

Mao's Long March Across America.

(2022-5-9)

([Older issue](#))

([Personal note.](#))

by

Dean Gotcher

"Words and actions should help to unite, and not divide, the people." (Mao Zedong)

"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

PART I

Maoism is based upon Marxism, which is based upon "dialectic 'Reasoning,'" i.e., "Reasoning" from "[sense experience](#)," establishing "human nature," i.e., "the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes," and "the pride of life," i.e., [the child's carnal nature](#), i.e., that which is "of the world," i.e., *stimulus-response over* and therefore *against* [the father's/Father's authority](#), i.e., being *told* what is right and what is wrong behavior (being held accountable for being wrong). When you leave the father's/Father's authority out of establishing right and wrong behavior all you have is the child's carnal nature, i.e., "human nature," i.e., "the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes," and "the pride of life" being 'justified,' i.e., Maoism, i.e., Marxism, i.e., dialectic 'Reasoning.' In other words for the Maoist, i.e., the Marxist, i.e., the psychotherapist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' "Reasoning" is subject to impulses, urges, and responses of the 'moment' (which are being stimulated by the world, stimulating the senses, i.e., sight, imagined or real) instead of subject to the father's/Father's authority (established commands, rules, facts, and truth which have been accepted as true, i.e., by faith, i.e., by having been *told*).

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

"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)

In other words, according to Karl Marx it is *lust*, what he called "*sensuous needs*," "*sense perception*," and "*sense experience*," "*only when it proceeds from Nature*" (instead of "*lust of the flesh*," "*lust of the eyes*," and "*pride of life*," only that which "*is of the world*") that "*reconciles*" you to "*the world*." (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3) If *lust* (*pleasure*, i.e., "*enjoying*

the present," i.e. the *"eternal present,"* i.e., *self interest,* i.e., *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, i.e., *stimulus-response*) is the standard for life (for the Marxist), then the father's/Father's authority (*"that gets in the way of lust"*) must be *negated* if man is to become at-one-with the world, i.e., *self-actualized*. The father/Father KNOWS the cost (the consequence) of being wrong (according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth). The child, *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' does not. (Children [as socialists/Marxists], pretending broomsticks are horses [living for the 'moment,' i.e., creating a world of their own imagination, i.e., how they *feel* and *think* the world "ought" to be] do not KNOW the reality, i.e., the cost [the risk, i.e., the dangers] of being around a horse [the real thing] and the responsibility [inconvenience] of taking care of it—wanting someone else to take on the risks and responsibilities [cost and inconvenience] for them so they can continue to live in the world of their imagination, i.e., in the world of their 'creation,' making everyone subject to the world of their 'creation,' i.e., to them.) It is an either-or situation. Either that which is *"of the world"* (*stimulus-response*, i.e., the flesh, i.e., *lust* and the world that stimulates it, i.e., 'change' according to the immediate surroundings—imagined or real) directs men's steps or the father's/Father's authority (being *told*). If *stimulus-response* (***the process of 'change'***) rules then *lust* of pleasure and hatred toward restraint (toward the father/Father and his/His authority) rules—'truth' (right) is subjective, i.e., is from within, i.e., internal responding to that which is external; lie (wrong) is external, inhibiting or blocking that which is internal. Put another way if *lust* for pleasure (*"enjoying the present"*) and hatred toward restraint is right then anyone who engenders or 'justifies' pleasure (*lust*) is right and anyone who gets in the way of pleasure (*lust*), i.e., who engenders hate is wrong. If being *told* rules then the father/Father, i.e., the father's/Father's authority rules—truth (right) is objective, i.e., is external, i.e., directing that which is internal; lie (wrong) is internal inhibiting or blocking that which is external. God confirms.

"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

"And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." 1 John 2:18

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

The soul is different than the flesh. The soul KNOWS from being *told*. The flesh by *"sense experience."* The soul (which is eternal, i.e., *"God breathed"*) KNOWS by being *told*, i.e., by revelation, i.e., by that which is above. The flesh (*"formed from the dust of the ground,"* which is passing away) knows by *"sense experience,"* i.e., by *stimulus-response*, i.e., only by that which is *"of the world,"* i.e., below.

"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

When God created Adam he made him, unlike any other living thing in the creation *"a living soul."* 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 could 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, which are all 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. By making man subject to *stimulus-response* man is (deceptively) equated to an animal, approach pleasure and avoid pain, denying the fact that man does what animals can not do, i.e., reason from being *told*. Psychology means "study of the soul." Yet "behavior 'scientists'" (as do Marxists) make the soul subject to the flesh, i.e., to *lust*, i.e., to *sense experience* (to the *cognitive*, *affective*, and *psycho-motor* domains, i.e., *stimulus-response*), not to the Father, i.e., to KNOWING right from wrong from being *told*.

Dopamine: the drug of 'choice' for the carnal mind.

"They will be 'happy' (for the 'moment,' i.e., in the 'eternal present,' forever chasing after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., Dopamine Emancipation (DE) that the world stimulates—until death) and own nothing, not even their soul (having sold it to the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist at the street corner of 'lust and affirmation,' i.e., pleasure and the approval of men, i.e., 'the group')." Our body naturally produces a chemical (a neurotransmitter) called dopamine (D) that is emancipated (E) (liberated) into a small gap (called a synaptic gap) between nerves (the posterior of the first nerve emancipating it, the anterior of the next nerve receiving it), transmitting information to the brain (and in the brain-via dendrites) that we have come in contact with something in the environment (in the world) that is pleasurable, i.e., that stimulates DE. For example, when a child comes in contact with something that is pleasurable in the environment (via

the senses of touch, taste, sight, smell, and sound), say in this case a toy that "feels" good, i.e., that *stimulates DE*, the child's natural inclination is to look into the environment to find out what it was (that stimulated *DE*, i.e., pleasure). Once located the child then moves in the direction of the toy (the object) in order to gain control of it (with controlling the toy or the environment in which the toy exists guaranteeing more *DE*, not only in the present but also in the future—*stimulus-response* which incorporates "approach pleasure-avoid pain"). When the toy is not the child's, i.e., the child is *told* the toy is not his to play with and he continues to play with it, "*the lust of the flesh*," i.e., *stimulus-response*, "*the lust of the eyes*," *coveting* or *lusting* after the object of pleasure in the environment that *stimulate DE*, and "*the pride of life*," i.e., the ability to control the environment, i.e., the situation and/or the people/object(s) that *stimulates DE*, it is *lust (DE)* that controls the child's thoughts and actions, i.e., that controls his life. The child is not in love with the toy. He is in love with the *DE (lust)* that the toy stimulates. The same is true for you when you make your carnal nature, i.e., *lust*, i.e., "*What can it get out of this situation and/or this person for my self*" the means to making decisions. Interestingly, in the child's response, i.e., [in his anger](#) toward anyone taking the object of his *lust* away (imagined or real), *dopamine* is *emancipation* (the adrenalin rush in anger). In and of your *self* you do not control *DE*. If there is no restraint, i.e., no father's/Father's authority, i.e., no fear of accountability (objective truth directing your steps) *DE* and the world that stimulates it (and those *manipulating* the immediate environment around you, i.e., your "*sense perception*" of it) controls you. In the child's eyes, *DE* is "*good*" and the father's/Father's authority, when it gets in the way of his *lust* is "*evil*." *DE* engenders *want*, i.e., *lust*. When you do what you *want*, i.e., what you *lust* after, you think you are in control of your life, when in truth what you *want*, i.e., *lust*, i.e., *DE* (and the world that stimulates it) is in control of you. All habitual drugs are tied to *dopamine*, imitating it, *emancipating* it, preventing its re-uptake. God is not against pleasure, i.e., *DE*, he gave us *DE* that we might enjoy His creation. It is when we *lust* after it, instead of obeying Him it becomes sin, i.e., *lust*. As covered later, *dialogue* 'justifies' *DE*, *discussion* restrains it, i.e., you, doing the father's/Father's will restraining your *self* (a sign of maturity). When choosing what to eat for lunch, for example, when you *want* to eat what is not good (not healthy) for you to eat you go to *dialogue*, 'justifying' *DE*. If you go to *discussion* you will not eat it (*DE* is restrained, i.e., you restrain your *self*). Marxists, i.e., psychotherapists, i.e., facilitators of 'change,' etc., and those following after them are intoxicated with, addicted to, and possessed by *DE*.

When *lasciviousness* rules in the heart of "*the people*" tyranny, anarchy, and revolution (rejection of the father's/Father's authority) rules. "*For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: All these evil things come from within, and defile the man.*" Matthew 7:21-23 "*Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred,*

variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Galatian 5:19-21

Marxism is the *praxis* of [Genesis 3:1-6](#), i.e., of *self (lust, DE)* 'justification,' *negating* [Hebrews 12:5-11](#), i.e., the father's/Father's authority (system), *negating* [Romans 7:14-25](#), i.e., the *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world is stimulating in the process. The role (duty) of the facilitator of 'change' is to move his client(s), through *dialogue* (Genesis 3:1-6) away from the father's/Father's authority (Hebrews 12:5-11) so he can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world is stimulating without having a *guilty conscience* (Romans 7:14-25) with their *affirmation* ([chart](#)). Living for the 'moment,' i.e., *lusting* after pleasure (*DE*) man is blind to where he (his soul) will spend eternity.

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

The law of the flesh is different than the law of the soul.

"For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." Romans 7:14-25

When "Reasoning" is made subject to the flesh, i.e., to the child's carnal nature, 'justifying' the carnal desires (*lusts*) of the 'moment,' that which is of the world, i.e., that which is temporary, i.e., passing away rules. When reasoning is made subject to doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., to doing the Father's will, that which is above the child's carnal nature, i.e., that which is eternal rules. God gives us the choice, either living in the "here-and-now," making it subject to the "there-and-then," or living in the "here-and-now," without considering the "there-and-then."

"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

"The words 'seem to' are significant; it is the perception which functions in guiding behavior." "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." "In this process the individual becomes more open to his experience. It is the opposite of defensiveness or rigidity. His beliefs are not rigid, he can tolerate ambiguity." ([Carl Rogers](#), on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy)

*"Tolerant children, it seems, are likely to come from homes with a permissive atmosphere." "Early training is an important agent in slanting a child toward tolerance." "Self-love is compatible with love of others [lust in self 'is compatible with' lust in others]." "This disposition grows naturally out of the early dependent relationship of mother and child, of earth and creature." (Gordon Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*) In other words it is the father's/Father's authority that engenders intolerance, i.e., *prejudice*, not the "mother and child," i.e., "earth and creature" relationship. All personal-social organizations (the list is long), from the home to national (and global) government and everything in between is structured upon this illustration of the mother "rescuing" the daughter from the father's authority—for the sake of her *relationship* with those that are of the world, i.e., her classmates. If you are tolerant of (biased toward) *lust*, i.e., tolerant of "human nature" you are intolerant of (biased against), i.e., *prejudiced* against doing the father's/Father's will. Conversely if you insist upon (you are biased toward) doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., if you insist upon doing the father's/Father's will you are intolerant of (biased against), i.e., *prejudiced* against *lust*, i.e., against "human nature." Relationship is intolerant of (biased against) that which gets in the way of, i.e., that inhibits or blocks relationship. Fellowship is intolerant of (biased against) that which gets in the way of, i.e., that inhibits or blocks fellowship. (Explained in greater detail below.)*

"... 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

*"It is not sensuality which is presented ..., but mysteries, adventures, obstacles, fears, dangers, and especially the attraction of what is forbidden." (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) Emphasis added.*

For Karl Marx (and the Word of God, i.e., James 1:14,15) it is "sensuality," "especially the attraction of what is forbidden" that "draws" you to "the world." As Karl Marx

understood, even the believer is subject to temptation, i.e., to that which is "of the world."

"The unspeculative Christian [the believer, the man of faith in God] also recognizes sensuality as long as it does not assert itself at the expense of true reason, i.e., of faith, of true love, i.e., of love of God, of true will-power, i.e., of will in Christ [Karl Marx wrote this]. Not for the sake of sensual love, not for the lust of the flesh, but because the Lord said: Increase and multiply." (Karl Marx, The Holy Family)

Lust is not sin until someone tells you (you are told) it is sin. Without the father/Father telling the child what is sin and what is not (what is right and what is wrong behavior) the child can sin without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without having a sense of *guilty*—fear of judgment and condemnation—for his carnal thoughts and carnal actions ("*theory and practice*").

"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

For the Marxist, it is the father's/Father's authority (the author and enforcer of law), i.e., children/men having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self* (thus missing out on *lust*, i.e., *DE*) in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will that stands in the way of what is "*actual*," i.e., "*human nature*," i.e., their natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, inhibiting or blocking (preventing) them from becoming their *self*, i.e., "*of the world*" only, i.e., *self-actualized*. Since, for the Marxist all that is is of the world (revealed via *stimulus-response*), as long as the father's/Father's authority remains in the environment men are forced to behave in a way that is contrary to their carnal nature, i.e., their natural inclination to enjoy the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world stimulates. It is therefore imperative to the Marxist, i.e., to the facilitator of 'change' that the father's/Father's authority be removed from the environment (*negated*) if man it to become his *self*, i.e., *self actualized*., i.e., if the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' is to sin (*lust*) without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without any having sense of *guilt* (accountability) for his carnal thoughts and actions.

"... the central problem is to change reality... reality with its 'obedience to laws.'" (György Lukács, History & Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?)

"Laws must not fetter human life [inhibit or block lust]; but yield to it; they must change as the needs [the lusts] and capacities [interests/attractions of lust] of the people change." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right') According to Karl Marx, laws must be subject to the child's/man's, i.e., Marx's carnal nature, not to the father's/Father's, i.e., God's authority. Expressing the voice of "*the people*" but

really speaking of his *self* Karl Marx wrote: *"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 received as God and worshiped by 'the people.'"* When you worship your *self*, you think everyone else, i.e., *"the people"* should worship you as well.

"So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." Romans 7:25

Negate the father/Father (the father's/Father's authority) and you *negate* the law, *negating* sin, thereby *negating* the *guilty conscience* for sinning.

*"Lawfulness without law [where the law of the flesh rules without (over and therefore against) the law of the father/Father, *negating* the father's/Father's authority (in the individuals mind) thereby *negating* the *guilty conscience* (for disobeying his/His laws) in his thoughts, directly effecting his actions, i.e., society]."* ([Immanuel Kant](#), *Critique of Judgment*)

*"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*)

Love of pleasure (*DE*) engenders hate of restraint. That is *"human nature."* The Marxist logic (*stimulus-response*) is therefore, place an individual (a man, a woman, a child, or a student) in an environment of pleasure (that stimulates *DE*) and he is at peace. Place him in an environment of restraint and hate becomes manifest. Therefore by placing an individual in an environment of pleasure, supported by those present, where he can share his *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint without fear of being rejected or condemned, he will gain enough courage (support, i.e., experience) to reject the father's/Father's authority in favor of his carnal nature. This can be done by *negating* (removing) the father's/Father's authority in the environment where he and others are deciding right and wrong behavior, thereby *negating* the law (and the enforcement of it) in their mind, where they can then *lust* after *DE* and question, challenge, disregard, defy, attack the father's/Father's authority without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without having any *sense* of *guilt*, i.e., without having any *sense* of accountability for their sins, i.e., for their *lusts*.

"And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves [your lusts] 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

Not until an individual can "*justify*" his *self*, i.e., his *lusts* before others (without fear of judgment or condemnation) can he find his identity in his own carnal nature and not in an authority above him, condemning him, i.e., condemning his carnal nature.

"The heart is deceitful above all things [thinking pleasure, i.e., lust (DE) 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' (DE) it lusts after]: who can know it?" Jeremiah 17:9 You (your carnal heart, i.e., the Karl Marx in you) can not see your [hatred toward the father's/Father's authority](#) as being evil, i.e., "*wicked*," i.e., "*desperately wicked*" because your *lust* for pleasure, i.e., *self interest* is standing in the way, 'justifying' the hate.

If man is 'justified' ("*united*") in his *lust* he is 'justified' in his hatred toward that which gets in his way, i.e., that "*divides*" (separates) him from his *lust* for *DE* (correlated to *repression*) and "*divides*" (separates) from those who *lust* after *DE* like him (correlated to *alienation*). It is in the latter *lust* (the approval of others, *affirming* the child's *lust*) that 'change' (*stimulus-response*) is most easily initiated and sustained, i.e., 'justified.'

*"... few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity [loyalty to the father's/Father's authority] in the face of apparent group unanimity; and the individual rejects critical feelings toward the group at this time to avoid a state of cognitive dissonance [[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*)]. To question the value or activities of the group, would be to thrust himself into a state of dissonance. Long cherished but self-defeating beliefs and attitudes may waver and decompose in the face of a dissenting majority." (Irvin D. Yalom, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*)*

This is the basis of Mao's long march across American, i.e., [education](#) (since the 50's and 60's), i.e., the use of Marxist curriculum in the classroom called "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)"—by which all teachers are certified and schools accredited today, 'justifying' the students' carnal nature, establishing their "[affective domain](#)" (their *lust* for *DE*) over and therefore against their parent's authority, i.e., the father's/Father's authority system ([Traditional Education VS. Bloom's "Taxonomies"](#)). "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" are "... a psychological classification system" used "*to develop attitudes and values ... which are not shaped by the parents.*" "*There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children.*" "*The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box' [a "box" (jar) full of evils, which once opened, can not be closed—once parental authority, i.e., 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 student's "feelings" from his or her parent's authority, i.e., the father's/Father's authority system] through challenging the student's fixed beliefs [pressuring the student (out of fear of group rejection) to publically, i.e., in "the group" (for the sake of group approval) question, challenging, disregard, defy, attack, etc., his parents commands, rules, facts, and truth] and getting them to discuss issues [evaluating the world through his carnal desires, i.e., his "lusts," i.e., his "self interests" of the 'moment,' that which he has in common with "the group"]." "... allows the individual [the student] a greater amount of freedom in which to achieve a Weltanschauung [World View]¹" (Bloom's "Weltanschauung," as he noted, was that of two Marxists, i.e., "¹Cf. Erich Fromm, 1941; T. W. Adorno et al., 1950.") "The affective domain [the student's natural inclination to "lust" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (DE) that the world (including "the group") stimulates and hatred toward restraint] contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people." (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*; David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*) Liberate the child's "affective domain," i.e., his lust for DE out from under the father's/Father's authority, i.e., restraint—replace the student's/man's loyalty to the father/Father with 'loyalty' to "the group"/"the people"—and the nation is 'changed.' By 1971 over one million of Bloom's "taxonomies" were published for the Communist Chinese education system. (Benjamin Bloom, *Forty Year Evaluation*) It is not that Marxism was not already here, i.e., "Has authority been banished in these later days? Has the world reached a point where it will condone the formation of pupil soviets?" (noted by Will C. Woods, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of California, March 1921, in the California "Blue Book" for education, 1958) "The institutions in socialist society which act as the facilitators between the public and private realms [society and the individual] are the Soviets." (Norman Levine, in preface to György Lukács, *Process of Democratization*—the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus is the [Soviet system](#), removing, i.e., negating the father's/Father's authority in establishing policy, i.e., in establishing right and wrong behavior). Marxism (Maoism) has become the foundation for education, i.e., for all teachers across the nation (and around the world). 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.*

"Perhaps one of the most dramatic events highlighting the need for progress in the affective domain ['liberation' of the student's carnal nature, i.e., lust from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., 'liberation' of the college student from his or her parent's, teacher's, minister's, God's standards, i.e., established commands, rules,

facts, and truth] *was the publication of Jacob's Changing Values in College (1957).*"
(*Book 2: Affective Domain*)

Prior to the fifties (the publication of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*") College students were generally held accountable for their behavior and thoughts—according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. Today college is "party time," i.e., students chasing after *DE*, i.e., students *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating without restraint, i.e., without having a *guilty conscience*.

"I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart." "Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee." Psalms 40:8, 119:11 Without the heart being changed (made subject to God and His Word) it is only "*of and for self*," 'justifying' its *lust* for pleasure (*DE*) and hatred toward restraint. Without the "law" in your heart all you have is a heart of *lust* and hate.

When the Marxist speaks of pleasure and unity ("*peace and affirmation*," i.e., "*Words and actions should help to unite, and not divide, the people.*" Mao Zedong) he is speaking of hate, i.e., his hatred toward restraint, i.e., his hatred toward the restrainer, i.e., his hatred toward the father/Father' and his/His authority (and anyone who thinks and acts like him/Him). For the Marxist, as long as the father's/Father's authority remains in control of the individual's personal thoughts and social actions, i.e., in the environment (imagined or real) the individual can not become his *self*, i.e., "*of the world*" only.

"The dialectical method was overthrown—the parts [the children] were prevented from finding their definition [their identity] within the whole [within the other children, i.e., within "the group," i.e., within society]." (Lukács)

"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*)

"Group members must be able to synthesize individual 'felt' needs [lusts] with common group 'felt' needs [lusts—turning on those who remain loyal to the father's/Father's authority]." ([Warren Bennis](#), *The Temporary Society*)

The Marxist agenda is therefore to "*unite*" men on what they have in common, i.e., *lust*, *negating* that which "*divides*" them from their *self* and from others—who, like them *lust* after pleasure (*DE*) and hate restraint.

"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;" Romans 3:23

"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)

Karl Marx understood the role of *dialogue*, i.e., *"a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without"* in revolution, i.e., in the overthrow (*negation*) of the father's/Father's authority in the individuals thought and in his social actions (emphasis added), when the individual acts in violence, i.e., in defiance toward a world of *"sinners"* judging him for being a sinner, giving him the duty to overthrow them in order to be his *self*, i.e., in order to *"feel at home in a sinful world."* It is in *dialogue* you *"set up a sinful world in [your] own home,"* i.e., you 'justify' your *self*, i.e., your *lust* for pleasure, i.e., *DE* (that the world stimulates) and your hatred toward restraint for getting in the way. It is in *discussion* that the father/Father retains his/His authority, i.e., that established commands, rules, facts, and truth direct your thoughts and actions. *Dialogue unites* us on what we have in common in the 'moment' (*stimulus-response*). *Discussion divides* us on who is right and who is wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (being or having been *told*). We 'juxtaposition' between the two (*discussion* and *dialogue*) in order to 'create' 'homeostasis,' pushing the "envelope" toward *dialogue* whenever the opportunity arises, i.e., the world stimulates *lust*, i.e., *DE* (without the father's/Father's authority being present, i.e., when fear of judgment and condemnation is absent; being *"positive and not negative"*)—called "progressivism." Karl Marx's criticism of Hegel was, he made 'change' subject to an external source (*"spirit"*), while for Marx it was internal, i.e., in the human heart, i.e., man 'justifying' his *self*, i.e., his *lusts* via *dialogue* (before others).

"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."* There is a *guilty conscience* in *discussion*, i.e., in not doing right but wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth.

"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 *guilty conscience* in doing wrong, according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth since there are no established commands, rules, facts, and truth to be wrong to in *dialogue*, i.e., in *dialogue* everything is an *opinion*, i.e., subject to 'change.'

Making *discussion*, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth subject to *dialogue*, i.e., subject to man's carnal nature, i.e., his *lusts* for pleasure (*DE*) that the world *stimulates* (and his hate that authority, i.e., restraint *stimulates*), makes commands, rules, facts, and truth subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to the situation and/or the people present in the 'moment,' turning those present against anyone holding them accountable to established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in their way. The objective of life then becomes the *praxis* of "*prevent[ing] someone who KNOWS from filling the empty space [the soul].*" (Wilfred Bion, *A Memoir of the Future*)

"When a man has finally reached the point where he does not think he knows it better than others, that is when he has become indifferent to what they have done badly and he is interested only in what they have done right, then peace and affirmation have come to him." (Georg Hegel in Carl Friedrich, *The Philosophy of Hegel*)

The opposite of right is wrong, not "*badly*"—which makes wrong an *opinion* not a fact or truth. There is no wrong in *dialogue* (except right-wrong thinking), making *discussion*, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth relative to the situation, i.e., an *opinion*. "*Peace*" according to Hegel, thus means one can sin, i.e., *lust*, i.e., enjoy the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without being held accountable, receiving the approval, i.e., "*affirmation*" of others (initiating and sustaining "*worldly peace and socialist harmony*"). The error in this "Reasoning" is that man (created in the image of God) can judge, i.e., reason (is able to distinguish between right and wrong behavior and thought), either judging a person from established commands, rules, facts, and truth (with right being doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will and wrong being disobeying, doing, wrong, sinning, i.e., *lusting* after *DE*), thus sustaining the father's/Father's authority, i.e., objective truth or judging a person from his own carnal nature (right being anyone 'justifying' his carnal nature, i.e., his propensity to *lust* after *DE* that the world is stimulating and wrong being anyone judging him for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after *DE*), which is subjective truth. Georg Hegel's dictum (establishing a standard for "Reasoning"), replacing the word "wrong" (a command, rule, fact, or truth) with the word "*badly*" (an *opinion*) is logically wrong, i.e., irrational (and deceptive), making it wrong for anyone to accuse him of being wrong. Run a business this way and you will soon be broke—the reason socialists are always looking for new victims (more taxes) to support their habits, i.e., their *lusts*. The marriage vow "*till death do us part*" now, at least in practice includes the clause "*until someone 'better' (who stimulates more DE) comes along.*" *There was a time when parent's raised their children to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. Today they are being raised to have a "better life," whatever that is in their eyes. Not that having a "better life" is wrong but doing wrong to have it is wrong.* In an environment of *dialogue*, i.e., of *self*'justification' where fear of the father's/Father's authority—*discussion*, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands,

rules, facts, and truth, which cuts off all hope of *dialogue*, i.e., of *lust*, i.e., of life—comes to the forefront, violence comes to the surface in defense of *self*, i.e., of *dialogue*, i.e., of *lust*, i.e., of *DE*, i.e., of "human nature," i.e., of Marxism. Not until *dialogue* is put into *praxis* (into social action, i.e., in your "relationship" with others deciding right and wrong behavior) can the father's/Father's authority, i.e., *discussion* be *negated*.

"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 in the individual, in "the group," and in society]." *"The whole system of Marxism stands and falls with the principle that revolution [negation of the father's/Father's authority in setting policy] is the product of a point of view in which the category of totality ["group think," what all children have in common, i.e., lust for DE and fear of losing it] is dominant."* (Lukács) *"Group think" begins with "What can I get out of this group for my self?" (lust for pleasure, which includes the approval of man) which then leads to "What will happen to me if the group rejects me?" (fear of man).*

"Revolutionary violence [overthrow of the father/Father and his/His authority] reconciles the disunited parties [the children/"the people"] by abolishing the alienation of class antagonism [the father's/Father's authority over the children/"the people"] that set in with the repression of initial morality [lust]. ... the revolution that must occur is the reaction of suppressed life [hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward authority], which will visit the causality of fate upon the rulers [the parents, the property owner, the business owner, etc., i.e., the father]. It is those who establish such domination and defend positions of power of this sort who set in motion the causality of fate [hate and violence toward them], divide society into social classes [parents over children, owners over workers, God over man, etc.], suppress justified interests [lusts], call forth the reactions of suppressed life [hate and violence], and finally experience their just fate in revolution [violence against and overthrow of their right of person (individuality, under God), right of conviction (speech and religion), property, and business]." (Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge & Human Interest, Chapter Three: The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory*) Jürgen Habermas, a Marxist amongst Marxists has established the language of the World Court.

"The Communist Manifesto makes the point that the bourgeoisie [the traditional, "middle-class" family, requiring those under authority to honor authority] produces its own grave-diggers [children/students, dissatisfied with their parent's authority, 'justifying' their "self," i.e., their lusts before one another, killing their parents (at least not caring what happens to them)]." (Lukács)

PART II

"Words and actions should help to unite, and not divide, the people." (Mao Zedong)

"Reasoning" from the flesh, i.e., from the *lusts* of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world stimulates VS reasoning from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., from established commands, rules, facts, and truth.

According to Mao, since all by nature *lust* after *DE* (sin), it is *lust*, i.e., *DE* (what all people have in common) that *"unites,"* it is therefore the father's/Father's authority (that rewards those doing the father's/Father's will and chastens or casts out those who are not) that *"divides."* It is thus the "duty" of the Maoist, i.e., the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' to remove the father's/Father's authority from the environment—removing the father's/Father's authority from individuals thoughts, i.e., the individuals *"words"* and his *"actions"* (remember it is *stimulus-response*)—in order for *"the people,"* i.e., Mao and those following him, i.e., those thinking and acting like him can be *lust* after *DE* without having a *guilty conscience*, with each others *affirmation*.

Side note: 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 and hate restraint, i.e., and want to get rid of anyone getting in the way) he means his *self*. 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.'*

According to Mao's "Reasoning," i.e., based upon Karl Marx's "Reasoning," i.e., dialectic "Reasoning" (the capital "R" in "Reasoning" means all there is for the Marxist is "Reasoning" from *feelings*, i.e., from *"sense experience,"* evaluating the world from *"human nature,"* i.e., *aufheben*) it is *lust*, i.e., *"human nature,"* i.e., *"the people's"* natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating (that *"the people"* have in common) that *"unites."* This requires the *individual* to be *unprejudiced*, i.e., *open minded*, i.e., *"positive,"* i.e., *permissive*, i.e., *tolerant* of the other person's natural inclination to *lust* after *DE*, *"building relationship"* with them based upon what he has in common with them and they have in common with him (the basis of common-ism), i.e., his and their natural inclination to *lust* after *DE*, which includes his and their *lust* for approval from one another, 'justifying,' i.e., *affirming* each other's *lust* for pleasure, which engenders *hatred toward restraint*, i.e., hatred toward the father's/Father's authority, i.e., hatred toward having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of their *lusts*, i.e., that *"divides"* them from their *self* (engendering *"repression"*) and *"divides"* them from one another (engendering *"alienation"*). Therefore it is the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the children/*"the people"* having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self* (in order to do right and not wrong

according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, evaluating themselves, others, and the world around them from the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth that they have accepted as "Is") that *"divides,"* i.e., that *"divides" "the people"* between those who are doing the father's/Father's will and those who are not—who are *lusting* after *DE* instead. Therefore, to the Marxist, it is the father's/Father's authority that produces individuals who are *prejudiced*, i.e., *close minded*, i.e., *"negative,"* i.e., *judgmental*, i.e., *intolerant* toward anyone doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., anyone *lusting* after *DE*, i.e., toward anyone not *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating* their *self* in order to do the father's/Father's will, thereby inhibiting or blocking *"human nature,"* i.e., preventing *"the people"* from becoming their *self*, i.e., *self actualized*. The father's/Father's authority therefore *"unites"* and *"divides" "the people"* based upon who is doing the father's/Father's will and who is not, *"uniting"* with those who, *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating* their *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth are doing the father's/Father's will, *"dividing"* from those who are not, i.e., who are *lusting* after *DE* instead, while Marxism *"unites"* and *"divides" "the people"* based upon who is *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating and who—doing the father's/Father's will instead—is not, *"uniting"* with those are *lusting* after *DE*, *"dividing"* from those who are not—those who, *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating* their *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth are doing the father's/Father's will instead. For the Marxist, the issue is not whether the father/Father is right or wrong. It is the father's/Father's authority itself they are out to *negate*—in the name of *"unity."* i.e., *"worldly peace and socialist harmony,"* i.e., that which is *"of the world"* only. *Discussion* is reasoning from established commands, rules, facts, and truth, *dialogue* is reasoning from your *feelings*, i.e., your *lust* for pleasure (*DE*) and hatred toward restraint. When it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior, *discussion* makes you subject to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to being *told* while *dialogue* makes you subject to your (and others) *feelings (lusts)* of the 'moment' (*DE*) and the world that is stimulating them. When it comes to establishing (defining) right and wrong behavior the Father uses *discussion* while the children of disobedience use *dialogue*, i.e., dialectic "Reasoning."

"For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Matthew 16:26

While the Son, Jesus Christ 'redeems' man from his sins, by His shed blood on the cross, the Father 'reconciling' him to Himself with His resurrection, so he can inherit eternal life (an issue of the soul, which is eternal), Karl Marx "redeems" man from the Father, "reconciling" him to his flesh, i.e., *DE* and the world that stimulates it, so he, living in the *"eternal present"* can inherit eternal death (after the death of his flesh).

(This issue is a compilation of many issues, thus the repetition of the above method of "Reasoning"—to the point of *ad nauseam*. For the Marxist there is no other method. Press on through for their quotations if nothing else.)

"Only a dead father is a good father." "The current generation is the first in the history of the world which has nothing to learn from grandparents;" "Freud noted that patricide and incest are part of man's deepest nature." (Yalom)

The child's feelings, thoughts, and actions and his relationship with others and the world around him have usurped the father's (the parent's) authority and grandparent's relevance (other than their supporting the child in his worldly pleasures, i.e. feeding, clothing, protecting, and loving him—loving him being equated to letting him be permissive, i.e. become at-one-with the world in pleasure in the 'moment' without *contaminating* him with their commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e. that which is of the "past" which creates *"neurosis,"* i.e., a condition where a person is caught between wanting to do the father's/Father's will and wanting to do his will, i.e., *lust* at the same time, having a *guilty conscience,* i.e., *feeling* bad about himself when he *lusts,* i.e., when he does not do the father's/Father's will, engendering *"repression,"* as a result of not being able to *lust* after *DE* and *"alienation"* i.e., not being able to have relationship, i.e., *"unite"* with others who *lust* after *DE*).

"Once the earthly family [where children learn to humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate their self in order to do the father's will] is discovered to be the secret of the Holy family [where the Son of God and those who follow him humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate their self in order to do the Father's will], the former must then itself be destroyed [vernichtet, i.e., annihilated, i.e., negated] in theory and in practice [in the persons personal thoughts and in his social actions]." (Karl Marx, *Feuerbach Thesis #4*)

"It is not really a decisive matter whether one has killed one's father or abstained from the deed,' if the function of the conflict and its consequences are the same [the husband/father no longer exercises his authority in the family, over his wife/children]." (Sigmund Freud in [Herbert Marcuse](#), *Eros and Civilization: a psychological inquiry into Freud*)

"... 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 Marcuse) 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 (Luke 15:11-24), 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, thereby *affirming* them, i.e., their "*incest*," 'justifying' and supporting their control over them.

What does psychology have in common with Marxism? Both are based upon the same ideology, i.e., the liberation of the flesh, i.e., *lust*, i.e., the children/"*the people*" from the father's/Father's authority. While one used outright violence against the father's/Father's authority in society the other, 'justifying' the individual's *lust* for pleasure (*DE*), 'liberates' the individual's feelings and thoughts from the father's/Father's authority, 'justifying' (in his mind) his questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way. Therefore, according to the Marxist it is the traditional family (where the *guilty conscience*, i.e., the feeling of *guilt* for doing wrong, i.e., where accountability for one's thoughts and actions according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth is initiated—sustaining the father's/Father's authority in society, i.e., in the classroom) that has to be *negated*.

*"As the [Frankfurt School](#) [[Theodor Adorno](#), [Erick Fromm](#), etc., including [Kurt Lewin](#), who edited their newspaper] wrestled with how to 'reinvigorate Marx', they 'found the missing link in Freud.'" (Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*)*

*"Marxian theory [society] needs Freudian-type instinct theory [man's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure, including his *lust* for approval from others, *affirming* his *lusts* and his natural inclination to hate restraint, i.e., to hate the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way] 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*," i.e., *lust* 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." ([Abraham Maslow](#), *The Journals of Abraham Maslow*)*

*"The individual [the student] is emancipated [is liberated from the father's/Father's authority] in the social group [in the "group grade"]." "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." "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." ([Norman O. Brown](#), *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*)*

My use of "[the father's/Father's authority](#)." in explaining Marxism is: the Marxist, having rejected the Heavenly Father's authority outright, perceives the earthly father as being the source for belief in the Heavenly Father. Therefore, to the Marxist it is the earthly father, i.e., the father's/Father's authority (the system itself), i.e., the *Patriarchal Paradigm*, i.e., the traditional, "middle-class" family (where children are trained up to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) that must itself be *negated*, i.e., removed from the environment, if man, i.e., the Marxist is ever to be 'liberated' from religion, i.e., from condemnation for sinning, i.e., for being wrong, i.e., from that which is "*negative*" to his flesh, i.e., his *lusts*—called "[the negation of negation](#)." There is no wrong, according to the Marxists except doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., making man subject to any authority above (external to) "*human nature*," i.e., above man's natural inclination to *lust* after *DE*. *Lust* for pleasure (*DE*, which includes the *affirmation* of *lust* (*DE*), i.e., the *affirmation* of "*human nature*") 'justifies,' in the Marxist's mind his hatred toward restraint, i.e., his hatred toward the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way. Marxism is all about removing the father's/Father's authority from the environment, thus removing the laws of restraint he/He enforces, removing the *guilty conscience* (any *sense* of *guilt*) for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after *DE* in the process—so the Marxist can *lust* after *DE* that the world stimulates without having a *guilty conscience*, with everyone's *affirmation*. If you support the father's/Father's authority, i.e., "rule of law," which engenders a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, you must be silenced, censored, and/or be removed from the environment for the "good" of the Marxist, i.e., for the "good" of "*the people*." That is what Marxism is about.

"... seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children."
Hosea 4:6

"For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." 1 Timothy 3:2-5

The Marxist, i.e., [the facilitator of 'change'](#) (both having the same system of "Reasoning"), perceiving his *self* as being the personification of "*the people*," who, like him *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating and hate restraint, i.e., hate the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way, is 'justified' (in his mind) in removing the father's/Father's authority from the environment (from the classroom environment) so "*the people*" (the students), i.e., so *he* can *lust* after *DE* without having a *guilty conscience*, with "*the people's*" (the student's) *affirmation*, i.e., support and praise. By the facilitator of 'change' moving communication in the classroom away from *discussion* (with its true meaning, i.e., where the one in authority has the final say regarding right and wrong behavior) to *dialogue*

(where everyone's *opinion*, i.e., *feelings*, i.e., *self interest*, i.e., *lust* becomes the basis for knowing right from wrong behavior) any student who holds onto the father's/Father's authority (the system itself), i.e., who refuses to go into *dialogue*, when it comes to defining right and wrong behavior will be martyred (rejected by "*the group*"). His grade reflects his tolerance or intolerance of unrighteousness, i.e., of *lust*. In other words, by placing a traditional minded (right-wrong thinking) student in an environment of *dialogue* (where there is no wrong—except right-wrong thinking) defining right and wrong behavior, he (his way of thinking) will be 'changed,' making *relationship* with others, i.e., *self interest* (Social-ism) more important than *fellowshipping* with the father/Father, and those who accept (submit to) his/His authority (individualism, under God) or he will be martyred (for his faith in the father/Father and his/His authority). Your way of thinking (*paradigm*), not how much you know on a particular subject (although that might be included) is what is being graded in a facilitated, "*group grade*," "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" classroom—where the father's/Father's authority is *negated* (not brought up, silenced, censored, or chased out of the room) so the facilitator of 'change' can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or student's are stimulating, without having a *guilty conscience*, with the students *affirmation*, converting or silencing those who bring the father's/Father's authority into the classroom environment, censoring and/or removing (martyring) those who resist, i.e., who condemn, i.e., who refuse to 'justify' his and their *lusts*. This is Marxism (Maoism) in your face, i.e., in the classroom today.

PART III

"Relationships built on self interest," i.e., *DE*. Marxism ([Obama](#))

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

Fellowship and relationship are different. You *fellowship* around objective truth (established commands, rules, facts, and truth that you have accepted as "is" and the one who has authored them)—made manifest via *preaching*, *teaching*, and *discussion* (when it comes to determining right and wrong behavior), dividing from (not having fellowship with) those who are wrong and/or insist upon *dialogue* (their *feelings*, i.e., their *opinion*, i.e., *DE* determining right and wrong behavior).

"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

You build "*relationship*" around subjective truth, i.e., your *feelings*, which are ever subject to 'change' (according to the people present and/or the situation at hand, i.e., the flesh, i.e., *DE* and the world that stimulates/effects it)—made manifest via *dialogue* (when it comes to determining right and wrong behavior), dividing from (not developing *relationship* with) those who insist upon *discussion* (established commands, rules, facts, and truth, which are to be accepted as is and obeyed, that get in the way of your *feelings*, i.e., your *lusts*). *Dialogue (relationship)* "*unites*" (based upon *feelings*, i.e., *DE*). *Discussion* (fellowship) divides (based upon who is accepting and obeying established commands, rules, facts, and truth and who is not). When the fellowship goes to *dialogue*, i.e., men's *opinions* instead of *preaching, teaching, and discussing* the Word of God, to be accepted as "Is," it becomes apostate, i.e., "*of the world,*" replacing fellowshiping with God and those who fellowship with Him with *relationship* with man. The Marxists' agenda today is: "Don't fight the 'church.' Join it and 'help' it 'grow' via *dialogue*—'*building relationship upon self interest,*'" as in Gnostic Reasoning, making God and His Word subject to the "feelings," i.e., the *lusts* of man. "*That which is Below corresponds to that which is Above, and that which is Above, corresponds to that which is Below, to accomplish the miracles of the One Thing.*" (*The Emerald Tablet of Hermes Trismegistus*, translated by Dennis W. Hauck.) "*The Hermetic tradition was both moderate and flexible, offering a tolerant philosophical religion, a religion of the (omnipresent) mind, a purified perception of God, the cosmos, and the self, and much positive encouragement for the spiritual seeker, all of which the student could take anywhere.*" (Tobias Churton *The Golden Builders: Alchemists, Rosicrucian's, and the First Freemasons.*)

*"Every form of objectification [doing the father's/Father's will] 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 [for not doing the "Father's" will]. "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*)*

Objective truth is truth that is external to you, i.e., not subject to your *feelings (opinion)* of the 'moment,' represented in the *preaching, teaching, and discussing* of established commands, rules, facts, and truth which are accepted as given, i.e., as "Is," by faith. You KNOW because you have been *told* (you are persuaded, i.e., *convinced*), resulting in you doing right and not wrong according to what you have been *told*—fellowshipping with others based upon established commands, rules, facts, and truth that you and they have accepted as "Is," with differences being resolved via *discussion (persuasion via facts and truth)*, rejecting any who are wrong (according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) or refuse to *discuss* (facts and truth) but want to [*dialogue*](#) (*feelings, i.e., opinions*)

instead. Subjective truth is 'truth' that is subject to a person's "*sense experiences*" of the past and the present (that the world stimulates), represented in the *dialoguing of opinions*, seeking *consensus*., i.e., 'justification,' i.e., *affirmation*. You "know" because you have *experienced* it for your *self*—*building relationship* with others based upon common *self interests*., i.e., common "*sense experiences*," rejecting those who insist upon *preaching, teaching, and discussing* established commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as given (as "Is), by faith. By focusing upon relationship (*feelings*), fellowship (faith in established commands, rules, facts, and truth and the one authoring them) is *negated*. *Dialogue negates discussion*, resulting in *feelings* taking the place of (becoming the basis of) fact and truth. The child's "*Why?*" in response to the parent's command (that gets in the way of the child's *lust*, i.e., the child's carnal desire of the 'moment') is an example of subjective truth (the child's *feelings*) responding to objective truth (the parent's command, rule, fact, or truth that is getting in the way of his *lust*), wanting objective truth, i.e., the parent to become subjective, i.e., subject to the child's carnal desires (*feelings*, i.e., *lusts*) of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating. By the parent going into *dialogue* with the child, regarding right and wrong behavior (in order to initiate or sustain "*relationship*" with the child), objective truth, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the parent's (the father's/Father's) authority is *negated*. The parent can be wrong and the child right regarding the particular issue at hand but for the Marxist, i.e., the Maoist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change ' that is not the issue. For him it is the parent's authority structure itself that is the issue, needing to be *negated* if the child is to become his *self*, i.e., "*of the world*" only.

"'Capital' [stored up pleasure]... is, according to Marx, 'not a thing but a social relation between persons mediated through things.' 'These relations,' Marx states, 'are not those between one individual and another [as equals], but between worker and capitalist, tenant and landlord [children and their parents, i.e., a "top-down" order], etc.,. Eliminate these relations and you abolish the whole of society [anarchy prevails, production comes to a halt]; a scientifically acceptable solution does exist [dialogue, i.e., dialectic "Reasoning"]... For to accept that solution, even in theory, would be tantamount to observing society from a class standpoint [from the children's perspective, i.e., feelings] other than that of the bourgeoisie [from the parent's established commands, rules, facts, and truth which are to be accepted as "Is," by faith and obeyed]. And no class can do that-unless it is willing to abdicate its power freely [either the child humbles, denies, dies to, controls, disciplines, capitulates his self in order to do the parent's (the father's/Father's) will or the parent's abdicate their "top-down" authority in order to keep "relationship" with the child]." (Lukács)

Money (which is stored up pleasure to the Marxist) is an issue to the Marxist because when the father is in control of it, he, i.e., the Marxist, i.e., the child of disobedience has little if any access to it, the father refusing to give it to him because of his doing wrong,

disobeying, sinning, i.e., his *lusting* after *DE* instead of doing his, i.e., the father's will. Access to the money can only become reality when the father/Father, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the father's/Father's control of it is *negated*. By making access of money guaranteed to everyone (equity), the Marxist is guaranteed access to and control over it.

When it comes to right and wrong behavior, when parents go into *dialogue* with their children (not [discussion](#), where parents have the final say, i.e., where they retain their authority), they have *abdicated* their authority to the child's carnal desires (in order to keep *relationship* with the child), establishing *relationship (feelings) over* and therefore against *fellowship*, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will. Socialism depends upon what man has in common, i.e., his natural inclination to *lust* after *DE* that the world stimulates, *wanting (lusting after)* others approval, i.e., *affirmation*. Individualism depends on an "external authority," i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (*alienating* him from those doing wrong). He can stand alone (in "the group") if need be (when it is wrong). When he is asked to defend his position (say in the classroom), if he goes to *dialogue* ("I feel" and "I think" aka "I believe," making his position an *opinion*) instead of *discussion* ("I KNOW because Dad says so," i.e., "It is written," where his position is external to him, i.e., is given to him) he makes himself, i.e., his *feelings*, i.e., his "sense perception" the means to knowing right and wrong. If he holds to his position, i.e., *discussion* (in the true meaning of the word) he risks alienating himself from those who, having an opposing position disagree with him (the reason we have majority vote and "rule of law" in government) or those who insist upon *dialogue*, i.e., their *feelings*, i.e., their *lusts* to know right from wrong (the reason we have socialists-Marxists in control of government).

*"Personal relations between men have this character of alienation. Hegel and Marx have laid the foundations for the understanding of the problem of alienation." "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 [lust] and of his own [lust] 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 [his and other's carnal nature and the world that stimulates it]." ([Erick Fromm](#), *Escape from Freedom*)*

"Authoritarian submission [humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating one's "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 Adorno's "logic" is that Fascism, instead of supporting the father's/Father's authority in the home and in the individual's thoughts and actions, negated it. "Our problem," according to Adorno, i.e., the Marxist is the father's/Father's authority in the children's/"the people's" thoughts, i.e., in the environment directly effecting their actions.*

*"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." (Abraham Maslow, *Maslow on Management*) Abraham Maslow's "Hierarchy of 'felt' needs" is all about lust, i.e., establishing lust over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority. Anyone defending Maslow's "Hierarchy of 'felt' needs" is defending their own lusts (their lust for pleasure and their lust for men's approval)—since that is what Maslow's "Hierarchy of 'felt' needs" (leaving the father's/Father's authority out) is all about.*

The father's/Father's authority (system or way of reasoning, i.e., *Patriarchal paradigm*) divides everyone based upon who is *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating* their *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth and those who are not—fellowshipping with, hiring, recognizing, approving, accepting, blessing, etc., those who are, rejecting those who are not, with those under the father's/Father's authority doing the same, i.e., thinking and acting the same way (evaluating and judging the world around them from the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth). Therefore, according to Mao's "Reasoning" (since all that "is" is "of the world," i.e., all there "is" is *stimulus-response*, i.e., there is no father's/Father's authority in what "is") in order to have "unity" (*worldly peace and socialist harmony*), he (and those who "Reason" like him) must divide everyone based upon who is 'justifying' *lust*, i.e., *esteeming "human nature"* and those who are not, *negating* those who are not, i.e., *negating* (removing from the environment) those who are adhering to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., those who insist upon others *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating* their *self* doing the father's/Father's will as well. Since the environment, according to the Maoist directly influences/effects/affects how "the people" think and act (aka *stimulus-response*), i.e., influences/effects/affects their "words and

actions," the father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth must be expunged from the environment in order for "*the people*" to become "*normal,*" i.e., to become their *self,* i.e., to become one according to their carnal nature, i.e., to become only "*of the world.*" This, according to the Marxist, i.e., the Maoist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' applies to all students in the classroom as well. In short: in order for the environment, i.e., the classroom to not contain that which messes up, i.e., interferes with the Maoist's, i.e., the Marxist's, i.e., the facilitator of 'change's' *lust* for pleasure (*DE*), the father's/Father's authority must be expunged from the environment, i.e., from the classroom (with the "help," i.e., the participation of the students) in order for it to be *negated* in "*the people,*" i.e., in the students thoughts and actions, i.e., "*words and actions.*" *Lust* and the augmentation of it, and the "Reasoning" that 'justifies' it (students coming to know their *self* as they are, i.e., "*of the world*" only) is the sum total of life, i.e., the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of Marxism, i.e., of Maoism. The following may be hard reading (other than because of my [writing style,](#) putting important, i.e., very important quotations near the end of an issue, that most writers would put up front)—coming to *know* there is more of Mao (Marx) in you (and in those around you) than you would like to know or are willing to admit. Maoism, i.e., Marxism would not spread as quickly (and as easily) as it does (when given a chance; when restraint is removed) if it was not so—especially amongst the youth.

PART IV

"Qui tacet consentire videtur," "ubi loqui debuit ac potuit" are Latin phrases used in law, meaning "*to be silent is to consent*" or your "*silence gives consent,*" "when you should have spoken and were able." When you are silent in the midst of unrighteousness, i.e., not correcting, reproofing, or rebuking the unrighteous in their *praxis* of unrighteousness, unrighteousness becomes the "norm," i.e., the law of the land.

Marxism, i.e., Maoism is all about the human heart, i.e., the 'justification' of *lust*. Apart from God's Word you can not understand world history, especially Marxism since your heart, i.e., *lust* for pleasure and resentment toward restraint is in control of your understanding (your reasoning), not God's Word.

"For the wicked boasteth of his heart's desire, and blesseth the covetous, whom the LORD abhorreth. The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God: God is not in all his thoughts." Psalms 10:3, 4

"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)

"Socialism rewards bad work, capitalism rewards good work." (Common knowledge in Europe, by those who have had to live under socialism.)

[Robert Owen's socialist plan](#) failed because the *"skilled and industrious"* workers left (because the lazy, incompetent, and vicious, i.e., the socialists were getting the same pay, i.e., were not kicked out, i.e., fired). Lenin knew that socialism could not work until no one could "escape," i.e., all must participate. In socialism (Marxism) the only way you can keep your job (or good grade) is to tolerate (not judge or condemn) the unrighteous, i.e., is to 'justify' the unrighteous, i.e., the facilitator of 'change.'

Even George Washington knew (understood) that *"despotism ... predominates in the human heart."* ([George Washington](#), *Farewell Address*) Unlike the French Revolution, which rejected the father's/Father's authority the American Revolution recognized it, establishing it not in an earthly King above *"the people"* but in the rights of the citizen, i.e., the individual himself, under God (under the Heavenly Father and His Son, Jesus Christ, the Heavenly King); recognizing private convictions aka freedom of the *conscience*, private property, private business, i.e., freedom of religion and speech, i.e., *"rule of law"*—with the citizen recognizing his neighbors rights, not infringing upon them, as his neighbor recognized his rights, not infringing upon them, likewise with the government not infringing upon the citizen's rights as the citizens did not infringe upon it's, limiting the power of government, breaking it up into different separate departments, making the constituents (the citizen) the father and the representative (the one in government) a child, sent to the store to re-present the father's interests (not infringing upon the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the citizens rights, under God), being removed from office if he no longer (*humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating his self*) re-presented the father's interests but served his own *self interests* instead, thus preventing him from making laws burdening the citizens with taxes and laws to serve his and his *"friends" self interests*, i.e., *lusts* putting the father, i.e., the citizens, i.e., the nation into debt (as is now done). The father/Father knows the cost (consequence) of being wrong (thus his *preaching and teaching* of commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as given, i.e., by faith and obeyed) while the child (*lusting after DE*) does not, making all subject to his carnal desires (*lusts*) of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating.

"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." Jeremiah 6:16

"And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them. And the people shall be oppressed, every one by another, and every one by his neighbour: the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honourable." Isaiah 3:4-5

"Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys." Heraclitus (Karl Marx based his ideology off of Heraclitus.)

All philosophers, socialists, psychologists, etc., begin with the premise that man is basically "good" or has the potential of becoming "good" providing he is raised up in a "good" environment (according to the philosopher's, socialist's, psychologist's, etc., perception of what is "good"). Only God is good. Therefore the philosopher's, socialist's, psychologist's, etc., defining of "good" 'justifies' his *self*, i.e., makes him God (in his eyes). Our *opinion* is always "good" in our eyes.

"And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God:" Matthew 19:17

"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

*"Opposition of science falsely so called" ("the antithesis of 'seems to be'"), i.e., the tossing back and forth of *opinions*, i.e., treating "I feel" and "I think" as *knowing* ("*gnosis*"), i.e., using his understanding, i.e., his "*sense experience*" as the bases for knowing right and wrong behavior is all that man has apart from God. A person can bury himself in (become intoxicated, addicted, and possessed by) the language (verbiage) of philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc., i.e., the so called "sciences," impressing others (and himself) on how "smart" he is, but not until he understands that the language of the philosopher, the psychologist, the sociologist, the anthropologist, etc., is all about 'justifying' *lust (DE)*, i.e., establishing his (the philosopher's, socialist's, psychologist's, etc.,) carnal nature, i.e., "*human nature*" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority—in defiance to God and His Word—can he KNOW what is happening to him and to those around him as he is being "educated" and is "educating" others in the process of 'change," i.e., in dialectic "Reasoning," i.e., in 'justifying' and putting "*human nature*," i.e., "*the lust of the flesh*," "*the lust of the eyes*," and "*the pride of life*" into practice (*praxis*), establishing *lust*, i.e., his *self interest* over and therefore against doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., over and therefore against doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority. All authority is from God. Not submitting itself to God's authority authority becomes subject to (a servant of) "*the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life*," i.e., to/of "*human nature*," i.e., to/of the world. Your ability to reason is given to you by God, to reason, i.e., to evaluate your *self* and the world around you from His Word. When you leave God out of your reasoning you can only "Reason" from your carnal nature, 'justifying' "*human nature*," i.e., your *lust* for pleasure (*DE*), that the world stimulates, 'justifying' your hate of restraint.*

"... casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ [doing the Father's will];" 2 Corinthians 10:5

The Protestant Reformation was the result of Martin Luther's 'liberating' the Word of God from *"human Reasoning,"* accepting the Word of God as "Is," i.e., by faith, un-tampered by men's *opinions.*, i.e., *"human Reasoning."*

Luther: *"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) *"Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light."* [Aristotle, as all philosophers do, believed that if you could 'create' a "good" environment you can create a "good" person.] *"Virtually the entire Ethics of Aristotle is the worst enemy of grace."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 31, Career of the Reformer: I, p.12)

"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
"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

Luther: *"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) Luther: *"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 a "good" environment can not produce a "good" person (no man is good). It is not an issue of works (before man and God) but of the heart (before God, i.e., changed by God, His *righteousness* imputed to us *by faith* in Him and His Word, directly effecting our conversation with our *self* and with others, effecting our actions—our actions not being directed by our *feelings*, i.e., or *lusts* of the 'moment' the the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating but by the Word of God, i.e., what the Heavenly Father says).

Luther: *"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)

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

The "wisdom" of men, instead of exposing the mind to the goodness/righteousness of God, exposes the mind to the perverse thoughts and actions of men. While *discussion* limits communication to right and wrong behavior, according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, *dialogue* opens up communication to all the deviant/perverse thoughts of man.

Luther: *"Here (Col. 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)

"Woe unto them that call evil ["human nature," i.e., lust] good, and good [the Father's authority] evil; that put darkness [pleasure] for light, and light [obedience to the Father] 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

Luther: *"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)

"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

"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

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

"Human Reasoning" is "light" to the flesh. The Word of God is light to the soul.

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

*"The ideas of the Enlightenment taught man that he could trust his own reason [his lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint] as a guide to establishing valid ethical norms and that he could rely on himself [his own carnal nature], needing neither revelation [the Word of God] nor that authority of the church [the preaching of the Word] in order to know good and evil." (Stephen Eric Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists*)*

"Human Reasoning" calls that which is pleasing to the flesh "right," i.e., "good," i.e., "light," i.e., "life," i.e., "I just can't wait to go out and play with my friends (and do what I want)" and restraint, i.e., the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way of pleasure "wrong," i.e., "evil," i.e., "darkness," i.e., "death," i.e., "I'll just die if I can't (if you don't let me) go out and play with my friends (and do what I want," i.e., "You are being un-Reasonable." God's Word declares the Father and His Son, who obeys the Father in all things commanded as "right," i.e., "good," i.e., "light," i.e., "life,"

"Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." James 1:17

*"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*

"For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Matthew 12:50

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." Matthew 7:21

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

"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes [shall be] they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and

followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Matthew 10:32-39

While the system or *paradigm* is the same for the earthly and the Heavenly Father, i.e., the *Patriarchal paradigm*, the earthly father is subject to the *lusts* of the world. Thus, making *lust* the drive of life and its augmentation the purpose, i.e., rejecting the Heavenly Father's authority, i.e., the system itself, Marxists, seeing the earthly father as being subject to the *lust* of the world, as the children, reject the earthly father's authority, i.e., the system itself, thus rejecting the Son, i.e., the need for salvation for one's sins, i.e., for one's *lusts*—establishing the flesh and the world that stimulates it over and therefore against soul and the Father who judges it. *"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."* Matthew 10:28

"Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 14:6

and you doing your will, in defiance or in indifference to the Father's will as "*wrong*," i.e., "*evil*," i.e., "*darkness*," i.e., "*death*." *Lust* unites man with man—according to his carnal nature, i.e., "*What can I get out of this situation and/or people for my self*," i.e., "*to satisfy my lusts*."

"The LORD knoweth the thoughts of man, that they are vanity." Psalms 94:11
"Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities; all is vanity." "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.: for childhood and youth are vanity." Ecclesiastes 1:2; 11:9, 10

God divides man from man based upon who is doing His will and who is not, i.e., who is redeemed and who is not.

"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

In order (as in "old" world order) for you to do the father's/Father's will it is faulty to think upon your *lusts*, i.e., your *self interests*, 'justifying' your doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., your *lusting* after *DE*. In order (as in "new" world order) to do your will, i.e., to 'justify your *lusts*, i.e., to realize your *self interests*, i.e., to "*actualize*" your *self* it is faulty to think upon doing the father's/Father's will, engendering a *guilty conscience* in you for doing (or thinking about doing) wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after *DE*. These are the only two choices you have. You can not have it both ways, deceiving your

self, making your *lusts* equal with (and therefore greater than) the father's/Father's authority, *negating* the father's/Father's authority in your thoughts (words) and actions, *negating* the *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after *DE* in the process. Even the Marxist, as you will see (using their own words), know this (yet do it, wanting you to join with them in doing it as well. It is why they become so "*desperately wicked*" against you when you bring the father's/Father's authority into the room with you, having to silence you, i.e., it at all cost).

"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

"There is a generation that curseth their father, and doth not bless their mother. There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their filthiness. There is a generation, O how lofty are their eyes! and their eyelids are lifted up. There is a generation, whose teeth are as swords, and their jaw teeth as knives, to devour the poor from off the earth, and the needy from among men."
Proverbs 30:11-14

PART V

Discussion (deductive reasoning) VS *Dialogue* (inductive reasoning).

To truly understand Marxism, i.e., Maoism it is necessary to first know the difference between [*discussion and dialogue*](#), [*deductive reasoning*](#) and [*inductive reasoning*](#). One recognizes the father's/Father's authority, i.e., objective truth, the other does not. If you make law via *discussion*, the father's/Father's authority stays in place, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth have the final say ("*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). If you make law via *dialogue*, the father's/Father's authority is excluded, i.e., is *negated*, the 'justification' of *lust* having taken its place. The difference between the two is based upon how you communicate with your *self* and with others and they communicate with their *self* and with you when it comes to defining (establishing) right and wrong behavior. The Lord, during the temptations in the wilderness remained in *discussion*, with the Father, i.e., "*It is written*" directing his thoughts and actions. The woman in the garden in Eden, during her temptation was drawn (seduced) into *dialogue*, 'justifying' her *lust*. When the master facilitator of 'change' drew the woman into *dialogue*, regarding right and wrong behavior he "owned" her. Not being able to draw the Lord into *dialogue*, i.e., the Lord remaining in *discussion*, i.e., subject to the Father's authority he could not "own" him. The same applies to you. Didactic reasoning (*discussion*) correlates with deductive reasoning, i.e., reasoning from what you have been *told* (what you have been taught, i.e., from what you KNOW), i.e., reasoning from established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., from an *a priori*, i.e., objective truth, with the father/Father, i.e., the one in authority having the final say on the matter,

inhibiting or blocking, i.e., preventing 'change' (at least rapid 'change')—change taking place because of persuasion (facts and truth), not *manipulation* ("feelings," i.e., your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the situation and/or people are stimulating).

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

"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

"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)

The father's/Father's authority is a political system (individualism, under authority, i.e., under God; with the children having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self* in order to do what the father/Father *tells* them, with each child being personally, i.e., individually held accountable for his or her particular actions). The child's carnal nature is a political system as well (rebellion and anarchy; with the child doing what he or she feels like doing, but having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after *DE*, thus restoring the father's/Father's authority when he gets into a position of authority). The facilitation of 'change' (psychology) is another political system (revolution; which, when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior, through the use of *dialogue* 'justifies' the child(ren)'s carnal nature, thus 'justifying' his *negation* of the father's/Father's authority, so the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist, i.e., the Maoist, along with all the children can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can *lust* after *DE* without having a *guilty conscience*, with each others [*affirmation*](#)—no longer judging and condemning one another for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after *DE*). In *dialogue* the world is in control of you, with you thinking you are in control of it, doing (and saying) what you want, not realizing that what you *want*, i.e., *lust* (*DE*) is in control of you. In *discussion* commands, rules, facts, and truth are in control of you (at least in your thoughts, with you possibly being wrong, with God always being right), directing the outcome of your thoughts and actions ("*words and actions*"). While you can do both, finding an equilibrium (*homeostasis*) where you can think about what you want to do (*dialogue* with your *self*) without you actually doing it (which, if you did it would engender a fear of getting caught, i.e., a *guilty conscience*) it is the restraint of commands, rules, facts, and truth (*discussion* with your *self*, i.e., "*What if I get caught or something goes wrong?*" i.e., fear of judgment or responsibility-accountability) that keeps you from doing it. By creating an environment of *dialogue*, i.e., an environment of "*I feel*" and "*I think*" when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior (in the "light" of the situation at hand), *discussion* (right and wrong based upon established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., based upon what you have been *told*, i.e., you *KNOW* because you

have been *told*, i.e., "*I knew better*") is overwhelmed, 'liberating' your mind (freeing it of fear of judgment or responsibility-accountability) so you can do what you want without having a *guilty conscience*, thus 'changing' your behavior. The *guilty conscience* is abated (*negated*) through *dialogue*, receiving "*the group's*" approval, i.e., *affirmation*. The language you use in communicating with your self and with others, when establishing right and wrong behavior is a political system. Whoever define terms for you, i.e., defines "*good*" and "*evil*" behavior directs your steps. With man, *lust*, i.e., pleasure, i.e., "*What can I get out of this situation and/or person for my self?*" is "*good*" and restraint, i.e., missing out on pleasure (having to do the Father's will instead) is "*evil*." With God, His *righteousness*, i.e., "*What does my Father want me to do?*" is "*good*" and your *sensuousness*, i.e., *lust*, i.e., "*What can I get out this situation and/or this person for my self?*" is "*evil*."

"O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things. But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." Matthew 12:34-37

Dialectic "Reasoning" (*dialogue*) correlates with inductive reasoning i.e., reasoning from "*sense experience*," i.e., from the children's (man's) carnal nature (who have rejected the father's/Father's authority, correlated to the *children of disobedience*), setting aside any command, rule, fact, or truth that comes between them and their carnal desires of the 'moment,' i.e., what they are *lusting* after in the 'moment,' including their desire, i.e., their *lust* to relate with others, i.e., with those who, having the same *lusts*, i.e., the same *self interest* 'justify' their *lusts*, finding, through *dialogue* what they have in common with one another, i.e., "*human nature*," i.e., "*the lust of the flesh*," "*the lust of the eyes*," and "*the pride of life*" and establishing right and wrong behavior (action or *praxis*) on it only, making commands, rules, facts, and truth subjective, i.e., subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, thereby 'justifying' their hate of restraint, i.e., their hatred toward the father's/Father's authority (the situation can 'change' but the *method* or *formula* remains the same). There is no father's/Father's authority in dialectic "Reasoning," i.e., in inductive 'reasoning' (nor in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus process*), there is only the carnal desires, i.e., *lusts*, i.e., *self interests* of those present, finding commonality (*consensus*, i.e., *affirmation*), i.e., what they can all agree upon (in the "light" of their *self interest*, i.e., their *lusts*) as the answer or solution to the current issue at hand, making right and wrong behavior (action) subject to their carnal nature, i.e., their *lusts*, i.e., their *self interest* of the 'moment,' i.e., "*human nature*" and the world that is stimulating it (and anyone *manipulating* it and/or their "*perception*" of it).

"Re-education must be clever enough in manipulating the subjects to have them think that they are running the show." "The objective sought will not be reached so long as the new set of values is not experienced by the individual as something freely chosen." "An outright enforcement of the new set of values and beliefs is simply the introduction of a new god who has to fight with the old god, now regarded as a devil." (Principles of Re-education, Kurt Lewin and Paul Grabbe "Conduct, Knowledge, and Acceptance of New Values"; The Journal of Social Issues)

"Human nature" is "the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes," and "the pride of life," i.e., that which is only "of the world." Marxism, i.e., Maoism is all about 'change,' i.e., being stimulated by and responding to the situation and or people present in the 'moment,' building relationship via dialogue with those who 'justify' your lusts, i.e., your self interest, i.e., "human nature," i.e., Marxism, i.e., Maoism, rejecting (negating) those who—adhering to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., insisting upon preaching, teaching, and discussing established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., refusing to compromise or set aside established commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to build relationship, i.e., refusing to 'change'—condemn "human nature," i.e., lust, i.e., the Marxist, i.e., the Maoist—why, to the Marxist you have to be removed, i.e., you have to be negated in order for them to have "peace" of mind, i.e., in order for them to have no sense of guilty (no guilty conscience) for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for lusting after DE. By simply (subtly) drawing you into dialogue, when it comes to right and wrong behavior the Marxist, i.e., the Maoist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' has won the day—a win-win day for him and for you, i.e., a win for his lusts and a win for yours—negating the father's/Father's authority in your thoughts and your actions in the 'moment' (removing the father's/Father's authority from the environment), making you at-one-with him, i.e., "of the world" only, 'justifying' your self, i.e., your lusts before the Marxist, i.e., the Maoist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' and those following after him, with you now joining with them following after him.

When it comes to right and wrong behavior, if you leave the father's/Father's authority, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will out of your thoughts, all you have is your self, i.e., your self interests, i.e., your lusts of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating.

History is the study of the lessons learned in the past, applying them to the present. Social(ist) studies is evaluating the past and the present from your carnal nature, i.e., from your lust for pleasure (DE) and resentment toward restraint, "Reasoning" from your self, i.e., from you lusts and hate of the 'moment,' in the light of (being influenced by) the current situation and/or people present instead of from the lessons, i.e., facts and truth that you have learned in the past and are learning now in the present.

"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools," Romans 1:21, 22

"1. All human behavior is directed toward the satisfaction of needs [the child's (man's) carnal nature "is directed toward the satisfaction of" lust (DE)], 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](#))

All the laws of nature are established by God. Man knows there *is* a God (becomes aware there is a God) because of them (*"Who done it?"*). We use the "scientific method" to discover the laws of nature, i.e., how they work and then apply them in order to 'change' the world, i.e., in order to make it a "better" place to live in (for the flesh). By making man subject to the "scientific method," i.e., to *stimulus-response*, i.e., to "behavior science" (so called science) man becomes subject to his carnal nature (DE) only, 'justifying' his *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, *negating* his soul, which is made in the image of God. This is the only direction the *"-ologies,"* including and especially sociology and psychology, i.e., Marxism, i.e., Maoism can take you.

"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, i.e., from faith to faith], 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 (where lust is "repressed") to theory, i.e., opinion (where lust is 'liberated')], 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, i.e., lusting], 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, i.e., lusting], guiding his behavior on the basis of his immediate experiencing [his lust for pleasure (for lust) and his lust for "the group's" affirmation, 'justifying' his (and their) lusts—'justifying' his (and their) resentment toward anyone inhibiting or blocking his (and their) lust for pleasure, including his (and their) lust for approval from others—'justifying' his (and their) lust]— he has become an integrated process of changingness." (Rogers) What is common in the spectrum of

'change,' from one end to the other, according to Rogers is *lust*, making the 'liberation' of *lust* (what all men have in common) from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., 'liberation' from "*fixity*," i.e., 'liberating' "*changingness*" (the flesh, i.e., *DE* which the world stimulates) the 'purpose' of life.

According to the Marxist, who has rejected the father's/Father's authority, if all are sinners (sin, i.e., *lust* is all that man has in common) then sin is the "*norm*," i.e., *lust* is the basis of "*human nature*," 'justifying' the *negation* of those who accuse him of being a sinner—preventing him from becoming his *self*, i.e., "*normal*," i.e., *self actualized*. Therefore world unity, i.e., "*worldly peace and socialist harmony*" can only become reality by man establishing "*human nature*," i.e., "*the lust of the flesh*," "*the lust of the eyes*," and "*the pride of life*," i.e., his *self*, i.e., his *self interest* over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, making *lust* (including his *lust* for approval from others—'justifying' his *lust*) the 'drive' of life and the augmentation of *lust*, i.e., "*the building relationship upon self interest*," i.e., upon *lust* (which includes removing anyone who gets in the way of "*the building of relationship upon human nature*," i.e., upon *lust*) the 'purpose' of life. (Do you see the pattern? There is no other.) When a man turns to his *self*, i.e., to his *lusts*, i.e., to his flesh (*DE*) that the world is stimulating to know right from wrong behavior he makes himself pray to the *manipulation* of those who *manipulate* the environment in order to *seduce*, *deceive*, and *manipulate* him, in order to use him for their own carnal pleasures.

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

When, in the garden in Eden, the master facilitator of 'change' (through the use of Neuro-linguistics ["*Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?*"], i.e., the language of the nervous system, i.e., an embedded statement in a question, as in, "I wonder whether you know where you knee is?" which destabilizes and then sensitizes you to your "feelings," i.e., to your *self*, i.e., to your knee, establishing your "feelings," i.e., your *self*, and as was in the case in the garden in Eden, establishing the woman's *lust*, i.e., *self interest* over and therefore against any standard that was restraining her, i.e., standing in her way) *seduced* the woman into *dialogue*, i.e., into sharing her *lust*, he "*owned*" her. *Discussion* retains the authority that restrains, i.e., that "is," preventing 'change,' at least rapid 'change.' *Dialogue* on the other hand contains the world (in our eyes) that "*ought*" to be, i.e., that we desire.

"The individual may have 'secret' thoughts ["ought's," i.e., "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 "feelings," i.e., his carnal desires, i.e., his lusts and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' that he is internally, i.e., privately thinking about] is particularly important, for here may lie the individual's potential [for 'change,' i.e., to

become of and for his *"self"* and the world that stimulates—'liberating' him from the father's/Father's authority that restrains]. " ([Theodor Adorno](#), *The Authoritarian Personality*)

"We have to study the conditions which maximize ought-perceptiveness."

"Oughtiness is itself a fact to be perceived." "If we wish to permit the facts to tell us their oughtiness, we must learn to listen to them in a very specific way which can be called Taoistic ["sense experienced"]." (Abraham Maslow, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*)

By drawing the woman into *dialogue*, i.e., by creating a non-hostile environment, i.e., a *"positive"* environment, i.e., a *"Ye shalt not surely die"* environment where she could share her *lust* to *"touch"* the *"Thou shalt surely die"* tree (without fear of judgment) she was 'liberated' (in her mind) to be her *self*—*self actualized*—replacing the "Father's" authority with her *lust(s)* of the 'moment' that the world stimulated. Reality, i.e., what was *"actual"* became subject to her carnal nature, i.e., to her impulses and urges of the 'moment' that the world stimulated, no longer subject to the Word of God, i.e., to what she was *told*, with Adam following (*lusting*) after her instead of obeying God, i.e., instead of doing what he was *told*. (After all, all she "saw" made "sense" to her, i.e., there was nothing wrong with the "forbidden" tree, i.e., it was like all the other trees—her "Reasoning," i.e., her understanding did not and could not KNOW that the issue was not that the tree itself would kill her but her and Adam's disobedience would lead to their no longer having access to the tree of life, leading to their and everyone else's eventual death for disobedience, i.e., for sinning.) When caught, like 'liberals' they blamed someone else for their "bad" behavior, with Adam blaming the woman—*"throwing her under the bus"* (along with "the Father" for creating her, i.e., for creating an "unhealthy environment" for him to live in)—and the woman blaming the master facilitator of 'change'—*"throwing him under the bus"* for "helping" her 'justify' her *lusts*. The facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist, using the same method, i.e., 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*, i.e., your *lust(s)* (what you covet) 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 when you get in his way, doing to you what you did to the father/Father for getting in your way, i.e., in the way of your *lust(s)*—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 *lusts* and *affirmation* in order to gain and retain power (control over you), getting rid of you when you get in his way (hurt his "feelings," i.e., get in the way of his *lusts* which he will not forget, nor forgive) since he is only interested in *lust*, i.e., in the pleasures of the 'moment,' with your *affirmation*, not your soul, i.e., where you (and he) will spend eternity.

"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

"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.)

When man directs his steps his flesh rules, i.e., *sensuousness*, i.e., *lust* prevails. When the Father directs his steps, his soul has peace, *righteousness* prevails. Because the Marxist has rejected the father's/Father's authority (the soul, i.e., where he will spend eternity), establishing the flesh and the world that stimulates it, i.e., the "here-and-now" (the "eternal present") as all there is to life, his objective is to "help" 'liberate' the flesh, i.e., *lust*, i.e., "*the people*," i.e., his *self* from the father's/Father's authority by getting them to focus upon (think about) their *lusts*, i.e., what they want, i.e., their *self interests* of the 'moment,' establishing right and wrong behavior upon what they all have in common, i.e., according to their "*sense experiences*" of the past and present, which is *lust*, which includes their *lust* for the approval of others, 'justifying' their *lusts* over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority—which divides them from one another based upon who amongst them is doing right and who is doing wrong, according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., from being *told*. For Karl Marx, i.e., the Marxist it is *lust*, i.e., what all men have in common (the basis of common-ism) that unites man to man—'justifying' mans natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world stimulates along with his resentment or hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way. It is the father's/Father's authority that divides man from man—between those doing the father's/Father's will and those who are *lusting* after pleasure (*DE*), doing their will instead—justifying those doing the father's/Father's will. Karl Marx, i.e., the Marxist (having rejected the father's/Father's authority so he can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., so he can *lust* after *DE* without having a *guilty conscience*) divides man upon those who are doing the father's/Father's will and those who are not; 'justifying' those who side with *lust*, 'justifying' *negating* the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* it engenders in the process.

PART VI

For the Marxist, "*building relationship upon self interest*," i.e., upon what people *lust* after, i.e., upon what they have in common unites "*the people*" in serving, protecting, supporting, praising, and worshiping, i.e., selling their soul to him—for 'justifying' their *lusts*.

Marxism, i.e., Maoism rises and falls on this alone, i.e., the 'justification' and the augmentation of *lust*, 'justifying, in the Marxist's, i.e., the Maoist's mind their *negation* of the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way. There is no other agenda. As the Marxist, Jürgen Habermas admitted (a Marxist of Marxists): "*If the 'restoring of life' of the world is to be conceived in terms of the Christian revelation, then Marx must collapse into a bottomless abyss.*" ([Jürgen Habermas](#), *Theory and Practice*) As the Apostle Paul pointed out in the first chapter of Romans, confirming Habermas' observation: the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' "*knows*" about the "*bottomless pit,*" i.e., "*the lake of fire that is never quenched,*" prepared for him and all who following after him. "*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 1:32 (See [Romans 1:21-31](#)) This is why the Marxist, i.e., the Maoist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' is so paranoid about the citizens, i.e., "*the people,*" i.e., "*the group*" hearing the truth, fearful they will accept it, i.e., believe it, doing the father's/Father's will instead of 'justifying' and following after him—serving (in time and money), protecting, praising, and worshipping him, i.e., 'justifying (*affirming*) his *lusts*, i.e., doing his will—rejecting him instead, warning him, i.e., informing and reminding him of where he will spend eternity if he does not repent and turn from his wicked ("*desperately wicked*") ways. Believing only in stimulus-response, i.e., the flesh and the world that stimulates it (only giving lip service to the father/Father if he/He is brought up in order to appease, i.e., deceive the naïve or ignorant, regarding his intent), as does the psychologist/psychiatrist/psychotherapist (explained below) the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' is forever troubled by the presence of the father's/Father's authority, needing to *negate* him, i.e., remove any trace of him from the environment (from the students/the peoples thoughts and actions) in order to have peace of mind, i.e., in order to be his *self*, i.e., of the world only.

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

According to Karl Marx the father's/Father's authority is 'created' in the child's act of obedience, i.e., in his *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating* his *self* in order to do the father's/Father's will, when the father's/Father's command, rule, fact, or truth gets in the way of his *lust(s)* of the 'moment,' that the world is stimulating, empowering the father/Father to rule over him, preventing him from becoming his *self*, according to his carnal nature— *self-actualized*. Therefore, according to Karl Marx, not until the child identifies with and unites with other children (as one class) in ridding his *self* of the father's/Father's authority (the opposing class) can he become his *self*, i.e., *self-actualized*, i.e., of (and for) the world only—with the "help" of the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' since he can not do it on his own (it does not come naturally). By simply making policy via *dialogue* (with any "discussion" being the result of *dialogue*, i.e., the facilitator of 'change's' and participants *opinions* first) a class is formed that is antithetical to the father's/Father's authority (which makes policy via *discussion*, i.e.,

according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth). *Discussion* restrains *dialogue*, making the outcome subject to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., subject to the father's/Father's authority. *Dialogue* negates *discussion*, i.e., *negates* restraint, making the outcome subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to the child's carnal desires of the 'moment,' which are being stimulated by the world, i.e., by the current situation and/or people present (imagined or real). The method of communication used in establishing policy defines right and wrong behavior, i.e., determines which "class" you belong to—for the father/Father, which "class" you are to restrain in order to bring them to the knowledge of the truth for their soul sake, for the Marxist, which "class" you are to negate (kill), since, for them *lust*, i.e., the "here-and-now" is all there is, not the soul, i.e., where they will spend eternity, i.e., the "there-and-then." (See the issue "[What Is Missing \(Negated\) In Dialogue.](#)")

"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 child, through *dialogue* can find his identity in the other children, who like him *lust* after pleasure (*DE*) and hate restraint can he overcome the effect of the father's/Father's authority, i.e., can he *negate* "the subjugating class" in himself and in society, i.e., in his thoughts and in his actions.

According to Karl Marx *"It is not individualism [the child, humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating 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, which the father's/Father's authority engenders] are made realities." (Karl Marx, in John Lewis, The Life and Teachings of Karl Marx)*

How you can tell if you or others are Marxist-Maoists: when you or they are concerned about your, your spouse's, your children's, others, their own "social life" instead of where you, your spouse, your children, others, or they will spend eternity.

"The real nature of man is the totality of social relations." (Karl Marx, Thesis on Feuerbach #6) In other words: only when man learns to compromise, i.e., to set

aside established commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to get along, i.e., in order to initiate and/or sustain relationship with others can he become his *self*.

According to Karl Marx the child can only know himself in what he has in common with other children (the basis of common-ism), i.e., his and their *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, i.e., hatred toward having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., hatred toward the father/Father, for having to do his/His will instead of his own—thus missing out on pleasure, i.e., *lust*, which includes the *affirmation* of others (who 'justify' his *lusts*). It is the father's/Father's authority that divides the children upon right and wrong behavior (according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth), to the Marxist "*repressing*" them (dividing them from their own nature), "*alienating*" them (divided them from one another), creating "*neurosis*" (their feeling *guilty* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*, i.e. for being their *self*). Without *negating* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., establishing the children, i.e., "*the group*," i.e., society over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, i.e., over and therefore against individualism, under God the children will forever remain divided between those who do the father's/Father's will and those who do not. I say "father/Father" since it is the father's/Father's authority system itself (which both the earthly father and the Heavenly Father have in common—"obey me or else") that the Marxist is going after (despite their using the same system themselves, in a plural voice—"obey us or else"—hiding "*me*" under "*us*" so he, the Marxist can, without having a *guilty conscience* live off "*the people*," i.e. use them as "*human resource*" and cast them away when they get in his way or no longer serve his purpose, unlike God who, in his love for you and those around you, sacrificed His own Son to save your and their soul).

"Protestantism [the priesthood of all believers, doing your best as unto the Lord, putting no man between you and the Lord] *was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism.*" (Max Horkheimer, *Vernunft and Selbsterhaltung*; English. *Reasoning and Self Preservation*)

Even the Transformational Marxist Max Horkheimer recognized that (unlike the Catholic Church, Cults, and all forms of socialisms, local, national, and global—which use [group dynamics](#) to control "*the people*"—there is no theocracy, i.e., taking up arms to defend "the faith" in and of this world; "*Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.*" John 18:36; You can only defend the flesh. Faith, as a shield defends you, i.e., your soul. You can not defend faith.)

Protestantism liberates the individual from "*group think*." *The believer* might be in "*the group*" but not of "*the group*," making him able to "*come out of the group*" (2 Corinthians 6:14-18), i.e., able to stand alone (with the Lord) when and if the fellowship goes wrong, i.e., goes counter to [the Word of God](#). This once permeated much of this nations thinking. Hebrews 10:25, i.e., "*Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is*" is now taken out of context (with those in the "church" not reading all of

Hebrews 10:23-31 when they quote it), making everyone subject to *group dynamics*, i.e., to *relationship building* around *common self interests*, not fellowshipping as individuals before a Holy, Pure, Righteous, and Judging God—the next verses, vs. 26, 27 stating "*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.*" Tolerating unrighteousness in the "fellowship" (in order to "grow the 'fellowship'"), which *dialogue* does is antithetical to the assembling of believers, i.e., to the saints. By bringing *dialogue* into the "Church," making the Word of God subject to the *opinions* of men or a man ([*private interpretation*](#)) Protestantism has been overcome by *group dynamics*, i.e., "*What does or will the group think?*"—rather than "*What does the Word of God say?*" i.e., "*What does my Heavenly Father want me to say and/or do?*" God is patient, that we might repent, but not tolerant (accepting) of unrighteousness, i.e., of our *lusts*.

PART VII

When children remain in an environment of *discussion*, when it comes to knowing right and wrong behavior the father's/Father's authority remains in place, i.e., in control of the children's actions (if not in their thoughts). Not until children can come together in an environment of *dialogue*, establishing right and wrong behavior from their carnal nature, i.e., from their impulses and urges, i.e., from their *lusts*, i.e., through dialectic "Reasoning" (*the dialectical method*) can they become their *self*, i.e., self-actualized, i.e., 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority in their thoughts, thereby able to relate with one another on what they have in common, i.e., *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating without restraint, i.e., without fear of judgment and condemnation, 'justified' (in their mind) in rejecting (questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking) the father's/Father's authority for the "good" of "*the people*," i.e., for the "good" of the Marxist.

"An examination of the role of education in the revolutionary processes in Hitlerian Germany and Soviet Russia demonstrates that a new controlling group can use the educational system to advantage to bringing about the changes it desires. This illustrates the effectiveness of the educational system in indoctrinating the youth with a desire for the type of society wanted by those in control. . . . To do this they must persist in the maintenance of a new system long enough for controlling interests to be thoroughly indoctrinated in the new social system." (Wilbur Brookover, *A Sociology of Education*)

Marxism is based upon the child's carnal nature, i.e., the child's natural inclination to *lust* after *DE*, making right that which stimulates pleasure (*DE*) and wrong that which inhibits or blocks it, i.e., that prevents it from becoming the basis of reality, i.e., from becoming all there is to life. Psychologists, as Marxists (as explained below, i.e., traditional

Marxists/Communists have a father figure leading "*the people*," equated to Fascism aka Nationalism while transformational Marxists/Communists aka Globalists have facilitators of 'change,' merging psychology and Marxism together, i.e., the individual and society, making them one and the same based upon what they have in common, i.e., *lust*) establish the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust over* and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, i.e., over and therefore against doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., over and therefore against doing the father's/Father's will. The father/Father knows the cost of being wrong (thus his insistence upon the child doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth that have been proven, in his mind to be right and not wrong). The child, *lusting* after *DE* does not, resulting in wrong, to the child being anyone getting in the way of his *lusts*, i.e., his carnal nature, right being anyone 'justifying' it, i.e., *lust*. This is why Maoism (Marxism) so easily captures the children, 'justifying' their *lusts*, i.e., establishing their *self*, i.e., their *self interest over* and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, i.e., over and therefore against having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self*, i.e., having to *negate* their *lusts* 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, 'justifying' their (the children's) rejection of the father's/Father's authority, not only in their thoughts but also in their actions (in their relationship with one another). As will be explained in greater detail below, the father's/Father's authority, i.e., objective truth, i.e., truth that is external to the child's carnal nature, i.e., restraining his *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating is maintained in *discussion*, with the father/Father having the final say, i.e., "*Because I said so*," i.e., "*I cause to be*," while the child's *lust* for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, i.e., subjective truth, i.e., truth that is internal to the child is maintained in *dialogue*. When it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior *dialogue* (psychology) has become the means of communication today, establishing the child's carnal nature over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, making *lust* right and the father's/Father's authority (that gets in the way of *lust*) wrong, 'justifying' (in the child's mind) his hatred toward restraint, i.e., his hatred toward the father's/Father's authority. This is the essence of Maoism (transformational Marxism), i.e., Marxism and psychology combined, 'liberating' children from the father's/Father's authority so the Marxist, i.e., the psychologist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can *lust* after *DE* without having a *guilty conscience* (what the father's/Father's authority engenders), with the children's *affirmation*. This is the role of "contemporary education," i.e., Maoist education, i.e., the use of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" in the classroom today, not only in America but around the world. Everyone is going after people and organizations in their effort to stop the spread of Marxism in America today while it continues, unabated in the classroom. Even home-schooling material and co-ops and "Christian" pre, grade, and high schools, Colleges, Universities, and Trade schools are using "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" as the basis of their curriculum today.

*"Blooms' Taxonomies" are "a psychological classification system" "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."** (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain* and David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*)*

In contemporary "education" what is "actual," i.e., "real" is not the parent's established commands, rules, facts, and truth but the child's own "feelings," i.e., carnal desires, i.e., "lusts" of the 'moment,' i.e., the "affective domain"—'justifying' the child's natural response to the current situation and/or people stimulating it, i.e., following after, serving, and protecting those who augment pleasure, fighting against those who get in pleasures way. It is "lust" that "reconciles" the child to the world (society) not the parent's authority, i.e., not established commands, rules, facts, and truth. It is "lust" that 'justifies' the child's rejection of (hostility toward) parental authority that gets in the way. 'Liberate' "lust" in the classroom and you 'liberate' the child from parental authority, i.e., you 'change' the world. As in a garden in Eden, "Ye shalt not surely die," 'liberated' two "children" from the "Father's authority," i.e., from "Thou shall surely die." Genesis 2:16, 17; 3:4

"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)*

**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*) "Unfreezing" engenders confusion i.e., [cognitive dissonance](#). It is the desire for group approval (*affirmation*) that belief is sacrificed at the alter of *self*, i.e., *lust* preservation.*

The following section is from a book explaining how the Communist Chinese brainwash their victims through the use of "*Lewinian change theory*," which is being used in the "*group grade*," facilitated, "*Bloom's Taxonomy*" classroom.

"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,' 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)

Group therapy, i.e., the "group grade," facilitated classroom applies the same method, i.e., procedure.

"In the group not only must the individual strive for autonomy but the leader must be willing to allow him to do so. ... an individual's behavior cannot be fully understood without an appreciation of his environmental press. ...one member's behavior is not understandable out of context of the entire group. ...there is no more important issue than the interrelationship of the group members. ... few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity in the face of apparent group unanimity; and the individual rejects critical feelings toward the group at this time to avoid a state of cognitive dissonance. To question the value or activities of the group, would be to thrust himself into a state of dissonance. Long cherished but self-defeating beliefs and attitudes may waver and decompose in the face of a dissenting majority. One of the most difficult patients for me to work with in groups is the individual who employs fundamentalist religious views in the service of denial. The 'third force' in psychology ... which emphasized a holistic, humanistic concept of the person, provided impetus and form to the encounter group ... The therapist assists the patient to clarify the nature of the imagined danger and then ... to detoxify, to disconfirm the reality of this danger. By shifting the group's attention from 'then-and-there' [parental authority] to 'here-and-now' [their feelings of the 'moment'] material, he performs a service to the group ... focusing the group upon itself. Members must develop a feeling of mutual trust and respect and must come to value the group as an important means of meeting their personal needs. Once a member realizes that others accept him and are trying to understand him, then he finds it less necessary to hold rigidly to his own beliefs; and he may be willing to explore previously denied aspects of himself. Patients should be encouraged to take risks in the group; such behavior change results in positive feedback and reinforcement and encourages further risk-taking. Members learn about the impact of their behavior on the feelings of other members. ...a patient might, with further change, outgrow ... his spouse ... unless concomitant changes occur in the spouse." (yalom)

Facts and truth are irrelevant, i.e., are subject to 'change' (to private interpretation) when they get in the way of the child's (and the facilitator of 'change's') *lust* for pleasure. By replacing *discussion* with *dialogue* when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior, making *dialogue* (feelings) *discussion* (facts and truth) and *discussion* (established facts and truth, i.e., objective truth) *dialogue* (an *opinion*, i.e., subjective truth), right and wrong behavior is made subject to the child's "feelings," i.e., the "*affective domain*," making the child's *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, i.e., 'change' right, i.e., "good" and restraint, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., absolutes that get in the way of 'change' wrong, i.e., "evil."

"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).

"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 (Benjamin Bloom's "*Weltanschauung*," i.e., world view) were two Marxists (Transformational Marxist's—Marxist's who merge socialism and psychology, i.e., Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud) 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 policy—moving education out from under parental (the father's/Father's) authority, i.e., local control ("[in loco parentis](#)") to government control, i.e., to their control.

We are seeing the effect of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*," i.e., Marxist curriculum being used in the classroom in America today—the *negation* of the father's authority in the home and the *negation* of respect for authority in the nation. The very core of the "middle-class" is based upon the father's authority, i.e., upon doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., upon doing what you are *told*, in the home, in the workplace, and in government. The constituents, according to the Constitution are the father, the representative, as a child is sent to the store to purchase the father's goods, doing the father's will. If he goes into *dialogue*, away from *discussion* in making law (as is now going on; explained below) he no longer re-presents the father, i.e., the constituents but his own *self interest*, i.e., his and his "friends" *lusts* instead, *negating* the father's, i.e., his constituent's authority in the law(s) he is making, i.e., making law(s) to satisfy (subject to) his and his "friends" *lusts* instead, putting the father, i.e., his constituents into debt to satisfy them—making his constituents, i.e., the father subject to him. What takes place in the classroom directly effects the nation. The *negation* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the *negation* of doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth ("*rule of law*") in the student's (the future citizen's) thoughts, directly effects his or her actions. This is the objective (desired

outcome) of those advocating and defending the use of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*," i.e., Marxist curriculum in the classroom—in defiance to the Word of God, i.e., "*rule of law*." We have (had) limited, representative government in order for the father (as a king, under God) to have private convictions, i.e., freedom of the *conscience*, freedom of speech and religion, authority over his family, private property, private business, raising his children up to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, doing the father's/Father's will, having a *guilty conscience* when they do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., when they *lust* after *DE* instead of doing what they are *told*.

"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](#)

While dad is not perfect, he may be (or may have been) a down right tyrant (or MIA/AWL)—as a child *lusting* after pleasure (*DE*) 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. The role of the father, besides loving his wife, i.e., the children's mother, providing food, clothing, safety, and a roof over his family's 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., to 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 when 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. God loves everyone but judges us according to our thoughts and actions, with us either accepting His authority, *humbling* our *self*, repenting of our *lusts*, doing His will or rejecting Him and His authority, *esteeming*, i.e., 'justifying' our *self*, i.e., our *lusts* doing our will instead, dying in our sin, facing his judgment, i.e., damnation (the lake of fire that is never quenched, prepared for the master facilitator of 'change and all who follow him).

The first part of Hebrews 12:5-11 reads: "*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."

The gospel message is based upon the Father's authority, with the Son of God doing the Father's will, requiring all who follow Him to do the same, for their soul sake.

"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 The message is: 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.

The father's/Father's authority (the system or paradigm itself) is reflected in traditional education, where the teacher:

- 1) *preaches* established commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaches* established facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith, and discusses any question(s) the children might have regarding the commands, rules, facts, and truth being taught, at the teacher's discretion, i.e., providing he or she deems it necessary, has time, the children are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking authority,
- 2) *rewards* the child who does right and obeys,
- 3) corrects and/or *chastens* 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) *casts out* (expels/grounds) any child who questions, challenges, defies, disregards, attacks the father's/Father's authority system (1-4), which retains the father's/Father's authority system in the child's thoughts and actions.

Your children are not yours, your neighbor's, the teacher's, ... the government's, the world's children. From conception their soul belongs to God. You are accountable to teaching them the truth—doing the Father's will. Those "of (and for) the world" come between them and the Father for their *lust's* sake.

"Concerning the changing of circumstances by men, the educator must himself be educated." (Karl Marx, Thesis on Feuerbach # 3)

All "educators" are certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" i.e., Marxist curriculum in the classroom. Marxism, as is

psychology is based upon the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority in the individuals thoughts, directly effecting his actions, i.e., 'justifying' his *lust* for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, establishing *lust*, i.e., the child's carnal nature over and therefore against doing the father's/Father's will.

"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/student's natural inclination to lust after DE]." "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)

If *thesis* is the father's/Father's authority, i.e., if commands, rules, facts, and truth remain in place establishing right and wrong behavior there can be no *synthesis*, i.e., no 'change.' If you make the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust* the *thesis*, which also resides in the father, *negating* the father's/Father's authority, *synthesis*, i.e. what the child and the father have in common, i.e., *lust* becomes reality, i.e., all there is to life.

"According to the philosopher Hegel, truth is not found in the thesis, nor the antithesis, but in the emerging synthesis [lust, what the thesis, i.e., the father and the antithesis, i.e., the child have in common] which reconciles the two." (Martin Luther King Jr., Strength to Love) "Building relationship upon self interest," i.e. lust, i.e., DE is the hallmark of Marxism.

"I could not of course imagine that the method which in the system of logic I have followed is not capable of much elaboration in detail, but at the same time I know that it is the only true method." "It is clear that no expositions can be regarded as scientific which do not follow the course of this method, and which are not conformable to its simple rhythm, for that is the course of the thing itself." (George Hegel in Carl Friedrich, The Philosophy of Hegel)

If the father/Father remains in authority he/He is the *thesis*, making the child's carnal nature (*lust*) the *antithesis*, preventing the child from 'discovering' his identity in the other children (establishing their *self*, i.e., their *lusts* over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority), i.e., preventing the children from becoming at-one-with one another, i.e., preventing *synthesis*. By making the child the *thesis* the father's/Father's authority becomes the *antithesis*, requiring the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority in order for all children to come together as one in *synthesis*. By removing the father/Father (*thesis*) from the classroom, replacing him/Him with a facilitator of 'change,' the classroom environment is established upon the child's carnal nature, making *lust* the *thesis*. Then any child who demonstrates, i.e., holds onto the father's/Father's authority, i.e., who gets in the way of *lust* becomes the *antithesis*, i.e., the object to be converted, silenced, censored, or removed (*negated*, i.e., martyred) in order for the children to become as one (*synthesis*), with the facilitator of 'change' ruling over them all (who, along with all the children following after him, has no *guilty conscience* for removing anyone who get in his way, i.e., in the way of pleasure, i.e., in the way of *lust*, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous, since *lust*, i.e., pleasure is the agenda). *Synthesis* makes the *antithesis* the *thesis* thereby *negating* the *thesis*.

By placing a child in a *synthesis* environment, i.e., in an open-ended, non-directed, facilitated, "*group grade*," "*Bloom's Taxonomy*" classroom he is instantly graded upon his tolerance or intolerance of *lust*. His future depends upon his tolerance. This is antithetical to traditional education where doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will is the agenda. It is faulty to start with Bloom's definition of terms, i.e., with "*human nature*," 'justifying' *lust*, i.e., the "*affective domain*" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority. Whoever defines terms for you controls your life. Not until you define the traditional classroom from the father's/Father's perspective, distinguishing it from Bloom's definition can you truly see what is going on, i.e., Bloom's agenda.

While traditional education makes "*knowing*" subject to being *told*, "*comprehending*," the students' understanding that they will be held accountable for being wrong or disobeying (*thesis*), "*applying*," if they do what they want instead of obeying (*antithesis*), i.e., if they do wrong and not right, "*analyzing*" being, as "dad" is taking them to the "woodshed" for being or doing wrong they now "*know*" how important doing what they are *told*, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth is, transformational education, i.e., "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" adds "*synthesizing*," where the students must set aside any established command, rule, fact, or truth, i.e., *negate* doing the father's/Father's will that gets in the way of their building relationship with one another based upon what they have in common (*synthesis*), i.e., their natural inclination to *lust* after *DE* and their hate of restraint, with "*evaluating*" being "did they do the process of compromise, i.e., of 'change' right," not letting the father's/Father's authority get in the

way or did they do the father's/Father's will instead, i.e., inhibiting or blocking the building of relationship upon "human nature," i.e., upon *lust*, i.e., upon what they have in common. If you start with Bloom's definition of "*knowing*," i.e., based upon the child's "*sense experience*," i.e., the child's *lusts*, *knowing* by being *told*, i.e., the father's/Father's authority is *negated* from then on—any student who resists, i.e., who refuses to sell his or her soul to the process will be pressured to convert, i.e., join in or be silenced, censored, and/or removed, i.e., rejected by "*the group*," i.e., martyred (with "*the group*" they were working on a "*group project*" with being punished for their "bad" behavior, i.e., for their not being able to "bring them around"). The "life raft moral dilemma," for example, where the student must kill someone or his *self* in order to save everyone else on the raft, requires the student to commit murder, i.e., to damn his souls in order to save "*the group*."

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the LORD; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Psalms 1:1, 2 The law, which is perfect can save no one (it condemns us). It reveals our sins, i.e., our *lusts* that we might repent, turn to the Lord for salvation, His *righteousness* (His fulfillment of the law) imputed to us by His grace, through our faith in Him; *"For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."* Romans 5:19

"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*) By replacing the traditional teacher with a facilitator of 'change,' i.e., a Marxist "educator" the students in the classroom are 'changed.'

"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*)

"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 of an individual or a group." (Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#))

The *guilty conscience*, i.e., the father's/Father's authority within the child:

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)

*"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*)*

'Change' is all about *negating* the father's/Father's authority in order to *negate* the *guilty conscience* (what the father's/Father's authority engenders) that gets in the way of *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*)*

Kurt Lewin explained (in two sentences) how the *guilty conscience* (the "*negative valence*") is 'created,' preventing 'change,' i.e., *lust* and how it can be *negated*, replaced with the "super-ego," emancipating 'change,' i.e., *lust*. The *superego* is the voice of the "village" within the child.

"... the superego 'unites in itself the influences [impulses and urges, i.e., lusts and hates] of the present and of the past [the student's resentment toward authority in the past becoming at-one-with his resentment toward authority in the present and vice versa, 'justifying his resentment toward authority].'" (Brown)

*"Superego development is conceived as the incorporation of the moral standards of society [socialism, which requires compromise for the sake of relationship]. Therefore the levels of the Taxonomy should describe successive levels of goal setting appropriate to superego development." (Book 2: *Affective Domain*)* By making the student's "feelings," i.e., his affective domain a part of the curriculum (in a group setting) his adaptability to or resistance to 'change' can be graded along a spectrum of (on one side of the spectrum) 'loyalty' to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (that get in the way of building relationship with others who *lust*) and insisting upon others doing the same (resulting in a bad grade) to (on the other side of the spectrum) 'loyalty' to the process of 'change,' i.e., to the dialectic process, i.e., to building relationship with others based upon *lust* (resulting in a good grade)—while working on a "group," i.e., a socialist project. A group of individuals working on a project is a group of individuals

working on a project (the objective is to do or get the project done right). When the agenda is to build relationship while working on a project it becomes socialist (whether the project is done right or not—doing it again only gives more time and money to build relationship, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' gets more money).

When it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior, by moving communication away from *discussion*, which retains the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the father/Father has the final say (which, to the flesh is "*negative*," i.e., gets in the way of *lust*) to *dialogue* (which, to the flesh is "*positive*," i.e., 'justifies' *lust*; why you are asked to be "*positive*" and not "*negative*" in meetings, i.e., in the classroom) the father's/Father's authority is *negated*. There is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only the participant's *lust* for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating and his resentment toward restraint being 'justified.'

We "*must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions* [see those people adhering to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., who believe in individualism, under God, i.e., who hold onto absolutes, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth] *in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue.*" (Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#))

"Bypassing the traditional channels of top-down decision making [bypassing 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*) 'Climate change,' 'global warming' originated from this man's writings, i.e., 'logic,' which Benjamin Bloom's "*Taxonomy*" carried into the classroom.

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*) The revolution was to make *opinion*, i.e., *theory*, i.e., what "*ought*" to be, i.e., *dialogue* science, not facts or truth, i.e., true *discussion* that gets in the way of 'change.' Kuhn continued: "*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 [not facts or truth] 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." In other words if the "scientist" does not readily flow in the language of *opinion*, i.e., of *theory*, i.e., of "ought to be," i.e., in *dialogue* but insists upon facts and truth, i.e., upon *discussion* he ceases to be a scientist. When the scientist insists upon *discussion* in a room full of *dialogue* he automatically appears to be argumentative, i.e., unreasonable. "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]." Bloom admitted, in his own words this is the same path his taxonomy took for education. "Certainly the Taxonomy was unproved at the time it was developed and may well be 'unprovable.'" (Benjamin Bloom, *Forty Year Evaluation*) "Whether or not the classification scheme presented in Handbook I: Cognitive Domain is a true taxonomy is still far from clear." (Book 2: *Affective Domain*) "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) [true science is observable and repeatable]." (Book 1: *Cognitive Domain*) It is in *dialogue* that 'change' is initiated and sustained, not in *discussion*, since *discussion* recognizes established commands, rules, facts, and truth, weighing man's observations from them/it, inhibiting or blocking 'change,' i.e., at least rapid 'change.'

PART VIII

"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) When you replace *discussion*, i.e., "rule of law," i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth with "feelings," i.e., *opinions*, i.e., *dialogue* the individual, under God is going to be martyred.

"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') Heraclitus' ideology is the foundation of the stoics.

Once "social worth," i.e., what is "good" for society, i.e., for "the group," i.e., for those in power (the facilitator of 'change') enters the courtroom (the classroom) the individual (born or unborn, elderly, innocent, righteous, i.e., individualism, under God) can receive no fair justice (or protection)—the Magna Carta, American Revolution, and the

Constitution (Bill of Rights) 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 of a crime ("*repressing*" the criminal, i.e., getting in the way of his *lusts*) and the perpetrator of the crime becomes the victim (not being able to become his *self*, i.e., *self actualized*, being "*repressed*" by the victim, i.e., by traditional society), making the victim the perpetrator of a crime against society, i.e., against "*the group*," i.e., against *lust*. This is the terrorism that is going on in the "*group grade*" classroom, with the individual student, holding onto his parent's/God's position having to be either converted (sell his soul to the approval of "*the group*"), silenced (to be silent is to consent, in the mind of the perpetrators, i.e., "*the group*"), censored, or removed (martyred). Rejection is one of the most painful experiences in life. This is reflected in the 'change' of "policy" in the Supreme Court, 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) The Supreme Court, rejecting Christ, embraced Karl Marx. The Court, as with the "*group grade*" classroom became Marxist when it rejected "*rule of law*," i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., individualism under God, replacing it with the "*feelings*," i.e., the *lusts*, i.e., the *self interests* of the socialists, i.e., "*the group*."

PART IX

*"Thinking through the process it is dialectically faulty to start with the negative, with anxiety [with the father's/Father's authority, i.e., with having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., with being held accountable for being wrong, disobeying, sinning]. The problem is to name the dynamic factor provoking anxiety to emerge [the father's/Father's authority coming between the child and the object he is lusting after, taking or threatening to take it away]. Anxiety is a function of spontaneity [reaction of hate and violence toward the restrainer, i.e., toward the person(s) taking the object of lust away (forever)]. Spontaneity can be defined as the adequate response to a new situation, or the novel response to an old situation. With decrease of spontaneity anxiety increases. With entire lose of spontaneity anxiety reaches its maximum, the point of panic [when the child is total focused on the object of his lust and fears it being taken away from him, i.e., losing it forever he is primed to act, i.e., to attack (at all cost, i.e., without considering the cost)]." ([J. L. Moreno](#), *Who Shall Survive*)*

If I, through *dialogue* find out what you are *lusting* after and offer to help you to attain it, I "own" you.

"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)

'Change' (Marxism) is based upon the heart of man, *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, hating restraint, i.e., hating the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way, i.e., for inhibiting or blocking (preventing) 'change.' Therefore laws must be subject to what the facilitator of 'change' perceives (feels) the *"the people's"* needs ("felt" needs, i.e., *lusts*) to be, i.e., what his needs ("felt" needs, i.e., *lusts*) are.

"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.

All children are "philosophers" or potential "philosophers," thinking about how the world "ought" to be ('justifying' and supporting their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating), hating restraint, i.e., hating the world that "Is," for getting in the way. *"The problem"* comes (according to the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' having rejected the world that "Is," i.e., the world of parental restraint, i.e., the father's/Father's authority) when children become parents themselves they force their children to do right and not wrong according to how they think the world "ought" to be, preventing their children from becoming their *self*, i.e., of the world only, i.e., preventing 'change.'

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 [who are 'defenders'

or resisters of 'change']. " (Ronald Havelock, *A Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education*)

"During the period of innovation [of change], 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](#)) *Lust* blinds you to where it is really taking you, to what it will cost you in the end, i.e., the price you will pay with your soul.

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, i.e., change has taken place. 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. Frogs should not sit in pots of water with fire under them.

*"In psychology, Freud and his followers have presented convincing arguments that the id [the child's impulses and urges of the 'moment'], man's basic and unconscious nature, is primarily made up of instincts which would, if permitted expression, result in incest, murder, and other crimes. The whole problem of therapy, as seen by this group, is how to hold these untamed forces in check in a wholesome and constructive manner [requiring a police state, i.e., sight based management since the guilty conscience (a product of the father's/Father's authority) for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after *DE* is not present to put a check on person's impulses and urges], rather than in the costly fashion of the neurotic [having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of the person's *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world stimulates]." (Rogers)*

It is therefore, in the use of "*crime, disorder, and fear of crime*" that the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the transformational Marxist (as a therapist) is able to initiate and sustain control over "*the people*," i.e., over the citizens by bringing them together as one, putting aside their differences, letting him become the authority over "*the geographic community*," i.e., over their homes, schools, property, and businesses.

*"The community of interest generated by crime, disorder, and fear of crime becomes the goal to allow the community policing officer an entree into the geographic community." (Trojanowicz, Dr. Robert, *The meaning of "Community" [Communism] in Community Policing*)*

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 respondent 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. Without the "help" (the *seduction, deception, and manipulation*) of the facilitator of 'change' the next generation of children, when they have children of their own will, like their parents *tell* their children to do right and not wrong according to their (the parent's) commands, rules, facts, and truth, maintaining the father's/Father's authority in society which they, as children resented (hated)—for getting in the way of their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world was stimulating. The difference between the child and the father is the father knows the cost of being wrong, the child, *lusting* after *DE* does not. The facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the psychotherapist perceives his or her *self* as being the personification of "*the people*," i.e., the personification of the children, who, like him *lust* after *DE*, hating restraint, takes the role of the parent in order to 'liberate' the children from the father's/Father's authority, not only in their thoughts but also in their actions, so he or she (the facilitator of 'change') can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can *lust* after *DE* without having a *guilty conscience*, with the children's, i.e., "*the group's*," i.e., "*the people's*" *affirmation*.

"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)

*". . . 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." (Bennis, *The Temporary Society*)*

The "educator," i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the group psychotherapist 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 student's love of pleasure and hate of restraint, 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.

PART X

"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

People think that the "Berlin Wall" came down because Communism was defeated. It came down because Communism had succeeded, having taken over education via the dialectic process, i.e., the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process, preparing the next generation to think and act like Karl Marx, *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*DE*) that the world stimulates, hating restraint, i.e., removing (*negating*) anyone who gets in their way, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous without having a *guilty conscience* (which is engendered via the father's/Father's authority). Every student today is trained in applying Abraham Maslow's "*Hierarchy of 'felt' needs*" and Rogerian psychology, i.e., Marxism in their lives. Both of whom, like Karl Marx rejected the father's/Father's authority.

"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." (Maslow, Journals)

"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 [subject to 'change']." (Michael Ray in Abraham Maslow, Maslow on Management)

"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)

"Concerning politics in North America the need of a firm cohesion is not yet present..." "For a state to become a state it is necessary that the citizen cannot continually think of emigrating, but that the class of cultivators, no longer able to push to the outside, presses upon itself and is gathered into cities and urban

professions. ... for a real state and a real government only develop when there is a difference of classes, when riches and poverty become very large and a situation arises where a great number of people can no longer satisfy its needs in the accustomed way." "But America does not yet approach this tension . . ." (Georg Hegel in Carl Friedrich, *The Philosophy of Hegel*) Written by Hegel thirty years after America became a nation.

While speaking of [*Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*](#), the Marxist-Maoist world they create depends upon slave camps to support their habits (socialism is not successful until no one can escape). Entertain them with *lust* and they will not rebel. Prevent them from hearing the truth (control the media and all means of communication) at all cost. Above all the "middle-class" where children are taught to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (in order to get ahead) must be negated for the peace of mind of the socialist, so he can *lust* without having someone 'judgmental' (prejudiced) in his face.

"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." (Adorno)

"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" today) as a result of this ideology.

"All individuals (organisms) exist in a continually changing world of experience (phenomenal field) of which they are the center." (Carl Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy)

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

Man becomes god as he *negates* God in his thoughts, 'justifying' his carnal thoughts and actions, making himself subject to the world that stimulates pleasure (and anyone manipulating it and therefore him in order to satisfy their own *lusts*). The laws of nature when applied to man's heart can only 'justify' his *lust* for pleasure and his hatred toward restraint.

"You make me feel wicked. You make me feel like I'm doing something wicked."
Response from a kindergarten teacher after only two minutes into explaining

"Bloom's Taxonomies." WOW!!! I was not ready for that response (much less that soon). I was just getting started. Needless to say she walked away, not wanting to hear any more, i.e., to repent and turn from her wicked ways. "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

"Behavior science," i.e., Marxism, i.e., Maoism has taken over America. Question the use of psychology in the "Church" today and you will quickly discover how Marxist it has become (even though it uses the name of the Son, i.e., the Lord Jesus Christ—Matthew 7:22, 23). When you are concerned about your children's social life, instead of where they will spend eternity, you are a socialist. The parable of the soils, i.e., the rocks is, you can go no deeper into the Word of God than your "friends" (relationship with others) will allow you. Relationship is based upon your children's "feelings," i.e., *lusts* that they have in common with other children. *"Building relationship upon self interest"* is the hallmark of Marxism, i.e., Socialism, i.e., Maoism. Fellowship is based upon that which (He who) is external to them, which (who) they have accepted as truth. In the garden, with the "help" of the master facilitator of 'change' *lust* and human relationship became the focus of life. At the cross, i.e., in Christ Jesus the Father's authority, i.e., fellowship is restored. *"for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ."* Galatians 1:10

"Ye do the deeds of your father." "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." John 8:41, 44

*"Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds;" Colossians 3:9 ;The Greek word for deeds is *praxis*. *Praxis* is doing what you want, i.e., *lusting* after *DE* without having a *guilty conscience*., i.e., without having any *sense* of accountability (before God) for your thoughts and actions. The imagination of the heart, unrestrained by the father's/Father's authority is evil.*

"And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." "... the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth;" Genesis 6:5; 8:21

"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

"The philosophy of praxis is the absolute secularization of thought, an absolute humanism of history." (Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks)

The name for the national test for teachers is *Praxis*, where doing what God *tells* you, i.e., what you KNOW from being *told* is absent, i.e., where you (and others) will spend eternity, according to the Word of God, i.e., *"the Father and the Son"* is not include. The objective of *praxis* is to solve life's problems without depending (or heavily depending) upon solutions learned in the past, thus evaluating the person's ability to "Reason," i.e., to innovate, i.e., to readily adapt to 'change' in a novel situation (for a believer, not to seek God's help in resolving life's problems, at least not to make it public, influencing others to think the same way). If the questions are asked "right" the believer will not realize that all his answers are Godless, i.e., are of the world only, i.e., the Lord is not included or dependent upon in the solution (there is nowhere to "fit" Him in—comfortably, i.e., without being contentious, i.e., argumentatively, i.e., "pushy," i.e., divisive).

"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." Matthew 10:32, 33

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

The role of the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the psychotherapist, i.e., the Marxist is to establish *lust over* and therefore against their having to do the father's/Father's will. Money plays a role as money to the Marxist is stored up pleasure, being withheld from him (the lazy, incompetent, and violent) because he will not do the father's/Father's will. The only resolution is total control of money so the Marxist can spend it (in the name of *"the people's"*) on his *lusts* without restraint, i.e., without being *told* right from wrong, without having to manually work (by the sweat of his brow) himself, i.e., *"the people"* will work for him, keeping him in power since he 'justifies' their *lusts*. Sounding more like Karl Marx than Karl Marx himself, who was not yet born, Hegel wrote:

"On account of the absolute and natural oneness of the husband, the wife, and the child [their lust for pleasure and their hate of restraint, what they all have in common—which is the basis of common-ism], where there is no antithesis [no "top-down," right-wrong way of thinking and acting] of person to person or of subject to object [everything is subject to the flesh, i.e., to lust and the world that stimulates it, i.e., to the Marxist (the facilitator of 'change') who, making this statement 'justifies' lust], 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)

This "Reasoning" follows in the footsteps of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (*Discourse on Inequality*) who wrote, "*The fruits of the earth [lusts] belong to us all [to the children, i.e., to Rousseau, et al, i.e., to the facilitator of 'change'], and the earth itself to nobody [in other words the father/Father, i.e., the individual under God/God has no right of authority],*" in defiance to God, i.e., "*The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof.*" In this way your spouse, your children, your property, your business, even you (your soul) belongs to Rousseau, Hegel, Marx, ... Mao, i.e., the facilitator of 'change.' Like the woman and Adam in the garden in Eden, what they see they "own," to be used for their pleasure, i.e., to satisfy their *lusts*, *negating* you if you get in their way, i.e., if you disagree. While you might work by "the sweat of your brow," Mr. Rousseau and his friends (who have never worked a day of their lives "by the sweat of his brow") can pick fruit off your tree, in the name of "*the people*" and walk away eating it, saying, "*It belongs to us all.*" You dare not complain. After all, in their mind you are working for "*the people*," i.e., for them, to satisfy "*the people's*," i.e., their *lusts*. As in the garden in Eden, all that they see belongs to them, to satisfy their *lusts*.

"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)

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

This is why I call "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" "*Secularized Satanism. Intellectualized witchcraft,*" through the use of *dialogue*, i.e., psychology removing the Word of God from the students' thoughts, replacing it with their *lusts*, 'justifying' their carnal actions. Calling all it can not understand "*phenomena*," this is all psychology, can do.

"For many generations we have bowed our necks to the yoke of the conviction of sin. We have swallowed all manner of poisonous certainties fed us by our parents, our Sunday and day care school teachers, our politicians, our priests, our newspapers, and others in a vested interest in controlling us." "Thou shalt not become as gods, knowing good and evil,' good and evil with which to keep children under control, with which to prevent free thinking, with which to impose local [familial] and national loyalties, and with which to blind children to their glorious intellectual heritage." "The mature person ... has the qualities of adaptability and compromise." "Is the family, the school, or the church teaching in that direction?" "The re-interpretation and eventually eradication of the concept of right and wrong which has been the basis of child training, the substitution of intelligent and rational thinking for faith in the certainty of the old people, these are the belated objectives of practically all effective psychotherapy." "Would it not be sensible to stop imposing our local prejudices and faiths on children and give them all sides of every question

so that in their own good time they may have the ability to size things up, and make their own decisions." "If the race is to be freed from its crippling burden of good and evil it must be psychiatrists who take the original responsibility." "Psychiatry must now decide what is to be the immediate future of the human race. No one else can." (G. B. Chisholm, Reestablishment of Peacetime Society: The Responsibility of Psychiatry)

Psychology and Marxism are one and the same, i.e., Maoism, 'justifying' man's carnal nature, establishing *lust over* and therefore *against* the father's/Father's authority, with Mao at the helm. The "educator" (the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Maoist) 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 restraint, 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.

"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

"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." "And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." 1 John 2:15, 18

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, i.e., no established aka absolute command, rule, facts, or truth to be accepted as is, by faith and obeyed), 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., can "lust" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, 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, Harken 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, capitulate 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 2022