

Discussion - Dialogue

([pdf format](#))

by

Dean Gotcher

([personal note regarding the following.](#))

"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

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

Discussion is different than ***dialogue***. *Discussion* deals with you doing or being right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth—making you subject to a "higher authority," i.e., to [the father's/Father's authority](#). *Dialogue* deals with your (and others) "feelings" of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world—making you subject to [the carnal nature of the child](#), i.e., to your carnal desires ("self interests") of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world, thereby making you subject to [whoever is manipulating the situation](#), i.e., your world.

Discussion ties you to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to doing/being right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. *Dialogue* ties you to your "self" and the world which stimulates your carnal desires, i.e., your "felt needs" of the 'moment.'

You have to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline* your "self" in a *discussion*—in order to do right and not wrong (be right and not wrong) according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. You have to suspend any command, rule, fact, or truth that gets in the way of *dialogue*, as upon a cross in order to "actualize" your "self interest," i.e., what you have been *dialoguing* with your "self" about—*esteeming* your "self," i.e., 'justifying' your "self" in the process.

You *discuss* your *position* (established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., "I know"), trying to persuade others of the truth of your position—in order for them (and you) to be/do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. You *dialogue* your *opinion* (your "feelings," i.e., "I think"), trying to "build relationship" (find common ground) with others based upon common "self interests"—in order to be ***affirmed*** ('justified') by them, thereby ***affirming*** ('justifying') them, i.e., their carnal nature.

What is missing in *discussion*, but is present in *dialogue*, is your effort ('drive') to 'justify' your carnal desires of the 'moment,' i.e., your "self," i.e., your "self interest" of the 'moment' which is being stimulated by the world, i.e., by the situation, which includes those you are *dialoging* with—desiring their ***affirmation***—willing to exclude, ignore, or attack any command, rule, fact, or truth that gets in the way of initiating or sustaining the "relationship." In *dialogue*, if you 'like' somebody (want their ***affirmation***—of your "self interest") you will exclude, ignore, or attack any command, rule, fact, or truth that can get in the way of (prevents, i.e., inhibits or blocks) the "relationship." If you do not 'like' somebody you will accept and/or give any command, rule, fact, or truth (real or imagined, true or false, no matter how small) to 'justify' your dislike (rejection) of them.

In *discussion* there is authority directing your steps, i.e., holding you accountable to doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. In *dialogue* there is only your carnal desires of the 'moment' and the world which stimulates them (imagined or real) directing your steps—which includes your desire for the approval from others, **affirming** your "*self*," i.e., **affirming** your "*self interest*," i.e., **affirming** your carnal desires of the 'moment'—which is 'like' not only intoxicating and addictive but possessive as well).

In *discussion* **knowing** is from being *told* (dealing with the soul) requiring faith in the one *preaching, teaching, and discussing* commands, rules, facts, and truth, making communication (reasoning) subject to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., making doing (or being) right and not wrong (according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) the objective of life. In *dialogue* **knowing** is from your own *experience*, i.e., "*experiencing*" for your "*self*," dealing with the flesh and the world which stimulates it (requiring sight), making communication (reasoning) subject to your "*feelings*" of the 'moment,' i.e., making "right" whatever/whoever makes you "*feel good*" (like god, i.e., "*good*," i.e., right or righteous in your own eyes, i.e., 'justified' in your "*self*") and "wrong" whatever/whoever makes you "*feel bad*" (not like god, i.e., not "*good*," i.e., not right or righteous in your own eyes, i.e., *guilty* for being wrong, disobeying, sinning), i.e., making pleasure the 'drive' of life and the "*building or relationship upon common self interest*" the 'purpose,' i.e., the objective of life. What is present in *discussion* is missing (negated) in *dialogue*.

"The philosopher Hegel said that truth is not found in the thesis nor the antithesis but in an emerging synthesis which reconciles the two." (Martin Luther King Jr. *Strength to Love*)
Reconciliation is therefore between the flesh and the world, i.e., man and his nature, i.e., man and mankind not between the creator and the created, i.e., God and man. In *discussion* the child is reconciled to the father's/Father's authority. In *dialogue* the father is "reconciled" to the child's carnal nature, *negating* the father's/Father's authority.

There is no *synthesis* in *discussion*, only duality (right and wrong). There is *synthesis* in *dialogue*, with "*self*," i.e., the flesh (the child's carnal desires) and the world (which stimulates them) becoming at-one-with one another (at peace i.e., in harmony with one another—called *consensus/affirmation*).

In *discussion* there is a guilty conscience for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning. In *dialogue* there is no *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, i.e., for disobeying, sinning against authority, i.e., for questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking authority and its established commands, rules, facts, and truth.

When it comes to doing right and not wrong, *dialogue* (the child's "*Why?*" in response to a command, rule, fact, or truth that gets in the way of his carnal desire, i.e. his "*self interest*" of the 'moment') is the child's effort to 'liberate' his "*self*" from authority. When it comes to doing right and not wrong (according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) *dialogue* is the child's effort to 'justify' his doing wrong, disobeying, sinning. When it comes to doing right and not wrong, *dialogue* is the child's effort to 'justify' his questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding attacking authority—doing so without having a *guilty conscience* (since there is no established command, rule, fact, or truth, i.e., no "*can not*," "*must not*," "*Thou shalt not*" in *dialogue*—other than *dialogue* itself, i.e., the child's carnal desires, i.e., his "*self interest*" of the 'moment' which is being stimulated by the world, i.e., by nature, i.e., by the situation and anyone manipulating it, i.e., *manipulating* him). In a dialectic world (a world of *dialogue*) it is a "crime" to prevent, i.e., inhibit or block a child from *dialoguing* with his "*self*," others, and the world (when it comes to doing or being right and not wrong) since "right" and "wrong" are established upon the child's carnal "*feelings*," i.e., the child's carnal nature, i.e., the child's "*self interest*" of the 'moment' which is being stimulated by the world, i.e., by the

In dialogue there is only a so called "*super-ego*," which makes the *conscience* subject to the child's carnal desires of the 'moment,' the world (situation) stimulating them, and whoever is *manipulating* it.

situation, and anyone *manipulating* it, thereby *manipulating* the child. You will be "wrong" (and therefore punished) for doing so, i.e., for taking the *manipulators* control over the child (and therefore all that goes along with the child) away from him.

In *discussion* established commands, rules, facts, and truth have to be included in determining the outcome—*deductive reasoning* (reasoning from established commands, rules, facts, and truth). In *dialogue*, established commands, rules, facts, and truth have to be excluded (rejected, i.e., "*suspended*," as upon a cross) when they get in the way of "*feelings*," i.e. the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' desired—*inductive reasoning* (reasoning from "*feelings*," i.e., from "*sensuous needs*" and "*sense perception*," i.e., from "*sense experience*," i.e., from your "*self*"). In *dialogue* established commands, rules, facts, and truth must be scarified upon the alter of "*self interest*" if and when they get in the way of *dialogue*, i.e., "*feelings*," i.e., "*self interest*."

In *discussion* we have to *humble, deny, die to, discipline, control* our "*self*" in order to be or do right (be justified) and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., authority. In *dialogue* we 'justify' our "*self*," i.e., 'justify' our carnal desires ("*lusts*") of the 'moment,' i.e., 'justify' our "*self interest*" which the world stimulates—with others *affirming* us, i.e., *affirming* our carnal desires ("*lusts*") of the 'moment,' i.e., *affirming* our "*self interest*" which the world stimulates, thereby *affirming* their "*self*," i.e., *affirming* their carnal desires ("*lusts*") of the 'moment,' i.e., *affirming* their "*self interest*" which the world stimulates, thereby making the "*esteeming*" of "*self*," i.e., "*the pride of life*," i.e., only that which is "*of and for self*" and the world the 'drive' and 'purpose' of life.

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

"The heart is deceitful above all things [thinking pleasure is the standard for "*good*" instead of doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., having to set aside pleasure, i.e., having to *humble, deny, die to "self*" in order (as in "old" world order) to do the father's/Father's will, i.e., in order to do right and not wrong according the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth], **and desperately wicked** [hating the father's/Father's authority which "*gets in the way*," i.e. which prevents, i.e., inhibits or blocks it from enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment'—which the world stimulates]: **who can know it?"** Jeremiah 17:9 You, *dialoguing* with your "*self*," i.e., 'justifying' your "*self*," i.e., 'justifying' your love of pleasure, i.e., your "*self interest*" can not see your [hatred](#) toward the father/Father as being *evil* or "**wicked**" because your love of "*self*," i.e., your love of ("*lust*" for) pleasure, i.e., your "*self interest*"—which the world stimulates—is "*in the way*," blinding you to the truth of the *deceitfulness* and *wickedness* of your heart.

"Laws must not fetter human life [inhibit or block the child's/man's carnal desires, i.e. pleasures, "*lusts*," enjoyments of the 'moment,' i.e., "*human nature*"; **but yield to it; they must change as the needs and capacities** [carnal desires and abilities, i.e., "*self interest*"] **of the people** [i.e., the "*self interest*" of those in power making decisions for "*the people*"] **change."** (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*)

If you *dialogue* your *position*, you loose your *position*. Your *position* becomes an *opinion*, i.e., "*I think I know*," making commands, rules, facts, and truth subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to your carnal "*feelings*" (desires, i.e., "*lusts*") of the 'moment' which the world is stimulating, making you subject

to whoever is *manipulating* it/them, thereby [manipulating you](#). Since in *dialogue*, unlike *discussion*, you have no absolute *position*, everything is subject to 'change,' i.e., there is no accountability for doing things "wrong"—you are only "accountable" for having done things "*badly*," which is not a crime, i.e., not punishable, requiring you to be "re-mediated" (if anything is done to you at all) in order for you to do things "better" (whatever that means?) the next time. In *dialogue* everything becomes subjective, i.e., subject to the "*feelings*" of everyone involved in the 'moment,' making 'judgment' or 'punishment' subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to the "*feelings*" (*opinion*) of both the victim **and the perpetrator**—which pretty much *negates* the victims "*feelings*" in the decision since his "*feelings*" are subject to his *position*, which has no true relevance in *dialogue*.

"Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state ["to best suit" the "self interest" of those in power making decisions]." (R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, *Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law*)

An "open ended," i.e., "*We can talk about anything*," "non-directive," "*I am not going to tell you what you have to say*" i.e., "*what is right or wrong*" environment is a *dialogue* environment. A *dialogue* environment *negates* a *discussion* environment (which is not "open ended," "non-directive") since in a *discussion* environment there is a drive toward arriving at an absolute right and not wrong (finite) answer based upon facts and truth—whether understood at the time (the objective being to do thing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth). It is in *dialogue* that 'change,' i.e., 'liberation' from established commands, rules, facts, and truth (that get in the way of the persons carnal desires of the 'moment,' which the world is stimulating) can take place.

***"The philosophers* [those who are dissatisfied with how the world "*is*," i.e., subject to authority (as a child is subject to the father's authority, as man is to God's), thinking about how it "*ought*" to be, i.e., satisfying their carnal desires ("*lusts*") of the 'moment' instead] **have only interpreted the world in different ways** [establishing, i.e., *preaching* and *teaching* their "*opinion*" as the only right way, thus inhibiting or blocking others from enjoying the carnal pleasures ("*lusts*") of the 'moment' which they desire], **the objective however, is change** [*dialogue*]."*"* (Karl Marx, *Feuerbach Thesis #11*)**

Which method of communication (reasoning) a person uses in order to make a decision—*discussion* or *dialogue*—directly affects the outcome. If the *objective* is to hold onto traditions, customs, doctrine, local control, nationalism, i.e., "*rule of law*," etc., i.e., faith in God (having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, needing to have faith in, repent, and obey) then *discussion* is the means to the desired outcome (along with *preaching* commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaching* facts and truth to be accepted as is, i.e., by faith—at least at first, until the facts and truth are understood—*rewarding* for obeying and doing things right, *chastening* for disobeying and/or doing things wrong, and *casting out* for questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking authority). But if the *objective* is socialism, humanism, universalism, globalism, communism, etc., (*communitization*, *democratization*, *synergism*, *communitarianism*, etc., i.e., *consensus*) then *dialogue* is the means to the desired outcome (along with the use of intimidation and/or outright force, i.e., removal of any resistance which does not co-operate with or participate in 'change,' thereby *negating* traditions, customs, doctrine, local control, nationalism, i.e., "*rule of law*," etc., i.e., faith in God, i.e., having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, needing to have faith in, repent before, and obey God). In *discussion* you are accountable to the creator, i.e., to His established commands and truth as well as the rules and facts of the laws of nature which He created. In *dialogue* you are the 'creator' of a world of your own 'liking,' which is subject to your carnal desires of the 'moment,' i.e., "*self interest*" which it stimulates.

In *dialogue* there is no "negative," i.e., no "***Thou shalt not,***" i.e., no established command, rule, fact, or truth, i.e., no "***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.***" only the "positive," i.e., only 'liberation' from the fear of judgment and damnation for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., only "***And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die:***" (Genesis 2:17; 3:4) Have you noticed that in psychology the agenda is to "encourage" people to be "positive," i.e., to *dialogue*, i.e., to share with one another their "*feelings,*" i.e., their carnal desires ("*lusts*") of the 'moment' which the world (current situation) is stimulating and not to be "negative"—insisting upon everyone being (doing) right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. This is why Norman O. Brown and Herbert Marcuse—who, explaining Sigmund Freud's ideology (psychology)—could write: "***To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit;***" "***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.'***" ([Norman O. Brown](#), *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*; [Herbert Marcuse](#), *Eros and Civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*) As Brown explained (Sigmund Freud's psychology, i.e., the reconciliation of man with his carnal nature and the world which stimulates it): "***The entry into Freud cannot avoid being a plunge into a strange world and a strange language—a world of sick men,It is a shattering experience for anyone seriously committed to the Western traditions of morality and rationality [faith in God] to take a steadfast, unflinching look at what Freud has to say.***" (Brown)

"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

"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;" "Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." Romans 1:28, 32

It is imperative that you understand the difference between *discussion* and *dialogue* if you are to understand the 'change' that is taking place in the world around you today. Understanding the difference between *discussion* (commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., "*I know,*" where reasoning is subject to commands, rules, facts, and truth which you have been taught, where the emphasis is upon being/doing right and not wrong) and *dialogue* ("*feelings,*" i.e., "*I think,*" where 'reasoning' is subject to your "*feelings,*" i.e., your carnal desires of the 'moment,' where the emphasis is upon getting what you *want*, i.e., "*building relationship*" with "*self,*" others, and the world) is key to understanding the difference between the "old" world order and the "new," i.e., the difference between the traditional family (with [the father's/Father's authority](#) in control—resulting in children having a [guilty conscience](#) when they do wrong, disobey, sin) and the "*millennial*" family (with [the children of disobedience](#), i.e., the [psychologist](#), i.e., the "*behavior scientist,*" i.e., the [group psychotherapist](#), i.e., the [facilitator of 'change.'](#) i.e., the [Transformational Marxist](#) in control—all being the same in [method](#) or [formula](#)), resulting in [the carnal nature of the child ruling the world](#)—making facts and truth subject to "*feelings,*" i.e., to "*sense experience*" only, i.e., *subjective*, resulting in children doing wrong, disobeying, sinning ("*lusting*") without having a *guilty conscience*. Look at those in government, in education, in business, in entertainment, in the media, and even in ministry today, thinking and acting like spoiled, sulking, hateful, vindictive, bullying, [calculating](#), rebellious children when they do not or can not have their way, thinking they can do what they want, when they want, i.e., do wrong, disobey,

sin ("**lust**") with impunity, wanting you to 'justify' (**affirm**) them (and their carnal nature) or get out of the way.

"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

"For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." Galatians 1:10

In a *discussion* you use established commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to justify your *position*. In *dialogue* you use your (and others) "*feelings*" of the moment' in order to 'justify' your "*self*." In *discussion* truth is objective, i.e., external to you—making you subject to knowing the truth. In *dialogue* truth is subjective, i.e., subject to your carnal "*feelings*" (desires, i.e., "**lusts**") of the 'moment' (and the world stimulating them)—making you subject to anyone *manipulating* them (your "*feelings*") thereby *manipulating* you. In a *discussion* right and wrong are subject to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. In *dialogue* right and wrong are subject to your carnal desires of the 'moment'—with "right" being pleasure and "wrong" being missing out on pleasure.

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

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

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

Simply put, when you *discuss* (*whatever*) with your "*self*" you are evaluating the situation from established commands, rules, facts, and truth, wanting to do (*whatever you are doing*) right and not wrong. When you *dialogue* with your "*self*" you are 'creating' (in your mind) a world of your own 'liking' (*imagination*), a world subject to your "*feelings*," i.e., your desire to enjoy and/or augment the carnal pleasures of the 'moment,' which the world is stimulating, and your desire to avoid and/or attenuate pain, including the pain which comes with missing out on pleasure. "*Rule of law*" depends upon *discussion*. "*Rule of lawfulness*" depends upon *dialogue*. Merging the two causes confusion (*cognitive dissonance*—where a person is caught between his belief and his "*feelings*" of the 'moment'), engendering tension and conflict between those insisting upon doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth and those insisting upon "*feelings 'good'*" about their "*self*," i.e., getting *what they want, when they want*, until one or the other gains predominance, i.e., bringing *dialogue* into a *discussion* moves the conversation (communication) toward the "*building of relationships*" resulting in any established command, rule, fact, or truth that gets in the way causing tension and conflict, while bringing *discussion* into a *dialogue* moves the conversation to a concern about being right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, or truth, with the potential of "*feelings*" being "*hurt*," i.e., "*relationships*" being "*frayed*" or broken—due to differences in accepted/rejected commands, rules, facts, or truth. *Discussing "personal-social"* issues is in actuality *dialogue*. Capitalism ("*capitulation*" of your "*self*," i.e., your "*feelings*" or desires of the 'moment,' i.e., your "*self interest*" in order to do the job right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) depends upon the former, i.e., upon *discussion*. *Socialism* (suspending commands, rules, facts, and truth, as upon a cross when they get in

the way of your "feelings" in order to "build relationship with others based upon common self interest"—common-ism) depends upon the latter, i.e., upon *dialogue*.

A brief overview of the difference between *discussion* and *dialogue*:

Discussion ties you to doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., to the father's/Father's authority, having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline* your "self" in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, having to do the father's/Father's will in order (as in "old" world order) to do/be right (*righteousness*), engendering a *guilty conscience* in you when we do wrong, disobey, sin. *Dialogue*, on the other hand, ties you to your "feelings," i.e., to your "sense experience," i.e., to the carnal nature of the child (*sensuousness*) and the world which stimulates it, 'justifying' (*esteeming*) your "self" (your "self interest"), i.e., your lusting" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (dopamine emancipation) which the world stimulates, thus 'justifying' your dissatisfaction with, resentment toward, hatred of restraint, i.e., of the father's/Father's authority which gets in the way.

If you start and stay with *discussion* you end up with the father's/Father's authority. If you start and stay with *dialogue* you end up with the child's carnal nature, i.e., "**all that is of the world.**" It is also true that if you start with *dialogue* but move to *discussion* you will end up with the father's/Father's authority. In like fashion, if you start with *discussion* but move to *dialogue* you end up with the child's carnal nature, i.e., "**all that is of the world.**"

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

Since there is no "*Thou shalt not*" (accountability to the father's/Father's authority) in *dialogue* there is no *negation* (of the child's carnal nature) in *dialogue*. This is why those of the "new" world order choose *dialogue*, i.e., the child's carnal nature, i.e., "**all that is of the world**" over and therefore against the "old" world order, i.e., *discussion*, i.e., the father's/Father's authority (since it is in *dialogue* the child's carnal nature is 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., from accountability, i.e., from judgment and condemnation for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning).

"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's/Father's authority, i.e., 'liberated' from established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of his carnal desires of the 'moment,' that the world is stimulating, so he can be his "self" again, as he was before the father's/Father's first command, rule, fact, and truth came into his life, of and for the world only]." (Georg Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*)

Anyone who, through *dialogue*, comes between the parents and their children, the employer and his employees, the constituents and their representative, God and man, 'liberates' the children from the parent's authority, the employees from the employer's authority, the representative from their constituent's authority, man from God's authority, no matter what "good" intentions they might have had in mind, making the child's, the employee's, the representative's, man's "feelings," i.e., "self interests" from then on the foundation from which to determine right from wrong. With pleasure, i.e., "self interest" being "right," anyone getting in the way of their "self interest," i.e., their parent's, their employer's, their constituent's, God's *position* "wrong," making their authority irrelevant (the "problem").

". . . any intervention between parent and child tend to produce familial democracy [liberation' of the child's carnal nature from the parent's authority] **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, regardless of whatever countermeasures may be taken." ([Warren Bennis](#), *The Temporary Society*)

In *discussion* you are accountable to established laws and their creator (as Jesus responded to his "felt needs," i.e., his physical, emotional, and "social" needs in the temptations in the wilderness, with the Father's authority, i.e., with **"It is written ... "** [Matthew 4:1-11](#), overcoming the **"the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes,"** and **"the pride of life,"** i.e., the child's carnal nature, i.e., the child's love of the carnal pleasures of this life and the world which stimulates them and his hate of the Father's authority which gets in the way, by placing his faith in [the Word of God](#)). In *dialogue* you create the world of your own 'liking,' according to your carnal desires ("**lusts**") of the 'moment,' 'justifying' them (as the women in the garden in Eden, with the "help" of the master facilitator of 'change,' 'justified' her "felt needs," i.e., her physical, emotional, and "social" needs of the moment,' i.e., her **"lust of the flesh," "lust of the eyes,"** and **"pride of life"**—**"and the woman saw ... "** [Genesis 3:1-6](#)). Mixing the two, i.e., bringing *dialogue* into *discussion* (when it comes to doing right and not wrong) only leads to confusion ([cognitive dissonance](#)) resulting in rebellion, anarchy, and revolution—if *dialogue* has its way, i.e., "wins" ("**win-win**")—**negating** the father's/Father's authority ([Hebrews 12:5-11](#)) in your thoughts and actions, called **"theory and practice,"** **negating** the **guilty conscience** ([Romans 7:14-25](#)) for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning in the process—replacing it with the so called **"super-ego"**—so you can do what you want, when you want, i.e., do wrong, disobey, sin ("**lust**," i.e., be **"of and for self"** and the world only) with impunity.

If the child is still *dialoguing* with (talking to) his **"self,"** i.e., 'justifying' his **"self"** after having been chastened by the father/Father (for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning) he has established his carnal desires of the 'moment' (his **"self"**) and the world which stimulates them over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority. It is this *dialogue* that socialists are most interested in gaining access. It is the child's **"dissatisfaction"** with authority where the 'drive' for 'change' resides.

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

"Persons will not come into full partnership in the process until they register dissatisfaction [with authority]." (Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#))

Discussion:

"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. At best this may produce agreement or compromise, but it does not give rise to anything creative." (Bohm and Peat, *Science, Order, and Creativity*) In a *discussion*, while (through the use of persuasion) positions on issues might

change, respect for authority (doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) remains in place.

Discussion is reasoning from established commands, rules, facts, and truth in order (as in "old" world order) to be or do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth—using [deductive reasoning](#), i.e., reasoning (evaluating life, i.e., thoughts and actions) from established commands, rules, facts, and truth. You make right and wrong subject to established commands, rules, facts, and truth in a *discussion*. There is a sense of accountability and a fear of judgment (*guilty conscience*) for being or doing wrong in a *discussion*. *Discussion* is a key element of the father's/Father's authority—[the tyrannical father refuses to use it, the benevolent father uses it](#). The father's/Father's authority system consists of 1) *preaching* commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaching* facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith, *discussing* any questions those under authority might have, at the one in authorities *discretion* (providing there is time, those under authority are able to understand, and they are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking authority), 2) *blessing* or rewarding those who obey and do things right, 3) correcting, reproving, *chastening* those who do wrong and/or disobey, and 4) *casting out* or expelling any who questions, challenges, defies, disregards, attacks authority—this is the same pattern of traditional education. The more "self" seeking, i.e., like a child the father becomes ("*lusting*" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' which the world stimulates) the more *tyrannical* he becomes, demanding his way without any *discussion*—refusing to admit he is wrong, when he is wrong (refusing to accept or admit that he is accountable to a higher authority, i.e., to God, the Heavenly Father). In *discussion*, while there may be differing positions, there is only one right one, the objective being to know it. In *dialogue*, on the other hand, there is no one right answer (position) since "*feelings*" are ever 'changing' according to the 'changing' situations of life, i.e., the carnal desires of the 'moment' which are being stimulated the world. The only constant in dialogue is what everyone has in common, their desire for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' which the world is stimulating, i.e., their "*self interest*" of the 'moment,' which is subject to 'change.'

Dialogue:

"A Dialogue is essentially a conversation between equals." "The purpose of dialogue is to reveal the incoherence in our thought [in our established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., belief which gets in the way of our carnal desires of the 'moment'—which are being stimulated by the world]... [dialogue engenders] **genuine and creative collective consciousness** [where we 'discover' and then "*building relationship*" with others based upon what we have in common with them (and they have in common with us), i.e., our (their) love of pleasure, i.e., our (their) desire to enjoy the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (which the world stimulates) and our (their) hate of restraint, i.e., hate of the father's/Father's authority which gets in the way of our (their) desires, i.e., our (their) "*self interest*"."] **"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*)

"The philosophy of praxis [dialogue, i.e., "self" 'justification'] **is the absolute secularization of thought, an absolute humanism of history."** (Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*) In the *praxis* of *dialogue*, all that is external to the child's carnal nature, preventing, i.e., inhibiting or blocking him from becoming his "*self*" is irrational and therefore irrelevant, i.e., of no worth or value. In the *praxis* of *dialogue* only that which is of the world, which stimulates pleasure, has true meaning, i.e., is "**actual.**"

Dialogue requires suspending truth, as upon a cross, in order to continue the *dialogue*, i.e., in order not to hurt someone's "*feelings*"—preventing them from participating in *dialogue* (out of fear of being 'judged,' i.e., rejected). Replacing *discussion* with *dialogue* (or injecting *dialogue* into *discussion*) is the *praxis* of replacing being 'judged' for being wrong (according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) with being 'judged' for inhibiting or blocking (preventing) *dialogue*—being 'judged' for initiating or sustaining the father's/Father's authority (which divides, i.e., 'judges' people for being wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) which inhibits or blocks (prevents) *dialogue*. Once *dialogue*, i.e., "*feelings*" gain control of communication (in establishing policy) anyone insisting upon *discussion*, i.e., commands, rules, facts, and truth will become the source of controversy, i.e., conflict and tension, i.e., will be labeled as being negative, divisive, hateful, intolerant, prejudiced, a "*lower-order-thinker*," maladjusted, not a "*team builder*," "*psychological*," "*mentally ill*," "*in denial*," a sociopath, a Fascist, a Nazi, a racist, neurotic, phobic, unreasonable, irrational, etc., and therefore become irrelevant in the eyes of "*the group*."

"In the dialogic relation of recognizing oneself [love of pleasure and hate of restraint] in the other, they experience the common ground of their existence [they come to a *consensus*, i.e., to a "*feeling*" of "*oneness*" based upon their carnal nature, what they have in common, i.e., "*human nature*," i.e., their "*lust*" for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' which the world stimulates (including the pleasure which comes with being accepted, i.e., *affirmed* by "*the group*," i.e., the "*pride of life*")]." (Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge & Human Interest*, Chapter Three: *The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory*)

There is a consequence in using *dialogue* to come to the truth since it makes us all "equal," making the truth subject to our common carnal nature. In doing so all that we have inherited from above (from the past) is *negated*, making us subject to whoever is in control of (facilitating) the next consensus meeting. **"On account of the absolute and natural oneness of the husband, the wife, and the child [their common "*lusting*" after the carnal pleasures of the world, including (and especially) their desire for *affirmation* from one another], where there is no antithesis [no "*top-down*," "*right-wrong*," "*Mine, not yours*" way of thinking and acting] of person to person or of subject to object, the surplus is not the property of one of them, since their indifference is not a formal or a legal one."** (Georg Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*) In other words your spouse, your children, your property, your business, etc., and even you are not yours but societies, subject to the "*felt needs*" of those in control of (facilitating) the next *consensus* meeting.

Dialogue is 'reasoning' from your "*feelings*" of the 'moment,' i.e., 'justifying' your "*self*," i.e., your carnal desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world, in order (as in "new" world order) to do or get what you want—using *inductive reasoning*. i.e., 'reasoning' (evaluating life, i.e., thoughts and actions) from your own "*sense experience*" (*aufheben*) in order to determine right from wrong. You make right and wrong subject to "*feelings*," i.e., *opinions* in a *dialogue*, with pleasure being "right," i.e., "good" and pain, which includes missing out on pleasure being "wrong," i.e., "bad," i.e., "evil." There is no accountability (to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) and therefore no fear of judgment for being or doing wrong (regarding established commands, rules, facts, and truth) in *dialogue*. *Dialogue* is a key element of the child's carnal nature, where the child 'justifies' his "*self*," i.e., 'justifies' his love of pleasure and hate of restraint (what all children have in common). The "*super-ego*," which is *antithetical* to the *guilty conscience* (doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) is subject to the child's "*feelings*," i.e., to the child's carnal desires and dissatisfactions of the past as well as those he is experiencing in the present.

"Without exception, patients [children/students] 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 where children are subject to their father's/Father's authority]." **"What better way to help the patient [the child/the student] 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 [to the [psychologist](#), i.e., the [group psychotherapist](#), i.e., the [facilitator of 'change'](#), i.e., the [Transformational Marxist](#) (all being the same in [method](#) or [formula](#), i.e., [paradigm](#), i.e., way of thinking and acting)]?"** **The therapist is the living personification of all parental images [takes the place of the parent]. Group therapists 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 according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth], they urge the group [the children/the students] to explore and to employ its own resources [dialogue their "feelings," i.e., their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' in the "light" of the situation, i.e., their desire for *affirmation* and fear of being rejected by "the group"]. The group [the children/the students must] feel free to confront the therapist [the "parental image"], who must not only permit, but encourage, such confrontation [rebellion and anarchy]. He [the child/the student] reenacts early family scripts in the group and, if therapy [[washing respect for the father's/Father's authority from the child's/students 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/the student] changes the past by reconstituting it." (Irvin Yalom, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*) This is only possible through *dialogue*—why "therapists," i.e., "human resource" personnel use it to gain control over "the people," for their own pleasure and gain, i.e., for their "self."**

[Discussion vs. Dialogue:](#)

Discussion is formal, partial (top-down, thus recognizing authority), *objective*—reasoning from established commands, rules, facts and truth, wanting to do (or be) right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth—thus respecting, honoring, and obeying authority, resulting in little if any change.

Dialogue, on the other hand, is informal, impartial (not top-down, thus engendering "equality," i.e., excluding/rejecting top-down authority which divides), *subjective*—'reasoning' from "feelings," i.e., from "self," with "right" being what is pleasurable ("*positive*") or what engenders pleasure (that which is of the world stimulating pleasure in the individual), which includes being *affirmed* ("*esteemed*") by others and "wrong" being pain ("*negative*") or what engenders pain, which includes missing out on pleasure because of having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline "self"* in order to do (or be) right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, which includes being judged, condemned, rejected by others for doing (or being) wrong—thus 'justifying' the questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking of authority, resulting in rapid 'change.'

Discussion leads to *confirmation*, i.e., *fellowshipping* based upon established commands, rules, facts, and truth.

Dialogue leads to *consensus (affirmation)*, i.e., "*relationship*" based upon "*feelings*," i.e., carnal desires, i.e., common "*self interests*."

Determining what is good (right) and what is not good (wrong) for you to eat on the menu (based upon established commands, rules, facts, and truth) is *discussion*. Deciding what you *want* to eat (what you "*feel*" like eating at the 'moment') on the menu is *dialogue*. Bringing *dialogue* ("*feelings*," i.e., *opinion*) into a *discussion*—regarding what you are going to eat on the menu—makes right and wrong subject to your "*feelings*" (your carnal desires, i.e., your "*self interest*") of the 'moment' so you can eat what you *want* to eat (food that is bad for you to eat) without having a *guilty conscience*. We *dialogue* what we *want* (desire) to eat. We *discuss* whether it is *good* for us to eat it or not. When we *dialogue* what is "*good*" for us to eat we can end up eating what is bad (wrong) for us to eat, without having a *guilty conscience*. This is [The Power of Dialogue](#).

"In the eyes of the dialectical process [dialogue], nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred." (Karl Marx)

"[W]e 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." "By educational objectives, we mean explicit formulations of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educative process . . . change in their thinking, their feelings, and their actions [paradigm change]." (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*)

"The affective domain [the child's "feelings," i.e., his or her love of pleasure and hate of restraint] is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box' [a "box" full of evils, which, once opened, i.e., once 'liberated' from their parent's authority, i.e., from the father's authority can not be closed]." ***"What we call 'good teaching' is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives [through dialogue, 'liberating' the children's "lust" for pleasure and hate of restraint in the classroom] through challenging the student's fixed beliefs [challenging their parent's commands, rules, facts, and truth] and getting them to discuss issues [share their "feelings," i.e., their love of pleasure and hate of restraint ("self interest") in the "light" of the current situation, i.e., desiring group affirmation and fearing group rejection, [learning to question, challenging, defy, disregard, attack authority in the process](#)—which is the basis of [enlightenment](#)]."*** (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*) Today, all "educators" are certified and schools accredited based upon their use of what are called "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)" in the classroom—replacing *discussion* with *dialogue* by inserting *dialogue* ("*feelings*") into the *discussion* (facts and truth), i.e., making facts and truth subject to "*feelings*" *negating discussion* (facts and truth) in the process—turning the children against their parent's authority.

"There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children." (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*) The "educator" does not have to tell the students to question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack their parents authority when they get home from school (if they are not doing that already), by participating in the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* classroom they will do that automatically when they get home.

Instead of holding the classroom accountable to the father's/Father's (the teacher's) authority, i.e., to doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., to *preaching* commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaching* facts and truth to be accepted as is (by faith), *discussing*, at the father's/Father's (the teacher's) *discretion*, any questions the children (students) might have regarding the commands, rules, facts, and truth being taught, *blessing* those who obey and do things right, *chastening* those who do wrong and/or disobey, *casting out* any who

question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack authority, the family (the classroom) is held accountable to the children's "feelings," i.e., to the children's carnal nature, i.e., to the **dialoguing** of *opinions* to a *consensus*, *negating* the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning in the process.

In *discussion* you weigh facts with facts ([the Word of God](#) with the Word of God), making "feelings" (your "self") subject to facts (to the Word of God). In *dialogue* you weigh your "feelings" with others "feelings" (your "self" with others), making facts (the Word of God) subject to your "feelings", i.e., your *opinion*, making facts subject to your carnal desires of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world. *Dialogue* ties you, i.e., your 'reasoning' to the world (to your carnal desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world). *Discussion* ties you, i.e., your reasoning to the laws of nature (which are established by God) as well as laws established by authority (which are established by God as well—as all authority, the office itself, is subject to God—while the laws may be wrong, i.e., subject to the carnal desires of the one(s) in authority, the office itself is not). While *dialogue* deals with your physical needs and desires (your "feelings," i.e., *sensuousness*), *discussion* deals with your soul (the truth, i.e., right and wrong, i.e., *righteousness*).

"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

"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

It is not that we do not *dialogue*. We do. For example when it comes to us choosing our daily bread, i.e., what type of bread we are going to use for our sub we tend to *dialogue* with our "self" (and with others) about what we *want*—while possibly *discussing* with our "self" (and with others) what type of bread is "good" or right for us to eat. But when it comes to doing (or being) right and not wrong, when we use of *dialogue* (which we tend to do) we make right (or good) whatever makes us "feel good" (making us "good," i.e., god in our own eyes), making wrong (or rather "bad") anyone who makes us "feel bad" (telling us that we are wrong, i.e., that we are not "good," i.e., that we are not god—deciding right from wrong, good from evil according to our carnal nature, i.e., according to our carnal desires of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world instead of from God's Word—needing to repent for our carnal thoughts and actions), making them "evil," we make God's authority, i.e., the father's/Father's authority "evil," and our own carnal nature, i.e., our carnal desires of the 'moment,' and the world that is stimulating them, "good."

"Common senses" (being wise in making a decision, knowing that man is fickle, i.e., not to be trusted "Get the facts and truth first"), i.e., "Don't make a snap decision based upon your *feeling* only" has been replaced with "good sense," i.e., making a decision with your carnal desires, i.e., your "self interest" in mind (which are/is being stimulated by the world), making your carnal desires, i.e., your "self interest" of the 'moment' "good" and anything/anyone standing in the way of them/it "evil."

"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!" Isaiah 5:20, 21

Dialogue is all about "self preservation," i.e., "What can I get out of this situation for my 'self,'" making 'reasoning' subject to "feelings," i.e., to the child's carnal desires and dissatisfactions of the

'moment,' requiring the "esteeming" of "self," i.e., "self" 'justification' (before others, i.e., **affirmation**, which, like a drug, is not only intoxication but addictive and possessive as well) in order to 'liberate' "self," i.e., the child's carnal nature from the father's/Father's authority, thus 'liberating' "self" from having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning (which the father's/Father's authority engenders) while *discussion* is all about doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, thus making reasoning subject to doing the father's/Father's will (faith)—requiring the child to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline* his "self," engendering a *guilty conscience* in the child when he does wrong, disobeys, sins (or is thinking about doing wrong, disobeying, sinning). In *dialogue* you aim to 'justify' your "self." In a *discussion* you aim to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, therefore you must *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline* your "self" in order to hear and receive the truth.

"Self" is "actualized" through *dialogue*, making the child's carnal nature ("human nature," i.e., your "feelings" of the 'moment') the medium from/through which right and wrong are 'known,' 'liberating' the child (your "self" and therefore society) from the customs, traditions, values, standards, etc., of the past. It is why *dialogue* is being used in all meetings today, in all professions, in order to establish policy and make decisions which 'liberate' society ("*the people*") from the "restraints," i.e., the "rules" and "laws" of the past ("*rule of law*"). Immanuel Kant called it "**lawfulness without law**," i.e., the law of the flesh (nature) without the law of God, i.e., the father's/Father's authority directing our steps and "**purposiveness without purpose**," i.e., the augmentation of pleasure without having to do the father's/Father's will. (Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgment*)

"Self-actualizing people have to a large extent transcended the values of their culture. They are not so much merely Americans as they are world citizens, members of the human species first and foremost." (Abraham Maslow, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*)

What is missing in *dialogue*?

In *dialogue* there is no father's/Father's authority, inheritance, posterity, history, tradition, unalienable rights, sovereignty, representation (representative government), limited government, local control, culture, heritage, absolutes (established commands, rules, facts, and truth), private convictions, private property, and private business, "limits and measures," being wrong, *humbling, denying, dying to, disciplining, controlling* of "self," contrition, repentance, forgiveness, salvation—redemption and reconciliation—(for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning), fellowship, etc. They are all missing (*negated*) in and through *dialogue*.

Only your (or your so called "representative's") carnal desires ("*self interest*") of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world, i.e., by the current situation (and anyone *manipulating* it) are made manifest and 'justified' through *dialogue*. When *dialogue* is put into *praxis*, all the above are—by laws made through the *consensus* process—out (*negated*).

According to dialectic 'reasoning' in order for a person to "actualize" his "self," i.e., "enjoy the present" the father's/Father's authority, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth must be *negated* not only in his thoughts but in his actions as well ("*theory and practice*"). It is the role of the "educator" not only to identify the father's/Father's

authority ("*prejudice*") in the classroom but to remove (*negate*) it as well—so all students can "*actualize*" their "*self*," i.e., 'liberate' their "*self*" from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., 'liberate' their "*self*" and society ("*the group*") from "**authoritarianism**," i.e., from having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. This follows in line with Karl Marx's ideology and agenda, i.e., the negation of the father's/Father's authority, not only in the minds of men but in their social actions (*praxis*) as well, so that man can be controlled by and enjoy "**the lust of the flesh**," i.e., his "**sensuous needs**," "**the lust of the eyes**," i.e., his "**sense perception**," 'justifying' his "*self*," i.e., his "**sense experience**," i.e., "**the pride of life**," making right and wrong subject to his carnal nature, i.e., his desire to enjoy the carnal pleasures of the 'moment,' which the world stimulates, so he can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack (*negate*) the father's/Father's authority (and anyone who adheres to it, i.e., who gets in his way) with impunity. Instead of recognizing that the problem lies in his own heart—his inclination of making pleasure the standard for "good" instead of doing the father's/Father's will (only God is good), thereby 'justifying' his hate of restraint, i.e., his hatred toward the father's/Father's authority—he seeks to 'create' a "*healthy environment*"—an environment void of the father's/Father's authority (where he has to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline* his "*self*" in order to do the father's/Father's will, i.e., where he has to do or be right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, requiring faith, which creates in him a *guilty conscience* when we does wrong, disobeys, sins)—so he can be "*of and for self*" and the world only, thinking and acting according to his carnal nature, removing (*negating*) "anything" that gets in his way (which includes the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, and the righteous), i.e., anyone who prevents, i.e., inhibits or blocks him from enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' which the world stimulates, doing so without having a *guilty conscience*.

"I have found whenever I ran across authoritarian students 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, The Journals of Abraham Maslow)

Identifying the "*problem*"—"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"—and coming up with the solution—"destroying" "*the early family*" "*in theory and in practice*."

"Authoritarian submission 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) emphasis (underline) added.

"Once the earthly family [with the children having to humble and deny their "*self*" in order to do their father's will] is discovered to be the secret of the holy family [with the Son, and all following Him having to humble and deny their "*self*" in order to do His Heavenly Father's will], the former [the earthly father's authority, requiring children to trust in and obey him]

must then itself be destroyed [*vernichtet*, i.e., *annihilated*, i.e., *negated*] ***in theory and in practice*** [in the children's personal thoughts and social actions—no longer *fellowshipping* with others based upon their father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth (customs, traditions, doctrine) but, through *dialogue*, "*building relationship*" upon common "*self interests*" (their carnal desires of the 'moment') instead]. (Karl Marx, *Feuerbach Thesis #4*)

"Authoritarianism," i.e., the father's/Father's authority can be *negated* in one fatal swoop, i.e., through *dialogue*—especially when done in [a group](#) setting.

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

"One of the most fascinating aspects of group therapy is that everyone is born again, born together in the group." Irvine D. Yalom, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*)

It is difficult for a person to hold onto their belief i.e., their faith in authority, be it in their parent's, their teacher's, their boss's, their leader(s), or God's authority when they sense "*the group*" excluding them, i.e., rejecting them (because of their "*ridged*," i.e., "*prejudiced*," i.e., unadaptable to 'change' "*negative*" attitude, i.e., their holding onto the father's/Father's restraints) as they ("*the group*") heads down the road, hand in hand, enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' they (the person) desires, without them. By the "educator" simply 'changing' communication (reasoning) in the classroom from the *preaching*, *teaching*, and *discussing* of established commands, rules, facts, and truth to the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus*, the father's/Father's authority is replaced (*negated*) with child's carnal nature.

"Few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity [their belief,] in the face of apparent group unanimity." (Irvin D. Yalom, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*) A *consensus* of three is more powerful in the mind (perception) of the child than a majority of nine to one.

"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*) Whoever controls the classroom or policy making environment controls the outcome, how the next generation is to think and act, either thinking and acting according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, desiring to do or be right and not wrong or thinking and acting according to their carnal desires of the 'moment' which are being *stimulated* by the world, which is being *manipulated* by those in control

For social(ist) 'change' to take place, what you *dialogue* with your "*self*" about in private (the "world" you 'create' in your own mind, based upon your love of pleasure and hate of restraint, i.e., your "*self interest*," along with your dissatisfaction with, resentment toward, hatred of restraint) must be made public (shared with others, i.e., "*the group*") and *affirmed* ('justified'), 'liberating' your "*self*" from (*negating* in your thoughts and actions) the top-down world of *discussion*, i.e., the "old" world order of you having to *humble*, *deny*, *die to*, *control*, *discipline* your "*self*" in order to do or be right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., having to respect, honor, and obey authority—learning to question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack authority instead. By being "*positive*" (using *dialogue*, i.e., focusing upon "*feelings*") and not "*negative*" (insisting upon

discussion, i.e., focusing upon being right and not wrong) a persons way of thinking, i.e., *paradigm* can be 'changed.'

"Change in organization [change in *paradigm*, i.e., change in your way of thinking and acting, relating with your "*self*," others, and the world, and responding to authority] **can be derived from the overlapping between play and barrier behavior** [bringing "*play behavior*," i.e., *dialogue* into a situation which requires "*barrier behavior*," i.e., *discussion* in order to arrive at the truth—doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth]. **To be governed by two strong goals** [being your "*self*," i.e., doing what you want to do, when you want (as well as being *affirmed* and not rejected by "*the group*") and doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth] **is equivalent to the existence of two conflicting controlling heads within the organism. This** [bringing *dialogue*, i.e., "*feelings*," i.e., desires ("*self interests*") into a situation which requires *discussion* in order to arrive at the truth, i.e., in order to do (or be) right and not wrong] **should lead to a decrease in degree of hierarchical organization** [doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth is weakened, "*self interest*" begins to rise up into focus, taking control of the persons "*feelings*" and "*thoughts*"]. **Also, a certain disorganization** [[cognitive dissonance](#)] **should result from the fact that the cognitive-motor system** [habit of reasoning from established commands, rules, facts, and truth based upon doing right and not wrong] **loses to some degree its character of a good medium because of these conflicting heads** [desiring approval from (*affirmation* by) others vs. desiring doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth]. **It ceases to be in a state of near equilibrium; the forces under the control of one head have to counteract the forces of the other before they are effective** [the person (refusing to join in/resisting *dialogue*) must be willing to stand alone (be willing to be rejected by others) in order to hold onto the truth or (joining in the *dialogue*) be willing to compromise the truth in order to initiate or sustain relationship with others—establishing "*human(ist) relationship*" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority]. " ([Kurt Lewin](#) in *Child Behavior and Development* Chapter XXVI *Frustration and Regression*)

It was found that this "**change in organization**" had to be put into practice (*praxis*) in order for it to stick, or the person would, under pressure of authority (desire for security and identity) revert back to his old way of thinking and acting (requiring him and others to think and act according to what is not of and for their carnal nature only—requiring the *preaching, teaching, and discussing* of established commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to be or do right and not wrong instead of *dialoguing* their *opinions* to a *consensus* in order to "get along," i.e., in order to "*build relationship upon self interest*"). Without "willingly" participating in his own 'change,' i.e., in group projects, which requires his willingness to *dialogue*, i.e., compromise his established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., his prejudices, i.e., without his willingness to be "positive" instead of "negative" in order to participate in group activity for the sake of group approval, i.e., *affirmation*, his old way of thinking and acting would remain in place. Social action (*praxis*), i.e., willingly participating in social projects (with the father's/Father's authority being left out, i.e., excluded, i.e., *negated*) is therefore a key ingredient to a person's "**change in organization.**"

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

In order (as in "[New World Order](#)") to initiate and sustain *dialogue*, established commands, rules, facts, and truth must be suspended, as upon a cross. Doing right and not wrong according to commands, rules, facts, and truth moves conversation (communication) into a *discussion*. "*Feelings*"

moves conversation (communication) into *dialogue*. Therefore, anyone preventing, i.e., inhibiting or blocking *dialogue*, i.e., insisting upon *preaching, teaching, and/or discussing* commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to be (or do) right and not wrong becomes a "resister of 'change,'" i.e., the "**problem**," i.e., the source of controversy, needing to be "converted," silenced, or removed in order to initiate and sustain a "new" world order based upon the child's carnal nature ("*feelings*" which are stimulated by the world) rather than the father's/Father's authority (having to obey established commands and rules and accept established facts and truth as given, by faith).

Wilfred Bion, of Tavistock fame, summed the whole process up as "***preventing someone who KNOWS from filling the empty space.***"

"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children." Hosea 4:6

While in a *discussion* there is accountability, i.e., a consequence for being wrong, i.e., a sense of guilt for doing wrong, in *dialogue* there is not, since in *dialogue*, wrong (prejudice, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth) must be suspended, as upon a cross, in order to initiate and sustain *dialogue*. Liberals use *dialogue* ("*feelings*"), which unites, and avoid *discussion* (right and wrong), which divides (unless it is a so called "discussion" of personal-social issues, i.e., a "discussion" based upon everyone's "*feelings*" regarding personal-social issues of the 'moment' in an open-ended, non-directed setting is *dialogue*), in order to initiate and sustain a *so called* "new" world order of 'change.' *Discussion* (doing right and not wrong) is founded upon the authority **system** of the father. *Dialogue* (the expressing of ones "*feelings*" of the 'moment,' i.e., ones desire for pleasure and resentment toward restraint) is found in the nature of the child, i.e., approaching pleasure and avoiding pain. As long as you can stay within *dialogue* you can "think," i.e., desire, dream, imagine, theorize, speculate, etc. and live as you please without condemnation.

Whoever controls your "*feelings*" (either fear of being wrong or fear of missing out on pleasure—including the **affirmation** of others, i.e., fear of rejection by others) controls your "*thinking*," i.e., how you reason, either reasoning from facts and truth or 'reasoning' from your "*feelings*" of the 'moment' which are being *stimulated* by the environment (the world) which is being *manipulated* by the facilitator of 'change.' By identifying your "*self interest*," i.e., your carnal desire(s) of the 'moment,' which is (are) being stimulated by the world (which now includes "*the group*"), then—using your fear of being rejected by "*the group*"—pressuring you into compromise your established commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to "*actualize*" your "*self*," i.e., "*actualize*" your carnal desire(s) of the 'moment'—which now requires group approval (**affirmation**)—the facilitator of 'change' is able to *seduce, deceive, and manipulate* you into making relationship with "*the group*"—in order to "*actualize*" your "*self interest*," i.e., your "*self*"—i.e., *socialism* more important than capitalism, i.e., having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline (capitulate)* your "*self*" in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will. It is called a *paradigm* 'shift' ('change'), where your thoughts and actions are 'changed' from doing the father's/Father's will to doing your own will, under the guidance of (with the "help" of) a facilitator of 'change'—who is now in control of your life, using you as "natural resource" (called "human resource") for his own pleasure and gain, i.e., for his own "*self interest*" (with your approval, i.e., **affirmation**).

"By a careful design, we control not the final behavior, but the inclination to behavior—the motives, the desires, the wishes [the persons "*feelings*"]. The curious thing is that in that case the question of freedom never arises." "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." (Carl Rogers, on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy)

Georg Hegel, not being able to use the word **wrong** (the language of the father/Father—with doing wrong being punishable, the focus being upon justice for the victim, the person who was wronged), i.e., only being able to use the spectrum or relativist word **"badly"** (the language of the child—with **"badly"** not being a crime, the child only needing to do things **"better,"** the focus being upon the person doing the wrong, i.e., the perpetrator, their **"feelings,"** that they might do **"better,"** disregarding the person who was wronged, i.e., the facts and truth), wrote: **"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** [peace meaning **"at-one-with self and the world"** and **affirmation** meaning **"with group approval"**]." (G. F. W. Hegel, in one of the casual notes preserved at Widener) emphasis added.

"Peace and affirmation" for Hegel meant the *praxis* of everyone enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (**"To enjoy the present reconciles us to the actual."** Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*)), which the world stimulates, which he called **"lusts,"** with everyone giving approval, i.e., **affirmation** to each others pleasure (**"lusts"**) of the 'moment' (engendering **"peace"**), especially the pleasure which comes with approval, i.e., **"affirmation."** Building upon Immanuel Kant's **"hope"** for mankind (**"lawfulness without law,"** i.e., the law of the flesh, i.e., love of pleasure, i.e., **sensuousness**, without the law and Word of God, i.e., **righteousness** and **"purposiveness without purpose,"** i.e., the purpose of life being the augmentation of pleasure, 'liberating' man from Godly restraints) and Hegel's **dialectic 'reasoning'** (**"self-'justification,"** i.e., 'justification' of pleasure **over** and therefore **against** the father's authority), the child's carnal nature, i.e., love of pleasure and hate of restraint has now become the 'driving' force of life, and the augmentation of pleasure, i.e., the child's carnal nature, i.e., love of pleasure and hate of restraint its 'purpose,' **negating** the authority of the father/Father, i.e., doing right and **not wrong**, according to the father's/Father's will, and the **guilty conscience** for doing **wrong** in the process.

"If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1 John 2:17

Georg Hegel believed that **"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 his feelings, thoughts, and actions and relationship with others is 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority, so he can be of and for "self," i.e., of and for the world only]." (Georg Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*) In this dialectic formula of placing the child's desire for pleasure **over** (above) and therefore **against** the father's/Father's authority, the fathers'/Father's authority **system** (doing right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth—thus having a **guilty conscience** for doing wrong) is **negated**, making all things which are of the father/Father now the property of **all** the children ("common-ism"). This follows in line with idea that **"the fruits of the earth belongs to all of us, and the earth itself to nobody."** (Jean-Jacques Rousseau,

Discourse on Inequality) which is *antithetical* to **"For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof."** 1 Corinthians 10:26

Hegel, sounding more like Karl Marx, than Karl Marx himself (who was not yet born), could then write: **"On account of the absolute and natural oneness of the husband, the wife, and the child** [their common **"lust"** for pleasure and hate of restraint], **where there is no antithesis of person to person or of subject to object** [with no father's authority over the children (and no husbands authority over the wife)], **the surplus is not the property of one of them** [there is no private, as in private convictions, property, or business, i.e., no "My wife. Not yours." "My children. Not yours." "My property. Not yours." "My business. Not yours"], **since their indifference is not a formal or a legal one** [discussion is formal, dialogue is not]. There is a consequence to basing 'reality' upon the nature of the children and their approval, i.e., basing right and wrong upon the pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., dialogue. Anyone who attains or desires to attain pleasure from your spouse, your children (providing they consent, i.e., are seducible, deceivable, and manipulatable), your property, your business, etc., has as much "right" to them as you.

Karl Marx wrote: **"The proletariat** [the child] **thus has the same right as has the German king** [the father] **when he calls, the people his people and a horse his horse."** (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of right'*) In other words, through the use of dialogue instead of discussion, that which is the father's now belongs to the child(ren). In common law, the party who can do harm to you must provide the means whereby they can not harm you. It is their, not your responsibility or burden to provide the means whereby to protect you and your property from any activity that they are doing that can infringing upon your right of private, as in property. Dialogue and the consensus process instantly removes that burden or barrier, allowing them direct access to that which is yours, placing the burden (cost) of protection upon you. Once the parent or the employer loses their right to discipline or remove the child or worker for their actions of insubordination (for their questioning, challenging, and disobeying, i.e., for their disrespect toward the parent or the employer and their authority), the parent or employer loses their family or their business to the tyrant and the system (praxis) of tyranny. The correlation between the family and the working environment is so close that to recognize the system of the one requires the recognition of the system of other, and therefore, for the socialist, the right and duty to negate both, i.e., to negate the authority system of the parent and the authority system of the private property and/or the private business owner, negating the language of **"Mine. Not yours."** The same applies to all borders and jurisdictions, whether local or national.

Marxism (common-ism) is based upon **"the common ground of ... existence"** (that which we all have in common with the child, i.e., his desire for the pleasures of the 'moment' along with his dissatisfaction or resentment toward the one inflicting pain upon him for doing wrong, initiating and sustaining the internal pain of missing out on the pleasure of the 'moment,' i.e., the seedbed of dialectic 'reasoning' in the child in the process). By negating the father's/Father's authority system (doing right and not wrong no matter the situation, i.e., no matter the temptation of pleasure or the presence of or the threat of pain) in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in his relationship with others, individualism (unalienable rights), under God is negated. By bringing dialogue, i.e., the child's feelings into the classroom, making the child's feelings of the 'moment' a part of the grade, i.e., the outcome, the parent's authority is system is negated in the child's feelings, thoughts and actions, and in his relationship with others and the world, as well as in his relationship with his parents, making him adaptable to 'change.'

Marx wrote: **"It is not individualism** [the child subject to the father's/Father's authority, having to humble, deny, die to, control, discipline his "self" in order to do the father's/Father's will] **that fulfills the individual, on the contrary it destroys him** [makes him **"neurotic"**]. **Society**

["human relationship based upon self interest," i.e., building relationship with others based upon the child's carnal desires, i.e., finding one's identity, i.e., "self" in "the group," i.e., in society] **is the necessary framework through which freedom** [from the father's/Father's authority] **and individuality** [to be "of and for self" and the world only] **are made realities.**" (Karl Marx, in John Lewis, *The Life and Teachings of Karl Marx*)

The essential ingredient for 'change' is *dialogue*.

The Marxist, Jürgen Habermas wrote: **"Then both parties recognize their rigidified position in relation to each other as the result of detachment and abstraction from their common life context. And in the latter, the dialogic relation of recognizing oneself in the other, they experience the common ground of their existence."** (Jürgen Habermas, *The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory*) **"With the devaluation of the epistemic authority of the God's eye view, moral commands lose their religious as well as their metaphysical foundation."** **"The shift in perspective from God to human beings has a further consequence. 'Validity' now signifies that moral norms could win the agreement of all concerned, on the condition that they jointly examine in practical discourse whether a corresponding practice is in the equal interest of all."** **"This idea of a discursively produced understanding also imposes a greater burden of justification on the isolated judging subject than would a monologically applied universalisation test."** (Jürgen Habermas, *Communicative Ethics The inclusion of the Other. Studies in Political Theory*)

In *dialogue* a person makes the future dependent upon his "feelings," i.e., his "**sensuous needs**" and "**sense perception**" of the 'moment,' i.e., his "**sense experience**" (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3), placing his hope in the world that is stimulating them, i.e., making himself subject to whoever is *manipulating* the situation, i.e., [seducing, deceiving, and manipulating](#) him. *Dialogue* is where pleasure, i.e., that which is "**positive**" supersedes doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, *negating* that which gets in the way of pleasure, i.e., *negating* that which is "**negative**"—referred to as ["the negation of negation."](#)

"The direction which constitutes the good life is psychological freedom to move in any direction [where] **the general qualities of this selected direction appear to have a certain universality."** **"Experience is, for me, the highest authority."** **"Neither the Bible nor the prophets, neither the revelations of God can take precedence over my own direct experience."** (Carl Rogers, *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*)

"Now that we know how positive reinforcement works [dialoguing opinions to a consensus, i.e., dialoguing our feelings (our carnal desires of the 'moment') to a feeling of oneness ('discovering' through *dialogue* the common carnal desires that we can all agree on, thereby **affirming** ourselves, and working together, as one, in fulfilling them, we establish our carnal desires of the 'moment,' i.e., our "**self**" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, i.e., his/His restraints)], **and why negative doesn't** [the father's/Father's authority to 1) give us commands and rules which go counter to and therefore restrain our carnal desires of the 'moment,' 2) reward us or bless us when we do what is right and obey, 3) chasten us when we do wrong and disobey, and 4) cast out those who disrespect i.e. who question and/or challenge his/His authority, i.e., who reject his/His restraints]... **'we can be more deliberate and hence more successful in our cultural design. We can achieve a sort of control under which the controlled** [the manipulated] **though they are following a code much more scrupulously** [more government regulations and oversight (sight based management)] **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. That's the source of the tremendous power of positive reinforcement—there's no restraint and no revolt. 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. (Carl Rogers, *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*)

While ***conformation*** is the objective of those of "common faith," having *fellowship* upon an established position, fact, or truth, i.e., requiring persuasion and discussion (*preaching* and *teaching*) and agreement (faith), ***consensus*** (a feeling of oneness), building relationship upon feelings, i.e., "self interest" on the other hand, is the objective of those using *dialogue*, where the *dialoguing* of *opinions* (including polls, surveys, feasibility studies, etc.) reveals everyone's current *desires* (for pleasure) and *dissatisfactions* (with restraint), i.e., that which all men have in common (regarding their carnal nature), with them, in the name of unity and peace, removing all that is not of "*human nature*," i.e., removing all that is 'irrational' and 'irrelevant' (that is not of the world), which divides or causes division. Without *dialogue* (using *preaching* and *teaching* and *discussion* instead) you can not arrive at a *consensus*, you can only arrive at an impasse, a division, or a conformation. To be silent in the midst of unrighteousness, i.e., refusing to reprove, correct, and rebuke unrighteousness for the sake of initiating and sustaining relationship (unity and peace) is to consent to "*human nature*," making unrighteousness the "norm," i.e., the law of the land.

"Bypassing the traditional channels of top-down decision making [using dialogue instead of discussion], our objective centers upon transform 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*)

Thus all institutions, whether they be of education, of work, of government, of entertainment, of the media, of religion, and even of the home, must submit to the *consensus* process of *dialogue* if they are to be recognized as having any relevance in the so called "new" world order. It all starts with ***how*** the child is being educated to think and act, not only in the classroom but in the home as well, with government departments using ***"social environmental forces to 'change' the parent's behavior toward the child,"*** pressuring parents into *dialoguing* (coming to *consensus*) with their children in the home, *negating* the "old" word order of parental authority in the process. (Theodor Adorno, *The Authoritarian Personality*)

'Liberals,' socialists (children of disobedience), those who resent restraint and hate the restrainer, will do all they can to get you into *dialogue* (or into "*discussing*" *personal-social issues*, i.e., your, their, and others "feelings," carnal desires of the 'moment'). *Dialogue* (sharing your "feelings" of the 'moment') is a universal language of the world (of the flesh, i.e., of the 'moment') while *discussion* (doing right and not wrong) is local (for the soul, for all eternity). Like tying both hands behind your back and letting someone punch away, once liberals (or your children) get you into *dialoguing* the universality of "*feelings*," with you then attempting to *discuss* doing right and not wrong, you will find yourself becoming the odd man out, labeled as being hardheaded, intolerant, irrational, not understanding, hateful, etc. It is how those promoting the process of 'change' (the language of *dialogue*) make you into being the bully in town, with you attempting to restrain them (and everyone else) from being what they want to be (or can be), i.e., of the world only, in truth making themselves the bully in town instead—"pressuring" you into supporting them in what they want to do, 'creating' a "new" world order without Godly restraint, resulting in them not caring what happens to you if you

get in their way. *Negating*, through the *praxis* of *dialogue*, the father's/Father's authority in your feelings, thoughts, and actions, as well as in your relationship with one another, 'changes' the world, 'liberates' you from having a *guilty conscience* for your unrighteous and abominable thoughts and actions.

By simply 'changing' ("shifting") our means of communication from *discussion* (doing right and not wrong, according to the father's/Father's will, i.e., [Hebrews 12:5-11](#), which engenders the *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, i.e., [Romans 7:11-25](#)) to *dialogue* (to our feelings of the 'moment,' according to the child's natural desire for pleasure and his resentment toward restraint, i.e., hate of the retainer) the Tower of Babel, Sodom and Gomorrah, the world as it was before the flood can be rebuilt, and world unity attained, i.e., Satan's Genesis project ([Genesis 3:1-6](#)) can be fulfilled, preparing the world for judgment day (where everyone will be judged according to the Father's standards). Without Christ Jesus (by His shed blood on the cross, in obedience to His Heavenly Father) 'redeeming' us from His Heavenly Father's wrath upon us for our sins and (by His resurrection from the grave) 'reconciling' us to His Heavenly Father (to spend eternity with Him) all we have is the things of this world, i.e., the carnal pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., *dialogue* (and eternal death). What the world can not know, since it is known only by those in the Lord, i.e., who walk by faith, is the *joy*, which is unspeakable (is unexplainable to the world) and the *peace*, which transcends understanding (is unexplainable to the world) which comes by the Holy Spirit, who is given by the Father and the Son to those of faith in them, confirming the Word of God alone, only.

"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world." 1 John 2:15

"Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." James 4:4

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

"Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." 1 John 3:1, 2

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

You *discuss* what is right and what is wrong, with only one right answer from above—which is the basis of "*fellowship*." You *dialogue* your carnal desires ("*self interest*") of the 'moment' which the world stimulates—which is the basis of "*relationship*." It is in the *praxis* of *dialogue* that the "new" world order is 'created,' 'creating' a world subject to the child's own '[liking](#),' i.e., a world of his own 'reasoning,' i.e., made in his image, 'created' when he *dialogues* ('reasons') with his "*self*," thinking according to his carnal desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' 'creating' a world 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., a world 'liberated' from established commands, rules, facts, and truth so he can do wrong, disobey, sin with impunity—*utopia*. When you bring *dialogue* into the "church," making the Word of God subject to the *opinions* of men, the outcome is always the same—apostasy—guaranteed, with facilitators of 'change,' i.e., "*wolves in sheepskin*" in control, 'justifying' their "*self*," i.e., 'justifying' their "*lusting*" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' which the world stimulates, who, through the use of *dialogue*, *seduce*, *deceive*, and *manipulate* the "church" into *affirming* them and their carnal ways—abomination.

"Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait is the gate, and narrow is

the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." Matthew 7:13-15

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." Acts 20:28, 29

© Institution for Authority Research, Dean Gotcher 2015, 2019