

authorityresearch.com

"I Am Doing An 'Experiment.'"
([Personal note.](#))

by
Dean Gotcher

"For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." 1 John 2:16

"And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." Luke 16:15

"The heart is deceitful above all things [thinking pleasure, i.e., lust is the standard for "good" instead of doing the father's/Father's will], and desperately wicked [hating anyone preventing, i.e., inhibiting or blocking it from enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' it lusts after]: who can know it?" Jeremiah 17:9 It can not see its [hatred toward the father's/Father's authority](#) as being evil, i.e., "wicked," i.e., "desperately wicked" because it's lust for pleasure is standing in the way, 'justifying' the hate.

"To enjoy the present reconciles us to the actual." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right') In other words "Lust, i.e., enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating over and therefore against the father/Father's authority that gets in the way reconciles us to the world." "Self is actualized in lust and the world that stimulates it."

"I am doing an [experiment](#)," said the spider to the fly, "why don't you come over for lunch and we'll 'discuss' it sometime." If you participate (go over for "lunch"), you die (you are the "lunch").

"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." Proverbs 16:25

"Flee also youthful lusts:" 2 Timothy 2:22

"I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Romans 7:7 When you KNOW what you are doing is wrong (having been *told*) and you do it anyway, that is sin (reveals your *lust*).

In order to 'change' something ("*the people*" in this case) you must first pick it up (*seduce "the people"* into participating—get them to act on their *lust*, i.e., "*What can I get out of this situation and/or people/person for my self?*") and examine it (*deceive* them into thinking their participation, i.e., *lust* will not harm them but will benefit them and others instead) in order to find out what it "is" (*how* they feel, think, and act toward their *self*, others, the world, and authority) (*aufheben*) then *experiment* with it (*manipulate* them) in order to find out how you can 'change' it (them)—in order to make it (them) into what you want it (them) to be, i.e., into what it (they) "ought" to be (in your mind) according to your understanding, i.e., in order to satisfy your carnal desires (*lusts*), i.e., your desired outcome.

"In short, philosophy as theory ["Reasoning" from an opinion, i.e., from "feelings," i.e., from lust] finds the 'ought' [lust, i.e., the child's carnal nature] implied within the 'is' [within the one in authority], and as praxis [setting aside the father's/Father's authority] seeks to make the two coincide [making the child's carnal nature, i.e., lust the source for authority]." (Comments by Joseph O'Malley Ed. of Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right')

While the father's/Father's authority, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth are not a part of the child's carnal nature, the earthly father and the child have this one thing in common, i.e., *lust* (*lust* for pleasure from the situation and object(s) in the environment, i.e., things and/or people and *lust* for the approval from others, *affirming* their *lust*) It is therefore *lust*, i.e., the law of the flesh that must become the law of the land

if unity ("*worldly peace and socialist harmony*") is to be achieved (*actualized*), requiring the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the law that divides. [Having read over six hundred social-psychology books](#), many of which are foundational to a Doctorate in sociology, psychology, etc., this is all they are about. Life is then no longer subject to laws that are external to you (to your control), i.e., unchangeable, but subject to what you want them to be, i.e., to what you think they "ought" to be, making laws subjective, i.e., subject to your carnal desires (*lusts*) of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating—instead of objective, i.e., established (which makes you subject to the father's/Father's authority). The 'liberal' does not perceive his *self* as breaking the law or being above the law, in his mind he., i.e., his flesh (*lust*) and the world that stimulates it is the law.

"Every form of objectification [faith in and obedience to parent or God, above "human nature"] results in alienation [not only the separation of self from lust (repression) but also the separation of self from others who lust (alienation)]." "God [faith in and obedience to God] is thus the anthropological source of alienation." (Stephen Eric Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and its Theorists*)

This is what the *experiment* is all about, with "*the spider*," i.e., the facilitator of 'change' *seducing* you into coming over for a free meal, i.e., 'justifying' your *lust* (with you, i.e., your soul being the meal), *negating* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., what is right and what is wrong behavior according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth in your thoughts—which warns you not to participate (for your soul sake). Everyone wants a "free meal" these days (doing what they want without the father's/Father's authority, i.e., restraint getting in the way) not knowing the price they will pay for participating. Every day in the classroom (from pre-school to [College](#) and beyond), in the workplace, in government, and [even in "the church"](#) this is what is now going on—"*It's party time. Don't let the restraints of the 'past,' i.e., the father's/Father's authority get in the way, i.e., spoil the party,*" with *lust* for entertainment, i.e., "feeling" "good" (worshiping the experience of worship) replacing suffering, enduring, dying to *self*, i.e., walking in faith, doing the Father's

will (no matter what people say or do to you, i.e., no matter what it will cost you, i.e., what *lusts* you will miss out on in this life).

"And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all." Luke 17:26, 27

"Hear, O earth: behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto my words, nor to my law, but rejected it." Jeremiah 6:10, 13-19

Negate the law, i.e., the father's/Father's authority (in your reasoning, i.e., in the home, in the classroom, in the workplace, in government, and even in "the church") and judgment for sin (disobedience) is *negated* (in your mind), 'justifying' your *lusting* after pleasure and your hating restraint. Every leader or ruler and every follower or peasant, i.e., every King and everyone subject to the King, i.e., every father and every child is subject to these choices, either *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating his self* in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts and truth, hating being or doing wrong (engendering what is called a *belief-action dichotomy*) or 'justifying' his *self, lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, hating restraint (engendering what is called "*theory*" - "*practice*" unity where carnal thoughts and carnal actions become one and the same with both being subject to, i.e., stimulated by and responding to the immediate surroundings). All of history is made up of these two options. From the garden in Eden to judgment day these are the conditions all people have faced, are facing, and will face—every day of their life. Everything in life is wrapped around these choices—EVERYTHING—from the home to the classroom, to the workplace, to government, to the "church," and everything in between. Everyone you have met in the past, you met or will meet today, and you will meet in the future faces these choices (doing the father's/Father's will or doing their will—even in the Lords name), including you.

The former way of feeling, thinking, and acting toward *self*, others, the world, and authority is known as a *Patriarchal paradigm*, where the father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* your *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., "*rule of law*" reigns ([Hebrews 12:5-11](#)), which engenders a *guilty conscience* in you for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after pleasure, leading to contrition and repentance ([Romans 7:14-25](#)). The latter is known as a *Heresiarchal paradigm* of 'change,' where you are only subject to (stimulated by and respondent to) the current situation and/or people present (with the facilitator of 'change' *manipulating* the situation and/or the people, i.e., the environment, i.e., *manipulating* you), with *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint guiding ('justifying') their feelings, thoughts, and actions (making "*Reasoning*" subject to *self*, i.e., *lust* preservation)—with you no longer having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning since there are no longer (in your mind) established commands, rules, facts, and truth to feel *guilt* for breaking or disregarding, i.e., no longer the father's/Father's authority to feel *guilt* for disobeying ([Genesis 3:1-6](#)). In transition the *Matriarchal paradigm* is where you are caught between the former and the latter *paradigms*, wanting to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., wanting to do the father's/Father's will yet doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., *lusting* after pleasure instead, with a *guilty conscience* (which is caused by the former *paradigm*), not willing to repent.

Every home, classroom, workplace, policy making, worship environment is built upon one of these *paradigms*., i.e., way of feeling, thinking, and acting toward *self*, others, the world, and authority, either 1) by faith doing the father's/Father's will, 2) doing your own will according to your *lusts* which the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people present (imagined or real) are stimulating, but with a *guilty conscience*, or 3) doing your own will without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., void of the father's/Father's authority in your thoughts, with "*the groups*" *affirmation*, which requires the "help" of a facilitator of 'change.' What is being taught and put into *praxis* today (even in the "Christian" schools) is of the latter—where

KNOWING from being *told* (faith), i.e., reasoning from established commands, rules, facts, and truth (which you have been taught) is replaced with Gnosticism (knowing via "*sense experience*"), i.e., "*Reasoning*" from your "*feelings*" (*lusts*) of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world, i.e., by the current situation and/or people present, and 'justified' (*affirmed*) by them, i.e., by "*the group*," which is being *manipulated* by the (master) facilitator of 'change,' where fear of God (concern for where you will spend eternity) is replaced with fear of man (concern for what pleasures, i.e., what *lusts* you can get out of the next 'moment' for your *self* [since *lust* and *self* having become one and the same, all there is to life is *lust*] that man can take away from you—resulting in: get rid of them before they get rid of you , i.e., do to them what you did to the father/Father for getting in the way of your *lusts* before they do to you what you did to the father/Father for getting in the way of your *lusts*—"What goes around comes around," i.e., what you sow, you reap, etc., i.e., get rid of the father/Father in order to *lust* after pleasure, without having a *guilty conscience* and all you have around you are those who will get rid of you if you get in the way of their *lusts*, without having a *guilty conscience*).

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient [decent];" Romans 1:28

Lust engenders fear of man and hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the restrainer, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority. All of *social media* (*socialist media*) is based upon *lust*, engendering hatred toward the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way, i.e., engendering no fear of God (fear of judgment) before "*the people's*" eyes. And you say "*Not me.*" If you are concerned about your or your family and friends social life, you are a socialist. As "*the people*" (you?) progressively become more tolerant of *lust*, i.e., of immorality those in power, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' can *praxis lust*, i.e., immorality without restraint, i.e., without accountability, i.e., without having a *guilt conscience*, which is why they *seduce* you into participating in the *experiment*, *deceiving* you into thinking it is to "help" you, when in fact they are *manipulating* you., i.e.,

turning you into *"human resource"* so they can use you to satisfy their *lusts*, with your *affirmation*, i.e., with your *consent*.

"Do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." Galatians 1:10

The dialectic process, i.e., the *experiment* is the *praxis* of "unfreezing," "moving," and "refreezing" you to a "new" way of thinking and acting—through the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process *negating* the father's/Father's authority in your thoughts so you, the facilitator of 'change,' and those following after him, i.e., *"the group"* can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, *negating* anyone who gets in the way without having a *guilty conscience* (to *affirm* unrighteousness, i.e., *sensuousness*, i.e., *lust* is to *negate righteousness*, i.e., the *righteous*, i.e., those doing the Father's will)

"A successful change includes, therefore, three aspects: unfreezing the present level ['justifying' your natural inclination to lust after pleasure in a non-judgmental, non-hostile environment (judgment and hostility will now be directed toward those who resist or refuse to participate, i.e., who continue to hold onto the father's/Father's authority], moving to the new level ['liberation' from, i.e., negation of the father's authority and the guilty conscience it engenders for lusting after pleasure], and freezing group life on the new level [finding your identity in "the group," with lust (yours and "the groups") being the common denominator, i.e., the bonding element]." "The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group [establishing lust over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority]." (Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#))

[The experiment](#), of which this issues is about is to remove the former *paradigm*, i.e., [the father's/Father's authority](#) and the [guilty conscience](#) it engenders from your feelings, thoughts and actions by moving you [through the Matriarchal paradigm](#), i.e., through your *"feelings"* for *self*, others, and the world around you, without the father's/Father's authority 1) being present, 2) getting in the way, or 3) being accepted, with the facilitator of

'change' ([taking the father's/Father's place of authority](#)) and those under his influence, 'justifying' your *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, thereby moving you to the [Heresiarchal paradigm of 'change,'](#) i.e., to where you, the facilitator of 'change,' and those influenced by him can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can *lust* after pleasure, *negating* anyone who gets in the way (including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous) without having a *guilty conscience*, with each others [affirmation](#).

A "change agent... should know about the process of change, how it takes place and the attitudes, values and behaviors that usually act as barriers.... He should know who in his system are the 'defenders' or resisters of innovations." (Ronald Havelock, A Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education)

*"When we learn to silence the inner voice that judges yourself and others, there is no limit to what we can accomplish, individually and as part of a team. Absence of judgment makes you more receptive to innovative ideas." (Michael Ray in [Abraham Maslow](#), Maslow on Management) When you "silence" God (God's judgment upon you for your sins) in your thoughts you become god (in your mind), making all subject to your carnal thoughts and actions, i.e., *lusts*—without having mercy.*

*"During the period of innovation, an environment is invisible. The present is always invisible because the whole field of attention is so saturated with it. It becomes visible only when it has been superseded by a new environment." (Federal Education Grant, Dec. 1969, Behavior Science in Teacher Education—commonly referred to as [BSTEP](#)—all Federal Education Grants are subject to this Grant. The book "1984" was a result of it, exposing what is in it) In other words, if you participate you will not know what hit you until it is too late. ([See Carl Rogers quote below.](#)) The example of the frog in the pot getting boiled is the result of it not jumping out immediately when it was put in, since the water in the pot (*lust*) felt good to begin with.*

This latter *paradigm* does not happen naturally. Without the *experimenter*, i.e., the *manipulator*, i.e., [the facilitators of 'change,'](#) i.e., the 'change' agent, i.e., [the psychologist](#), i.e., [the behavioral "scientist,"](#) i.e., ["the psychotherapist,"](#) i.e., [the Marxist \(Transformational Marxist\)](#)—all being the same in *paradigm*, i.e., in way of feeling, thinking, and acting toward their *self*, others, the world, and authority (all of whom, from now on will be referred to as [the facilitator of 'change'](#))—"helping" you put your carnal thoughts (*lusts*) into action, making your *lusts* and actions (behavior) one and the same (*theory-practice*) you would either repent before the father/Father, holding your *self* and others accountable to the father/Father and his/His authority, sustaining the father's/Father's authority in society or continue to do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., continue to *lust* after pleasure, but with a *guilty conscience*, sustaining the father's/Father's authority in your mind. ['Change,' i.e., the 'change' process, i.e., Marxism](#) is all about *negating* the father's/Father's authority (the system itself) so everyone (especially the facilitator of 'change') can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can *lust* after pleasure without having *guilty conscience*, with everyone's support (*consent*), i.e., 'justification,' i.e., *affirmation*.

"Human consciousness [lust] can be liberated from the parental complex [the father's/Father's authority, i.e., restraint] only by being liberated from its cultural derivatives, the paternalistic state and the patriarchal God." (Norman O. Brown, Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History)

If you have ever participated in [the "group grade" classroom](#) or the *"Total Quality Management"* (TQM) workplace (and if you have not, when and if you do) you have participated in the process of 'change,' i.e., the [dialoguing](#) of [opinions](#) to a [consensus](#) process, i.e., the ["scientific method,"](#) i.e., the *"experiment,"* 'justifying' your *self*, i.e., your (and *"the group's,"* and especially the facilitator of 'change's') natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' ([dopamine emancipation](#)) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people were stimulating, i.e., esteeming your *self*, establishing your *self*, i.e., your *self interests*, i.e., your *lusts* (which were subject to the situation and/or people around you at the time—imagined or real—[which are ever 'changing'](#)) over and therefore

against the father's/Father's authority, i.e., over and therefore against your having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* your self in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., over and therefore against your having to do the father's/Father's will, making everyone in the room subject to the same "formula"—'justifying' "*human nature,*" i.e., their *self*, i.e., their natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and their natural inclination to hate restraint, i.e., to hate the restrainer, i.e., to hate the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way, thereby *negating* the father's/Father's authority, thereby *negating* the *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders) for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after pleasure (in thought and in action, i.e., "*theoretically and practically*"), 'liberating' their *self*, i.e., their "*feelings*" (their "affective domain," i.e., their *lust* for pleasure) and their thoughts (their "*cognitive domain*," i.e., their thinking upon the items or people in the environment that stimulate pleasure, i.e., *lust*, roleplaying them in their mind) from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., from fear (*guilt*) of judgment, moving their feelings and thoughts closer to their carnal nature (their "*psycho-motor domain*"), i.e., to the flesh and the world that stimulates it, making their "*Reasoning*" subject to the environment around them at the time, i.e., in the 'moment' that *stimulates lust* (aufheben) and anyone *manipulating* it, i.e., *manipulating* them, making them subject to the *seducer, deceiver, and manipulator*, i.e., to the facilitator of 'change' instead of to the father/Father (who *tells* them what is right and what is wrong behavior)—which is the intended 'purpose' of the *experiment*—so the facilitator of 'change' could *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders, i.e., which you more than likely brought into the room, i.e., into the classroom or meeting with you before you decided to "*throw the father's/Father's authority under the bus*" out of your *lust* for pleasure—["*What can I get out of this situation and/or these people for my self?*"]—and fear of being rejected by "*the group*"—[fear of "*the group*," i.e., "*What will the group think (and do to me)?*" "*What will happen to me?*" replacing your fear of the father/Father, i.e., "What will my father/Father think (and do to me)?" "*What is the right thing to do?*"]—thereby identifying with "*the group*," i.e., with *lust*, i.e., with "*human nature*" instead of with the father/Father,

i.e., instead of doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, 'justifying' [establishing] *lust*, i.e., "*human nature*" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, *negating* your having to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth [therefore no longer holding others accountable to the same standards, i.e., "*prejudices*," i.e., absolutes, i.e., way of thinking]), with your and "*the group's*," i.e., "*the people's*" affirmation—replacing individualism, under God with socialism.

By removing the father's/Father's authority, i.e., that which is "*negative*" from the room (by "converting," silencing, censoring, martyring anyone who adheres to the father's/Father's authority) the facilitator of 'change' (who perceives his *self* as being the personification of "*the group*," i.e., "*the people*," who like him *lust* after pleasure and hate restraint, i.e., hate the restrainer, i.e., hate the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way of their *lusts*), along with all participants can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., can be "*positive*" with everyone's (and, if you participated with your) *affirmation*. There is no "plan B" (no other way of thinking) to those who "*Reason*" this way ("*leaning to their own understanding*"), i.e., all must participate in (or be tolerant of) the process of 'change,' i.e., the *experiment* or be silenced, censored, or removed, i.e., *negated*.

"... it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." Jeremiah 10:23

"Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD." "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the LORD, and whose hope the LORD is." Jeremiah 17:5, 7

The *experiment*, i.e., *lust* is not academics (learning established commands, rules, facts, and truth and applying them, i.e., KNOWING right from wrong from being *told*) although academics is (commands, rules, facts, and truth are) now under *lust's* control, i.e., made subject to *lust*. The agenda of the facilitator of 'change' is to:

*"Prevent someone who KNOWS from filling the empty space [when you are deciding how to respond to the current situation and/or the people present—rejecting the father's/Father's authority, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of lust, letting lust have it way]." (Wilfred Bion, *A Memoir of the Future*)*

The soul *KNOWS* from being *told*. The flesh by "*sense experience*." In the *experiment* you sell your soul (which is eternal) for the *lusts* of the 'moment' and the world that stimulates them—which is passing away. The *experiment*, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' rejects *KNOWING* (from being *told*), letting the flesh, i.e., "*sense experience*," i.e., *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, i.e., that which is of the world lead the way.

"For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"
Mark 8:36, 37

When God created Adam (man) he made him, unlike any other living thing in the creation, "*a living soul*."

"And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Genesis 2:7

He then *told* ("*commanded*") him what he could and could not do, i.e., He *told* him what was right and what was wrong behavior, i.e., which trees he could eat the fruit of and which one he was not (lest he die).

"And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Genesis 2:16, 17

No animal, being subject only to stimulus-response (approach pleasure - avoid pain) and impulses and urges (instincts) can read or write a book, i.e., can be *told* or *tell* others what is right and what is wrong behavior, i.e., what they can and can not do. To apply science, i.e., "behavioral science"

to man is to make him an animal, subject to stimulus-response and impulses and urges (which can only be known from "*sense experience*," i.e., pleasure-pain engendering *lust* and hate), *negating* (damning) his soul (which can only *KNOW* from being *told*, i.e., by the Word of God).

"But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."
Matthew 4:4

The 'moment' the "leader" of a meeting, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' asks you "*how you feel*" and "*what you think*," i.e., asks you to share your *opinion*, i.e., asks you to enter into *dialogue* with him or her (and "*the group*") regarding right and wrong behavior (asking you to be "*positive*," i.e., to be tolerant of deviant behavior, i.e., of *lust*, bringing in "*appropriate*" information, and not "*negative*," i.e., not to be judgmental, condemning, etc., of it, i.e., bringing in "*inappropriate*" information, rejecting of it) you are in the *experiment*, i.e., you are in the dialectic process of 'change.' The dialectic process of 'change' began in the garden in Eden, not with God, who *KNOWS* right from wrong but with the master facilitator of 'change' who "helped" two "children" establish right and wrong behavior upon their own carnal nature, establishing their *self*, i.e., their *lusts*, i.e., "*human nature*" over and therefore against the "Father's," i.e., God's authority. It is here that the master facilitator of 'change' first came between the "father/Father" and his "children," "helping" them 'justify' their *self*, i.e., their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world stimulated over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority. It is through his use of neurolinguistics ("*Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?*")—an embedded statement in a question (the most powerful form of hypnosis, used to destabilize and then sensitize a person to their subconscious carnal desires, i.e., their impulses and urges, i.e., their *lusts* of the 'moment')—that the master facilitator of 'change' was able *seduce*, *deceive*, and *manipulate* the woman into *dialoguing* her *opinion*, i.e., into sharing her *self interest*, i.e., her *lust* of the 'moment,' i.e., her desire to "*touch*" the "*Ye shalt surely die*" tree, 'creating' a safe zone/place/space, i.e., a "*Thou shalt not surely die*" environment, 'liberating' her to "*think*" for her *self* (apart from the Word of God, i.e., apart from the "Father's")

authority), becoming *"rational," "reasonable," "practical"* (in her own eyes) according to her *"understanding,"* doing her will instead of the *"Father's,"* i.e., God's.

"Woe unto them that call evil [lust] good, and good [the father's/Father's authority] evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!"
Isaiah 5:20, 21

*"The ideas of the Enlightenment taught man that he could trust his own reason [his own "feelings," i.e., his "sensuous needs" and "sense perception," i.e., his "sense experience," i.e., his lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint] as a guide to establishing valid ethical norms and that he could rely on himself, needing neither revelation [the Word of God, i.e., the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth] nor that authority of the church [the Son of God, Jesus Christ] in order to know good and evil." (Stephen Eric Bronner *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists*)*

"Enlightenment is man's release from his self-incurred tutelage. Tutelage is man's inability to make use of his understanding without direction from another. Self-incurred is this tutelage when its cause lies not in lack of reason but in lack of resolution and courage to use it without direction from another. Sapere Aude! Dare to know! 'Have courage to use your own reason!'- that is the motto of enlightenment." (Immanuel Kant, Konigsberg in Prussia, 30 September 1784)

"We must ultimately assume at the highest theoretical levels of enlightenment ... a preference or a tendency ... to identify with more and more of the world, moving toward the ultimate of mysticism, a fusion with the world, or peak experience, cosmic consciousness, etc."
"Enlightened economics must assume as a prerequisite synergic institutions set up in such a way that what benefits one benefits all."
"Enlightenment management and humanistic supervision can be a brotherhood situation." "The more enlightened the religious

institutions get, that is to say, the more liberal they get, the greater will be the advantage for an enterprise run in an enlightened way [according to man's carnal nature]." (Maslow, *Management*)

"Experience is, for me, the highest authority." "Neither the Bible nor the prophets, neither the revelations of God can take precedence over my own direct experience." ([Carl Rogers](#), *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*)

"This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish." James 3:15

"Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness." Luke 11:35

"And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." 2 Corinthians 11:14, 15

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." 2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4

The 'moment' the master facilitator of 'change' got the woman into *dialogue*, regarding right and wrong behavior he "owned" her. By "helping" her to openly share her carnal desire, i.e., her *lust* of the 'moment, i.e. to "*touch*" the fruit of the "*Thou shalt not*" tree, i.e., in a non-judgmental, i.e., "*Ye shall not surely die*" environment he was able to open her mind up to the "possibilities." In this way, the woman, dissatisfied with not having what she wanted, taking council from the master facilitator of 'change' become the first "scientist" ("behavioral scientist"), evaluating the situation via her "senses"—establishing "*human nature*," i.e., what she understood over and therefore against the "Father's," i.e., God's authority. Then putting it into *praxis*, i.e., acting on it (the devil did not "*make her do*

it," i.e., we all choose) she "resolved" the 'crisis,' i.e., the problem without God and His Word getting in the way (which was "the problem"). Adam, *lusting* after the woman, i.e., choosing to follow after her instead of obey the "Father," established his carnal nature, i.e., "*the lust of the flesh,*" "*the lust of the eyes,*" and "*the pride of life*" as the basis for determining right and wrong behavior as well. 'Liberated' (in their mind) from the "Father's" authority they became their *self* without restraint (without the "Father's" authority, i.e., without established commands, rules, facts, and truth getting in the way of their *lust*), i.e., they become *self actualized*. When confronted with their sin's, i.e., their *lusts* they became the first 'liberals,' i.e., instead of showing remorse for their sins and repenting they ('justifying' their *self*) blamed someone else for their "bad" behavior, with Adam blaming the woman—"throwing her under the bus" (along with God for creating her, i.e., for creating an "unhealthy environment" for him to live in)—and the woman blaming the Serpent—"throwing him under the bus" for "helping" her 'justify' her *lusts*. The *experiment* is [Genesis 3:1-6](#), i.e., is you 'justifying' your *self*, i.e., your natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, establishing your *self*, i.e., your *lusts* over and therefore against the "Father's" authority being put into *praxis*, *negating* [Hebrews 12:5-11](#), i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., your having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline* your "*self*" in order to do the father's/Father's will, *negating* [Romans 7:14-25](#), i.e., your having a *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders) when you do wrong, disobey, sin, thereby *negating* your need for a savior, i.e., your need to repent before the Father for your doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for your *lusting* after pleasure in disobedience. There is nothing we can do to resolve this dilemma on our own, since there is no work we can do to resolve it. It is only by the work of the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ (which the world rejects) that it can be resolved.

"Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light." "Virtually the entire Ethics of Aristotle is the worst enemy of grace." (Luther's Works: Vol. 31, Career of the Reformer: I, p.12) Aristotle believed a "good" environment created a "good" (virtuous) person, that "goodness" resides in a person, waiting to be realized (actualized) if properly

nurtured, i.e., if the person is raised (educated) properly—making man, i.e., *self* the definer of good and evil instead of God (who alone is good)—*"the meaning of sin" "is dependent on the arbitrary choice of the sophists."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p. 216)

Replacing the Word of God with the "wisdom" (*opinions*) of men and making the Word of God subject to it faith, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., *righteousness* is replaced with *sensuousness*, i.e., the child's carnal nature, i.e., men's understanding of the Word of God and the world according to his flesh.

"Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Hebrews 11:1

"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Romans 10:17

"But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Hebrews 11:6

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast." Ephesians 2:8, 9

"And if it seem evil unto you to serve the LORD, choose you this day whom ye will serve; ... but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD." Joshua 24:15

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, And will

be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Corinthians 6:14-18

There is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only the individual's carnal desires, i.e., his or her *lusts* of the 'moment' being expressed and 'justified.' That is why, when it comes to determining (defining) right and wrong behavior it is the language of choice for the facilitator of 'change', i.e., for the *seducer*, *deceiver*, *manipulator* and all who participate—establishing *lust* over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority.

"The family [with the father's/Father's authority] is one of these social forms which ... cannot be changed without change in the total social framework." (Max Horkheimer, Kritische Theori) In other words: the language of the home has to be 'changed' along with the language of society if 'change' is to be initiated and sustained.

And you thought the class was about learning facts and truth in order to solve a problem or the meeting was about fixing a bridge, repairing a road, etc., in order to solve a crisis. That was only a ploy (the problem or crisis might be real but with the "spider," i.e., the facilitator of 'change' in the room the outcome is going to be different) to get you to participate in the *experiment*, i.e., to "*come over for lunch*" (with you being "*the meal*," the lab rat, etc.), in order to "fix" you, i.e., in order to get you to *negate* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., *negate* your turning to the father/Father, i.e., to established commands, rules, facts, and truth [*discussion*] in order to solve a problem or crisis, thereby *negating* the *guilty conscience* that the father's/Father's authority engenders in you for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*dopamine emancipation*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, thereby *negating* your holding others accountable to the same established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of their carnal nature, i.e., their natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure—thereby *negating* your engendering a *guilty conscience* in them for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after pleasure, which, if it was not *negated*, would sustain the father's/Father's authority in

you and in them, getting in the way of the facilitator of 'change's' desire to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a *guilty conscience*, with your and "*the group's*" *affirmation*. The facilitator of 'change' can not use you (as "*human resource*") to satisfy his own carnal pleasures, i.e., his *lusts*—with you serving, protecting, supporting, praising, and worshiping him—while you, having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* pleasure refuse to *affirm* him, i.e., while you, holding onto (adhering to) the father's/Father's authority in your thoughts and actions, judge, condemn, reject him and his carnal thoughts and acts. While the child naturally hates restraint (hates missing out on *dopamine emancipation*) he does not necessarily hate the father/Father. It is in the act (*praxis*) of *self*'justification' before others, i.e., "*the pride of life*" (being supported by the facilitator of 'change' and those following after him) that the child 'shifts' his hatred from hatred toward restraint toward hatred toward the father/Father and his/His authority—'driven' by his *lust* for pleasure, 'justified' (*affirmed*) by "*the group*" he is now 'purposed' in killing the father/Father, *negating* his/His authority, *negating* the *guilty conscience* it engenders in the process, in his and in others thoughts and actions. This is what "*paradigm shift*," i.e., 'changing' the way a person feels, thinks, and acts toward his *self*, others, the world, and authority, i.e., the *experiment* (the revolution) is all about. The "leader" of the next class or meeting you attend might have this *experiment* (agenda) in mind for you—"helping" you to become your *self*, i.e., to become *self actualized*, *lusting* after pleasure, hating the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way, without having a *guilty conscience* ("*with no fear of God before [your] eyes*," Psalms 36:1)—so beware: "*Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices.*" 2 Corinthians 2:11

If life is based upon stimulus-response, i.e., "*sense experience*," where *lust* is the 'drive' of life and its augmentation the 'purpose,' then anyone/anything getting in the way of *lust*, i.e., in the way of life must be *negated*.

The thinking ("*Reasoning*") behind those who 'created' the formula (who have rejected the father's/Father's authority) is: If "*human nature*," i.e., *lust*

for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*dopamine emancipation*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating and hatred toward restraint (*stimulus-response*) is all there is to life then anything or anyone who gets in the way of *lust*, i.e., who engenders hate is not of and for the world and must be *negated*. Therefore the father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* your *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth and the *guilty conscience* it engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*dopamine emancipation*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulated, i.e., for being "*human,*" i.e., for being your *self* must be hated and *negated* if "*the people*" and the facilitator of 'change' are to become their *self*, i.e., *self-actualized*, i.e., are to become only "*of and for self,*" i.e., are to become only of and for the world that stimulates *lust*. According to this formula: hate, if it is not carried out against the object of restraint allows the object of hate, that which is not of the world, i.e., the father's/Father's authority to remain. Millions (hundreds of millions) have died violent deaths because of this formula. "*Peace,*" according to this formula (according to the world) is being able to *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without fear of being judged, condemned, and/or cast out, with everyone's approval (*affirmation*), i.e., with no one in the environment (in the room) engendering a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, for sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after pleasure. This formula, i.e., this "*peace*" is *antithetical* to the gospel message, i.e., to the Father and His son, Jesus Christ and the peace they give. Peace to the soul, which is eternal, which is of God is different than peace to the flesh, which is of the world, passing away.

"Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." John 14:27

"And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Philippians 4:7

The "*problem*," for the facilitator of 'change' is, if you want to 'create' "*worldly peace and socialist harmony*," i.e., if you want to restore the "*Tower of Babel*" you must first *negate* the father's/Father's authority that causes division. Twenty students, for example, from twenty different homes, with father's who disagree with one another on personal-social issue (regarding right and wrong behavior) results in twenty students, holding onto their father's position (authority) refusing to get along with one another when it comes to right and wrong behavior (personal-social issues). By switching ("*shifting*") communication, i.e., curriculum in the classroom from the *preaching, teaching, and discussing* of established commands, rules, facts, and truth which are to be learned by faith and obeyed as given, which retains the father's/Father's authority system (engendering division based upon those doing right according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth and those who are not, i.e., those who are doing wrong) to the students *dialoguing* their *opinions*, i.e., their carnal desires (*lusts*) of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or students are stimulating to a common "*feeling*" of agreement (at least tolerance), i.e., to a *consensus* (in an environment void of the father's/Father's authority system, where the students can share their carnal desires, i.e., their *lusts* without fear of being judged, condemned, and cast out), unity (which is based upon the students carnal nature, i.e., *lusts*—what they all have in common, engendering *common-ism*) *negates* division (which is caused by the father's/Father's authority system engendering individualism, under God, i.e., "*rule of law*").

"The philosophy of praxis is the absolute secularization of thought, an absolute humanism of history [where all thought and action is void of the father's/Father's authority]." (Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks) The name for the national test for teachers is Praxis.

*"Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds [the Greek word for deeds is praxis];" Colossians 3:9 The "old" man sinned, i.e., *lusted* after the things of the world without fearing judgment, i.e., without fearing God (without bringing judgment and God up in his conversation with his *self* and with others), 'justifying'*

his sins (*lusts*) and the sins (*lusts*) of others, making sin (*lust*), i.e., "human nature" the "norm." The "*lie*" being you can sin (*lust*) without being held accountable, i.e., without being judged (and condemned) by God.

The "*lie*" is the *praxis* of *self*'justification,' i.e., of *self-actualization*, i.e., of thinking and acting without having a fear of God, i.e., without established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the father's/father's authority getting in the way, i.e., without having a sense of accountability (eternal consequence) for your carnal thoughts and carnal actions—of being at-one-with the world, 'justifying' (*affirming*) those around you who think and act the same way, "*building relationship with others based upon your and their common self interests*"—which is the *praxis* of Marxism/Communism/Socialism/Psychology/Globalism.

"Self-actualizing people have to a large extent transcended the values of their culture [their parent's/God's authority aka the father's/Father's authority system]. They are not so much merely Americans as they are world citizens, members of the human species [of the world only—that stimulates lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint] first and foremost." (Abraham Maslow, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*)

"[E]very one of us shall give account of himself to God." Romans 14:12

"Every one that is proud in heart [who establishes his self, i.e., lust over and therefore against the Father's authority] is an abomination to the LORD: though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished." Proverbs 16:5 Your *opinion*, nor the *opinion* of others will count on the day of judgment.

Without the *affirmation*, i.e., "*the pride of life*," i.e., without others 'justifying' your (and you 'justifying' their) natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*dopamine emancipation*) that the world stimulates, i.e., without your (and their) ability to control the environment and/or item or person that stimulates pleasure, i.e., *lust*, i.e.,

dopamine emancipation (silencing those who bring the father's/Father's authority into the room), the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* it engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating remains in *force* in the room (You deceive your *self* when you think you can "defend" the world of God, when in truth [as a shield, i.e., a force] it defends you from your *self* and the world. When you defend it you make it subject to your understanding, i.e., to your *lusts*). [Kurt Lewin's "force field analysis"](#) was to help the facilitator of 'change' identify the "*force fields*" in the room, so he could neutralize (*negate*) the "*negative*" *force field* (called "[the negation of negation](#)"), i.e., *negate* those who adhere to the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., those who are "*prejudice*," i.e., 'loyal' to established commands, rules, facts, and truth—holding others subject (accountable) to them as well—while 'liberating' the "*positive*" *force field*, i.e., those who want to *lust* after pleasure without being judged, condemned, and/or cast out, i.e., without having a *guilty conscience*. By *negating* the father's/Father's authority in the room the facilitator of 'change' is able to gain control over all who are in the room. The *experiment* is all about using the "*the people's*" "[affective domain](#)," i.e., *self interest*, i.e., *lust* to gain control over them in order for the *experimenter*, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' to use them (as "*human resource*") for his own gain, i.e., to 'justify,' satisfy, and support his own *lusts*.

While the child loves pleasure, i.e., *lusts* after *dopamine emancipation* that the world stimulates the father/Father loves his/His children, teaching them to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, that they might live a long life/inherit eternal life. The children's system of thought binds them to the world that stimulates pleasure, i.e., *lust*. The father's/Father's system of thought binds him to doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, desiring his children think and act the same way. Facilitators of 'change' know this. Hating and rejecting the father's/Father's authority they side with the children, i.e., with their *self interests*, i.e., with their *lusts* and the

world that stimulates them instead of with the father/Father who gets in their way.

It is here that *dopamine emancipation* (the *affective domain*) plays such a key roll in the *experiment*. As explained in the issue [dopamine emancipation](#) the child is not in love with the toy, he is in love with the pleasure (the *dopamine emancipation*) the toy stimulates in him, wanting to control the environment, i.e., the toy in order to *stimulate* more pleasure (*dopamine emancipation*) in him in the future. Thinking about it, which *stimulates dopamine emancipation* in him, not being the same as having the real thing, interestingly *stimulates* more *dopamine emancipation* in him than when he has it (anticipation). His natural (carnal) inclination is to hate anyone who, *telling* him to put the toy up, takes it way away from him (resulting in him missing out on or being cut off from the item stimulating *dopamine emancipation*). His hatred becomes more intense (desperate) when the "threat" is made while the item is all that is on his mind. It is also his nature to cast the toy aside when it no longer brings him pleasure (no longer *stimulates dopamine emancipation*) or a toy comes along that takes it place, i.e., that *stimulates* more *dopamine emancipation* in him than it. This applies to adults as well, replacing toys with people, casting people aside when they no longer bring them pleasure (*stimulate dopamine emancipation* in them), i.e., when they no longer satisfy their *lusts* or get in their way (including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous), looking for others who will take their place, i.e., who will satisfy their *lusts* instead. The marriage vow "*for better or for worse*" now has the clause "*till someone better* ("*Who stimulates more dopamine emancipation*") *comes along*," at least that is what is happening in *praxis*. It is not that we do not need *dopamine emancipation*, God created us with it in us. It is when it is used to establish right and wrong behavior, making us subject to the world that stimulates it instead of God, who created it in us that we might take pleasure in His creation, worshiping and obeying Him and not it and the world that *stimulates* it—disobeying Him. While choosing off a menu what you want to eat for lunch, for example, if the item you want to eat is bad for you (you have been *told* or learned from past experience), if you go to *discussion* (commands, rules, facts, and truth) to determine whether you will eat it or not it is more than likely you will not but if you

go to *dialogue* (the *affective domain*, i.e., *lusts*, i.e., *dopamine emancipation*, i.e., *self interest*) it is more than likely you will. *Lusts* is plural in that it not only applies to the item of *lust* but also *lust* for the approval of others, 'justifying' your *lusts*, i.e., approving you (*affirmation*). Like a drug (which it is, i.e., all habitual drugs are associated with it—stimulating it, preventing its reuptake, or imitating it), pleasure, i.e., *lust*, i.e., *dopamine emancipation* is not only intoxicating and addictive, it is possessive as well. *Affirmation*, i.e., 'justification' from others makes it worse. Social media is *dopamine emancipation* on steroids. The wars of the world (and in the home) are a result of it. Without the restraint, i.e., the restrainer, i.e., the father's/Father's authority getting you off the drug (detoxing you—a fast, for example detoxes you of your *lust* for food, and being overweight), *lust*, i.e., *dopamine emancipation* becomes not only the 'drive' of life, its 'augmentation' becomes the 'purpose,' necessitating the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority (and anyone who is 'loyal' to it) for getting in the way.

"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." Isaiah 55:8, 9

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Matthew 6:24

"Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" Romans 6:16

"Trust in the Lord with all thine heart, and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths." Proverb. 3: 5-6

"And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven." Matthew 23:9

Whoever defines terms for you controls your life. When man defines terms for you he 'justifies' his *self*, i.e., his *lusts*, holding you accountable to 'justifying,' i.e., *affirming* his *lusts*. When the father/Father defines terms for you he/He 'justifies' his/His *self*, i.e., his/His authority—holding you accountable to doing right and not wrong according to his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth. This applies to the Heavenly father as well as to the earthly father—who is accountable to the Heavenly Father in all things.

As will be explained later on in greater detail, [discussion](#) retains the father's/Father's authority (objective truth) while *dialogue* retains the child's carnal nature, i.e., the child's *lust* for pleasure, which is subject to the world (subjective truth) along with his dissatisfaction with, or resentment and hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority (for getting in the way). Defining terms (especially when dealing with right and wrong behavior) via *discussion* retains the father's/Father's authority, with his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth having the final say, while defining terms via *dialogue* makes commands, rules, facts, and truth subject to the person's (or "*the group's*") carnal desires (*lusts*) of the 'moment,' that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating, as well as subject to his (or "*the group's*") dissatisfaction with, or resentment and hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority. Without the *dissatisfaction* (along with *dialogue*) 'change,' i.e., the *experiment* can not be initiated or sustained.

"Persons will not come into full partnership in the process until they register dissatisfaction [with restraint, i.e., with the father's/Father's authority]." (Benne)

Read the following all the way through (as I so often do, many supporting quotations and verses are found near the end of this issue—it would also be helpful in understanding the quotations below by reading who is making it first, which is sighted at the end of the quotation). It is all relevant to what is happening in the classroom, in the workplace, in government, in the home, etc., and even in the "church" today. As 'liberal' professors tell me after my lecture on the dialectic process "*We can not refute a word you said*" (in front of their students at that -- I am amazed at them doing that, at

least out loud to their students). You can not refute the following information (it is source material, i.e., on record). You can only, in denial deny it. Their own words and [the Word of God](#) expose and condemn them and their works (the *experiment*).

"Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth."
Ephesians 6:1-3

While dad (the "*earthly father*") is not perfect, he may be (or may have been) a down right tyrant (or MIA/AWL)—as a child *lusting* pleasure without restraint—his office of authority is perfect, having been given to him by God (the "*Heavenly Father*") who is perfect, in which to do His will. When it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior it is important that he *discusses* with his children any command, rule, fact, or truth they question, providing he deems it necessary, has time, they are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking his authority. Without the *discussion* (where the father/Father holds himself accountable to the same commands, rules, facts, and truth as he holds the children, with the "earthly father" admitting he was wrong, when he was wrong) [wrath can develop in the child \(the pathway to Marxism\)](#).

"He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." 1 John 2:22

One father is from below, i.e., is the earthly father. The other Father is from above, i.e., is the Heavenly Father. Reject the authority of the one above the one above, i.e., the Heavenly Father and all you have is the one above, i.e., the earthly father, who, despite teaching you right from wrong is subject to "*the lust of the flesh,*" *lust of the eyes,*" and "*the pride of life*" himself, yet, having taught you right from wrong has engendered a *guilty conscience* in you for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning. Reject the authority of the one above, i.e., the earthly father and the one above the one above, i.e., the Heavenly Father and all you have is your *self*, i.e., your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, making *lust*, i.e., your *self*

right (righteous in your own eyes) and the father's/Father's authority (that gets in the way of *lust*) wrong (evil)—so the facilitator of 'change' i.e., the "*antichrist*" can *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without any sense of accountability to God for his thoughts and actions, with "*the people's*" *affirmation*, i.e., their support, protection, praise, and worship.

"Let no man deceive you with vain words [self 'justifying, i.e., lust 'justifying' words]: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them." Ephesians 5:5-7

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Colossians 2:8

"... it is clear that Paul wants Christ alone to be taught and heard. Who does not see how the universities read the Bible? ... it has been so bothersome to read and respond to this filth." (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.259)

"Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;) And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching. For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his

people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."
Hebrews 10:23-31

"Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the LORD, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Isaiah 55:7

"O give thanks unto the LORD; for he is good; for his mercy endureth for ever." 1 Chronicles 16:34.

"By mercy and truth iniquity is purged: and by the fear of the LORD men depart from evil." Proverbs 16:6

All of history (including the study of history) is wrapped around the father's/Father's authority, i.e., man having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* his *self* in order do right and not wrong according to what he has been *told*, i.e., his doing the father's/Father's will and the child's carnal nature, i.e., his natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure (wanting to control the world, i.e., the situation and/or the people that stimulate pleasure—covetousness and adultery—hating restraint). Social study (socialist study) is wrapped around the child's carnal nature, 'justifying' the facilitator of 'change's' *lusts*, 'justifying' the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority (the study of history). *Negate* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., having to do the father's/Father's will and all you have to work with (in determining right and wrong behavior) is your carnal nature, i.e., your natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure, 'justifying' your *self*, i.e., your *lusts*, i.e., 1) your *lust* for pleasure and 2) your *lust* for the *affirmation* (approval) of men and 3) your hatred toward restraint, dying in your sins.

"Individuals move not from a fixity through change to a new fixity [from doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, truth, changing their position only when persuaded with facts and truth], though such a process is indeed possible [in other words, "We do not want to think about/focus on/accept that way of

thinking"]. But [through a] *continuum from fixity to changingness* [from belief, i.e., faith and obedience to theory, i.e., *opinion*], *from rigid structure to flow* [from "What does the father/Father want me to do?" to "What do I want to do?" and "What will 'the group' think?"], *from stasis to process* [from doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth to *self (lust)* 'justification']". "At one end of the continuum the individual avoids close relationships [with those who are deviant, i.e., doing wrong, disobeying, sinning], which are perceived as being dangerous. At the other end he lives openly and freely in relation to the therapist and to others [those doing wrong, disobeying, sinning], guiding his behavior on the basis of his immediate experiencing [his *lust* for pleasure (*lust*) and his *lust* for "the group's" affirmation, 'justifying' his *lusts*]— he has become an integrated process of changingness." (Rogers)

The "spider" (having no mercy) wants to have you for "*lunch*," that is the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of the *experiment*. The facilitator of 'change' comes between the father/Father and his children/man, liberating the children/man from the father's/Father's authority—and his/His mercy—so he can use them to satisfy his own *lusts*. The facilitator of 'change' replaces the father/Father with his *self*, i.e., *negates* the father's/Father's authority so he can use the children to satisfy ('justify') his *lusts*. This is what the "*social-psychological experiment*" ("*behavior 'science'*"), i.e., the so called "new world order" (what we see going on all around us today) is all about. By *negating* the father's/Father's authority (fear of judgment) in the child's/man's thoughts, 'liberating' him from the father's/Father's authority (by 'justifying' the child's *lusts*) the facilitator of 'change' is able to use him (as "*natural resource*") to satisfy his own *lusts*, casting him aside 1) when he no longer stimulates *lust* in him, 2) someone else comes along who stimulates more *lust* in him, or 3) he gets in the way of his *lusts*, doing to him what he did to the father/Father for getting in the way of his *lusts*, doing so without having a *guilty conscience* (without mercy)—with the person's *affirmation*, i.e., his 'justification' (at least at first before he becomes aware of the fact that "*he is the lunch*," if he ever becomes aware—[see Carl Roger's statement father down in the issue](#)).

*"Eliminate these relations [i.e., the father's/Father's authority over the children, i.e., the children/citizens doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth they have been told] and you abolish the whole of society [["the traditional channels of top-down decision making"](#)]; ... a scientifically acceptable solution does exist [which is done through the use of *dialogue* (when it comes to defining right and wrong behavior), establishing *self* and society upon the child's ("*the group's*," "*the people's*," i.e., "*the citizen's*") "feelings," i.e., *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, i.e., the child's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and hate restraint, i.e., hate the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way, with the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the "scientist," i.e., the "lab technician" taking the father's/Father's place, 'justifying' the child's ("*the group's*," "*the people's*," i.e., "*the citizen's*") carnal nature (*lusts*)—*negating* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., *negating* having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, thereby *negating* the *guilty conscience* which the father's/Father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after pleasure, resulting in the children refusing to do what they have been told, so the facilitator of 'change,' who 'justifies' the children's ("*the group's*," "*the people's*," i.e., "*the citizen's*") *lusts*, can *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience*, with the child's ("*the group's*," "*the people's*," "*the citizen's*") *affirmation*, i.e., support and praise] ... For to accept that solution, even in theory [as an *experiment*] would be tantamount to observing society from a *class standpoint* [from the children's perspective, making all subject to their "feelings," i.e., their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world stimulates (the basis of stimulus-response)] *other than that of the bourgeoisie* [from the father's/Father's authority, having to accept and obey established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., having to be told right from wrong behavior, thereby having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after pleasures]. And no class can do that-unless it is willing to abdicate its power freely." ([György Lukács](#), *History & Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?*)*

Having you for "*lunch*" is the heart and soul of Marxism and psychology, i.e., of globalism. As long as the father's/Father's authority stays intact globalism can not be initiated or sustained. Many quotations from Marxists and psychologists are given below in order to prove the point that this is the only agenda. There has been none other.

"For one class to stand for the whole of society, another must be the class of universal offense and the embodiment of universal limits. A particular social sphere must stand for the notorious crime of the whole society, so that liberation from this sphere appears to be universal liberation. For one class to be the class par excellence of liberation, another class must, on the other hand, be openly the subjugating class." *"The only practically possible emancipation is the unique theory which holds that man is the supreme being for man."* (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right*) In other words, not until the children can find their identity in one another can they unite as one in overcoming the effect of the father's/Father's authority in themselves and in society.

"The dialectical method was overthrown—the parts [the children] were prevented from finding their definition [their identity] within the whole [within "the group," through dialogue 'justifying' their lusts]." (Lukács) As long as the children are subject to the father's/Father's authority they can not find their identity in what they have in common with "*the group*," i.e., *lust*.

Either the child submits to the father's/Father's authority, abdicating (not yielding to) his *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world stimulates (imagined or real) in order (as in "old" world order) to do the father's/Father's will or the father/Father abdicates his authority in order (as in "new" world order) to "*build relationship*" with the child—based upon the father's and the child's carnal nature, i.e., the child's *lust* for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating and the father's *lust* for approval from, i.e., acceptance by the child. It is important to point out here that *fellowship* is based upon objective truth, i.e., an external authority or fact or truth that all can agree on, while *relationship* is based upon subjective truth, how

everyone "feels" about each other, i.e., what they can get out of each other that makes them "feel good," i.e., like God, but unlike God establishing right and wrong behavior upon their carnal nature instead of upon His Holiness. "*Building relationship upon common self interest,*" i.e., upon *lust* is the foundation of Marxism since *lust* is the common denominator of all classes (the father, the mother, and the children) making it the basis of common-ism aka Communism, i.e., Globalism. To focus on the family, i.e., the relationship between the parents and the children, making them equal via [dialogue \(when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior\) is to negate the father's/Father's authority.](#) As you will see (quotations given below) this is the ideology and agenda, i.e., the *praxis* of psychology. By moving communication (when it comes to defining right and wrong behavior) away from *discussion*, which retains the father's/Father's authority (objective truth) to *dialogue*, which 'justifies' the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust* (subjective "truth"), *lust* (and the 'justification' of it) *negates* the father's/Father's authority, 'liberating' the child from having a *guilty conscience* for disobeying the father/Father, i.e., for questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking the father/Father and his/His authority. "*Discussing*" personal-social issues is not *discussion* but *dialogue*, so do not be fooled when the word *discussion* is used in place of *dialogue* (to deceive the innocent or ignorant). You can not get to *synthesis*, i.e., "*worldly peace and socialist harmony*" as long as the father's/Father's authority (*thesis*) remains in place, restraining the child's carnal nature (*antithesis*). By making the child's carnal nature (which is also found in the father) the *thesis*, the father's/Father's authority becomes the *antithesis* (the object to be remove), creating *syntheses*, i.e., relationship between the children and the father becoming one—based upon what they have in common, i.e., *lust*. ([What you lose when you dialogue your rights instead of discuss your rights.](#))

". . . any intervention between parent and child tend to produce familial democracy [replacing discussion, which retains the father's/Father's authority with dialogue, which 'justifies' the child's carnal nature 'liberates' the child from the parent's authority, i.e., from having to do right and not wrong according to the parent's (the father's/Father's) established commands, rules, facts, and truth]

*regardless of its intent." "The consequences of family democratization take a long time to make themselves felt—but it would be difficult to reverse the process once begun. ... once the parent can in any way imagine his own orientation to be a possible liability to the child in the world approaching." "... Once uncertainty is created in the parent how best to prepare the child for the future, the authoritarian family is moribund [the father's/Father's authority is negated in the child's thoughts, directly effecting his or her actions—questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way, doing so without having a guilty conscience], regardless of whatever countermeasures may be taken." "The state, by its very interference in the life of its citizens, must necessarily undermine a parental authority which it attempts to restore." "For however much the state or community may wish to inculcate obedience and submission in the child, its intervention betrays a lack of confidence in the only objects from whom a small child can learn authoritarian submission." ([Warren Bennis](#), *The Temporary Society*)*

In other words, in the act of establishing right and wrong behavior if the father sets aside *discussion* (established commands, rules, facts, and truth, which retains his authority [in a *discussion* the one in authority has the final say, i.e., "Because I said so," "Never the less," "It is written"]) in order to participate in *dialogue* with his children (in order to "build relationship" with them [in *dialogue* there is no father's/Father's authority, i.e., no doing wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, or truth, there is only the child's natural inclination to *lust* after the things in the world, 'justifying' his *self*, i.e., his *lusts*]) he *negates* his authority. Since there is no father's/Father's authority, i.e., "I am right and you are wrong, do what I say or else" in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, in a *theory*, or in the *consensus* process, when the father uses *dialogue* in establishing right and wrong behavior he establishes his and his children's *lusts*, i.e., 1) his and their *lust* for pleasure and 2) his and their *lust* for *affirmation* ("building relationship upon self interest" [bringing "relationship" and "self interest" together] unites both parties upon *lust*) over and therefore against his/His authority. *Dialogue*, i.e., "I feel," "I think" is the language used in an

experiment, i.e., when no one *knows* for certain what is right and what is wrong, i.e., whether the *experiment* will work or not.

Dialogue is found in the home. It is the choice of language used when the child does not want to do what he has been *told*. The child's "*Why?*" in response to the father's/Father's command or rule (that gets in the way of his *lusts*) is to get the father/Father to set aside *discussion* (where the father/Father has the final say, i.e., "*Because I said so*"), i.e., to draw the father into *dialogue*, where there is no "Can not," "Must not," "*Thou shalt not*," only *opinions* (the father can not hold the child accountable for "disobeying" when he says "*I do not think you should go out*") so the child can do what he wants without being punished (without being held accountable). If the father goes into *dialogue*, whether he has intended to or not he has abdicated his authority to the child's (and his) "feelings," i.e., to the child's (and his) *lusts*. "*Come over for lunch and we'll 'discuss' my experiment*" said the spider to the fly. When the fly shows up at the spider's residence, looking around he asks "*Where is the experiment?*" then, seeing the table set he asks, "*What's for lunch?*" The spider responds, "*You are the 'experiment.' My lunch.*" When *dialogue* is used to established right and wrong behavior it will have your soul for "*lunch*," "*devouring*" the father/Father, i.e., *negating* the father's/Father's authority in you so you can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., so you can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a *guilty conscience*, with the world's *affirmation*, dying in your sin.

*"Change in organization [from 'loyalty' to the father/Father to 'loyalty' to 'the group' and the facilitator of 'change'] can be derived from the overlapping between play and barrier behavior [between dialogue and discussion, which when used together (in establishing right and wrong behavior) engenders confusion i.e., cognitive dissonance—"The lack of harmony between what one does and what one believes." "The pressure to change either one's behavior or ones belief" (Ernest R. Hilgard, *Introduction to Psychology*)]." (Barker, Dembo, & Lewin, "frustration and regression: an experiment with young children" in *Child Behavior and Development*)*

"My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; Knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience. But let patience have [her] perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing. If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord. A double minded man is unstable in all his ways." James 1:2-8

"... God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble. Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you. Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double minded." James 4:6-8

To participate is to *negate*, i.e., is to be *negated*. When *dialogue* ("I feel" and "I think"), i.e., *opinion* is used to establish right and wrong behavior the father's/Father's authority is *negated* ("*devoured*"). The agenda of the facilitator of 'change' is to move communication away from *discussion* ("*barrier behavior*," i.e., having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) toward *dialogue* ("*play behavior*," i.e., freedom to *lust* after pleasure, without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without having a fear of being judged, condemned, or cast out) in order to initiate and sustain 'change,' i.e., in order to make those present subject to their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, making them subject to the facilitator of 'change' who is *manipulating* the environment (the language in the room being used to resolve conflicts and tension) in order for him to *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience*, with his 'client's' *affirmation*. By 'creating' an "*open-ended*," "*non-directive*," "*Be positive, Not negative*" environment the father's/Father's authority is *negated*, i.e., is replaced with the child's *lust* for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' the world is stimulating, creating *cognitive dissonance*—making those present dependent upon the facilitator of 'change' in order to resolve the conflict or tension (or be rejected by "*the group*" if they refuse to follow after the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., refuse to 'justify' the group's *lusts*).

"Dr. Skinner says: 'We must accept the fact that some kind of control of human affairs is inevitable. We cannot use good sense in human affairs unless someone engages in the design and construction of environmental conditions which affect the behavior of men.'" (Rogers) All man has to work with, when he rejects the father's/Father's authority (being *told*) is his carnal nature, i.e., his *lusts*, i.e., "*the lust of the flesh*," "*the lust of the eyes*," and "*the pride of life*" and the world that stimulates it (stimulus-response). He is then subject to *seduction*, *deception*, and *manipulation* by the facilitator of 'change' in order to achieve the facilitator of 'change's' desired goal, i.e., "*worldly peace and socialist harmony*" so he can *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience*, with "*the people's*" *affirmation* (their emotional and financial support).

"But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." James 1:14, 15 Many go to Washington D.C. "to fight for the cause," to impress their friends, and to enjoy great meals only to end up getting "cooked." Those in Washington know how to "cook humans"—1) find their *self interests*, i.e., their *lusts*, 2) offer to "help" them achieve (*actualize*) them, and 3) they "own" them. "*What can I get out of this situation and/or person for my self?*" i.e., to satisfy your *lusts* always leads to "*What will happen to me if they reject me or turn on me?*" i.e., fear of man (leading to compromise) instead of God (doing right and not wrong, i.e., the Father's will no matter the cost to you in this life). *Dialogue* is lethal when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior, making right and wrong subject to your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating instead of to the Father, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth, *selling* your soul to the master facilitator of 'change' in order to enjoy the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a *guilty conscience*, with his and his followers *affirmation*, dying in your sins.

"Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now

worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Ephesians 2:2,3

"For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Titus 3:3-7

"And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." 1 John 2:18 Why sell your soul for that which is passing away, i.e., *lust* and the world that simulates it, after death spending eternity in the lake of fire that is never quenched, gnashing your teeth, when God, who is eternal created you to abide with Him throughout eternity, abiding in his love, joy, and peace? With God there is no *experiment*. God is not confused, i.e., He does not have to 'discover' the truth. He KNOWS right from wrong, commanding you to do right and not wrong, i.e., to do His will. You get one shot in this life at getting it right, so you had better get it right—dying to your *lusts*, enduring the rejection of others for not *affirming* their *lusts*, and following after the only begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, doing the Father's will.

"[T]he friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." James 4:4

"and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." 1 John 1:3

Education is not just education, i.e., all the same. How the child is educated establishes his political system. Education is not just what the child is taught but also how he is taught. How you educate the child, i.e., from established commands, rules, facts, and truth, reinforcing the father's/Father's authority (which is a political system) or from the child's carnal nature, 'justifying' his natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*dopamine emancipation*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, establishing his *self*, i.e., his *lusts* over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority (which is also a political system) directly effects the outcome. One is based upon KNOWING from being *told* (right is right and wrong is wrong, i.e., black is black and white is white, which, being objective are not easily, if at all adaptable to 'change') the other from the child's *feelings* (*lusts*) of the 'moment' (which, being subjective are easily adaptable to 'change,' based upon the situation and/or people present, i.e., "*What can I get out of this situation and/or people for my self*"), hating restraint, i.e., hating the father's/Father's authority when it gets in his way. The 'moment' education becomes an *experiment*, i.e., subject to the child's *opinions*, i.e., theories (which are subject to constant 'change,' based upon who is *manipulating* the situation and/or people present) the father's/Father's authority, i.e., KNOWING right from wrong from being *told* is *negated*.

"1. All human behavior is directed toward the satisfaction of needs [the child's carnal nature "is directed toward the satisfaction of" lust], 2. the individual will change his established ways of behaving for one of two reasons: to gain increased need satisfaction [lust satisfaction] or to avoid decreased need satisfaction [to "avoid" missing out on lust], and 3. 'augmentation' ['changing' the environment, i.e., removing the father's/Father's authority] in the possibilities of needs [lust] satisfaction." (Douglas McGregor in Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#))

In an *experiment* the lab technician, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' is not held accountable for bad results, providing he follows directions. When parents turn their children over to the facilitator of 'change's' *experiment* they are the ones accountable for the results, i.e., for the 'change' in their

children's thoughts and actions, i.e., for their children's bad behavior—for their children questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking their established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., their authority without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without having any sense of *guilt*—that is the purpose (intended outcome) of the *experiment* (called Outcome-Based Education, Goals 2000, Common Core as well as many other names—continuously changing the name in order to keep the process, i.e., the *experiment* alive, as parents find out [often to late] how bad it is, i.e., what it is doing to their children, i.e., turning their children against their authority [what is the facilitator of 'change's' intended purpose—who is not accountable for the results since it is the parents who willingly participated in the *experiment*, putting their children in it (as a result of their *lust* for their friends, neighbors, relatives, etc., i.e., "the villages" approval, i.e., "*the pride of life*")]. When you go into the *experiment* you have your soul (from and subject to He who is above), when you come out you have only your *flesh* (only that which is below) having sold your soul to those running the *experiment*. The *experiment* is found in what are called "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)," what all certified teachers and accredited schools have to apply in their classrooms today (explained in greater detail later). This including "Christian," private, voucher schools, etc.,—from pre-school to post graduate. Even home school co-ops and material are using it as their curriculum. The question might be asked, "*Where are the fathers in the home school movement?*" Mom seems to be running the "show," i.e., the home. "*Bloom's taxonomies*" negates the father's/Father's authority in education, turning education over to the mother and the children, with the facilitator of 'change' (the designers of the "*taxonomy*") in control.

"Certainly the Taxonomy was unproved at the time it was developed and may well be 'unprovable.'" (Benjamin Bloom, Forty Year Evaluation)

"It has been pointed out that we are attempting to classify phenomena which could not be observed or manipulated in the same concrete form as the phenomena of such fields as the physical and biological sciences. It was the view of the group that educational objectives

stated in the behavior form have their counterparts in the behavior of individuals ... observe(able) and describ(able) therefore classifi(able)." (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*) When "human nature," i.e., "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" becomes the standard for "good" behavior, than the individual who retains 'loyalty' to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to "bad" behavior must be either converted, silenced, censored, or *negated*.

Benjamin Bloom dedicated his first Taxonomy to [Ralph Tyler](#), who's student Thomas Kuhn (quoting Max Planck) wrote "*A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it.*" (Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*—As Irvin Yalom in his book, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy* pointed out: "*The current generation is the first in the history of the world which has nothing to learn from grandparents;*") "*If a paradigm [a 'change' in culture, from Patriarch to Heresiarch] is ever to triumph it must gain some first supporters, men who will develop it to the point where hardheaded arguments can be produced and multiplied*" which eventuates "*an increasing shift in the distribution of professional allegiances*" whereupon "*the man who continues to resist after his whole profession has been converted is ipso facto ceased to be a scientist.*" "*Thomas S Kuhn spent the year 1958-1959 at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavior Sciences, directed by Ralph Tyler, where he finalized his 'paradigm shift' concept of 'Pre- and Post-paradigm periods.'*" "*Kuhn admitted problems with the schemata of his socio-psychological theory yet continued to urge its application into the scientific fields of astronomy, physics, chemistry, and biology [which found its way into the classroom].*" (Kuhn) All Tyler, Bloom, Kuhn, et al. did was 'shift' communication in the lab from *discussion*, which holds everyone accountable to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., to limits and measures to *dialogue*, which makes the *experiment* itself (*opinion*) the outcome, putting the *theory* into practice (*praxis*), silencing any true scientist who (using established commands, rules,

facts, and truth, i.e., limits and measures, i.e., "rule of law") questions and/or rejects the outcome, i.e., the *theory*.

"We recognize the point of view that truth and knowledge are only relative and that there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all time and places." (Book 1: Cognitive Domain) "In the eyes of the dialectic philosophy [using dialogue, i.e., "feelings" to come to the "truth"], nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred." (Karl Marx's ideology, as explained by Friedrich Engels) Benjamin Bloom simply paraphrased Karl Marx's ideology (without giving him credit, for obvious reason).

*"Whether or not the classification scheme presented in Handbook I: Cognitive Domain is a true taxonomy is still far from clear." (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain) The "classification scheme" (the "taxonomy") grades the child's "feelings" along a spectrum (a continuum) from 'loyalty' to the father's/Father's authority (bad grade) to 'loyalty' to "the group," the process of 'change,' and the facilitator of 'change' (good grade), not upon his learning established commands, rules, facts, and truth (absolutes) that reinforce his 'loyalty' to the father's/Father's authority, a way of thinking that gets in the way of 'loyalty' to "the group," the process of 'change,' and the facilitator of 'change.' It is not a true *taxonomy*, i.e., scientific but an ideology (*theory*) being put into practice (*praxis*), under the guise of being "scientific". Everybody loves taking part of an *experiment* (like the foolish fly, in this case not knowing they are the *experiment*). People do not normally get up in the morning saying "I can hardly wait for someone to seduce, deceive, and manipulate me today. I hope they do it so well I will never become aware of it (or, if I become aware of it, I become good at it, seducing, deceiving, and manipulating others myself)."*

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication,

wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." Romans 1:28-32

In participating in the *experiment* (or putting your children in it) that is what you (or they) have become/done. All must participate in the *experiment* or the *experiment* is not successful. Put another way, the *experiment* is not successful until no one can escape.

"No hypothesis in this body of writings has been fully tested. Nor will it be tested fully until it has been used widely in thoughtful experimentation with actual social changes. The school offers an important potential laboratory for the development of a truly experimental social science. Experimentally minded school workers can develop and improve the hypotheses suggested in these readings as they put them to the test in planning and evaluating changes in the school program." "Experiments on groups and leadership training suggest the following conclusions: (a) The change of a group atmosphere from autocracy or laissez faire to democracy through a democratic leader amounts to a re-education of the followers toward 'democratic followership.'" "(b) The experiments show that this shift in roles cannot be accomplished by a 'hands off' policy. To apply the principle of "individualistic freedom" merely leads to chaos. Sometimes people must rather forcefully be made to see what democratic responsibility toward the group as a whole means." "It is true that people cannot be trained for democracy by autocratic methods. But it is equally true that to be able to change a group atmosphere toward democracy the democratic leader has to be in power and has to use his power for active re-education [once in power the facilitator of 'change' will do whatever it takes to remain in power, what [Patrick Henry](#). warned about]. The more the group members become converted to democracy and learn to play the roles of

democracy as followers or leaders, the more can the power of the democratic leader shift to other ends than converting the group members." "(c) ... lecture and propaganda do not suffice to bring about the necessary change. Essential as they are, they will be effective only if combined with a change in the power relations and leadership of the group. For larger groups, this means that a hierarchy of leaders has to be trained which reaches out into all essential subparts of the group. Hitler himself has obviously followed very carefully such a procedure. The democratic reversal of this procedure, although different in many respects, will have to be as thorough and as solidly based on group organization." (Benne)

*"Concerning the changing of circumstances by men, the educator must himself be educated." ([Karl Marx](#), Thesis on Feuerbach # 3) In other words, in order for the "educator" to 'change' the world, he must reject (negate) the father's/Father's authority system in the classroom, which engenders individualism, under God, replacing it with the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust* which, when 'justified' in a group setting 'liberates' the child and society from the father's/Father's authority system. How the educator is educated directly effects the child, effecting government, i.e., how the child will vote when he comes of age.*

*"The justice of state constitutions is to be decided not on the basis of Christianity, not from the nature of Christian society [not from the father's/Father's authority] but from the nature of human society [from the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust*]." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right')*

"Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state [those in power]." (R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law) Once "social worth," i.e., what is "good" for society, i.e., for those in power enters the courtroom the individual (born or unborn) can receive no fair justice (or protection)—the Magna Carta and American Revolution were in

response to this issue. When *discussion*, based upon established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., "rule of law" is replaced with *dialogue*, i.e., *opinion* the victim becomes the perpetrator ("*repressing*" the criminal, getting in the way of his *lusts*) and the perpetrator of the crime becomes the victim (not being able to be his *self*, i.e., being "*repressed*" by the victim, i.e., by traditional society), making the victim the perpetrator of a crime against humanity, i.e., against *lust*.

This is reflected in the 'change' of "policy" regarding human life, changing it from "*Every system of law known to civilized society generated from or had as its component one of two well known systems of ethics, stoic or Christian [men's opinions or the Father's authority]. The COMMON LAW draws its subsistence from the latter, its roots go deep into that system, the Christian concept of right and wrong or right and justice motivates every rule of equity. It is the guide by which we dissolve domestic friction's and the rule by which all legal controversies are settled.*" (Strauss Vs. Strauss., 3 So. 2nd 727, 728, 1941) to "*there has always been strong support for the view [opinion] that life does not begin until live birth. This was the belief of the Stoics.*" (ROE v. WADE, 410 U.S. 113 15, 1973)

"*A change in the curriculum is a change in the people concerned—in teachers, in students, in parents*" "*Curriculum change means that the group involved must shift its approval from the old to some new set of reciprocal behavior patterns.*" "*... people involved who were loyal to the older pattern must be helped to transfer their allegiance to the new.*" "*Re-education aims to change the system of values and beliefs [paradigm] of an individual or a group.*" (Benne)

"*Change in methods of leadership is probably the quickest way to bring about a change in the cultural atmosphere of a group.*" "*Any real change of the culture of a group is, therefore, interwoven with the changes of the power constellation within the group.*" (Barker, Dembo, & Lewin, "frustration and regression: an experiment with young children" in *Child Behavior and Development*)

"The child takes on the characteristic behavior of the group in which he is placed. . . . he reflects the behavior patterns which are set by the adult leader of the group." (Kurt Lewin in Wilbur Brookover, A Sociology of Education)

Changing the leadership in an environment where the child is learning what is right and what is wrong behavior (from the father's/Father's authority, where established commands, rules, facts, and truth direct his steps to the facilitator of 'change,' where his "feelings" and the "feelings" of others, i.e., *lust* direct his steps) directly effects how he feels, thinks, and acts toward his *self*, others, the world, and authority.

"Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee."
Psalms 119:11

"Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it." Proverbs 22:6

"And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Ephesians 6:4

Traditional education reinforces the father's/Father's authority, teaching (*telling*) the child what is right and wrong behavior—with the one in authority holding himself accountable to the same commands, rules, facts, and truth he holds those under his authority, asking for forgiveness as he forgives those who ask for forgiveness (repenting) for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, *discussing* with his children (this is very important) any question(s) they might have regarding the commands, rules, facts, and truth being taught, at his/His discretion, i.e., providing he/He deems it necessary, has time, the children are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking his/His authority. Transformational education, i.e., the *experiment* on the other hand *negates* (in the child's mind, i.e., in his thoughts) the father's/Father's authority—being *told* what is right and what is wrong behavior—directly effecting his behavior (turning him against the father's/Father's authority, i.e., refusing to be *told* what is right and what is wrong behavior since his "feelings," i.e.,

his *lusts* of the 'moment' which the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating and his resentment toward restraint, i.e., toward being *told* now direct his thoughts and actions [seeing no need to forgive or ask for forgiveness (be forgiven) for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after pleasure since there is no one in authority to ask for forgiveness from—since they are doing and 'justifying' the same (just don't get in their way or embarrass or expose them, since they, having no sense of mercy, will not forgive you)]).

"Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time: Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you." 1 Peter 5:5-7

Traditional education.

Traditional education, i.e., "old school" is based upon the father's/Father's authority (system). Even though the "earthly father" might be wrong the child learns the importance of being/doing right and not wrong (there is accountability or consequences). The father's/Father's authority (the *Patriarchal paradigm*) is based upon the 1) *preaching* of established commands and rules to be obeyed as given, the *teaching* of established facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith, and the *discussing* of any question(s) the children might have regarding the commands, rules, facts, and truth being taught, at the father's/Father's, i.e., the educator's discretion, i.e., providing he/He deems it necessary, has time, the children are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking his/His authority, 2) *rewarding* the child who does right and obeys, 3) *correcting* and/or *chastening* the child who does wrong and/or disobeys, that he might learn to *humble*, *deny*, *die to*, *control*, *discipline*, *capitulate* his "*self*" in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Fathers' will, and 4) *casting out* (expelling/grounding) any child who questions, challenges, defies, disregards, attacks the father's/Father's

authority system (1-4). This follows a biblical pattern, where the Father directs the paths of those under his authority. In the traditional family all individuals are, i.e., each child is held personally accountable for his actions toward the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, engendering "individualism, under God," i.e., a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, engendering respect toward the father's/Father's authority—not dependents upon "*the group's*," i.e., the other children's approval although that might be present (with the other children reinforcing the father's/Father's authority) but not mandatory for the child's obedience (explained farther down).

"I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." John 5:30; 12:47-50

"And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." [Hebrews 12:5-11](#)

"And he said to them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away? For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels." Luke 9:23-26 1) deny your *lusts*, 2) endure the rejection of others for not *affirming* their *lusts*, and 3) follow the Lord, doing the Father's will.

"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. 1 John 2:15

The role of the father, besides providing food, clothing, safety, and a roof over his families head is to train up his children in the admonition of the Lord—doing the Father's will—and teach them how to "pull weeds," i.e., work (get off their duff, expecting someone to wait on them). A father, in the true sense of the word, i.e., a [benevolent father](#) loves his children while hating their doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, holding them accountable for their actions—*chastening* them when they do wrong, disobey, sin that they might learn to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their "*self*" and do right, obey, not sin, grounding them when they reject his authority, having mercy on them then they repent and do what is right, but not hating them, wanting to kill them as the carnally minded, i.e., *lust* seeking child does when the father gets in his way, i.e., in the way of his "*lust*" for pleasure.

"O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace be with thee. Amen." 1 Timothy 6:20-21

Transformational education (the *experiment*):

Transformational education is based upon the carnal nature of the child, i.e., the child's natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*dopamine emancipation*) that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating (imagined or real), hating restraint, i.e., hating the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way. All of philosophy, sociology, and psychology is based upon resolving the conflict between the father's/Father's authority and the child's carnal nature, making the child's carnal nature, i.e., "*human nature*," i.e., human "*Reasoning*" ([aufheben](#)), i.e., men's *opinions* the substance from which to establish right and wrong behavior. The Protestant Reformation, i.e., "*the priesthood of all believers*," engendering "individualism, under God" was in response to this way of thinking. "*Protestantism was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism.*" (Max Horkheimer, *Vernunft and Selbsterhaltung*; english: *Reasoning and Self-Preservation*) Martin Luther wrote: "*Miserable Christians, whose words and faith still depend on the interpretations of men and who expect clarification from them! This is frivolous and ungodly. The Scriptures are common to all, and are clear enough in respect to what is necessary for salvation and are also obscure enough for inquiring minds ... let us reject the word of man.*" (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.217) "*In vain does one fashion a logic of faith, a substitution brought about without regard for limit and measure.*" (Luther's Works: Vol. 31, Career of the Reformer: I, p. 12) "*My advice has been that a young man avoid scholastic philosophy and theology like the very death of his soul.*" (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.258) "*The sophists have imposed tyranny and bondage upon our freedom to such a point that we must not resist that twice accursed Aristotle, but are compelled to submit. Shall we therefore be perpetually enslaved and never breathe in Christian liberty, nor sigh from out of this Babylon for our scriptures and our home?*" (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.217) "*The sophists, nevertheless, rise proudly up, hold their ears, close their eyes, and turn away their heart just so that they may fill all ears with their human words, and alone may occupy the stage so that no one will bark against their assertion[s] ... The word of man is sacred and to be venerated, but God's word is handed over to whores ... the meaning of sin ... is dependent on the arbitrary choice of the sophists.*" (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the

Reformer: II, p.216) *"I greatly fear that the universities, unless they teach the Holy Scriptures diligently and impress them on the young students, are wide gates to hell. I would advise no one to send his child where the Holy Scriptures are not supreme. Every institution that does not unceasingly pursue the study of God's word becomes corrupt."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 1, The Christian in Society: p. 207) *"We do not become righteous by doing righteous deeds but, having been made righteous, we do righteous deeds."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 31, Career of the Reformer: I, p. 12) In other words, only God is good (righteous)—His righteousness imputed to man only by his faith in Him. When man attempts to create a "good" person by 'creating' a "good" environment (for him to grow up in) all he has to work with (and therefore *actualize*) is *"the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes,"* and *"the pride of life,"* justifying' his *self*, i.e., his *lusts* before men, deceiving himself and all who listen to him, dying in his sins. *"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast."* Ephesians 2:8, 9 *"But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."* Hebrews 11:6 *"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."* Romans 10:17 The father's/Father's authority requires faith. The child's carnal nature requires *lust*, which the world (sight) engenders. Herein lies the difference between traditional and transformational education, i.e., KNOWING from being *told*, i.e., the father's/Father's authority (which deals with the soul—belief-action dichotomy) and the *experiment*, i.e., knowing from *"sense experience,"* i.e., from *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, i.e., from the child's carnal nature which is stimulated by the world (stimulus-response; *theory-practice*).

"The child, contrary to appearance, is the absolute, the rationality of the relationship; he is what is enduring and everlasting, the totality which produces itself once again as such [once he is 'liberated' from the father'/Father's authority to become as he was before the father's/Father's first command, rule, fact, or truth came into his life (separating him from his "self" and the world), "of and for self" and the world only]." (Georg Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*)

"Lawfulness without law." "Purposiveness without purpose."
 ([Immanuel Kant](#), *Critique of Judgment*) In other words: the law of the flesh, i.e., the child's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure without the law of the father/Father, i.e., the father's/Father's authority getting in the way, becomes the means to knowing right from wrong behavior, making the "purpose" of life the augmentation of *lust*, 'justifying' the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to do the father's/Father's will that gets in the way.

"Laws must not fetter human life [lust]; but yield to it; they must change as the needs [lusts] and capacities of the people change." (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) Anytime a socialist, a Marxist, a facilitator of 'change,' a psychotherapist says *"the people"* (perceiving his *self* to be the personification of *"the people,"* who like him *lust* after pleasure, hating restraint, i.e., wanting to get rid of anyone getting in the way of *lust*) he means his *self*.

"... the central problem is to change reality... reality with its 'obedience to laws.'" (Lukács)

"From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts." James 4:1-3 (Read [James chapters 4 and 5](#) for the total picture.)

While the law can save no one, it reveals we need a savior, i.e., someone to redeem us from our *self*, i.e., from our *lusts*. Without it we become God, 'justifying our *self*, i.e., our *lusts*. The *"problem,"* according to the Transformational Marxist is the father's/Father's authority (*"prejudice,"* i.e., established laws, i.e., commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of *"human nature,"* i.e., *lust*), i.e., how to *"eradicate"* it.

"The peasantry [the traditional family] constantly regenerates the bourgeoisie [the father's/Father's authority system]—in positively every

*sphere of activity and life." "We must learn how to eradicate all bourgeois habits, customs, and traditions everywhere." ([Vladimir Lenin](#), *Left-Wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder An Essential Condition of the Bolsheviks' Success* May 12, 1920) Millions (hundreds of millions) died violent deaths (were "eradicated" and continue to be "eradicated") as a result of this ideology. It is the agenda of the *experiment*.*

*"Authoritarian submission [humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulate "self" in order to do the father's/Father's will] was conceived of as a very general attitude that would be evoked in relation to a variety of authority figures—parents, older people, leaders, supernatural power, and so forth." "God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority." "Submission to authority, desire for a strong leader, subservience of the individual to the state [parental authority, local control, Nationalism], and so forth, have so frequently and, as it seems to us, correctly, been set forth as important aspects of the Nazi creed that a search for correlates of prejudice had naturally to take these attitudes into account." "The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem." ([Theodor Adorno](#), *The Authoritarian Personality*)*

The error in Adorn's "logic" is that Fascism, instead of supporting the father's/Father's authority in the home/in the individual's thoughts and actions it *negated* it. By generalizing, i.e., making the father's/Father's authority synonymous to a local or National leader he sidestepped this truth. As explained below our "founding fathers" made the father of the home the King, i.e., limited the power of government in order for the father/Father to rule over his family, land, and business (freedom of private convictions, i.e., religion, private property, private business, speech, etc.,) with as little government interference as possible. By going after (*negating*) the father's/Father's authority in the home all those rights are *negated*, i.e., the family comes under the socialist's/Marxist's control.

"Our aim is not merely to describe prejudice [established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of lust, i.e., "human nature"] but to explain it in order to help in its eradication. Eradication means re-education." "Using social-environmental forces to change the parent's behavior toward the child." (Adorno) Eradication means crushing (silencing) the parents if necessary in order to 'liberate' the children (lust) out from under their authority, i.e., out from under having to humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate one's self in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will, so the facilitator of 'change' can lust after pleasure without having a guilty conscience (which the father's/Father's authority engenders), with the children's (and now the crushed parents) affirmation (in the mind of the facilitator of 'change' to be silent is to affirm, i.e., to consent).

"The antithesis of the 'authoritarian' type was called 'revolutionary.'" "By The Authoritarian Personality [Theodor Adorno's book] 'revolutionary' had changed to the 'democratic.'" (Martin Jay The Dialectical Imagination: The History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923-1950) This is why President Ronald Reagan stated, "I did not leave the democratic party. The democratic party left me [became Marxist]."

"A democratic society repudiates the principle of external authority." (John Dewey Democracy and Education)

"In a democratic society a patriarchal culture should make us depressed instead of glad; it [a patriarchal culture] is an argument against the higher possibilities of human nature, of self actualization." "In our democratic society, any enterprise—any individual—has its obligations to the whole." (Maslow, Management)

"Self-actualizing people have to a large extent transcended the values of their culture [their parent's/God's authority aka the father's/Father's authority]. They are not so much merely Americans as they are world

citizens, members of the human species first and foremost." (Maslow, Human Nature)

*"In the traditional society each child is at the mercy of his parents. The 'natural processes' by which they socialize him makes him a replica of them." "The family has little to offer the child in the way of training for his place in the community." ([James Coleman](#), *The Adolescent Society*)*

In Transformational education, it is the child who 'creates' (who is *guilty* of 'creating') the father's/Father's authority when he *humbles, denies, dies to to, controls, disciplines, capitulates* his *self* in order to do the father's/Father's will—instead of doing his own—thereby 'creating' a ("*negative*") "*force*" which is "*alien*" to and "*hostile*" toward his carnal nature, i.e., his *lusts*. Any time you are in a "*be 'positive' not 'negative'*" environment you are being "asked" to get rid of the father's/Father's authority (that which is *negative* to the flesh, i.e., *lust*) and be tolerant of or *affirm lust* (that which is 'positive' to the flesh, i.e., *lust*).

"The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force." (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3)

By making the child subject only to that which is "*of the world*" (stimulus-response), which can be "observable and definable" (but not "repeatable" since, while all children have a soul, some children will choose to do the Father's will while other children, in disobedience to the Father, will chose to do their own), not all children will respond according to the laws of nature, as true science requires), the Transformational Marxist makes the child subject to stimulus-response (approach pleasure and avoid pain, including the pain of missing out on pleasure—for every action there is an equal reaction) and impulse and urges (instincts), i.e., into an animal—to be *seduced, deceived, and manipulated* like one of Thorndike's chickens, Skinner's rats, Pavlov's dog, i.e., like a lab rat ([NTL's](#), i.e., National Training Laboratories), i.e., turned into "human resource" to be used by the Marxist (a [predator, charlatan, pimp, pedophile](#)) for his own pleasure, i.e., to support and satisfy his or her own *lusts*.

"And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you." 2 Peter 2:3

The facilitator of 'change,' through the use of *dialogue* is able to 'discover' what you *covet*, i.e., what you *lust* after, i.e., your *self interest*. He is then able to gain your trust, i.e., he has your best interest, i.e., your *self interest* in mind. Having gained your trust he "owns" you, i.e., he is able to use you (as "*human resource*") to satisfy his *lusts*, i.e., his *self interest* with your *affirmation*, casting you aside when you no longer satisfy his *lusts*, i.e., his *self interest* or you get in his way, doing to you what you did to the father/Father for getting in your way—it is the "game" you decided to play when you turned to him for direction (advice) instead of to the father/Father. He is dependent upon you, i.e., your *affirmation* in order to gain and retain power, getting rid of you when you get in his way (hurt his "feelings," which he will not forget). The father/Father is not dependent upon you, showing mercy and grace to you, forgiving you when you repent and obey, i.e., when you do what is right according to his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth.

"Sense experience must be the basis of all science." "Science is only genuine science when it proceeds from sense experience, in the two forms of sense perception and sensuous need, that is, only when it proceeds from Nature." (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3)

All Karl Marx did was redefine "*the lust of the flesh*," "*the lust of the eyes*," and "*the pride of life*," i.e., only that which is "*of the world*," as "*sensuous need*," "*sense perception*," and "*sense experience*," i.e., only that which is "*of Nature*," making the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust*, i.e., that which is stimulated by "*the world*" the only means to knowing the 'truth,' i.e., to knowing what is "*actual*" and what is not, i.e., to knowing what is right and what is wrong behavior, with pleasure, i.e., *lust* (and hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority) being right and the father's/Father's authority, i.e., that which gets in the way of *lust* being wrong.

"The words 'seem to' are significant; it is the perception which functions in guiding behavior." (Rogers)

By making behavior a "science," i.e., only subject to "the world" the father's/Father's authority, i.e., that which is "alien" and "hostile" to "human nature," i.e., to "the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes," and "the pride of life" is negated (removed from the learning, i.e., classroom environment) in order for the child to become his *self*, i.e., only of "the world."

Transformational education is based upon the child's carnal nature, i.e., "the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes," and "the pride of life," i.e., stimulus-response, thus making the father's/Father's authority the enemy of the classroom, i.e., the enemy of "the group," i.e., the enemy of "the state."

"To enjoy the present reconciles us to the actual." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right')

This concept is not only found in Marxism but also in psychology.

"Self-perfection of the human individual is fulfilled in union with the world in pleasure." "According to Freud, the ultimate essence of our being is erotic." "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." "Eros is the foundation of morality." (Brown)

In other words, it is *lust (Eros)* that "reconciles" the child to *the world*, requiring the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority in order (as in new world order) for the child to become his *self*, i.e., *self-actualized*. This Sigmund Freud, along with Karl Marx agreed on.

"Once the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the Holy family, the former must then itself be destroyed [vernichtet, i.e., annihilated, i.e., negated] in theory and in practice." (Karl Marx, Feuerbach Thesis #4)

"... the hatred against patriarchal suppression—a 'barrier to incest,' ... the desire (for the sons) to return to the mother culminates in the

*rebellion of the exiled sons, the collective killing and devouring of the father." (Sigmund Freud in [Herbert Marcuse](#), *Eros and Civilization: a psychological inquiry into Freud*)*

While Karl Marx *negated* the father's/Father's authority in society. Sigmund Freud did it in the individual. Sigmund Freud's history of the prodigal son is not of the son coming to his senses, humbling his *self*, returning home, submitting his *self* to his father's authority, learning his inheritance was not his father's money but his father's love for him, but of the son joining with his "friends," returning home, killing the father, taking all that was his (the father's), using it to satisfy their carnal desires, i.e., their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, killing all the fathers in the land so all the children could be the same, i.e., like them.

"As the [Frankfurt School](#) wrestled with how to 'reinvigorate Marx', they 'found the missing link in Freud.'" (Jay)

*"Marxian theory ["the group," i.e., society] needs Freudian-type instinct theory [the individuals *lust* for pleasure, including his *lust* for approval from others, *affirming* his *lusts*, and his hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority] to round it out. And of course, vice versa." "Third-Force psychology is also epi-Marxian in these senses, i.e., including the most basic scheme as true-good social conditions ['liberation' of "self" from the father's/Father's authority] are necessary for personal growth, bad social conditions [submission of "self" to the father's/Father's authority] stunt human nature,... This is to say, one could reinterpret Marx into a self-actualization-fostering Third- and Fourth-Force psychology-philosophy. And my impression is anyway that this is the direction in which they are going now." (Maslow, *Journals*)*

*"Freud saw that in the id there is no negation [no parental authority, i.e. no Godly restraint, i.e. no "Thou shalt not"], only affirmation and eternity [only the child's natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates]." "Children have not acquired that sense of shame which, according to the Biblical*

story, expelled mankind from Paradise, and which, presumably, would be discarded if Paradise were regained [if pleasure (lust) became the agenda, i.e., the 'drive' and 'purpose' of life]. "The repression of normal adult sexuality is required only by cultures which are based on patriarchal domination [on doing the father's/Father's will]." "Our repressed desires are the desires we had unrepressed, in childhood; and they are sexual desires." "Parental discipline, religious denunciation of bodily pleasure, . . . have all left man overly docile, but secretly in his unconscious [in his urges and impulses of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world] unconvinced, and therefore neurotic [caught between his desire for parental approval and his lust for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulation, having a guilty conscience for thinking about or doing the latter]." "The foundation on which the man of the future will be built is already there, in the repressed unconscious; the foundation has to be recovered ['liberated' from the guilty conscience, requiring the negation of the father's/Father's authority]. (Brown)

"Yet nakedness is absolutely right. So is the attack on antieroticism, the Christian & Jewish foundations. Must move in the direction of the [Reichian orgasm](#)." "I must put as much of this as is possible & usable in my education book, & more & more in succeeding writings." (Abraham Maslow, *The Journals of Abraham Maslow*)

"I have found whenever I ran across authoritarian students [those who adhere to the father's/Father's authority] that the best thing for me to do was to break their backs immediately." "The correct thing to do with authoritarians is to take them realistically for the bastards they are and then behave toward them as if they were bastards." (Maslow, *Management*)

"All cooperative schemes which provide equal remuneration to the skilled and industrious and the ignorant and idle must work their own downfall. For by this unjust plan they must of necessity eliminate the valuable members and retain only the improvident, unskilled, and vicious." (Robert Dale Owen, Robert Owen's son)

The "group grade" classroom produces a culture where the incompetent, the unskilled, and the vicious are rewarded from the work of others.

"Prior to therapy the person is prone to ask himself, 'What would my parents want me to do?' During the process of therapy the individual come to ask himself, 'What does it mean to me?'" (Rogers)

*"There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children." (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*)*

Mao's long march across America began in earnest in the fifties and sixties with the introduction of Marxist curriculum in the classroom—called "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)." We are seeing its effect in America today. All "educators" are certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" i.e., Marxist curriculum in the classroom. By 1971 over one million of Bloom's "*taxonomies*" were published for the Communist Chinese education system. (Benjamin Bloom, *Forty Year Evaluation*) Ask any teacher today if they have ever heard of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" and they will probably smile, thinking you are a fellow comrade ready to inform them on some new way of applying it in the classroom. Any teacher questioning and/or challenging their use in the classroom will be looking for another job, if they can find one—having been labeled "unfit" to teach.

"Blooms' Taxonomies" are "a psychological classification system" used "to develop attitudes and values ... which are not shaped by the parents." "Ordering" "different kinds of affective behavior," i.e., "the range of emotion(s)" "organized into value systems and philosophies of life." "It was the view of the group that educational objectives stated in the behavior form have their counterparts in the behavior of individuals, observable and describable therefore classifiable [true science is "observable and repeatable," i.e., objective, i.e., constant not "observable and describable," i.e., subject to an opinion, i.e., subject to 'change']." "Only those educational programs which can be

specified in terms of intended student behaviors can be classified."
"What we are classifying is the intended behavior of students—the ways in which individuals are to act, think, or feel as the result of participating in some unit of instruction." "... ordering and relating the different kinds of affective behavior." "... we need to provide the range of emotion from neutrality through mild to strong emotion, probably of a positive, but possibly also of a negative, kind." "... organized into value systems and philosophies of life ..." "...many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in some ways brought into question while more rational and nonauthoritarian behaviors are emphasized." "The student must feel free to say he disliked _____ and not have to worry about being punished for his reaction." (Book 1: Cognitive Domain and Book 2: Affective Domain)

"To create effectively a new set of attitudes and values, the individual must undergo great reorganization of his personal beliefs and attitudes and he must be involved in an environment which in many ways is separated from the previous environment in which he was developed.... many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in some ways brought into question while more rational and nonauthoritarian behaviors are emphasized." "The effectiveness of this new set of environmental conditions is probably related to the extent to which the students are 'isolated' from the home during this period of time." "... objectives can best be attained where the individual is separated from earlier environmental conditions and when he is in association with a group of peers who are changing in much the same direction and who thus tend to reinforce each other." (Book 2: Affective Domain)

The following section is from a book explaining how the Communist Chinese brainwash their victims.

*"The manner in which the prisoner came to be influenced to accept the Communist's definition of his guilt can best be described by distinguishing two broad phases—(1) a process of 'unfreezing,' [see the issues on Kurt Lewin, [Unfreezing, Moving or Changing, Refreezing People](#), [Force Field Analysis](#), and [Group Dynamics](#); "Unfreezing. This term, also adopted from Lewinian change theory, refers to the process of disconfirming an individual's former belief system." ([Irvin D. Yalom](#), *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*) "A successful change includes, therefore, three aspects: unfreezing the present level, moving to the new level, and freezing group life on the new level." (Kurt Lewin) "In brief, unfreezing is the breaking down of the mores, customs and traditions of an individual – the old ways of doing things – so that he is ready to accept new alternatives." (Edger Schein and Warren Bennis, *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach*)] in which the prisoner's physical resistance, social and emotional supports, self-image and sense of integrity, and basic values and personality were undermined, thereby creating a state of 'readiness' to be influence; and (2) a process of 'change,' in which the prisoner discovered how the adoption of 'the people's standpoint' and a reevaluation of himself from this perspective would provide him with a solution to the problems created by the prison pressure."*

*"Most were put into a cell containing several who were further along in reforming themselves and who saw it as their primary duty to "help" their most backward member to see the truth about himself in order that the whole cell might advance. Each such cell had a leader who was in close contact with the authorities for purposes of reporting on the cell's progress and getting advice on how to handle the Western member . . . the environment undermined the (clients) self-image." ". . . Once this process of self of self re-evaluation began, the (client) received all kinds of help and support from the cell mates and once again was able to enter into meaningful emotional relationships with others." (*Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays in Readings on Human Interaction*, ed. Warren G. Bennis, Edgar H. Schein, David E. Berlew, and Fred I. Steele)*

"The affective domain [the student's natural inclination to "lust" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world (including "the group") stimulates and hate restraint] contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people." "The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box' [a "box" full of evils, which once opened, can not be closed—once the father's/Father's authority, i.e., fear of judgment, i.e., "the lid" is removed it is difficult if not impossible to put it back on again]. 'It is in this 'box' that the most influential controls are to be found.'" "In fact, a large part of what we call "good teaching" is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives ['liberating' the child's carnal thoughts from the father's/Father's authority] through challenging the student's fixed beliefs [challenging the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth] and getting them to discuss issues [evaluating the world through their carnal desires, i.e., their "lusts," i.e., their "self interests" of the 'moment']." (Book 2: Affective Domain)

"In the more traditional society a philosophy of life, a mode of conduct, is spelled out for its members at an early stage in their lives." "A major function of education in such a society is to achieve the internalization of this philosophy." "This is not to suggest that education in an open society does not attempt to develop personal and social values." "It does indeed." "But more than in traditional societies it allows the individual a greater amount of freedom in which to achieve a Weltanschauung¹." "¹Cf. Erich Fromm, 1941; T. W. Adorno et al., 1950." (Book 2: Affective Domain)

Erich Fromm and T. W. Adorno were two Marxists who were members of the "[Frankfurt School](#)" who came to the states, fleeing Fascist Germany in the early 30's—who entered our universities and "assisted" our government in making policies—moving education out from under parental (the father's/Father's) authority, i.e., local control ("[in loco parentis](#)") to government, i.e., their control. You can not get any closer to local control than the traditional family—where local control emanates from.

*"We are proud that in his conduct of life man has become free from external authorities, which tell him what to do and what not to do."
 "All that matters is that the opportunity for genuine activity be restored to the individual; that the purposes of society ["the group"] and of his own become identical." "... to give up 'God' and to establish a concept of man as a being ... who can feel at home in it [the world] if he achieves union with his fellow man and with nature." (Erick Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*)*

*"Fromm gave the humanitarian, idealist, and romantic proponents of the New Left a Marx they could love." (Stephen Eric Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and its Theorists*)*

By making the child's "self interest," i.e., "lusts" of the 'moment,' i.e., the "affective domain" the core of his classroom experience the "educator" is able to 'change' his way of thinking and acting—he will naturally follow the "educator" wherever he is leading.

"If we have the power or authority to establish the necessary conditions, the predicted behaviors [our potential ability to influence or control the behavior of groups] will follow." "We can choose to use our growing knowledge to enslave people in ways never dreamed of before, depersonalizing them, controlling them by means so carefully selected that they will perhaps never be aware of their loss of personhood." "We know how to change the opinions of an individual in a selected direction, without his ever becoming aware of the stimuli which changed his opinion." "We know how to influence the ... behavior of individuals by setting up conditions which provide satisfaction for needs of which they are unconscious, but which we have been able to determine." We can achieve a sort of control under which the controlled though they are following a code much more scrupulously than was ever the case under the old system, nevertheless feel free. They are doing what they want to do, not what they are forced to do." "By a careful design, we control not the final behavior, but the inclination to behavior—the motives, the desires, the wishes. The

curious thing is that in that case the question of freedom never arises."
(Rogers)

"Without exception, [children] enter group therapy [the "group grade" classroom] with the history of a highly unsatisfactory experience in their first and most important group—their primary family [the traditional home with parents telling them what they can and can not do]." "What better way to help [the child] recapture the past than to allow him to re-experience and reenact ancient feelings [resentment, hostility] toward parents in his current relationship to the therapist [the facilitator of 'change']? The [facilitator of 'change'] is the living personification of all parental images [takes the place of the parent]. Group [facilitators] refuse to fill the traditional authority role: they do not lead in the ordinary manner, they do not provide answers and solutions [teach right from wrong from established commands, rules, facts, and truth], they urge the group [the children] to explore and to employ its own resources [to dialogue their "feelings," i.e., their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' in the "light" of the current situation, i.e., their desire for "the group" approval (affirmation)]. The group [children] must feel free to confront the [the facilitator of 'change'], who must not only permit, but encourage, such confrontation [rebellion and anarchy]. He [the child] reenacts early family scripts in the group and, if therapy [[brainwashing](#)—washing respect for and fear of the father's/Father's authority from the child's brain (thoughts)] is successful, is able to experiment with new behavior, to break free from the locked family role [submitting to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will] he once occupied. ... the patient [the child] changes the past by reconstituting it ['creating' a "new" world order from his "ought," i.e., a world "lusting" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, i.e., a world void of the father's/Father's authority and the guilty conscience which the father's/Father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "lusting" after pleasure in disobedience]." (Yalom)

The "educator" (the facilitator of 'change') does not have to *tell* the students to question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack their parent's authority when they get home from school, if they were not doing that already (*telling* them would be "old school," maintaining the "old" world order of being *told* even if it was done for the 'purpose' of 'change,' i.e., for the 'purpose' of creating a "new" world order), all they have to do is use a curriculum in the classroom that "*encourages*," i.e., pressures the students to participate in the process of 'change,' i.e., into *dialoguing* their *opinions* to a *consensus*, 'justifying' their carnal nature, i.e., "*lust*" over and therefore against their parent's authority. Being *told* to be "*positive*" (supportive of the other students carnal nature) and not "*negative*" (judging them by their parent's standards) pressures students to 'justify' their and the other students love of pleasure and hate of restrain, doing so in order to be approved, i.e., *affirmed* by "*the group*," resulting in "*the group*" labeling those students who, holding onto their parent's standards, i.e., refusing to participate in the process of 'change' or fighting against it as being "*negative*," divisive, hateful, intolerant, maladjusted, unadaptable to 'change,' resisters of 'change,' not "team players," lower order thinkers, in denial, phobic, prejudiced, judgmental, racist, fascist, dictators, anti-social, etc., i.e., "*hurting*" people's "*feelings*" resulting in "*the group*" rejecting them—the student's natural desire for approval and fear of rejection forces him to participate. The same outcome applies to all adults, in any profession who participate in the process. Once you are 'labeled,' you are 'labeled' for life. In the soviet union, once you were 'labeled' "*psychological*," no matter how important you were in the past, your life was over, your career was done.

What 'change' is all about.

"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, the objective however, is change." (Karl Marx, *Feuerbach Thesis #11*)
 Inscribed on Karl Marx's tomb so it must be important. The father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* one's *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will inhibits or blocks, i.e., prevents 'change.'

Only when a person is stimulated by and responds to the world, i.e., to the current situation and/or people around him, according to his carnal nature (*lusting* after pleasure and hating restraint) can 'change' be initiated and sustained, requiring the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders) in the person's thoughts and actions.

In other words, for Karl Marx, while children resent the father's/Father's authority, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth for getting in the way of their *lusts*, when they grow up and have children of their own they establish commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority over their children, preventing 'change,' i.e., preventing their children from becoming their *self*—*lusting* after pleasure, having a *guilty conscience* when they do. While Karl Marx established the killing of fathers (the King and all who supported his way of thinking and acting) as the pathway to 'liberty,' he was not able to *negate* the *guilty conscience* in those doing it, who then, when left to their *self*, restored the father's authority system, only this time with "*the group*"—known as Fascism. It was the *guilty conscience* that needed to be 'change' (to the "super-ego") if 'change' was to be permanent. (The "super-ego" unites the person's *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint in the past to the present, making *lust* for pleasure and hate of restraint the foundation from which to evaluate and respond to the current situation and/or people present.)

"The personal conscience is the key element in ensuring self-control, refraining from deviant behavior even when it can be easily perpetrated." "The family, the next most important unit affecting social control, is obviously instrumental in the initial formation of the conscience and in the continued reinforcement of the values that encourage law abiding behavior." (Dr. Robert Trojanowicz, The meaning of "Community" in Community Policing)

"The guilty conscience is formed in childhood by the incorporation of the parents and the wish to be father of oneself." "What we call 'conscience' perpetuates inside of us our bondage to past objects now

part of ourselves:"" (Brown) A definition of the *guilty conscience* from a Marxist's perspective.

Kurt Lewin explained (in two sentences) how the *guilty conscience* (the "*negative valence*") is 'created,' preventing 'change,' i.e., *lust* and how it could be *negate*, emancipating 'change,' i.e., *lust*.

"The negative valence of a forbidden object which in itself attracts the child [the guilty conscience] thus usually derives from an induced field of force of an adult." "If this field of force loses its psychological existence for the child (e.g., if the adult goes away or loses his authority) the negative valence also disappears." (Kurt Lewin; A Dynamic Theory of Personality)

In other words, the "*negative valence*," i.e. the *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "*lusting*") is *negated* when the father's/Father's authority is *negated* in the child's thoughts, thus 'justifying' his carnal actions, i.e., *lust*—with "*the group's*" support, i.e., *affirmation*. This requires his participation in "*the group*."

"... the superego 'unites in itself the influences [impulses and urges, i.e., lusts and hates] of the present and of the past.'" (Brown)

"Superego development is conceived as the incorporation of the moral standards of society. Therefore the levels of the Taxonomy should describe successive levels of goal setting appropriate to superego development." (Book 2: Affective Domain)

While the father's/Father's authority engenders "individualism, under God" "*the group*" makes each individual accountable to what he has in common with "*the group*," requiring him to compromise (at least set aside) any command, rule, fact, or truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority in order to "get along," i.e., in order to be a part of "*the group*." It is his *lust* for the approval of others, *affirming* his *lusts*, i.e., "*What can I get out of this situation or this person for my self?*" that keeps him 'loyal' to "*the group*," i.e., "*What will happen to me if they reject me and/or turn on me?*"

"Individualism, under God," i.e., 'loyalty' to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to established commands, rules, facts, and truth is sacrificed at the alter of "group approval," i.e., *affirmation*, i.e., the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* process.

"It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately." "The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group." (Kurt Lewin in Bennie)

The desire for approval (*affirmation*) from other's facilitates 'change,' i.e., compromise for the sake of relationship. It is not only "*repression*" (not being able to *lust* after pleasure) that is of concern here but also "*alienation*" (not being able to relate with others with the same *lusts*, i.e., *self interests*). By identifying with the father/Father, doing the father's/Father's will the child is prevented from identifying with his *self* and "*the group*," i.e., society, i.e., *lust*.

"The more of himself man attributes to God, the less he has left in himself." (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3)

"Every form of objectification results in alienation" "Alienation is the experience of 'estrangement' (Verfremdung) from others, . . ."
"Alienation has a long history. Its most radical sense already appears in the biblical expulsion from Eden." "God is thus the anthropological source of alienation . . ." *"Alienation will continue so long as the subject engages in an externalization (Entausserung) of his or her subjectivity." (Stephen Eric Bronner, Of Critical Theory and its Theorists)*

"Personal relations between men have this character of alienation. Hegel and Marx have laid the foundations for the understanding of the problem of alienation." (Fromm)

"The major barrier to mutual interpersonal communication is our very natural tendency to judge, to evaluate, to approve or disapprove, the statement of the other person, or the other group." (Rogers)

"When we learn to silence the inner voice that judges yourself and others, there is no limit to what we can accomplish, individually and as part of a team. Absence of judgment makes you more receptive to innovative ideas ['change']." (Michael Ray in Maslow, Management,

*"It is not individualism [the child, humbling, denying, dying to ,, his "self" in order to do the father's/Father's will] that fulfills the individual, on the contrary it destroys him. Society [the child's desire for approval from others, requiring him to compromise in order to "get along," i.e., in order to "build relationship"] is the necessary framework through which freedom and individuality ["freedom" from the father's/Father's authority and "freedom" to "lust" after pleasure without having a guilty conscience] are made realities." (Karl Marx, in John Lewis, *The Life and Teachings of Karl Marx*)*

*"It is not the will or desire of any one person which establish order but the moving spirit of the whole group. Control is social." (John Dewey, *Experience and Education*)*

*"The real nature of man is the totality of social relations." (Karl Marx, *Thesis on Feuerbach* #6)*

"The individual is emancipated [liberated rom the father's/Father's authority] in the social group." "Freud commented that only through the solidarity of all the participants could the sense of guilt [the guilty conscience which is engendered by the father's/Father's authority] be assuaged." (Brown)

*"In the dialogic relation of recognizing oneself [one's lusts] in the other, they experience the common ground of their existence." ([Jürgen Habermas](#), *Knowledge & Human Interest, Chapter Three: The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory*)*

The *dialoguing* of opinions to a consensus process negates the father's/Father's authority—since there is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only the participant's carnal desires, i.e., *lusts* of the 'moment' being 'justified.'

"In an ordinary discussion people usually hold relatively fixed positions and argue in favour of their views as they try to convince others to change." (Bohm and Peat, *Science, Order, and Creativity*) *Discussion* divides upon being right and not wrong, i.e., KNOWING, which is formal, i.e., judgmental, i.e., the father/Father retains his authority in *discussion*, i.e., has the final say, i.e., *"Because I said so," "Never the less," "It is written."* Majority vote retains the father's/Father's authority system although the father might lose out on the particular issue at hand.

"A dialogue is essentially a conversation between equals." "The spirit of dialogue, is in short, the ability to hold many points of view in suspension, along with a primary interest in the creation of common meaning." (Bohm and Peat, *Science, Order, and Creativity*) *Dialogue* unites upon *"feelings,"* i.e., *"I feel"* and/or *"I think,"* i.e., an *opinion*, which is informal, i.e., non-judgmental, i.e., the child retains his carnal nature in *dialogue*, having the final say (against authority, i.e., absolutes, i.e., the father's/Father's authority). There is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, or in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only the child's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and hate restraint being 'justified.' *Dialogue* moves *opinions* to a *consensus*, *negating* the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* it engenders in the process.

Karl Marx understood the importance of *dialogue*, where the father's/Father's authority is missing, i.e., is rejected, i.e., is denied entry, i.e., not tolerated.

"Not feeling at home in the sinful world. Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home." "Critical Criticism is a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without." (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) In other words: being condemned, rejected, and cast out for being a sinner (because of the father's/Father's authority) in a *"sinful world"*—having rejected the Heavenly Father's authority, who is perfect, recognizing only the early father, who like the children *lusts* after pleasure and hates restraint, he

is 'justified' in his mind in making *lust* (what both the father and the children have in common) the basis of "*dialogue*," *negating* the father's authority in the outcome. "*Critical Criticism*," i.e., *dialogue* pushed to its pure state, i.e., hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way of *lust*, i.e., for cutting off *dialogue* (*lust*) with his "*Because I said so*," "*It is written*," *dialogue* restored (regarding right and wrong behavior), i.e., "*pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without*" must "*set up a sinful world in its own home*," i.e., must remove the father's/Father's authority from the world around it—without the *dialogue*, i.e., hate and *negation* (violence) toward the father's/Father's authority there can be no 'justice,' i.e., no equity. This is the foundation of thought for "*Critical Race Theory*." It has nothing to do with race (that is only a cover, i.e., to get you in the room). It is all about *lust*, i.e., removing (*negating*) anyone (by any means) who gets in *its* way. *Dialogue* in its pure state, 'justifying' the "human heart," i.e., the child's *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint can only lead to that outcome.

"*I am nothing and I should be everything*" (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) In other words: "*I am called a sinner, condemned, and cast out when I should be recognized as being in 'ownership' of all things, and worshiped.*" "*The fruits of the earth belong to us all* [i.e., to the one making this statement], *and the earth itself to nobody* [i.e., there is no higher authority above the one making this statement]" (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on Inequality*), voiced in defiance to "*The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof*" (1 Corinthians 10:26). "*The proletariat* [i.e., the one making this statement] *thus has the same right as has the German king* [the father/Father] *when he calls, the people his people and a horse his horse*" (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*). What the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the psychotherapist sees, he "owns." Whenever a Marxist says "*the people*" ("*the proletariat*") he means his "*self*"—perceiving his *self* as being the personification of "*the people*," since he, like "*the people*" *lusts* after pleasure and hates restraint, i.e., hates the father's/Father's authority for

getting in the way of his and *"the people's" lusts*, he is 'justified' (in his and *"the people's"* eyes) in silencing, censoring, and/or removing anyone who gets in *"the people's,"* i.e., his way, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous with *"the people's" affirmation* (since he is doing it for their "good"). When he says *"It is not about you"* when you question his actions he is saying *"It is all about me, so I can lust after pleasure without having a guilty conscience, with your affirmation. If you refuse to affirm me ("the people"), i.e. my lusts ("the people's" lusts) or get in my way ("the people's" way), 'the people' will remove (negate) you (since, having 'justified' their lusts I now "own" them). It appears I must keep an eye on you from now on for the 'good' of 'the people,' i.e., for my 'good.'"*

By making the child's carnal nature, i.e., *"human nature,"* i.e., *lust* the basis of life, i.e., the foundation of society, George Hegel, sounding more like Karl Marx than Karl Marx himself, who was not yet born could write:

"On account of the absolute and natural oneness of the husband, the wife, and the child [their common lust for pleasure including their lust for the approval from others], where there is no antithesis [no "top-down" right-wrong way of thinking and acting] of person to person or of subject to object, the surplus is not the property of one of them, since their indifference is not a formal or a legal one." (Georg Hegel, System of Ethical Life) As J. L. Moreno stated it in his book Who Shall Survive?: "Parents have no right upon their offspring except a psychological right. Literally the children belong to universality [to him and those who think like him]."

"Despotism ... predominates in the human heart." (George Washington, Farewell Address) Even George Washington understood the nature of "the human heart," i.e., why the power of those in government had to be limited so fathers could raise their children up according to their standards, 'justifying' freedom of the conscience, religion, and speech, i.e., private convictions, property, and business, i.e., unalienable rights, under God.

Unlike any other government on earth, America made the father of the home the King, limiting government to the vote of the citizens (majority vote), i.e., establishing law upon the authority of the father in the home, i.e., "rule of law," retaining the right of private convictions (freedom of the *conscience, religion, speech*), private property, private business. You can not get any more local than the home. Local control begins in the home ("*in loco parentis*"), i.e., is initiated and sustained by the father's/Father's authority in the home, engendering individualism (under the father's/Father's, i.e., under God's authority, i.e., "rule of law") in the next generation of citizens—knowing right from wrong (by being *told*), having a *guilty conscience* (knowing they will be held accountable) for doing wrong. The farther you move control (over behavior) away from the home, i.e., away from the father's/Father's authority the less local it becomes, i.e., the more compromised it becomes. Limited, representative government was established because of the "*human heart*," i.e., the child's/the "representative's" natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure. Limited, representative government, and unalienable rights (rights no man can put a lien on since they are not from "human nature," i.e., *lust* for pleasure and hate of restraint) are based upon the father's/Father's authority, with the father/Father engendering a *guilty conscience* (accountability for one's actions) in the children (in the next generation of citizens and the "representative") for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after pleasure (instead of doing the father's/Father's will). In this system of government the child (as a representative) is sent to the store (to the capital) to re-present the father's (the constituent's) position, i.e., his rights and wrongs, i.e., to purchase the father's (the constituent's) goods. He is no longer sent to the store (voted out of office) if he compromises the father's/Father's standards (replaces representation with mediation), i.e., spends the father's money on his *self*, i.e., to satisfy his own *self interests*, i.e., *lusts* and the self interests, i.e., *lusts* of others he has "*built relationship*" with. "*Rule of law*" (the "*priesthood of all believers*"—who puts not man between them and God, reflected in the representative putting no man between him and his constitution and the Constitution that protects them from governmental, i.e., from his abuse, i.e., from his usurping their God given rights) retains individualism, under God while the *consensus* process retains the "representative's" *self interests (lusts)* of the 'moment,'

that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating. Limited, representative government has been replaced with the *self interests* of the child(ren), i.e., the "representative," who's interest is in his *self*, i.e., in satisfying his *lusts*—who perceive his *self* as being the personification of "*the people*" (since they *lust* after pleasure just like him—which is the base of socialism/common-ism), making *lust*, i.e., his *self interest* his platform, instead of doing right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's (the constituent's) established commands, rules, facts, and truth, thereby *negating* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., "rule of law" (limited, representative, constitutional government) as the law of the land. There is no representation in the *consensus* process, other than the process of *compromise*, done for the sake of *self interest*, i.e., to satisfy the participant's *lusts*.

"[We] must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions [see those people adhering to the father's/Father's authority] in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue." (Benne) 'Shifting' communication in a meeting or classroom from *discussion* to *dialogue* (when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior) and the agenda is accomplished.

*"The individual may have 'secret' thoughts ["lusts"] which he will under no circumstances reveal to anyone else if he can help it [out of fear of being judged, rejected, and/or punished]. To gain access [through getting him or her to *dialogue*, i.e., to share his or her "feelings," i.e., carnal desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' (that he is internally, i.e., privately struggling with) with others] is particularly important, for here may lie the individual's potential [for 'change,' i.e., to become of and for his or her "*self*" and the world only—'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority]." (Adorno)*

By 'shifting' communication (regarding right and wrong behavior) away from *discussion*, where the father's/Father's authority, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth have ("rule of law" has) the final say to *dialogue*, i.e., to where the children, i.e., the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust* has the final say, the world is 'changed,' i.e., the children are 'liberated from

the father's/Father's authority (system). It is here where *"the group,"* i.e., [group dynamics](#), i.e., your desire (*lust*) for *"the groups"* approval (*affirmation*) comes into play.

"(T)he group to which an individual belongs is the ground for his perceptions, his feelings, and his actions" (Kurt Lewin, Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics)

"One of the most fascinating aspects of group therapy is that everyone is born again, born together in the group." (Yalom)

"There is no more important issue than the interrelationship of the group members." "To question the value or activities of the group, would be to thrust himself into a state of dissonance." "Few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity in the face of apparent group unanimity." (Yalom)

"Group members must be able to synthesize individual 'felt' needs [lusts] with common group 'felt' needs [lusts]." (Bennis)

"Only when the immediate interests [lusts, i.e., self interests] are integrated into a total view and related to the final goal of the process do they become revolutionary [overthrowing the father's/Father's authority]." (Lukács)

"Bypassing the traditional channels of top-down decision making [the father's/Father's authority] our objective centers upon transforming public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics."

"Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common interests and ultimately to world interests transforming public consensus into one favorable to the emergence of a stable and humanistic world order." "Consensus is both a personal and a political step. It is a precondition of all future steps." (Ervin Laszlo, A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World Order)

Where are your children getting their education? How is the *experiment* going? Look around you, it is going quite well (even in the "Christian"

schools, Colleges, and Universities). Question the use of psychology today, even in the "church" and you will quickly discover how Marxist, i.e., *experimental* (subject to "*the lust of the flesh,*" "*the lust of the eyes,*" and "*the pride of life,*" i.e., "*Make me 'feel' 'good,' i.e., like God and I will follow you*") it has become.

"To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit;" (Brown)

"... the 'original sin' must be committed again: 'We must again eat from the tree of knowledge in order to fall back into the state of innocence.'" (Marcuse)

"The transgression of the wicked saith within my heart, that there is no fear of God before his eyes. For he flattereth himself in his own eyes, until his iniquity be found to be hateful. The words of his mouth are iniquity and deceit: he hath left off to be wise, and to do good. He deviseth mischief upon his bed; he setteth himself in a way that is not good; he abhorreth not evil." Psalms 36:1-4

Robert Owen's son wrote of his father's socialist *experiment*. *"All cooperative schemes which provide equal remuneration to the skilled and industrious and the ignorant and idle must work their own downfall. For by this unjust plan they must of necessity eliminate the valuable members and retain only the improvident, unskilled, and vicious."* (Robert Dale Owen, Robert Owen's son) Since then lab technicians of social 'change' realize they can not let any "rats" (especially those with money) escape, i.e., that all must participate if the *experiment* is to be successful (if they are to live off of "*the peoples*" money). Perceiving money as being stored up *dopamine emancipation* (pleasure) in the hands of traditional authority, who determine who will receive it or not based upon their doing right and not wrong according to their established commands, rules, facts, and truth, must, according to the facilitator of 'change' be taken from everyone (especially the fathers) and distributed to all who participate in their program so the facilitator of 'change' can live off it, enjoying the carnal pleasures (*lusts*) of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, with "*the*

people's" affirmation, removing anyone who gets in their way, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous. The road to "Utopia" is paved with the bodies of those who got in the way of the experiment, i.e., lust. The "Berlin wall" did not come down because Communism was defeated. It came down because Communism had succeeded—replacing the father's/Father's authority with the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process so all (especially the leadership, i.e., the facilitators of 'change,' i.e., "big brother") can sin, i.e., can lust after pleasure without having a guilty conscience, with everyone affirmation.

"Black is black and white is white. Neither torture, maltreatment nor intimidation can change a fact. To argue the point... serves no useful purpose." (P.O.W. Major David F. MacGhee responding to brainwashing attempts by the Communist North Koreans, January 19th, 1953)

"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Timothy 4:3, 4 "Climate 'change,'" evolution, etc., are all "fables" 'created' by man in order to negate God's Word (God's judgment) in this thoughts, so he can sin, i.e., lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a guilty conscience. There is no other purpose (the facts will not support the theory).

"Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." Ecclesiastes 11:9

Facilitators of 'change,' i.e., psychologists, i.e., behavioral "scientists," i.e., "group psychotherapists," i.e., Marxists (Transformational Marxists)—all being the same in method or formula—are using the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus (affirmation) process, i.e., dialectic 'reasoning' ('reasoning' from/through the students "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., from/through

their "[lust](#)" for pleasure and their [hate of restraint](#), in the "[light](#)" of their desire for group approval, i.e., [affirmation](#) and fear of group rejection) in the "[group grade](#)," "[safe zone/space/place](#)," "[Don't be negative, be positive](#)," "[open ended, non-directed](#)," [soviet](#) style, [brainwashing](#) (washing [the father's/Father's authority](#) from the children's thoughts and actions, i.e., "[theory and practice](#)," [negating](#) their having a [guilty conscience](#), which the father's/father's authority engenders, for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning in the process—called "[the negation of negation](#)" since the father's/Father's authority and the [guilty conscience](#), being *negative* to [the child's carnal nature](#), is *negated* in *dialogue*—in *dialogue*, *opinion*, and the *consensus* process there is no father's/Father's authority), [inductive 'reasoning'](#) ('reasoning' from/through the students "[feelings](#)," i.e., their natural inclination to "[lust](#)" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment'—[dopamine emancipation](#)—which the world stimulates, i.e., their "[self interest](#)," i.e., their "[sense experience](#)," [selecting "appropriate information"](#)—excluding, ignoring, or resisting, i.e., rejecting any "[inappropriate](#)" information, i.e., established command, rule, fact, or truth that gets in the way of their desired outcome, i.e., pleasure—in determining right from wrong behavior), "[Bloom's Taxonomy](#)," "[affective domain](#)," French Revolution ([Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité](#)) classroom "environment" in order (as in "new" world order) to 'liberate' children from parental authority, i.e., from the father's/Father's authority system (the [Patriarchal Paradigm](#))—as [predators, charlatans, pimps, pedophiles, seducing, deceiving, and manipulating](#) them [as chickens, rats, and dogs](#), i.e., treating them as natural resource ("[human resource](#)") in order to convert them into '[liberals](#),' [socialists](#), [globalists](#), so they, '[justifying](#)' their "[self](#)" [before one another](#), can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., "[lust](#)" with impunity.

"Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein. Also I set watchmen over you, saying, Hearken to the sound of the trumpet. But they said, We will not hearken." Jeremiah 6:16, 17

[Home schooling](#) material, co-ops, conferences, etc., are joining in the same [praxis](#), fulfilling [Immanuel Kant's](#) as well as [Georg Hegel's](#), [Karl Marx's](#),

and Sigmund Freud's agenda of using the pattern or method of Genesis 3:1-6, i.e., "*self*" 'justification,' i.e., dialectic (*dialogue*) 'reasoning,' i.e., 'reasoning' from/through your "*feelings*," i.e., your carnal desires of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world (including your desire for approval from others, with them *affirming* your carnal nature) in order to *negate* Hebrews 12:5-11, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline* your "*self*" in order to do the father's/Father's will, *negating* Romans 7:14-25, i.e., your having a *guilty conscience* when you do wrong, disobey, sin, thereby *negating* your having to repent before the father/Father for your doing wrong, disobedience, sins—which is the real agenda.

*"And for this cause [because men, as "children of disobedience," 'justify' their "*self*," i.e., 'justify' their love of "*self*" and the world, i.e., their love of the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*dopamine emancipation*) which the world stimulates over and therefore against the Father's authority] God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie [that pleasure is the standard for "*good*" instead of doing the Father's will]: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth [in the Father and in His Son, Jesus Christ], but had pleasure in unrighteousness [in their "*self*" and the pleasures of the 'moment,' which the world stimulates]." 2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12*

© *Institution for Authority Research*, Dean Gotcher 2021