



FRANCE AND GOD

CHAPTER 5

Because the logic of man is created by conflict, suffering and misfortune, it does not allow him to meet love in its true dimension!

The flesh, the war!

The human being

The flesh is this psychological part of our soul that originates in the animal world, our human genetic descent, which will necessarily lead us from birth, and more or less throughout our life. From our conception, it will begin to be educated by power struggles, and submit to what dominates it. It will extract of it images that will allow it, by assimilation between them, to bring out what it will interpret as being good or evil.

According to education and experience, it will therefore be for each one, his good, and his evil. That's why it's so hard for us to understand each other. If we imagine two individual situations originating from the same starting point, as the majority of twins are, since the experience since gestation cannot be perfectly identical, the ends, although nearly similar, are obligatorily a somewhat different. In this particular case, the differences do not necessarily appear in broad outline, because the bases of education, the environment frequently similar, and the external society often remaining the same, the sources of conflicts are smaller and above all manageable without real clashes by the subjects between them.

In childhood, everyone will have more or less difficulties in accepting limits to his self-centeredness, necessary for his own survival in the group. This is why the conflict will be more or less stormy according to the child, and of course, depending on how parents approach it.

As much renewed by the Spirit of God this carnal part will be it, that we will always have access to it, if we give reason to it. From the conception of the embryo, this construction appears and grows by adapting itself to the necessities of survival of its environment, while keeping a more or less good harmony with its fellows. As long as the contact with this environment remains in the higher part of the values received, this construction will assert itself, consolidate itself in a presumption of fundamental truth of its values, and will remain acceptable for the entourage in question. As opposed to this dimension, the problem will come when this environment will no longer correspond to his understanding of the received image, then will be born the: Conflict!

As children, it's thus that some more sensitive, can be corrected simply by the word or a significant gesture of calling into question for them, and others will have to be corrected more severely. The incidence of a mild or severe method will not necessarily appear on the behavior and the character of the adult person in a favorable atmosphere, because the carnal of this one having been more or less subject to an image to which it will have normally given reason, it will know it must not go

beyond this limit in its reference context. These are the limits that are so important for the balance of the child and the adult, which are variable depending on the individual and his environment. The carnal part, human, therefore, will have been rationalized by a moral or physical suffering in order to be able to coexist with his fellow men, without biting them too much, without over-attacking them, without seducing them hypocritically, without too much dominating, without too much to let crushed, while remaining in a good balance of oneself.

Although conflict is essential to the construction of our soul, according to its management, it will produce a stable or unstable result. In a desire for tranquility, we would generally like to avoid this conflict as an adult, but it is a mistake to flee it. For some children it will settle by a simple movement of the look, and for others a little more severely. From the fetus stage, the child will begin to receive signals that will make it all the easier for him to make the distinction, that the conflict will have been addressed calmly and at the right time.

In this animal world of the flesh, there can be no education without a conflicting situation, without relations of initial power. Although difficult to manage, these conditions are necessary, which is why they must be approached with serenity on the part of the adult. Each of these conflicting situations is the food of the soul, in the construction of our initial individual logic. The conflict will have been positive when it brings the child to a submission that will elevate him to the values of respect for the other. It will be negative, when it brings him to either an uncontrolled dominant attitude or to a crushing of its personality.

Thus is how our soul resembles a mountain stream, near of which we would stand on a bank, and that we should cross every time we a given come across a situation. In each situation encountered one or more bridges would make it possible to pass from one side to the other of the valley. When this situation is known and controlled, we always take the same bridge and that suits us. The difficulty arises, however, when we are challenged in our usual actions or we meet with unknown situation, especially if we must interpret it quickly. According to our position of the moment, of the attitude of mind in which we find ourselves then, we use one or the other of these bridges.

The higher they are at altitude near the source, the more stable and sturdy they will be, because they are easily hung on solid rock. Their length will not be very large, because the stream is small, and the mountains close to each other, but they will remain fundamental values. If they are poorly built, it will be more difficult to go up to them, their altitude being higher, but will still remain the main communications channels. These are the bridges of our first understandings, created by each of our relationships and parental conflicts in our early years. They are fundamental for our balance in the received context, since solidly fixed to a solid rock lacking in major part of sediments that little by little become our personal analyzes.

Conflicts will not always have come into sight to the parents, because in the relationship parent's children, they will have often been lived in a more or less mild and sometimes unconscious way of the adult, **in the only interpretation of the child in look at parental behavior**. Others, on the other hand, treated in a strong manner, to see too hard, will be able eventually to go as far as to create disorders of behavior misunderstood later. This is indeed the art of being "parents", this art, already taking birth in our earliest childhood, for the future parent.

To the mild manner of authority, it is indeed often easier to substitute the hard way. Although it may sometimes be necessary very occasionally, it is easier to make it too hard, rather than balanced. To this opposite, it is quite obvious that to sit a bridge between two mountainsides, the tool used is not the brush, as could be a reproving smile, although compassionate. Conceived to withstand for many years the floods of the strong torrents of life, it would otherwise be quickly destabilized from the first rising waters, or even as soon as it was borrowed as reasoning, especially in adulthood.

In the mountains, a bridge is generally built on two rocky escarpments, nearest possible to each other than can be the other parts of the slopes. They are for the child, the main time of parental contacts from which the child will keep images and limits of behavior in relation with the remainder of the society. The "tools" necessary for the preparation of both mountain slopes are provided available to parents. They range from encouragement in the manifestation of love of the child, to the more or less severe reprimand.

If it is normal to take tools corresponding to the work to be done, it is generally not useful to use the dynamite which would destroy the bases of the said escarpments, and the points of reference of the child. This dynamite is often only an unexpected anger or violence from one or both parents sometimes even between them. In its egocentricity, the child then sees it as a personal implication of which it does not necessarily understand the meaning. A gaping hole can then occur, in the soul of the child, which can go as far as to sweep one or more existing points of reference.

The parent-child relation which could have existed naturally by the circumstances, and which would have produced an additional reference, according to the power of the explosion, will at least distance the slopes of the mountain from each other. The more this explosion will have been strong, the more it will contribute to confusion and fears of respect for parental rules, to see society in the soul of the child. A torrent of high mountains, obviously does not cross only one rocky escarpment, and from escarpments in escarpments, other bridges, other images, can be created, necessary for the individual's construction.

Here we are simplifying the problem by bringing it back to the unity of a person or a group. If we add to these family and fraternal circumstances, the external environment or the simple disunity of the couple, we would soon realize that what one person can strive to build in one way, it is easy for another to sweep it by any deformation of already accepted references, individual or collective. This multiplies all the more the complexity of our individual reactions.

The initial bridges are the very foundations of the individual and will in general be very frequently used and therefore very stable. For other people, it can go from minefields to others minefields. If the one who lived these minefields found in adulthood the momentum of his first years it will see the both mountainsides not too distant, to the point that he would like to take the step towards possible parental references for example. He will however reject them most often, for fear of finding a suffering identical to that experienced in childhood that he could not bear anymore. The more time is spent, the more the river will be enlarged, and the less easy it will be to cross it, but the more likely it will be to feel rejected in its refusal of personal acceptance. If he tries to apply what he thinks he perceives from a distance, his actions will be so vague and influenced by so many other received values that they will further distance him from his aim: **The recognition and the love of his parents for example!**

That's why it's so important to live from a very young age, a happy parents-children proximity, because from before the birth, these kind of bridges are built. The rocky escarpments are then as numerous as there can be reciprocal contacts, and more bridges will have been constructed and will have been often used, the greater the "parental" dimension of the child then of the adult will be. It will therefore be easier for this new adult to accurately assimilate situations seen on the other side of the valley, and to use the bridge corresponding best to the diversity of his analyzes. However, it is good that the limits created are balanced, allowing everyone to flourish in his share of childhood and personal analysis, without causing smothering of his personality.

The first youthfulness passed, not many bridges will be again built, and the majority of those already existing will be used, can then strengthen themselves in their presumption of truth or be deteriorated. The valley will have widened, the mountains will less higher, and the cultivable land of reasoning will often produce a more unstable construction of those that may eventually be created. The torrent will generally be less impetuous, but as it will be more abundant, it will not be less difficult to cross.

The topography of the terrain has changed, the mountains are lower, but the length of the bridges has increased, and their anchor on the ground has become more difficult. The shores are more varied, and the universe of discoveries has expanded. They appear through the out-of-school environment, in which the child begins to put into practice according to a personal analysis, then in the adult. If they may seem easier to access at first glance, it is not really so, when the sediments of life have come to both to hinder the construction, and especially later, access. The understanding of déjà vu will eventually establish itself to give an opening to the construction of a new bridge, but the "land" to evacuate to establish the foundations will be more or less difficult to remove. This ground which is none other than our reasoning due to our subconscious, will make more perplexed those having previously lived difficult contacts. They will then find harder to differentiate themselves from their behaviors and will have a harder time accepting the change in attitude. The positive conflict will therefore be more difficult to manage with those who have

experienced many minefields, often because of their fear of being abused again, just as for their inverse, with those who have been maintained in too great presumption of truth for lack of having received certain limits.

So that all these bridges built through the upheavals of life to remain durable and reliable, it will be necessary to remove more and more alluvium of reasoning to sit on firm ground, at the risk that their own weight makes collapse them. **This is one of the reasons why, when we meet God, we have to become like a child again.** These are often very difficult circumstances or failures that have led us to God, which is why the conflicts generated by this situation must be managed in a positive way to be beneficial to the establishment of a new bridge. The generality is unfortunately quite different, and produces more often the destruction or the great deterioration of the bridges primitively used by the individual, without any other bridge coming to open a new path of access with new reasoning. Many of them become then the excluded of our society, which we find in a great idleness in the streets, for lack of having been able to bear the pitfalls of their failures.

We are indeed much more fragile than we can suppose when everything is fine; for example, because we have suffered from misunderstanding of a father or mother in our childhood, or have simply believed it, we will have condemned them and will retain this condemnation unconsciously as an adult. We will reproduce, if need be, by opposing but equally extreme attitudes, situations similar to those of our parents. It is in this that God gave His fifth commandment, (*Exodus 20-12*) *Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.*//

To honor one's father or mother, indeed brings these basic references, indispensable to the construction of every human being.

If this advice is given to children, others are given to parents: (*Ephesians 6-4*) *And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.*//

The Old Testament is nothing different from the New. Although many keep from the old, the image of "who likes well, punishes well", to correct to excess, there is in this adage the balance, from which those who claim themselves of it, bring us a bad image. **We could read, whoever loves his child before himself, knows how to bring him all good things with balance, and by love for him, never in excess neither violence nor weakness, in balance therefore, for make him the winner of life.**

In order to be able to go further, just as we lifted the veil on "divine" kingship, I would like to lift a taboo of religiosity ¹, which tends to interpret the "carnal" dimension only in the sexual relation. Jesus did say, (*John 3-6*) *That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.*//

1) Religiosity: Effect of sensitivity on religious attitude, leading to a vague personal religion.

Did he set these limits of the flesh, in the only sexual relationship? Of course not! If that were the case, it would mean that anything that is not sexuality is spirit. So he gave it for any attitude born in the soul under the animal kingdom and by the animal kingdom, whether it be the human feelings that one can consider the best or the worst. The dimension of the flesh indeed depends well on the animal kingdom, of which sexuality is a part when it is related only to the needs of the body, the one already available to Adam and Eve. It was for this simple reason that it was so impossible for them to enter the kingdom of God, having eaten the tree of knowledge in the face of their conscience. This conscience being the image of God the Father in us!

The "flesh" indeed can only reproduce what it knows, and what it recognizes exists only in the dimension "**domination / submission**". The French vocabulary, although rich, does not allow us to truly differentiate between submission by recognized inferiority, or freely consented submission recognized to be from God as a result of respect for established responsibilities, which then falls under the Spirit of God.

So we could almost write about the flesh "**responsibility = superiority / submission = inferiority**". Unfortunately, far too many couples and families have lived and still live, believing that they respect the word of God. It is also for this reason that the right to vote was only granted to women so late. Given the inferiority attributed to them, by the submission they owed to the man,

normally protective by nature, their opinions were not taken into account, whereas they are generally more sensitive than the man in the flesh to feel the snares.

The flesh seeks the value in which it was formed, and in which it is thus glorified. It leads us to act as it has learned to do for all that can bring it merit, by a recognition of its domination or submission, as well physical as intellectual and spiritual. We thus reproduce what we know, by assimilation to a given situation, and gradually our soul is built.

Moreover, it is not really constructed alone, because it is **subjected to the "Spirit" or dominated by the "spirit"** that leads it. Do not worry; when we talk about the spirit with a small "s", even if we do not talk about the Spirit of God, we are not talking about "demonic" spirits but more about an certain incitement to the "feelings" more or less well appropriate to a particular situation. This is a human dimension on which the enemy of our souls takes its rights, even if the Holy Spirit is also the one who can lead us. We will lingered over this later in the following chapters.

Let's return for the moment to the carnal dimension of a person who has lived all the mine holes from the various explosions, which sometimes left it without real constructive references. They can be for certain of them, feelings of rejection, for others inferiority complexes, for others still inconstancies...

Their management can be difficult, because they can unfortunately bring great damage by deep mental deteriorations. Those who live them may eventually see them, but without understanding them or being able to remedy them. These feelings sometimes push them into extremes that make them look like bad persons, see the "worst". If these people are vaguely aware of their problems, they may assign their misfortune to an only wound that remains gaping over and over again, but do not understand that their bad behavior is due to another of these injuries, much smaller sometimes but also much older and deeper.

These, on the bridges of our examples, are like cavities covered superficially with a thin film of clay or even with a reflection of the sun, which veils the perception of it. As long as the person is in a thoughtful situation, it avoids them almost naturally, but plunges her foot into it every time it meets it in a spontaneous situation. These traps disappear indeed from the conscious memory, but remain all the more active in the spontaneous reactions, which take then the shortcut of the mind without having the time to pass by the supervision of our analysis. Grudges or revolts buried under appearances of forgiveness due to forgetfulness, unexpectedly give excessive behaviors by feeling of injustice and assimilation to a first received image, even if the subject acts to the opposite in conscious situations.

This human mental construct is ours, and we are even much attached to it, because it is **"our life"**, our behavior, and if we change it we would have the impression of no longer being **"ourselves"**. The behaviors generated by this construction sometimes create to us difficulties, and in some parts of our lives we would sometimes like to see them disappear, but as we have forgotten the reasons for their appearance and we need of them to protect ourselves from the evil that we have suffered or would be likely to live again, we keep them without knowing them in the dimension in which they really trap us. They remain and even become what we call: **WE!**

We do not like that others touch at this part of ourselves; it is our protective bubble, the one we consider ourselves strong to possess. This consideration generally does not exist in a perceptible way to the person itself, except in cases of unclosed wounds where it "interprets" them as intellectually justified, often because of an egocentrism above the average.

All these bad stones that come off the bridge each time we step on it, see bridges half-sunken by lack of utilization, are the reflection of our subconscious, our spirit. All the traps set by our human nature have all the more impact on our behaviors than we are rendered unaware by what is called scientifically, the neural pruning. The less we remember, the more we equate it with "ourselves". If we would remember it, we would have in front of our calculated free will, whereas this set produces a short circuit in our soul to impose certain reactions to which we have one day given reason. The less we remember, the more we equate it with **"ourselves"**. If we would remember it, we would have our calculated free will as comparison means, whereas this set produces a short circuit in our soul to impose certain reactions to which we have one day given reason.

Why ourselves? Because the person is more mind than body. If what we see is the body, what we live, what **"we are"**, is spirit. This brings our soul to compare itself with the **"conscience"**, the image of the Father to which we have access unlike animals. The comparison between the

behavior of our soul and that of our conscience is made in us through a distorting mirror that are the carnal feelings of our subconscious, our spirit born under the carnal tutelage of Satan or the mirror without compromise of the Spirit God who is the Holy Spirit given by Jesus.

The carnal dimension, although "spiritual" is related to the lower spirit, and that's what we're looking at for now. That of the Holy Spirit is also spiritual, but true to the image of God. It is through this exact mirror that God wants to revive our hearts and our subconscious, our spirit, no longer open only to the dialogue with spirits of carnal nature, but also with the Holy Spirit.

The rewriting of this set can be only made through our thoughts, our words, and especially our **"reactions"**. It is what we will look in the following chapter.

As long as we live in the initial state, only the carnal dimension is in us, more subject to Satan's dressage logic than to his flourishing in the Love of God. As we have already discussed the subject, this led previous generations to interpret literally some biblical texts of the sometimes severe correction, to see exaggerated to have to apply to the child, because perceived only carnally. Since May 68 and its "Hippie revolution" more idealized by delusions caused drug than by the realities of this world, we have often gone to the opposite extreme. It even happened a time, where to do remonstrating to a child became a form of abuse. That brings us today to France, to a certain youth who knows no more its limits, because we have not fixed them. That is why now that we try to enforce them, they remain subject to their analyzes, in which recognize them as possibly good in their thoughtful actions, but disappear in a dominant position of their carnal presumptions, often by group effect or in their spontaneous reactions.

So the problem does not come from the children, but from the parents, that is today's grandparents. Some of these "grandparents" would like to return to a very brutal way, hence a rise in reciprocal violence and a growing misunderstanding between generations.

It seems that since 2001 and the reestablishment of the teaching of morality in school, the different governments are starting to become aware of it and that is a good thing. This morality that we had in the primary classes, I will say at random, until 1968. The fruits will certainly not be immediate, because the masons know it, it is faster to demolish than rebuild. This is why we will have to remain all the more patient and tolerant while waiting for the harvest of the new reforms. The danger is however to restart the cycle to zero, adopting a too great violence, which would eventually reproduce another May 68.

So, what happened? For fear of taking a tool too powerful to dig the foundations of bridges, as had perhaps been done by previous generations, we have taken to dig neither a pickaxe nor often even a shovel, but a broom or even sometimes a feather duster. As soon as these children, become teenagers or adults, live a conflict superior to the "feather duster", they feel assaulted, but for want of benchmarks, they can find fun to play with bombs which kill the others. They do not accept the reprimand, but consider having rights, because they have gone into the dominant position, even if that leads some of them to live on the street, not to submit to the established rules. We are reaping today our carelessness of yesterday, facing once again, to a balance that God wanted to give.

Everyone must therefore do a work on himself that God alone knows, without fear of losing face before God and men, in a fear that is no longer attached to the carnal results but to the nature's change of our own psychology. *(Matthew 10-28 / 31) 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. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered.*

Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows.//

Although our hair is generally in everyone's sight, I do not know anyone, except perhaps the bald ones, to have such knowledge of him. All the more reason for what is hidden, buried, under all external appearances, and which has piled up in our souls. These appearances, our doubts and our presumptions often lead us to behaviors that we consider bad for others, whereas we consider them good for ourselves. We then condemn others, without knowing the deep reason for their attitudes. **We compare ourselves, with OUR eyes. Those there are not likely to contradict us!** In this case our analysis comes in reality from the source that imposes our reactions and not our conscience. We then contradict such behavior, such value, such rules, such law, in order to, it

seems to us, to be able to live properly and peacefully in a world of peace. Poor of us, we would be well only in the country of Robinson Crusoe, alone on our island.

As we saw in the previous chapter, since man is not capable of changing himself, and each being different from the other, can he really construct an ideal universe to his own dimension?

It is not the human being that we must condemn through these reflections, but what he feels as being himself and that is only an image buried in his soul by the enemy of our souls, which includes the collective memory. This collective memory that we sometimes identify as a basic postulate that we place before God Himself, and which leads us to build our couple and our environment on futile values opposed to this God of Love, while thinking to serve Him.

The couple, the groups and the nations

We have so far spoken of the individual and will now extend our meditations to the group stage, whether they are couples or nations.

God "gave" the woman to the man and asked him to be subject to him. Does this mean that the man will have all the rights that he deems fit and that in no way she will be entitled to the word? This interpretation was and remains too often advocated by egocentric and misogynistic religions who do not even know that physically weaker, the woman must be protected. Instead of bringing man to support her, cherish her and submit to herself knowing willingly to consider her needs with equity, this leads to abuses of the man over the woman, perpetrated sometimes as a normality in the name of God.

If the man takes account only of him, without submit himself to his wife, to know his needs, what does he do well before God? Did not Jesus give His own life for the forgiveness of our sins? That is to say, His "**Wife**"! This Wife that we are all if we follow Him, and whom we will talk about again. If he has set an example for those who want to follow Him, why can not we do it? Once again the cause lies in the bad image we have of the man in our flesh, the great, the beautiful, the strong, who is catch by nobody off guard. The image that remains of "the MAN" in a collective memory, of the kingfish firstly idolized by his wife, while the latter suffers silently from the bullying of the husband, but is itself valorized compared to the image that she possesses of the submissive woman... everything exists in this carnal human nature.

In this collective memory of another time, we find our: We! The one we want to seem, for ourselves and the image we "must" give of ourselves to be listened to and followed. If we turn our gaze to the collective memory of our society, there is in it the idolatry of the man who has defeated the divine royalty established by God, and generates in some French the glory of their: "**Revolutionary character**".

As we have already mentioned, rather than lose a minimum of his feudalism, this King of the French, Louis XVI, had indeed preferred to have his acolytes drawn on his own subjects. This king had confounded what many confuse, his rights and his duties conferred upon him by the anointing he had received from God in order to fulfill his function as king. The duty to behave for the best of all, **without discrediting God in whose name he was going to act.**

Let us never forget that our position as a man never gives us any rights over other human beings, especially if we have received from God the anointing to behave well as a husband toward our wife, as a pastor toward our church or the king toward our subjects. Must we deduce from this that the execution of Louis XVI was legitimate?

We can not take the plunge, because was it really necessary? This is the whole problem of revolutions that lead individuals to reprehensible individual acts and sins, just as they even more easily lead an entire people to ignoble exactions, legitimized by collective behaviors that are just as important sins.

We could almost believe to hear some people, that there is something glorious about not knowing how to dialogue and prefer to massacre. God does not see it that way, quite the opposite. We have seen in the chapter "The Revolutions", nothing comes out of really good from these revolutions. They produce an inverse of privileges and generate counter-revolutions at least equal to what existed previously.

We are therefore entitled to wonder what collective feeling really brought the execution of Louis XVI to the French people, apart from the absurd image which remains to us, of making our revolutionary character a glorious cause. It led some persons to suppress what represented for the people of that time the part of the king god to rule over him, and as a direct consequence, the refusal to let himself be governed by the true God. There is, however, a very large part of our people for whom it was not so, as we had noticed in the preceding chapter, because they had kept themselves away from the principal revolutionary torments.

The French revolution, although communist in character from 1792 to 1794, did not destroy predominantly the image of God which subsisted, contrary to what 1917 produced in Russia. It allowed the people, however, to detach themselves from the image of human kingship as a representation of God, thus of good. This is why, as we will see it later, even if the errors remain the errors and must be treated as such, as numerous as they may be, 1789 can now turn to our advantage if we treat the effect in a good way. It is sufficient, however, to compare the evolution of the three countries of which we have spoken England, France, and Russia, to realize that the longer carnal feudalism lasted, the more bloody extremism it created, and an explosion of violence.

The same is true of the individual as of the people, the one who refuses too much of the conflict by fears, shyness or idolatry of the other, will not settle it first in the dialogue, but will often find himself forced to settle it in the excesses. Through the parallel of these various personal or collective examples, it confirms that a people is built and acts psychologically in the very image of the individual. The basis of values that we lower ourselves to flout, through what we suffer, will have the same impact on the behavior of an individual as on that of a people, even if the impact is more durable on a people to because of the diversity of its cells and its lifespan. If the revolution of 1789 had been avoided in its exterminating part, no doubt there would have been no introduction of this base of revolutionary value a little absurd still today among the French people.

Just as a man can perceive the identity he considers to be his by means of bad deeds, the French people recognize itself through revolutionary acts, which it easily condemns in others. Is not that often our case? A bit like a human being is made up of cells, which merge with each other to give a body, so a people is made up of human beings who gather together to give a nation. That is why the forfeiture of Louis XVI was at least equal to that of the people, because just as the head does not destroy the body under the pretext that it is hot, cold or hungry, it should not have had such carnal reaction by mounting a coalition against his people, to retain abusive privileges.

This is one of the reasons that led God to say to the prophet Samuel, as we saw in chapter three, that it was He whom His people rejected, when, at the time of the judges, it had asked for a king in His place. **Man struggles to acquire or retain privileges, while God is the absolute integrity.** God does not, therefore, want men greater than one another, at least in their attitudes of heart toward their fellows. Man led by his flesh chooses first of all the image of the great man, according to the greatness he venerates, to be assimilated to the one in whom he finds personal glory. The image he then imposes of the "submission" becomes more that of serfdom, which can go as far as a form of prostitution. This is why the idolatry of the strongest brings about the servitude of others. Servitude besides which is not due solely to the fact of the leader, but to all the subjects who install themselves in a voluntary lowering for the benefit of the one they place above them.

In moments of crisis, this need to satisfy the more or less carnal part of a people, allows manipulators to gather popular masses, claiming that after heaven will exist on earth. These men, wholly led by demons, are not ashamed to act in the name of God, as angels exterminators of millions of other "bad". The weaker and the less close to God persons, then let themselves fooling, as individually we can let ourselves be dominated by a bad incitement of the spirit, facing a good exhortation of the Spirit.

Different theses, more pompous than the others, will then be justified. In the utopian governments of proletarian dictatorships, therefore, the human nature of each one will be enhanced to that of the Spirit of God by its identification with the developed ideology of which it becomes the guardian and the opposite, so close that is the traditional dictatorship the nature of one is raised to that of God. In the utopian governments each tries to establish the "Earthly Paradise", the Celestial Jerusalem, to "his" way, silencing God to the benefit of the all-puissant party better than God, while the presumptuous dictator seeks to establish it in "HIS" way, enhancing himself above God.

The mode of action remains the same, by lowering the glory of God to a level lower than that of the human. Both of these types of government create a structure in which the party or the dictator puts himself in God's place, as the devil does so well. Everything is submitted to God, the Head, and everything is like watering of God, like a "theocracy" of God on earth. God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but they put themselves at the head of everything and everyone, see everything and hear everything, but above all, manage and dominate everything. That is why we must learn from what Jesus has bequeathed us by "submitting one to another" (Ephesians 5:21). **In which democratic system can we be most submitted to each other? The Republic!**

Unlike the monarchy, even the parliamentary, the republic elects a president who, according to the constitution, becomes again an ordinary citizen at the end of his mandate. Even if he is a little set apart for a time, there is not a definitive situation here, which more or less scleroses the spirit of the one to whom the title is attributed from his earliest childhood. A human must remain in its human dimension to remain balanced, but kings no longer have the right to be it. They are doomed to live as watched and admired examples, but on the first faux pas, they are just vile individuals everyone is talking about. They are a bit like caged men surrounded by lions. Their real human misery is perhaps, not to be entitled to this status of man, and this is what we will remember before all things for their defense.

In some Christian circles, however, there is still some doubt about God's will to keep theocracies, rather than establish democracies. We will not enter into theological debates, but will remain attached to the defense of the words of Jesus to love us, therefore to remain submitted one another. We will then notice that if God has allowed monarchy to be established against his will for so many centuries as we have seen, and that it is the same of democracy, it would still leaves us plenty of time for us to come to repentance.

We will not go further in the first instance with regard to the carnal behavior of nations, the important thing being to have penetrated to the heart of the problem, doing the parallel between the individual or collective soul. Thus, what we will see in the next chapter, as being good for man, will be good for the nation. The flesh, for its part, will reproduce eternally only what it has known and by which it has been "**tamed**". If the man was really without God, he would have no other alternative, and that's why we find in our culture, some proverbs as "**Chase the natural and it will come back at a gallop**". If we had no other alternatives to our carnal dimension, we would probably be right to be pessimistic. It is not necessarily so, and this is what we will see in the next chapter.

Before turning to the more that God offers us, let us look briefly at what contributes to the wobbly construction of our carnal psychology and continues to dominate our reactions, even after having sincerely given reason to the God's will. We can all see that if some of our reactions can remain hidden by the intellect when we have a sufficient response time to bring our reasoning, it is not the same in the reflex reactions related to our subconscious. In action, we are therefore able to change our natural, but faced with spontaneous reactions, it always comes back at a gallop.

This is almost mathematical, biblical, because our carnal psychology is conditioned by the spirit, in opposition to the Spirit, with a great "E", which is the Holy Spirit of God. So it's not a problem of intelligence, ability or any other possible differentiation of the human being, but of our very nature. We are certainly the most evolved beings of the "animal" kingdom on earth. We may have somewhat surpassed it, in the sense that God allowed us from creation to reign over the animal dimension, and created us in His image. The limits of our psychology, however, are never educated in joys and happiness, which are the driving force of many presumptions as long as they are of a carnal nature, but in sufferings that curb our egocentrism. That's why we are not great in the kingdom of heaven.

This one is firstly kingdom of the Spirit, and beneath, of the spirit that are the masters of our carnal feelings. Jesus told us of this, about John the Baptist in *(Luke 7-26 / 28) But what went ye out to see? a prophet? Yea, I say to you, and [what is] more excellent than a prophet.*

*This is he concerning whom it is written, Behold, *I* send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee;*

for I say unto you, Among them that are born of women a greater [prophet] is no one than John [the Baptist]; but he who is a little one in the kingdom of God is greater than he.//

There is nothing surprising that our nature is from a lower level to any part of the Kingdom of heaven, and to any even fallen angel, since we still live today, under the dominion of the Prince of this world originally called Lucifer, then after the "Fall" Satan or the devil.

To make sure of this, let us read what Satan claimed to have authority over the world, at the temptation of Jesus, *(Luke 4-6) And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it.//*

Jesus' response to this assertion of the devil was not "behind me Satan, you are only a liar".

If Satan is the master of the kingdoms of this world; as for life, what about though it is? *(Job 1-12) And the LORD said unto Satan, Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand. So Satan went forth from the presence of the LORD.// and (Job 2-2/6) And the LORD said unto Satan, From whence comest thou? And Satan answered the LORD, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it.*

And the LORD said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil? and still he holdeth fast his integrity, although thou movedst me against him, to destroy him without cause.

And Satan answered the LORD, and said, Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face.

And the LORD said unto Satan, Behold, he is in thine hand; but save his life.//

God is the God of life, of the supreme. Nothing can be agreeable to Him, if not the life which He Himself gives and, moreover, wants to give us in abundance. When Jesus spoke of Satan, He did not oppose his declarations, but instead named him as a prince. A prince certainly judged and called to disappear from our logic, because of what he was and still is for us through his lower limits: *(John 12/31) Now is [the] judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out.//*

His judgment has been carried out since two thousand years through the "**suffering Messiah**" who suffers the crucifixion because of the conspiracy of people too attached to their own religious and carnal values, when at the cross Jesus pronounced these words "**All is finished**". The execution of the sentence, however, is postponed until His Return as "**Reigning Messiah**" in place of Satan, so that a majority of the earthlings are at the benefit of the birth of the Spirit in them. **So we are not talking here about the resurrection of the dead, but of the "living", which is a little bit the same thing.**

The limits of our antiquated logic

In many fields, we all come more or less to see our abuses out of bounds, between the dominant and rich north, and the southern majority exploited, generating migratory currents especially with regard to Africa, but moreover in the lack of use of science and new technologies for the sole reason of immediate profits and rivalries between nations. All that God gives of good on this earth, we find the way to use it for our loss. We all tear one another to pieces, at a time when it would be more than urgent to agree on a global scale, to solve the climatic phenomena that we have increased and still multiply. Politics does not escape it since it is a reflection of ourselves, and it is perhaps in it that we can become more aware of our actual limits.

Two methods clash, one strong the other soft! The strong way claims domination whatever its extreme political orientation, the other moderate seeks to give reason to the "**love**" of his **neighbor**, but often remains carnal from a side and the other. In this last group, two formations remain quite similar to each other in the management of the nation, but remain in fact far removed by the vision that they have of the human hierarchy, their image of God being different. One seeks the image of the rich man drenched by God, giving alms to his fellows, in a justice not always obvious to perceive, especially if we add the fraudulent sources of income as we see so often, the other not only acts in the same way, but says to do the opposite, and justifies man in a justice often contrary to that of God, responding to simple lusts and human deregulations against nature.

We cannot therefore say that we have already entered the dimension of "the Spirit", although both seek to get approach to it at best. Their efforts are very deserving and it is humanly very good, but they struggle in vain. An enormous danger hangs over both of these antagonisms: the disinterestedness of the electors. We are in a democracy, and the peril comes from those who no longer believe in it, who no longer have faith in a better future, because they are too attached to the value of money rather than to the better of the humanity. These are our limits, because unfortunately those who return to carnal and violent methods are numerous and determined, even if the presidential elections of 2002 showed us the benefit of the coalition of moderates.

What is impossible for man is possible to God, and of course it is to Him that we must turn. We turn us certainly, but how?

Will we go to Catholic mass, Protestant or Evangelical worship, Jehovah's Witnesses or...? Will that change anything? NOTHING!

Nothing indeed, because knowledge is certainly useful, but as we have just seen, used with an old software that is our carnal psychology, it will never change anything. Each will come out with a different knowledge of the other, and that is why there are so many wars in us and around us. Men say, if God existed, He could not allow such abominations, but in the Garden of Eden who disobeyed, God or man?

The man, by following what the serpent told him, let himself be led by his bad psychology, to do what God had forbidden him. God knew why, not us! Just as it is case of the child who wants to test if the fire is burning, and his father forbids to him. When he burns himself, the father tells him and repeats to him, I told you so, but the child accepts hardly believe it, considering that it was the father who let him do it. We do this with God, He defends us, we do, and we hold Him responsible. How will we be able coming out of such a context?

The thing is too simple, the teaching is certainly not the same everywhere and brings some differences, but the question is not really there! There are seven Churches, described in the Apocalypse, from which will come the one and the other of the victorious believers. Nothing of all that can be our divisions can be pleasing to God because He wants us to be advocates of one another beyond our differences and we will talk about it again. **Only our FAITH is pleasant to Him**, the teaching being there only to better lead us to use this faith in order to make us victorious of our psychology, vulnerable to the incitements of the enemy since originating from this one.

(Hebrews 11-1/4) Now faith is [the] substantiating of things hoped for, [the] conviction of things not seen. For in [the power of] this the elders have obtained testimony.

By faith we apprehend that the worlds were framed by [the] word of God, so that that which is seen should not take its origin from things which appear.

By faith Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained testimony of being righteous, God bearing testimony to his gifts, and by it, having died, he yet speaks.//

As we have seen together, the flesh can reproduce only what it knows, in the dimension that it interprets the thing. Faith, on the contrary, allows us, when we lose our footing within different limits of our own, to continue to let ourselves be carried into works that God has prepared in advance for us. Only faith can thus gradually bring into our souls the dimension of the Spirit, which can save the world, not by the resurrection of the dead, but by the living. God wants to put His laws in us, to His way, and not that we put them ourselves, to our way *(Romans 3-27 / 31) Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.*

Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.//

God wants to reset our antiquated software built on the basis of an egocentrism refrained by fear, by a new one to his Glory based on the Love of others. This dimension leads our spirit to the true glory of the Spirit, that of God. Only this dimension of our soul will remain, for only it leads to the true Love of its neighbor. That's why it starts with the boundless acceptance of making Jesus our Lord, giving Him the entirety of our life.

With our full trust in him, He can then gradually lead us to strive toward the perfection of a Love of unflinching integrity, because of divine nature and no longer human (see the description in 1 Corinthians 13).

The path is there, but no one can say for his part "I have arrived", as the Apostle Paul reminds us in (Philippians 3- 12 / 16) *Not that I have already obtained [the prize], or am already perfected; but I pursue, if also I may get possession [of it], seeing that also I have been taken possession of by Christ [Jesus].*

*Brethren, *I* do not count to have got possession myself; but one thing -- forgetting the things behind, and stretching out to the things before, I pursue, [looking] towards [the] goal, for the prize of the calling on high of God in Christ Jesus.*

As many therefore as [are] perfect, let us be thus minded; and if ye are any otherwise minded, this also God shall reveal to you. But whereto we have attained, [let us] walk in the same steps.

This is what we will try to do, for and in the Love of God. **To Him be all Glory!**

This work cannot be sold. It is offered free of charge for information by Association CHRETIENS DE L'ESPOIR, 2 Impasse Saint Jean - 26110 - VINSOBRES - France.
Tel. (33) 0954705737 – Fax (33) 0959705737 - E-mail: christianofthehope@free.fr
Company registration number 444 684 427 00016