

Thesis, antithesis and synthesis.

According to our current understanding, a thesis needs its counterpart - the antithesis - to be confirmed or to be revised (falsified) by it. If the opportunity should be open both for the confirmation and the revision, thesis, antithesis and synthesis must be separate principles. This option must indeed exist until we have found the examined law as a real law. In the event, however, that the antithesis confirms the thesis fully, the antithesis must be either insubstantial or identical to the thesis.

If the antithesis is insubstantial, it is of no use. In this respect, an antithesis confirms the thesis completely only then, if it is identical with the thesis. But then it does no longer exist as a counterpart to the thesis and is identical both to the thesis and the synthesis. If these three principles of understanding are identical to each other, they are no longer separate principles. However, the possibility both of the confirmation and the revision made required the separateness. Moreover, then thesis and synthesis do no longer fulfill the polar structure of the material world.

Thus, on the one hand, the non-existence of the antithesis provide no absolute statement about the thesis. On the other hand its existence can never really confirm the thesis, because it would always question them, in which the separateness again is required. Finally, the antithesis can become a rule, which makes the former rule to the exception. In any case, the antithesis has always an attenuating function, if it is not identical to the thesis, but it may be never so great that it can bring the whole thesis to disappear. For, if the antithesis can bring the theory completely to disappear, it would be something like a thesis and would also be identical to the synthesis. Then thesis, antithesis and synthesis were again no more separate principles and would no longer be consistent with the polar structure of the material world. Again, the antithesis would no longer exist as a counterpart to the thesis.

We see that the antithesis neither can confirm nor can quite completely revise the thesis, if both principles are separated to each other. **This in turn has the consequence that in the sense of an absolute statement about the things there is only the possibility that thesis, antithesis, and synthesis may be no separate principles.** Nevertheless, the sense of synthesis is to interconnect thesis and antithesis in a way that it can itself be a finality. **But this finality would require that thesis, antithesis and synthesis must be identical to each other.** This is exactly what the structure of the material world prohibits.

Because the antithesis is potentially in the thesis, and vice versa, the two principles are always something like two half-units/half-truths which are always in itself something incomplete. Because, what would make a principle complete is potentially in the other principle, even though it may be only a very small part. The missing part of the respective principle cannot be refunded completely because of the temporal or spatiotemporal separation of the complementary principles. If each principle in itself is incomplete, the respective units which result from the complementary principles, are also incomplete. This in turn follows from the fact that the nonlinearity is considered in the universe, according to which the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. And so the two complementary principles always give anything less than what would make the whole thing if they were inseparably linked.

In practice, this means that no thesis can give an absolute synthesis together with its antithesis, because each result can again be questioned. Finally, there is nothing final, from which we can say that now we have found the truth. **If so thesis, antithesis and synthesis remain separate principles, we can bring them in no absolute relationship.** This has the consequence that if we yet attempt to combine them, we will bring the dialectic three-step process into an illusory spiral to never come close to an absolute statement. If no absolute statement is approached, we get no absolute truth. Even by the combination of infinite half-truths we never get a real (final) synthesis, because half-truths are always incomplete. Ultimately, in this respect the sciences are almost a confirmation, because they cannot tell us whether this world is real or an illusion.

Our immaterial spirit in his nature is not really subject to the space-time separation. Only if our spirit has bound his vibrations to matter, he's obviously off the knowledge. Then his thoughts are half-truths. His truth refers to what he perceives in the material world, which is an illusory world. He's not aware of his own nature. **Instead of this, he perceives the body, what is a wrong perception, because he perceives something imaginary as real and something real as non-existent or as an illusion.** This wrong perception simulates a reality as true which is a perception and a truth as true which is wrong. Because this truth is wrong, it naturally always left room for doubt, what is indicated by the very fact that on the material realm no absolute synthesis can be defined, from which we can say that we have now found the (final) truth.

All the questions which are asked away from the knowledge, to assign an absolute reality to the material world, naturally lead to answers, which in turn raise new questions. The corresponding replies in turn raise new questions, and so on. Again we encounter an analogous principle as seen in the Yin-Yang-System. As the answer lies in the question, the question lies in the answer. In this way, we cannot come to the knowledge.

If the immaterial spirit would not exist, we wouldn't be able to understand, as it seems. But why we are aware of this dilemma? Because our spirit is generally capable of knowledge and because he is immaterial. If our spirit can't understand currently, his position is just not right. However his position can be changed. Furthermore the fact, that we can be aware of this dilemma, is a strong indication that the basis of our understanding is at a level which allows a legal point of view. So, once again we reach the theme of dreaming. The dream implies that there is a wakefulness (in background as a conservative size), which is our basic condition.

The dream can appear to us as something real, what is an illusion in reality. So the dreamer can be a not-knower only in his dream, but in reality - that is in his wakefulness - it is a knower. In addition, Socrates is expected to have been aware of it, as he said of himself, he knows that he knows nothing. As he said this, he should not have understated. In this respect, the knowledge, that we are dreaming, is nothing new. We are now at a point in time that allows to see behind the principle of the dream.

An absolute synthesis is a finality that is not really violable, except as a perceived mirage, and it need not be separately confirmed. Because, that which is, is like it is. In this sense the idea of thesis and antithesis, to bring them into the synthesis, contains a process which itself leads us to the knowledge and the awareness of our real reality. Therefore, half-truths can also serve as a springboard to the truth. **They can lead us away from the truth on the one hand or they can bring us to it, on the other hand.** If they should lead us to the truth, we need to include the spirit to all our considerations. Because only the spirit is capable of knowledge and is even the synthesis, he is to found on the spiritual realm of the universe, which is on the light side.

That which is capable of knowledge, is real. That which is real, can't be polar (dual) and may not really be dependent on space-time. If we perceive such a dependence, it is only a deceptive perception, which is not true. In this respect, if our dialectical three-step has a joining character, it brings us to the knowledge and to the repealing of misperception at the same time. Then, the illusory perception (perception of illusions in a manner as if they were real) occurs in the background, whereas the awareness of our true reality enters in the foreground at the same time, which means wake up.

How to bring thesis and antithesis into synthesis psycho-energetically? To the answer, here briefly the list:

- reconciliation of opposites
- neutral look at things as a teaching module
- try to look behind the scenes of things
- forgiving understanding
- harmonization of any situation
- comprehending accept
- [holofeeling](#)
- Love, which harmonizes all what is disharmonic
- ...

[See the meaning of the Yin-Yang-System.](#)
[See the great Polarization.](#)