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**1. Introduction.**

This short, somewhat egg-heady essay of just over fifteen pages was self-published as an eBook on Amazon on December 21st, 2020 and presents a dialectical view that unites the Materialistic Dialectic of Communism with the original Idealist Dialectic of Hegel which requires a fair understanding of the gist of this essay which is derived from a set of four previously submitted Facebook posts that can collapse Communist governments and Oligarchic economies worldwide in just a matter of a few months through the spontaneous break-out of a combination of rioting and dancing in the streets that will free the victims of both Communism and Oligarchy and establish the leadership of those who have best mastered this newly introduced “Dialectic of Balance,” an evolutionary development that unites Capitalism and Communism in a higher dialectical understanding that can only be described as a Dialectic of Dialectics. It need only be understood by a few hundred worldwide to have this effect.

Those who understand the dialectical notion of sudden paradigm shift first presented by Georg Friedrich von Hegel in the early 1800’s, usually referred to as the change from quantity to quality and the driving motivator behind Marxist and Maoist revolution will know immediately what I am referring to.

Once this understanding reaches the threshold of being fairly well understood by a few hundred individuals dispersed throughout the world, the new dialectic will reach “Critical Mass” and a paradigm shift will occur and lives and fortunes will be made and lost overnight as the Idealist and Materialist Dialectics fall together and are subsumed and sublated into this new “Dialectic of Balance” and radically change leadership and hierarchy worldwide.

This shift is many ways predicted by both Hegelians and Marxists, but it was not specifically mentioned by either those idealistic or materialistic dialecticians and is a coming cultural phenomenon rather than an individual understanding of the difficult notion of dialectics.

2. Instruction in Both the Hegelian Idealistic and the Marxist Materialistic Dialectic.

In the ordinary logic that prevailed from early Greek philosophy until the early 1800’s, “dialectic” referred to what was merely ordinary cognitive argument and syllogism applied through the Socratic method where a discussion, focusing on logically established truth and the pursuit of knowledge rather than on rhetorical skill and the art of persuasion were used to establish or question propositions and arguments.

The Idealistic and Materialistic Dialectic is a much more intellectually challenging form of dialectical reasoning first described by Hegel is used in conjunction with a dynamic rather than a static universe and is meant to establish propositions and conclusions about the fundamental structure of the physical universe, its evolution as well as the structure and evolution of the psychical, the philosophical, and the historical.

The Socratic Dialectic then and now assumes either a universe at rest or isolated in a frozen moment of time and space while the Hegelian Idealistic Dialectic is a novel form of argument which presupposes an ever mobile, dynamic universe with an ever mobile presentation of discoverable truth that requires a separate dialectic to be observed and described to evaluate and make judgements about all of previous, contemporary, and future developments of truth through time.

The dynamic, Idealistic Dialectic can also observe and describe the movement of a culture through time in terms of a never ending cycle of the alternation of coming to be and coming not to be (e.g. you cannot step into the same river twice) that demonstrates a third part of a three-part cycle between being and not being as becoming.

While later writers identified this process as thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, Hegel never did. In fact Hegel criticized that model as excessively conceptualized and divorced from the reality of the non-thinking forces of the universe. His description of the cycle of being, becoming, not being was “abstraction, concretization, and negation” which better describes the on-going changes in the unthinking, ever changing river and recognizes that the changes in the river are only recognized by the observer describing it.

The dialectic of the dynamic universe simply represented in the example of the river, can also be applied to cultural developments over time viewing a particular period of history as a concretization or the being of that culture at that point of time, its on-going modifications as its abstraction or non being, and its reconstitution as its becoming or the negation of its concretization by its abstraction. In the evaluation of the dynamic universe, these changes can be recognized as momentary or fleeting or taken in the longer term as the development of historical eras.

This dynamic dialectic used to evaluate a dynamic culture allowed Hegel to describe the development of simple logical capabilities of an early culture into progressively more complex capabilities as a distinct and recognizable series of predictable stages through which all cultures must progress in order to advance their level of civilization.

The Hegelian Dialectic was the model for the Marxist, Leninist, Stalinist, and Maoist Materialistic or Communist Dialectic originally proposed by Marx which used this same dynamic process to describe developments in the economic systems of a culture over time in a similar manner. His proposal however “turned Hegel on his head” as they say by reversing the primary orientation of the dialectic from the psychical (the Idealistic) to the physical (the materialistic). In support of this change Marx argued that philosophers like Hegel could interpret history but could not change it and change was required to address the problems of industrialization that Marx and others wanted to address. His reversal of idealistic thinking into materialistic thinking required and made it possible to view history in economic rather than philosophic terms, and he argued this difference made it possible to use dialectical reasoning to both evaluate historical change and to effect rather than merely interpret historical change.

The difference between the Idealistic and Materialistic Dialectics also reflected and reenergized the two or three hundred year debate between the Rationalistic and Empirical viewpoints to the applications of scientific methods in the Scientific Revolution that began around the time of Bacon and Descartes, continued through the eras of Hegel and Marx and still continues to some extent today in the “mind-body problem”. The following two sections, the first rather short and the second a good bit longer and much more difficult address these developments in the history of philosophy and science before returning in Section 5 to an assessment of the value of the Materialistic Dialectic of Communism, which is demonstrated to be the same, but somewhat more sophisticated as the unconscious but quite palpable and effective dialectics of oligarchy.

**3. This One’s a Little Harder and More Egg-Heady.**

"The perceptual apparatus results in perception," is a tautologically correct assertion whose only value is to discount the idea that perception cannot actually be scientifically established as might be asserted by either Rationalists or Empiricists in a moment of incaution: Rationalists, citing Descartes, might assert that "Cogito ergo sum" means pure cognition can include no sense data whatsoever and thus science is impossible, and empiricists, following Berkeley, might assert there could be no reason with which to receive and assess perception at all as a Tabla Rasa is a Tabla Rasa; thus, also rendering all science impossible. Both extremes are begged by strict applications of the two positions, and frankly, are hard to deny

However, not wishing to enter into a discussion of this old debate, the tautological assertion that the perceptual apparatus results in perception is a useful beginning for the observation and analysis of perception as a necessary prerequisite to any postulation of either innate reason or a Tabla Rasa.

Neither Rationalism nor Empiricism deny the existence of perception, they just ignore it in discussions of the role of sense data independent of a discussion of perception in a rush to establish either innate reason or a Tabla Rasa as the foundational source of good science. This, however, is a fundamental error in approach and methodology, avoiding the necessity of observing, describing, and analyzing the nature of perception itself before either position can be asserted.

In properly approaching the observation and description of perception before anything else, it is necessary to conclude that both ever-changing and ever-present sense data are perceived to some degree by all animate organisms (at least) from their operations in the inanimate world in which they vary their existence either automatically or by design.

This forces the sole conclusion that an organism has one mechanism for perceptual reception and another one for perceptual response and in some cases a third for the evaluation of perceptual data to allow for more than one possible response and a deliberative process to make decisions.

In the lowest level organisms such as amoebas and even plants, it seems likely that the mechanism for perceptual reception and response are all that is needed, but in higher level organisms particularly those that are independently mobile, the apparatus for the reception of sense data must be distinct from the apparatus for the response to sense data, and in even higher organisms, those which exhibit the ability to choose between possible reactions to sense stimuli, it is necessary to postulate a third mechanism, the one which evaluates sense data for the best possible response among two or more.

To make this third and likely final possibility clear, the particularly complex organisms of higher primates, including those with the faculty of speech, provide particularly useful specimens for exemplification of the matter. In particular, in their exhibition of complex sense data reception and discrimination, complex sense data processing and evaluation, and complex and varying responses to sense data, it is necessary to postulate three distinct, holistic aggregates of sense data that arise, interact, and disappear in an on-going, coordinated symbiosis that accounts for the mobility of these organisms.

Thus, it is necessary to conclude that in these higher organisms, the reception of sense data results in an on-going, ever changing self-image as a “perceived self" which is immediately mixed with an on-going, ever changing "perceiving self" which includes memory, cognitive capabilities, and the ability to produce a third self-image as a "potential self" or "imagined self" that may or may not be communicated to the physical organism proper to initiate and maintain the activities of sense response.

Thus, perceived self, perceiving self, and potential or imagined self are constantly generated, and, based on an impetus by perceiving self, some aspect of imagined self is communicated to the physical apparatus to initiate and then maintain response.

4. THIS ONE IS WAY EGG-HEADY, BUT IT'S SUNDAY, AND IF YOU'VE GOT NOTHING BETTER TO DO, WHY NOT THINK ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE UNIVERSE? BESIDES, IT QUESTIONS WESTERN SCIENCE AT ITS CORE [ORIGINAL TITLE OF THE FACEBOOK POST].

"The Mind-Body Problem is not the Problem or The End of Western Science as We Know It," a discussion from my essay, "Defending Olympus":

.

The Mind-Body Problem as classically and currently conceived has never been scrutinized in and for itself. Arguments over two millennia have provided a cacophony of positions on the issue, but the issue itself has not been questioned as the distinction between mind and body in one form or another has been taken as an axiomatic given from the earliest philosophical reconsiderations of folklore and superstition. While philosophers have exhausted the possible variations of how a mind body problem might be conceived and have supported every one of those positions or the others in that process, they have not looked sufficiently at the unified, common source of that dichotomy, which is perception, which must first be looked at impartially on its own without any such preliminary assumptions about its nature.

The unified, common source of both mind and body, which has so far been falsely identified as one entity which is an apparatus capable of physical perception and interactions with sense data but without a mechanism for reflection and another which is capable of reflection without an apparatus for perception, both of which are aspects of the to some degree observable and to some degree predictable interactions of a specific and individual mind/body with a general and universal cosmos/sense data, are in fact at the base artifacts of a singular on-going perception.

The principles of good science dictate that a proper and preliminary investigation of perception itself is a necessary prerequisite to any formal observation, investigation, and description of anything else and even before postulating mind and body and long before a Mind-Body Problem can be discussed.

By observing, investigating, and describing perception first, without such presuppositions, the Mind-Body problem emerges in a way that challenges the entire history of western science and demonstrates the impossibility of ever separating mind and body as well as the seeming impossibility of ever demonstrating a connection between them.

This discussion not only recasts the Mind-Problem in this rather troublesome but new fashion, it also provides a solution to it through the demonstration of a “half-psychical, half-physical” connection, a “missing link” that definitively resolves 2000 years of polemicized argument, and even more importantly, it demonstrates an extreme poverty of stimulus from the side of matter that cannot account for even the most basic aspects of conscious experience and much of the physical world without attributing a far greater role to mind than has been affected to date, a role that can only be recognized through the postulation of mind as the hypothesized fifth interaction of physics, and which creates a whole new world of science through the primacy of the physics of thought, the primes of thought processes that constitute the fundamental forces.

As stated, to properly begin a formal study of man and his world is to first observe and describe the perceptual process and detail explicitly what can and cannot be known of it before it is brought to bear on the observation of anything else. This leads inevitably and immediately to the identification of three components of perception: the sense data, the organs of sense reception, and the organs of response as well as the identification of their three functions, the reception of sense data, the processing of sense data, and the response or lack of response to sense data.

Body, mind, God, or cosmos can as yet play no role in the discussion until the three components and their three functions are better observed, analyzed and described. Even formal distinctions and definitions of thought and world are as yet premature. Strictly applied, the dictates of sound scientific investigation insist that even the outside world cannot yet be firmly posited as the organs of reception may in fact be organs of the generation of sense data.

In addition, it must be recognized that the three components and the three functions of perception are irretrievably intertwined and interdependent. While it is of course possible to separate and investigate their operations and interactions in principle, they cannot be separated in fact without the destruction of all three components and all three functions resulting in the death of the individual under consideration.

It is then further noted that some responses to the sense data seem to be immediate and automatic while others seem to be considered. Those that seem to be immediate and automatic are either perpetual life processes such as breathing or intermittent and variable such as responses to pain, while those that seem to be considered are those which involve multiple possible actions or deferments of actions such as walking or eating.

With the recognition of the dichotomy of automaticity and the possibility of delay, the issue of a possible conscious perceiver making decisions first arises and raises two questions: is the multiplicity of possible alternative actions and deferments of actions necessarily mediated by a choice by a cognizant perceiver, or are they in fact just a species of automatic physical response the foundations of which are not yet understood? The question must also be asked in the reverse wondering if the automatic responses are in fact considered but in a way not yet recognized. It is here that mind and body dualism first enters the discussion, but it enters under the weight of the understanding that if any of the three sensory components or any of the three sensory functions were removed the being under examination would cease to exist.

The intuitively obvious presence to the scientist and to all normal, perceiving, human beings being observed or questioned on the matter of a knowing perceiver making choices, an agent, identified, recognized, reported, and addressed in language in the first person singular must also be subjected to similar scrutiny.

This knowing agent has an awareness of at least some of the automatic processes over which he/she has no control which are considered of crucial importance to the maintenance of the existence of that agent, whose existence itself is taken to be of the utmost importance and for which it believes many of its choices such as eating and sleeping are being made. This all important sense of existence of the perceiver is designated as “life” by the perceiver and contrasts with physical determinations of death which describe the cessation of the perceptual apparatus.

The crucial dependence on the physical world of the body for the maintenance of life is also known to the agent. This agent also reports doubt as to his/her freedom and independence in some of the choices that are made and to whether or not some or many are in some way determined by other beings as much as by the body and the physical world.

That is, this agent also identifies, recognizes, reports, and comports him/herself and others not only as agents but as a theme or a patient, something acted upon by other things and other organisms which is constructed of interactions with the physical world and communal interaction with other organisms, and the determinations of behaviors by those participants also play a role in making choices.

In fact, borrowing terminology from modern theoretical syntax, the agent will often regard him/herself and other beings and other things as any of agent, patient, theme, experiencer, stimulus, instrument, force, goal, recipient, source, beneficiary, or cause of his/her own and others’ actions and will report using such determinations as factors in making choices. Thus, to the individuals, interactions with other minds play as large a role in determining choices as simple agency or subject-hood and at least as much as physical determination by the body or the material world.

That is, in addition to the role played by physical stimuli, the conception of the central agent as 1st person singular to him/herself or as 2nd or 3rd person singular to others in at least two or three of the different roles just outlined is also reported to play a part in determining choices.

To cover the wide range of possible roles, the agent is more adequately described as a consciousness rather than an agent which can more flexibly accommodate the many, varying roles, and this consciousness is determined to be variously, independent of, dependent on, or interdependent with, though not of the same substance as, other consciousness’s of the world as well as independent, dependent, and interdependent on the physical components of the body and the rest of the world.

The term “mind” might be considered a suitable alternative or even preferable to the term consciousness, but the term mind is inadequate to and wider in scope than this subsuming of roles just described as it is neutral in regards to deliberations that take roles into account, and it is still a necessary term and cannot be abandoned as it serves the purpose of a more general category to describe the locus of all mental phenomena conscious or not.

5. Exposing both Communism and Oligarchy.

Returning now to the discussion of the Idealistic and Materialistic Dialectics and their impending collapse into one, which, given the nature of dialectics will inevitably be followed by their re-arising as a new and third possibility that includes both, it is necessary to recognize that the Idealistic Dialectic, argued to be interpretive only and to lack any means of praxis (Marx’s term for practical application), has been relegated to a realm of a few proponents thoroughly trained in philosophy and either not believing or not caring that the Idealistic Dialectic has no praxis, while the Materialistic Dialectic, consciously recognized, studied, and applied as such in the Communist Dialectic and unconsciously recognized and applied in an Oligarchic Dialectic is currently driving the political and economic systems of the world of both Capitalist and Communist nations and has reached the saturation point in terms of quantity referred to as critical mass which precedes the transformation of quality in an immanent paradigm shift.

 In spite of the complexities of modern political and economic systems, the fact remains that progress of the dialectic through the dissemination of its understanding among the world’s populations is the fundamental factor in the impetus that will ignite the paradigm shift and everything else in our political and economic systems will be preserved, jettisoned, or transformed according the dialectical dynamic.

 This is and has been widely studied in Communist countries and to some small degree in Capitalist economies and those that understand the dialectic recognize that everything else in politics and economics is completely superfluous.

This understanding by an elite of Dialectic Materialists of both Communist and Capitalist backgrounds has transformed the theories and practices of governments and economies into mere snipe hunts maintained by those in power to keep the populace bamboozled and at bay, while they secure and expand their power, wealth and influence at the expense of the populations around them and in their realm of responsibility.

The Materialist Dialectic now seen in its latest form in both Capitalist and Communist Oligarchies might now be better named the "Dialectic of Expeditiousness" as it is designed to support to the highest degree, the greed and will to unquestioned power of those who recognize its value and function and which is found in all tyrannies whether they be oligarchies, aristocracies or dictatorships.

The true goal of the praxis of the Dialectic of Expeditiousness is for a power mad Communist or Capitalist oligarch to maintain him/herself in power through a theory that, as stated, is in essence a snipe hunt for all those who don't understand the dialectic, and its proper role in maintaining power.

With a never ending back and forth and run around for the population sent to the chase the snipe of progress and prosperity through theory, "practical" methods, and promises, all of which are too obscure or too vague to ever provide any recognizable or testable mastery, the credulous who don't understand that everything but the dialectic is the wayward, elusive snipe, are forever maintained in a fruitless dance of one step forward and two steps back with the equivalent of a Mao, a Stalin, or a Trickle Down Fairy dangling a utopia at the end of the endless road that only they know can never be achieved.

Those who hold power through understanding that the dialectic alone is the sole theoretical mechanism of the entire theory that is meant to be taken seriously and is the sole mechanism that could have any practical effect do not have to know Communist theory or the Trickle Down Fairy theory in any great depth. They only need to know half a dozen strategies couched in those theories that keep the populace dancing the dance and chasing the snipe.

The masters of the Dialectic of Expeditiousness keep entire administrations and entire populaces in the fruitless and futile dance that will never reach an end while they hold power, wealth, and authority through a pretense to having deeply understood the whole theory rather than just the dialectic and those half a dozen or so minor strategies to keep the dance going.

Even for those who have only recently understood that the dialectic is the sole praxis and that everything else is a snipe hunt are kept at bay through forcing them to prove themselves with the impossible theory which the new comers know is a morass they will never escape.

Exposing this dynamic of the Dialectic of Expeditiousness is potentially a dangerous thing to do as it could inspire more of the power mad to study the dialectic of expeditiousness and further propagate the abuses of communism and oligarchy. However, on the positive side, it could also provide a too wide knowledge of this dynamic and significantly increase the competition of the masters of the dialectic and at first weaken it and then destroy it for all those would benefit from it through the presence of excessive competition. Both possibilities could result.

Fortunately, there is a third and a better possible result in exposing the snipe hunt organizers if it is possible to provide a theoretical mechanism that can be offered instead that can either subsume or undermine the Dialectic of Expeditiousness, which is the deeper reason for the current exposition, to present a solution that at first subsumes and then undermines the Dialectic of Expeditiousness, and then replaces it with a new dialectic of its own.

This solution is one that is actually quite simple and obvious for those who are capable of dialectical thinking of the sort just described, so simple and so obvious in fact that it is surprising that it has not been noticed before.

The solution exists in the nature of basic dialectic itself as the recognition that the Materialistic Dialectic is the natural opposing negation of the original Idealistic Dialectic and the Dialectic of Expeditiousness is a historically developed degradation of the weaker of the two dialectics and will naturally be subsumed, sublated and recombined with the original in a higher and more valuable understanding.

This newer and more advanced dialectic, the Dialectic of Balance, which includes practical materialistic goals and leadership along with practical idealistic goals and leadership resulting in goals and leadership that synthesize economics and politics as well as philosophical and historical growth in an economic-political system and philosophical-historical dialectic that can only be understood and achieved through understanding the two earlier dialectics and uniting them in a dialectic of dialectics (like an interweaving triplet of three porous but indestructible balls mixing with a second triple of three porous but indestructible balls, to form a third set that absorbs and supervenes over the first two).

This is not a simplistic argument seeking to promote a mediating socialist economic system between the extremes of Capitalism and Communism (both of which are materialist and neither of which are idealistic) but a proposal for a far more intellectually difficult achievement in the understanding of the subsumption/sublation of two dialectical systems into their recombination in a dialectic of the immediate interpenetration and interchange of the Idealistic and Materialistic Dialectics into the Dialectic of Balance.

**6. Linchpin to Armageddon.**

The problem with a Materialistic Dialectic is that learning it proceeds through a very difficult intellectual process to understand, achieve, and then apply it, but once it has been achieved, the user’s intellect is necessarily overwhelmed by matter in a reversal of the original ability to use the intellect to approach and affect the material world and matter as matter, the undifferentiated environment, has subsumed the mind. The materialistic collective now determines everything the materialist dialectician does and says. The mind over matter processes that were used to accomplish the Materialistic Dialectic has become replaced by a matter over mind reality, and the intellect and the personality of the materialist dialectician is gone. To use the movie series *Matrix* for an example, the dialectician has become a Smith.

The user has become an automaton and a slave to the conventions of current, popular materialism with no ability to choose or determine anything personally and is no longer capable of using intellect to improve his/her understanding in any way or to modify it in any way under his/her own direction. Everything is a “we” and nothing is an “I” in a sameness of insatiable consumption that results in a never ending pyramid scheme of organization and leadership driven by the materialistic competitiveness that quips, “The one who dies with the most money wins.”

He/she has sabotaged their intellectualism in action and frozen it in subservience to the operations of matter, and has it in name only as a past accomplishment that cannot be undone or altered, which results in constant assertions of past degrees and awards but no ability to innovate or respond spontaneously or personally. Humor, creativity, and vulnerability in others is now despised.

Intellect has been rendered inoperative and is overwhelmed by the collective and the instinctual and the Materialist now lives by drives alone and simply consumes without the satiation that would otherwise have been determined by the operations of the intellect and good sense. Like a dog rabidly devouring his dinner rather than taking time to savor, to choose between main dish and side dishes, or to enjoy the atmosphere and place settings or conversation with others at the table, there is no goal beyond consumption and nothing to enjoy in particular or along the way. Consumption itself is the sole taste and the sole goal

Every family, social, or professional engagement is characterized by efforts by a desperate completion to dominate and consume and if the slightest frustration of their efforts are presented whether reasonable or not, the materialists are overwhelmed and become predators rather than consumers seeking to destroy the source of frustration as avidly as they consume anything and everything in their path. The insatiable consumption has become a ravenous aggression until the object of frustration is destroyed and then consumed to reestablish the pattern of insatiable consumption. Hegel aptly called this form of perpetual competition in social interaction, “a battle to the death.”

This drive to consumption leaves the Materialistic Dialcticians constantly unsatisfied, frustrated, and on edge, resulting in the dour, bitter, and angry countenances of the “successes” at this dynamic. They can neither understand nor question their own insatiability and blame the world or the liberals or the poor … anyone and anything for their frustration and insatiability in a desperate bid to understand what can rise to no greater awareness than a general sense that someone or something is at fault. The someone or something that is at fault cannot be them because they are a “we” that has succeeded which is the sole demonstration of success or achievement.

Oligarchs and Communists are identical in this as both use a Materialistic Dialectic to arrive at their positions of influence, power, and wealth, and neither can any longer question or move beyond that point where they simply consume whatever and wherever they can constantly and insatiably with no concern for anyone or anything, not even themselves, other than consumption.

The philosophical bases and justifications for both oligarchy and communism seem different and even opposed, but that is merely an artifact of the historical circumstances that led to the development of the Materialistic Dialectic in the culture from which it was learned. The original Capitalist, Communist, or Oligarchic philosophies are as frozen in time and space as are their adherents and proponents. The philosophies and the adherents and proponents do not and cannot change because they have achieved exactly what they wanted, the overwhelming of the intellect by the material; thus, intellect is no longer available for re-evaluation and further development of the dialectic either in principle or to suit changing physical, cultural, and historical variations in time or in taste.

Their personalities as well as their discretion are at the mercy of a collective that determines everything and which is as frozen in time and space as they are. They are no longer capable of contributing to the culture or to its on-going historical development and have become drains on its resources and destructive forces that cannot understand or participate in the dynamic processes of culture and history.

They are smug in their achievement and cruel, foolish, and indiscriminate in their application of it, but they cannot choose with particularity or personal taste and live in a world in which everything is determined by the wider network of those who have achieved the same, frozen intellectual standpoint. They also find it difficult to think and cannot introspect at all or reason things through and respond impulsively and aggressively toward anything that is not understood, presents an intellectual challenge, or threatens a change to the status quo.

Both communists and oligarchs thus contribute nothing, consume only, and are destructive to any culture that does not make efforts to either jail them to reeducate and redirect them in their efforts or, at the very least, removes them from positions of power and influence and legally curtails the dynamics that made them possible in the first place.

Fortunately, those who understand the Idealistic Dialectic and have not abandoned that for the Materialistic can, by regarding and considering the differences between the Idealistic and the Materialistic Dialectics, subsume and sublate both into the Dialectic of Balance which will naturally and automatically subsume and sublate the Materialistic Dialectic and the materialists themselves into lesser roles within the spheres of influence of the Dialectic of Balance and the frozen world of dominance and insatiable consumption will be dissolved and replaced by reason, common sense, and leadership and organization that reflects the practical needs and goals of the entire society rather than just those who consume without thinking or caring who are what is destroyed in the process.

7. CONCLUSION.

In general, the paradigm shift that will inevitably result as the understanding of the Dialectic of Balance spreads need not be feared, but as stated in the Introduction to this short eBook, lives and fortunes will be lost and made overnight, and as such, there will be short term, very real danger. However, lacking formal planning and organization and generated through an apotheosis of the wisest of the wise, it represents an evolutionary advance of the species from homo sapiens sapiens to homo sapiens sapiens sapiens and will end quickly, perhaps in just a few months, with very positive gains for the common good worldwide that will end "ends justifies the means thinking," polarization and demonization of opposing parties and philosophies as well as much oppression and misery on the planet and will hold the species in good stead for at least another two or three thousand years.

It will not matter much if governments change their form of organization or declare their economies to be anything other than what they are whether they be Communist, Socialist, or Capitalist as the new paradigm will be able to work within any of them toward positive goals that benefit the common good.

If you’re interested in either encouraging or preventing it, work on the material originally presented here to get as deep an understanding of the dynamic as you can and simply go about your business with the new perspective.