

"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

"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Ephesians 6:12

"Commit thy works unto the LORD, and thy thoughts shall be established." Proverbs 16:3

Overview Of The Dialectic Process.

by

Dean Gotcher

Audios of the following: ([Short intro to Intro](#)) [Intro to the Audios, Part 1](#), [Part 2](#), [Part 3](#), [Part 4](#), [Part 5](#), [Part 6](#), [Part 7](#), [Part 8](#).

Short intro to the Intro of the website authorityresearch.com

"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

When it comes to knowing right and wrong behavior, apart from the Word of God, i.e., apart from what the Father, and the Son say, i.e., apart from what you are *told* ("*It is written*") all you have is "sense experience," i.e., your *opinion* and the *opinions* of others, 'justifying' your and their self, i.e., 'justifying' your and their sin(s), i.e., 'justifying' your and their *lusts* ("*self interests*") before one another, which is dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process, i.e., the 'reasoning' "*of the world.*" Those "*of (and for) the world*" (of and for *dialogue*) seek to *negate* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., seek to *negate* their having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., seek to *negate discussion* where the father/Father has the final *say*, i.e., seek to *negate* their being held accountable for doing or being wrong, disobeying, sinning, replacing *discussion* with *dialogue* where they can think and act according to their carnal nature, i.e., where they can actualize their carnal desires of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*, as well as question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack the father/Father and his/His authority without fearing being judged, condemned, cast out, silencing, censoring, and removing anyone who, adhering to the father's/Father's authority get in the way (of their *lusting* after pleasure), including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, and the righteous, doing so without having a *guilty conscience* (since the *guilty conscience* is engendered from the father's/Father's authority which they have *negated*). In *dialogue* you are god, doing what you please. In *discussion* God is God, with you having to do what he *says*. The unregenerate heart is based upon *dialogue*, *lusting* after pleasure, hating restraint. The regenerate heart on *discussion*, with God and His Word having the final *say*. When you base your conservation on *dialogue* instead of *discussion*, when it comes to behavior you are speaking the language of the world, 'justifying' your *lusting* after pleasure and your dissatisfaction, resentment, hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father/Father and his/His authority for getting in the way. This is what the dialectic process (*dialogue*) is all about.

What is missing in the world today is the father's/Father's authority (the father/Father *telling* those under his/His authority what is right and what is wrong behavior, *preaching* and *teaching* commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as is and obeyed/applied, and *discussing* any questions they might have with them, with the father/Father having the final say, and holding them accountable; which deals with the soul since the soul KNOWS by being *told*). All there is today is the children's/the people's *self interests* of the 'moment,' doing what they *want* (what they "feel" like doing, *dialoguing* with themselves and with others their carnal desires of the 'moment' that the current situation and/or object, people or person is *stimulating*; which deals with the flesh since the flesh knows by *stimulus-response*), void of Godly restraint—which is the effect of dialectic 'reasoning,' of *self*'justification.' If we apply Fichte's formula (not Hegel's) of *thesis*, *antithesis*, *synthesis* to the establishing of right and wrong behavior, with the father/Father (being *told*) being the thesis, making the child (*stimulus-response*) the antithesis, there is no synthesis as the father's/Father's authority restrains the child from becoming at-one-with other children who's values conflict with those of the father's/Father's. But if we, when it comes to behavior make the child (a person's "feelings" and "thoughts"; the "affective domain") the thesis (which today is the case), thus making the father's/Father's authority (doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth correlated to being "prejudiced") the antithesis, by *negating* the father's/Father's authority (called "the negation of negation") synthesis becomes actualized as the children become at-one-with one another on what they have in common, their *lust* for pleasure and their resentment toward restraint. Although this goes over most people's heads (it did not go over Karl Marx's) since there is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, i.e., in "I feel" and "I think," i.e., in an *opinion* (it is only found in *discussion*, where the father/Father has the final say) communication (and therefore behavior) is today based upon *dialogue*, resulting in the father's/Father's authority now being limited if not excluded from the individuals thoughts as well as from society, and even from the "Church," men's *opinions*, i.e., men's "feelings" and "thoughts" now ruling the day, void of Godly restraint. When it comes to behavior, without the father's/Father's authority, accountability for one's thoughts and actions there is only the child's carnal nature, i.e., lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint in control of "the people's" thoughts, directly effecting ('justifying') their actions. This is the formula that now is in control of the minds of men, doing what they *want*, having no fear of God (living in the "eternal present" having no concern regarding where they will spend eternity after death), even in the "Church." What is wrong with eat, drink, and be merry "for tomorrow you might die" is you might die *today*. That changes everything, life (what you are thinking, what you are saying, and how you are acting right now) gets serious. (Luke 12)

Intro to the Audios

There were two plans in the garden in Eden (which continue today), plan A and plan B, i.e., God's plan and the master facilitator of 'change's' plan. God's plan is for you to do what you are *told* (which requires faith) while the facilitator of 'change's' plan is for you to do what you *feel* like doing (which is based upon *sensuousness*, i.e., *stimulus-response*). Yet there was a third plan, plan C a byproduct of plan B. While plan B is for you to disobey, disobedience is with a *guilty conscience* (with you still recognizing the Father's authority) retaining the father's/Father's authority in your thoughts plan C is different. It is disobey without having a *guilty conscience* (by 'justifying' your *self* you deny the Father's authority). The latter is dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e, using reasoning (which God gave you to reason from His Word) to 'justify' your *self*, i.e., to 'justify' your *lust* for pleasure, thus *negating*, in your mind there being a restrainer, i.e., accountability to God (a father/Father) for your

carnal thoughts and actions, which is the spirit of antichrist—"*He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.*" 1 John 2:22 The *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process is the *praxis* of antichrist. There is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only your carnal desires of the 'moment' being 'justified.' "*God is not in all his thoughts*" "[T]here is no fear of God before his eyes." Psalms 10:4, 36:1.

These plans or *paradigms* directly correlate with communication. When it comes to knowing right and wrong behavior, when you use *discussion* (which retains the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the father/Father has the final say) you retain the father's/Father's authority in your thoughts ("What would my father/Father say") directly effecting your actions. When you use *dialogue* (the dialectic process, i.e., the language of "I feel" and "I think," i.e., "What can I get out of this situation and/or object, people, or person for my *self*") you are doing plan C. God only accepts His plan, doing what the Father says. "*It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.*" Jeremiah 10:23 "*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 Plan B is you yielding to the temptations of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* yet having a *guilty conscience* for your thoughts and your actions (bringing you to repentance if you go back to *discussion*) while plan C is your listening to the master facilitator of 'change,' continuing to *dialogue*, i.e., to 'justify' your *self*, making your *self* god when it comes to knowing right and wrong behavior. In *discussion* God is God, having the final say (with you walking by faith, trusting in the Lord). In *dialogue* you are god, having the final say (with you walking by sight, leaning to your own understanding). When it comes to the Word of God, i.e., to what God commands, whenever you use *dialogue* to define it you are breaking the first commandment, you are making your *self* god, i.e., you are making your *self equal with* and therefore greater than and therefore against God and His authority. "*I will not give my glory unto another.*" Isaiah 48:11

When it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior the facilitator of 'change' rejects pure *discussion*, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth. Since for him *discussion* is tied to belief, *dialogue*, which is tied to *desires* must always be present in establishing right and wrong behavior. Therefore he can only see a spectrim (a "paradigm shift," from pre- to post-paradigm) from *dialogue* confronting *discussion* to *discussion* "so called" being made completely subject to *dialogue*, making behavior (right and wrong) subject to men's *opinions* so he can sin, i.e., *lust* without being judged, condemned, and cast out, with everyone *affirming*, supporting, defending, praising, and worshiping him instead.

Bohm and Peat in their book *Science, Order, and Creativity* explain the difference between *discussion* and *dialogue* as a means of communication, where in *discussion* (when it comes to right and wrong behavior, i.e., when it comes to you having been *told* what you can and can not do) the father/Father has the final say, "*Because I say so,*" "*Do what I say or else,*" "*It is written*" etc., while in *dialogue* everyone is entitled to their *opinion*, i.e., there is no "top-down" father's/Father's authority system. "*In an ordinary discussion people usually hold relatively fixed positions and argue in favor of their views as they try to convince others to change.*" "*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.*"

Thus when a person lives in the language of *discussion* they do what they are *told*. For example Jesus stated: "*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 12:47-50 "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." John 5:30 "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 and in the wilderness He went to "It is written" as a response to the temptations, i.e., "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. You will notice that the Lord's description of the comforter, who is sent to the believer to help him in his walk, contains judgment for doing wrong. "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you." John 14:15-18 "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John 14:26 (This is why we study to show ourselves approved unto the Lord, the Holy Ghost bringing to our remembrance what we have read and heard from the Word of God.) "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: Of sin, because they believe not on me; Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged." John 16:7-11

As long as a person remains in the language of *discussion* when it comes to behavior, i.e., to doing right and not wrong from being *told* he remains loyal to the father's/Father's authority system. While the earthly father can be wrong, the right-wrong way of thinking, i.e., the language of *discussion* remains in place. This is why the Heavenly Father, who is never wrong is the only Father for the believer, thus removing any confusion as to what is right and what is wrong behavior. "*And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.*" Matthew 23:9

In the language of *discussion* ("I KNOW," which is subject to the there and then, i.e., what you have been *told* in the past and the consequences of doing or not doing it in the future) and *dialogue*, ("I feel" and "I think," subject to desires and interests the 'moment') both of which we all have, we can use *dialogue* ("I feel" and "I think" or "I like" and "I do not like") in what we have been *told* we **can do** (what trees we can eat the fruit of), i.e., we remain under the father's/Father's authority system but when we use *dialogue* in response to what we have been *told* we **can not do** we have usurped the father's/Father's authority, making ourselves the arbiter of right and wrong behavior according to our carnal desires of the 'moment' (this applies to any situation or condition of restraint, where we have been *told* what we **can not do**). It is when we return to *discussion* with ourself we experience a *guilty conscience* for what we have thought, said, or done, either repenting or returning to *dialogue* with ourself and with others in an effort to 'justify' our carnal thoughts and carnal actions. "*The individual may have 'secret' thoughts ["lusts"] which he will under no circumstances reveal to anyone else if he can help it [out of fear of being judged, condemned, punished, and rejected]. To gain access [through getting him or her to dialogue, i.e., to share his or her "feelings," i.e., desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' with others] is particularly important, for here may lie the individual's potential.*" ([Theodor Adorno](#), *The Authoritarian Personality*)

When the individual establishes what is right and what is wrong behavior through *dialogue* (where it is wrong to be continuously *told* you are wrong) he can do what he *wants* without having a *guilty conscience*, as long as he remains in *dialogue* with his *self* and with others (who will not judge, condemn, cast him out for what he is thinking, saying, or doing, i.e., who will not *tell* him he is "wrong," as *dialogue* can not function in an environment of continuously being *told* "you are wrong," as in a *discussion*, since in *dialogue* everything is an *opinion*). This is why children, politicians, friends, etc., who have participated in the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process can not go into a true *discussion* with you when you question what they are saying or doing—with their insisting that you go into *dialogue* with them in order to have a "reasonable" (non-judgmental), "rational" conversation. Labeling you as being argumentative if you refuse to participate in the process of 'change'—if you refuse to abdicate the father's/Father's authority system. This is where we are today.

When men lean to their own understanding (when establishing right and wrong behavior) instead of trusting in the Lord, i.e., instead of doing the Father's will they are doing [Genesis 3:1-6](#), i.e., doing what the master facilitator of 'change' wants them to do, i.e., 'justify' their *self*, i.e., 'justify' their *lusts*, establishing "*human nature*" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority. Dialectic 'reasoning' (which is used by all philosophers, sociologists, psychologist, psychotherapists, facilitators of 'change,' etc., i.e., which is the wisdom of men) is the *praxis* of Genesis 3:1-6, i.e., the use of *dialogue*, i.e., of "I feel" and "I think," making men's *opinions*, along with their approval of one another, i.e., *affirmation* (the *consensus* process) the ground from which to establish right and wrong behavior—*negating* what the father/Father says, in the process *negating* men having a *guilty conscience* for doing their will instead of the father's/Father's. "*Prior to therapy the person is prone to ask himself, 'What would my parents want me to do?' During the process of therapy the individual come to ask himself, 'What does it mean to me?'*" (Carl Rogers) Contemporary education ("*Bloom's Taxonomies*") and society is based upon Genesis 3:1-6—used in order (as in "new" world order) for men in high places to enjoy the carnal pleasures (*lusts*) of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* without having the father's/Father's authority (being judged, condemned, and cast out for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* instead of doing right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth) and the *guilty conscience* it engenders getting in the way. All I have to do is 'create' a "positive" environment, i.e., a safe place/space/zone where your children, teachers, legislators, ministers, etc., can share their *carnal desires*, i.e., their *self interest*, i.e., their *lusts* without being judged, condemned, cast out, i.e., void of the father's/Father's authority, i.e., removing that which is "negative" to the flesh (thereby 'justifying' their *lusts*) and I "own" them, turning them against the father's/Father's authority for getting in their way. You can label it any name you want (there are many) they are all the same, i.e., the *praxis* of Genesis 3:1-6, *negating* the Father's authority in men's thoughts, directly effecting their actions.

Part 1.

"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" Jeremiah 17:9

The natural (unregenerate) heart, making pleasure ([dopamine emancipation](#)) the purpose of life (instead of [doing the father's/Father's will](#)) becomes "*desperately wicked*" in its effort to protect its [lust](#) for pleasure (when it fears it being taken away; "*I'll just die if you don't let me*" "*That's not*

fair." "I hate you."). It can not see its [hatred of the father's/Father's authority](#) (the Karl Marx in it) as being wicked ("desperately wicked") because its *lust* for pleasure is standing in the way, 'justifying' the hate.

"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.)

This sums up man's effort to overthrow the father's/Father's authority system, from the garden in Eden until judgment day. It is what is going on today (called the dialectic process of 'change,' 'change' meaning *stimulus-response*, approaching and augmenting pleasure and avoiding and removing that which engenders pain, which includes the pain of missing out on pleasure, imagined or real). Instead of reasoning from what the father/Father *says*, from what the child/man is *told*, in dialectic 'reasoning,' 'reasoning' is from the sensation of the 'moment,' with pleasure being "good," missing out on pleasure being "bad" or "evil," 'justifying' the "conversion" of or silencing, censoring, and/or removal of those who do (and insist upon others doing) the father's/Father's will. Dialectic 'reasoning' is the *praxis* of [Genesis 3:1-6](#), i.e., of self 'justification,' *negating* [Hebrews 12:5-11](#), i.e., the father's/Father's authority, in the process *negating* [Romans 7:14-25](#), i.e., having a *guilty conscience* (a fear of being judged, condemned, cast out) for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*. When men reject/deny the father's/Father's authority, i.e., "*justify their self, i.e., 'justify' their lusts before one another,*" dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., Genesis 3:1-6 is what they are doing.

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

In *dialogue* ("I feel" and "I think"), *opinion* is treated as "fact," which makes commands, rules, facts, and truth subject to the current situation and/or object, people, or person present (imagined or real), i.e., subjective, engendering 'change,' 'rapid 'change' whereas in *discussion* ("I KNOW because _____ says so, i.e., I have been *told*," "*It is written*"), established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority has the final say, i.e., is objective, inhibiting or blocking 'change,' at least 'rapid 'change." Using *dialogue* to establish right and wrong behavior makes anyone who tries to use *discussion* appear to be unreasonable, irrational, and argumentative (if they persist). That is the "power" of dialectic reasoning ('reasoning' through *dialogue*, i.e., through "*feelings*"), making anyone who insists upon doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., according to that which is "of the past" appear to be out of step with the times (and therefore irrelevant, thus being able to silence, censor, and remove them without a thought of what happens to them, i.e., the pain and suffering they are going through, and will continue to go through as a result of being silenced, censored, and cast out which includes violence or threat of violence against them). In *dialogue* you are god. In *discussion* God is God, you are not. *Dialogue* resides in the natural (carnal) heart, "I'll do what I want." *Discussion* resides in the regenerate heart, "*Thy Word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against thee.*" Psalms 119:11 Genesis 3:1-6 (*dialogue*; "I feel" and "I think") was the woman's response to the temptation to sin (with Adam following). [Matthew 4:1-11](#) (*discussion*; what the Father says, "*It is written*") was the Lord's

response to the temptation to sin (calling all to follow Him, doing the same, i.e., doing the Father's will). "*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 In dialectic 'reasoning' there is no Father (no law above man's carnal nature), therefore there is no sin, therefore there is no need of a savior. There is only man living (and dying) in his sins.

"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

The father/Father authors commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as is (by faith) and obeyed/applied and enforces them. The father/Father *tells* those under his/His authority what is right and what is wrong behavior and holds them accountable to what he/He has *told* them, engendering a *guilty conscience* (and a fear of being judged, condemned, and cast out) in them when they do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., when they follow after *lust* instead of doing the father's/Father's will. The child's/man's natural inclination is to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* (which includes the affirmation, i.e., praises of other children/men) and to hate restraint.

Although the earthly father is born into sin (is *guilty* of *lusting* after pleasure instead of doing the Heavenly Father's will) the system of authority itself (doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, being held accountable for doing wrong) is the same as the Heavenly Father who is holy, i.e., who knows no sin. In dialectic reasoning (using *dialogue* to establish right and wrong behavior, 'liberating' *lust* out from under the father's/Father's authority) it is the system itself (the father's/Father's authority system) that is under attack, with those "of (and for) the world" siding with the child's/man's, i.e., their carnal nature, establishing the child's/man's/their natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure over and therefore against doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., *dopamine emancipation* over and therefore against the father/Father and his/His authority, i.e., *stimulus-response* over and therefore against doing what they are *told*.

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

God did not *negate* the father's/Father's authority system (the *Patriarchal paradigm*). He simply established His authority over the earthly father's authority—no one or thing is to come between us and the Father, and His Son Jesus the Christ, who are one in agreement (engendering the "priesthood of all believers"—you can not fully understand the American Revolution and the original "Bill of Rights" [no one is to come between a father and his convictions, i.e., free speech and religion, property, and business, his family, i.e., his wife and his children, under God] without understanding this; the reason the original "Bill of Rights" are so vehemently hated by the left, i.e., by the 'liberals'). Those "of (and for) the world" seek to *negate* the father's/Father's authority system itself so they can *lust* in peace, i.e., without having a *guilty conscience*, with *affirmation*, i.e., without being judged, condemned, cast out, engendering "worldly peace and socialist harmony."

"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](#)

The soul knows by being *told*. The flesh by "sense experience" (*stimulus-response*).

"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

In a garden in Eden we find the "Father" (God) *telling* the "child" (Adam) what is right and what is wrong behavior (something he did with nothing else in the creation, which, being of nature, i.e., of the world is subject only to *stimulus-response*, i.e., approach pleasure and avoid pain—only man, made in the image of God can *read* and *write* a book, be *told* and *tell* others what is right and what is wrong behavior, with man knowing right from wrong by being *told*).

*"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? [this is a neurolinguistic construct (an imbedded statement in a question, sensitizing a person to their *lusts*, when it comes to right and wrong behavior, beginning the process of liberating a person's *lust* out from under their fear of judgment, i.e., out from under the father's/Father's authority)—which is one of the most powerful forms of hypnosis] 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 [she revealed her *lust*], lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die [removing the "negative," i.e., fear of judgment (which was not a lie regarding the here-and now, i.e., the tree itself did not kill her—or Adam—but a lie regarding the there-and then, with God removing her—and Adam—from having access to the "tree of life" for their disobedience, then, after death both coming to judgment, i.e., inheriting eternal life or eternal death)]: 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 [evaluating ([aufheben](#)) from her senses, i.e., from her understanding she made her *self* god, i.e., the establisher of right and wrong behavior], 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](#) (emphasis added)

The "master facilitator of 'change'," i.e., the "master psychotherapist," by creating a safe place/zone/space, i.e., a "positive" environment where the woman could share her feeling and thoughts of the 'moment' regarding the "forbidden tree," without fear of being judged, condemned, cast out, seduced, deceived, and manipulated (beguiled) her into sharing her carnal feelings (to touch the "forbidden tree") and her carnal thoughts (there was nothing wrong with the tree, it was just like all the others trees, the only difference being she could decide for herself what was right and what was wrong behavior). "Justifying" her *self*, i.e., her *lust*, i.e., her *self interest* (*stimulus-response*) she ate the fruit thereof, with Adam (abdicating his office of authority) following.

When caught, like 'liberals,' refusing to confess they were wrong 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*. The facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the psychotherapist, i.e., the Marxist, using the same method, i.e., through the use of *dialogue* is able to 'discover' what you *covet*, i.e., what you are *lusting* after, i.e., your *self interest*. He is then able to gain your trust, i.e., he has your best interest, i.e., your *self interest*, i.e., your *lust(s)* (what you covet) in mind. Having gained your trust he "owns" you, i.e., he is able to use you (as "*human resource*") to satisfy his *lusts*, i.e., his *self interest* with your *affirmation*—casting you aside when you no longer satisfy his *lusts*, i.e., his *self interest* or when you get in his way, doing to you what you did to the father/Father for getting in your way, i.e., in the way of your *lust(s)*. It is the "game" you decided to play when you turned to him for direction (advice) instead of to the Father.

"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

"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

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

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

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

"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

Who you turn to for direction directly effects your thoughts and actions, to the father/Father, doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth or to those "of (and for) the world," *lusting* after pleasure, hating restraint (the restrainer).

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

Genesis 3:1-6 is the first recorded event of dialectic reasoning (reasoning from "sensuous need," "sense perception," and "sense experience," i.e., from the "lust of the flesh," the "lust of the eyes," and the "pride of life" aka "I can decide for myself what is right and what is wrong behavior, according to my carnal nature") being put into action (*praxis*). It is the

same *praxis* being used today to 'create' a "new" world order, based upon "human nature," i.e., *lust*, rejecting the father's/Father's authority, i.e., Godly restraint.

Part 2.

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

"Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds;" Colossians 3:9

The Greek word for "*deeds*" is *praxis*. *Praxis* is doing what you want, i.e., *lusting* after *pleasure* without having a *guilty conscience*., i.e., without having any *sense* of accountability (before God) for your carnal thoughts and carnal actions. "*Praxis*" is the imagination of the heart, unrestrained by the father's/Father's authority. The name for the National Test for teachers is "*Praxis*." Its title means exactly what it says, no righteousness found here, only that which is "of (and for) the world."

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

Facilitation of 'change,' i.e., psychotherapy, i.e., Marxism is the *praxis* of Genesis 3:1-6. The role (duty) of the facilitator of 'change' et al is to move you (your spouse, your children, your teachers,), through *dialogue* (there is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, have I said that already) away from the father's/Father's authority (system) so he (the facilitator of 'change' et al) can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating without being judged, condemned, cast out, i.e., with your *affirmation* ([chart](#)). If the father says "I don't think" or "I don't feel like you should go out" he can not discipline the child for going out. It was only his *opinion*, the result of *dialogue*. In *dialogue* ("*the dialectic philosophy*") he has no authority.

"In the eyes of the dialectic philosophy, nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred." (Karl Marx's ideology, as explained by Friedrich Engels)

This ideology is found in a famous curriculum used by educators across the nation and around the world: *"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." (Benjamin S. Bloom, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain)*

Bloom's *Weltanschauung*,¹ i.e., world view, i.e., how a person perceives and responds to his self, others, the world, and authority was of two Marxists; ¹*Cf. Erich Fromm, Escape from Freedom, 1941; T. W. Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality, 1950," using dialogue (when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior) to 'liberate' student's from their parent's authority. (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain)*

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

Adorno wrote (in the book Bloom referenced): *"Authoritarian submission [humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating one's "self" in order to do the father's/Father's will] was conceived of as a very general attitude that would be evoked in relation to a variety of authority figures—parents, older people, leaders, supernatural power, and so forth." "God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority." "Submission to*

authority, desire for a strong leader, subservience of the individual to the state [parental authority, local control, Nationalism], and so forth, have so frequently and, as it seems to us, correctly, been set forth as important aspects of the Nazi creed that a search for correlates of prejudice had naturally to take these attitudes into account." "Family relationships are characterized by fearful subservience to the demands of the parents and by an early suppression of impulses not acceptable to them." "The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem." ([Theodor Adorno](#), *The Authoritarian Personality*) The "problem," according to Adorno is parental authority getting in the way of the facilitator of 'change's' (his) control of the children's/man's thoughts, directly effecting their actions. By the *praxis* of generalizing, labeling all parents as Fascists (or potential Fascists) the deed is done—in fact Fascism destroyed the father's authority in the home and God the Father's authority over man. By generalizing, details (facts and truth) are taken captive to (*negated* by) *opinion* (the feelings of the 'moment'), allowing whoever is generalizing control of the outcome. Whoever defines terms for you (or you allow to define terms for you) controls the outcome (your life).

"There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children." (Book 2: Affective Domain)

All "teachers" (as I was in 1971, from a "Christian" college) are certified and schools accredited (including private, parochial, "Christian," and home school) based upon their use of what are called "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)," i.e., Marxist curriculum (quoted above, with more quotations given below), used to 'liberate' children from their parent's authority and man from God's by replacing the father's/Father's authority (system or paradigm) with the students "[affective domain](#)," i.e., their *lust* for pleasure and resentment (hatred) toward restraint, i.e., replacing doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (doing the father's/Father's will, via generalization equated to being "Fascist") with *stimulus-response*—the idea being, create a "healthy" environment, void of

the father's/Father's authority ("prejudice") and you can 'create' a "healthy" person, no longer judging, condemning, casting others out (dividing them from others) for their doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for their *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' instead of doing what they are *told*. Prejudice against those doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., prejudice against those *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* instead of doing the father's/Father's will results in their judging, condemning, casting those out who disobey the father/Father being 'justified,' since their way of thinking is based upon being *told*. In dialectic reasoning their way of thinking is replaced with prejudice against their insisting upon everyone *humbling, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating their self*, i.e., *denying their lusts* in order to do the father's/Father's will resulting in those hating the father's/Father's authority (system) judging, condemning, casting them out, i.e., removing them from the environment, i.e., from the world, i.e., killing them being justified, since their way of thinking is based upon *stimulus-response*.

All the facilitator of 'change' has to do (as the 'master facilitator of 'change' did with the woman in a garden in Eden) is get you, your spouse, and your children to share (*dialogue*) your and their *opinion* (feelings and thoughts) regarding right and wrong behavior and your authority as a father or parent (the father's/Father's authority system) is *negated*. There is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only the participant's *lusts*, i.e., their *self interest* of the 'moment' being 'justified.' The same is true for your elected officials, your police, your educators, etc., even your "minister." This is what God has warned us about in His Word.

"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

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

The American Revolution, unlike other revolutions, and the Constitution with its Bill of Rights that followed was based upon a King. Not a King (or a directorate, soviet, committee, etc.,) over a nation but rather the father in the home as King, i.e., private conviction (freedom of speech and religion), private property, private business, etc., being the right of the father, under God (unalienable rights). This limited the power of those in government, who, "[*Bypassing the traditional channels of 'top-down' decision making,*](#)" i.e., usurping the power (limits and measures) of the Constitution, i.e., the right of the citizens to establish law (according to their standards) would sell the liberties of the citizens in order (as in "new" world order) to satisfy their carnal desires of the 'moment,' making and passing laws that would turn the citizens into their slaves ("human resource"). (Ervin Laszlo, *A Strategy For The Future: The Systems Approach to World Order*) All I have to do is (through the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* process) "discover" your re-presentative's *self interests*, i.e., his *lusts* of the 'moment' and building relationship with him, offer to help him realize them and I "own" him, with him no longer re-presenting you but instead serving me, making him my slave as well as you as he passes law to take your God given rights away, gaining control over all you have, can say, and do so I can rule the world, using "the people" to pay for my fancy houses (estates), my fancy cars, my fancy boats, my fancy vacations, my fancy women without accountability ("governance")—figuratively speaking. (This is what President Eisenhower was talking about regarding the "military establishment," which has now become the global corporate establishment, including leaders of nations.) The *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* process is the "building of relationship upon self interest," i.e., upon "What can I get out of this situation and/or object, people or person for my self?" which leads to "How can I convert, silence, censor, or remove those who judge, condemn, and threaten to cast me out? Doing whatever it takes to removing them in the name of 'the people.'" Where we find our self today as a Nation.

Part 3.

"The words 'seem to' are significant; it is the perception which functions in guiding behavior." ([Carl Rogers](#), *on becoming a person: A Therapist View*)

of Psychotherapy)

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

"O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called [that "seems to be" science, based upon opinion—there is no absolute in an opinion]: which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace be with thee. Amen." 1 Timothy 6:20-21

As there is absolute in the laws of nature (which God has established and we discover) there is absolute in the Word of God (which God has established and has *told* us to obey). Making man (knowing right and wrong behavior) subject to the laws of nature, i.e., to *stimulus-response* makes man subject to the world only, which is the outcome of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., reasoning from our senses, i.e., from the flesh and the world that stimulates it (*negating* faith, i.e., being *told*, which deals with our soul).

"Lawfulness without law," where the law of the flesh ("sense experience") rules without the law of God (being *told*) getting in the way and "purposiveness without purpose," where the augmentation of pleasure is the 'purpose' of life, not doing the father's/Father's will. ([Immanuel Kant, Critique of Judgment](#)) ([Immanuel Kant, Critique of Judgment](#))

Without the Father, i.e., the Father's authority there is no law (law from above, i.e., from being *told*, there is only the law of the flesh, i.e., the law of *stimulus-response*, i.e., of "sense experience," i.e., "of the world"). Without the law there is no sin, i.e., being judged, condemned, cast out. Without the Son (obeying the law, i.e., doing what the Father says, in all things commanded even to death on the cross, covering our sins by his shed blood, imputing his righteousness to all who, repenting place their faith in him) there is no redemption, i.e., salvation. Without the Father raising the Son from the grave there is no reconciliation to the Father. In *lust*, in *coveting*, in *dialogue* there is no Father's authority, i.e., there is no

established command, rule, fact, and truth, i.e., there is no sin, i.e., there is no redemption, i.e., there is no reconciliation, all there is is man (the child) 'justifying' his self, i.e., 'justifying' his natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure (that the world is *stimulating*) and hate restraint (the father's/Father's authority), i.e., all you have is *stimulus-response*, i.e., the 'justification' of *lust*, 'redeeming' man from the father's/Father's authority, 'reconciling' him to the world. In *dialogue* ("I feel" and "I think"), when it comes to right and wrong behavior all you have is the "prince of the power of the air," i.e., the master facilitator of 'change' and all who are following after (being *seduced*, *deceived*, and *manipulated*, as "human resource" by) him, *lusting* after pleasure (including the praises of men) and hating restraint (the father's/Father's authority) for getting in the way. In *dialogue* there is no Father, i.e., law. There is no Son, i.e., redemption. There is only you 'justifying' your self (your *lusts*) before men. In Christ Jesus alone is there redemption, i.e., salvation. In the Father alone is their reconciliation. All the rest is "of (and for) the world," with man dying in his sins, being cast into the lake of fire that is never quenched, prepared for the master facilitator of 'change' and all who, following after him, establish self, i.e., *lust* (and the world that *stimulates* it) over and therefore against doing the Father's will. After having read over six hundred social-psychology books, which are foundational to our culture today, given over five thousand lectures from coast to coast, taught on the subject of dialectic reasoning in a University (all in the light of the Word of God), all I can say is, unless you are built upon the Son of God, Jesus Christ, doing the Father's will (walking in and pointing people to them) you have nothing of worth to say (no matter how important you might think you are or what you have to say is—it is all vain).

"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 12:47-50 "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." John 5:30 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 "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
"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:" Romans 5:1 *"So then faith cometh by hearing [being told], and hearing by the word of God."* Romans 10:17 *"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 *"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 *"... do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ."* Galatians 1:10

"Protestantism [the priesthood of all believers, i.e., doing your best as unto the Lord, i.e., putting no one between you and the Lord, i.e., doing the Father's will] was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism." (Max Horkheimer, *Vernunft and Selbsterhaltung*) Max Horkheimer was a Marxist, director of the Institute of Social Research a. k. a. "the Frankfurt School" for a time.

"Miserable Christians, whose words and faith still depend on the interpretations [opinions] 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 [the opinions of men]." (Martin Luther, *Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer*) What Luther found in the "Church" of his day, as he was seeking to be a "good" Catholic, was the use of *dialogue* to define the Word of God, making it subject to the *opinions* of men, making it subject to 'change,' i.e., no longer the Word of God—who is the same yesterday, today, and forever, i.e., throughout eternity.

"If the 'restoring of life' of the world is to be conceived in terms of the Christian revelation [what the Father says], then Marx must collapse into a bottomless abyss." ([Jürgen Habermas](#), *Theory and Practice*) Jürgen Habermas was a Marxist, i.e., a member of the "Frankfurt School."

The 'change' process, i.e., Marxism. How it is done.

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

If I (through *dialogue*) gain access to what you *covet*, i.e., to what you are *lusting* after, i.e., your *self interest* and offer to "help" you attain (actualize) it I "own" you, i.e., I make you subject to my control. This is the hallmark of Marxism, i.e., the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process. Most Americans today (especially in high places) are Marxist in thought and do not know it or are unwilling to admit it—*lusting* after pleasure (which includes the praises of men), i.e., "building relationship upon *self interest*" instead of *humbling, dying to, denying their self*, i.e., their *lusts*, doing the father's/Father's will.

The dialectic process (the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process) engenders the attitude "You can't *tell* me what I can and can't do. And if you do I'm going to get rid of you." (The "me," "I," and "I'm" can be replaced with "use," "we," and "we're." where "the group" or party says, "You can't tell us what we can and can't do. And if you do we're going to get rid of you.") It is in the *dynamics* of identifying with "the group" that the individual is 'changed,' replacing his being an individual in "a group," thinking and acting according to what the father/Father says, i.e., has *told* him, with "the group" now being in the individual, i.e., in his thoughts, having to suspend (set aside, i.e., *negate*) doing what the father/Father says in order to *build relationship* with others upon common *self interests* (*lusts*), directly effecting his actions. If I use the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process (the dialectic process) on your child(ren), your wife, your teacher(s), your neighbor(s), your doctor(s), your reporter(s), your sheriff, your town council, your legislator(s), your minister, etc., I "own" them, turning them against you and your authority as a father, *negating* (in their thoughts) any law that restrains them from taking control over ("owning") all they see (along with turning them against the authority of God the Father). For example, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in defiance to "*the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof*," i.e., rejecting the Father's authority stated "*the fruits of the earth belong to us all, and the earth itself*

to nobody," except to him (Jean-Jacques Rousseau), who, in his mind "owned" whatever he saw and behaved accordingly. (1 Corinthians 10:26; Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on Inequality*) Georg Hegel, sounding more like Karl Marx than Karl Marx himself stated: "*On account of the absolute and natural oneness of the husband, the wife, and the child, where there is no antithesis of person to person [no "top-down" order] or of subject to object, the surplus is not the property of one of them, since their indifference is not a formal or a legal one,*" therefore your spouse, your children, your property, your business, and even your soul is not yours but are all subject to those who, *lusting* after pleasure and hating restraint reason dialectically, i.e., like the woman in the garden, "own" whatever they see.

Part 4.

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

By moving the child's focus from being on the father/Father, i.e., on what the father/Father would say to "the group," i.e., to what all the children have in common (making the child and his carnal nature the basis of communication), the child's paradigm, i.e., his way of feeling, thinking, and acting toward his self, others, the world, and authority is 'changed.'

"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*)

"It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately." "The individual accepts the new

system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group."
(Kurt Lewin in Benne)

The following explains the difference between individualism and socialism, i.e., the father's/Father's authority (having to *humble, die to, control, discipline, capitulate your self*, i.e., *deny your lusts* in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will—refusing to compromise in order to "get along," i.e., refusing to built relationship, i.e., become at-one-with those who are doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., *lusting*) and the facilitation of 'change' ('justifying' your and others [including the facilitator of 'change's'] natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or object, people, or person is *stimulating*, thereby 'justifying' their dissatisfaction with, resentment toward, hatred of restraint and anyone initiating and sustaining the father's/Father's authority system, either converting them or silencing, censoring, removing them if they continue to get in the way, i.e., refuse to participate and 'change'—refuse to compromise established commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to build relationship with those doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., *lusting, judging, condemning, casting them out* instead). The father/Father demands no compromise regarding his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth. Relationship built upon *self interest* demands it. While in a traditional society the environment can contain both those who do and do not do the father's/Father's will those advocating *stimulus-response* (as all there is) must remove the father/Father and his/His authority (the father's/Father's authority system and the *guilty conscience* it engenders) from the environment in order for all to become as one, thinking and acting according to their carnal nature ('justifying' perverse behavior)—not judging, condemning, casting men out for their carnal (perverse) behavior, i.e., not being "prejudiced," except against the father's/Father's authority system and all who adhere (submit) to it.

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

"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

I do not have to *tell* your child to question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack your authority as a parent, all I have to do as a "teacher" (using "Bloom's Taxonomies" in my classroom) is 'justify" your child's *lusts* (his or her "*affective domain*"), "helping" your child "build relationship" with other children upon their common "self interests" and I "own" your child, turning your child against you and your authority as a parent.

"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 3:12

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

"Only when the immediate interests [the children's 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 child, 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 pleasure and fear of losing it] is dominant." (Lukács) "Group think" begins with "What can I get out of this group for my self?" (lust for pleasure, which includes the approval of man) which then leads to "What will happen to me if the group rejects me?" (fear of man).

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

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

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

Karl Marx wrote: *"For one class to stand for the whole of society, another must be the class of universal offense and the embodiment of universal limits. A particular social sphere must stand for the notorious crime of the whole society, so that liberation from this sphere appears to be universal liberation. For one class to be the class par excellence of liberation, another class must, on the other hand, be openly the subjugating class."* *"The only practically possible emancipation is the unique theory which holds that man is the supreme being for man."* (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right*) Replacing the traditional leader with the facilitator of 'change' and the deed is accomplished.

"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*)

With traditional leadership the individuals in a group are held personally accountable to commands, rules, facts, and truth that are established by the leader of "the group," only changing their position through persuasion while in a facilitated meeting the individual's paradigm, i.e., the way he feels, thinks, and acts toward self, others, the world, and authority is 'changed,' 'justifying' his *lust* for pleasure and dissatisfaction, resentment, hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the restrainer (toward the traditional leader and all who follow after his way of thinking and acting, 'loyalty to "the group," i.e., toward his and its *lust* for pleasure and dissatisfaction, resentment, hatred toward restraint now guiding this thoughts—instead of any command, rule, fact, or truth established by the father/Father—directly effecting his behavior).

"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." (Irvin D. Yalom, [The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy](#)) Lust ("What can I get out of this situation and/or object, people, or person for my self?") is what binds the individual to "the group" (and to the facilitator of 'change'). Fear ("What will happen to me or what will they do to me if I get in their way or I do not go along?") is what keeps the individual subject to "the group" (and to the facilitator of 'change').

"Dissonance" or "cognitive dissonance" is *"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](#)) Yalom continues: "Few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity [their loyalty to the father's/Father's authority (system, way of thinking, or paradigm)] in the face of apparent group unanimity." The individual's desire (*lust*) for "the group's" approval, affirming his *lust(s)*, i.e., the pressure or force of "the group" ('justifying' his *lusts*—see [Force Field Analysis](#), [Group Dynamics](#), and [Unfreezing, Moving or Changing, Refreezing People](#), work done by Kurt Lewin) blocks out his desire for (blinds him to) the father's/Father's approval, who, instead of 'justifying' his *lusts* (as "the group" does or is doing), inhibits or block's him from doing (actualizing) what he is *lusting* after, i.e., prevents*

him from doing what he wants—judging, condemning, and threatening to cast him out for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the current situation and/or object, people, or person is *stimulating* (imagined or real), instead of *humbling, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating* his self, i.e., *denying* his *lust(s)* in order to do what he is *told* (by the father/Father), i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will.

"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](#)

The law of God, i.e., of the soul is known by being *told*. The law of the world, i.e., of the flesh is known by "sense experience," i.e., by *stimulus-response*. Those "of (and for) the world," i.e., of *stimulus-response*, refusing to recognize eternal death (a consequence for their carnal thoughts and carnal actions) can only see the "eternal present," i.e., their *lust* of the 'moment' that the world (the current situation and/or object, people, or person) is *stimulating*, removing all who get in its (their) way.

"In this process [the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus, i.e., dialectic 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)

Part 5.

Belief (faith) is grounded in *discussion*, with the father/Father having the final say (engendering a *guilty conscience* along with a fear of judgment, condemnation, being cast out for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*) while behavior (*stimulus-response*) is grounded in *dialogue*, in what a person feels and thinks in response to the world around him (imagined or real). In *dialogue* there is no father's/Father's authority, i.e., inheritance, posterity, history, tradition, unalienable rights, sovereignty, representation (representative government), limited government, local control, culture, heritage, absolutes (established commands, rules, facts, and truth), private convictions, private property, and private business, "limits and measures," being wrong, *humbling, denying, dying to, disciplining, controlling, capitulating* of "self," contrition, repentance, forgiveness, salvation, conversion—redemption and reconciliation—(for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning), fellowship, etc. They are all missing (*negated*) in and through *dialogue*. If I can get your "representative" into *dialoguing* his *opinion* to a *consensus* with me I have "emancipated" him from re-presenting you, I now "own" him. All the above are now missing in his making of law, i.e., in his establishing right and wrong behavior for the citizens. They are only found in *discussion*. Moving conversation from *discussion*, established commands, rules, facts, and truth to *dialogue*, feelings and thoughts of the 'moment' in response to the current situation and/or object, people, or person present (imagined or real) is what 'change' (the 'change' process) is all about—in order for the facilitator of 'change' to live in a world of 'change' without being held accountable to the father/Father for his thoughts (at least in this thoughts in the 'moment'), 'justifying' his carnal actions. While in a *discussion* a person can be wrong (regarding commands, rules, facts, and truth), the idea of right and wrong remains, in *dialogue* there is no wrong (except insisting upon right and wrong being the right way of thinking), there is only *opinion*, the persons thoughts of the 'moment' being expressed, which makes everything subject to 'change.' Fellowship is grounded in *discussion*. Relationship in *dialogue*, thus the "building of relationship upon self interest," through *dialogue negating* judgment, condemnation, being cast out for a person's carnal thoughts and carnal actions, *negating* "prejudice" based upon established

commands, rules, facts, and truth with prejudice now being toward anyone demanding all do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, getting in the way of what all people have in common, *"the lust of the flesh, and lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,"* i.e., human nature, causing division.

"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 that they are wrong, i.e., from faith to faith], though such a process is indeed possible [in other words, "We do not want to think about/focus on/accept that way of thinking"]. But [through a] continuum from fixity to changingness [from belief, i.e., faith and obedience (where lust is "repressed") to theory, i.e., opinion (where lust is 'liberated')], from rigid structure to flow [from "What does the father/Father want me to do?" to "What do I want to do?" and "What will 'the group' think?"], from stasis to process [from doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth to self (lust) 'justification']." "At one end of the continuum the individual avoids close relationships [with those who are deviant, i.e., doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., lusting], which are perceived as being dangerous. At the other end he lives openly and freely in relation to the therapist and to others [those doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., lusting], guiding his behavior on the basis of his immediate experiencing [his lust for pleasure (for lust) and his lust for "the group's" affirmation, 'justifying' his (and their) lusts—'justifying' his (and their) resentment toward anyone inhibiting or blocking his (and their) lust for pleasure, including his (and their) lust for approval from others—'justifying' his (and their) lust]— he has become an integrated process of changingness." (Rogers)

This is the essence of Marxism, where compromise (of any kind) is essential in order to initiate and sustain relationship with others. For the Marxist, individualism (under the father's/Father's authority) must be *negated* if man is to become at-one-with his fellow man, based upon what they all have in common, i.e., their carnal nature. According to Karl Marx:

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

"The individual [the child/student] is emancipated [is liberated from the father's/Father's authority] in the social group [in the "group grade"]."
"Freud commented that only through the solidarity of all the participants could the sense of guilt [the guilty conscience which is engendered by the father's/Father's authority] be assuaged." "Self-perfection of the human individual is fulfilled in union with the world in pleasure." "According to Freud, the ultimate essence of our being is erotic." "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." "Eros is the foundation of morality." "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*) Man's sexual organs were made for a woman and a woman's for a man, with the "two becoming one," all for the purpose of pro-creation (the family with the parents in control). Making pleasure an end in itself moves both men and women beyond the marriage bed, with no limit in sight, with whoever and whatever engenders pleasure becoming an end in itself (debauchery prevails—see the issue on [Divorce](#)).

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

When the focus is upon relationship, established commands, rules, facts, and truth must be set aside (suspended as upon a cross), *negating* the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (no matter what the cost), *negating* judging, condemning, casting the person out for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*, *negating* the *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* in the process. The 'justification' of sin and the *negation* of anyone who judges, condemns, cast others out for sinning is the hallmark of Marxism, i.e., the use of *dialogue* ("I feel" and "I think") in establishing right and wrong behavior.

"Not feeling at home in the sinful world, Critical Criticism [dialogue] 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, *"Not feeling at home"* in a world of sinners, judging men (firing, demoting, not relating with, judging, condemning, casting men out) for sinning, *"Critical Criticism"* (*dialogue*; since in *dialogue* there is no father's/Father's authority therefore no *guilty conscience*, i.e., fear of being judged, condemned, cast out for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*, i.e., for not doing the father's/Father's will), i.e., communication with *self* and with others, when it comes to behavior must be through *dialogue* (*"Critical Criticism"*) which being *"a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without"* does not

recognize the father's/Father's authority, thus 'justifying' the removal (*negation*) of the father's/Father's authority ("prejudice") from the environment so all can *lust* in peace (without having a *guilty conscience*) with *affirmation* (with everyone's approval, i.e., not judging, not condemning, not casting the deviant out)—in the classroom, in the workplace, in the community, in government, etc., including in the home (and even in the "church"). (More on the difference between *discussion* and *dialogue* [explained farther down in the issue](#).) In brief any *discussion* which comes through *dialogue* is from the world, i.e., is from "sense experience" (*lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint) and is not from the father/Father, i.e., is not from being *told* (which requires faith, at least at first until understood); when *discussion* comes via *dialogue* there is no limit or measure to what man can say or do, all is subject to the process of 'change.'—"In vain does one fashion a logic of faith, a substitution brought about without regard for limit and measure." Luther's Works: Vol. 31, Career of the Reformer: I, p. 12; in *dialogue* all man ends up with is impulses and urges directing his thoughts, with no voice from above *telling* him right from wrong regarding behavior, i.e., how he should think and act. One is from vain speculation, i.e., *opinion* the other from being *told*, requiring faith. Reasoning from "sense experience" is antithetical to reasoning from what you have been *told*, making you subject to *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it, i.e., *stimulus-response* instead of doing the father's/Father's will—which Marxism is out to *negate* in order to 'justify' *lust*.

In his writing "*The Holy Family*" Karl Marx generalized regarding fruit trees, focusing upon what they all had in common, making that the basis of reasoning. Anyone with an orchard knows while there a common features with fruit trees it is knowing the details (how they differ from one another) you end up with a crop. By generalizing when it comes to man, only that which is of the world is recognized, using what God created in man (only in man), his ability to reason, to 'justify' his *lust* (in disobedience to God), i.e., what he has in common with all men, makes that which is of God moot in the eyes of man. "The big print giveth and the small print taketh away." While God commanded man to eat the fruit from all the trees in the garden, he commanded him not to eat the fruit of one (lest he die).

Generalizing, i.e., making all trees the same via sight, the woman (as Karl Marx, with Adam following) *negated* the small print (the details)—as do all who use dialectic 'reasoning' (reasoning through *dialogue*, i.e., "I feel" and "I think") when it comes to knowing right and wrong behavior, making all subject to *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it (in defiance to God).

Karl Marx knew that by focusing upon sensuousness, all the world can be 'changed,' even the "believer." He wrote: "*The unspeculative Christian* [the believer, the man of faith in God] *also recognizes sensuality as long as it does not assert itself at the expense of true reason, i.e., of faith, of true love, i.e., of love of God, of true will-power, i.e., of will in Christ* [Karl Marx wrote this]. *Not for the sake of sensual love, not for the lust of the flesh, but because the Lord said: Increase and multiply.*" (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*)

Karl Marx knew that by getting even the believer to focus upon sensuousness, even the believer could be 'changed.' "*It is not sensuality which is presented ..., but mysteries, adventures, obstacles, fears, dangers, and especially the attraction of what is forbidden.*" (*ibid.*) emphasis added.

"... every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" James 1:14,15

"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." Isaiah 55:8, 9 "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Matthew 6:24 "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" Romans 6:16 "And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." 1 John 2:18 ". . . every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Romans 14:12 "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

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

The student/man is forced (under the pressure of the "group's" approval or rejection of him) to choose between either doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., being *told* (judging, condemning, casting out those who disobey the father/Father), thus facing rejection by "the group" or becoming at-one-with "the group," i.e., 'justifying' *lust* (what comes naturally to everyone in "the group," i.e., judging, condemning, casting out those who adhere to the father's/Father's authority system).

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

By replacing the traditional educator with a facilitator of 'change' the student's ("*the people's*") way of thinking (and therefore their behavior) is 'changed.' *"Change in methods of leadership is probably the quickest way to bring about a change in the cultural atmosphere of a group."* *"Any real change of the culture of a group is, therefore, interwoven with the changes of the power constellation within the group."* (Barker, Dembo, & Lewin, "frustration and regression: an experiment with young children" in *Child Behavior and Development*) As long as the father's/Father's authority system remains in place the process of 'change' can not be initiated or sustained. *"The dialectical method was overthrown—the parts [the children] were prevented from finding their definition [their identity] within the whole [within "the group," through dialogue 'justifying' their lusts]."* ([György Lukács](#), *History & Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?*)

By replacing (in the environment) what the father/Father says (demands) with the child's/man's "feelings" of the 'moment' (that the environment, i.e., that the situation, object, people, or person is *stimulating*) the child/man is 'changed.' *"Part of the dialectics of the process of winning independence from parental authority lies in using the extrafamilial peer group as a foil to parental authority, particularly in the period of adolescence."* (Bradford, Gibb, Benne, T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method: Innovation in Re-education) *"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*)

What does the "group grade," the *consensus* meeting, the soviet (of the "former" soviet union), the directorate (of the French Revolution), the ministers alliance, "bipartisanship," etc., have in common: they are (were) all 1) a diverse group of people (which must incorporate the deviant), 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, there is only the participants *lusts*, i.e., their *self interests* of the 'moment' being 'justified' and supported), 3) over social issues (producing worldly peace, where everyone can *lust* without feeling *guilty* and socialist harmony, where everyone can *lust* without being judged, condemned, cast out), 4) in a facilitated meeting (since the process does not come naturally, i.e., needs someone to initiate and sustain it) 5) to a pre-determined outcome (that no decision be made without steps 1-4 being carried out—in order to *negate* the father's/Fathers authority in establishing rules, policies, and law, i.e., in establishing right and wrong behavior, i.e., *negate* having to *humble, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* one's *self*, i.e., *deny* one's *lust* in order [as in "old" world order] to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will) in order [as in "new" world order] for everyone to do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world (that the current situation and/or object, people, or person) is *stimulating*, without the father's/Father's authority getting in the way (being in their thoughts, directly effecting their actions). "*There is no type of past behavior too deviant for a group to accept once therapeutic group norms are established.*" (Yalom) People think the "Berlin Wall" came down because Communism was defeated when in fact it came down because Communism had succeeded, using the *consensus* process (group therapy) in order to *negate* the father's/Father's authority while establishing right and wrong behavior, directly effecting everyone's actions.

Part 6.

All I have to do in order to "own" your child, i.e., turn your child against you and your authority is place him or her in with *a group* of children not judging, condemning, casting anyone out (except those fighting against the group's participation), requiring everyone to be "positive," i.e., tolerate of ambiguity, 'justifying' sin and not "negative," judging, condemning, casting out those who sin and ask them how they "feel" and what they "think" when they are *told* what they can and can not do.

The *dialoguing* of their *opinions* to a *consensus* 'justifies' their *self interest*, along with their belongingness to "*the group*," which has now become more important to them than their parents, i.e., their parent's authority. In *dialogue* (when it comes to behavior) the child, deciding right and wrong behavior according to his or her carnal desires, i.e., *lust* of the 'moment' (setting aside, i.e., suspending as upon a cross any command, rule, fact, or truth that is getting in the way of the pleasure of the 'moment' and the approval of his or her peers, his or her concern being with the "here-and-now"—with "What can I get out of this situation and/or object, people, or person for my *self*) is God. In *discussion* he or she is not God (with doing right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth having the final say, his or her concern being with the "there-and-then"—with what he or she has been *told* in the past and the consequence of his or her thoughts and actions in the future).

"In an ordinary discussion people usually hold relatively fixed positions and argue in favor of their views as they try to convince others to change." *"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*) The *negation* of the father's/Father's authority in the mind of the children (controlling their thoughts, thus their actions) is what contemporary education, with its emphasis upon the "[*affective domain*](#)" is all about (even in the private, parochial, "Christian," and home school). If you are more concerned about your child's social life then where he or she is going to spend eternity, you are a socialist. You can deny that (all day long) but you can not refute it. To

be silent in the midst of unrighteousness is to make unrighteousness the "norm."

The *guilty conscience* is engendered from doing wrong and not right according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., not doing the father's/Father's will. The "super-ego" from *stimulus-response*., i.e., approach pleasure and avoid pain (which includes the missing out on pleasure). *"The guilty conscience is formed in childhood by the incorporation of the parents and the wish to be father of oneself."* *"What we call 'conscience' perpetuates inside of us our bondage to past objects now part of ourselves:"* (Brown) *"The personal conscience is the key element in ensuring self-control, refraining from deviant behavior even when it can be easily perpetrated."* *"The family, the next most important unit affecting social control, is obviously instrumental in the initial formation of the conscience and in the continued reinforcement of the values that encourage law abiding behavior."* (Dr. Robert Trojanowicz, *The meaning of "Community" in Community Policing*) It is the *guilty conscience* that restrains the father's/Father's authority in society—the person refusing to compromise (set aside a. k. a. suspend) what he has been *told* (in order to initiate or sustain relationship with others who are doing wrong). *"Superego development is conceived as the incorporation of the moral standards of society."* (*Book 2: Affective Domain*) In other words it is society that engenders right and wrong behavior, 'justifying' compromise (setting aside a. k. a. suspending what you have been *told*) in order to initiate and sustain relationships. If society is to be rid of the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way of relationships the *guilty conscience* for doing wrong disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* has to be *negated*. *Negate* the fear of judgment, condemnation, being cast out when it comes to establishing behavior and the *guilty conscience* is *negated*, effectively *negating* the father's/Father's authority in the person thoughts, effecting his actions. *"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 what being "positive" (tolerating,

i.e., 'justifying' *lust*) and not "negative" (judging, condemning, casting out the one who *lusts*) is all about.

Those "of (and for) the father's/Father's authority system" are "prejudiced" against using *dialogue* ("I feel" and "I think") when it comes to what the father/Father says (always including "Thou shalt surely die," i.e., accountability to the father/Father for their thoughts and actions in their conversation with their self and with others). Those "of (and for) the world" are "prejudiced" against using *discussion* ("I KNOW," i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., what the father/Father says) when it comes to the lusts of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating (leaving out and denying "Thou shalt surely die," i.e., accountability to the father/Father for their thoughts and actions in their conversation with their self and with others).

The father/Father holds you accountable to obeying and applying his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth. The facilitator of 'change' 'liberates' you from the father's/Father's authority, thus 'liberating' you from his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth—in order for you (and him) to lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a *guilty conscience*, no longer having a fear of being judged, condemned, and cast out for your (and his) immoral behavior. In the *consensus* process all policies, rules, and laws are void of the father's/Father's authority system. "*Bypassing the traditional channels of 'top-down' decision making [negating the father's/Father's authority while establishing policy and/or making law, i.e., while establishing right and wrong behavior (using dialogue instead of discussion—the true meaning of the word—when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior accomplishes the deed aka Praxis] our objective center's upon transforming public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics.*" "*Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common [lust] interests and ultimately to world interests, transforming public consensus into one favorable to the emergence of a stable and humanistic world order.*" "*Consensus [getting rid of the father's/Father's authority, especially in establishing right and wrong behavior] 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) It is in "the group" you set aside (compromise) the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth (suspend the *truth*, as upon a cross) in order (as in "new" world order) to initiate and sustain relationship—based upon your and the other persons common *self interest*, i.e., upon your and their *lusts* of the 'moment' that you and they have in common.

"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, the objective however, is change." (Karl Marx, *Feuerbach Thesis #11*)
Inscribed on Karl Marx's tomb so it must be important.

In other words, father's demanding their children do what they say (as Kings demand the citizens do what they say) cause division between the children (the people) of the world, dividing them from one another upon what their father (the King) commands, inhibiting or blocking 'change.' Only by the children finding what they have in common, i.e., their *lust* for pleasure and resentment toward restraint can they become one. It is only in *lust* that the world *stimulates* (and hatred toward restraint) that 'change' can be initiated and sustained.

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

Our Highest Court once recognized the effect of the "Christian" faith upon this nation and the world. *"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) In ROE V. WADE the court wrote: *"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) Stoicism is an offshoot of the work of Heraclitus who wrote: *"Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys."* Karl Marx based his ideology off of the work of Heraclitus, as the Highest Court in America has done, where *lust* is now established over and therefore against the father's/Father's (the Constitution's) authority. *"Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state [the court]."* (R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, *Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law*) *"Bypassing the traditional channels of 'top-down' decision making"* has accomplished the deed.

Without 'change' taking place in education, 'change' can not be initiated and sustained.

"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."* (Benne)

Martin Luther, of the Protestant Reformation wrote: *"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)

"My advice has been that a young man avoid scholastic philosophy and theology like the very death of his soul." (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.258) It was the ideology of Aristotle (and all philosophy), that by creating a "healthy" environment you can develop a "healthy" person, that Martin Luther and the Protestant Reformation rejected. No man is righteous, righteousness can only be imputed to man by God, by man's faith in the Son, Jesus Christ and in the Father alone (by the work of the Holy Spirit).

Karl Marx's response to education in his day was: *"Education as yet is unable and unwilling to bring all estates and distinctions into its circle. Only Christianity and morality are able to found universal kingdoms on earth."* (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*)

Part 7.

It was in the 50's that Karl Marx's process of 'change' took over the nation via the introduction of *"Bloom's Taxonomies"* into education (John Dewey had an eroding effect but this was a complete *coup de grace*). *"Perhaps one of the most dramatic events highlighting the need for progress in the affective domain was the publication of Jacob's Changing Values in College (1957)."* (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Education Objectives Book 2 Affective Domain*)

The "teacher" using "Bloom's Taxonomies" in the classroom, basing education upon the *"affective domain,"* i.e., upon the students *self interest,* i.e., upon their natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and resent (hate) restraint takes on the role of a "facilitator of 'change.'" The facilitator of 'change,' perceiving his *self* as being the personification of "the people," who, like him *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the moment the world *stimulates,* hating restraint, sees it as his duty to 'justify' the students' natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure in order to 'justify' his natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure. When you question the facilitator of 'change's' actions he (or she) will respond with "It is not just about you," really meaning "It is all about me, so I can *lust* after pleasure without being judged, condemned, cast out, without having a *guilty conscience,* with your

affirmation. If you refuse to *affirm* me, i.e., 'justify' my *lusts* or get in my way 'the people' will remove (*negate*) you (since having 'justifying' their *lusts* I now 'own' them). It appears I must keep an eye on you from now on for my 'good.'" This is the true meaning of "sight based management."

The soul *KNOWS* by being *told*, the flesh knows by "*sense experience*." You persuade with facts. You *manipulate* with *feelings*. This is the difference between *discussion* and *dialogue*. In *dialogue* (which is subject to your feelings) you do what you are *told* because you *have to* (or else—fear of judgment, condemnation, being cast out and the *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after pleasure keeps you under the parent's/God's control). In *discussion* (which is subject to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) you do what you are *told* because you *want to* (you *want to* do or be right and not wrong).

The facilitator of 'changes' objective is to "*prevent someone who KNOWS from filling the empty space*." (Wilfred Bion, *A Memoir of the Future*) This is antithetical to God and His Word. "*Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the LORD: though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished. By mercy and truth iniquity is purged: and by the fear of the LORD men depart from evil.*" Proverbs 16:5-6

Right and wrong behavior is no longer known by being *told*, i.e., by the Word of God, i.e., by faith (which is objective) but known by "*sense experience*," i.e., by "*the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life*," i.e., by sight, i.e., by perception, i.e., by what "seems" to be (which is subjective), i.e., by "What can I get out of this situation and/or object, people, or person for my self?" which leads to "What will happen to me if they reject me and turn on me?" (engendering fear of man instead of God).

"*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*)

"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

You can not leave the Father out without leaving the Son out (doing the Father's will)—who the Father sent to 'redeem' us by his shed blood on the cross. And you can not leave the Son out (doing the Father's will) without leaving the Father out—who raised the Son from the grave in order to 'reconcile' us to Himself.

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

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

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

Dialogue contains that which we like and desire to have (and do not like and want to avoid). *Discussion* that which is right (and wrong) according to external (established) commands, rules, facts, and truth that we have been taught (*told*). When we take *dialogue* into the area where we have been *told* not to go (think upon or do) *lust* is made manifest (along with hatred toward restraint, i.e., hatred toward missing out on pleasure). Establishing behavior upon *dialogue* 'liberates' the child/man from the father's/Father's authority, making them subject to *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it only (*stimulus-response*).

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

Our body naturally produces a chemical called dopamine, a neurotransmitter that is "emancipated" or "liberated" into a small gap called a synaptic gap between two nerve endings, the posterior of the first

nerve "emancipating" it, the anterior of the second receiving it. Dopamine engenders the sensation of pleasure. All habitual drugs are tied to it (emancipating it, imitating it, preventing its re-uptake). The child is not in love with the toy. He is in love with the dopamine the toy stimulates in him. Man is not in love with the situation and/or the object, people, or person. He is in love with the pleasure (dopamine emancipation) the situation and/or object, people, or person is stimulating, i.e., "emancipating" (whether imagined or real). It is the sensation of pleasure along with the sensation of hate (toward whoever is inhibiting or blocking, i.e., preventing dopamine emancipation), i.e., that which the situation and/or object, people, or person is stimulating, i.e., only that which is "of (and for) *the world*" that Karl Marx was (and those of "behavior science," i.e., stimulus-response are) focused on.

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

Karl Marx simply secularized 1 John 2:16, redefining "the lust of the flesh" as "sensuous need," "the lust of the eyes" as "sense perception," and "the pride of life" as "sense experience," where only that which "is of the world," i.e., which "only . . . proceeds from Nature" is all there "is," i.e., is "actual." Psychotherapists think the same way.

"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)

It is therefore the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., that which engenders "prejudice" against dopamine emancipation, i.e., that which prevents the child/man from becoming his self, i.e., self actualized, i.e., only "of the world" that has to be negated in the child's/man's thought, directly effecting his actions (his reaction toward his self, other, the world, and authority) in order for the Marxist and psychotherapist to control them and therefore the world. Rejecting the father's/Father's authority all those "of (and for) the world" can recognize is *stimulus-response*, i.e., the child's/man's (their) natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and hate restraint, perceiving the earthly father's authority as engendering the Heavenly Father's authority.

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

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

While the heavenly Father is holy and the earthly father is born into sin both have the same authority system, *preaching* commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaching* facts and truth to be accepted as is (at first at least by faith) and applied, *discussing* with those under his/His authority any questions they might have regarding his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth, providing he/He deems it necessary, has time, those under his/His authority are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking his/His authority, 2) *rewarding* those who do right and obey, 3) *correcting* and/or *chastening*

those who do wrong and/or disobey, that they might learn to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their "self" in order to do right and not wrong according to the established commands, rules, facts, and truth they have been taught (*told*), i.e., in order to do the father's/Fathers' will, and 4) *casting out* (expels/grounds) those who question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack his/His authority, which restrains the father's/Father's authority system in the child's/man's thoughts, directing effecting his actions, resulting in the those under the father's/Father's authority KNOWING right from wrong from being *told* (especially when it comes to behavior). Traditional education, while it might inculcate bad or wrong information replicates this way of thinking and acting. Transitional education, where little instruction takes places is bad. While Transformational education, which rejects the father's/Father's authority is wicked. Rejecting the Father's authority, Karl Marx (and all who adhere to stimulus-response when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior) determined that faith in God, i.e., the Heavenly Father was the result of children accepting and submitting to the father's authority in the home, thus requiring the *negation* of the earthly father's authority in order for man to become at-one-with his self and his fellow man, thinking and acting according to his carnal nature (what he has in common with all men) without restraint.

Lenin (of the Russian Revolution) put it this way: "*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)

The essence of Marxism is leaving out of your conversation (your communication) with your *self* and with others the father's/Father's authority, i.e., God's judgment upon, condemnation of, and casting out those who sin—that man might repent. For the facilitator of 'change' and the person who follows after him "*God is not in all his thoughts.*" "[T]here is no fear of God before his eyes." Psalms 10:4, 36:1

*"As the [Frankfurt School](#) 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*)*

[Theodor Adorno](#) and [Erick Fromm](#) were members of the "Frankfurt School," officially the *Institute of Social Research*, while [Kurt Lewin](#), who edited their newspaper was not. Kurt Lewin's work on [Force Field Analysis](#), [Group Dynamics](#), and [Unfreezing, Moving or Changing, Refreezing People](#) was imperative to its success.

Part 8.

Transformational Marxists ("The Frankfurt School" a. k. a. "The Institute of Social Research") merged Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud. *"Marxian theory [society] needs Freudian-type instinct theory [man's natural inclination "lust ... "] 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*)* Psychology is in line with Marx's ideology.

Sigmund Freud as did Karl Marx set out to *negate* of the father's/Father's authority. While Karl Marx began with society Sigmund Freud began with the individual. *"... 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." "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 home, 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.

"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)

All that "is" *"is of the world,"* i.e., is *stimulus-response*, which is passing away (is only of the 'moment,' i.e., the "eternal present"). Only what is of and from God, i.e., being *told* and obeying by faith is of eternal value. You can not have faith without being *told*. Likewise you can not have mercy without first being found guilty. 'Justifying' your self, i.e., your *lusts*, i.e., your *self interest negates* your salvation. [To] *"purge [man] of sin' with all the aids of the dialectics, therefore, is to rob him of true salvation, of his eternal destiny."* (Rene Fulop-Miller, *The Power and Secrets of the Jesuits*, p.468.) *"And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire"* which is never quenched, prepared for the master facilitator of 'change' and all who follow after him, 'justifying' their *lusts*, establishing "human nature," i.e., their carnal thoughts and carnal actions as being equal with, therefore greater than, and therefore against the father/Father and his/His authority. Revelation 10:15

You do have a choice, either choose to deny your *self*, i.e., die to your *lust*, pick up your cross, i.e., endure the rejection of others for denying (reproving, correcting, judging, condemning, rejecting) them for establishing their *lusts* and the *lust* of others over and therefore against doing the Father's will, and follow the Lord Jesus Christ, doing the Father's will, inheriting eternal life or choose to 'justify' your *lusts* and the *lusts* of others, dying in your sins, inheriting eternal death. If you use or participate in the use of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" (the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus*—suspending the truth, i.e., Jesus Christ upon the cross in order to initiate and sustain relationship with others) in the classroom you choose to die in your sins, i.e., you choose to spend eternity in the lake of fire that is never quenched, prepared for the master facilitator of 'change' and all who follow after him instead of following after the Lord, doing the Father's will, inheriting eternal life.

"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

© *Institution for Authority Research*, Dean Gotcher 2024