a higher authority for identity and 'purpose,' i.e. people become dependent upon an authority, perceived dialectically, as being "ruthless" toward human nature, i.e. socially hostile, i.e. anti-democratic, whether it be a man, a group of men, or God himself, for example any minister and his followers who do not work with and for the community, i.e. partnership with "the village" for the "betterment" of society, but who isolate themselves from the ways of the community, yet work to bring the community into their way of thinking, i.e. perceived as "under their control," would be considered potentially fascist, and be labeled as such by a democratic government). The words, quoted in italics, above are by David R. Krathwohl and Benjamin Bloom in *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*, who acknowledge the ideologies, i.e. the world view or the paradigm of the Transformational Marxists, Theodor Adorno and Erick Fromm as being their "Weltanschauung" —which would be of no particular interest except for the fact that Bloom's books are the basis for teacher certification and school accreditation not only in the states but around the world; see my articles on "Bloom's Taxonomies.") When man can not find identity with that which is at-one with his human nature, that which is "changeable" to his "felt" needs of the moment, he becomes subject to that which is not of his nature, he remains subject to that which is eternally (externally) established, despite his internal changing needs. He therefore remains controlled and limited by that which goes counter to his "felt" needs of the moment (his will remaining subject to another's will, his laws of the flesh remaining subject to, i.e. repressed by laws which are not in harmony with or subject to the laws of his flesh).

Karl Marx believed that "Laws must not fetter human life; but yield to it; they must change as the needs and capacities of the people change." (Marx, Critique) He believed that by the act of obedience, the child "gives life" to the parent, "gives life" to that system and its laws which work counter to and are "hostile" toward his human nature—by his obedience to higher authority's laws and his submitting to their use of chastening to

keep him subject to their will, both of which inhibit or block human will and desire, he gives higher authority life. "The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force." (Marx, MEGA I/3) By his obedience toward and acceptance of (or love for) the authority figure who chastens him (uses force to inhibit or block his sensuousness and spontaneity) when he is disobedient to their will, man, according to Marx, sustains a scripturally based, patriarchal, top-down system where God is above man and man is below God, where a father is above the children and the children are below or subject to the father's will, etc. as described in Hebrews. "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. 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. Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? 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. 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." Hebrews 12:6-11). God's system (as exhibit in the traditional family system) must be based upon the chastening of human nature or else human nature will rule the day (the children will rule the home and lawlessness, confusion, and depravity will prevail). Therefore, according to the dialectical system, to reject the system which uses chastening, the rejection of chastening for doing that which is wrong is the first step which must be taken if man is to be freed from the control of higher authority, i.e. freed from the controlling effect of God upon his will. "Thinking through the process it is dialectically faulty to start with the negative, with anxiety. The problem is to name the dynamic factor provoking anxiety to emerge [chastening or judgment]." (Moreno) By creating an environment whereby carnal man (and his worldly nature) can "feel" freed from chastening (freed from the traditional way of setting the standard for determine right from wrong, good from evil, through the use of chastening and judgment), by initiating and sustaining an environment which replaces preaching and teaching (inculcating doctrine through

"negative" force, chastening or threat of it) with a dialogue (freely and openly sharing opinions, how he feels and what he thinks without fear of chastening or judgment) in setting standards of right and wrong, good and evil, man is liberated to think and act in accordance with his human nature. After all, wasn't that what the forbidden tree in the garden in Eden was all about, choosing which system to put into praxis to "know" what is good and what is evil ("God said it is evil" is replaced with "It does not make sense to me that it is evil, it seems alright to me." One knowing is from above, "It is written," that which is accepted by faith, spiritual, eternal—from God, while the other "knowing" is from below, "I think ... I feel," that which is experiential, sensual, temporal—of the flesh). Socrates was executed because he destroyed respect for authority, i.e. faith in God, or in Athens' case, faith in the gods, and he corrupted the morals of the youth. Liberals (in the true meaning of the word) will do all they can to cover this up (deceiving themselves and others) because their objective is to initiate and sustain the dialectical process (Socratic Critical Thinking) into the lives of every person they meet, to sear their conscience and justify the wickedness of their hearts. "Therapy for normals" continues the same program of 'change' (disrespect for authority and the promotion of immorality), liberating humanity from the fear of God and love for His Word (I originally had the word "theology" here but that is a method which now evaluates God and His Word, to show ourselves approved before men, whereas we must evaluate ourselves from God and His Word, studying His Word to show ourselves approved before God, whether men approve or not is not the issue). The dialectical idea (the same idea Socrates had) was: don't fight against "theology," support it with philosophy, sociology, psychology, anthropology, i.e. human reasoning, and liberate it from God and His absolutes, freeing man from the fear of God and love for his word, through the use of open-ended, non-directed —unrestrained, non-judgmental —discourse, freeing him from the "repression" of "patriarchal domination," (from the parental authority condition) so that he could be himself again, i.e. be normal. "The repression of normal adult sexuality is required only by cultures which are based on patriarchal domination." "Human consciousness can be liberated from the parental (Oedipal) complex only by being liberated from its cultural derivatives, the paternalistic state and the patriarchal God." "The abolition of repression

would only threaten patriarchal domination." "Freud, Hegel, and Nietzsche are, like Marx, compelled to postulate external domination and its assertion by force in order to explain repression." "Adult sexuality, restricted by rules, to maintain family and society, is a clear instance of repression; and therefore leads to neurosis." (Brown) "Acceptance of religion mainly as an expression of submission to a clear pattern of parental authority is a condition favorable to ethnocentrism." "... ethnocentrism takes the form of pseudopatriotism; 'we' are the best people and the best country in the world, and we should either keep out of world affairs altogether (isolationism) or we should participate -- but without losing our full sovereignty, power, and economic advantage (imperialism). And in either case we should have the biggest army and navy in the world, and atom bomb monopoly." "Confronted with the rigidity of the adult ethnocentrist, one turns naturally to the question of whether the prospects for healthy personality structure would not be greater if the proper influences were brought to bear earlier in the individuals life, . . ." "For ethnocentric parents, acting by themselves, the prescribed measures would probably be impossible." (Adorno)

When men choose "sense experience" as their basis for determining what is good and what is evil they reject not only revelation from God but God himself, making themselves gods instead. When mankind consciously and "rationally" unites upon his common "sense experience," he is within the realm of the dialectical process, a process whereby many gods are in the process of becoming one universal god. This is a Gnostic concept which Satan knew, for evil intent, would happen if and when man rejected God's Word as absolute, unquestionable and universal. "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Genesis 3:5 "And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." Genesis 3:22-24 Adam and Eve did not die from something which was bad in the fruit of the 'forbidden' tree, they died because they changed their paradigm

from accepting God's definition of good and evil "as given," i.e. changed from being at-one with God, under his authority and direction (and therefore live, i.e. having access to the tree of life), to determining for themselves, dialectically —sensually, what is good and what is evil, God then driving them from the garden in Eden, so that they could continue to be at-one with nature, under its direction, 'driven' by their carnal nature (and therefore die, i.e. not having access to the tree of life). Unless a man repents of his sins before God, he will not only die physically, but know eternal death as well. Man's paradigm is heresiarchal by nature. Despite his efforts to be patriarchal he is still bound by the flesh. It is only in Christ he can know and live in a patriarchal paradigm, as God intended in the garden in Eden.

According to those who use the dialectical process, the 'purpose' of life is to use the dialectical process in the liberation of man from God, so that he can become a god himself, and then using the same process in the uniting of all gods into one god, uniting them upon that which is 'good,' in their eyes, i.e. that which is physically, mentally, and socially pleasurable and beneficial to all gods (pleasurable and beneficial to all of mankind). The idols men make, whether it be in stone, wood, or people (singular or plural), are not the gods they worship. They are the creators of the idols, they are the gods they worship. Consensus is a worship service. It is a group of men worshiping themselves as gods.

By using the Genesis 3:1-6 process, one society (in harmony) and one world (in peace) can be created (divide and conquer: dividing man from God above by making him a god among gods and then reuniting him with all gods, uniting him upon that which all gods have in common, knowing good and evil from their own perspective, good being that which is sensually pleasurable, thereby "conquering" God above by creating god below, creating "God," which is society made only in the image of man, and man made only in the image of society; "Every form of objectification [perceiving an object external to our human nature, external to and restraining our common sense experiences, as being real]... results in alienation. Transcending alienation involves transcending objectification.;" (Bronner) "In direct contrast to German philosophy, which descends from heaven to earth [Hegel perceived an "absolute spirit" creating a new world order out of the "masses"], here we ascend from earth to heaven [Marx

perceived the praxis of man, i.e. the "masses" creating a new world order out of themselves, out of praxis of mankind negating any and all god's above man himself, man must not create images of god in his own image (and let it rule over him), he must create his own image of himself (and thereby free himself from "other worldliness" and "domination")." (Marx, MEGA I/5) "The great polemic against Hegel in *The Holy Family* [written by Karl Marx] concentrates mainly on this point.. Hegel's inadequacy is that he only seems to allow the absolute spirit to make history. The resulting otherworldliness of consciousness vis-d-vis the real events of history becomes, in the hands of Hegel's disciples, an arrogant-and reactionary confrontation of 'spirit' and 'mass'." (Lukács', *History*) According to Transformational Marxists (social-psychologists) the Traditional Marxists are still taken captive by Hegel's "'spirit' and 'mass'," above-below duality.

Man, by creating an environment whereby all men can collectively participating in the Genesis 3:1-6 project (the dialectical process), "consenting to be in concord in opinion or sentiment" (Merriam-Webster—"consensus"), knowing and uniting upon that which is good (according to his natural perception), can create a new world order where he, becoming as one, i.e. becoming as one god, can live and work together in a world utilizing "good sense," accepting "the process of becoming" as the "good life." Thus, "the good life" is not something in the there-and-then, but is in the here-and-now, in "the process," the process of 'change.' It is only up to man himself to create the environmental conditions which will allow "the process" to give him life, i.e. where the sensation of "becoming," is for him, the "good life." "Dr. Skinner says: 'We must accept the fact that some kind of control of human affairs is inevitable. We cannot use good sense in human affairs unless someone engages in the design and construction of environmental conditions which affect the behavior of men.'" "Environmental changes have always been the condition for the improvement of cultural patterns, and we can hardly use the more effective methods of science without making changes on a grander scale." "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 appear to have a certain universality." "When the individual is inwardly free, he

chooses as the good life this process of becoming." "The major barrier to mutual interpersonal communication is our very natural tendency to judge, to evaluate, to approve or disapprove, the statement of the other person, or the other group." "the whole emphasis is upon process, not upon end states of being ... to value certain qualitative elements of the process of becoming, that we can find a pathway toward the open society." (Rogers) Diaprax follows (is exemplified by) Karl Marx's way of thinking. "It is not individualism that fulfills the individual, on the contrary it destroys him. Society is the necessary framework through which freedom and individuality are made realities." (Karl Marx) "The essence of man is not an abstraction inherent in each particular individual." "The real nature of man is the totality of social relations." (Marx, Thesis # 6) "Only within a social context individual man is able to realize his own potential as a rational being." (Marx, Critique) This is also reflected in psychology, i.e. Sigmund Freud and those who follow his line of thinking. "The individual is emancipated in the social group." (Brown) "The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group." (Lewin in Benne) "One of the most fascinating aspects of group therapy is that everyone is born again, born together in the group." (Yalom) "Freud, Hegel, and Nietzsche are, like Marx, compelled to postulate external domination and its assertion by force in order to explain repression.... Therefore the question confronting mankind is the abolition of repression – in traditional Christian language, the resurrection of the body. The resurrection of the body is a social project." (Brown) emphasis added Erick Fromm, at one time a member of the Transformational Marxist's organization "The Institute of Social Research," AKA "The Frankfurt School," believed that man could not overcome God's influence in his life without transcending the pain of isolation by uniting himself with society, both in theory and in practice, i.e. that social unity is inhibited when man does "not take the last logical step, to give up 'God' and to establish a concept of man as a being who is alone in the world, but who can feel at home in it if he achieves union with his fellow man and with nature." (Fromm, Escape) This is the dialectical process as it is being put into practice (praxis) in America today, as well as around the world, for the 'purpose' of social harmony and world peace. This is Diaprax —Genesis 3:1-6, man becoming as gods, man directing his own steps according to his

ways. "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 Whether done as an individual or collectively through consensus, the praxis is the same, it is sin. "Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the LORD: though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished." Proverbs 16:5 Regarding the socializing (Common-izing) of America and the world, it was the "priesthood of all believers" teaching, as practiced by those within the protestant reformation, which was the greatest obstacle to be overcome (that man, by accepting the Heavenly Father only, "And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven." Matthew 23:9, could stand alone (yet under God's direction), without socialist identity, i.e. the group, the community, etc, by being liberated from the earthly father, i.e. the Pope, the king, the facilitator, etc., he could stand alone, not only being freed from the world system, he would be willing to fight for liberty for all, despite what the team, the neighbors, the village, the county, the state, the nation, and the world—the "'New' World Order"—and even the apostate church might say to him, about him, or do to him). The Transformational Marxist, Max Horkheimer wrote: "Protestantism was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism." (Horkheimer, Vernunft) (Erick Fromm wrote that Luther's "priesthood of all believers" helped free man from the Pope, but that it was up to men, like himself, to help man free man from belief in God and loyalty to the King.)

The strength of the traditional family (the "breeding ground" of private business), with its restraints upon the individual (his immoral nature; his "polymorphous perverse behavior") and therefore its restraints upon society (tyranny, mob rule, democracy, etc.), was therefore the greatest barrier to socialism, i.e. globalism, common-ism, etc. and thus had to be annihilated. The same message Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov gave back in 1920 is still being put into practice today. At this time without guns, the process being used today is seducing its victims with promises of world peace and social justice; "if we can only work together as a team." He stated: We must overcome a "more powerful enemy, the bourgeoisie [the middle class-traditional family system], whose resistance ... and whose power lies ... in the force of habit, in the strength of small-scale production."

"Unfortunately, small-scale production is still widespread in the world, and

small-scale production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale." "... the peasantry constantly regenerates the bourgeoisie—in positively every sphere of activity and life." "... gigantic problems of re-educating ..." "... eradicating their bourgeois habits and traditions...." "... until small-scale economy and small commodity production have entirely disappeared, the bourgeois atmosphere, proprietary habits and petty-bourgeois traditions will hamper proletarian work both outside and within the working-class movement, ..." "... in every field of social activity, in all cultural and political spheres without exception." "We must learn how to eradicate all bourgeois habits, customs and traditions everywhere." (Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov) Just months prior to Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov (Lenin's) speech, Georg Lukács wrote: "The workers' council [which the consciousness of the proletariat has striven to create ever since its inception] spells the political and economic defeat of reification [the following of an established way of doing business]. In the period following the dictatorship it will eliminate the bourgeois separation of the legislature, administration and judiciary." (Lukács) emphasis added The significance of such thinking takes on meaning when you consider what George Washington stated in his Farewell Address concerning the "separation of the legislature, administration, and judiciary." "It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution, in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment 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 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. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way

which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield." (Washington) emphasis added

The effect the protestant reformation has had upon this nation is reflected in the laws and the political systems which have come down to us through the ages. These laws and political systems have changed as those who practice the dialectical process facilitate change upon those who have little or no understanding regarding the importance of standing alone with established truth (a 'closed system' of unchangingness), truth which comes from above, above the carnal "despotic" nature of man which wants to consolidate power unto its own carnal desires (an 'open system' of 'change'). The separation of the offices of government had only one purpose, to preserve the freedom and liberty of the individual, and most importantly, the freedom and liberty of the family with the father at the head, the only place where all branches are united in one office, i.e. the father being the head of the home. The secular system (the state) honored (did not impede or usurp) the office and authority of the earthly father (barring inhuman treatment, unwarranted and excessive punishment, etc.; "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right." "And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Ephesians 6:4) and the sacred system (religion) honored (did not impede or usurp) the office and authority of the heavenly father (as well as the office and authority of the earthly father). In both systems the individual is "created" (in the image of the higher authority), being set free from the tyranny of the carnal masses below (the carnal nature within and the carnal nature of society without). It is therefore the 'purpose' of those possessed with or influenced by the dialectical process, to destroy the traditional family through the praxis of "positive social change" via the consensus process. The soviet system was designed around that very 'purpose': a diverse group (which engenders conflict between faith and belief—in that which is above, and behavior and opinion—that which is below), dialoguing to consensus (which negates that which is above, i.e. belief must be preached and taught and can only be perceived as

an opinion in dialogue; to consensus meaning becoming as one "with sensuousness," i.e. the "felt" needs of human nature, that nature which counters or negates the restraints of the conscience, i.e. negates right vs. wrong since it knows no wrong in itself), over social issues (human feelings make everything social), in a facilitated meeting (the leadership skilled in manipulating the participants with the dialectical process, focusing the group upon only the "appropriate information" and upon the "appropriate behavior"), to a pre-determined outcome (that outcome being everybody's participation in the process—by doing so they collectively negate the top-down, patriarchal paradigm or traditional way of thinking and acting). In this way human nature annihilates anything which inhibits or blocks the "advancement" of human nature (open systems annihilate closed systems, i.e. closed systems inhibit or block open systems, i.e. the flesh being an open system, being lawless, lawless except to its own self, temporal, 'changing,' while the spirit is a closed system, in agreement with the law of God, eternal, unchanging). For man to 'change' from being under God to being god himself, the open system of 'change' had to be put into praxis to negate the closed system of absolutes. It is either one system or the other, one system based upon chaos, the other based upon order. For man to create order (his new world order) out of chaos, he had to first initiate and then sustain chaos against the order which is from above, i.e. the order created by a patriarchal paradigm, whether it be God or an earthly father initiating and sustaining a 'closed' system of "It is written" and "Because I said so." "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." (Marx Theses #4) Both Karl Marx (sociology) and Sigmund Freud (psychology) saw it that way. Marx saw religion, i.e. that which is sacred, sacred being that which you will not question (when man is not willing to question his faith even when it does not make sense to him in a specific situation, or does not make sense to others he wishes to build relationship with, for whatever reason, i.e. the desire to build relationship with those of like nature being blocked by the fear of judgment from God, the parent, the church, etc.), as being the root cause (and the manifesting) of all social ill (social unrest and divisions). Without freedom to question religion (freedom to question the closed system of right-wrong, above-below, without having freedom from

the "opiate," i.e. freedom from the fear of questioning God and his authority or the parent and their authority, freedom from the fear of future judgment), man, according to Marx, could not free himself from religion's control, and thus could not become himself (finding himself in an open system, i.e. that system which is found only in nature —which is really a closed system, but even if you explained that to them that they wouldn't understand, as the Apostle Paul explained in [Romans 1](#)). Karl Marx wrote: "Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people." "The critique of religion is the prerequisite of every critique." "The critique of religion ends with the categorical imperative to overthrow all conditions in which man is a debased, enslaved, neglected, contemptible being." "The critique of religion ends in the doctrine that man is the supreme being for man." (Marx, Critique) Marx believed, practiced, and promoted the condition which man had to participate in if he was to free himself from God, the condition of questioning God from the human perspective, from nature only (human questions, tied to human feelings, produce human answers, i.e. the answers are in the questions, how the question is asked will determine what the answer will be, whoever controls the questions controls the outcome). Marx clearly states the condition which had to be negated if man was to be freed from God. "The more of himself man attributes to God, the less he has left in himself." (Karl Marx in T. B. Bottomore) He believed that the King's horses were actually the people's horses, i.e. that the earth which is the Lords and the fulness thereof is really man's world, i.e. that the father's possessions, i.e. his house, his wife, his children, etc. are really the children's (collective) property. Without the annihilation of the former (the father, the patriarch, the traditional family, the bourgeoisie), the latter (the children, the heresiarch, the social family, i.e. "the village," the proletariat) could never be free. It was the structure of religion (fear of God and of his judgment upon sin), its top-down system, which prevented "change," change which was necessary if man was to become himself. The traditional family with its closed system which prevents change therefore had to be destroyed through its participation within an open system of change, "an open system ... which is responsive to its environment and readily adapts itself to disturbances in an acceptable and creative manner... that changes are more acceptable than the rules

which prevent them." (Grinder & Bandler)

When Grinder and Bandler's counseling practices (to "change" the family from a closed system of top-down to an open system of community, from an there-and-then to a here-and-now system) failed they considered "the breaking up of a family system [to] be the most beneficial outcome for the family members in terms of their ability to change and grow... [this being their solution to helping the family members who are] struggling to free themselves from the patterns of family interactions in which they are trapped." *ibid* This is the 'purpose' for all of counseling, where counselors, as Satan, come between the father and his family, come between God and man, taking that which is not his to take, playing the role of god to make man a god amongst god's . Irvin Yalom writes: "Yet, who is God's God?" "Psychotherapists who are deeply depressed and who know that they must be their own superbeing, their own intercessor, are more apt to plunge into final despair." "I have often thought that the inordinately high suicide rate among psychiatrists was one tragic commentary on this dilemma." (Yalom) Carl Rogers wrote: "It seemed to me it would be a horrible thing to have to profess a set of beliefs, in order to remain in one's profession." "The inner core of man's personality is the organism itself, which is essentially both self-preserving and social." "Do we dare to generalize from this type of experience that if we cut through deeply enough to our organismic nature, that we find that man is a positive and social animal? This is the suggestion from our clinical experience." "We try to create a relationship with him in which he is safe and free. . . To accept him as he is, to create an atmosphere of freedom in which he can move in his thinking and feeling and being, in any direction he desires." "The individual in such a moment, is coming to be what he is. He has experienced himself." "The individual increasingly comes to feel that this locus of evaluation lies within himself." (Rogers)

Freud recognized the same correlation between the earthly father figure and the heavenly father figure, as Marx did, that not questioning higher authority and its affect upon the person suppressed/repressed nature, a person's (and societies) 'true' nature can not becoming actualized. Without the annihilation of the patriarch condition, man could not know liberty, sensual liberty. "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." (Freud in Marcuse) Freud created psychology as a means to free man's nature, his "Id," his "organismic nature," his sensual impulse, from the restraints of the father's "Ego," the father's will, where instead of finding gratification within nature (in that which is natural) man is forced to find gratification in that which is above nature (in that which is not natural but spiritual, inhibiting or blocking of man's sensual 'moment' with nature). "Freud ... stressed the role of religion in the historical deflection of energy from the real improvement of the human condition to an imaginary world of eternal salvation...." (Marcuse) It was the Transformational Marxists who understood the doctrine both Marx and Freud built their thoughts and actions upon, the dialectical imagination. Marx placing the individual's identity in a society of revolution (social praxis) and Freud identifying in the individual a society of revolution, a society of impulses and pleasures. "As the Frankfurt School wrestled with how to 'reinvigorate Marx', they 'found the missing link in Freud'" (Jay) "Freud speaks of religion as a 'substitute-gratification'— the Freudian analogue to the Marxian formula, 'opiate of the people.'" (Brown) The Transformational Marxist, Theodor Adorno wrote (take into account as you read his statements that our education system is built off of this man's ideology): "God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority." "The conception of the ideal family situation for the child: (1) uncritical obedience to the father and elders, (2) pressures directed unilaterally from above to below, (3) inhibition of spontaneity, and (4) emphasis on conformity to externally imposed values." "An attitude of complete submissiveness toward 'supernatural forces' and a readiness to accept the essential incomprehensibility of 'many important things' strongly suggest the persistence in the individual of infantile attitudes toward the parents, that is to say, of authoritarian submission in a very pure form." "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." "The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem." "Using social environmental forces to change the parent's

behavior toward the child." "What is particularly important here is that recognition of one's own individuality is the basis for recognition of the individuality of everyone, and for the democratic concept of the dignity of man." (Adorno) Wilhelm Reich was a "God father figure" of social-psychology and his works greatly influenced the works of social engineers. He wrote especially concerning the role of the traditional family, regarding its inhibiting or blocking of social change. "The authoritarian family becomes the factory in which the state's structure and ideology are molded." (Reich) To him the large family had to be eradicated if nationalism was to be abated.

In the end, the 'purpose' of the dialectical process (social-psychology) all comes down to liberating man from "the patriarchal God." "Human consciousness can be liberated from the parental complex only by being liberated from its cultural derivatives, the paternalistic state and the patriarchal God." (Brown) Both Marx and Freud echo the same theme, death to the traditional family and its patriarchal father figure. Without its death the God of righteousness can not be put to death and the sensuousness of man can not come to life. Only Satan could come up with such a plan. He only has one plan and one way on how to do it, i.e. as recorded in Genesis 3:1-6, i.e. the dialectical process, i.e. using the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, i.e. that which is of the world, to draw man away from faith in God and His Word, to get him to focus upon those things which are common to his nature and to this world. The problem is not our living in the world of Diaprax, it is the world of Diaprax living in me. Since Satan could not get rid of the church by directly attack he decided to promote it from within, getting it to depend upon the things of the world to grow itself, thereby making it apostate. He attempts to do the same with you by the same method, Diaprax. "For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward." 2 Corinthians 1:12 "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not." 1 John 3:1

QUOTATIONS NOT YET INCORPORATED INTO THE ARTICLE: with some having comments.

"The community of interest generated by crime, disorder and fear of crime becomes the goal to allow community policing officer an entree into the geographic community." "The theme underlying much of the research is that once you can identify a community, you have discovered the primary unit of society above the level of the individual and the family that can be mobilized to take concerted action to bring about positive social change." (Trojanowicz)

"Identifying common ground, where all factions of a community can work together for the common good of the community in a broader problem-solving approach. Forming a partnership between police and the rest of the community where each is accountable to each other and the community as whole." "Shift in philosophy about police duties vs. community responsibilities to a team concept of Total Quality Management of the community. Reidentifying the police role as a Facilitator in the community." (COPS)

"Unfortunately, because of the reduction of influence exerted by neighbors, the extended family and even the family, social control is now often more dependent on external control, than on internal self-control." (Trojanowicz)

"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.'" (Bronner) For example the Korean War, the "Bay of Pigs," the Vietnam war, etc. were not about stopping Communism, but rather using the crisis to gain access to the American public for the purpose of bringing America under the control of Transformational Marxism with its emphasis upon Communitarianism, Common-ism, Democratization, Conscientization, Globalism, etc. The dialectical agenda is not about stopping crime but rather on how to use it to gain access to the American family and thereby gain control over the individual, changing him into an agent of social change, within the family and the community, making them, the individual,

the family, and the community, one and the same in thought and action (in theory and in practice).

The traditional family produces the conscience, which restrains change, while the social family ("the village") produces the "super-ego," which initiates and sustains 'change.' For change to take place the conscience must be converted into an adaptable to change, tolerant of ambiguity, super-ego. To get from the conscience to the super-ego the person must be helped through the stage of confusion (the attempt to fuse opposites where $A + -A$ can become what appears to be an A again. The trickery is to convince people the first A and the second A are the same, when they are not. The first A is a living soul, the second A has lost his soul. " For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Matthew 16:26). In the first A , life is in the blood, thus bread is essential to life since it provides nourishment via the blood to the cells of the body (as God designed it). But according to Jesus, the first A must also include, living according to "every word which proceedeth from the mouth of God." The $-A$, while including life in the blood, where bread is essential to life, it would also includes the sensuousness of touch, taste, sight, smell, and sound, all of which are not essential to life, as long as nourishment via some means is available to the body, being transported by the blood to the cells. While man, without sensual awareness of pleasure or pain—being in a comatose condition—would still be alive, he would not be functioning according to how God designed him. God is not against pleasure. He created us with the ability to know it and enjoy it. He is against the love of pleasure, when it supersedes his will. Therefore, while sensuousness is found in A (but being limited and restrained by "every word which proceedeth from the mouth of God") as it is found in $-A$, it is not under the same paradigm (as those who use the dialectical process would like you to think, to be explained later). By merging A and $-A$, 1) where bread as a source of nourishment for the body remains, 2) and bread as a source of pleasure to the senses remains, living according to "every word which proceedeth from mouth of God" is set aside, i.e. negated. Thus the paradigm of A and $-A$ are united into a new paradigm of 'change.' What Hegel, and those of the dialectical philosophy, would want you to think, is both A and $-A$ are simply two opposing

positions which love bread and have differing gods not of this world (illusionary gods), which limit their pleasures of this life. By both A and -A focusing upon what they have in common, the need for bread and the love of the pleasure it gives, they can find common ground, negating the restraint which their gods have upon them. By liberating the sensuousness of pleasure in both A and -A, "every word which proceedeth from the mouth of God" is negated. Thus A can become an A again, only this time, having found what it has in common with -A, void God, -A (-A thinking that it was the A all along, the original A being its opposition, i.e. being -A) and A can become an A again, both having completed the same process (negating the patriarchal paradigm, at least for the 'moment'), i.e. two opposites, by putting aside (for the moment) that which divides them, and finding what they have in common, are in the process of becoming one in the praxis of negating God.

Satan, knowing there is only one God, would like man to believe that there are many (many opinions). Thus to clearly expose diaprax for what it is A, unlike Hegel's A, is someone who serves the true and living God and -A is someone who serves a god of man's own making (in his own effort to know God, not knowing of God's revealed Word, he attempts to make a god of his own but one bound to the sensuousness of this world, therefore he ends up worshiping rocks, trees, stars, i.e. items of the creation including man and angels). Therefore, if A = bread and God's word, which restrains the sensuousness of man (restrains the lust of the flesh), and -A = bread and the sensuousness of life (which is not lust since "every word which proceedeth from the mouth of God" is not present to produce a guilty conscience according to God's Word), then by finding what A and -A have in common you negate God's Word, having uniting A and -A into a new A, this time without "every word which proceedeth from the mouth of God." This is the consensus, dialectical, synthesis process. The problem here, as resolved above, is that A and -A both have a need for bread and a need for God, yet both have a lust for the things of this world as well (including bread). By making God equal with all gods, being simply differing opinions of men (differing opinions, according to dialectical thinking, produced as a result of living in a limited and repressed traditional environment) the one and true God is dismissed as being just another opinion. Then by finding what we all have in common, needing

bread and desiring the pleasures of this life, and putting aside our differing rigid 'opinions' of god and his demands regarding our lives (dividing us), the god system (the above-below patriarchal paradigm) can be negated, not by force but by 'willful' participation as both A and -A come to a consensus for the cause of social harmony and world peace. They end up producing a new dialectically 'positive' A, where men is now many gods becoming as one, in theory and in practice . In the end, since A is a wicked person who knows and is able to obey the only true, living, and righteous God (God's righteousness imputed and his Spirit given to the person of faith so that he can obey, i.e. grace and power, love, and a sound mind) and -A is a wicked person with a god or gods of his own making or someone else's making (his wickedness remaining despite his best efforts to be righteous, i.e. works salvation), when both men come together in consensus, A putting aside God of righteousness, for the sake of human unity (basing 'purpose' of life upon his own 'driving' "sensuous needs" and "sense perception") and -A putting aside his god or gods of man's own making, for the sake of human unity (basing 'purpose' of life upon his own 'driving' "sensuous needs" and "sense perception"), both are uniting upon that which they have in common, that which is of the world—their own wicked nature—and, to sustain their unity, they must from then on devour any and all who seek after righteousness, since, according to dialectical thinking man's wickedness is perceived as being good when all come to consensus upon it as being good, righteousness inhibits or blocks human relationships. The dialectical praxis is to create producers of wickedness who consume the righteousness as their daily bread. Therefore, Consensus is a pack of wicked people driven in the purpose of devouring the righteous.

"Not feeling at home in the sinful world, Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home." (Karl Marx The Holy Family) Not feeling comfortable in a world which goes against man's carnal nature (his sin nature), a world influenced by the traditional family (with its rules and restraints against sin), the children must learn how to practice their carnal human nature (their sin nature) within the home to disrupt and change it (with the help of "change agents" within education, government, the community, and the church coming along side them in their quest for family tolerance of 'change'), changing the family into a tolerant and

harmonious social institution, supportive of man's carnal human nature, that nature which binds all mankind as one in his quest for love and unity (the love of unity, i.e. the love of pleasure and peace —approval of men—which comes by attaining freedom from repression —discrimination—against man's carnal human nature, alienating him from himself and from what he has in common with all of mankind —changing "thesis," or belief, into "sin-thesis," theory or opinion). The freedom to "question all authority" frees man from the authority which he questions (as was done in Genesis 3:1-6), replacing truth with opinions, belief with theory, rules with sensuousness and spontaneity, conscience with situation ethics (consensus in licentiousness), Godly restraint with social restraint (fear of God with fear of man), righteousness with pleasure, right and wrong with mediation, faith with doubt ("honest" doubt), obedience to higher authority with questioning higher authority, preaching and teaching with dialogue, etc. Only God will not put up with it forever, being patient for a time, knowing that some will repent. Without the confusion (the attempt to fuse opposites, i.e. putting belief and behavior on the consensus table at the same time which causes what is called "cognitive dissonance," resulting in a destabilizing condition which makes the person more subject to the conditions which pressure him into 'change,' changing him from a person who supports his belief to one who is supportive of human behavior, freeing him, and those around him, from the voice of higher authority and therefore the restraints of higher authority). A lawless world is a sinless world. That is how the lawless one can rule the world.

"Acceptance of religion mainly as an expression of submission to a clear pattern of parental authority is a condition favorable to ethnocentrism." "... ethnocentrism takes the form of pseudopatriotism; 'we' are the best people and the best country in the world, and we should either keep out of world affairs altogether (isolationism) or we should participate -- but without losing our full sovereignty, power, and economic advantage (imperialism). And in either case we should have the biggest army and navy in the world, and atom bomb monopoly." (Adorno)

[TQM:](#)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Kurt Lewin

Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics. 1948

Adorno, Theodor, *The Authoritarian Personality*

Introduction to Sociology

Allport, Gordon, *The Person in Psychology, Selected Essays by Gordon Allport*

Beiser, Frederick, *Hegel, 168, 169*

Benne, Kenneth, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*

Society as Educator in an Age of Transition, Eighty-sixth Year of the National Society for the Study of Education,

Bennis, Warren, *The Temporary Society* (an award winning book on business)

BSTEP, Behavior Science in Teacher Education Program, Federal Education Grant, Dec. 1969

Bloom, Benjamin, *Forty Year Retrospect*

Taxonomy of Educational Objective Book 1: Cognitive Domain

Bottomore, T. B., *Selected Reading in Sociology and Social Philosophy*

Bronner, Stephen Eric, *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists*

Brookover, Wilbur, *Socialization in the School*

Brown, Frank, *Education for Responsible Citizenship*, Ralph W. Tyler,

"Achievement Testing and Curriculum Construction," *Trends in Student Personnel Work*, 1949

Brown, Norman O., *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*

Coleman, James, *The Adolescent Society*

Public School-Private School

COPS, *Community Oriented Policing Services*, US Department of Justice

Dewey, John, "Social Psychology," *Psychological Review*, I (July, 1894), p. 404

Dressell, Paul, et al. *General Education: Explorations in Evaluation*, American Council on Education

Drucker, Peter, 'More freedom' or 'more harmony'? Henriette Roland

Holst, Jacques Engels and the influence of class and gender on socialists' sexual attitudes. Paper submitted to the seminar on "Labour organizations

and sexuality", Université de Bourgogne, Dijon 5 October 2001
 Engels, Frederick, *The Condition of England A review of Past and Present*,
 by Thomas Carlyle
 Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*
 Friedrich, Carl, *The Philosophy of Hegel*
 Fromm, Erich, *Escape from Freedom*
You shall be as gods
 Gramsci, Antonio, *Selection s from the Prison Notebooks*
 Grinder, John & Richard Bandler, *The Structure of Magic II*
 Habermas, Jürgen, *Communicative Ethics The inclusion of the Other.*
Studies in Political Theory
Knowledge & Human Interest, Chapter Three: The Idea of the Theory of
Knowledge as Social Theory
Theory and Practice
 Speech accepting the Peace Prize of the German Publishers and
 Booksellers Association Paulskirche, Frankfurt, 14 October 2001
 Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, *Vorlesungen über die Aesthetik Volume 1*
 Hilgard, Ernest R., *Introduction to Psychology*
 Horkheimer, Max, *Eclipse of Reason* 1947
Vernunft and Selbsterhaltung
 Howard, Jane, *Please Touch: A Guide Tour of the Human Potential*
Movement
 Jay, Martin, *The Dialectical Imagination: The History of the Frankfurt*
School and the Institute of Social Research 1923-1950
 King, Martin Luther, Jr., *Abstract of "A Comparison of the Conceptions of*
God in the Thinking of Paul Tillich and Henry Nelson Wieman"
Strength to Love
 Krathwohl, David, Bloom, Benjamin, et al. *Taxonomy of Educational*
Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain
 Kuhn, Thomas, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*
 Laszlo, Ervin, *A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World*
Order
 Lenin, Vladimir (Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov), *Left-Wing Communism: an*
Infantile Disorder An Essential Condition of the Bolsheviks' Success, May
 12, 1920
 Lewin, Kurt, *A Dynamic Theory of Personality: Selected Papers*

Principles of Re-education, "Conduct, Knowledge, and Acceptance of New Values" The Journal of Social Issues, 1:3:56-65 August, 1945

Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics. 1948

Lewis, John, *The life and Teaching of Karl Marx*; International Pub.; NY, 1965

Lukács, György , *History & Class Consciousness Class Consciousness What is Orthodox Marxism?*

Marcuse, Herbert, *Eros and Civilization*

Maslow, Abraham, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*

Maslow on Management

Toward a Psychology of Being

Marx, Karl, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'

The Holy Family, Chapter VII Critical Criticism's Correspondence 1; The Critical Mass

MEGA I/3

MEGA I/5

Thesis #4 on Feuerbach

Thesis #6 on Feuerbach

Thesis #11 on Feuerbach

Moreno, J. L., *Who Shall Survive?*

Nugent, Jim, *Henry Nelson Wieman*

Paul, Richard, *Critical Thinking Handbook*

Piaget, Jean, *Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child: Development of Teaching Methods*

Reich, Wilhelm, *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*

Rogers, Carl, *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*

Sarv, Ele - Silvia, [*Teacher education in a postmodern society: an Estonian perspective*](#)

Schein, Edger, and Warren Bennis *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach*

Schubeck S. J., 1993

Seay, George Russell, Jr. *Theologian of Synthesis: The Dialectical Method of Martin Luther King, Jr. as Revealed in His Critical Thinking on Theology, History, and Ethics.*

Spady, Bill, *Outcomes, "Shifting the Grading Paradigm that Pervades Education"*

Trojanowicz, Robert, *The meaning of "Community" in Community Policing*

Ulyanov , Vladimir Ilyich (see Lenin above)

Vygotsky, L. S., *Mind in Society*

Washington, George, *Farewell Address*

Wieman, Henry Nelson, *Religious experience and scientific method.*

Wheat, Leonard, *Paul Tillich's Dialectical Humanism: Unmasking the God above God.*

Yalom, Irvin, *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*

Hegel's Lectures on the History of Philosophy Introduction B. Relation of Philosophy to Other Departments of Knowledge

FOOTNOTES

1. Situation: where things are judged by their context or environmental situation instead of by unquestionable and "*universally binding*" principles. As in "situation ethics."

2. Categorical imperative: where things are judged by unquestionable principles rather than by their context or environmental situation. "*A moral obligation or command that is unconditionally [unquestionable] and universally binding [applies to everyone and/or everything].*" Merriam-Webster's bracketed information added

3. "*Sense-perception* (see Feuerbach) must be the basis of all science. Only when it proceeds from sense-perception in the two-fold form of *sensuous* consciousness and *sensuous* need – is it *true* science. All history is the history of preparing and developing "man" to become the object of *sensuous* consciousness, and turning the requirements of "man as man" into his needs. History itself is a *real* part of *natural history* – of nature developing into man. Natural science will in time incorporate into itself the science of man, just as the science of man will incorporate into itself natural science: there will be *one* science. " (Karl Marx; *Private Property and Communism*; 1844)

4. "But since for the socialist man the *entire so-called history of the world* is nothing but the creation of man through human labour, nothing but the emergence of nature for man, so he has the visible, irrefutable proof of his *birth* through himself, of his *genesis*. Since the *real existence* of man and nature has become evident in practice, through sense experience, because man has thus become evident for man as the being of nature, and nature for man as the being of man, the question about an *alien* being, about a being above nature and man – a question which implies the admission of the unreality of nature and of man – has become impossible in practice. *Atheism*, as the denial of this unreality, has no longer any meaning, for atheism is a *negation of God*, and postulates *the existence of man* through this negation; but socialism as socialism no longer stands in any need of such a mediation. It proceeds from the *theoretically and practically sensuous consciousness* of man and of nature as the *essence*. Socialism is man's *positive self-consciousness*, no longer mediated through the abolition of religion, just as *real life* is man's positive reality, no longer mediated through the abolition of private property, through *communism*. Communism is the position as the negation of the negation, and is hence the *actual* phase necessary for the next stage of historical development in the process of human emancipation and rehabilitation. *Communism* is the necessary form and the dynamic principle of the immediate future, but communism as such is not the goal of human development, the form of human society." (Karl Marx; *Private Property and Communism*; 1844)

5. "To say that man is a *corporeal*, living, real, *sensuous*, objective being full of natural vigor is to say that he has *real, sensuous objects* as the object of his being or of his life, or that he can only *express* his life in real, *sensuous* objects. *To be* objective, natural and *sensuous*, and at the same time to have object, nature and sense outside oneself, or oneself to be object, nature and sense for a third party, is one and the same thing " (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy in General*; 1844)

6. "If I *know* religion as *alienated* human self-consciousness, then what I know in it as religion is not my self-consciousness, but my alienated self-consciousness confirmed in it. I therefore know my self-consciousness that belongs to itself, to its very nature, confirmed not in *religion* but rather in

annihilated and superseded religion. " "A peculiar role, therefore, is played by the act of *superseding* in which denial and preservation, i.e., affirmation, are bound together. " (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy in General*; 1844)

7. "First as a *merely formal*, because abstract, act, because the human being itself is taken to be only an *abstract, thinking being*, conceived merely as self-consciousness. And,

Secondly, because the exposition is *formal* and *abstract*, the supersession of the alienation becomes a confirmation of the alienation; or for Hegel this movement of *self-genesis* and *self-objectification* in the form of *self-alienation and self-estrangement* is the *absolute*, and hence final, *expression of human life* – of life with itself as its aim, of life at peace with itself, and in unity with its essence.

This movement, in its abstract ||XXXI| form as dialectic, is therefore regarded as *truly human life*, and because it is nevertheless an abstraction – an estrangement of human life – it is regarded as a *divine process*, but as the divine process of man, a process traversed by man's abstract, pure, absolute essence that is distinct from himself.

Thirdly, this process must have a bearer, a subject. But the subject only comes into being as a result. This result – the subject knowing itself as absolute self-consciousness – is therefore *God, absolute Spirit, the self-knowing and self-manifesting idea*. Real man and real nature become mere predicates – symbols of this hidden, unreal man and of this unreal nature. Subject and predicate are therefore related to each other in absolute reversal – a *mystical subject-object* or a *subjectivity reaching beyond the object* – the *absolute subject* as a *process*, as *subject alienating* itself and returning from alienation into itself, but at the same time retracting this alienation into itself, and the subject as this process; a pure, *incessant* revolving within itself. " (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy in General*; 1844)

8. "*For us, mind has nature for its premise, being nature's truth and for that reason its absolute prius. In this truth nature has vanished, and mind has resulted as the idea arrived at being-for-itself, the object of which, as well as the subject, is the concept. This identity is absolute negativity, for whereas in nature the concept has its perfect external objectivity, this its alienation has been superseded, and in this alienation the concept has become identical with itself. But it is this identity therefore, only in being a return out of nature.*" [§ 381].

"As the *abstract idea, revelation* is unmediated transition to, the *coming-to-be* of, nature; as the revelation of the mind, which is free, it is the *positing* of nature as the *mind's world* – a positing which, being reflection, is at the same time, a *presupposing* of the world as independently existing nature. Revelation in conception is the creation of nature as the mind's being, in which the mind procures the *affirmation* and the *truth* of its freedom." "*The absolute is mind. This is the highest definition of the absolute.*" " 384.] |XXXIV

© *Institution for Authority Research, Dean Gotcher 2010-2015 (2023/9/14)*