

## It Is All (Everything Is) About The Father.

(*Personal note.*)

by

Dean Gotcher

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

*"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*

I wish my children and grandchildren would read this, ALL OF IT, but I doubt that will happen with more important things to do (and it being difficult to read, i.e., requiring much thinking and understanding of history—besides I write rather didactically with few illustrations; see Personal note above as well as [My writing "style"](#)). In brief, having read over six hundred social-psychology books (some three times over), books that are foundational to the mindset of those now running this nation (and the world), the following exposes their agenda in the light of [the Word of God](#). The problem being, most people have succumb to their "Reasoning," "Reasoning" from their feelings making it difficult if not impossible for them to accept the reality of the danger they are in—with their enjoying the 'moment' of pleasure that the process of 'change' offers them blinding them to where it is taking them. My hope is their eyes would be opened by the Word of God as they labor through the following, exposing (with the globalists own words, which are quite alarming/revealing—quotations selected from the volumes of books they have written), what they are doing to their soul—buying and selling it at the street corner of *lust* and *affirmation*.

*"The current generation is the first in the history of the world which has nothing to learn from grandparents;" ([Irvin D. Yalom](#), *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*)*

It is all about the father/Father, i.e., the father's/Father's authority that is. (When I say the father/Father I mean the authority system itself, which is the same for the earthly father and the Heavenly Father.) The so called "new" world order is all about *negating* it in everyone's thoughts, directly effecting their actions. The father/Father is the author and the enforcer of commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., demanding those under his/His authority do right and not wrong according to them, i.e., obey him/Him, holding them accountable for their actions, i.e., chastening them for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "*lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' (*dopamine emancipation*) that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or person is or people are stimulating"

(imagined or real)—from now on abbreviated "*lusting ...*" or "*lust ...*"—instead of *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating* their *self* in order to do his/His will, casting them out (grounding them) if they question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack his/His authority. According to those "of and for the world," being held accountable to established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of "*lusting ...*" is synonymous with the father's/Father's authority aka spirit (as it does not come from within the child/man himself but is external to his "sense experience," i.e., to his "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, making the father's/Father's authority and *stimulus-response* antithetical to one another).

The following might seem obvious, but without understanding it (truly understanding it) you can not understand what is going on in the world around you, i.e., what the so called "new" world order, "climate 'change,'" "sight based management," "Critical Race Theory," Socialism/Communism (both national, i.e., fascist and international, i.e., globalist, i.e., Marxist in structure—which we are now entrenched in), etc., is all about. 'Change' (which you hear of everywhere you turn these days) is all about the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the *negation* of it so everyone can "*lust ...*" without having a *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders). "*Lusting ...*," what everyone has in common is not what stands in the way of *building relationships*, it is the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority. *Relationship* is built upon common feelings, i.e., desires while *fellowship* is built upon commands, rules, facts, and truth agreed upon. It is this source of division between people that the "new" world order seeks to *negate*, uniting people on what they have in common, i.e., *lust, negating* (converting, silencing, censoring, removing) those who insist upon doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., upon doing the father's/Father's will.

While in "old school" what the father/Father would say comes to mind while you are having a *discussion* with someone—regarding their thoughts and actions—in the "new" world order what the father/Father would say does not come to mind, i.e., is irrelevant. In the "old" world order the father's duty is to check the "backpacks" of his children's "friends," knowing they not only bring all their problems into his children's lives (into their thoughts and actions)—which include their family, relatives, and friends problems—but into his home as well (especially when it is a marriage—while everyone knows a rotten apple spoils a good apple, they do not think about the fact a good apple does not make a rotten apple good, i.e., marrying a wicked person, in the hope of making them righteous does not work, i.e., is foolish, marring them 'justifies' their wickedness). The carnally minded child (of the "new" world order) does all he (or she) can to prevent the father from checking his "friends" "backpack"—so he and his "friend" can "*lust ...*" without restraint, i.e., without being judged, condemned, and/or cast out or be divided from one another.

*"Prior to therapy the person is prone to ask himself, 'What would my parents want me to do?' During the process of therapy the individual comes to ask himself, 'What does it mean to me?'" "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) Therapy is simply negating what dad/God, i.e., the father/Father would say regarding your thoughts and your actions (regarding your behavior), resulting in your *self interest*, i.e., your *lusts*, i.e., your "feelings" and "thoughts" (your *opinion*) of the 'moment,' and those *affirming* ('justifying') them directing your steps, with the therapist taking the father's/Father's place, as the master therapist took God's place in a garden in Eden.*

*"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the LORD; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Psalms 1:1, 2 The moment a person leaves God, i.e., the Father out of what is right and what is wrong behavior they are godless in that moment, i.e., they are "ungodly" (in fact they have made themselves God, establishing right and wrong behavior according to their carnal nature) even though they might call themselves a "Christian."*

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

The "traditional home/family" is based upon the father's authority, with those under his authority having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to his standards, i.e., in order to do his will. This is also true for the Heavenly Father, who demands that all who are under His authority (all of mankind) do right and not wrong according to His Word, i.e., do His will. While there is only one Heavenly Father there are (generally speaking) as many fathers in a village as there are families, therefore, if there is leadership in the village (traditionally) there is either one leader acting as a father, either gaining power by force, by inheritance, by popularity, or by the vote of the citizens or a group of individuals establishing order, all in support of the father's authority in the home—yet differing from one another on what is right and what is wrong behavior in the home, the father of each home being the judge of that; obedience to the father being the main concern of all, with the father's obedience to the village (to the village's laws) being the concern of the village. If the father's children become an issue to the village it is the father who gets the wrap, because he is not keeping his children subject to, i.e., respectful of authority. The father's/Father's will, that his/His children do right and not wrong according to his/His (established) commands, rule, facts, and truth is different than the child's will, to *"lust ..."* This is all reflected in language, i.e., in how we communicate with one another, especially when it comes to establishing (defining) right and wrong behavior—*discussion* manifests the father's/Father's authority,

i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth, *dialogue* manifests the child's *self interest*, i.e., the child's natural inclination to "lust..."

*Discussion*, when it comes to behavior is the father's/Father's authority (telling the child what to do, according to his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth). *Dialogue* on the other hand, when it comes to behavior is the child 'justifying' his carnal nature ('justifying' his natural inclination to "lust ...," as well as 'justifying' his dissatisfaction with, resentment toward, hatred of anyone getting in his way, i.e., the father's/Father's authority). Which one you turn to, when it comes to right and wrong behavior directs your steps, i.e., what you are thinking, saying, and doing or going to do. That is why those "of and for the world," when it comes to behavior turn to *dialogue*, i.e., to your *lusts*, i.e., to your *self interests*, i.e., to your *feelings* when they communicate with you, 'justifying' your (and their) carnal nature, establishing *lust*, i.e., "human nature" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority (which *tells* you what to do instead of asking you how you "feel" and what you "think," i.e., asking you for your *opinion*—leaving the outcome up to you).

While dad (your earthly father) is not perfect—he may be (or might have been) a down right tyrant (or MIA/AWOL), thinking and acting as a child, "lusting ..." without restraint (no longer being a loving and caring father, i.e., a [benevolent father](#), being only a "father" in the flesh, "of the world," i.e., for his *self interest* only)—his office of authority is perfect, having been given to him by God (the Heavenly Father), who is perfect in which to do His will. While the father can be wrong and the child right, regarding an issue it is the office of authority itself that those "of and for the world" are after, i.e., seek to *negate*. For example, in defense of the office, while Saul (acting as a father over the nation Israel) was wrong, David spared his life, respecting the office Saul served in (under God). 1Samuel 24:3-22 While those having faith in and obeying the father/Father not only *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self* in order to do the father's/Father's will, they also "encourage" others to do the same (referred to as a *Patriarchal paradigm*; where a person's feelings, thoughts, and actions toward his *self*, others, the world, and authority are subject to the father/Father—which inhibit or blocks change, especially rapid change) those "of and for the world," i.e., "*of and for self*," rejecting ([hating](#)) [the father's/Father's authority](#) side with the child, i.e., with [the child's carnal nature](#), i.e., with the child's (and their) natural inclination to "lust ...," hating restraint, i.e., hating the pain of missing out on the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, establishing "human-'of the earth'-nature" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority (referred to as a *Heresiarchal paradigm*; where a person's feelings, thoughts, and actions toward his *self*, others, the world, and authority are subject to his carnal desires, i.e., his *lusts and hate* of the 'moment' which are ever changing in response to the current situation and/or people present—which initiates and sustains 'change,' i.e., rapid 'change'). While, in the "old" world order, i.e., "old school" the child changed his heart from doing his will to doing the father's/Father's will in the "new" world

order the child 'changes' his actions in response to the current situation and/or people present—called *stimulus-response*—based upon his feelings and thoughts of the 'moment,' i.e., approaching/approving pleasure and avoiding/hating restraint, i.e., hating the pain which comes with missing out on pleasure, hating the one initiating it, i.e., the missing out on pleasure. In the *Patriarchal paradigm*, the child reasons from the commands, rules, facts, and truth he has been taught (*told*), i.e., what is right and what is wrong is based upon them, suffering the loss of the pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates that are in opposition to them as well as the loss of fellowship with others who disagree with them, while in the *Heresiarchal paradigm* (of 'change') the child "reasons" from his carnal desires of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, i.e., "What can I get out of this situation and/or this person or these people for my *self*," *building relationship* with those who have the same *self interests*, i.e., *lusts* as he. There is much in Scriptures regarding *lusting* after pleasure, i.e., sinning and enduring the suffering (missing out on pleasure) that comes with doing the Father's will.

*"Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; That he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God." 1 Peter 4:1, 2*

*"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*

*"... for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." Galatians 1:10*

It can only be one or the other, i.e., the father's/Father's authority or the child's carnal nature (one restrains the flesh, the other 'justifies' it). This applies to all that is going on in the world around you, including what is going on in you today, choosing between faith or sight, i.e., righteousness or sensuousness, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., what you are *told* or leaning to your own understanding, i.e., to your "*lusting ...*," i.e., doing your will instead (scriptures and quotations—from those "of and for the world"—given below to prove the point). The greatest barrier to those "of and for the world" is the father's authority in the home and the Father's authority in the thoughts of men, directly effecting their actions—why those "of and for the world" are so obsessed with *negating* it. This has happened literally everywhere you turn. Without someone drawing your attention to it you would not be aware (prayer to the Lord Jesus Christ, Bible reading, Ten Commandments on the wall, "board" of correction, etc., in the school, manger scene on the courthouse lawn, "Act of God" replaced with "mother nature" on the weather, "Do you know the Lord" replaced with "Are you suicidal" in the hospital, etc.,—only those "of and for the world" would want them gone). No one took our liberties away. We gave them away in the name of (for the "good" of) "the people," i.e., for the approval of men, making

*relationship* with man more important than fellowshiping with the Father, and His Son, Jesus Christ and those who follow after Him.

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

*"Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God:"* excerpt from Matthew 19:17 Conversely, for the carnally minded child (*lust* being good) he is God (good) when he can *lust* without someone above him restraining him or making him feel guilty.

*"Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Matthew 5:48*

*"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;"* Romans 3:23 While we have all sinned, being "perfect" before the Father is the result of His Son's righteousness (His obedience to the Father in all things commanded) being imputed to us, by our faith in Him, i.e., dying to our *self*, i.e., denying our *lusts*, suffering rejection from others for not 'justifying' their *lusts*, following after Him, being led by and walking in the Spirit, doing the Father's will—the Holy Spirit will only do the Father's will.

Whether you realize it or not the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority is the ONLY agenda that has been going on (in the home to the highest office in the land) since the garden in Eden and will continue to go on until the Lord's return (so the child, i.e., the carnal child in man can "*lust ...*" without having a *guilty conscience*). All of history (including the history you have studied in school or college) is based upon the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority (although teachers/professors do not teach that because they reject the father's/Father's authority or, if they do accept the father's/Father's authority they want to keep their jobs). If "*only that which proceeds from Nature,*" i.e., that which is "of the world," i.e., your *self interest*, i.e., how you "*feel*" and what you "*think*" is all there is (which is the mantra today; "If it feels good do it") then 'liberation' from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., compromise, which is found in the father himself, i.e., setting aside his standards (which he holds his children to) in order to initiate and sustain relationship with others (relatives, etc.) is what mankind has in common, it is in compromise, i.e., in being "tolerant of ambiguity (deviancy)" for the sake of "relationship," i.e., for the approval of men, i.e., for *self preservation* that "worldly peace and socialist harmony" can become 'reality.' *Lust* now rules over the home and the land. Everywhere you turn today *lust* is the agenda, with people removing ("tuning out," censoring, counting as of no value) anyone who inhibits or blocks them from having "fun," thus 'justifying' the "removal" of the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous, *negating* the *guilty conscience*, i.e., having any sense of *guilt* for their actions

(which the father's/Father's authority engenders—more on this later). Even the "church" knows if you don't make them "feel bad" for their sin but entertain them (worshiping the worship experience itself) instead they will come back again, and again, and again, etc., i.e., you can "grow" the "church" i.e., build the cash flow and keep it going.

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

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

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

The father/Father KNOWS the cost of being or doing wrong, for him/Him doing wrong being "bad." The child, "*lusting ...*" does not, for him or her missing out on pleasure being "bad." For example, children, pretending broomsticks are horses (living in the 'moment,' i.e., creating a world of their own imagination, i.e., how they *feel* and *think* the world "is" or "ought" to be) do not KNOW the reality, i.e., the cost (the risk, i.e., the dangers) of being around a horse (the real thing) and the responsibility (inconvenience) of taking care of it—wanting someone else to take on the risks and responsibilities (cost and inconvenience) for them so they can continue to live in the world of their imagination, i.e., in the world of their 'creation,' making everyone subject to the world of their 'creation,' i.e., subject to their imagination, i.e., subject to them. This is the mentality of those "of and for the world," i.e., disobedient children in adult bodies, who, without the father's/Father's restraint ("rule of law"), i.e., without having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "*lusting ...*", think and act as though everything they see they "own." Having rejected the father's/Father's authority, i.e., accountability for their carnal thoughts and actions, *lust* is all they have. Taking "ownership" (in their mind) of all they see (that engenders *lust*)—seeing no wrong in it—their agenda is to remove (silence, censor, refuse to listen to, kill, etc.; question, challenge, deny, defy, disregard, attack) anyone who gets in their way, i.e., who is "unreasonable," therefore "irrational" (in their mind not being practical, i.e., not serving their *self interest*—made manifest in the child's response to the father's command that prevents him from doing what he wants, i.e., "Why?" "You don't understand," "Your not being reasonable," "I'll just die." "I hate you."). All, and I mean All fortune five-hundred companies, along with tens of thousands of other companies around the world (might be one you work for) develop policy upon the simple illustration of a young girl (with the help of her mother) being liberated from the father's authority in order for her to build relationship (teamwork) with other children in her school (in the workplace) who's behavior her father disapproves of, corrupting her

values, i.e., you can bring up anything under the sun but not the Father, i.e., be "judgmental," causing division between children (men); [Using Role Playing In The Classroom To Negate The Father's Authority In The Home](#) (negating private business, with corporate business taking its place) source: Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#).

*"Words and actions should help to unite, and not divide, the people." (Mao Zedong)  
What the father/Father says must be put aside for the sake of "the group," i.e., for the sake of "the people," i.e., for the sake of unity (worldly peace and socialist harmony).*

*"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it. He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." Matthew 10:34-40*

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

*"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Corinthians 14-18*

The gospel message is based upon the Heavenly Father and His authority, establishing the Heavenly Father, i.e., the Father's authority over His Son, Jesus Christ, as well as over the earthly father and those under his authority—who, without the Heavenly Father directing their steps are subject to their carnal nature, i.e., "lusting...."

*"I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me."  
"For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his*

*commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." John 5:30; 12:47-50*

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

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

*"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*

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

Without the Father there is no Son. Without the Son's obedience to the Father (in all things commanded) there is no salvation from the Father's wrath upon you for your sins, i.e., for your disobedience, i.e., for your "*lusting ...*" God gave us the ability to enjoy the world we live in, i.e., *dopamine emancipation* that we might thank and praise Him, not that we would worship it (*lust after dopamine emancipation* and the world that stimulates it).

*"Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Matthew 4:10*

If all there is is "*of the world,*" i.e., "*the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,*" i.e., is *stimulus-response* as those "*of and for their self*" and the world perceive, then the Father's authority must be *negated* if man is to be his *self*, i.e., is to sin, i.e., is to "*lust ...*" without having a *guilty conscience* (which is engendered by the Father's authority). If I have twenty students in my class, from twenty different families, whose fathers differ from one another on personal and social issues I have twenty students, if they are loyal to their father's authority who are divided from one another. If I am "*of and for the world*" (which I am not) for me to move their loyalty to my way of thinking I must move communication in the classroom away from doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, sustaining the father's/Father's authority system to where the students can share their carnal desires, i.e., their *lusts* without fear of being judged, condemned, or cast out, i.e., without fear of the father's/Father's authority, thereby replacing their loyalty to the father/Father with loyalty to one another (and to me), 'justifying' their (and my) carnal nature, i.e., their (and my) natural inclination to "*lust ...*," making all the children "children of disobedience." (This is the education system we have today, explained in greater detail below—an education system I earned by teaching degree on [[\*Bloom's Taxonomies\*](#)] (all Bloom did, when it comes to right and wrong behavior was remove the father's/Father's authority from the classroom, removing it from the students thoughts and therefore their actions, 'justifying' their thoughts and actions

instead, thereby turning them against the father/Father and his/His authority)], which I had to repent of in order to do the Father's will—after explaining it, in brief to a kindergarten teacher, a relative of mine, who uses it in her classroom, her response was *"You make me feel wicked. You make me feel like I am doing something wicked."* which was the proper response, although I sensed no repentance on her part as she walked away.) When man does not do the Father's will, but his own will instead he is a child of disobedience, i.e., walking in sin, facing the wrath of the Father for his thoughts and actions.

*"Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Ephesians 2:2, 3*

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

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

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

The soul KNOWS from being *told*. The flesh by *"sense experience,"* i.e., *stimulus-response*. When God created ("*formed*") Adam He made him, unlike any other living thing in the creation "*a living soul*." He then *told* ("*commanded*") him what he could and could not do, i.e., He *told* him what was right and what was wrong behavior, i.e., which trees he could eat the fruit of and which one he could not (lest he die).

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

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

No animal, which are all subject only to *stimulus-response* (approach pleasure - avoid pain) and impulses and urges (instincts) can *read* or *write* a book, i.e., can be *told* or *tell* others what is right and what is wrong behavior, i.e., what they can and can not do. By making man subject to *stimulus-response* (only that which is of the world) man is (deceptively) equated to an animal (approach pleasure and avoid pain) denying the fact

that man does what animals can not do, i.e., reason from being *told*, which requires faith in the one giving the command, rule, fact, and/or truth.

*"[P]revent someone who KNOWS from filling the empty space." (Wilfred Bion, A Memoir of the Future)*

This is why man is hollow, chasing after pleasure (which is ever passing away) to fill the void, i.e., to fill *"the empty space,"* the void (the soul) only being filled (satisfied) by [the Word of God](#), KNOWING from being *told*. Those "of and for the world," i.e., *"of and for self,"* having heard the Word (it condemning them), seek to remove it from the environment so they, and those listening to and following after them can *lust* without having a *guilty conscience*, with each others *affirmation*.

*"Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." Romans 1:32 (See [Romans 1:21-31](#))*

*"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*

When it comes to right and wrong behavior, when you leave the father/Father (and His Son, Jesus Christ) out of your conversation with your *self* and with others all you have in this life is your *self*, i.e., your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, i.e., your perception of how the world "ought" to be, 'justifying' your *self* (and others who think and act like you), deceiving your *self* (and them) that you (and they) can do what you (and they) want, i.e., can *lust* without being held accountable—getting rid of those who get in the way of the things you (and they) are *lusting* after, i.e., your (and their) *self interests* without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without being held accountable for your (and their) carnal thoughts and carnal actions (at least in your and their mind). (This is why Cane could say *"Am I my brother's keeper?"* after killing Abel, i.e., after getting rid of that which made him "feel" bad, his world of importance being only about *himself*—Genesis 4:9). Leaving the Father, and therefore His Son out of this life ("group hug" won't help you) all you have is eternal death, i.e., the lake of fire that is never quenched, prepared for those who reject the Father, and His Son, Jesus Christ waiting for you.

*"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 [*lust and the affirmation of men*] is abomination in the sight of God." Luke 16:15*

*"Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts 10:34, 35*

*"The heart is deceitful above all things [thinking pleasure, i.e., lust is the standard for "good" instead of doing the father's/Father's will], and desperately wicked [hating anyone preventing, i.e., inhibiting or blocking it from enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' it lusts after]: who can know it?"* Jeremiah 17:9 It can not see its [hatred toward the father's/Father's authority](#) as being evil, i.e., "wicked," i.e., "desperately wicked" because its *lust* for pleasure is standing in the way, 'justifying' the hate. ([Mark 7:21-23](#))

Unique amongst the nations, America established the father's authority over the nation with the limiting of government, i.e., forming a representative, constitutional government with its "Bill of Rights" (the American "Bill of Rights" was in defense of the father's/Father's authority—the father's authority in the home, over his land and business/individualism, under God, the French "Bill of Rights" was in defense of the child's carnal nature—[Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité](#)). In America, instead of one, a King, as a father ruling over the nation (or no King, but a group of people ruling over "the people" instead) the citizen was the "father" (the king) and the representative was the "child" (the servant) sent to the store (to the capital) to buy the father's goods (to re-present the father, i.e., to do the father's will—protecting the father from governmental encroachment, eroding/usurping his rights of private conviction, property, and business). When the child (the representative) made law to serve his *lusts*, i.e., when he spent the father's money on his *self*, i.e., on his and his "friends" *self interests* he was brought home, another child (one of obedience) sent in his place. You can not get any more local, regarding local control than the father's authority in the home, what the American "Bill or Rights" was all about, what those "of and for the world," i.e., who "*lusting ...*" are in opposition of, i.e., seek to *negate*.

*"... despotism ... predominates in the human heart."* ([George Washington](#), *Farewell Address*)

Even George Washington understood the nature of the human heart and the necessity of "rule of law," i.e., restraint of those in government.

*"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation [one or all branches making law bypassing the citizens vote, i.e., restraint]; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."* *ibid.* The Constitution, as a father (Constitution meaning a statue, i.e., a standard) protected the individual citizen, i.e., the father's from the tyranny of those in government and the masses, that is until the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* process, i.e., *self interest*, i.e., "*What can I get out of this situation and/or these people for my self (to satisfy my lusts)?*" became the means to making law.

The Protestant reformation, i.e., "*The priesthood of all believers*," "*Doing your best as unto the Lord*," "*Putting no man between you and the Lord*," engendering individualism, under God, freed you from "*the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life*," resulting in you, no longer being under the control, i.e., the influence of those "*of the world*," being able to stand alone (under God) in the face of opposition, insisting those around you do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., limits and measures and "rule of law."

*"Protestantism was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism."* (Max Horkheimer, *Vernunft and Selbsterhaltung*; English. *Reasoning and Self Preservation*) This from a Marxist. With another Marxist, Jürgen Habermas stating "*If the 'restoring of life' of the world is to be conceived in terms of the Christian revelation [being told by the Father], then Marx [socialism, globalism, etc.,] must collapse into a bottomless abyss.*" ([Jürgen Habermas](#), *Theory and Practice*)

Those of the world have sought to bypass the father's/Father's authority so they can rule the world without restraint. This is where how we communicate with one another (when it comes to right and wrong behavior) comes into play. *Dialogue* ("I feel," and "I think") initiates and sustains 'change.' *Discussion* ("*The law/dad says*," "*It is written*") inhibits or blocks it. By bringing *dialogue* into an environment *discussing* law, i.e., establishing right and wrong behavior the father's/Father's authority is brought into confrontation with the *lusts* of those present, pressuring those 'loyal' to the father's/Father's authority to either abdicate the father's/Fathers authority (for approval of "*the group*," *affirming* their *lusts*), be silent (to figure out what is going on, experiencing [cognitive dissonance](#)), or to resist (facing rejection aka censorship by "*the group*," i.e., by those 'loyal' to their *lusts* and the people who *affirm* them). Any child, worker, educator, legislator, etc., who is 'loyal' to the father's/Father's authority in an environment (meeting) establishing right and wrong behavior via *dialogue (lust)* is going to be martyred (at least be *excommunicated without writ*), i.e., will experience rejection, condemnation/shaming, anguish (deep emotional pain) and *negation* if he persists.

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

*"A dialogue is essentially a conversation between equals." "The spirit of dialogue, is in short, the ability to hold many points of view in suspension, along with a primary interest in the creation of common meaning."* (Bohm and Peat, *Science, Order, and*

*Creativity*) *Dialogue* unites upon "*feelings*," i.e., "*I feel*" and/or "*I think*," i.e., an *opinion*, which is informal, i.e., non-judgmental, i.e., the child retains his carnal nature in *dialogue*, having the final say (against authority, i.e., absolutes, i.e., the father's/Father's authority). There is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, or in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only the child's natural inclination to "*lust ...*" and hate restraint being 'justified.' *Dialogue* moves *opinions* to a *consensus*, *negating* the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* it engenders in the process.

If a policy making group (from the classroom to government) is moved from *discussion* (Robert's Rules of Order—the original version), which retains the father's/Father's authority to *dialogue* (the facilitated meeting), where the *opinion*, i.e., the *lusts* of the 'moment,' i.e., where those with their *self interests*, i.e., their "*What can I get out of this situation and/or these people for my self?*" controls the outcome the father's/Father's authority is *negated* in the outcome. The "author" (instigator) of 'climate change,' Ervin Laszlo stating as much, i.e., explained how it is done.

*"Bypassing the traditional channels of top-down decision making [bypassing the father's/Father's authority] our objective centers upon transforming public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics." "Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common interests and ultimately to world interests transforming public consensus into one favorable to the emergence of a stable and humanistic world order." "Consensus is both a personal and a political step. It is a precondition of all future steps." (Ervin Laszlo, A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World Order)*

*"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." (Rogers)*

That starts with the human heart, i.e., with *lust*. If I can gain access (via *dialogue*) to your *self interest(s)*, i.e., to your *lust(s)* of the 'moment,' offering to "help" you *actualize* it (them) I "own" you. The same applies to your representative, i.e., your elected official in office. If I can gain access (via *dialogue*) to his (or her) *self interest(s)*, i.e., to his *lust(s)* of the 'moment,' offering to "help" him *actualize* it I "own" him. The same applies to your spouse, your children, your neighbors, your teachers, your minister, turning them against you if you insist upon them doing right and not wrong according to your established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of their *lust(s)*, i.e., their *self interest(s)*—now having my (and others) support aka *affirmation* that their *lust(s)*, i.e., their *self interest(s)* are right and your commands, rules, facts, and truth, that are getting in the way of their *lust(s)*, i.e., their *self interest(s)* are wrong.

*"And through covetousness [your lusts] shall they with feigned words [offering to "help" you achieve your hearts desires, i.e., your self interest in order to gain your trust, i.e., to gain control over you] make merchandise of you [use you as natural resource ("human resource") to satisfy their lusts, casting you away (as you did the father/Father) when you get in their way or no longer serve their purpose, i.e., their lusts]." 2 Peter 2:3*

The law of the flesh, i.e., *lust*, i.e., *covetousness*, i.e., "*human nature*" is restrained (inhibited or blocked) by the law of the father/Father, i.e., "rule of law," i.e., by doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rule, facts, and truth. That is why those of (and for) the world, i.e., "*of and for self*" seek to *negate* the father's/Father's authority, removing it from the environment, thus from the thoughts and actions of men. *Stimulus-response* is "of and for the world," i.e., is "of and for *self*," while being *told* is from above, i.e., "rule of law."

*"... the central problem is to change reality... reality with its 'obedience to laws.'" (György Lukács, History & Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?) For the Marxist, laws prejudice a man against his carnal nature, preventing him from becoming his self, i.e., of the world only.*

*"Laws must not fetter human life [inhibit or block lust]; but yield to it; they must change as the needs [the lusts] and capacities [interests/attractions of lust] of the people change." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right')* According to Karl Marx, laws must be subject to the child's/man's, i.e., his carnal nature, not to the father's/Father's, i.e., God's authority. Expressing the voice of "*the people*," but really speaking of his *self* Karl Marx wrote: "*I am nothing and I should be everything.*" (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) In other words: "*I am called a sinner, condemned, and cast out when I should be received as God and worshiped by 'the people.'*" When you worship your *self* you think everyone else, i.e., "*the people*" should worship you as well.

*"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." (G. F. W. Hegel in Carl Friedrich, The Philosophy of Hegel)* Hegel, by replacing wrong (the opposite of right) with "*badly*" declares there is no judgment for being or doing wrong (since there is no wrong), there only duty is to do things "better" the next time, whatever that might mean (being only an *opinion*, i.e., subject to private interpretation, i.e., subject to 'change'). Parents used to train their children to do right and not wrong. Today it is all about having a "better" life. There is nothing wrong with having a "better" life as long as you do not do wrong to achieve it. The marriage vow of "till death do us part" now includes (in practice) "until

someone better comes along." Hegel's *"peace and affirmation"* is being able to *lust* without having a *guilty conscience*, having everyone else's approval, i.e., affirmation.

Being *told* the law, i.e., the way it "is" and the consequence for disobeying engenders the *guilty conscience*. *Negate* the father/Father (the father's/Father's authority) and you *negate* the law, *negating* sin, thereby *negating* the *guilty conscience* for sinning, i.e., for *"lusting."* This is the ideology of those of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., who "Reason" from their carnal nature, therefore 'justify' their *"lusting,"* hating those who obey the law, i.e., who do the father's/Father's will, i.e., who insist that those "of the world" repent and do the father's/Father's will as well.

*"I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet."* Romans 7:7

*"So then with the mind [being told] I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh [by "sense experience"] the law of sin."* Romans 7:25

*"The guilty conscience is formed in childhood by the incorporation of the parents and the wish to be father of oneself." "What we call 'conscience' perpetuates inside of us our bondage to past objects now part of ourselves:"* (Brown) A definition of the *guilty conscience* from a Marxist's perspective.

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

The law of the father/Father vs. the law of the flesh.

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

*the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin."* Romans 7:14-25

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

*"In psychology, Freud and his followers have presented convincing arguments that the id [the child's impulses and urges of the 'moment'], man's basic and unconscious nature, is primarily made up of instincts which would, if permitted expression, result in incest, murder, and other crimes. The whole problem of therapy, as seen by this group, is how to hold these untamed forces in check in a wholesome and constructive manner [requiring a police state, i.e., sight based management since the guilty conscience (a product of the father's/Father's authority) for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for lusting after dopamine emancipation is not present to put a check on a person's impulse and urge], rather than in the costly fashion of the neurotic [having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of the person's lusts of the 'moment' that the world stimulates]." (Rogers) This is like boarding a train with no brakes. It is not how far down the track you are ("I'm not a bad, i.e., as far down the track as he is") it is that you are on the track in the first place—the end is still the same, i.e., judgment, condemnation, and eternal death.*

Those "of and for the world," perceiving the *guilty conscience* (a product of the father's/Father's authority) as a *neurotic* construct—inhibiting or blocking, i.e., preventing a person from being his *self*, i.e., from being "of the world only"—make it their duty to remove the father/Father, i.e., the father's/Father's authority from any environment establishing right and wrong behavior (the 'logic' of *stimulus-response*). In other words 'create' a "healthy," i.e., a "good" environment—according to your definition of what "healthy" or "good" is, which makes it subjective, i.e., subject to your flesh, i.e., to your *lusts* and hate—and you 'create' a "healthy," i.e., a "good" person. 'Create' an "unhealthy" environment—one which is subject to the father's/Father's authority—and you 'create' an "unhealthy" person. In order (as in new world order) for everybody (especially those "of and for the world") to be their *self*, i.e., to *lust* without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without being *neurotic*, i.e., without fearing the father's/Father's judgment upon them for doing their will, i.e., for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "*lusting*," a "healthy," i.e., a "good" environment (void of the father's/Father's authority) must be 'created.' Kurt Lewin summed it up in two sentences.

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

This is no different than what happened in a garden in Eden, where, with the "help" of the master facilitator of 'change' two "children" put aside the "Father's authority," so they could be their *self*, i.e., be of the world (*stimulus-response*) only.

*"Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat."*  
[Genesis 3:1-6](#)

The idea being (of those "of and for the world") if you remove the father's/Father's authority, i.e., "negativity," i.e., "Thou shalt surely die" (judgment for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*) from the environment that is establishing right and wrong behavior, insisting upon "positivity," i.e., the child's carnal nature, i.e., "Ye shalt not surely die" instead ("tolerance of ambiguity"; death not coming from eating the fruit of the tree itself, it was not poisonous—the woman was "scientifically" correct, it was good for food and pleasing to the eyes, it was just like all the other trees—the only difference being their disobedience, i.e., "thinking for their self," i.e., according to their flesh, 'justifying' their *lusts*, but death coming instead from their disobedience to the "Father," as a result of their no longer having access to the tree of life, God's judgment upon them, and all mankind for their disobedience) the *guilty conscience*, which the father's/Father's authority engenders is *negated*, so those present (especially those "of and for the world") can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can be their *self*, i.e., can "*lust ...*" without having a *guilty conscience*, with everyone's approval, i.e., *affirmation*. When it comes to defining/establishing right and wrong behavior the moment someone "asks" (tells) you, i.e., pressures you via "group" approval or rejection (the pressure of "the group" is the key to brainwashing) to be "positive" and not "negative" they have infringing upon your right/freedom of speech and religion. Protestant, as in Protestant reformation means "*Thou doest protest to much.*" In other words you refuse to move from your position, continuing to present it openly, refusing to be silent, knowing to be silent is to consent to that which to you know to be wrong, having been *told* (by one above, i.e., by the

father/Father via his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth). Under the father/Father you do not defend your position. It defends you. You simply present it, by faith letting it speak for, i.e., defend you. The 'moment' you go "I feel" and "I think" regarding your position you have abdicated it to "the group," i.e., to the fear of group rejection, i.e., to your *lust* for group approval. To indoctrinate a person in the process of 'change' you do not have to attack the father/Father outright, just leave him/Him out (deny him/Him input, i.e., do not bring what he/He says up) in setting policy, i.e., in establishing right and wrong behavior and the deed is done. This was the purpose of kindergarten, devised by socialists to accomplish the same. Any environment establishing right and wrong behavior, i.e., law which replaces *discussion*, i.e., "rule of law," i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth with *dialogue*, i.e., with the "feelings" and "desires" (*lusts*, i.e., *self interests*) of those present is accomplishing the deed. "[Building relationships on self interest](#)," when it comes to making law or establishing policy is a Marxist construct, *negating* the father's/Father's authority in establishing policy and making law. (The soviet system is 1. a diverse group of people, which must include the deviant, i.e., the "disenfranchised," i.e., those dissatisfied with, resenting, hating the father's/Father's authority, i.e., hating restraint, i.e., hating missing out on pleasure, i.e., hating not being able to satisfy their *lust*, 2. *dialoguing* their *opinions* to a *consensus*—there is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process, i.e., there is only the participants "*lusts*," i.e., "*self interests*" of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, and *affirmation*—3. over personal-social, i.e., emotional issues, 4. in a facilitated meeting—the facilitator of 'change' prevents those loyal to the father's/Father's authority from controlling/having input in the meeting/classroom, preventing those loyal to the father's/Father's authority from controlling the outcome of the meeting/classroom, which would result in everyone remaining subject to the father's/Father's authority—5. to a pre-determined outcome—that all policy/decisions/laws must be made through the "*Soviet*" system, i.e., the *consensus* process *negating*, i.e., rejecting the father's/Father's authority in establishing policy and making law.)

Who *told* you?

*"Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God amongst the trees of the garden.... I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself. And he [God] said, Who told thee that thou wast naked?"*  
(excerpts from Genesis 3:8-11)

Rejecting being *told*, turning to *stimulus-response*, i.e., reasoning from the flesh instead (when it comes to right and wrong behavior) is sin.

*"Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?"*  
Genesis 3:8

The liberal response is not to admit you are wrong, i.e., is to blame someone else or the situation:

*"And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. And the LORD God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." Genesis 3:12, 13*

When caught, like 'liberals' they both blamed someone else for their "bad" behavior, with Adam blaming the woman—*"throwing her under the bus"* (along with "the Father" for creating her, i.e., for creating an "unhealthy environment" for him to live in)—and the woman blaming the master facilitator of 'change'—*"throwing him under the bus"* for "helping" her 'justify' her *lusts*.

*"And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil [but in his case reasoning not from God's Word but from his flesh and the world that stimulates it]: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken." Genesis 3:22, 23*

As your inheritance in this life is based upon your parents approval of you, your inheritance from God, i.e., eternal life is based upon His approval of you—requiring repentance, turning from you wicked ways, and living in faith in His Son, doing His will.

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

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

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

Whoever defines terms for you controls your life, i.e., where you will spend eternity.

*"On account of the absolute and natural oneness of the husband, the wife, and the child [their lust for pleasure and their hate of restraint, what they all have in common—which is the basis of common-ism], where there is no antithesis [no "top-down," right-wrong way of thinking and acting] of person to person or of subject to object [everything is subject to the flesh, i.e., to lust and the world that stimulates it, i.e., to the Marxist (the facilitator of 'change') who, making this statement 'justifies' lust], the surplus is not the property of one of them, since their indifference is not a formal or a*

*legal one.*" (Georg Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*) In other words there is no one above man directing his steps, i.e., there is only man living for the 'moment.'

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

*"In our democratic society, any enterprise—any individual—has its obligations to the whole." "Tax credits would be given to the company that helps to improve the whole society, and helps to improve the democracy by helping to create democratic individuals." "Any company that restricts its goals purely to its own profits, its own production, and its own sales is getting a kind of a free ride from me and other taxpayers." (Abraham Maslow, *Maslow on Management*)*

What was unique about America, i.e., the reason some many people have come to America is the "right" of private conviction, property, and business with the understanding that your neighbor is not to infringe upon your rights as you are not to infringe upon his rights. The same being true for the government and the people. Socialists have introduced, for example programs like "public-private partnership" which destroys private rights. Private is nobodies business (it is your business alone). Public is everybody's business (as all are involved). "Public-private partnership" makes that which is yours public, i.e., everybody's business and for the socialist, public business only their business, i.e. nobodies business but theirs, once they are in control of making law and gather funds to support their cause (socialism).

*"For one class [those "lusting ..."] to stand for the whole of society, another [class, i.e., those humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating their self in order to do the father's/Father's will, demanding others do the same] must be the class of universal offense and the embodiment of universal limits. A particular*

*social sphere must stand for the notorious crime of the whole society, so that liberation from this sphere appears to be universal liberation. For one class to be the class par excellence of liberation, another class must, on the other hand, be openly the subjugating class." "The only practically possible emancipation is the unique theory which holds that man is the supreme being for man." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right) In other words, not until the child, through dialogue can find his identity in the other children, who like him "lust ..." and hate restraint can he overcome the effect of the father's/Father's authority, i.e., can he negate "the subjugating class" in himself and in society, i.e., in his thoughts and in his actions (the Marxist's continual reference to "theory and practice," i.e., the carnal mind and carnal action, impulses and urges coming together, becoming one).*

*"Parents have no right upon their offspring except a psychological right. Literally the children belong to universality [to him and those who think like him]." ([J. L. Moreno](#), *Who Shall Survive?*)*

*"An act of violence is any situation in which some men prevent others from the process of inquiry [from lust]...any attempt to prevent human freedom is an 'act of violence.' Any system which deliberately tries to discourage critical consciousness [questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way of lust] is guilty of violent oppression." (Freire, P.1970. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. p.74)*

*"Using social-environmental forces to change the parent's behavior toward the child." ([Theodor Adorno](#), *The Authoritarian Personality*)*

Martin Luther (rejecting Aristotelian ethics, i.e., *stimulus-response*) wrote:

*"The sophists, nevertheless, rise proudly up, hold their ears, close their eyes, and turn away their heart just so that they may fill all ears with their human words, and alone may occupy the stage so that no one will bark against their assertion[s] ... The word of man is sacred and to be venerated, but God's word is handed over to whores ... the meaning of sin ... is dependent on the arbitrary choice [opinion] of the sophists." (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.216)*

*"We do not become righteous by doing righteous deeds but, having been made righteous, we do righteous deeds." (Luther's Works: Vol. 31, Career of the Reformer: I, p. 12)*

The "wisdom" of men easily drowns out (blinds you to) the wisdom of God when your eyes are upon your *self* and the world around you, instead of upon Him. That is why those "of and for the world" focus on you, i.e., your "feelings" of the 'moment' in their effort to "help" them 'justify' themselves, i.e., their *lust*.

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

*"Here it is clear that Paul wants Christ alone to be taught and heard. Who does not see how the universities read the Bible? ... it has been so bothersome to read and respond to this filth." (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.259) Luther referring Colossians 2:8.*

It is either faith (doing the father's/Father's will) or sight (doing your will instead). Both have here-and-now and there-and-then consequence, with God, eternal consequence for you.

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

*"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*

Without restraint, i.e., the father's/Father's authority all you have is the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust*. That is why the focus is on the child (and the family) today, since there is no father's/Father's authority in the child, there is only the child's carnal nature seeking satisfaction, i.e., *actualization*. Replace *discussion*, which retains the father's/Father's authority, restraining the child with *dialogue*, which does not contain the father's/Father's authority and the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust*, i.e., the child rules the day. God requires *discussion* ("*Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.*" Isaiah 1:18-20), with Him having the final say. If you reject *discussion* all you have is *dialogue*, i.e., your carnal desires. God does not have to curse you. All He has to do, removing His hand of protection is let you have your way, i.e., turn you over to your carnal desires and you curse yourself.

*"And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them. And the people shall be oppressed, every one by another, and every one by his neighbour: the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honourable." "As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." Isaiah 3:4-5, 12*

*"... and children shall rise up against their parents, and shall cause them to be put to death."* Mark 13:12

Georg Hegel, establishing *lust*, i.e., the child's carnal nature over the father's/Father's authority wrote:

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

*"Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys."* (Heraclitus) In other words *"feelings,"* i.e., *lust* (the child's carnal nature) should direct the steps of man, not established commands, rules, facts, and truth (the father's/Father's authority) that get in the way, i.e., that inhibit or block 'change.'

Karl Marx based his ideology off of Heraclitus—as did the stoics; as did the Supreme court in *Roe V Wade*. Rejecting *"Every system of law known to civilized society generated from or had as its component one of two well known systems of ethics, stoic or Christian [men's opinions or the Father's authority]. The COMMON LAW draws its subsistence from the latter; its roots go deep into that system, the Christian concept of right and wrong or right and justice motivates every rule of equity. It is the guide by which we dissolve domestic friction's and the rule by which all legal controversies are settled"* (Strauss Vs. Strauss., 3 So. 2nd 727, 728, 1941), replacing it with *self interest*, i.e., *"there has always been strong support for the view [opinion] that life does not begin until live birth. This was the belief of the Stoics"* (ROE v. WADE, 410 U.S. 113 15, 1973), the Supreme court established Marxism, i.e., *"The justice of state constitutions is to be decided not on the basis of Christianity, not from the nature of Christian society [not from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., from "rule of law"] but from the nature of human society [from the child's carnal nature, i.e., from lust, i.e., from the child's ("the peoples") self interest],"* (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) as the law of the land.

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

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

In other words, according to Karl Marx, et al, *lust*, i.e., enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating reconciles you to the world, i.e., *self* is *actualized* in *lust* and the world that stimulates it. By establishing *lust* as the foundation (the 'drive' and the 'purpose') of life, Karl Marx established *lust*, i.e., "human nature," i.e., what all men have in common (the basis of common-ism) over and therefore against the father/Father's authority. Rejecting the Father, i.e., the Father's authority Karl Marx and all who think like him *perceived* the Heavenly Father as being the result of the earthly father's authority in the home, requiring the *negation* of the earthly father's authority in the home and in society (as well as in any group meeting where right and wrong behavior is being established) in order to *negate* the Heavenly Father's authority in the thoughts and actions of "*the people*," in order (as in 'new' world order) for mankind, i.e., Karl Marx himself to sin, i.e., to "*lust ...*" without fearing judgment (damnation).

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

*"Not feeling at home in the sinful world, Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home." "Critical Criticism is a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without."* (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) In other words, according to Karl Marx, "*Not feeling at home*" in a world of sinners (for all have sinned) calling him a sinner, his conversation with his *self* must "*set up a sinful world in [his] own home*," i.e. in his own mind. The difference between *discussion* and *dialogue* is in a *discussion* the father/Father has the final say, i.e., "*Because I said so*," "*Never the less*," "*It is written*" while in *dialogue*, what Karl Marx called "*Critical Criticism*" there is no father's/Father's authority. There is only everyone's own *opinion*, based upon their perception of how the world "ought" to be, i.e., the world in the 'moment,' i.e., of the "*eternal present*." *Dialogue* is "*a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without*," i.e., intolerant of "*I am right and you are wrong*" since wrong is not a part of his *perception* of his *self*, i.e., is not a part of his *lust*, which seems to him, in the 'moment' to be right.

*"The individual may have 'secret' thoughts ["ought's," i.e., "lusts"] which he will under no circumstances reveal to anyone else if he can help it [out of fear of being judged, rejected, and/or punished]. To gain access [through getting him (or her) to dialogue, i.e., to share his "feelings," i.e., his carnal desires, i.e., his lusts and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' that he is internally, i.e., privately thinking about] is*

*particularly important, for here may lie the individual's potential [for 'change,' i.e., to become of and for his "self" and the world that stimulates—'liberating' him from the father's/Father's authority that restrains].* (Adorno) By gaining access (via *dialogue*) to the person's *"secret" thoughts,* i.e., his *lust* for pleasure and rejection of the father's/Father's authority ("Critical Criticism"), helping him 'discover' this commonality with others, he can be 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority in this thoughts, united with others in removing the father's/Father's authority from society.

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

*"Only when the immediate interests [lusts, i.e., self interests] are integrated into a total view and related to the final goal of the process do they become revolutionary [overthrowing the father's/Father's authority in the individual, in "the group," and in society]."* *"The whole system of Marxism stands and falls with the principle that revolution [negation of the father's/Father's authority in setting policy] is the product of a point of view in which the category of totality ["group think," what all children have in common, i.e., lust for dopamine emancipation and fear of losing it] is dominant."* (Lukács) *"Group think"* begins with *"What can I get out of this group for my self?"* (lust for pleasure, which includes the approval of man) which then leads to *"What will happen to me if the group rejects me?"* (fear of man). What starts with fear of death under the father/Father, i.e., chastening (missing out on pleasure)—which the child learns does not kill them—in "the group," *lust* being all there is (life) to "the group," he will do all he can to defend "the group," i.e., *lust*, i.e., life, all becoming the same in his thought, directly effecting his actions.

When right and wrong behavior is developed by one's participation in "the group," what everyone has in common, i.e., *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraints takes control of the person (the tyranny of the masses).

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

*"Revolutionary violence [overthrow of the father/Father and his/His authority] reconciles the disunited parties [the children/"the people"] by abolishing the alienation of class antagonism [the father's/Father's authority over the children/"the people"] that set in with the repression of initial morality [lust]. ... the revolution that must occur is the reaction of suppressed life [hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward*

authority], *which will visit the causality of fate upon the rulers* [the parents, the property owner, the business owner, etc., i.e., the father]. *It is those who establish such domination and defend positions of power of this sort who set in motion the causality of fate* [hate and violence toward them], *divide society into social classes* [parents over children, owners over workers, God over man, etc.], *suppress justified interests* [lusts], *call forth the reactions of suppressed life* [hate and violence], *and finally experience their just fate in revolution* [violence against and overthrow of their right of person (individuality, under God), right of conviction (speech and religion), property, and business]." (Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge & Human Interest, Chapter Three: The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory*) Jürgen Habermas, a Marxist amongst Marxists has established the language of the World Court.

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

*"Freud noted that patricide* [hatred toward the father's/Father's authority] *and incest* [lust for pleasure] *are part of man's deepest nature.*" ([Irvin D. Yalom](#), *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*)

Rejecting the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the system or *paradigm* itself, Karl Marx's object was to *remove* the father's/Father's authority from the environment, i.e., from society (from "the group," as in do not be "negative," insisting upon doing the father's/Father's will, judging others from it, but be "positive," i.e., tolerant of unrighteousness, i.e., of *lust*), thus *negating* the father's/Father's authority in "the people's" thoughts, directly effecting their actions. This was the 'reasoning' behind the Russian revolution and all [dopamine emancipation](#) driven revolutions prior and since.

*"The peasantry* [the traditional family] *constantly regenerates the bourgeoisie* [the father's/Father's authority system]—*in positively every sphere of activity and life.*" *"We must learn how to eradicate all bourgeois habits, customs, and traditions everywhere."* ([Vladimir Lenin](#), *Left-Wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder An Essential Condition of the Bolsheviks' Success* May 12, 1920) Millions, hundreds of millions of people have died (and continue to die) violent deaths as a result of this ideology.

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

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

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

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

*"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*)*

All "educators" are certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)" i.e., Marxist curriculum in the classroom—including "Christian." By 1971 over one million of Bloom's "taxonomies" were published for the Communist Chinese education system. (Benjamin Bloom, *Forty Year Evaluation*)

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

[Theodor Adorno](#) and [Erich Fromm](#) were Marxists, i.e., members of the "[Frankfurt School](#)," who came to the states, fleeing Fascist Germany in the early 30's—who entered our universities and "assisted" our government in making policy—moving education out from under parental (the father's/Father's) authority, i.e., local control ("[in loco parentis](#)") to government, i.e., their control.

*"We are proud that in his conduct of life man has become free from external authorities, which tell him what to do and what not to do." "All that matters is that the opportunity for genuine activity be restored to the individual; that the purposes of*

society ["the group"] and of his own become identical." "... to give up 'God' and to establish a concept of man as a being ... who can feel at home in it [the world] if he achieves union with his fellow man and with nature." (Erich Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*)

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

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

Sigmund Freud, like Karl Marx ('justifying' his "lusting ...") hated the father's/Father's authority.

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

Sigmund Freud's history of the prodigal son is not of the son coming to his senses, *humbling* his *self*, returning home, submitting his *self* to his father's authority, learning his inheritance was not his father's money but his father's love for him (Luke 15:11-24), but of the son joining with his "friends," returning home, killing the father, taking all that was his (the father's), using it to satisfy their carnal desires, i.e., their "*lusts*," killing all the fathers in the land so all the children could be the same, i.e., like them, thereby *affirming* them, i.e., their "*incest*," 'justifying' and supporting their control over them.

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

*collective killing and devouring of the father."* (Sigmund Freud in Marcuse)

*"According to Freud, the ultimate essence of our being is erotic." "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." "Eros is the foundation of morality." "Freud saw that in the id there is no negation [no parental authority, i.e. no Godly restraint, i.e. no "Thou shalt not"], only affirmation and eternity [only the child's/student's natural inclination to lust after dopamine emancipation, the "eternal present"]." "Children have not acquired that sense of shame which, according to the Biblical story, expelled mankind from Paradise, and which, presumably, would be discarded if Paradise were regained [if pleasure (lust) became the agenda, i.e., the 'drive' and 'purpose' of life]." "The repression of normal adult sexuality is required only by cultures which are based on patriarchal domination [on doing the father's/Father's will]." "Our repressed desires are the desires we had unrepressed, in childhood; and they are sexual desires." "Parental discipline, religious denunciation of bodily pleasure, . . . have all left man overly docile, but secretly in his unconscious [in his urges and impulses of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world] unconvinced, and therefore neurotic [caught between his desire for parental approval and his lust for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, having a guilty conscience for thinking about or doing the latter]." "The foundation on which the man of the future will be built is already there, in the repressed unconscious; the foundation has to be recovered ['liberated' from the guilty conscience, requiring the negation of the father's/Father's authority]." ([Norman O. Brown](#), *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*)*

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

Marxism and psychology have this in common, 'justification' of the child's carnal nature, 'justifying' the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way.

*"Our aim is not merely to describe prejudice [established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority that get in the way of lust, i.e., that inhibits*

or blocks "human nature"] but to explain it in order to help in its eradication. Eradication means re-education." (Adorno)

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

"A change in the curriculum is a change in the people concerned—in teachers, in students, in parents . . . ." "Curriculum change means that the group involved must shift its approval from the old to some new set of reciprocal behavior patterns." "... people involved who were loyal to the older pattern must be helped to transfer their allegiance to the new." "Re-education aims to change the system of values and beliefs of an individual or a group." "For actual changes in 'content' and 'method' we must change the people who manage the school program. To change the curriculum of the school means bringing about changes in people—in their desires, beliefs and attitudes, in their knowledge and skill . . . curriculum change should be seen as a type of social change, change in people. Curriculum change means a change in the established ways of life, a change in the social standards. It means a restructuring on knowledge, attitudes, and skills in a new pattern of human relations. Educators and others in the role of change agents must have a method of social engineering relevant to initiating and controlling the change process." (Benne)

"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*)

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

Martin Luther understood the importance of education and how it can be used to either glorify God or glorify man, i.e., the flesh.

"I greatly fear that the universities, unless they teach the Holy Scriptures diligently and impress them on the young students, are wide gates to hell. I would advise no one to send his child where the Holy Scriptures are not supreme. Every institution that does not unceasingly pursue the study of God's word becomes corrupt." (Luther's Works: Vol. 1, *The Christian in Society*: p. 207)

"Eradication" of "prejudice," i.e., negation of the father's/Father's authority from the individual's thoughts and from society is what Karl Marx, Vladimir Lenin, and "Bloom's Taxonomies" have in common. This required removal of the father's/Father's authority

from the classroom (the learning environment), i.e., from the pre-school to the University and beyond.

*"Perhaps one of the most dramatic events highlighting the need for progress in the affective domain ['liberation' of the student's carnal nature, i.e., lust from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., 'liberation' of the college student from his or her parent's established commands, rules, facts, and truth] was the publication of Jacob's Changing Values in College (1957)." (Book 2: Affective Domain) Parents today are sending their children to Colleges/Universities they believe reflect their values (including "Christian" and "conservative") not knowing professors are being required to use "Bloom's Taxonomies" in the development of their curriculum/syllabus, liberating their children from the father's/Father's authority system.*

*"Bloom's Taxonomies" are "... a psychological classification system" used "to develop attitudes and values ... which are not shaped by the parents." "Ordering" "different kinds of affective behavior," i.e., "the range of emotion(s)" "organized into value systems and philosophies of life." "It was the view of the group that educational objectives stated in the behavior form have their counterparts in the behavior of individuals, observable and describable therefore classifiable [true science is "observable and repeatable," i.e., objective, i.e., constant not "observable and describable," i.e., subject to an opinion, i.e., subject to 'change']. " "Only those educational programs which can be specified in terms of intended student behaviors can be classified." "What we are classifying is the intended behavior of students—the ways in which individuals are to act, think, or feel as the result of participating in some unit of instruction." "... ordering and relating the different kinds of affective behavior." "... we need to provide the range of emotion from neutrality through mild to strong emotion, probably of a positive, but possibly also of a negative, kind." "... organized into value systems and philosophies of life ..." "...many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in some ways brought into question while more rational and nonauthoritarian behaviors are emphasized." "The student must feel free to say he disliked \_\_\_\_\_ and not have to worry about being punished for his reaction." "The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box' [a "box" (jar) full of evils, which once opened, can not be closed—once parental authority, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., fear of judgment, i.e., "the lid" is removed it is difficult if not impossible to put it back on again]. ' It is in this 'box' that the most influential controls are to be found." "In fact, a large part of what we call 'good teaching' is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives ['liberating' the student's "feelings" from his or her parent's authority, i.e., the father's/Father's authority system] through challenging the student's fixed beliefs [pressuring the student (out of fear of group rejection) to publically, i.e., in "the group" (for the sake of group*

approval) question, challenge, disregard, defy, attack, etc., his parents' commands, rules, facts, and truth] *and getting them to discuss issues* [evaluating the world through his carnal desires, i.e., his *lusts*, i.e., his "*self interests*" of the 'moment,' that which he has in common with "*the group*".] "*The affective domain* [the student's natural inclination to "*lust ...*" and hate restraint] *contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people.*" (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*; David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*)

It is the child's response to the father's/Father's authority that determines whether he is a Marxist (in thought and in action) or not. Thus the "need" of a "taxonomy," at least the perception of it, i.e., that it is a taxonomy, i.e., true science.

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

*"It has been pointed out that we are attempting to classify phenomena which could not be observed or manipulated in the same concrete form as the phenomena of such fields as the physical and biological sciences. It was the view of the group that educational objectives stated in the behavior form have their counterparts in the behavior of individuals ... observe(able) and describ(able) therefore classifi(able) [true science is observable and repeatable]." (Book 1: Cognitive Domain)* If it is not a true "taxonomy," i.e., true science, man is more than *stimulus-response*, i.e., not only of the world.

*"Whether or not the classification scheme presented in Handbook I: Cognitive Domain is a true taxonomy is still far from clear." (Book 2: Affective Domain)*

Having dedicated his first "taxonomy" to Ralph Tyler, whose student was Thomas Kuhn it is clear to see where Bloom's so called "taxonomy" was taking science, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth.

*"A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." "If a paradigm [a 'change' in culture, from Patriarch to Heresiarch] is ever to triumph it must gain some first supporters, men who will develop it to the point where hardheaded arguments [not facts or truth] can be produced and multiplied" which eventuates "an increasing shift in the distribution of professional allegiances" whereupon "the man who continues to resist after his whole profession has been converted is ipso facto ceased to be a scientist." "Thomas S Kuhn spent the year 1958-1959 at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavior Sciences, directed by Ralph Tyler, where he finalized his 'paradigm shift'*

*concept of 'Pre- and Post-paradigm periods.' "Kuhn admitted problems with the schemata of his socio-psychological theory yet continued to urge its application into the scientific fields of astronomy, physics, chemistry, and biology [which found its way into the classroom via "Bloom's Taxonomies"]." (Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*)*

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

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

*"There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." Proverbs 14:12*

*"Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." Matthew 23:28*

*"Judge not according to the appearance [from what seems to be right to you], but judge righteous judgment [from what the Father and His Son Jesus Christ say]." John 7:24*

An Overview of "Bloom's 'cognitive' taxonomy:" In traditional education, i.e., "old school" *knowing* is being *told*, *comprehending* is understanding you will be held accountable for being or doing wrong, *application* is, if you disobey or do wrong, *evaluating* is, as you are being "taken to the wood shed," you now KNOW you need to do what you are *told*). "Bloom's" adding of *synthesizing* and *analyzing* (the children 'reasoning,' i.e., evaluating, i.e., *aufheben* right and wrong behavior from their flesh and the world around them that stimulates it aka *stimulus-response*) to *knowing*, *comprehending*, *application*, and *evaluating* negates the father's/Father's authority in the students' thoughts, directly effecting his actions. Thus the so called taxonomy evaluated where along a spectrum of 'change' (from 'loyalty' to the father's/Father's authority to 'loyalty' to his and other's carnal nature) the student resided at any given moment in any given situation.

*"Individuals move not from a fixity through change to a new fixity [from doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, truth, changing their position only when persuaded with facts and truth], though such a process is indeed possible [in other words, "We do not want to think about/focus on/accept that way of thinking"]. But [through a] continuum from fixity to changingness [from belief, i.e., faith and obedience to theory, i.e., opinion], from rigid structure to flow [from "What does the father/Father want me to do?" to "What do I want to do?" and "What will*

*'the group' think?"]*, from stasis to process [from doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth to *self (lust)* 'justification']. " *At one end of the continuum the individual avoids close relationships [with those who are deviant, i.e., doing wrong, disobeying, sinning], which are perceived as being dangerous. At the other end he lives openly and freely in relation to the therapist and to others [those doing wrong, disobeying, sinning], guiding his behavior on the basis of his immediate experiencing [his lust for pleasure (to lust) and his lust for "the group's" affirmation, 'justifying' his lusts]— he has become an integrated process of changingness [stimulus-response].*" (Rogers)

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

*"A natural step in the present study, therefore, was to conceive of a continuum extending from extreme conservatism to extreme liberalism and to construct a scale which would place individuals along this continuum."* (Adorno) This in its very act (praxis) *negates* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., right and wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, making everything subject to the sensation of the 'moment,' i.e., right being that which *stimulates* pleasure, wrong being that which inhibits or blocks it, *stimulating* hate. Generally speaking, while "conservative" might be immoral dividing on position/possession, "liberals" 'justifying' immorality, i.e., making laws that legalize immorality are united on it, dividing "conservatives" on their positions so they can win the day.

*"The philosophy of praxis is the absolute secularization of thought, an absolute humanism of history."* (Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*) There is no father's/Father's authority, i.e., established command, rule, fact, or truth, when it comes to right and wrong behavior in *praxis*. The name for the National test for teachers is [Praxis](#), supporting Marx's, i.e., Bloom's ideology.

*"We recognize the point of view that truth and knowledge are only relative and that there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all time and places."* (Book 1: *Cognitive Domain*)

*"In the eyes of the dialectic philosophy [using dialogue, i.e., "feelings" to come to the "truth"], nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred."* (Karl Marx's ideology, as explained by Friedrich Engels) Benjamin Bloom simply paraphrased Karl Marx's ideology (without giving him credit, for obvious reason).

For Karl Marx it is the child who 'creates' the father's/Father's authority (by his obedience), not the father/Father who creates the child (in his image).

*"The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force." (Karl Marx MEGA I/3, pp. 83-84)*

By the child *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating* his self in order to do the father's will, Karl Marx believed it was the child who 'created' the father's authority. Thus Karl Marx 'justified' the child's hatred toward (questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking) the father's authority because it got in the way of his *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world was stimulating, i.e., "human nature." This is antithetical to the Word of God.

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

Important to KNOW: The father's/Father's office of authority is summed up in his *preaching* commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaching* facts and truth to be accepted as is, i.e., by faith until understood, and *discussing* with those under his authority any questions they might have regarding his commands, rules, facts, and truth at his discretion (providing he deems it necessary, has time, those under his authority are capable of understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking his authority), *rewarding* (blessing) those who are doing right and obeying, *chastening* (correcting) those who are doing wrong and/or disobeying in order for them to learn to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their self and do right according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, casting out or expelling (grounding) those who are questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking authority. This is also the method or system, i.e., the political system of traditional education. It is a "top-down" political system socialist/Marxists, i.e., those of and for their self (and the world) are well aware of and seek to *negate*.

*"He that spareth his rod hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes." "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him." "Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell." Proverbs 13:24; 22:15; 23:14*

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

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

*"Hear, ye children, the instruction of a father, and attend to know understanding."  
"He that refuseth instruction despiseth his own soul: but he that heareth reproof getteth understanding." Proverbs 4:1; 15:32*

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

*"And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Ephesians 6:4* Nurture entails chastisement aka correction. Admonition entails focusing upon the Lord, making the child's thought and actions subject to Him, i.e., desires to do His will.

The role of the father, besides loving his wife, i.e., the children's mother, providing food, clothing, safety, and a roof over his family's head is to train up his children in the admonition of the Lord—doing the Father's will—and teach them how to "pull weeds," i.e., to work (get off their duff, expecting someone to wait on them). A father, in the true sense of the word, i.e., a [benevolent father](#) loves his children while hating their doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, holding them accountable for their actions—*chastening* them when they do wrong, disobey, sin that they might learn to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their "self" and do right, i.e., obey, i.e., not sin, grounding them when they reject his authority, having mercy on them when they repent and do what is right, but not hating them, wanting to kill them as the carnally minded, i.e., *lust* seeking child does when the father gets in his way, i.e., in the way of his *lust* for pleasure. While capitalism rewards good work, socialism rewards bad, the capitalist wanting the body (to get the job done) the socialist wanting the soul, knowing the body will come along. God loves everyone but judges us according to our thoughts and actions, with us either accepting His authority, *humbling* our *self*, repenting of our *lusts*, doing His will or rejecting Him and His authority, *esteeming*, i.e., 'justifying' our *self*, i.e., our *lusts* doing our will instead, dying in our sin, facing his judgment, i.e., damnation (the lake of fire that is never quenched, prepared for the master facilitator of 'change and all who follow him).

*"I have found whenever I ran across authoritarian students [those who adhere to the father's/Father's authority] that the best thing for me to do was to break their backs*

*immediately." "The correct thing to do with authoritarians is to take them realistically for the bastards they are and then behave toward them as if they were bastards." (Abraham Maslow, Maslow on Management)*

This is the attitude those of and for the world have regarding anyone who adheres to and attempts to promote the father's/Father's authority in their class. Abraham Maslow's "Hierarchy of felt needs" is void of the father's/Father's authority, 'liberating' the student from the father's/Father's authority. This is the benchmark of Marxism (and psychology).

*". . . any intervention between parent and child tend to produce familial democracy [replacing discussion, which retains the father's/Father's authority with dialogue, which 'justifies' the child's carnal nature 'liberates' the child from the parent's authority, i.e., from having to do right and not wrong according to the parent's (the father's/Father's) established commands, rules, facts, and truth] regardless of its intent." "The consequences of family democratization take a long time to make themselves felt—but it would be difficult to reverse the process once begun. . . . once the parent can in any way imagine his own orientation to be a possible liability to the child in the world approaching." "... Once uncertainty is created in the parent how best to prepare the child for the future, the authoritarian family is moribund [the father's/Father's authority is negated in the child's thoughts, directly effecting his or her actions—questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way, doing so without having a guilty conscience], regardless of whatever countermeasures may be taken." "The state, by its very interference in the life of its citizens, must necessarily undermine a parental authority which it attempts to restore." "For however much the state or community may wish to inculcate obedience and submission in the child, its intervention betrays a lack of confidence in the only objects from whom a small child can learn authoritarian submission." ([Warren Bennis](#), *The Temporary Society*)*

No one is to come between the husband and his wife, the father and his children, with the husband being over the wife and the father over the children (except God, the Father) if the traditional home is to remain in place. The husband and wife, to be believers must agree that Genesis and the rest of the scriptures are true (as written) and that the Lord is the one who directs their steps, casting all their cares upon Him. See the issue on [Divorce](#).

*"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient [decent]; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful:" Romans 1:28-32*

Evolution, 'climate change,' etc., are "*fables*," created by men to *negate* (in their mind) sin and therefore God's judgment upon them, so they can "*lust ...*" without having a *guilty conscience*.

*"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables."* 2 Timothy 4:3, 4

This is where *therapy*, i.e., the rejection of the father's/Father's authority in establishing right and wrong behavior has brought us today—a nation of depravity (everywhere you turn).

*"In this process the individual becomes more open to his experience. It is the opposite of defensiveness or rigidity. His beliefs are not rigid, he can tolerate ambiguity."* (Rogers)

The facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the group psychotherapist, i.e., the Marxist engenders a political system that is hostile toward the father's/Father's authority. KNOWING by being *told* and knowing by "*sense experience*" (when it comes to knowing right from wrong behavior) are both political systems. They are antithetical to one another. One is based upon the father's/Father's authority the other upon the facilitator of 'change,' 'justifying' "human nature." The facilitator of 'change,' perceiving his *self* to be the personification of "the people," who like him "*lust ...*" sees it as his duty to 'justify' them, i.e., their *lusts*, i.e., their *self interests* thus 'justifying' his *self*, i.e., his *lusts*, i.e., his *self interests*, converting, silencing, censoring, removing anyone who gets in his, i.e., in "*the people's*" way. When he says "*It is not about you*" when you question his actions he is saying "*It is all about me, so I can lust after pleasure without having a guilty conscience, with your affirmation. If you refuse to affirm me, i.e. my lusts or get in my way, 'the people' will remove (negate) you (since, having 'justified' their lusts I now "own" them). It appears I must keep an eye on you from now on for my 'good.'*" All facilitator's of 'change' and their followers are intoxicated with, addicted to, and possessed by *lust*, 'justifying' all who think and act like them, converting (*seducing, deceiving, and manipulating*), silencing, censoring, removing anyone who gets in their way (including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous) so they can "*lust ...*" without having a *guilty conscience*, with your *affirmation*.

*"Without exception, [children] enter group therapy [the "group grade" classroom] with the history of a highly unsatisfactory experience in their first and most important group—their primary family [the traditional home with parents telling them what they can and can not do]." "What better way to help [the child] recapture the past than to allow him to re-experience and reenact ancient feelings [resentment, hostility] toward parents in his current relationship to the therapist [the facilitator of 'change']? The [facilitator of 'change'] is the living personification of all parental*

*images [takes the place of the parent]. Group [facilitators] refuse to fill the traditional authority role: they do not lead in the ordinary manner, they do not provide answers and solutions [teach right from wrong from established commands, rules, facts, and truth], they urge the group [the children] to explore and to employ its own resources [to dialogue their "feelings," i.e., their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' in the "light" of the current situation, i.e., their desire for "the group" approval (affirmation)]. The group [children] must feel free to confront the [the facilitator of 'change'], who must not only permit, but encourage, such confrontation [rebellion and anarchy]. He [the child] reenacts early family scripts in the group and, if therapy [brainwashing—washing respect for and fear of the father's/Father's authority from the child's brain (thoughts) ] is successful, is able to experiment with new behavior, to break free from the locked family role [submitting to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will] he once occupied. ... the patient [the child] changes the past by reconstituting it ['creating' a "new" world order from his "ought," i.e., a world which "lusts," i.e., a world void of the father's/Father's authority and the guilty conscience which the father's/Father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "lusting ..."]."* (Yalom)

What is brainwashing? It is washing the father's/Father's authority, i.e., fear of judgment for disobeying the father/Father (equated to Nationalism) from the person's thoughts, directly effecting his actions.

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

The following section is from a book explaining how the Communist Chinese brainwash their victims through the use of "*Lewinian change theory*," which is being used in the "*group grade*," facilitated, "*Bloom's Taxonomy*" classroom today. Any one having participated in a "group grade" classroom or *consensus* meeting can readily identify the steps of brainwashing described below.

*"The manner in which the prisoner came to be influenced to accept the Communist's definition of his guilt can best be described by distinguishing two broad phases—(1) a process of 'unfreezing,' ["In brief, unfreezing is the breaking down of the mores, customs and traditions of an individual – the old ways of doing things – so that he is ready to accept new alternatives." (Edger Schein and Warren Bennis, *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach*)] in which the prisoner's physical resistance, social and emotional supports, self-image and sense of integrity, and basic values and personality were undermined, thereby creating a state of 'readiness' to be influence; and (2) a process of 'change,' in which the prisoner discovered how the adoption of 'the people's standpoint' and a reevaluation of himself from this perspective would provide him with a solution to the problems created by the prison pressure."*

*"Most were put into a cell containing several who were further along in reforming themselves and who saw it as their primary duty to 'help' their most backward member to see the truth about himself in order that the whole cell might advance. Each such cell had a leader who was in close contact with the authorities for purposes of reporting on the cell's progress and getting advice on how to handle the Western member . . . the environment undermined the (clients) self-image."*

*". . . Once this process of self of self re-evaluation began, the (client) received all kinds of help and support from the cell mates and once again was able to enter into meaningful emotional relationships with others." (Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays in Readings on Human Interaction, ed. Warren G. Bennis, Edgar H. Schein, David E. Berlew, and Fred I. Steele) See [Unfreezing, Moving or Changing, Refreezing People, Force Field Analysis](#), and [Group Dynamics](#) for more on the subject.*

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

By discovering a person's *lust*, the facilitator of 'change' can (as a [predator, charlatan, pimp, pedophile](#)) control him, using him for his own pleasure.

*"Dr. Skinner says: 'We must accept the fact that some kind of control of human affairs is inevitable. We cannot use good sense in human affairs unless someone engages in the design and construction of environmental conditions which affect the behavior of men.'" (Rogers)*

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

This is the *praxis* of *dialoguing opinions* to a *consensus*—which is the basis of establishing behavior in most meetings today, from the home to government, and everything in between—making *lust* the 'drive' and its augmentation the 'purpose' of life, *negating* the father's/Father's authority in setting policy and making law.

*"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*

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

*"Thinking through the process it is dialectically faulty to start with the negative, with anxiety [with the father's/Father's authority, i.e., with being held accountable for being wrong, disobeying, sinning]. The problem is to name the dynamic factor provoking anxiety to emerge [the father's/Father's authority coming between the child and the object he is *lusting* after, taking or threatening to take it away]. Anxiety is a function of spontaneity [the child's natural reaction of hate and violence toward the person(s) taking the object of *lust* away (in his eyes forever)]. Spontaneity can be defined as the adequate response to a new situation, or the novel response to an old situation. With decrease of spontaneity anxiety increases. With entire loss of spontaneity anxiety reaches its maximum, the point of panic [when the child is totally focused on the object of his *lust* and fears it being taken away from him, i.e., losing it*

forever he is primed to act, i.e., to attack (at all cost, i.e., without considering the consequences)]." (Moreno) By keeping the child focused upon what he might lose, in the event the father's/Father's authority gains control of the situation the child is primed to respond, i.e., to attack the father/Father (and anyone who supports him/Him).

*"Flee also youthful lusts:"* 2 Timothy 2:22 Don't walk by it, "flee" from it. If you look (think) upon it, it will "own" you. The eyes are stronger than the ears. *"Hell and destruction are never full; so the eyes of man are never satisfied."* Proverbs 27:20

*Lust* leads to violence, in order to initiate and sustain it.

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

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

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

Psychology, as does Marxism destroys the father's authority in the home, likewise destroying the Father's authority in the thoughts of man, directly effecting his actions, i.e., where he will spend eternity

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

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

The 'Reasoning' of man is all about 'justifying' his *self*, i.e., 'justifying' his natural inclination to *lust ...*, 'justifying' his natural inclination to hate restraint, i.e., to hate the father/Father and his/His authority for getting in the way. It is the father's/Father's law (that restrains/condemns the flesh) that those of the world hate, not the law of the flesh (that engenders *lust*).

*"Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Romans 3:19*

*"For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." James 2:10*

*"For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:"  
"For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Romans 8:3, 2*

*"He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." 1 John 3:8*

While the law can save no one it is by the law we come to KNOW we are sinners, i.e., that we are not God, i.e., that we are not perfect, i.e., that we are not in control of life (death comes—then comes 'judgment'), i.e., that we need salvation, i.e., reconciliation to the Father. Focusing upon the *"eternal present,"* i.e., the *lusts*, i.e., the *self interests* of the 'moment' that the world stimulates blinds man to where he will spend eternity.

*"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Corinthians 5:10*

*"And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not*

life." 1 John 5:11, 12

*"For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world." 2 Corinthians 1:12*

*"Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; That he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries: Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you: Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead." 1 Peter 4:1-5*

Question the use of psychology in the "church" today and you will quickly discover how Marxist it has become—with everyone running to the "Christian" bookstore to get everyone's *opinion* of the Word of God instead of reading it for themselves.

*"Miserable Christians, whose words and faith still depend on the interpretations of men and who expect clarification from them! This is frivolous and ungodly. The Scriptures are common to all, and are clear enough in respect to what is necessary for salvation and are also obscure enough for inquiring minds ... let us reject the word of man." (Martin Luther, Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.217)*

When you turn to man for direction (regarding right and wrong behavior), instead of the Father, and His Son Jesus Christ, you *deny* the Father's authority.

*"Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself [deny his lusts], and take up his cross [denying the lusts of others enduring their rejection of him for doing so], and follow me [doing the Father's will]."*  
Matthew 16:24

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

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

How has your conversation with your *self* and with others been today? Has the Father, and His Son Jesus Christ been a part of it? Or has it been only about your *self* and the world

around you, i.e., others and the situation(s) of the 'moment' you find your *self* in (*stimulus-response*).

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

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

"Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein." Jeremiah 6:16

Home schooling material, co-ops, conferences, etc., are joining in the same praxis, fulfilling Immanuel Kant's as well as Georg Hegel's, Karl Marx's, and Sigmund Freud's agenda of using the pattern or method of Genesis 3:1-6, i.e., "self" 'justification,' i.e.,

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

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

For years, almost monthly I was asked to speak on the radio (they called me) regarding this process of 'change,' some shows being three hours long. Some nine years ago, when I was asked to share my final comments (on a conservative talk radio station, with national outreach) I spoke on the issue of *righteousness* (KNOWING I was going where no "conservative" radio show wants to go). Since then no one calls me to share. It is like I dropped off the edge of the earth. As they say "Go figure."

© *Institution for Authority Research*, Dean Gotcher 2022