

Diaprax Exposed: Exposing the formula for 'change.'

Written for believers who have been or are being hurt by the process of 'change' and what to know what happened or is happening to them and their loved ones, as well as *how* to respond. If Jesus Christ is your savior and Lord, the following information will encourage you in your walk with Him, knowing what the enemy of your soul is doing and how he is doing it, trying to keep you from enduring to the end. But if you do not know the Lord and His Heavenly Father, or do not desire to know them (asking forgiveness from them and repenting of your sins), it will only give you more information on what is happening to you and the world around you, leaving you in your sins.

by

Dean Gotcher

"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

If you are *into the Word*, i.e., if you know [the Word of God](#), you should be able to have a good bible study as you read through this material, as it exposes (explains) the dialectic process, i.e., the process of 'change,' i.e., the process that has now become the law of the land—***"lawfulness without law"*** (Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*), where man (man's mind) is 'liberated' from the law of God, i.e., where the law of the flesh (the law of sin) is 'liberated' from judgment and condemnation, i.e., where [men, women, and children](#) are 'liberated' from having a *"guilty conscience"* for doing wrong, for taking that which is not theirs to take, claiming it as theirs, by 'liberating' [the nature of the child](#) (*"human nature"*) from parental restraint, i.e., by 'liberating' the children from their [father's authority](#), *negating the father's authority system* in their feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in their relationship with one another in the process, so that ***all can sin with impunity***, i.e., with no fear of God, 'creating' a so called "new world order" of ***"peace and affirmation,"*** making [abomination](#) the law of the land. ***"There is no fear of God before their eyes,"*** the iPad (the pleasure of the 'moment') having taken His place. Romans 3:18 I provide you with some scripture (key verses) but many more scriptures should come to mind during your reading.

The key to understanding the dialectic process, is someone coming between the father and his children, 'liberating' them from their father's authority **system** (faith and obedience) so that they can be themselves again, as they were before the father's first command, rule, fact, or truth, i.e., carnal, i.e., thinking and acting according to sight, i.e., of the world only, 'justifying' themselves, i.e., their carnal nature, following after the way of the woman in the garden in Eden (and every man since), who, questioning God's command and rule and challenging His authority, 'liberated' herself from God's authority **system** (faith and obedience), following after the way of the world (thinking and acting according to her carnal desires of the 'moment,' 'justifying' herself), instead of following after the way of Christ, who was obedient to His Heavenly Father in all things commanded. ***"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 ***"Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God."*** Luke 16:15 The only way for you to overcome the *affect* dialectic 'reasoning' ('self' 'justification') has upon you is in following after Christ Jesus, i.e., being 'redeemed' from His Father's wrath upon you (for your disobedience, i.e., for your sins) by His blood, i.e., with His *righteousness* being *imputed* to you by your faith in Him, being 'reconciled' to His (your) Heavenly Father by His resurrection. ***"I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."*** John 14:6 ***"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

The dialectic idea is: if the Heavenly Father's authority **system** is the same as the earthly father's authority **system**—obedience to our earthly father's commands and rules and faith in his facts and truth is the same **system** as obedience to our Heavenly Father's commands and rules and faith in His facts and truth—then by *negating* the child's faith in and obedience to the earthly father's authority **system** (faith and obedience), getting him to question his father's commands and rules and challenge his facts and truth, i.e., question and challenge his authority **system**, the Heavenly Father's authority **system** (faith and obedience) will be *negated* in his thoughts and actions in the process. According to dialectic 'reasoning,' by removing the *preaching* of commands and rules to be obeyed (as given) and the **teaching** of facts and truth to be accepted as is (by faith) in the child's classroom experience and replacing it with the *dialoguing* of *opinions* (which are subject to the child's carnal desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' i.e., of the flesh and the world only) to a *consensus*

(to a "feeling" of "oneness" with the "the group," i.e., with the world), as was done in the garden in Eden, the deed (the *praxis*) can be accomplished, i.e., the world ('liberated' from Godly restraint) can become united as one (of "human nature," i.e., of the world only) united in unrighteousness and abomination, as we now see happening all around us.

Forgive me for my paragraph sentences, there are a few that are extremely long and I know that will stop any but the most determined (who are upset with the dialectic process, i.e., its *affect* upon them and want to know *what* it is and *how* to deal with it) from continuing on. While they may be long, they are connected in thought—they may have to be re-read, i.e., thought through, in order to be clearly understood. As the original saying goes, "*Le bon Dieu est dans le détail*" (*the good God is in the detail*).

As you persevere (trudge) through the first few pages, [Hegel's](#) (Marx's, Freud's, Obama's, etc.) *dialectic process* should become clear—having read [over 600 social-psychology books](#) on the subject, of which many are required reading for a PhD in Education and Administration, and taught in a University on the subject, seeing how it is explained or rather not explained by other professors, leaving students clueless regarding its use on them, my intent is to make it clear so that you will understand its *affect* upon you and those around you (your family and friends, your "community," state, and national leaders, ministers, i.e., its *affect* upon education, the workplace, government, entertainment, the media, the "church," etc., i.e., its *affect* upon all policy setting environments, including the home). It is a process of analysis, called "*enlightenment*" (*aufheben*) or "*higher order thinking skills*" (what the scriptures call "*oppositions of science falsely so called:*" 1 Timothy 6:20 when used on man) that is being used to turn that which is spiritual into "academics," removing 'judgmentalism,' i.e., removing doing right and not wrong, i.e., removing *righteousness* (personal accountability before God alone—for our thoughts and actions) as the issue of life, replacing it with our (and other's) "*feelings*" of the 'moment.' i.e., *sensuousness* so that we can "*feel better*" about ourselves and be "*less offensive*" to others. The dialectic process, i.e., Hegel's (Marx's, Freud's, Obama's) method of thinking would not be *affective* if it was not for the fact that we are all already doing it, i.e., thinking about how to '*change*' the situation (the environment, the world) we find ourselves in (in the 'moment,' in the here-and-now), in order to make our lives more pleasurable, i.e., more "*enjoyable*"—satisfying ('justifying') our carnal desires, i.e., our *urges* and *impulses* of the 'moment,' including our hatred (our natural reaction) toward restraint, i.e., toward whatever or whoever keeps us from having what we want, when we want it, i.e., toward the pain of missing

out on pleasure, making pleasure (the augmentation of it) rather than doing right and not wrong (which is established by God, parent, teacher, boss, etc.,) the 'drive' and 'purpose' of life.

The women in the garden in Eden (Eve) used dialectic 'reasoning' ("self 'justification'") when she *evaluated* (*aufheben*) the situation of the 'moment' (her desire to **"touch"** the tree), 'reasoning' (*evaluating* the situation of the 'moment') in the "light" of her *"feelings"* of the 'moment,' following after ('justifying') *"human nature,"* i.e., the law of the flesh, i.e., *sensuousness*, determining right from wrong according to sight, i.e., according to her own understanding, i.e., according to her *"feelings"*—her **"sensuous need"** of the 'moment' [her desire to *"touch"*] and **"sense perception"** [what *"she saw"*], making that which was **forbidden**, good, pleasing, and desirous, i.e., making right and wrong subject to **"Nature Only"** (Karl Marx, *Thesis on Feuerbach*)—instead of from the Word of God, i.e., obeying God's command, rule, fact, and truth by faith, with her *subjectivity*, i.e., *"human nature"* superseding **the Word of God**, i.e., *objectivity*, i.e., that which is not of *"human nature,"* i.e., not of the world, i.e., that which she could not understand in and of herself, i.e., that which she could not identify with (in the 'moment'), i.e., that which did not proceed from (was not in and of) herself but had to be accepted by faith. Commands, rules, facts, and truth carry within them accountability, i.e., the threat of judgment for disobedience or a consequence for doing things wrong. Unlike *deductive 'reasoning'*, which depends upon an *a priori*, a command, rule, fact, or truth to reason from, which carries a consequence for disobedience or for doing things wrong, dialectic 'reasoning' removes the threat of judgment for disobedience or the consequence for doing things wrong, resulting in the command, rule, fact, or truth losing its relevance—the person from then on only being able to 'reason' according to their desired outcome, i.e., as in *inductive 'reasoning'* only including or tolerating (recognizing and embracing) that information (*appropriate* information) which is relevant to, i.e., which 'justifies,' i.e., which guarantees the *desired* outcome, excluding or refusing to recognize that information (*inappropriate* information, i.e., impractical information, i.e., irrelevant information), i.e., the threat of judgment for disobedience or the consequence for doing things wrong, which gets in the way, i.e., which inhibits or prevents 'change.' Just because everyone agrees (comes to a *consensus*) on a solution does not make it right—*consensus*, i.e., the approval of men is the pride of life. It is facts and truth that makes it right.

"Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose

heart departeth from the LORD." Jeremiah 17:5 ***"Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the LORD: though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished."*** Proverbs 16:5

Dialectic 'reasoning' is *"of and for"* self. It is the 'justifying' of man's deceitful and wicked heart, 'liberating,' i.e., saving him from Godly restraint ([Genesis 3:1-6](#)), as the child's deceitful and wicked heart is 'justified,' 'liberated,' and 'saved' from parental restraint (the father's authority) through the use of [psychology](#) (*psychoanalysis* and *psychotherapy*)—*negating "Because I said so,"* i.e., the *preaching* and *teaching* of commands and rules to be obeyed ("or else") and facts and truth to be accepted as is (by faith), with the use of *"I feel"* and *"I think"* opinions. The parent's and God's method, pattern, system, or paradigm are the same, i.e., *Patriarch* ([Hebrews 12:5-11](#)), which engenders a *"guilty conscience"* in the child or man, which therefore engenders the need for repentance before parent or God and forgiveness from parent or God for doing wrong, i.e., for disobedience, i.e., for sinning ([Romans 7:11-25](#)), which those of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., 'self' 'justifiers' hate (refuse to do), attempting to, as you will see, [annihilate](#) the parent or God's authority **system**, by 'justifying' *"human nature"* ([the child's nature](#)) over and therefore against Godly (parental) restraint, 'creating' a "new" world order of 'justified' unrighteousness and abomination, where man (and child) can sin with impunity. When it comes to satisfying our carnal desires, i.e., doing what we want to do (knowing or having been told that what we are doing is wrong) and getting caught for doing it, we naturally respond with the ***"It's not my fault."*** *"It's ___ my friend's, my parent's, the teacher's, the bosses, the environment's, the situation's, your ___ fault,"* i.e., ***"It's the woman's fault," "It's the serpent's fault," "You don't understand"*** syndrome ('justifying' "self"), rejecting the ***"It's my fault. It's your garden (property) and not mine. Forgive me for disobeying, for doing wrong. I will not do it again."*** i.e., recognition-confession-repentance response (humbling and denying "self"). The former ("self 'justifying'") response is that which made Adam and the woman in the garden in Eden the first socialist. Socialists, whether nationalist (fascist) or globalists (commonists) blame someone else or the situation for their "bad behavior," which they do not see as being "bad" or "that bad," i.e., *evaluating* the situation from ***their "feelings"*** of the 'moment,' making right and wrong situational, i.e., adaptable to 'change,' subject to their carnal desires, i.e., their carnal imaginations, i.e., their carnal thoughts of the 'moment.'

"Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;" 2 Corinthians 10:5

Dissatisfied with the way the world "is," i.e., having to do what someone else tells you to do, i.e., not being able to actualize your desires (your "*feelings*") of the 'moment,' i.e., your interests, i.e., your self, not being able to do what you want to do, when you want to do it, "***thinking***" about (*imagining*) ***how the world (the situation) "ought" to be***, i.e., being able to do that which satisfies *your desires* (your *urges* and *impulses*) of the 'moment,' as a speculator, i.e., as a philosopher, your *imagination*, i.e., your "*ought*" is where your "*spin*," i.e., i.e., your generalization (half truth) comes from (which is not in the details, i.e., excludes "the rest of the story," but tries to avoid or detract from it), used in order to 'justify' your actions or desired actions, i.e., in order to 'justify' your "self", i.e., your "*feelings*" of the 'moment,' i.e., your "*understanding*," using dialectic 'reasoning' ("self-justification") to 'justify' your 'changing' of the world, i.e., questioning and challenging authority, i.e., 'changing' what "*is*" (facts and truth) into with "*ought*" to be (opinions and theories), i.e., that which is of the world, i.e., of "human nature," i.e., of man's carnal nature only. By putting your *imagination*, i.e., your carnal thoughts and carnal desires (your "*sensuous needs*") of the 'moment,' i.e., that which you perceive as being "good" (pleasure always *feels* "good," including the pleasure which comes from the approval of others, and pain, including the pain of missing out on pleasure and/or the pain which comes from being rejected by others always *feels* "bad") into action, especially with others agreeing and participating with you (*affirming* you, i.e., "helping" you to "*actualize*" yourself, i.e., your self interests, i.e., your carnal desires of the 'moment'), where your carnal desires, your "*ought's*," your imaginations and dialectic 'reasoning' (which 'justifies' them) are 'justified' in their eyes, in your eyes, as their self interests, i.e., their carnal desires of the 'moment,' their "*ought's*," their imaginations and dialectic 'reasoning' (which 'justifies' them) are 'justified' in your eyes, in their eyes, makes you and them one and the same, i.e. "one" in "*feelings*" and in "*thought*" as well as in "*action*"—with everyone becoming as "one" in *consensus* and *praxis* (in group, community, i.e., social action) in the 'moment,' with your thoughts becoming at-one-with the groups thoughts and the groups thoughts become at-one-with your thoughts, where your actions (in defiance to authority, i.e., in defiance to the world that "is") are 'justified' by their actions (in their defiance to authority, i.e., in their defiance to the world that "is") as their actions (in defiance to authority, i.e., in defiance to the world that "is") are 'justified' by your actions (in your defiance to authority, i.e., in your defiance to the world that "is"), with all working as "one" in the *praxis* of 'create' a "new" world order based upon "*feelings*," i.e., creating the world as it "*ought*" to be, 'liberated' from parental (and Godly) restraints—with their commands and rules to be obeyed as given and facts and truth to be

accepted as is, by faith, which inhibit or block the pleasures of the 'moment,' interfering with or preventing the child from having a "[social life](#)," i.e., [a socialist life](#).

If P equals the pleasure of the 'moment, A equals the approval of others (which is pleasurable), and R equals the restraining of pleasure which sometimes comes with doing what is right, then the A of parental authority, which emphasizes R, is not as strong as the A of the group which emphasizes P. All children have within them the desire to have pleasure—including having the pleasure which comes from the approval of others (for doing right in their eyes), and to avoid pain—including avoiding the pain which comes from the missing out on pleasure, as well as avoiding the pain which comes from being rejected by others (for doing wrong in their eyes). When right and wrong are tied to a source outside of the child's impulse and urges of the 'moment,' i.e., a source above his natural inclination to approach the pleasure of the 'moment,' pleasure has the potential of being restrained. That is, when the child accepts doing right and not wrong as his way of thinking and acting then approaching pleasure and avoiding pain becomes subject to an authority greater than (above) him, i.e., above nature, directing his steps i.e., controlling his actions as he learns to control his feelings, thoughts, and actions (control himself, i.e., his "self") in obedience to authority, becoming mature in the process. Conversely, the more the child makes pleasure right the more he makes parental restraint wrong. That is, when right and wrong become subject (subordinate) to pleasure and pain, then right and wrong becomes subject not only to the situation but to the person or the persons who controls or manipulates the environment or situation in order to stimulate pleasure or pain within the child (including the pleasure which comes from the approval of others and/or the pain which comes from their rejection). This conflict between right-wrong (an authority above the child) and pleasure-pain (from himself, i.e., his natural desire, i.e., his "lust" of the 'moment') is adaptable to 'change' over time, influenced by the emphasis of one over and therefore against the other, i.e. either doing right and not wrong, restraining pleasure or pleasure being right and pain being wrong, 'liberating' pleasure. While Jesus restrained himself in the wilderness, not eating, worshipping, or acting without His Father's approval, i.e., thinking and acting according to His Heavenly Father's will, the woman in the garden in Eden, taking on the father's authority as her own, put aside restraint in order to satisfy her desire of the 'moment,' i.e., to *relate* with the "forbidden" tree. The world can not understand the believer, who is filled with the Holy Spirit, having joy, peace, and love which the world can not have, the unredeemed only having the pleasures of the world and the self which "lusts" after them. Despite the tension between the two (an authority restraining

pleasure and the child's desire for the pleasure of the 'moment') the child tries to maintain a state of "equilibrium," with pleasure and approval from someone above him being the same, as close as is possible. Since group approval is based upon putting aside R in favor of P (at the family reunion tell your relatives, i.e., "the group," that they are wrong and see how relationship goes), by 'shifting' the environment from R to P, A is changed from parental authority to group approval.

By the child turning to the group, which approves of pleasure (A+P—which is *positive*), the child is turned against parental authority, which restrains it (A+R—which is *negative*). In other words A+P *negates* A+R. "Right" is from then on based upon group approval (being *positive*), which augments pleasure, rather than upon parental authority (being *negative*), which restrains it. By moving the emphasis from doing right and not wrong toward the pleasure-pain spectrum (focusing upon the child's desires or "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., approaching pleasure and avoiding pain, rather than upon obeying authority. i.e., doing right and not wrong according to those above him, i.e., by removing the threat of punishment, 'judgment,' the threat of parental restraint for doing wrong) right-wrong becomes situational, i.e., becomes subject to the child's "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., to that which is of the world which stimulates them and "the group" which 'justifies' them. Although this can be one big leap it is usually a progressive (incremental) process of 'change.' If the child was *righteous* from birth (doing right and not wrong all the time), the moment he moved in the direction of the pleasure-pain spectrum, the leap ('change' from faith to sight) would have been made (as what happened in the garden in Eden). But since the child is born into this world with his natural inclination to approach pleasure and avoid pain, he is born into unrighteousness, i.e., into sin. Until the time he becomes aware of right from wrong the child is not culpable for his actions—you don't punish babies, you remove the object which they are not to have from them (or them from the object) as you tell them "No." Chastening is used on the child, when he is aware of right and wrong, in order to teach him not to do wrong ([Hebrews 12:5-11](#)), engendering a "*guilty conscience*" within him for doing or thinking about doing wrong ([Romans 7:11-25](#)). Eventually the child is treated as an adult, where he is held accountable for evaluating the situation and using calculation, i.e., "*higher order thinking skills*," i.e., dialectic 'reasoning' to figure out how to get rid of, overcome, or circumvent that which is preventing him from arriving at his desired outcome, i.e., having or doing what he wants, when he wants have it or do it—as a facilitator of 'change,' using *seduction, deception, manipulation*, i.e., fraud and/or violence (stimulating others to do it for him in order) to get his way, making wrong (doing

what he wants, when he wants to do it, having what he wants, when he wants to have it) right and right (the father's authority to restrain him) wrong, thereby (having 'justified' himself, i.e., 'justifying' his carnal nature) thinking and acting without having a "*guilty conscience*" for doing wrong ([Genesis 3:1-6](#)). (A+P) / (A+R) reveals where along the spectrum of 'change' you are at any given 'moment.' For example: on a scale of 1 to 10, where group approval is weaker than parental approval (or parental approval is higher than group approval), i.e., 2 / 10 the score for 'change' would be low, i.e., .02, while when group approval is higher than parental approval (or parental approval is lower than group approval), i.e., 7 / 3, the score for 'change' would be high, i.e., 2.3. By accentuating P (group approval, i.e., augmenting pleasure and attenuating pain) over and against R (parental approval, i.e., doing right and not wrong) in a group environment, your level of resistance toward or desire for 'change' can be made manifest, i.e., evaluated.

The child accepts right-wrong as his way of thinking and acting as an authority above him uses pain (chastening and/or removing the source of pleasure from him when he does wrong, i.e., when he disobeys) as well as pleasure (rewarding him and/or approving his actions, i.e., his obedience, i.e., his doing right and not wrong) to engender within him a desire to do right and not wrong, i.e., engendering a *guilty conscience* within him when he does (or is thinking about doing) wrong in the process. The *guilty conscience* ties the child to right-wrong thinking and acting, engendering rigidity within him (the voice of his father, i.e., his commands and rules when he is not around), while the *super-ego* incorporates the child's "feelings" of the 'moment' i.e., his desires of the 'moment,' "helping" him determine right from wrong in the given situation according to his current "feelings," i.e., his desires of the 'moment,' i.e., 'justifying' his "lusts" of the 'moment' in the "light" of the current situation, engendering 'change' Once "lust" is 'justified' action will follow. Without the action, i.e., without eating of "the forbidden fruit," "feelings" would continue to remain subject to parental authority, i.e. influenced by their attempts of restraint, keeping the "*guilty conscience*" in tact, preventing "rational" 'change.' To move the child from right-wrong (rigidity) to the pleasure-pain spectrum of 'change' an emphasis upon pleasure (including the pleasure which comes from the approval of others who likewise desire pleasure) must be emphasized over and against pain (over and against chastening for doing wrong, engendering "repression" of self and "alienation" from others who have the same desires and interests). If the facilitator of 'change' can stay within the child's spectrum of doing right and not wrong vs. approaching pleasure and avoiding pain (his *desire* for pleasure and *dissatisfaction* with restraint), emphasizing pleasure (what the child

desires in the 'moment') without engendering a guilty conscience for doing wrong (without going so far as to activate the child's guilty conscience, i.e., the voice of the father within him for doing wrong, with the child reporting the facilitator of 'change' to "the authorities," who will remove the facilitator, inhibiting or stopping the process of 'change'), the child will (by nature, according to his desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment') move in the direction of pleasure, with "feelings," i.e., his desires of the 'moment,' i.e., "human nature" transcending doing right and not wrong, making approval from those 'justifying' the pleasure of the 'moment' superseding approval from those preventing (restraining) pleasure. The process of 'change' can be advanced only so far as the group is 'willing' to participate (compromise) in that day. By moving the classroom experience from the *teaching* and *preaching* of rules, commands, facts, and truth to be learned by the children to the children "*discussing*" amongst themselves the social issue of the day (*dialoguing* their "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment' regarding the situation), their structure of 'reasoning' is turned from honoring authority, i.e., maintaining loyalty to parental authority to the honoring of social relationship, i.e., initiating and sustaining loyalty to "the group" and the process of 'change.' In this way each classroom (group) experience of *pleasure being right* incrementally (progressively) 'liberates' the child (moves the child father away) from parental authority, resulting in the child returning home, challenging parental authority, creating disharmony, chaos, "***conflict and tension***" within the home.

As pointed out before, as the parent's attempt to restore "equilibrium" in the home by putting more pressure on the child, i.e., limiting the child's access to pleasure in order to "bring him around," the child, emboldened by his classroom experience of "group approval" (of pleasure over and against restraint), challenges parental authority, destabilizing the home even further. While the parent starts with the physical pain of ***chastening*** and then moves to the emotional pain of rejection (if the child persists in seeking after carnal pleasure, i.e., fighting against parental authority), casting the child out, if necessary, that he might repent, the group starts with the emotional pain of rejection and then moves to the physical pain of ***annihilation*** (if the child persists in restraining pleasure, i.e., supporting and promoting parental authority) by *neutralizing*, *marginalizing* and then *removing* (***annihilating***) the child (along with his parents) in order to purify "the group," i.e., the world of parental restraint. Since parental restraint prevents the child from becoming at-one-with the world, in the eyes of those who 'reason' dialectically, parental restraint (the parent chastening the child to make him do right and not wrong) is a "hate" crime, requiring the child being taken away from the parent once such behavior becomes

known, 'labeling' the parent as being *psychological* (as not being "normal," limiting or preventing his employment), imprisoning him if he resists, i.e., if he persists in his "old" ways, refusing to participate in the process of 'change,' encouraging others to join with him in fighting against it instead—with those of the process 'labeling' them as being "*extremists*," i.e., the source of controversy, causing social unrest, i.e., their actions being harmful to not only their children but to the "community" as well. Once you make the child's "feelings" the center of attention, once the parents start with the child's "feelings" to determine right from wrong, i.e., abdicating their authority to the child's "feelings" of the 'moment,' parental authority becomes moribund, clearing the pathway to abomination, clearing the path of any obstacles of restraint.

Non-action, i.e., not reproving, correcting, or rebuking unrighteousness, i.e., tolerating unrighteousness is action (an act) in and of itself, i.e., is 'justifying' unrighteousness in the feelings, thoughts, and actions of others, as well as in the relationship they have with you, *negating righteousness*, i.e., *negating* doing right and not wrong as the issue of life, i.e., *negating* the "*guilty conscience*" for doing wrong in the process. Our unrighteousness blinds us to the act of 'justifying' unrighteousness in our silence, when it is perpetrated or being promoted. Not responding to a fool (a person who is argumentative and void of reason, i.e., who is wallowing in non-sense) is appropriate, since responding to a fool (trying to bring him to sound reason, where he refuses to go or is incapable of going) gives his foolishness "importance," with no one being able to tell the two of you apart thereafter. But your silence, in the midst of unrighteousness (when it can be addressed, i.e., when there are ears to hear, i.e., when people still have a "guilty conscience" for doing wrong or a warning of 'judgment,' i.e., the consequence for one's actions is necessary), reveals the unrighteousness in you, making unrighteousness ("*human nature*," i.e., your desire for the approval of men, that which is of the flesh, i.e., of the world) the "norm." This is the hallmark (the 'drive' and 'purpose') of dialectic 'reasoning.' Transcending having to do what someone else says, i.e., no longer having to think and act according to someone else's standards i.e., no longer having to obey their commands and rules which prevent you from satisfying your "*felt needs*" of the 'moment,' you can now do what you want to do in the 'moment,' i.e., do what you please, encouraging others to do and be the same as you, i.e., unrighteous, i.e., "***Only that which is of nature***" (Karl Marx), i.e. "*free*." "***If it feels good, just do it.***" (Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*) Whenever Herbert Marcuse spoke (in America and in Europe), disrespect for parental authority, i.e., *revolution* broke out.

"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)

Hegel's method (**system** or pattern) of thinking (self 'justification') is being used today in almost every facet of our lives (*affecting* not only our private thoughts but also our public actions—with laws now being based upon "feelings," i.e., upon "consensus," i.e., upon *sensuousness*, which is ever 'changing,' *negating* laws which are based upon facts and truth, i.e., upon doing right and not wrong, i.e., upon *righteousness*, which is unchanging). Hegel's dialectic method (modified by the merging of Marx and Freud, i.e., called Transformational Marxism, i.e., *psychoanalysis* and *psychotherapy*) is being used today in order—as in "new" world order—to *negate* [the father's/Father's authority system](#) (the father's authority **system** is the lid to "Pandora's" box" (the child's *urges* and *impulses* of the 'moment'), i.e., a box full of evils, which, once opened, i.e., once the father's authority **system** (which engenders a "guilty conscience" in the child for doing wrong, for disobeying) is removed from the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions, as well as from his relationship with others, it can not be closed, i.e., the child's carnal heart, which, once 'liberated' from the father's authority **system**, can not be restored to the father and his authority **system**) in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions and in his relationship with others, i.e., in order to 'liberate' man's feelings, thoughts, and actions, and his relationship with others from our Heavenly Father's (God's) authority **system**, i.e., in order to "help" man and child and the world to become at-one-with one another "again," i.e., as the child and his world were (those of dialectic 'reasoning,' in their blindness—denying they are blind, living in darkness—are *gnostic* in structure of thought, believing [starting with the *premise*] that the essence of man existed before God the Father's first command or rule, that all men, being of god, i.e., as god, i.e., universal, i.e., "one" in nature, were, while as children under their father's authority **system**, divided amongst themselves, fighting against one another because of their adherence to their father's authority **system**—[If I have a class of twenty students, I have twenty students whose father's commands and rules differ amongst the students. The only ways to unite them as "one" is to show them how to "transcend" their father's authority **system** by "helping" them 'create' "oneness" upon their common "feelings," i.e., desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' i.e., upon their desire for pleasure and dissatisfaction with restraint, focusing them upon how they were]) before the father's first command or rule (which were to be obeyed without question) and fact or truth (which were to be accepted

as is, i.e., by faith) intervened, i.e., carnal in nature **only**—'[creating](#)' a '[new](#)' world order void of Godly [restraint](#), i.e., 'creating' a world subject to man's carnal nature, i.e. subject to the child's love of pleasure and hatred ([anger and rage](#)) toward restraint (tell your child to put the ipad up and then take it out of his hands when he does not, and witness the Karl Marx in your child as he reaches for it, looks at you in contempt, yells at you, and fights against you, trying to take it back). As a teacher, in replicating the father's authority **system** in the classroom, i.e., keeping "**Pandora's box**" closed, the children remain divided from one another. But by focusing upon their "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment,' i.e., by opening "Pandora's box," they can 'discover' their "oneness" in nature, transcending ('liberating' themselves from) their father's authority **system** in the process.

As "**Bloom's Taxonomies**," which all *certified* "teachers," including "Christian" teachers, and *accredited* schools, included private schools, are grounded upon today, states: "**The affective domain** [the child's feelings, i.e., his desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment'] **is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box.'**" Their premise (and agenda) is to "open" *the box*, "helping" the child to become himself again, as he was before his parent's commands and rules entered ("repressed") his life. "**To keep the 'box' closed** [to keep the parent's authority **system** in place during the child's educational experience, engendering a "*guilty conscience*" in the child for doing wrong, for disobeying] **is to deny the existence of the powerful motivational forces that shapes the life of each of us.**" (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2 Affective Domain*) Since the child's carnal desires of the 'moment,' i.e., his "**affective domain**," i.e., the **system** of the flesh, is not by nature subject to the father's authority **system**—the father, having to use force (chastening or the treat of it) to encourage the child to obey him, in order to initiate and sustain his authority—by starting with the child's "**affective domain**," i.e., his "feeling" of the 'moment,' making it the focus of attention, i.e., encouraging it, i.e., "rising" the child's "expectations" to satisfy it, by 'liberating' the child's desires of the 'moment' from the father's threats of chastening, the father's authority **system** (doing right and not wrong) becomes subject to the child's carnal authority **system** (approaching-augmenting pleasure and avoiding-attenuation pain), affectively *negating* the father's authority **system** in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions and in his relationship with others in the 'moment.' Again: since, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' the fathers' authority **system** is not a part of the child's nature (with the child's desire for approval being 'changeable,' i.e., being able to be "shifted" from seeking the father's approval, which restrains pleasure, to seeking "*the group's*"

or societies approval, which 'justifies' pleasure) it is *affectively negated* in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions as well as in his relationship with others when it (his "feelings," i.e., his desire of the 'moment' and dissatisfaction of the 'moment') becomes the focus of attention, i.e., approved. We can all side (sympathize, i.e., identify) with the child who wants to *"fit in,"* i.e., who wants to have the approval of others, i.e., his "friends." But God has not called us to *"fit in."* He has called us to stand alone (as aliens) with Him, i.e., with the truth, in a world loving the pleasures of the 'moment' (including the pleasure which comes from the approval of others) more than Him. It is not that God is against pleasure. He created it. It is that He is against the love of it over and against Him. If your children are more in love with the toys you give them than with you, refusing to put them up when you tell them (being *"disobedient to parents"*), they do not love you. The same is true for adults who are *"lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God."* [2 Timothy 3:1-5](#) 'Liberate' the child's *"affective domain"* from the father's authority **system** and the child *affectively* becomes subject to *"the group,"* i.e., to society (to what he has in common with all the children in the world, i.e., the love of pleasure) over and therefore against the father's authority **system**.

Diaprax, i.e., the *dialectic process* ("self 'justification'") being put into *praxis* (into "group" or social action), i.e., [the consensus process](#), will become more easily understood (easier reading) as you go on. But be forewarned, the following will be *"extremely offensive material"*—as this website has been labeled (censored) by MacAfee—to those who are carnal in mind and in action, i.e., in *theory and in practice*, exposing them for what they are doing, not only to themselves but also to others, in their use of the dialectic [formula](#) for 'change.'
"As in the days of Noah"

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

The following information explains how *diaprax* (the dialectic process, i.e., what you are *dialoguing* with your "self" or talking to your "self" about in the 'moment,' i.e., discussing your desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' with your "self," i.e., 'justifying' your thoughts and actions of the 'moment' to your "self"—which is very important for someone to know if they are to initiate and sustain your participation in the process of 'change,' i.e., "help" you to 'justify' your and their carnal desires of the 'moment' over and against the

father's/Fathers' authority *system*), through the use of "*group dynamics*," "*force field analysis*," and "*unfreezing, moving or 'changing,' and refreezing*" (with you uniting with others with the same desires and dissatisfactions, 'justifying' your carnal thoughts by putting them into social action, or *praxis*, *negating* the "*guilty conscience*" for doing wrong in the process) 'changes' the way you and your children, friends, relatives, neighbors, boss and fellow workers, government and "spiritual" leaders, etc., feel, think, and act as well as *how* you relate with (treat or behave towards) your children, friends, relatives, neighbors, leadership, etc., and *how* they relate with (treat or behave towards) you and one another. It is the process that is *affecting* ('changing') your life right now, i.e., what you are thinking to yourself about and how you are acting toward yourself and others and what they are thinking about you and how they are acting toward themselves and you right now, whether you (and/or they) are at home, at a family or other (social) gathering, at class or at work, or at church. What is denied (and therefore *esteemed*) in the formula for 'change' is the *wickedness* of man's heart (through the use of "man is 'good' or basically 'good'" doctrine, i.e., the "*blank tablet*" theory, with man or the child needing a 'good' education, i.e., a 'good' environment or 'proper' upbringing to become 'good,' i.e., in order to manifest or "actualize" his "goodness"). In rejecting the authority of God, i.e., rejecting God's judgment upon man for his wicked ways, the *wickedness* of man's heart (Hegel's *universality* or the commonality of society, i.e., man's desire for 'change') becomes the initiator and sustainer of 'change,' with man (the *particular*, i.e., the individual) deceiving himself into believing that he is "good," or can become "good" by 'changing' how he feels, what he thinks, and how he acts toward himself as well as toward others, i.e., with him not only *tolerating* but also participating in the *praxis* (social action) of 'change,' making unrighteousness and abomination, i.e., the "goodness" of man's heart ("*human nature*"), i.e., man's desire for pleasure (including his desire for approval, i.e., 'justification' from other men desiring 'change' or pleasure) and his resentment (hatred and anger) toward restraint (including the pain of missing out on the pleasures of the 'moment' in order to do what is right and not do wrong) the way of life.

By identifying with and uniting with others (who are likewise restrained, i.e., who desire 'change'), i.e., by personalizing the group's "need" (and therefore societies "need") to be 'liberated' from parental authority, i.e., by resisting and fighting (along with them) against that which divides him from himself (preventing him from satisfying his carnal desires of the 'moment,' which engenders his desire for 'change'), i.e., by getting rid of the pain of missing out on the pleasures (satisfying the *impulses* and *urges*) of the 'moment' (whether imagined or

real), 'change' (the *negation* of the father's authority *system*, i.e., the *negation* of Godly restraint, i.e., the 'liberation' of the child's carnal nature) becomes the only "right" way to think and act. Without putting it (the *negation* of the father's authority *system*) into action (into social action or *praxis*) it only remains an untried *theory*, locked up in the ivory tower of the mind. The tension between pleasure, i.e., the desires of the 'moment,' and restraint, i.e., doing right and not wrong remains in a state of equilibrium as long as the desire for pleasure is not augmented as restraint is increased to maintain that state of equilibrium. Increase the child's desires (augment the child's attention toward pleasure, including the pleasure which comes from the approval of others who have the same desires, i.e., "group approval") over and against the restraint (the right and wrong established by parents, conflicting with the nature of the child, with parental restraints being increased to maintain control over the child) and a volatile response (revolution) is likely to ensue, with 'change,' or the desire for it, being guaranteed. In this way of thinking and acting the child's way of thinking and acting, i.e. his love of ("lust" for) pleasure, i.e., the universality of "*human nature*" (approaching and fighting for pleasure and avoiding and fighting against pain, including the pain of missing out on pleasure) supersedes the father's authority, i.e., *negates* doing right and not wrong according to the father's standards—thus missing out on the pleasures of the 'moment' in doing so, making the individual child, i.e., the *particular* subject to society, i.e., to the *universality* (to the "common-ism") of "*human nature*," subject to the "*wickedness*" and "*deceitfulness*" of man's heart, i.e., subject to unrighteousness and abomination—with the facilitator of 'change,' who advances them, now being in control of the situation and the child. The facilitator of 'change' does not *tell* the child how he is to behave, he instead controls, i.e., *manipulates* the situation (the environment), augmenting the feelings and thoughts of the child in the direction of pleasure by 'liberating' the child from the threat of parental restraint, i.e., "*Ye shall not surely die*," with the child responding accordingly, i.e., according to his natural desires, behaving according to the facilitator of 'change's' desired outcome, i.e., according to man's carnal nature only, void of ('liberated' from, i.e., hostile toward) Godly restraint. [Genesis 3:1-6](#) The tension (*antithesis*) between seeking approval from those who prevent you from satisfying your hearts desire (having to do right and not wrong instead) and approval from those who 'justify' your hearts desire makes it easy for you to go in the direction of the 'justifiers,' *synthesizing* the two, i.e., fulfilling your hearts desire of the 'moment' with the approval of men, i.e. experiencing "[peace and affirmation](#)."

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

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

While **traditional** thought (and action) is based upon competence and morality (doing what is right and not doing wrong, i.e., using self control and self discipline, i.e., humbling and denying your self to do what is right, requiring commands and rules to be obeyed and facts and truth to be accepted as is, i.e., by faith, and the use of reward or blessing to encourage the doing of right and chastening or the threat of punishment for doing wrong, from some**one** in authority, which engenders a "*guilty conscience*" after doing, while doing, or for just thinking about doing wrong, thus holding others accountable to the same commands, rules, facts, and truth), **transformational** thought (the way of thinking which is going on today, i.e., dialectic 'reasoning') is based upon the **way** or **how** you (and others) are "feeling," "thinking," and "acting" in the 'moment' (augmenting pleasure and attenuating pain not only for yourself but for others as well, engendering "*self esteem*" through group approval, i.e., thinking and acting according to your own carnal desires of the 'moment,' along with or in "concord" or agreement with others who are having the same carnal desires, i.e., with the *approval* of others, thus building relationship, i.e., "*human relationship*," i.e., "*social skills*," i.e., [socialist skills](#), i.e., no longer thinking and acting according to some**one** else's standards, i.e., no longer holding yourself and others accountable to their commands and rules, no longer fearing punishment or judgment for sinning, i.e., no longer having a "*guilty conscience*" for doing wrong, but instead, having the "*right*" to express anger and rage (hatred) toward (*murmur* against) anyone who *preaches* commands and rules to be obeyed without question and *teaches* facts and truth to be accepted as is by faith—who bless those who obey, chasten those who disobey, and cast out those who question and challenge their authority to do so, i.e., who, through "*threats*" and "*bribes*" inhibits or blocks their pleasures of the 'moment'), with **transitional** thought being caught between doing right and not wrong and approaching pleasure (wanting to do what is right yet approaching "forbidden" pleasures instead, experiencing a "*guilty conscience*" in doing wrong). While our Heavenly Father demand's perfection (*righteousness*), as He is perfect, our earthly father, who is not perfect, can only expect us, as God does, to do what is right and not wrong, with *righteousness* (perfection) having to be *imputed* to us, by faith in God instead, 'justification' being found in Him alone. These ways of thinking are commonly referred to as *paradigms*, with the **traditional** (commands, rules, facts, and truth based, "top-down," right-wrong, individualism under authority) way of feeling, thinking, and acting, and relating with others being **Patriarchal** (authoritative, established, unchanging) in paradigm, the **transitional** (feelings based, i.e.,

approaching pleasure-avoiding pain yet still having a guilty conscience for doing wrong, i.e., for disobeying) way of feeling, thinking, and acting, and relating with others being *Matriarchal* (relationship, while still under authority sometimes conflicting with, i.e., disagreeing with authority) in paradigm, and the *transformational* (self-social 'justification,' "equality" based) way of feeling, thinking and acting, and relating with others being *Heresiarchal* (questioning, challenging, attacking authority, thereby *negating* the "guilty conscience" for doing wrong, initiating and sustaining 'change') in paradigm.

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

The lie (the great *deception*) of *diaprax* (the practice of 'justifying' to ourselves our carnal thoughts, i.e., our hearts desires, and our carnal actions of the 'moment') is that we can decide for ourselves, according to our "*feelings*" of the 'moment,' what is right and what is wrong behavior (what is "good" and what is "evil"), 'justifying' to ourselves and to others (with others *affirming*) that we can sin with impunity, i.e., that we will not be held accountable for our carnal thoughts and our carnal actions of the 'moment' since everybody else is thinking carnally and acting carnally as well, i.e., not 'judging' us—not reproof, correcting, or rebuking us—for being carnal, *affirming* to us that our carnal thoughts and carnal actions are "*normal*" and therefore alright (making us *righteous* in our own eyes). While our "*feelings*" of the 'moment' can tell us whether we are right or wrong when it comes to the laws of nature (which are established by God), they can not tell us what is right or wrong when it comes to morals and ethics (values), While having compassion on the innocent and the helpless is right, someone can use our compassion to *seduce*, *deceive*, and *manipulate* us for their own evil (carnal, i.e., "self"-ish) purpose and gain. Without the father's/Father's authority (directing and restraining us) the laws of the flesh ("*human nature*," i.e., "*feelings*") can only make us subject to our carnal or "self"-ish nature (our love of pleasure, including the pleasure which comes from the approval of others, and our resentment toward the pain which comes from restraint, including the pain of rejection, i.e., reproof, correction, and rebuke which comes from those we seek approval from, for doing wrong, i.e., missing out on pleasure, including the pleasure which comes from their approval) and the world around us that stimulates them (our "*feelings*"), i.e. making us materialistic, i.e., of the world only. The dialectic 'logic' is based upon the nature of the child. As a child did as he willed, before the father's first command, rule, fact, or truth and threat of chastening for doing wrong, i.e., feeling, thinking, and acting according to his own carnal nature and nature

itself, i.e., feeling, thinking, and acting according to "*human nature*" only, according to dialectic 'logic,' he was "*normal*." As the father's authority **system** gained control over the child's nature, through the father's use of commands and rules and physical force (pain and removal of pleasure) for disobedience, i.e., with the child accepting (submitting to) the father's "top-down," "*do as I say or else*," authoritative way of thinking and acting (as explained in [Hebrews 12:5-11](#)), the child became "*abnormal*."

The objective of *dialectic* 'reasoning,' is to *negate* that way of thinking and acting, i.e., to *negate* the father's authority **system**, replacing it with "*human nature*," i.e., love of the world and "*self*" 'justification' instead, putting that way of thinking, i.e., "self" 'justification' into social action, called **praxis**—from where we get **diaprax**, i.e., man 'justifying' himself before men, 'justifying' his carnal desires of the 'moment,' according to what he finds he has in common with all mankind, i.e. his carnal nature, i.e. "*human nature*," making it, through the pattern or **system** used in the garden in Eden, i.e., [Genesis 3:1-6](#), the law of the land, i.e., using dialectic 'reasoning' to 'justify' "*human nature*," 'liberating' the child's carnal nature (and therefore the child) from the father's authority **system**, [making the child's carnal nature \(without the father's restraint\), i.e., unrighteousness and abomination the law of the land.](#), 'liberating' the child (and therefore man) from having a "*guilty conscience*" for being "*normal*," 'liberating' him from needing a savior to 'redeem' him from God's judgment upon him for his sins ([Romans 7:11-25](#)) since "*the law of the flesh*," i.e., "*the law of sin*," i.e., "*human nature*" has now been classified as being "*normal*," i.e., as being OK (as in "I'm OK. You're OK").

"If the guilt accumulated in the civilized domination of man by man [as a result of the father's/Fathers authority system] can ever be redeemed by freedom [with the child being as he is, i.e., carnal in nature], then 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.'" (Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*) As you will see [psychology](#) (*psychoanalysis* and *psychotherapy*) has played a major roll in the 'changing' of this nation, 'liberating' the child from his parent's authority **system**, i.e., 'liberating' man from God's authority **system**.

"To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit;" (Normal, O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*)

While the child's "feelings" still remained subject to his own carnal nature (internally thinking about his own

carnal desires), his actions fulfilled his father's will, doing what his father commanded (having a *"guilty conscience"* when he disobeyed), making the child (according to dialectic 'reasoning') abnormal, i.e., "neurotic," "repressed" in himself, "alienated" from others, i.e., not of the world only, i.e., not "normal," i.e., unhealthy—physically, mentally, and socially (what the so called "health care package" is all about). Rejecting the father's/Father's (God's) authority **system**, those of dialectic 'reasoning' can only conclude that "the problem" is **how** the child is thinking, i.e., that his thoughts (being subject to doing the father's/Father's will) and his actions (doing the father's/Father's will) are dividing him from (are at odds with) his carnal nature (*"human nature"*) resulting in the child only being able to find resolution (salvation) from his internal conflict or tension (between his natural inclination to approach pleasure and avoid pain and his desire to do his father's/Father's will, which he is not always able to accomplish—having a *"guilty conscience"* when he disobeys) in an authority external to (greater than) his carnal nature, i.e., believing in (having faith in), following after, and obeying that which is not of his nature and the world, resulting in him seeking forgiveness from and repenting before his Heavenly Father, for his carnal thoughts and carnal actions (for his sins), i.e., for being *"normal."*

"O LORD, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."

Jeremiah 10:23 ***"In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths."*** Proverb. 3: 6

According to those of dialectic 'reasoning,' only by *negating* the *"guilty conscience"* for disobedience—the affect the earthly father has upon the child—can the *"guilty conscience"* for sinning—the affect the Heavenly Father has upon man—be *negated*. The objective of the dialectic "thinker," i.e., the facilitator of 'change' is to get the child to think through his "feelings" (according to his carnal desires of the 'moment') in order to *negate* the affect the father/Father has upon him. The facilitator of 'change,' in order to "help" the child express himself as he is, embodies, in adult body, the nature of the child, allowing the child "freedom" to express his carnal desires and dissatisfaction without fear of judgment or reprisal, i.e., without having a "guilty conscience," i.e., doing that which the child is already doing himself, i.e., *dialoguing* with himself. The facilitator of 'change's' or the 'change' agent's "job" is to *seduce, deceive, and manipulate* the child, i.e., to "help" the child express (expose), through *dialogue*, his carnal desires, in order to gain, through *"group approval"* (through the *consensus* process) his trust, and thereby, getting him to 'willingly' work for 'change'

(*praxis*), *negate* the father's/Father's authority in his personal thoughts and his social actions, i.e., in his relationship with others, resulting in the facilitator of 'change' living off the child's efforts (works) and inheritance, using him as "*human resource*," exalting himself, making himself the center of attention, i.e., the object to be worshiped (instead of God), leaving them (both the facilitator and the child) in their sins, subject to eternal death.

"And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you ;" 2 Peter 2:22 "Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD." Jeremiah 17:5 "And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." Matthew 23:12 "And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Philippians 2:8 "But he giveth more grace. Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud [those who seek man's approval], but giveth grace unto the humble [those who seek His approval]. Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up." James 4:6, 10 "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time:" 1 Peter 5:6

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' not until the child's thoughts become "*critical*" of authority (called "*critical theory*") can the child come to know himself as he is, of nature only—"*in and for self*." Since "*self*" loves pleasure and hates pain, including the pain of missing out on pleasure, philosophy begins with the child thinking (*dialoguing* within himself) about how the world "*is*," inhibiting or blocking pleasure and engendering pain, thinking about how it "*ought*" to be, engendering pleasure and augmenting pain. Therefore the only way to produce a "normal," i.e., "healthy" child, in philosophical terms, is to create an "*in and for self*" situation, where the child, i.e., the "*individual*" (the *particular*) and society, the "*group*" (the *universal*) can become "**one**" in thought and in action (in *theory and practice*)—where "*in self*," i.e., the child, i.e., the individual, i.e., the *particular* in thought (in *theory*), through *dialoguing* his *opinion* (his "feelings," i.e., his desires and his dissatisfactions) with others to a *consensus* (to a "feeling" of **oneness** with others, i.e., to an approval or *affirmation* from others) can "*self*" (since "*self*" is common to all) become "*for self*," i.e., at-one-with the "*group*," i.e., at-one-with society, i.e., at-one-with the universal, and, through action (through *practice*, i.e., through social action, called *praxis*) *negate* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the fear of judgment for doing wrong, i.e., for disobeying the father/Father and thereby remove the "*guilty conscience*" from not only the

individual but from society, i.e., from the world as well. 'Liberate' the child, i.e., the individual from the father's/Father's authority (so that the child can be of his "*self*" again) and society, i.e., the world can become of its "*self*" again (at-one-with the nature of the child). With both being of "*self*," i.e., "*in and for self*," "*self*" becomes 'reality,' i.e., "*actualized*" as the child and society unite with one another in the *praxis* of 'liberating' themselves (that which is of the world only) from the father's/Father's authority. By 'justifying' themselves over the father's/Father's authority, and putting their thoughts into *praxis* (into social action) against the father's/Father's authority, those who 'reason' dialectically' seek to do as they please, living according to their carnal nature without having a "*guilty conscience*," i.e., without having a sense of condemnation and ensuing judgment for their carnal thoughts and carnal actions.

"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. 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. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." 1 John 2:15-18

While, for the child, pleasure is good and pain is bad or evil (which, according to the law of the flesh, is "normal"), for the father, despite the absence of or the missing out on pleasure or the presence of pain in doing so, doing right is good and despite the amount of pleasure gained or the amount of pain avoided in doing so, doing wrong (disobedience) is bad or evil. Therefore, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' for the child to become "normal" (healthy) again, it is essential that his "feeling" (his desires and dissatisfactions) of the 'moment' become the issue of importance (the source for direction) and not the father's commands, rules, facts, and truth. Thus the father's *system* of *preaching* and *teaching* commands and rules to be obeyed and facts and truth to be accepted as is (by faith) must be replaced with the child's *system* of *dialogue*, i.e., of the child talking to himself about his desires and dissatisfaction of the 'moment.' It is only through *dialogue*, i.e., the child talking to himself about his "feelings," i.e., his desire for pleasure (which is good in his eyes) and his resentment toward authority which prevents him from satisfying it (which is evil in his eyes), being made manifest (through *dialogue* with others), that the "true" nature of the child can become manifest. According to *diaprax*, it is only in the "*approval of others*" (who have the same desires and resentments or dissatisfactions) being put into action (*praxis* or social action, or "*actualized*") that the child can become himself again,

"normal," of the world only, as he was before the father's first command, rule, fact, or truth and threat of punishment for disobeying or doing wrong made him abnormal. In this way, the more *deviant* (adaptable to 'change,' responsive to the *sensuous* 'moment') the child becomes the more "normal" (good or "healthy") he becomes. It is how good (God's *righteousness*) is turned into evil (because it makes us "feel" bad) and evil (our carnality) is turned into good (because it makes us "feel" good). It is so addictive that once we partake of it, without God's intervention (without the father's/Father's authority), it is impossible for us to get off it. The "feeling" of pleasure (including the "feeling" of pleasure which comes from "*group approval*," i.e., the approval of others, i.e., "*affirmation*," real or perceived, i.e., imagined, while thinking about or while doing what you desire, i.e., what is "enjoyable," i.e., what is pleasing to you, i.e., what makes you "feel good," i.e., what you are "lusting" after in the 'moment,' which is "*the pride of life*") is so powerful it can blind you to the harm you are doing to others in your effort to attain and/or sustain it.

Dialogue replaces the love of the father/Father (who chastens, reprovcs, corrects, and rebukes us that we might do what is right and not wrong) with the love of pleasure (which makes us subject to our carnal nature and the world around us that stimulates it). It is why *dialogue* (revealing, evaluating, and *affirming* our carnal desires and the carnal desires of others, with indifference to authority—*aufheben*) is so powerful. It take us out (washes our brain) of the restraints (fear of judgment and failure) which come from the *preaching* of rules and commands to be obeyed and the *teaching* of facts and truth to be accepted as is (by faith), which restrains the flesh, i.e., which inhibits or blocks the 'moment' of carnal pleasure instead of 'liberating,' *affirming*, and "*actualizing*" it, which *dialogue* does. Just be forewarned, as offensive as it may sound, it is (what facilitators of 'change' do to your child or you through the use of *dialogue*). As your child learns to *praxis aufheben* ("*enlightenment*"), i.e., to pick up something (that is not theirs) to *evaluate* (through *dialogue* to experience as theirs in the 'moment,' for their pleasure), their *derrière* is exposed (that which is private, i.e., that which is nobody else's business but theirs, becomes public, i.e., becomes everybody else's business in the 'moment,' for their pleasure). The same is true for you. In *dialogue* you expose your heart's desires, "the good, the bad, and the ugly." "Maybe" it is not such a good thing for you (or your child) to do, especially when facilitators of 'change' are around, i.e., those who have an agenda, i.e., a hidden agenda to 'liberate' you (and your child) from our Heavenly Father's authority, from Godly restraint, as Satan, the first (and master) facilitator of 'change' did to two "children" in the garden in Eden. [Genesis 3:1-6](#)

"But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ [who obeyed His Heavenly Father in all things commanded and has called us to do the same, in and through Him, by faith; while obedience will not save you, faith in Christ, which leads to obedience, will]." 2 Corinthians 11:3 "Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;" 2 Corinthians 10:5 "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Romans 7:24, 25 "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth." Colossians 3:1 "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." James 4:4 "No servant 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." Luke 16:13 "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 14:6

1). Group dynamics:

our desire for approval and our fear of rejection by others in the "consensus" meeting, i.e., our 'willingness' to compromise or to be silent in the midst of unrighteousness, i.e., not reproofing, correcting, or rebuking others when they are wrong, in order to initiate and sustain relationship with them because we like them, have need of them to get what we want (to fulfill our desires or "felt needs"), and/or because we fear being rejected, labeled, and attacked by them (as well as by "the group"), i.e., accused of being "disrespectful," "judgmental," "self-righteous," "intolerant," "prejudice," "hateful," "negative," "divisive," "maladjusted," a "lower order thinker," "narrow minded," "unadaptable to 'change,'" not a "team player," "psychological," "antisocial," an "isolationist," a "dinosaur," a "homophobe," "in denial," etc.. Group dynamics relies upon the dynamics which lies within all of us, i.e., the conflict or tension between what we publically say we believe (*thesis*) and how we feel or what we think about it internally (*antithesis*), i.e. which includes our natural desire for the things, events, or people of pleasure and our dissatisfactions with or resentment toward the things, events, or people who prevent us from attaining them, that which we talk to ourselves or *dialogue* within ourselves (in private) about throughout the day

(and sometimes throughout the night). It is what makes every person of the world (born of the flesh, born into sin) the same, i.e., with themselves being the center of their universe, evaluating it according to their feelings of the 'moment,' i.e., in their own eyes (dissatisfied with the way the world "is," i.e., blocking or inhibiting them from getting or doing what they want to do in the 'moment,' thinking about or imagining how it "ought" to be, i.e., pleasing to them), with their feelings and thoughts (their mind) being constantly occupied with the hope of having a day of pleasure, with approval (without pain, i.e., with rejection), focused upon approaching, acquiring, or controlling (enjoying) things, events, or people of pleasure, including the pleasure of their approval, and avoiding, overcoming, 'changing,' or *negating* the things, events, or people who engender pain, including the pain of rejection. *Synthesis*, i.e., enjoying the pleasures of the 'moment,' 'justified' by group approval (*affirmation*), is 'created' by making "feelings" the *thesis*, therefore making belief (restraint or resistance to the impulses and urges of the 'moment') the *antithesis*, i.e., the object to overcome (to be silenced and *negated*). Instead of the child being submissive (silent), obeying the parent, the parent must be either "equal" with the child, i.e., permissive, or else be submissive (silent), serving and protecting the child who is 'lusting' after the pleasures of the 'moment.'

According to dialectic 'reasoning' we all have within us a *spectrum* of "changingness" (which in truth is only our ability to either obey or disobey) from 1) willingly doing what is asked of us, doing what is right (doing what we have been told, i.e., walking by faith—for our good and for the good of others) whether we get any pleasure out of it for ourselves or despite it being painful, i.e., our pleasure coming from pleasing (obeying) the one who gives us orders to obey, who "directs our steps," 2) wanting to do what is right yet doing wrong, having a "guilty conscience" afterward, i.e., having a tendency to resent being restrained or blocked from doing what we want to do in the 'moment' while still wanting approval from the one blocking or restraining us, 3) doing what we want to do (or doing what comes naturally to us) in the 'moment,' doing wrong without having a "guilty conscience," *hating* (even striking out against) anyone who restrain or attempt to restrain us from doing wrong, 4) uniting with others doing the same, and 5. uniting others (not just uniting with others but uniting others) in the social action (*praxis*) of *negating* (silencing) the *system* of authority which produces a "guilty conscience" in us (and others) for doing wrong. *Group dynamics*, i.e., 'justifying' the carnal thoughts and actions of others in

order to initiate and sustain their approval, 'justifies' our carnal thoughts and actions. *Group dynamics* takes us from 1. obedience to authority, through 2. *dialoging* with ourselves (internally, privately) regarding our desires and dissatisfactions, i.e., thinking about our "feelings" of the 'moment' instead of about doing right and not wrong, yet feeling guilty afterwards for doing wrong, 3. striking out against (rejecting) authority, doing what we want to do in the 'moment, as an individual (isolated from authority and society), 4. finding others to "do our thing" with, *dialoging* our desires and dissatisfactions with others (with "*the group*"), thus, with group approval 'justifying' our desires of the 'moment,' and 5, uniting "*the group*" through the use of *group dynamics*, 'purposed' in 'liberating' "*the group*," i.e., society from having a "*guilty conscience*" for doing what is wrong, i.e., 'liberating' "*the group*" from having a "*guilty conscience*" for *negating (annihilating)* the authority **system** from society—making the questioning, challenging, circumventing, i.e., the *negating* of authority, i.e., the doing of wrong the "norm," i.e., making the law of the flesh (the law of sin) the law of the land. By bringing the deviant (those who do wrong and do not care how anyone else feels or thinks about their actions, who 'justify' themselves, i.e., their thoughts and actions to themselves) into the room, and asking the group to tolerate him, the facilitator of 'change' can tell where along the spectrum of 'change' each individual in the room is in regard to their feelings and thought in the 'moment,' being able to classify him according to his response ("*negative*" or "*positive*" response) to the deviant. The individual's tolerance of the deviant or their reproving, rebuking, correcting (intolerance) of the deviant reveals where along the spectrum of 'change' they are in the 'moment,' i.e., reveals the level of conversation they are already having within themselves, i.e., whether they are privately thinking to themselves or imagining doing what the deviant is doing (or talking about) or not.

Group dynamics is based upon the ideology of Immanuel Kant, who, in *Critique of Pure Reason*, wrote of a society where "**lawfulness** [the law of the flesh, which is subject to the situation of the 'moment'] **without the law** [without the Law of God, which is not subject to the situation of the 'moment']" is the law of the land, echoed in the *praxis* of Karl Marx who, in *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* wrote of a society where "**Laws must not fetter human life; but yield to it; they must change as the needs and capacities of the people change** [allowing deviancy, i.e., unrighteousness, i.e., abomination, i.e., "human nature" to take "ownership" (control) of the world]." (Karl Marx,)

In philosophical terms, **"the people"** are those in position of determining the current **"needs"** of the "citizens" and establishing policy for them in the 'moment,' according to the councils *perception* of what the "citizens" **"needs"** (carnal desires) are in the 'moment,' i.e., what they feel and think the "citizens" can handle regarding 'change' (what the citizens **"need"** but do not yet realize), yet are 'willing' to "allow" government, i.e., **"the people"** to **"actualize"** (increasingly taking control over the citizens property and lives through regulations), making rapid 'change' (government regulations) regarding what the "citizens" can say and do increasingly easier, subject to the "councils," i.e., "the groups," i.e., **"the peoples"** perception (embodiment) of the **"capacity"** ('willingness') of the "citizens" to tolerate and participate in the process of 'change,' replacing government control from true representative government (local control) to government by **"consent"** (global control), with government establishing policy according to their **"sensuous needs"** and **"sense perception"** of the 'moment,' determining the **"needs"** (the carnal desires) of the "citizens" in the 'moment' and establishing policy accordingly. Since parental control is local control (parochial) and representative government tends to preserve such control, council control, through the *consensus* process (which removes parental control from the policy setting environment, which 'liberates' "human nature," which is common to all, which is universal) engenders global control. In this way laws established yesterday can easily be 'changed' today, making the "citizens" subject to **"the peoples"** (the councils, "the groups") **"perception"** of **"the peoples"** **"felt needs"** (according to their carnal desires) of the 'moment.' Thus, through the use of *group dynamics*, **"the individual is emancipated** ["human nature," i.e., carnality is 'liberated' from the authority of the parents, and/or God, 'liberating the individual from having a **"guilty conscience"** for doing wrong] **in the social group** [through his desire for approval from **"the group"**]." (Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*) **"The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs** [rejection of their parent's and God's authority, i.e., 'liberation' of their carnal thoughts and carnal actions] **by accepting belongingness to the group."** (Kenneth Bennie, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*) **"One of the most fascinating aspects of group therapy is that everyone is born again, born together in the group."** (Irvine D. Yalom, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*) While Jesus had a "group," he *preached* to them and *taught* them the truth (from above), he did not *dialogue* with them to help them 'discover' the truth (within them) , according to their "feelings" ("felt needs") of the 'moment.'

The significant thing about (and the power of) *dialogue* (a "group think," "group dynamic " thing), i.e., the sharing of your *opinion* with others, i.e., the sharing of your feelings and thought (what you are talking to your "self" about in the 'moment,' in response to the current conditions or situation) with others regarding the things you desire to have, events you desire to participate in, and/or people you desire to relate with (that is, have approval from), i.e., which or who you get pleasure (*dopamine emancipation*) from in the 'moment' and want to (hope to) get more pleasure from in the future, as well as regarding your dissatisfaction, disagreement, and/or resentment toward those in authority over you, especially regarding their commands, rules, facts, and truth which get in the way of the things you want to have, events you want to participate in, and/or people you want to relate with, i.e., your dissatisfaction with, disagreement with, and/or resentment toward established standards (feelings and thoughts which you normally have to keep secret, i.e., which you have to keep to yourself, i.e., which you talk to your "self" about, in private only, in order to continue receiving approval and support from those in authority—who would disagree with you, reproofing, correcting, or rebuking you for thinking them aloud, i.e., for voicing them) is that once the *dialoging* of your *opinion* is done with others, done in order to initiate and sustain a *consensus* with them (a "feeling" of "oneness," i.e., "relationship" with them, based upon your and their *loving* of pleasure and the *hating* of restraint, i.e., that which is "in and for self," i.e., the flesh, i.e., pleasure and of the world only, i.e., having to set aside that which divides, i.e., that which is not "in and for self" and "of" the world only, i.e., parental and Godly restraint, as authority is given by God, with some using it for themselves, i.e., for evil, and others using it under God, i.e., for good), i.e., once you 'discover' "common ground" ('discovering' your "self" in them, i.e., in their "self," i.e., you 'discover,' through *dialogue*, that they are talking to their "self" about the same things you are talking to your "self" about) with *deviants*, i.e., with those who, as you, *dialogue* within themselves, regarding the things, events, and/or people of pleasure they desire to have, experience, and/or relate with and their resentment toward restraint), who agree with your "felt" needs, i.e., your desires of the 'moment' as well as your dissatisfaction with, your disagreement with, and/or your resentment (hatred) toward those in authority and their commands, rules, facts, and truth which inhibit or block you from actualizing your desires (your "felt needs") of the 'moment,' and initiate relationship with them, once the *divulging of your "self interest" with others for the sake of "building relationship" with them* becomes a part of the classroom

experience, i.e., becomes the focus of education, once "*self interest* (the law of the flesh and eyes and "self-justification," i.e., "lust," enjoyment, or pleasure and the 'justification' of it—in the 'moment,' i.e., in the "here-and-now," i.e., having "control" over the situation [which is the basis for socialism, whereas capitalism, i.e. capitulation is setting aside the pleasures of the 'moment,' working hard in order to have it in the future, i.e., "storing it up" for the future in the form of money, property, knowledge, or skills, i.e., "*surplus capital*," gaining pleasure in having it available for themselves ("*My property*," "*My family*," "*My business*," etc.) as well as for their children and friends in the future, with the children and friends usually receiving money and property in the form of inheritance (now becoming their property, business, etc.) after the capitalists death, i.e., providing they brought pleasure into his life and not pain]) and "*relationship with others*" (for socialists, relationship is with those who are seeking after the same pleasures of the 'moment,' who are only "*in, of, and for*" the world [believing in "**Ours**. Not just yours."—upon entering someone's home and hearing the home owner say "*What are you doing in My House?*" "*Get out of My House.*" "*Quite talking to My Children.*" "*Quite meddling in My Business.*" socialists know who to kill, annihilate, destroy, *negate*, etc.] where with capitalist, relationship is with those who have learned to set pleasure aside, for the 'moment' and expect others to do the same, i.e., in order to "*know the value of a dollar*," in order to have or acquire more of it in the future. getting pleasure out of having money and property [*"surplus capital"*] in the process, which is ***similar in pattern*** to believers setting aside the pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., the pleasures of this life for the joy that lies ahead with the Lord in Heaven—hint, hint—the error of this way of thinking, i.e., this correlation, i.e., this generalization, i.e., with dialectic 'reasoning' is that believers receive joy and peace in *this* life, which those who are still "*of*" the world, including capitalists, i.e., who have not been 'redeemed' by Christ, through His blood, 'reconciled' to His Father, by His resurrection, and received the Holy Spirit, can not have, know, and therefore can not understand, only being able to understand the pleasures or "lusts" which come from the flesh and the world, i.e., of the 'moment' only, therefore leaving them "puffed up" in the mind, ever learning, i.e., trying to understand, but never being able to, since true understanding can only begin with the fear of God, i.e., with the fear of judgment for doing wrong, i.e., repenting before God and asking Him for forgiveness, humbling yourself, i.e., turning to Him for direction), i.e., *theory* and *practice* (carnal thought and carnal action) become one and the same (with everyone becoming at-one-with one another in *consensus*), anything of authority and restraint, including

the Ten Commandments on the schoolhouse wall, the Word of God in the textbooks, prayer in the name to the Lord Jesus Christ (to His Heavenly Father, who, through Him becomes Our Heavenly Father), and the paddle (physical or corporal punishment) for doing wrong or bad grades (mental punishment) for being wrong (for seeking after the pleasures of the 'moment' instead of setting them aside in order to do what is right), i.e., freedom *of* religion, freedom *of* the conscience, and freedom *of* speech, i.e., freedom to *preach* and *teach* the truth ("*private convictions*") in the public arena, all of which come from authority external to (above) you, i.e., restraining your "*self interests*" of the 'moment,' i.e., inhibiting or blocking your "lust," pleasure, or "enjoyment" of the 'moment,' has to be removed from the classroom, the public-private-home school and all its activities (since even private and home schools become public in their use of the process of *dialoguing opinions* to a *consensus*, with questions asking the child "*how*" **he** "*feelings*" in response to the given story, i.e., situation and "*what*" **he** "*thinks*" is the best answer or response to the given situation [*situation ethics*"], rather than insisting that he give the right—and not the wrong—answer or response to the given situation, determined by the one in authority), thus in effect (since education shapes the way the next generation of citizen think and act) making the agenda and outcome of all public policies and activities, whether they be community, city, county, state, or national, freedom *from* religion, freedom *from* the conscience, and freedom *from* speech, *negating* the citizens right to *preach* and *teach* the truth in the public arena (including in the classroom), thus directly affecting the home, i.e., the parent's authority over their children (*negating* the parent's right to *preach* and *teach* their "*Thou shalt not* __[disobey]__ *or else*" commands, rules, facts, and truth, engendering the "guilty conscience" for doing wrong, i.e., restraining the child's *dialogue*, i.e., his "*Why?*" with "*Because I said so,*" i.e., with the threat of corporal punishment for disobedience, i.e., for following after their own "feelings" [pleasures, "lusts," enjoyments] of the 'moment' instead of obeying their [the parent's] rules and commands and having faith in their facts and truth), as well as in the "church," i.e., *negating* God's (the Heavenly Father's and His Son's) authority over man (at least in the child's/man's/the public's *thoughts* and *actions*), as well as the "guilty conscience" for sinning ([for doing wrong](#)), as G. F. W. Hegel explained in one of the casual notes preserved at Widener "**he has become indifferent to what they have done badly,**" which only *dialogue* i.e., *discussing* personal "feeling" and "thoughts" (regarding *social*, i.e., "*relationship*" *issues* of the 'moment') can accomplish, instead of *preaching* and *teaching* right from wrong, i.e., accusing someone of being wrong, which inhibits or blocks *dialogue*.

Dopamine emancipation, i.e., the pleasure of the 'moment' (that which of the world only) can be stored up in the form of money or property, what Karl Marx called "*surplus capital*," and used to force children ("the people") to suspend their dopamine emancipation (their pleasure of the 'moment') in order to satisfy their parent's (the King's, the noble's, the bourgeoisies, etc.) dopamine emancipation of the 'moment.' Dopamine is a chemical our body naturally produces which is experienced as the pleasure of the 'moment' when it is 'emancipated' or 'liberated' into the area between nerve endings—as a result of us coming into contact with something of pleasure in the environment or thinking about something of pleasure. It is part of the law of the flesh. Avoiding pain, which includes the pain of missing out on pleasure, is the other part. All habitual drugs are associated with dopamine emancipation. Money is simply stored up pleasure ("drug money") to be used in the future (for vacations, buying property, etc.) to apprehend more dopamine emancipation. It is why children become depressed, upset, or angry (hateful) when they don't have it (when they think they should have it) or lose it (when it is taken away from them for behaving badly). Money (pleasure) is not the problem. The problem is our "love" of it over (and therefore against) God.

By the children learning to suspend the pleasure of the 'moment' (sometimes having to be "detoxed" via. the parent's use of the paddle) in order to please their parents, in order to do right and not wrong according to the parent's command, rules, facts, and truth, in order to attain dopamine emancipation, i.e., the pleasure of the 'moment' in the future, embracing their parent's morals, values, and belief *system* in the process, passing them (and it) on into the future, they make *capitulation* (the "old" world order) the pathway to pleasure for others as well, forcing others to suspend the pleasures of the 'moment' (as their parent's did to them, i.e. learning self control, self discipline, and the value of a dollar) in order to gain access to their own dopamine emancipation in the future, in the form of cash payment for labor. Thus the children, learning to control the environment according to the parent's authority *system*, i.e., forcing others to suspend the pleasures of the 'moment' (in order to do right and not wrong) in order to please themselves in the future, initiate and sustain the "old" world order.

It is the "*surplus capital*" (the stored up pleasure, i.e., the "drug money" which the children will inherit from their parents) that the facilitator of 'change' is wanting to gain access to, in order to use it for himself (claiming it is for everybody), living off the children's' inheritance (the parent's money or God's earth) without having to adhere to the parent's (God's) morals, values, principles, or belief **system**. By returning the children to the pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., via. the pleasure of "*group approval*," i.e., via. the "pleasure" of socialism (done supposedly for the sake of "equality," i.e., so that all can "equally" share in dopamine emancipation, i.e., so that all can "equally" share in the pleasures of the 'moment' [except those who refuse to participate], called *consensus*), the children (unknowingly) abdicate their inheritance (that which is of their parent's) to those who are now in control of the environment (to those who now control the taxation-information-policy setting system), the facilitators of 'change.' The right-wrong **system** of parental authority (of "self" control and self discipline, i.e., of self restraint) is now superseded by the pleasure-pain (stimulus-response, i.e., self esteem) **system** of the child's nature, i.e., of 'human nature.' "Equality" means that you work and do your job right in order to make sure the person who does not work or who does not do the job right is happy, i.e., does not feel guilty since it is someone else's fault ("the groups," i.e., the systems fault, i.e., "someone, excluding them, did not do things right") when things go wrong.

When children are 'liberated' to "lust" after the pleasures of the 'moment' they (along with their inheritance) become the property of those who are *manipulating* the environment for the 'purpose' of "equality," i.e., they become subject to (under the influence and control of) the facilitators of 'change,' who now live off of their parent's money, i.e., live off of the children's inheritance. In this way, "the earth is the Lords" with man having "dominion over it," under God is replaced with Rousseau's, "the earth belongs to no one and its fruit to everyone," i.e., with it now belonging only to those who hate God's authority, to those want to *manipulate* (use) everyone and everything for their own pleasure. Socialist, because they get pleasure or hope (want) to get pleasure (dopamine emancipation) from looking at your land, your children, your business, your spouse, and even you, think they own your land, your children, your business, your spouse, and even you—establishing laws to make it so. While parents (through the use of chastening) detox their children,

i.e., 'liberate' their children from their addiction to the drug of pleasure, the group, through group approval, supplying the child with the drug of pleasure, 'liberates' the child from their parent's authority, keeping them addicted to the drug of pleasure instead. If you live for the pleasure of the 'moment' (according to your "self interest" of the 'moment') you may die an early death (some are killed before they are born) in order to satisfy someone else's pleasure of the 'moment' (to satisfy their "self interest" or addiction of the 'moment'). "[*Building relationship upon self interest*](#)" is not a good thing. It will cost you your life (your soul).

The prodigal son thought his inheritance was his father's money, only, after losing it all and returning home (willing to be a slave to his father) to find out that his inheritance was his father's love for him. The things of the world will soon pass away but God has "stored up" for those who love Him, eternal life. ([John 3:15-21](#))

By starting with the child's "feelings," i.e., with his "*self interest*," i.e., making his "feelings" of the 'moment' (which are influenced by the current situation) the focus of attention (as Satan did with the woman in the Garden in Eden, [Genesis 3:1-6](#)), the child's *opinion* (which entails his love of pleasure—with pleasure being "good" in his eyes—and his hate of restraint—with restraint, i.e., the missing out on pleasure, being "evil" in his eyes) is 'liberated' out from under the father's authority, i.e., out from under his father's *preaching* and *teaching* of commands and rules to be obeyed and facts and truth to be accepted as is (by faith) along with his use of chastening for doing or being wrong ([Hebrews 12:5-11](#)), i.e., you can not reprove, correct, rebuke, or chasten or come under conviction, contrition, condemnation, or come to true repentance in and through *dialogue*, thus *negating* the voice of the father in the child, i.e., *negating* the "*guilty conscience*" (the fear of judgment, i.e., the need to repent and ask for forgiveness, as well as the need for mercy and grace) for doing wrong in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions as well as in his relationship with others ([Romans 7:14-25](#)), makes the child's carnal nature (his desires of the 'moment' and his resentment toward restraint, i.e., his dissatisfaction with the way his world "is," i.e., subject to restraints, thinking about how it "ought" to be, i.e., subject to pleasure, that way of feeling, thinking, and acting he has in common with all the children of the world) good and the father's authority (with his commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., that way of feeling, thinking, and acting which divides children from their own nature, other children, and the world) evil,

making the approaching of pleasure (and the avoiding of pain, i.e., the pain of rejection) the 'drive' of life instead of doing right and not wrong (living according to the father's standards) and *"the building of 'human relationship,'"* i.e., the augmentation of pleasure (*affirmation*) and the attenuation of pain (*alienation*) the 'purpose' of life instead of doing the father's will. Thus, through the use of *dialogue*, *"the group,"* i.e., the "community," i.e., society, i.e., humanity, that which is supportive of the child's carnal nature, i.e., that which is of the world only becomes [the child's only source of identity](#). From here on, the child's "feelings" of pleasure (including the "feelings" of pleasure which come from *"group approval"*) 'justifies' not only his "feeling" of hate but also his acts of rage toward authority and restraint (done in order to not only protect the "feeling" of pleasure which comes from relating with things and events which engender pleasure but also done in order to protect the "feeling" of pleasure which comes from having relationship with *"the group,"* i.e., the "feeling" of pleasure which comes from *"group approval,"* the child doing all that he can do, fighting against the parents and their authority in order to prevent them from taken him away from *"the group"* and therefore losing the pleasure which comes from *"group approval,"* possibly facing, and therefore fearing the pain of *"group disapproval"* as well).

Keeping it in perspective, i.e., according to the Word of God:

When the paddle (the rod, i.e., chastening, i.e., punishment, i.e., judgment) is removed from the parent's (or teacher's) hand, when the parent (or teacher) no longer has or uses their (God given) power of authority to initiate and sustain the "old" world order of commands and rules to be obeyed and facts and truth to be accepted as is (by faith), the child automatically becomes subject to his own carnal nature, the carnal nature of those around him, and the world (unless he becomes subject to God's authority), i.e., making himself (his "self" or "interest," which are the same) subject to his own impulses and urges of the 'moment,' the environment which stimulates them, and those who *manipulate* the environment, *seducing* and *deceiving* him, using him to satisfy their own carnal pleasures as he satisfies his own, 'creating' a "new" world order based upon the "feelings" (*"felt needs"*) of the 'moment,' a "new" world order of unrighteousness and abomination where the child no longer reproves, corrects, or rebukes his "self," i.e., repents for doing wrong and does what is right, i.e., matures, but instead sins (disobeys) with impunity, i.e.,

with no "guilty conscience" (with no sense of accountability for his thoughts and actions before a Pure, Holy, and Righteous God, i.e., no awareness of or refusing to recognize his own wickedness and thus condemnation, i.e., the eternal consequence which results from following after his carnal thoughts and carnal actions, i.e., no fear of the eternal damnation of Hell which awaits him for his sins). While the earthly father chastens his children for his own pleasure, so that he can do as he wills, for his own pleasure (dad and mom are not perfect, they may be down right tyrants, but their office of authority, given to them by God, is perfect, under Him), our Heavenly Father (who is perfect) chastens us (who, by faith in Him, are 'redeemed' from eternal damnation, through His Son's death on the cross, covering our sins by His shed blood, 'reconciling' us to Himself, through His Sons' resurrection) that we might partake in his Holiness. What the Heavenly Father, and His only begotten (and obedient) Son, Jesus Christ "*bring to the table,*" that no earthly father can, is the Holy Spirit, giving us His Love, Joy, and Peace, none of which the world or "human nature" can offer, much less understand, only being able to make "feelings" (pleasure and pain), that which they can understand, the ground or basis from which to determine 'reality,' i.e., from which to evaluate, i.e., from which to determine for themselves what is right and what is wrong (for the 'moment'), holding onto what makes them "feel good" rather than doing what is right (according to the conscience).

The "problem," according to those of dialectic 'reasoning,' is that while a child might fight against his parent's authority (as a child), [when he becomes a parent himself he tends to replicate it, i.e., use his parent's "top-down" authority system on his own children](#), thus perpetuating (propagating) the "old" world order of doing right and not wrong according to the parents standards, producing a "guilty conscience" (the fear of judgment) in their children, preventing 'change.' Therefore the "**Objective**" of dialectic 'reasoning,' as you will see, is to 'create' a classroom environment in which the child can learn *how* to 'liberate' himself (as well as others—including his own children in the future) from his (*the*) parent's authority **system** (from the "guilty conscience" for disobeying, i.e. for doing wrong) in order to 'liberate' man (the "*group,*" the "*community,*" society, the world) from God's authority **system** (from the fear of judgment and eternal Hell for his sins, i.e., being held accountable before God for his carnal thoughts and carnal actions). It is not a matter of

whether the father is a tyrant or a benevolent, loving, caring, providing for, protecting father, it is the **system** itself which is under attack. According to those of dialectic 'reasoning' the father's authority (parental authority) "must" be *negated* if the "new" world order of 'change' is to replace the "old" world order which resists 'change.' 'Change' can only take place if knowing (because you have been told) is replaced with "feelings" (experiencing for your yourself), belief with theory, facts and truth with opinion, preaching and teaching with dialogue, doing right and not wrong with love of pleasure and dissatisfaction with restraint, eternity with the 'moment,' i.e., with the "eternal present," the soul (which is eternal) with the cognitive, affective, and psycho-motor domains (making man of the world only). A person or child 'driven' by the pleasures of the 'moment' ('driven' by the flesh and the world which stimulates it), 'purposed' in augmenting pleasure (making the world a "better" or "safer" place to "live," i.e., "lust" within) is a man or child 'driven' by hate, 'purposed' in removing the father/Father and his authority **system** (*negating* the restrainer and his restraint) from the world.

For example: teachers today (along with their classes and their school) are graded upon their use of Bloom's Taxonomies. Bloom's (Marzano's, Webb's) Taxonomies, while recognizing the traditional way of teaching, replicating the **system** of parental authority (holding it in contempt), trains all teachers in the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' calling it "*higher order thinking skills*," which when used on rocks, plants, and animals is good (true science), but when used on values (making all participants natural resource, i.e., of the world only), what the bible calls "*so called science*," is evil, dictating to all teachers, students, faculty, community leaders, parents, etc. the kind of society they demand (their educational "**Objective**"), i.e., a society of children 'liberated' from their parent's authority **system** as well as a society 'liberated' from God's—the "**Objective**" being: don't go after God himself, go after His authority **system** (by going after the parent's authority **system**) and He will "wither away" in the feelings, thoughts, and actions of the child as well as in man and society as they do as they please, i.e. sin (question, challenge, and disobey authority) with impunity (with no "*guilty conscience*").

As long as you keep your feelings and thoughts (of pleasure and resentment) to yourself, i.e., private, reproving, correcting, rebuking your "self" for thinking and/or doing them, i.e., for thinking of or doing

wrong, they remain between you and God, resulting in "**private convictions**" or a "*guilty conscience*" (putting you under conviction, experiencing contrition, asking for forgiveness from God or parent for doing wrong, repenting), with you remaining as an individual under an authority above you. But when you make your feelings and thoughts public, i.e., when through *dialogue* you make them known to others (who do not reprove, correct, or rebuke you for thinking and/or doing them, i.e., for sinning against God or disobey your parent's), they can be used against you, not only turning you against what you believe (your "**private convictions**"), but [turning you against belief itself](#) (*negating the "guilty conscience" for doing wrong*), with you becoming an individual subject to your feelings and the feelings of others in the 'moment,' i.e., subject to "the group" and the world around you instead. As the Marxist Theodor Adorno wrote: "***The individual may have 'secret' thoughts which he will under no circumstances reveal to anyone else if he can help it. To gain access is particularly important, for here may lie the individual's potential.***" (Theodor Adorno, *The Authoritarian Personality*) As one training manual for 'change' stated it: "***We must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue.***" (Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#)) This is the objective of those facilitating 'change' in your child in the "*group grade*" classroom, facilitating 'change' in your spouse in the "*team building*" workplace, facilitating 'change' in your representative in the "*consensus building*" meeting, facilitating 'change' in your minister in the "*ministers alliance*," etc..

[Psychoanalysis](#) is based upon the concept of the child *dialoguing* within himself, wishing for 'change,' i.e., according to Sigmund Freud, wishing that his father were dead so that he could have his mother's total attention, as carnal man wishes that God were dead so that he could do as he wills without having a "guilty conscience." Its total 'purpose' is to "liberate" *dialogue*, thereby not only 'liberating' the child from the father's authority but also 'liberating' man from God's. "***Freud noted that patricide*** [the children killing (and *devouring*) their father] ***and incest*** [the children carrying out their carnal impulses and urges of the 'moment,' i.e., have sensual (sexual) relationship with the mother without a sense of guilt] ***are part of man's deepest nature.***" (Irvin Yalom, *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*) *Psychotherapy* merges Sigmund Freud (the individual) and Karl Marx ("*the group*").

It is why the citizens religious principles and standards (which restrain government from inhibiting, blocking, or usurping their God given right *of* religion, conscience, and speech), when brought into the *consensus* (group dynamic) process, are missing in the outcome, with public policy being established upon, and thereafter promoting and supporting humanistic principles and standards (unrighteousness and abomination) instead. For example: town councils are hearing "*the peoples*" petitions only to then *dialogue* amongst themselves to a *consensus*, resulting in socialist-humanist-environmentalist-globalist policies superseding local control, *negating* representative, limited government in the process. [The process guarantees the outcome.](#)

"Self" loves pleasure, including the pleasure of approval, and hates pain, including the pain of rejection. When we can have both pleasure and approval (affirmation) at the same time we are *esteemed*. If we can not have both we are either humbling, denying, controlling, or disciplining our "self" under established standards, i.e., only finding pleasure in the approval which the one setting the standards of right and wrong gives us, with us restraining our desired pleasures of the 'moment' in order to do their will, i.e., in order to please them, what Freud called "*substitute gratification*," or else, finding pleasure without (against) their approval, having a "*guilty conscience*" afterwards (the effect of still desiring their approval).

"*Self esteem*" is "*group esteem*," i.e., group approval, *negating* the commands, rules, facts, and truth that restrain "self" (that inhibit or block it from becoming at-one-with the pleasures of the 'moment'), *negating* the "*guilty conscience*" for disobedience in the process. *Self esteem/group esteem* engenders in man and child the perception that they can sin (disobey) with impunity. Group dynamics circumvents and therefore *negates* self control, self discipline, the humbling or denying of self, engendering "*self esteem*" instead, where pleasure for self and approval by others, i.e., by "*the group*" become one and the same, of the world only, with everyone living in the 'moment,' being controlled by their "feelings" of the 'moment,' which are being *manipulated* by the facilitator of 'change' who *manipulates* the environment ("*the group*") in order to stimulate the "feeling" of "oneness," i.e., the feeling of "*fraternity*," i.e., *consensus*, along with the fear of group disapproval, i.e., which leads to rejection, isolation, and (as history has shown) death.

It would be a simple matter, with you simply going your way and *"the group"* simply going theirs, except *"the group"* is focusing upon your daily needs. Their rejection of you (your way of thinking and acting) directly affects whether you will be able to (or be allowed to) satisfy your daily needs your way. Your worth is now being determined by them, i.e., by their "felt" needs of the 'moment,' i.e., by their desires, perceptions, and *opinions*. There is no representation in the group dynamics, *consensus* process, only the *"the group's" opinion*, i.e., their "feelings" of the 'moment,' which are ever subject to 'change'—yet never 'changing' from their procedure and intended outcome, the *negation* of the parent's/God's authority, i.e., the *negation* of the child being subject to his parents (the father's) authority and man being subject to God's (the Heavenly Father's) authority. It is all about making man subject to *"the group's" opinion*, i.e., subject to their "feelings" of the 'moment' instead. The idea is, if you make *"the group,"* the "community," etc., "feel good" (approve their carnal ways) they will make you "feel good" (approve you, i.e., supply you with your daily "felt" needs). But if you make them "feel bad" (reject their carnal ways, i.e., reprove, correct, or rebuke them, i.e., produce a *"guilty conscience"* in them for doing wrong, for sinning) they will make you "feel bad" (reject you, i.e., making laws that will force you to be silent and support them, supplying them and those who follow them with their daily "felt" needs).

2) *Force field analysis:*

used by facilitators of 'change' to distinguish between or "taxonomize" the different ways of thinking or paradigms within the "the group," "mapping the room" along a spectrum of 'change,' *from* one end of the spectrum being the people who promote a "negative" *force field* of restraint, making all issues subject to the father's/Father's authority system, refusing to go against their conscience, i.e., refusing to 'compromise' their position insisting that everyone do what is right and not wrong, i.e., obey instead of disobey their father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, thus using the language of authority (*"I know," "You are wrong," "You can not do that," "Thou shalt not," "Because I, my parents, the teacher, the boss, ... and/or God said so"*) which inhibits or prevents 'change,' **to** the other end of the spectrum being people who promote a "positive" *force field* of desire, making all issues subject to "human nature," i.e., where the loving of pleasure (including the pleasure which comes from the approval of "the group" approving of your approving of its love of pleasure) and the hate of pain (including the pain which comes from "the group" disapproving of you attempting to restrain, inhibit, or

prevent it from having the pleasure it desires in the 'moment,' including the pleasure of your approval of its pleasure) is the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of life, participating in and promoting 'compromise,' thus using the language of relationship ("How do you *feel*?" and "What do you *think*?") that encourages (initiates and sustains) 'change.'

The facilitator of 'change' is able to initiate and sustain 'change' by 'changing' the environment, i.e., by 'changing' the way people deal with the issues of the 'moment,' i.e., moving them away *from* their use of the "*negative*" *force field*, i.e., away *from* *preaching* and *teaching* doing right and not wrong, which is "*negative*" (in "*feelings*"), dividing people from one another, moving them *to* the use of their "*positive*" *force field*, i.e., *to* *dialoguing* their *opinions* to a *consensus*, i.e., augmenting pleasure and attenuating pain, which is "*positive*" and not "*negative*" (in "*feelings*")—which includes augmenting the pleasure which comes from the approval of others and attenuating the pain which comes from being rejected by them (for reproofing, correcting, rebuking them, i.e., for making them "feel" bad, i.e., for creating a "guilty conscience" in them for doing wrong)—which unites people with one another. When you make pleasure and the augmentation of it (a "*positive*" *force field*) the agenda (the 'drive' and 'purpose') of life then you must hate anyone who restrains pleasure (despising or hating those who insist upon you always doing things right and not wrong, i.e., judging, punishing, or condemning you when you do things wrong, despising or hating those who promote a "*negative*" *force field*), turning love (as God the Heavenly Father chastens those he loves, condemning, i.e., judging and casting out those who reject His authority) into a hate crime, 'justifying' hate against the restrainer, with any actions taken to *negate* him as being right (making the loving, encouraging, and promoting of socialism, deviancy, unrighteousness, and abomination right), as his actions of restraint are now considered as being wrong (making any judging, condemning, or intolerance toward socialism, deviancy, unrighteousness, and abomination wrong, i.e., a hate crime). It is not so much that you personally take action against those who refuse to take part in the 'change' process, it is that whatever happens to them (their pain of rejection, isolation, etc.) no longer enters your mind, i.e., no longer is a concern of yours.

You know group dynamics is having its affect upon you when you *do not* reprove, correct, or rebuke someone when they are wrong or doing wrong because you fear losing relationship with

them (including your children), i.e. you fear losing their approval, which includes being fearful of what others might say about you (or do to you), making relationship with them or their approval, as well as the approval of others more important, i.e., "more" 'right' than the truth, i.e., making anything which inhibits or is a barrier to relationship, including the truth, wrong, turning freedom *of* the conscience into freedom *from* the conscience. Doing right and not wrong, according to one's convictions and belief, i.e., guaranteeing all individuals their right of conscience, i.e., their right to proclaim the truth, holding to their position in "the group" meeting, standing alone if need be without being deprived of (or fear of lose of) their life, liberty, and pursuit of conscience—what was the catalyst for the modern age is now being replaced with the approaching of pleasure, including the pleasure which comes with the approval of others, being right and the administration of pain, including the pain of missing out on pleasure or causing others to miss out on pleasure (in order to do what is right) being wrong—that is the catalyst for the post-modern age, 'creating' an age void of parental and Godly restraint, i.e., void of the "*guilty conscience*" for doing wrong, creating a new world order in which man perceives that he can sin with impunity since sin is no longer an issue of life and death, with life now being based upon pleasure and the augmentation of it in the "here-and-now" and death being based upon pain, the absence of pleasure in the "here-and-now," a state of pleasure somewhere else, or non-existence, because Hell, a place of eternal torment for sinning against God and God's means of salvation, i.e., faith in Christ Jesus alone, is no longer being (or allowed to be) *preached* and *taught* in the public arena for fear of hurting peoples "feelings" and causing division, judgmentalism, etc.,. The word of God is to be spoke. It is to be hidden in the heart so that out of the heart it is spoken in the public arena so that those who have ears to hear can hear and believe. Group dynamics silences it, i.e., pressures you to set it aside (for the 'moment') in order to initiate and sustain "human relationship" in the public arena, as well as in the private arena. **How** the child responds in the public arena (in "*the group grade*" classroom) affects **how** you will respond in the privet arena (when he gets home).

The Italian [Transformational Marxist](#), Antonio Gramsci wrote in his prison notebooks; "***Truth is a moment in correct praxis.***" In other words, truth is not external to man, dividing him from his own nature, *repressing* him, *alienating* him from himself, others and the world, but is man putting aside that which *represses* "human nature," i.e., *negating* that which *alienates* him from himself, others, and the

world in order to become at-one-with himself, others, and the world in the 'moment' instead. Truth is not to be found in right and wrong restraining nature (*thesis*) nor in nature without right and wrong (*antithesis*) but in right and wrong and nature becoming at-one-with one another in the 'moment' (*synthesis*), with the pleasure of others having pleasure being 'right' and the pain of missing out on pleasure (to do right) being 'wrong.' The Transformational Marxist, [Martin Luther King Jr.](#) wrote, "***The philosopher Hegel said that truth is found in neither the thesis nor the antithesis, but in an emergent synthesis which reconciles the two.***" (Martin Luther King Jr., *Strength to Love; "A Tough Mind and a Tender Heart"*) It is this "*positive*" *field of force*, i.e., our love of pleasure and our love of the approval of others approving of our love of pleasure (group dynamics) that makes us all common, i.e., of the world, from where we derive *common-ism*, i.e., a society of children in adult bodies insisting that everybody take care of their "felt" needs (their feelings of the 'moment') NOW, attacking anyone who they perceive is preventing their "felt" needs (their feelings) of the 'moment' from being met (from being satisfied).

3) ***Unfreezing, moving/changing, and refreezing people:***

(A) ***seducing*** them into participation in the process of 'change' by encouraging them to *dialogue* with one another, i.e., to openly share their *opinions*, i.e., to share with one another their "feelings," i.e., their desire for pleasure and their dissatisfaction with or resentment toward restraint, i.e., divulging their "*positive*" and "*negative*" *force fields* within, without fear of reproof, correction, or rebuke, i.e., without parental authority engendering the "*guilty conscience*." The "*guilty conscience*" is *negative*, the voice of the father/Father judging and condemning the child's/man's carnal desires of the 'moment' as being wrong, judging and condemning the "*positive*," i.e., judging and condemning the facilitator of 'change' and "*the group*" not only for being wrong but for coming between the father/Father and his/His children, not only turning the children away from the father/Father but also against him/Him, making the children think they are not only "equal" with the father/Father but above him/Him, no longer needing his/His directions and restraints. **You are seduced with your carnal desires, according to the things you covet, including the desire for the approval of others.** It is why the seducer (the facilitator of 'change') will make every effort to "*unfreeze*" you, coming along side you, identifying with your "problem," getting you to trust him as a "friend," getting you to relax and divulge your "felt needs" of the 'moment' (divulging your desires and dissatisfactions, i.e., your desires of the flesh, tying you to the world, and

your dissatisfaction with that which blocks or inhibits you from satisfying them and it, i.e., your parents or some external authority of restraint). Socrates was found guilty of two things, corrupting the morals of the youth and turning them against their parents and God(s) authority, i.e., *negating* faith, both being the result of one thing, coming between the parents and their children, "helping" the children to "think for themselves," according to their carnal desires of the 'moment' ('justifying' their love of pleasure and their resentment towards parental restraint), ['liberating' the children out from under their parent's authority](#). In *dialogue* the children pick up the parent's standards and examine them, i.e., evaluate them according to their desires and resentments of the 'moment' (*aufheben* or enlightenment), *negating* the parent's authority in the process. *Dialogue* acts as a filter, using the sensual (your "*sensuous needs*" and "*sense perception*," i.e., how you are feeling and what you are thinking in the 'moment,' in the immediate situation) to filter out that which restrains, i.e., that which is not of the temporal 'moment' (not contemporary, of the sensory), *negating* rote memorization and faith. (The following is an example of Socratic "programming" being used in Common Core today:

<https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/bring-socratic-seminars-to-the-classroom>)

B) ***deceiving*** them in believing that they will not be held accountable for their "feelings" and thoughts of resentment towards authority which they are "openly" sharing with one another in "*the group*," when "*the group*" is already doing so, resenting and disapproving of (judging and condemning) anyone introducing or defending the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., refusing to set aside, question, and/or challenge the father/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth in the 'light' of the carnal desires of the 'moment,' including the desire for approval from others. **You are being deceived when somebody tells you, and deceived when you believe them, that you will not be held accountable for your thoughts and actions.** Why do you sense or experience hostility toward you in a supposedly non-hostile group meeting when you reprove someone in "the group?" It is because "*the group*" is 'justified' in judging anyone who is judging them, producing a "*guilty conscience*" in them for doing wrong. Instead of using the pain of physical force (which exemplifies and therefore reinforces the father's/Father's authority) the pain of rejection is being used instead to "bring them around."

C) ***manipulating*** them through the *consensus* process, i.e., coming to an agreement on a common

opinion, and then putting that "collective" (common-ist) *opinion* into social action or *praxis*, 'discovering,' affirming, and propagating the process of 'change,' *negating* the father's/Father's authority not only in themselves but also in "*the group*," the "community," the nation, and wherever else they happen go around the world, i.e., transforming themselves, "*the group*," the "community," the nation, and the world **from** being 'loyal' to the father/Father's authority, i.e., *preaching* and *teaching* his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., sustaining his/His "*prejudiced*" way of thinking and acting within themselves and society, preventing 'change' from taking place, **to** now being 'loyalty' to "*the group*" and their carnal desires instead, not only questioning the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth but challenging his/His authority as well, *negating* the father's/Father's authority in the process. **You are being manipulated when someone uses you for their own carnal pleasures (gain), deceiving you into believing that what you are doing is for yourself and/or for others of your interest.**

Diaprax, the practice of putting into social action dialectic 'reasoning,' 'changes' the way people feel, think, and act, i.e., 'changes' **how** they respond to themselves, to others, to the world, and to authority. It changes your children, your spouse, your boss, your elected officials (your representatives), your minister, etc., and you (if you or they participate) into a socialist (seeking the approval of the many, i.e., "the group," the "committee," or the "community" instead of the one, the many becoming the "one" instead). For example: it 'changes' **how** children feel, think, and act toward their parents after participating in the "*group grade*" classroom (doing what they "feel" like doing in the 'moment,' challenging their parent's authority instead of obeying them, pleasure having superseded or supplanted obedience to their parents authority as the way of life). As the textbook *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain* (which is the foundation for teacher certification and school accreditation, both public and private) reads: ***"There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children."*** (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*)

The hallmark of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., the group dynamics process, from the Garden in Eden on, where a person is caught between his feelings of the 'moment' and the commands and rules he is to obey and the facts and truth he is to accept as is, i.e., by faith, thinking about how the world "is," i.e., restraining him from satisfying his carnal desires of the 'moment,' and how it "ought" to be, satisfying his carnal desires of the 'moment,' 'justifying' his feelings over and against the established standards of restraint, is the facilitator of

'change' coming between the husband and his wife, coming between the parent's and their children, coming between God and man, "helping" them to "think" for themselves, according to their carnal desires of the 'moment,' 'justifying' their resentment toward restraint, 'liberating' the wife out from under her husband's authority, the children out from under their parent's authority, and man out from under God's authority, creating a new world order based upon "human nature," i.e., upon [the wife's, the children's, and man's carnal desires of the 'moment.'](#) making themselves subject to the pleasures of this world only, subject to the *seduction, deception, and manipulation* of the facilitator of 'change.' ***"And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you ;"*** 2 Peter 2:22 In other words, through your desire to satisfy your carnal desires of the 'moment,' taking pleasure in ("lusting" after) that which is not yours but someone else's, facilitators of 'change' using deceitful words ("plastic" words, i.e., carefully molded words) are able to turn you into "human resource," using your wife or your husband, your children, your property, your business, and you for their own carnal pleasures of the 'moment,' with your approval (since you are getting what you want, i.e., what you coveted after). ***"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's."*** Exodus 20:17

By the facilitator of 'change' getting you to *dialogue* your *opinion*, i.e., getting you to uncover (reveal, divulge) what it is that you are coveting after, i.e., what you are desiring, taking pleasure in, enjoying, or "lusting" after that is not yours but your "neighbor's" (what your neighbor has, i.e., what your parent's have or can do and you do not have or are not allowed to do—as Karl Marx believed that the King's horse was everybody's horse), he is able to deceive you into believing that what you are thinking, i.e., "lusting" after in the 'moment' is OK, because it is common to all men. Thereby, with you trusting him, because he is providing you a way to attain that which you desire (making you subject to stimulus-response, i.e., to the flesh and the world, no longer subject to doing right and not wrong, i.e., to your parent's or God's authority), he is able to ***"make merchandise of you,"*** i.e., he is able to buy and therefore sell you (as natural resource). By the facilitator of 'change' getting *"the group"* to do the same, i.e., to 'justify' your and therefore their covetousness, he makes that which is yours theirs (his) to enjoy and that which is theirs (his) yours to enjoy. Loving your neighbor as yourself is now interpreted with "lusting" in mind (living *"in and for"* yourself as you live *"in and for 'the group'"*), when in truth the scriptures explain it another way (denying yourself, recognizing that that which

belongs to somebody else is theirs, not yours—from which we get private family, property, and business):

"For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Romans 13:9 What transpires in the group dynamics setting is what we read about in Micah 2:2 ***"And they covet fields, and take them by violence; and houses, and take them away: so they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage."*** Only in this case, the landowner is 'willing' to *"share"* that which is his with everybody else, knowing that if he does not he will lose it (when he has already lost it to the group dynamic process, i.e., to the facilitator of 'change's' control and pleasure).

Cognitive dissonance is produced when a person is caught between his belief (doing right and not wrong) and his behavior ("lusting" after the things of the world), between what Kurt Lewin called, ***"barrier behavior"*** and ***"play behavior."*** ***"Unfreezing. This term, also adopted from Lewinian change theory, refers to the process of disconfirming an individual's former belief system."*** (Irvin D. Yalom, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*) By placing a child in a group dynamics environment (as in a laboratory experiment) which pressures him into either holding onto his "ridged" beliefs, i.e., his parent's standards or going with his natural desire pleasure, including the pleasure which comes from the approval of *"the group,"* i.e., his "feelings" of the 'moment,' cognitive dissonance would become manifest in the child, pressuring him to choose between one or the other. Change in the child's way of thinking (***"organization"***) would therefore be more easily accomplished in *"the group dynamic"* setting or environment, changing him **from** obedience to his parent's authority **to** initiating and sustaining relationship with *"the group,"* **from** doing right and not wrong **to** the approaching of pleasure and the avoiding of pain, including the approaching of the pleasure of group approval and the avoiding of the pain of group rejection. Kurt Lewin wrote: ***"It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately."*** (Kurt Lewin in Kenneth Bennie, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*) ***"Change in organization can be derived from the overlapping between play behavior and barrier behavior. To be governed by two strong goals [parental approval and group approval] is equivalent to the existence of two conflicting controlling heads within the organism. This should lead to a decrease in degree of hierarchical organization [the child's 'loyalty' to parental authority, desiring approval from his parents would become confused with (overshadowed by) his desire of the 'moment,'***

i.e., his desire for approval from "the group"]. **Also, a certain disorganization should result from the fact that the cognitive-motor system loses to some degree its character of a good medium because of these conflicting heads** [lose of identity with his parent's position result in confusion, destabilization, i.e., in a lose of his own identity, lose of his moral foundation, and lose of meaning in life, which was founded upon them]. **It ceases to be in a state of near equilibrium; the forces under the control of one head have to counteract the forces of the other before they are effective** [either the voice of the parent, i.e., the guilty conscience for disobedience has to re-gain control over the child's thoughts, preventing 'change,' or the voice of "the group," i.e., his desire for pleasure and group approval will gain control of his thoughts instead, engendering 'change']. " (Kurt Lewin in Barker, Chapter XXVI *Frustration and Regression*) If "the group" is encouraged (pressured) to arrive at a *consensus*, where everyone must be in agreement with the outcome, then any individual resisting 'change' becomes overwhelmed, tending to succumb to group approval. (group pressure) **"Few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity** [holding onto their former beliefs] **in the face of apparent group unanimity."** How evil is this!

By shifting education (or any learning environment) **from** being facts based **to** being feelings based, group dynamics (*psychoanalysis* and *psychotherapy*) comes into play in the students life inside and outside the classroom, with the focus of educational objectives becoming the students behavior in regards to where his loyalty lies in any given moment, along a spectrum from loyalty to parental authority (self control and self discipline, humbling and denying of self) to loyalty to group relations ("self" 'liberation'). As Bloom wrote: **"It was the view of the group that educational objectives stated in the behavior form have their counterparts in the behavior of individuals, observable and describable therefore classifiable."** **"Only those educational programs which can be specified in terms of intended student behaviors can be classified."** **"What we are classifying is the intended behavior of students—the ways in which individuals are to act, think, or feel as the result of participating in some unit of instruction."** **"Educational procedures are intended to develop the more desirable** [according to the child's self interest] **rather than the more customary** [subject to the parent's authority] **types of behavior."** (Benjamin Bloom, et al., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Book 1, Cognitive Domain*) By putting students under the pressure of group dynamics their loyalties could be detected and 'changed' (if need be) **from** loyalty to parental authority, i.e., to doing right and not wrong established by their parents **to** loyalty to the group, to "human relationship" established upon pleasure ("enjoyment," "lust,"

i.e., "self interest") and the augmentation of it. As Carl Rogers wrote, regarding the results of the student's 'change' in 'loyalty': ***"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."*** ***"If we have the power or authority to establish the necessary conditions, the predicted behaviors will follow."*** ***"Now that we know how positive reinforcement works, and why negative doesn't' ... 'we can be more deliberate and hence more successful in our cultural design.'*** ***"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. That's the source of the tremendous power of positive reinforcement—there's no restraint and no revolt."*** (Carl Rogers, *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*) ***"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."*** (Carl Rogers, *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*)

As Bloom admitted: ***"To create effectively a new set of attitudes and values, the individual must undergo great reorganization of his personal beliefs and attitudes and he must be involved in an environment which in many ways is separated from the previous environment in which he was developed."*** ***"...many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in some ways brought into question while more rational and nonauthoritarian behaviors are emphasized."*** (David Krathwohl, Benjamin Bloom et al., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*) As Rogers admitted: ***"We know how to change the opinions of an individual in a selected direction, without his ever becoming aware of the stimuli which changed his opinion."*** ***"We know how to influence the ... behavior of individuals by setting up conditions which provide satisfaction for needs of which they are unconscious, but which we have been able to determine."*** (Carl Rogers, *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*) As Karl Marx lamented about education in his day: ***"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*), he found the answer: ***"Concerning the changing of circumstances by men, the educator must himself be [re-]educated."*** (Karl Marx, *Thesis on*

Feuerbach # 3) **"Re-education aims to change the system of values and beliefs of an individual or a group."** (Kenneth Benne, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*)

If "alignment" of "theory and practice" (if *opinion* and flesh, not belief and action or spirit and flesh, which are a dichotomy, i.e., at odds or in conflict with one another, being of different substance), i.e., if classroom experience and student behavior (if stimulus and response and not learning facts and recalling them on demand, which requires self-control and self discipline, i.e., the humbling and denying of self) is the **objective** of education, then, based upon Bloom's world view, i.e., upon his **"Weltanschauung,"** Marxism must be the outcome for student *practice* (behavior) since on page 166 of his *Affective Domain Book 2* he lists two Marxist's (Theodor Adorno and Erick Fromm) as the basis of his *theory (opinion)*, i.e., the foundation of his curriculum, which is required for teacher certification as well school accreditation. It is the *theory and practice* for Common Core, where the child's or the adult's *opinion* and social actions (self interests and relationship with others) become one-and-the same, transcending parental, national, and Godly restraints. Such has been the 'shift' in education from the late 50's and 60's on, when *Bloom's Taxonomies* became the curriculum used to 'change' the learning environment in the classroom and the school, using group dynamics to 'change' not only the students, but the school, the teachers, the staff, the "community," the home, and the world as well. What should be noted about Bloom's Taxonomies is what Bloom wrote about it forty years after its publication.

"Certainly the Taxonomy was unproven at the time it was developed and may well be 'unprovable,'" that it **"adopted Ralph W. Tyler's idea of an educational objective as a change in behavior; ways of acting, thinking, and feeling, [which included] covert as well as overt states and responses."** (*Bloom's Taxonomy: A Forty Year Retrospect*) Realizing that Bloom's *theory* is Marx's *theory*: **"The only practically possible emancipation** [from parental, national, and Godly restraint] **is the unique theory which holds that man is the supreme being for man,"** that the classroom experience for the child must start with the child's *opinion*, i.e., with his feelings and thoughts of the 'moment,' instead of with his parents, teachers, or God's commands, rules, facts, and truth, in a group dynamic environment. (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*). This is essential if the belief-action dichotomy (the parent's and/or teachers authority over the child and the bosses and/or God's authority over man, restraining "human nature") is to be replaced with *theory and practice* (the 'liberating' of "human nature" from parental restraint and Godly restraint, i.e., from the parent's authority and from God's authority), 'changing' the child, man, society, and the world, making the [child's carnal nature](#) the

foundation for 'reality' instead.

By treating all beliefs as *opinions* and facts and truth as *opinions*, (by making the parent's commands, rules, facts, and truth subordinate to the child's feelings and thoughts of the 'moment') those of dialectic 'reasoning' make 'reasoning' subject to the flesh and the world, i.e., subject to their "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., subject to that "hope" which seeks only after the pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., which comes from the flesh and the world, making man's thoughts and actions subject to his own "feelings" and the world alone, which leads to death. To make hope subject to the pleasure's of the 'moment,' i.e., subject only to the here-and-now, makes eternal life and eternal death no longer an issue (moribund), *negating* faith and belief, lasting facts and truth, in the process. It is why Bloom, placing hope in 'changing' the way that students think and act, **from** belief, facts, and truth **to** *opinions* and *theories*, could write: "***truth and knowledge are only relative and that there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all time and all places***" (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*), paraphrasing Karl Marx who wrote: "***In the eyes of the dialectic philosophy, nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred.***" (Karl Marx)

The terms *group dynamics*, *force field analysis*, and *unfreezing, moving or 'changing,' and refreezing* ([which are the key ingredients in brainwashing](#)) originated with Kurt Lewin, a Transformational Marxist—Transformational Marxists are Marxists who merge Marx and Freud—who (coming to America from Germany in the early 30's) advancing the fields of *psychoanalysis* and *psychotherapy*, making it possible to bring Marxism into the classroom, and therefore into the home, the "community," the media, the workplace, the government (from the national government down to the local), and even into the church without encountering crippling resistance, thus being able to initiate and sustain the process of 'change.' In regards to the word 'change' itself, Karl Marx wrote about it in his eleven *thesis* on Feuerbach (a materialist). His final and most important *thesis* goes like this: "***The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways; the objective is change itself.***" (Karl Marx, *Thesis on Feuerbach #11*) Have you heard the world 'change' recently? Most America's are Marxist and do not know it or are unwilling to admit it. In their ignorance, in their denial, or in their effort to remain "underground" (*esoteric*) they discredit anyone who explains what Marxism really is. [Are you a Marxist?](#)

If you make "obey - do not disobey" (do right - do not do wrong) your ground of being (your *thesis*), then your

nature to "approach pleasure - avoid pain" becomes subject to the father's/Father's authority, producing a "guilty conscience" (*antithesis*) in you when you disobey or do wrong, preventing 'change' (*synthesis*). But if you make your nature to "approach pleasure - avoid pain" the *thesis*, then the father's/Father's authority becomes the *antithesis*, thus 'liberating' you from the "guilty conscience" for disobedience or for doing wrong, allowing you the "right" to examine, evaluate, critique (criticize) the father's/Father's rules, commands, facts, and truth in the 'light' of the 'moment' (*aufheben* or enlightenment), 'creating' *synthesis* in the process, with obedience to anyone who augments pleasure being right and obedience to anyone who engenders the pain of missing out on pleasure being wrong, i.e., the act of disobedience to authority (civil disobedience) now being right (the right to hold onto local, parochial, traditional laws and private convictions which prevent 'change,' i.e., which prevent socialist-environmentalist-globalist control over family, private property, and business being therefore wrong).

The question must be asked. If we sacrifice the guilty conscience (a product of the father's/Father's authority system) upon the alter of 'change,' 'changing' it into a "super-ego" which is subject to the "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., which are forever subject to 'change,' that is subject to the situation of the 'moment,' then what is to become of society? The answer is a police state (government without a guilty conscience), engendering and using crime, unrighteousness, and abomination in order to initiate and sustain 'change,' which engenders crime, unrighteousness, and abomination.

For those who want 'change,' the "problem" centers around parental authority, which produces individuals (children and therefore future citizens and leaders) who, holding onto their parent's "ridged" ("*prejudiced*") way of thinking and acting, i.e., holding onto their parents beliefs and principles (in a "ravidly" 'changing' world), refusing to 'change,' i.e., inhibiting, resisting, blocking 'change,' prevent a "new" world order from becoming a 'reality.' The object is therefore to use the education system, "community" projects and crisis, social and environmental issues, government programs, departments, and agencies, the media, entertainment, and even the "church" "***to change the parent's behavior toward the child,***" to where parent's now no longer hold their children accountable to their right and wrong but instead (with the "help" of the "community") "help" their children 'discover' what is right and what is wrong for themselves and society in the 'moment,' to where their "felt needs" (their carnal desires) and the "felt needs" (the carnal desires) of society become one and the same in the 'moment,' i.e., of the world only. (Theodor. W. Adorno, *The Authoritarian Personality*) It is not only "*the*

village" that 'liberates' the children from their parent's authority, but it is also "*the village*" in the brain of the parents ("*What will the 'village think?'*") that 'liberates' the children from their authority as well.

The father's/Father's authority *system* is explained in [Hebrews 12:5-11](#). According to dialectic 'reasoning,' parents and God (in the eyes of the child) are the same—as far as structure of thought and action. Both fathers:

- 1) *preach* commands and rules to be obeyed and *teach* facts and truth to be accepted as is, i.e., by faith,
- 2) *bless* or *reward* those who obey or do thing right,
- 3) *chasten* and/or *reprove, correct, or rebuke* those who do wrong, and
- 4) *casting out* those who reject the authority *system*.

If you accept this *generalization* (a half truth, the other half, i.e., man's *deceitful* and *wicked* heart and God's *Holiness, Purity, and righteousness*, is missing) as your premise for 'change,' then to 'liberate' society from God's authority the children must be 'liberated' from the father's authority structure of right-wrong, obey-do not disobey, top-down, above-below way of thinking and acting. The whole of Gnosticism, Kabbalism, Hermeticism, etc. i.e., the so called "New World Order" is based upon this concept, the 'liberation' of the common (the child's nature) out from under (and therefore against) that which divides (the father's/Father's authority), i.e., 'discovering' and uniting upon that which is common, "human nature," becoming as "One" (from where we get "*common-ism*" AKA Communism) by *negating* that which divides.

Again, in more detail:

if the parent's "system" (the earthly father's authority), i.e., the earthly father's paradigm (*Patriarch*), i.e., his way of thinking and acting (above-below, right-wrong, top-down authority) is the same as God's "system" (the Heavenly Father's authority), i.e., the Heavenly Father's paradigm (*Patriarch*), i.e., His way of thinking and acting (above-below, right-wrong, top-down authority) and

[if the child's faith in his parent's \(with the child being subject to the earthly father's authority\) engenders \(is a precursor to\) man's faith in God \(with the only begotten Son of God, and therefore man, being](#)

[subject to His Heavenly Father's authority](#)),

then the child *must* be 'liberated' from parental restraint (*negating* the child's recognition of and honoring of his parent's authority, *negating* the father's authority over him) if man is to be 'liberated' from Godly restraint (*negating* man's recognition of and honoring of God's authority, *negating* the Heavenly Father's authority over His Son and therefore over man himself). Whether it is national socialism (fascism) or global socialism (communism) the father's authority must be *negated*. The difference between national socialism and global socialism is that while both *negate* the father's authority in the home, *negating* the "guilty conscience," global socialism *negates* the father's authority "**system**" while national socialism uses it (with the Fuhrer taking the place of all the fathers). But instead of casting out those who challenge their authority, as the father in the home does, both forms of socialism, i.e., national and global kill them instead, without having a "guilty conscience."

What is missing in this "formula" is that the Heavenly Father is Pure and Holy and Righteous in and of Himself while the earthly father is not, being of the flesh ([Hebrews 12:5-11](#)). By those of dialectic 'reasoning' justifying their carnal nature ([Genesis 3:1-6](#)), i.e., rejecting the Heavenly Father's nature and therefore rejecting His judgment upon man for his nature and therefore rejecting man's need for a savior (making their "formula" antithetical to [Romans 7:14-25](#)), they can only focus upon the earthly father's nature (seeking after pleasure and avoiding pain) and the nature of the child (seeking after pleasure and avoiding pain), [making them both one and the same](#), of the world only, concluding that the only problem with the world is that fathers insist upon their children honoring their authority, as God over man, with the children having to "repress" their own nature, i.e., having to humble, deny, control, discipline themselves, i.e., "alienating" themselves not only from their own carnal nature but from the carnal nature of the world as well, having a "guilty conscience" when they do disobey their parents, i.e., when they do not "repress" themselves and "alienate" themselves from the world, i.e., when they are being of the world only, i.e. [when they are being "normal."](#) When man defines God, the Heavenly Father, according to his own nature, i.e., redefining God by "*humanizing*" his Word, i.e., making it (and God) subject to men's *opinions*, he sets up the 'justification' of dialectic 'reasoning,' making God a product of man's feelings, thoughts, and actions. In this way he 'justifies' the lie that we are like God and God is like us, i.e., loving in nature, when in truth God's love is *Holy, Pure, and righteous* (not of the flesh) and our love is for *pleasure* (of the flesh).

In this way, in the eyes of those who 'reason' dialectically ('justifying' themselves, the flesh, and the world),' Jesus Christ becomes an "example," showing us *how*, through "civil disobedience" (questioning and challenging authority) to 'liberate' ourselves from the "establishment," i.e., from the father's/Father's authority, instead of being the Son of God, obedient to His Heavenly Father in all things commanded, being our only means to salvation from Hell, i.e., from torment and eternal death for our sins (for our disobedience) against His Father—with the Son, sent by His Father, in obedience to His Father, 'redeeming' us, by His shed blood upon the cross, *from* the wrath of His Father upon us for our disobedience, i.e., for our sins against Him, 'reconciling' us *to* His Father by His Father resurrecting Him from the grave, His Father forgiving us for our sins, 'imputing' His *righteousness* upon us by our faith in His Son, His Father setting Him at His right hand, giving Him the kingdom, adopting us as His children, the Father and His Son sending the Holy Spirit to confirm His Word, comfort us, and empower us, in His love, to do His work, with the Father telling His Son when to go get His bride, that we might spend eternity with Him and His Son, in Their glory, partaking in Their Holiness forever. From Genesis to Revelation it is about the Father's authority and faith, which leads to obedience. Without the obedient Son of God our disobedience (and judgment) could not be overcome. In and through the obedient Son of God we are now made children of God, why the Apostle John could write: ***"And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."*** 1 John 3:1 Leave out the Father's authority and you lose the gospel message, turning it into a socialist gospel instead..

The 'logic' of dialectic 'reasoning' (the 'drive' and the 'purpose' of the *"group grade," consensus* meeting) is to *negate* the earthly father's authority structure over the child by *negating* the earthly father's authority structure within the child, i.e., *negating* the child's "guilty conscience" for disobedience, i.e., for being "normal," thereby *negating* the Heavenly Father's authority structure over man by *negating* the Heavenly Father's authority structure within man, i.e., *negating* man's "guilty conscience" for sinning, i.e., for being "normal," therefore *negating* his need for a savior, other than the "facilitator of 'change'" whose job it is to "help" him "save" himself (his "self") from the father's/Father's authority structure. In this way, instead of attacking the Son outright (and creating a reaction against them), those of dialectic 'reasoning' *negate* the father's/Father's authority structure itself (*negating* the issue of doing right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's standards, i.e., *righteousness*) by "helping" man esteem his "self" and the world (*sensuousness, "tolerance of*

ambiguity," "deviancy in unity," etc.) with the need for the Son (faith in the obedient Son which leads to obedience to the Father, i.e., judgment for sin and God's Grace, i.e., the issue of faith, Holiness, and righteousness) **"withering away."** By 'liberating' the child's nature in the classroom, i.e., 'liberating' the flesh (the child's lusting after the things of the world, i.e., the pleasures of the 'moment') from the parent's restraints, i.e., from the law (so that the child can be "of and for self," i.e., only of the world) you can 'liberate' man's nature in society, i.e., 'liberating' the flesh (man's lusting after the things of the world, i.e., the pleasures of the 'moment') from God's restraints, i.e., from the law (so that man can be "of and for self," i.e., only of the world). By 'justifying' the carnal nature of the child (what they are "thinking" in the 'moment,' i.e., what they are talking or *dialoging* with themselves in the 'moment' about, based upon their "feelings" of the 'moment,' subject to the "situation" of the 'moment,' i.e., the pleasures they are desiring from the situation of the 'moment' as well as not getting what they "want" in the 'moment,' resenting what or who is preventing them from getting what they want in the 'moment') you 'justify' the law of the flesh, i.e., the law of sin, i.e., man's carnal nature ([Romans 7:14-25](#)), 'liberating' man from the law of God and the "guilty conscience," i.e., from his need to repent (his "felt needs" having already been met or going to be satisfied), and from Godly restraint, creating a so called new world order based upon what Immanuel Kant called **"lawfulness without law."** i.e., where **"lawfulness,"** based upon the child's/man's "feelings" of the 'moment,' his carnal nature seeking "oneness" with the world in the 'moment,' "lusting" after the pleasure of the 'moment' (*consensus*), i.e., ever 'changing' according to his "felt needs" of the 'moment,' stimulated by the situation of the 'moment,' rules over the world instead of God's "law," fear of judgment, and a "guilty conscience" for sinning, 'creating' a new world order void of Godly restraint as we now see happening today.

Karl Marx wrote (regarding *negating* established law with the "consensus process," i.e., where man's "felt needs" of the 'moment' are met, i.e., where resistance to 'change' is overcome through [the soviet system](#)): **"Laws must not fetter human life; but yield to it; they must change as the needs and capacities of the people change."** (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*) Those who studied the *consensus* process, as it was being applied in the "former" Soviet Union wrote (warning us of the reign of "terror" that ensues when government **uses crime [crisis]** to gain access to, i.e., control over "the people," i.e., the "community," in order to initiate and sustain 'change'): **"Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state** [where "leadership" is

"advised" (*seduced, deceived, and manipulated*—at least the "more backward" leadership are, those in the know doing the process with full knowledge of what they are doing) by "consensus groups," with its members being *seduced, deceived, and manipulated* (at least the "more backward" members are, those in the know doing the process with full knowledge of what they are doing) by facilitator's of 'change']." (R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, *Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law*)

While overt pain (physical or conscious pain, which perpetuated a "top-down," right-wrong system of authority over "the people") was applied in the "old" soviet system (why Transformational Marxists consider Traditional Marxist's, hard line Communist's, as being equivalent to Fascist's), covert pain (subconscious pain, the pain which comes from the fear of being rejected, circumventing the "top-down" right-wrong system of authority) is applied in the "new" soviet system (to get the people on board the train of 'change'). According to dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., according to Karl Marx (and those who developed the soviet system), it is in "*human nature*," and only in "*human nature*," i.e., only [in the child's nature](#) (what all the world has in common, that is the conscious love of pleasure and the hate of pain, as well as the subconscious pleasure which comes from the approval of others, i.e. the subconscious pleasure of being loved and the subconscious pain which comes from the rejection of others, i.e., the subconscious pain of being hated), 'discovered' and 'liberated' in the "*consensus group*," i.e., in the "*group grade*" (the training ground for future socialist leadership and citizens) that we can initiate and sustain "*equality*," i.e., that we can create "*worldly peace and socialist harmony*." It is here that majority vote (based upon principles, doing right and not wrong), representative, limited government (local control influenced by the parent's authority structure) is replaced by the *consensus* process (where local control is circumvented, i.e., *negated* by the common feelings of love of pleasure and hate of restraint, i.e., by socialist-globalist-environmentalist issues), where the "feelings" of the 'moment' (the child's "feelings" of the 'moment') are influenced by facilitators of 'change' (circumventing the child's parent's authority structure, coming between the parents and their children, encouraging the children to "think for themselves," i.e., to transcend their traditions, customs, borders, and beliefs, 'liberating' the children from respecting and honoring their parent's authority), *manipulating* the physical, mental, and social environment for the purpose of 'change' (globalism). Whoever controls the environment, where the child is learning *how* to initiate and sustain policy, controls the future world—with either parental authority engendering local control (limited, representative government based upon doing right and not wrong, using private ballot, majority vote to protect the citizens, 'limiting'

governments influence upon their private lives) or facilitators of 'change' using the *consensus* process to engender globalism (totalitarianism based upon the "feelings" of the 'moment,' where all individuals must expose their private convictions in the *consensus* process, to expose themselves to public scrutiny, to where the pleasure of "*group approval*" and of "*felt needs*" being met and the pain or fear of "*group disapproval*" and death now controls their lives).

By simply replacing the father's/Father's authority "system," i.e., the *preaching* and *teaching* of commands and rules to be obeyed and facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith (right-wrong) with the child's/man's self-'justification' "system" (pleasure-pain), i.e., the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus*, i.e., with the child's/man's "feelings" (his lust for pleasure, including the pleasure which comes from the approval of others, approving of his lust for pleasure) and his "thoughts" (taken captive to his "feelings" of the 'moment'), you accomplish the deed (the *praxis*), you *negate* the father's/Father's authority in the classroom, in the workplace, in government, in the home, and even in the church, i.e., 'liberating' the child and therefore man to be "of and for" the world only, i.e., carnal, 'creating' a "'New' World Order" of unrighteousness and abomination (using a structure of thought as "new" as [Genesis 3:1-6](#), i.e., "self" 'justification'). "*Equality of opportunity*" is based upon the dialectic agenda of 'liberating' all children from the restraints of parental authority, so that they can be who they were before the father's first command, rule, fact or truth, i.e., carnal, of the world only. Remove the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth and His chastening or judgment for doing wrong or for disobedience, which engenders the "*guilty conscience*" (the lid to "Pandora's box") from the classroom environment and unrighteousness and abomination (the child's/man's deceitful and wicked heart, i.e., the *affective domain*, i.e., that which is in the "box") will automatically rise to the top (come out of the "box"—which you can not close once it is opened). "***The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box.'***" (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*) What the child and the facilitator of 'change' call "cream" rising to the top ('justifying' themselves) the father/Father calls "scum" (knowing the child's/man's wicked heart). "***The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?***" Jeremiah 17:9

Therefore *psychological portfolios*, i.e., profiling the children along the right-wrong - pleasure-pain spectrum (the law of the father/Father - the law of the flesh), mapping ("*taxonomizing*") their progress through the "*group grade*" process—from loyalty to their parent's (holding onto their parent's position on issues, defending

their parent's authority structure over them and therefore their right to judge others for doing "wrong," sustaining their parent's right-wrong way of thinking and acting), through loyalty to themselves (doing what they want in the 'moment' yet still having a "guilty conscience" for disobeying their parents, i.e., for doing "wrong"), to loyalty to "*the group*" (with no "*guilty conscience*" for questioning their parents position on issues and challenging their parents authority structure, i.e., their parent's ridged "wrong" having become irrational in the 'changing' times and therefore their right-wrong/obey-do not disobey authority structure irrelevant)—through the testing (assessment) process knowing where the children are at any given 'moment,' **tracking** their progression or regression so that they all might continue down the same pathway of 'change,' identifying and then preventing or overcoming and child's potential return to the parental authority structure (caused by their re-developing a "*guilty conscience*" for disobedience, for doing "wrong"), identifying the "problem" before they attain a position of influence amongst (over) the other children, getting them to join with them inhibiting, resisting, or fighting against 'change.' The same applies to adults in the "community," in the workplace, in government, and even in the "church," i.e., knowing their willingness to participate in or their resistance toward the *consensus* process (preferably prior to the meeting) in order for the facilitator of 'change' to maintain control of the meeting and therefore control over the "community," the workplace, government, and the "church," overcoming any resistance to 'change.'

With 'change' being "*positive*," i.e., joining with "*the group*" in augmenting pleasure and attenuating pain (based upon the child's nature of approaching pleasure and avoiding pain), which engenders "*the groups*" approval (acceptance) and resistance to 'change' being "*negative*," i.e., inflicting pain (based upon the parent's right-wrong thinking, i.e., judgmentalism) upon individuals within "*the group*," and therefore upon "*the group*" itself, which engenders "*the groups*" disapproval (rejection), the 'change' process is able to overcome any resistance to 'change,' with the facilitator of 'change' maintaining his position of influence (control) over "*the group*," therefore guaranteeing the objective, the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority structure over, not only the individual child, but "the group" and society as well. According to those of dialectic 'reasoning,' without the facilitator of 'change' maintain control over the meeting, the process of 'change' would fall apart, resulting in the children/the adults ('liberated' from parental/Godly restraint, yet still wanting some semblance of stability in their lives) returning to a top-down ("*authoritarian*") system of governance (Fascism, i.e. national socialism), preventing (inhibiting or blocking) "*worldly peace and socialist harmony*," i.e., "the New World

Order," i.e., global socialism from becoming a 'reality.'

By the facilitator of 'change' or members of "*the group*" (during the meeting) labeling the right-wrong thinking individual (*righteousness*) as being "judgmental," i.e., as being "intolerant of ambiguity" (as being intolerant of or "hateful" toward the deviant), the pleasure-pain thinking individual (*sensuousness*, i.e. the deviant) is protected from developing a "guilty conscience" (for doing or thinking wrong), the right-wrong thinking person already having been labeled as such. With the augmenting of pleasure and the attenuating of pain (established by "*the group*") superseding (*negating*) doing right and not wrong (established by an external authority), i.e., with pleasure and approval by "*the group*" being recognized as the 'drive' and 'purpose' of the meeting (and therefore of life), the *consensus-"group grade"* meeting declares war upon *righteousness*, without openly stating such. After all, the *consensus* meeting is not just about fixing the crisis at hand, it is about "fixing" you, i.e., 'changing' your way of feeling, thinking, and acting and relating with or behaving toward others, toward authority, and toward God. In similar fashion, the "*group grade*" classroom is not just about your child learning about the crisis at hand, it is about "fixing" them, i.e., 'changing' their way of feeling, thinking, and acting, and relating with or behaving toward others, toward you and your authority, and toward God, learning to be silent in the midst of unrighteousness, letting the unrighteous have their way without having a "guilty conscience."

Like [the shell game](#), what takes place is not as it appears, seeing the bb roll towards one shell, making up our minds where it has landed we do not see it skillfully being placed under another. While the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth are *specific*, to be applied at all times and in all places, the dialectic process is *general* ("feelings" or "*sense experience*" based), not just dependent upon the child's feelings of the 'moment' but upon his *experience* of 'justified' defiance to authority as well, learned in his "*group grade*" experience in the classroom—which he can refer back to, guiding him in his feelings, thoughts, and actions toward parental authority when he gets home. By the child learning how to solve social crisis in the classroom, crisis is created in the home, the "oppressed-oppressor" (*disenfranchised* and *affranchised*) conditions found in the nations of the world, now correlated with himself and his parents authority. The classroom "*group grade*" experience, as therapy (*psychotherapy*), gives him that experience of 'change' that he can (and will) take back into the home, 'creating' an experience of 'change' there as well. After all, in the end, it is all about "***using social environmental forces*** [on the child in the classroom, giving him an experience in ***how*** to "rationally" challenge

his parent's position on social issues, so that when he gets home he can get his parent's to question their position of authority, in the 'light' of the 'changing' times as well, in order] **to change the parent's behavior toward the child.**" (Theodor. W. Adorno, *The Authoritarian Personality*) Instead of the classroom being used to teach children how to fix (solve) math problems, it is being used to teach them how to "fix" their parents. By the children now perceiving their parents commands, rules, facts, and truth as being "irrational" in a 'changing' world, they are 'justified,' in their minds, that their parents authority is 'irrelevant.' With their parent's authority ("*prejudice*") now perceived as being the cause or source of "social" problems, the children walk past their parents, giving them no heed, doing what they want instead.

This behavior is true for all venues of life, with those in the workplace, in government, and even in the church ignoring all restraints, demanding and carrying out their unrighteous and abominable desires, *negating* all institutions that stand in their way (as we now see being demonstrated not only in this country but around the world). What might appear at first to be "innocent fun," i.e., roll-playing (used to 'liberate' a persons feelings from any past restraints) and acting (using a past experience of love for the world and hate of restraint, in order to remain consistent in directing current and future behaviors, i.e., *seducing, deceiving, and manipulating* "the audience" into participation) becomes a deadly game, *negating* all resistance which stands in its way so that all who want to be a part of the present and the future, must emotionally and physically participate. Even "ministries" are playing the "game," *seducing, deceiving, and manipulating* their "members" in "the church," "growing" it upon the "feelings" of the world instead of *preaching and teaching* the Word of God as is (unmingled with human 'reasoning,' i.e. without dialectic 'reasoning'), letting the Word of God and the Holy Spirit bring them under conviction, to the Lord (to fellowship with "***the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ***"), and therefore into the fellowship.

While the parent's chasten the child for doing wrong (which is specific), wrong, to the child, now becomes (through his "*group grade*" experience) anyone who 'limits' his and "*the groups*" possibilities, i.e., his and its potential (which is general). While the Ten Commandments are specific, i.e., murder, adultery, bearing false witness, etc. are not 'justified' "*under certain conditions,*" man's laws are not, they are general, i.e., under certain conditions speeding (within reason) is 'justified,' getting someone to the hospital in a life and death situation for example. When that is done, turning that which is specific into general, i.e., changing commands,

rules, facts, and truth into *opinions*, which are changeable in 'changing' times, a "New World Order" is created, i.e., a "New World Order" where the children, the community, the nation, and the world (including the "church") can do wrong (evil) without having a *"guilty conscience,"* where *"the children of disobedience"* (facilitators of 'change') control the classroom, the home, the community, the nation, and the world (including the "church") without restraint. God has warned us of this "game." ***"Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them."*** Ephesians 5:6, 7 ***"Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them."*** Colossians 3:5-7

Diaprax, i.e. the dialectic process (*"human reasoning,"* the child/man 'justifying' himself) being put into social action (*praxis*), is not academics, as those of dialectic 'reasoning' would like you to believe, it is spiritual, having eternal consequences. Vanity, greed, and envy have always been the catalyst for 'change,' with the pleasures of the 'moment' blinding man (and the child) to what he is (wicked and deceitful in heart), what he is doing to himself and to others (*seducing, deceiving, and manipulating*), and the consequence of his actions (*praxis*), i.e., where he is going. ***"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."*** Proverbs 16:25 ***"Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness. And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain ['driven' by their own lusts and pride]. Therefore let no man glory in men."*** 1 Corinthians 3:18-21

Group dynamics is *"the group's"* (the *"community's,"* the *"committee's,"* etc.,) influence upon you, influencing your feelings of the 'moment,' using your desire for approval from others (pleasure) as well as your fear of rejection by others (pain), to 'change' the way you feel, think, and act and respond to (or relate with) others. Any time you are around others who stimulate pleasure in you or who you *perceive* as being the doorway to pleasure, you are being influenced in **how** you respond to them (as well as **how** you respond to your "self" and everything and everyone else around you) in the 'moment.' The same can be said for pain, including the pain of rejection by others. Therefore, your ***"self interest,"*** i.e., your desire for pleasure and to avoid pain (actual or

perceived), including that pleasure which comes from the approval of others and the pain which comes with rejection, is the *dynamo* for 'change.' Self and interest ties you to the *sensual* 'moment,' i.e., to the world. The more interest the child/man has toward the things of the world the more self is made manifest, therefore self and interest are the same, tying us to the things of the world (basing 'reality' upon our "*sensuous needs*" and "*sense perception*" of the 'moment'). It is why philosophy, psychology, and sociology (*psychoanalysis* or *psychotherapy*) is based upon "*self interest*" seeking "*relationship*" with others of the same "*self interest*," augmenting pleasure and attenuating pain, basing 'reality' (our hope) upon our "feelings," which are ever 'changing' according to the situation of the 'moment,' resenting (hating) restraint. It is our interest in self preservation, "lusting" after the things of the world, that makes us readily adaptable to 'change.'

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." "But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." "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 3:1-5, 13; 4:3, 4 "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus 2: 11-14 We are not saved by good works. We do good works because we are saved.

"The groups" approval and rejection of your child (or you) is different than the father's approval and rejection of the child (or God's approval and rejection of you). "The group" demands that the child **compromise** the father's position in order to initiate and sustain relationship with it, while the father demands that there be **no compromising** of his position, chastening the child when he does, casting the child out only when he questions and challenges his authority to chasten him for disobedience. (The same is true for you and God, the Heavenly

Father.) When the earthly father, using the father's authority **system**, becomes a ruler over the citizens, insisting that the citizens not compromise his position (which is of the world), he creates a conflict with the citizens, where the citizen has to choose between serving him, serving their flesh (their interests of the 'moment'), or serving God, the Heavenly Father (who is not of the world), with the earthly father, who fears God, casting out those who question and/or challenge the father's authority **system** and the earthly father, who does not fear God, killing those who question and/or challenge his authority instead. Unless the earthly father makes himself subject to the Heavenly Father's authority, recognizing the right of the citizens to do (or not do) the same (limiting the power of government over the citizens, under God, letting God be the final judge over their soul), government becomes totalitarian in **system**. *"The group"* likewise casts members out, but in their case, for **refusing to compromise** the father's/Father position, i.e., for the person bringing condemnation upon *"the group,"* i.e., creating a *"guilty conscience"* within members of *"the group"* for their disobedience, causing social disharmony. Death eventually comes to the "cast out one" (to those who refuse to compromise, who refuse to abandon their "private convictions" for the social, i.e., socialist cause) at the hands of government agencies ("caretaker" departments and institutions) which are established for and dedicated to the "benefiting" of **all** of society.

*"The whole discussion becomes species-wide, One World, at least so far as the guiding goal is concerned. To get to that goal is politics & is in time and space & will take a long time & cost much blood." ". . . A caretaker government could immediately start training for democracy & self-government & give it little by little, as deserved." "This is a realistic combination of the Marxian version & the humanistic. (Better add to definition of "humanistic" that it also means one species, One World.)" "Only a world government with world-shared values could be trusted or permitted to take such powers. If only for such a reason a world government is necessary. It too would have to evolve. I suppose it would be weak or lousy or even corrupt at first—it certainly doesn't amount to much now & won't until sovereignty is given up little by little by 'nations.'" (Abraham Maslow, *The Journals of A.H. Maslow, Volumes I and II*) "We must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue." (Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#))*

It is this desire for approval from the other children/from men (from *"the group"*—from the two or more) that turns your child/you into a socialist, *negating* the approval of the father/Father (of God—of the one), which

makes them/you an individual(ist), under him/Him—where they/you can stand alone, with the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, in the midst of and apart from *"the group,"* refusing to **compromise** the father's/Father's position in order to initiate and sustain relationship with *"the group"* (refusing to set aside the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, even for the 'moment'), doing so with a *"clear conscience."* It is our children's/our right to hold fast to their/our father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth in the midst of *"the group,"* refusing to compromise, i.e., refusing to participate in (cave in to) *group consensus* that they/we derive *"freedom of the conscience"* (their/our 'religious' liberties). Diaprax (group dynamics) only offers them/us *"freedom from the conscience,"* i.e., freedom **from** the father's authority, i.e. freedom **from** his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., freedom **from** faith, allowing (encouraging) them/us to **compromise**, i.e., to do (or tolerate) unconscionable things (abominations), such as Lawrence Kohlberg's "lift raft dilemma" where the child must kill somebody for *"the group's"* survival (no different than German soldiers murdering their own wounded soldiers and their captives to save time and supplies for the war effort) without having a *"guilty conscience,"* *negating* (questioning, challenging, and 'liberating' themselves/us **from**) the father's/Father's authority in the process.

Socialism, whether national or global, must *negate* the father's/Father authority in order to initiate and sustain its agenda, world dominance. When the child's/our *"self interest"* ("lusting" after the pleasures of the 'moment,' seeking approval from *"the group"* which approves of it) supersedes the father's/Father's authority to say "No" and to chasten for disobedience, the father's/Father's authority, freedom **of** the conscience, our religious 'liberties,' our inalienable rights are *negated*. Local control is based upon the citizens right to say "No." It depends upon the right of the father to say "No" to anyone attempting to supersede his God given authority to say "No" to his children, "No" to anyone entering or on his property, and "No" to anyone working in or dealing with his business, and enforce it (where the *"guilty conscience,"* limited government, and a civil society is created).

Only one right answer (all the rest being wrong), i.e., the father's/Father's authority engenders a conscience. Many different answers, with none being "wrong" (*opinions* amongst *opinions*), i.e., "group dynamics" (the *consensus* process) *negates* it. If your children/you do not humble themselves/yourself under the father's/Father's authority, denying, controlling, and disciplining themselves/yourself according to (and

therefore doing) the father's/Father's will, they/you will succumb to the effects of group dynamics—placing their/your hope in the pleasures of this world (including the approval of "the group") only, therefore serving the world (and *"the group"*) only, losing their/your inheritance (their father's money, property, and business in this life/eternal life), and regarding the Heavenly Father, losing their soul (spending eternity in torment, in Hell) in the process. ***"For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"*** Matthew 16:26 Interest in the "here-and-now," i.e. living in the 'moment,' in pleasure (exalting self) *negates* concern regarding where you will spend eternity (humbling and denying self).

What you might not realize, in your effort to control the situation of the 'moment' (in order to solve or alleviate a crisis, i.e. in order to approach or augment pleasure and to avoid or attenuate pain, which includes the pleasure of approval and the pain of rejection) the situation of the 'moment' controls you, i.e., your desire for pleasure and for approval (therefore your desire to avoid pain and disapproval or rejection) controls your feelings, thoughts, and actions and your relationship with others (or how you respond to others). If you like somebody or "feel" you need them in order to attain what you desire, you are more apt to compromise your principles (set aside right and wrong as an issue) in order to initiate and sustain relationship with them then if you do not like them or they do not offer you any advantage to life, making 'right' and 'wrong' subject to what you can get out of the situation (your ***"self interest"***) instead of subject to established conditions of conduct and thought (principles).

'Right' and 'wrong' according to the child is different than right and wrong according to the father/Father. While the father's/Father's right and wrong restrains the child, the child's right and wrong *negates* the father's/Father's authority. Therefore 'right' and 'wrong' made subject to the child's nature, i.e., subject to the situation of the 'moment,' i.e., subject to the child's feelings of the 'moment,' i.e., subject to the approaching or augmenting of pleasure and the avoiding or augmenting of pain (therefore making 'right' and 'wrong' "'readily adaptable to 'change'") *negates* right and wrong made subject to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., subject to his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth, which are established for all times and places (therefore are unadaptable to change, i.e. unchanging). As stated above, Bloom, whose curriculum (reworked by Marzano and Webb) is used by "educators" in the classroom today, wrote: ***"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 all***

places." (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*) Marx wrote: **"In the eyes of the dialectic philosophy, nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred."** (Karl Marx) Bloom admitted that his curriculum, i.e., that his *"Taxonomy,"* i.e., that his **"Weltanschauung"** (his world view) was Marxist, in his second Taxonomy (*Book 2 Affective Domain*) citing Theodor Adorno (*The Authoritarian Personality*) and Erick Fromm (*Escape from Freedom*), who were both Marxists, as examples of his work.

Group dynamics (the child's 'willingness' to compromise the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to **"build relationships"** with others, in order to solve a crisis) *negates* the father's/Father's authority in all participants when *consensus* is the desired outcome. It has a direct effect upon **how** the children will respond to the father/Father and his/His authority after "the group" meeting or session. The father's/Father's authority is missing (under attack) in socialism (globalism) since **"building relationships upon 'self interest,'"** i.e., establishing **"equality"** upon the child's carnal nature (upon our love of pleasure and hate of restraint—what we all have in common) *negates* it.

While your earthly father is subject to pleasure (the "lusts" of the "flesh" and "eyes" and the "pride of life") himself, your Heavenly Father is not. He is Holy. Yet both have the same pattern, system, or paradigm—[Hebrews 12:5-11](#)—establishing right and wrong upon obedience or disobedience to their/Their established commands, rules, facts, and truth (which are external to the child's feelings of the 'moment,' restraining or directing him), with right being the child/man trusting in (placing his faith in) the father/Father, honoring (not questioning and/or challenging) his/His authority, therefore obeying his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth as given, even when they go against (conflict with) the child's/man's "feelings" of the 'moment,' and disobedience being the child/man not trusting in (not having faith in) the father/Father, questioning and challenging (not honoring) the father's/Father's authority, therefore disobeying (setting aside) the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, especially when they get in the way of (conflict with) the child's/man's "feelings" of the 'moment.'

While the earthly father, being of the flesh, might be tyrannical in his office of authority, under God (who is merciful and full of grace) he is to be benevolent instead. Yet according to dialectic 'reasoning,' whether he is tyrannical or benevolent, his office of authority is the same (restraining the child's nature) and therefore must be

negated. Antithetical to the father's/Father's authority, where obedience is right and disobedience is wrong, the child's nature is to make 'right' and 'wrong' subject to the pleasure or pain of the 'moment,' pleasure being right and pain being wrong, making himself and 'right' and 'wrong' subject to the world, i.e. subject to the situation of the 'moment' only, therefore making him subject to whoever is manipulating the situation, i.e. setting up the conditions in which policy (in solving the issue at hand or crisis) is established.

'Right' and 'wrong,' for the child, is based upon his carnal nature responding to the immediate situation, making (in the child's mind) the father/Father and his/His authority the source of conflict and tension—[Genesis 3:1-6](#), where, through the use of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., "self" 'justification' the child is able to 'liberate' his mind (and therefore his actions, including his relationship with others) from the father's/Father's authority, resulting in the child doing what he wants in the 'moment' without having a "*guilty conscience*," (a "*guilty conscience*" can only come from having only one true option and not doing it, while a "clear conscience" comes from doing it or holding on to it in the midst of conflict—"*tolerance of ambiguity*" *negates* or sears the conscience, making "feelings," i.e., the super-ego the determinant of 'right' and 'wrong' in any given situation), i.e., *negating* the father's/Father's authority in his feelings, thoughts, and actions and in his relationship with others in the process (where there is no longer a need to repent and be forgiven for sinning against the father/Father, since there is no father's/Father's authority to sin against, resulting in the child being unwilling to forgive others who have wronged him, getting his "*just dues*" instead, doing so without having a "*guilty conscience*").

Antithetical to the child's 'right' and 'wrong,' right and wrong for the father/Father is based upon the child's obedience or disobedience of his/His established laws, making (in the father's/Father's mind) the child's carnal, rebellious nature the source of conflict and tension—[Romans 7:14-25](#)—producing a "*guilty conscience*" in the child for disobedience, sustaining the father's/Father's authority in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions and in his relationship with others (requiring the child to repent and be forgiven, [forgiving others](#) who have wronged him as well). "*To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also: for if I forgave any thing, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ; Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices.*" Ephesians 2:10, 11

When you make the father's/Father's authority (where the child has to be *told* what is right and what is wrong in order to *know* right from wrong, where the knowledge of revealed facts and truth, facts and truth has

to be *preached* and *taught*, i.e., with facts and truth having to be accepted as is, "as given," by faith, established for all times and places) **subject to the child's nature** (where *knowing* right from wrong is according to the pleasure or pain of the 'moment,' where knowing is based upon the child's "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., knowing by *sensuousness* or the child's "*sense experience*" of the 'moment,' i.e., made manifest in the child's *opinion*, *dialoguing* with himself as well as with others), **the father's/Father's authority is *negated in the feelings, thoughts, and actions of the child.*** The child's nature of approaching pleasure and avoiding pain (with pleasure being the standard for "good" or "right" and pain being the standard for "bad/evil" or "wrong"), restrained ("*repressed*") by the father's/Father's authority (where right and wrong, good and bad/evil are based upon obeying or disobeying the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts and truth) is anathema (antithetical) to the child's nature, with "good" or "right" being based upon the pleasures of the 'moment' (instead of doing right and not wrong, according to the father's/Father's standards or will). The child's nature (where subjective 'truth' is *positive* to the child) made subject to parental authority (where objective truth is *negative* to the child) "*alienates*" the child from initiating and sustaining relationship with other children of differing values and beliefs (but of the same nature).

This is why meetings must be "*positive*" if 'change' (the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority, i.e., "*the negation of negation*") is to take place. The child's feelings of the 'moment,' made subject to (restrained by) parental authority (the father's/Father's authority), is anathema (antithetical) to the parent's authority, made subject to the child's nature. *Negating* parental authority, by allowing all children to become "as-one," i.e., feeling, thinking, and acting and relation with one another according to their "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., becoming subject to the world only, creates a "new" world order where man, tolerating his carnal nature, i.e., 'liberating' himself from Godly restraint, becomes as "one," i.e., as "god," only in this case, determining right and wrong, good and evil according to his carnal nature, i.e. according to the pleasure or the pain of the 'moment' only.

Group dynamics turns "***Thy will be done,***" "Me, working for my father, doing my father's will," "***Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven***" into "***Our will be done,***" "We, working for us," "***As above so below,***" where the child's (and man's) "***self interest***" *negates* the father's/Father's authority, *compromise negates* no compromise, *the super-ego* (the voice of "the group," i.e., the "village") *negates* the conscience (the voice of

the father/Father), the child's *"ought"* negates the father's/Father's "Not," *dialoguing opinions* negates the *preaching* and *teaching* of facts and truth, *"I think"* and *"I feel"* negates "I know," *theory* negates belief, *sight* negates faith, *self esteem* negates self-control and self-discipline, humbling and denying your self in order to do the father's/Father's will, *the disobedient "son"* (Adam) negates the obedient Son (Jesus Christ), *sensuousness* negates righteousness, *"self 'justification'"* ("self-actualization") negates sin, *the "new" world order"* (the child's desire of the 'moment') negates the "old world order" (the father's/Father's authority), *"human rights,"* i.e., *the "right" of the child* negates inalienable rights, i.e. the right of the father, *that which is below* negates that which is above (by making that which is above equal with that which is below) with the child esteeming himself as god, creating a world made in his image. ***"Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the LORD: though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished."*** Proverbs 16:5

By making the child's feelings (or his *opinion* of the 'moment') equal with (and therefore greater than) the father's/Father's authority (to *preach* and *teach* facts and truth to be accepted as is and commands and rules to be obeyed) the child is 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority (at least in his perception of the 'moment'), *negating* the father's/Father's authority in his feelings, thoughts, and actions and in his relationship with others, all being done without the child's awareness of what is happening to him in the 'moment' (the 'changing' of his paradigm) because he is getting what he "wants" in the 'moment.'

You can apply these different patterns, systems, paradigms, or ways of thinking, acting, and relating to others to all aspects of life, i.e., to the family, education, workplace, government, "church," etc. Change can be either subject to the father's/Father's authority (the *Patriarchal Paradigm*) where truth is established once and for all (accepted by faith) or to the child's feelings (the *Heresiarchal Paradigm*) where 'truth' is ever 'changing,' subject to the situation of the 'moment' (subject to sight). Which form of change is being initiated and sustained depends upon which paradigm is being applied in the given situation. The child's paradigm seeks to *negate* the father's/Father's authority (and those who support it) making his carnal nature "lusting" after the pleasures of the 'moment' (*sensuousness*) the 'drive' and 'purpose' of life while the father's/Father's paradigm restrains the child's paradigm, making doing right and not wrong (*righteousness*) the issue of life. If the father/Father abdicates his right to establish right and wrong, i.e., abdicates truth to the child's "feelings" of the 'moment, i.e., to the child's paradigm he/He *negates* his/His authority.

Basing 'truth' ('right' and 'wrong') upon the child's carnal nature ("lusting" after the pleasures of the 'moment') creates a "new" world order based upon man's carnal nature, 'liberated' from Godly restraint. ***"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 For example: any "pastor" who sets God's word (revealed truth) aside for the approval of men (sensual 'truth'), following after men's *opinions*, i.e. using polls, surveys, and feasibility studies for direction instead of the [Word of God](#) (feeding "his" sheep upon the pastures of men's wisdom instead of upon the pure world of God), is apostate, either being a "hireling" or a "wolf in sheep skin."

Kurt Lewin, the "father" of group dynamics, wrote: ***"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 [the "system" of 'change'] by accepting belongingness to the group ."*** (Kurt Lewin, in Kenneth Benne, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*) In other words, you accept the ***"new"*** system (become at-one-with the "new world order") by basing 'right and wrong,' i.e., 'reality' upon your feelings, thoughts, and actions and relationship with others—where you are 'willing' to participate in and promote the ***"system"*** of 'change', i.e. i.e., common-ism, human-ism, environmental-ism, *synergism*, social-ism, global-ism, etc., i.e., *democratization, conscientization, self-actualization*, etc., (Marxism) by coming to the "'knowledge' of 'good' and 'evil,'" i.e., "discover 'truth'" by 'justifying' (tolerating) the carnal (rebellious) nature of others in order to initiate and sustain relationship with them, thereby 'justifying' your carnal (rebellious) nature ("*human nature*," [all that is of the world](#)), rejecting (*negating*) the father's/Father's authority ***"system"*** (the "old world order" of pre-established commands, rules, facts and truth to be accepted by faith) in the process. If you understand this, i.e., your ***"felt need"*** for approval from others (in this case choosing approval from ***"the group,"*** where you must compromise, i.e., you must set aside, at least "for the 'moment'" the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to initiate and sustain relationship with it over and against approval from the father/Father, where you must not compromise, i.e., you must not disobey, set aside, question, or disregard his commands, rules, facts, and truth, even for the "moment") you understand what 'change,' i.e., *Diaprax*, i.e., practicing the dialectic process is all about.

Karl Marx wrote: ***"It is not individualism*** [where the individual is subject to principles established by an authority above him] ***that fulfills the individual, on the contrary it destroys him. Society*** [where the individual

must be 'willing' to compromise or "set aside for the 'moment'" pre-established principles, i.e. where he must be readily adaptable to 'change' in order to initiate and sustain "*human relationship*," i.e., "*group*" or "*community*" identity] ***is the necessary framework through which freedom*** ['liberation' from the father's/Father's authority] ***and individuality*** ['liberation' of the child's/man's carnal nature, so that the child/man can be as he perceives he is, of the world only] ***are made realities.***" (Karl Marx in John Lewis, *The Life and Teachings of Karl Marx*)

"In order to effect rapid change, [one] must mount a vigorous attack on [the family](#) lest the traditions of present generations be preserved. It is necessary, in other words, artificially to create an [experiential chasm](#) between parents and children—to insulate the children in order that they can more easily be indoctrinated with new ideas." (Warren Bennis, *The Temporary Society*) The purpose of education is therefore to ***"develop persons*** [a new or the next generation of citizens] ***who see non-influencability of private convictions*** [the father's/Father's principles and authority] ***in joint deliberations*** [in a *consensus* meeting] ***as a vice rather than a virtue.***" (Kenneth Benne, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*) ***"Bypassing the traditional channels of top-down decision making, our objective centers upon transform public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics."*** ***"Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common interests and ultimately to world interests.... transforming public consensus into one favorable to the emergence of a stable and humanistic world order."*** ***"Consensus is both a personal and a political step. It is a precondition of all future steps."*** ([Ervin Laszlo](#), *A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World Order*)

While the father/Father, with his/His "*top-down*" authority "***system***" of "*doing right and not wrong*," judges (condemns, i.e. reproves, corrects, and rebukes) the child's compromising (or setting aside even for the 'moment') of his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth (the child doing so in order to initiate and sustain relationship with others for the purpose of attaining pleasure or to avoid pain) as being wrong (as being bad behavior), the child, with his "*equality*" "***system***" (what he has in common with all the children of the world) of "*approaching pleasure and avoiding pain*," desiring to initiate and sustain relationship with others who, despite having differing positions or beliefs and values than his father's/Father's, desire the same pleasures ("***self interests***"), must compromise or set aside his father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth for the 'moment' (for the situation), along with them doing the same, i.e., compromising or setting aside their father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth for the 'moment' for the sake of satisfying "***self interest***" and ***building relationship***," with all *negating* the father's/Father's authority "***system***" in the process. The use of a

crisis, where all (having the same *"self interest"*) are willing to work together, makes the *"relationship building"* process easier to fulfill. Thus any refusal to compromise (or loyalty to) the father's/Father's authority *"system"* in the midst of *"relationship building,"* i.e., any rejecting of and/or fighting against *"belongingness to the group"* becomes wrong, i.e., becomes bad behavior, i.e., makes the resister to 'change' *irrational* and therefore *irrelevant* (disapproved by and therefore rejected by *"the group"*) if they persist. You don't tell the child what he is doing is wrong, you create an environment (of peer rejection) and he will figure it out on his own, making himself subject to the situation, i.e. to the world only.

George Hegel explained the *"new system of values and beliefs,"* i.e., the *"belongingness to the group"* this way: *"When a man has finally reached the point where he does not think he knows it better than others, that is when he has become indifferent to what they have done badly and he is interested only in what they have done right, then peace and affirmation have come to him."* (G. F. W. Hegel, in one of the casual notes preserved at Widener) George Hegel's *peace* is your becoming at-one-with the world, in pleasure, in the 'moment' and his *affirmation* is the 'moment' of pleasure you are having with the world being approved by others, i.e., it is the nature of the child being 'justified' over and against the father's/Father's authority. Try to run a business or a country this way and you will go into debt, having to live off of (confiscate) the parent's hard earned money or the children's inheritance (*"surplus capital"*) to continue. Hegel believed that *"the child, contrary to appearance, is the absolute, the rationality of the relationship; he is what is enduring and everlasting, the totality which produces itself once again as such* [once his feelings, thoughts, and actions and relationship with others is 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority *'system'*]." (George Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*)

In regards to the parents, i.e., the father and mother along with the children accepting *"human relationship"* (becoming at-one-with the "community") as being the 'drive' and 'purpose' of life, Hegel, sounding more like Karl Marx than Marx himself, wrote: *"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 or of subject to object* [no father's authority over the children (and husbands authority over the wife)], *the surplus is not the property of one of them* [there is no private, as in private property or business, i.e., no "My family." "Not yours."; "My property. Not yours."; "My business. Not yours"], *since their indifference is not a formal or a legal one."* There is a consequence to basing 'reality' upon the approval of men, i.e., basing right and wrong upon the pleasures of the

'moment.' Anyone who attains pleasure from your children, your spouse, your property, your business, etc., has as much "right" to them as you do.

Diaprax is the *dialectical process* (the child's nature of approaching pleasure and avoid pain, i.e., his love of the world 'liberated' from parental restraint, of doing right and not wrong according to their standards) being put into *praxis*. It is your desire for or *love of pleasure*, including (especially) *the pleasure which comes from "the approval of others,"* i.e., of "*human relationship*" and your resentment toward or *hate of restraint*, i.e., *your resentment toward the person (or persons) who or thing (or things) which prevents (inhibits or blocks) you from having the pleasure of the 'moment' you desire*, i.e., your *hate of the person or thing* which engenders the pain which comes from your missing out on the pleasure of the 'moment,' especially the pain which comes from your not being able to relate with others or being rejected by others who you desire to relate with, being put into social action. It is the Karl Marx in you, i.e. your love of pleasure and hate of restraint being put into praxis. You did not know you had Karl Marx in you, did you?

Diaprax would not work (on you and others) if he was not there, waiting to "help" you 'justify' your "self," i.e., 'justify' your and others carnal ways. When it comes to choosing between the flesh (approaching pleasure and avoiding pain, i.e., thinking and acting according to the nature of the child and the world) and the spirit of God (doing right and not doing wrong, i.e., thinking and acting according to the Father's will), i.e. the child's carnal (rebellious) nature and the father's/Father's authority "*system,*" you can not "*love*" one without "*hating*" the other. You can not "*hold to the one*" without "*despising the other.*" "*Loving*" one results in you "*hating*" the other. "*Holding to the one*" results in you "*despising the other.*" "*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* [follow after the only begotten Son of God, obeying His Father, doing His Father's will above, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to God's will] *and mammon* [follow after "*human nature*" below, i.e., where approaching pleasure and avoiding pain is the 'drive' of the 'moment' and augmenting pleasure and attenuating pain is the 'purpose' of the 'moment,' making all things subject to the world, including God]." Matthew 6:24

If you love the world—make your carnal-rebellious nature, i.e., your "*lust of the flesh,*" "*eyes,*" and "*pride of life,*" i.e., your feelings of the 'moment,' i.e., the approaching pleasure and avoiding pain your bases for

evaluating life—you must hate the father/Father and his/His authority **"system,"** i.e., you must question his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth, and challenge his authority at all times. But if you love the father/Father and his/His authority **"system"**—making his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., his/His will, i.e., his/His words, i.e. doing right and not wrong your bases for evaluating life—you must hate the world, i.e., you must accept his restraining of your carnal-rebellious nature, i.e., his/His chastening of you so that you might do what is right and not wrong, i.e., think and act according to his/His will. ***"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. 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 2:15, 16 ***"For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," "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 [rejecting the father's/Father's authority], whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards [of the world only], and not sons."*** [Hebrews 12:5-11](#)

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' which is based upon the "feelings," "sensation," or ***"sense experience,"*** i.e., ***"sensuous needs"*** and ***"sense perception"*** (Karl Marx) of the 'moment,' if you make the father's/Father's authority **"system"** the *thesis* (the issue of life), i.e., if you start with the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth and his/His right to chasten for disobedience or for doing things wrong, then the child, following after his feelings of the 'moment,' becomes the *antithesis* (the source of conflict and tension of life), resulting in a world of fathers/Fathers chastening their children for following after their feelings of the 'moment' instead of doing their father's/Father's will, preventing *synthesis* (***"oneness," "consensus"***), i.e., preventing the children from becoming at-one-with all the children of the world, i.e., preventing the child's "feelings" of the 'moment' (man's carnal nature) from becoming the bases of reality—determining what is right and what is wrong (what is good and what is evil). But if you make the child, following after his feeling of the 'moment' the *thesis* (the issue of life), then the father/Father's authority **"system"** becomes the *antithesis* (the source of conflict and tension of life), resulting in a world of children questioning their father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth and challenging his/His authority, i.e., *negating* the father's/Father's authority **"system"** in the process, thereby initiating and sustaining *synthesis* (***"oneness," "consensus"***), i.e., the children becoming at-one-with all the children of the world, with the children's "feelings" of the 'moment' (man's carnal nature) becoming the bases of 'reality'—determining what is right and what is wrong (what is good and what is evil).

When love is *of* pleasure (and not of the Father), then love (pleasure) binds you to nature, i.e. making you captive to the things of the world, i.e., making you at-one-with nature (the world) and nature (the world) at-one-with you in the 'moment.' Without chastening, i.e., without "intervention," you will find yourself, as a drug addict, forever under the influence and control of the environment or the situation of the 'moment' which offers you pleasure or the hope of attaining pleasure, your 'reasoning' ('justification') forever taken captive to the pleasures of the 'moment' (or the hope of them), as well as taken captive to those *manipulating* the environment or the situation of the 'moment,' 'justifying' them.

In his work, *Critique of Pure Reason*, Immanuel Kant could only deduct from nature that if hope is found in happiness and if happiness is found in pleasure, enjoyment, "lust," etc., and if pleasure is found in the mind, then hope can only be found within the mind becoming at one with nature (the stimulant of pleasure in the mind) in the 'moment,' i.e. that only with *thought* (emotion, i.e., that which is 'changing' with the 'changing' situations of the 'moment') becoming at-one-with *practice* (motion, i.e., that which is 'changing') and *practice* (motion) becoming at-one-with *thought* (emotion), can man and nature (the world) become one, *negating* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., faith in the process. While Kant made 'reason' equal with faith (setting them at odds with one another, retaining *antithesis*, i.e., conflict and tension), Hegel and Marx elevated 'reason' above faith, i.e., elevated the child's nature (the world) above the father's/Father's authority, engendering *synthesis*, uniting the child's nature (emotion) with nature (motion), *negating* faith (the father's/Father's authority, i.e. "right-wrong," i.e. "rigidity," i.e., absolutes) in the process. Instead of being **"lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God"** (2 Timothy 3:4), God, our Heavenly Father instructs us to set our **"affection on things above, not on things on the earth"** (Colossians 3:2), **"casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ"** (2 Corinthian 10:5).

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' world unity ("*worldly peace and socialist harmony*," i.e., "*democracy*") can not be based upon the father's/Father's authority **"system."** It can only be based upon the child's carnal-rebellious nature, i.e., "human nature," i.e., upon that which all men have in common, i.e. their love of the things of the world and their hate of restraint, *negating* the father's/Father's authority **"system"** in the process. According to Sigmund Freud, [patricide 'liberates' incest](#), i.e., incest *negates* the father's/Father's authority. To

'liberate' the child's nature (to *praxis incest*) you must *negate* the father's/Father's authority (you must *praxis patricide*). What is missing in all of this is, it is not how far down the road you have gone (you might not agree with the level of compromise, i.e., the level of immorality someone else has lowered themselves to while traveling down the road of compromise), it is the road you are on, i.e., you are either on the road of compromise, i.e. 'justifying' "*human nature*" (being silent in the midst of unrighteousness and abomination for the sake of initiating or sustaining relationships, which makes unrighteousness and abomination the "norm") or you are on the road of no compromise, i.e., obeying the father/Father, honoring his/His authority (reproving, correcting, or rebuking unrighteousness and abomination). While earthly fathers, seeking after the pleasures of the world, are not perfect, some even being tyrants or absent, their office of authority is perfect, having been given to them by God, to obey and serve Him in.

"Building relationship upon 'self interest'" establishes the child's carnal interest (approaching pleasure and avoiding pain, i.e. *sensuousness*, i.e. the child's carnal desires of the 'moment') over and against the father's/Father's authority (doing right and not wrong, i.e. with the child feeling, thinking, and acting and relating with others and the father/Father according to his/His will, i.e. according to *righteousness* (in the case of God), i.e. with the father/Father restraining the child's natural inclination to become at-one-with the world, in pleasure, in the 'moment'). Since parochialism (with local ideologies limiting the influence outside sources have upon the child), individualism (with each individual child being subject to their father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, inhibiting or blocking socialist/worldly unity, i.e. *consensus*), nationalism (with limited government, i.e., local control restraining socialist, i.e., preventing Federal programs and money from coming between the parents and their children—"helping" the children "transcend" their traditional "roots," i.e., their parent's values and beliefs, i.e., "helping" the children overcome their parent's "prejudices" and "biases," i.e., changing the way the children feeling, thinking, and acting, and relating with one another and respond toward parental authority). ***"What we call 'good teaching' is the teacher's ability to challenge the student's fixed beliefs." "There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children."*** (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*)

If your "objective" in education is to produce capitalists (an "old" world order where everyone *capitulates*, i.e., submits to a higher authority, setting aside the pleasures of the "moment" in order to get the job done right and

not wrong, indicative of a "producer" driven society) you must make sure that you 1) *preach* and *teach* commands and rules to be obeyed without question and facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith, 2) bless or reward those children who obey or do things right, 3) chasten or discipline those children who disobey or do things wrong, and 4) cast out (expel) those children who disrespect (question or challenge) your authority **"system."** In order to initiate and sustain the "old" world order, not only in the classroom but in the world as well, you must hold each child, as an individual, personally accountable for their answers or response to the fact based questions they are taught and are asked to repeat, revealing whether they have learned them or not. Regarding the capitalist nature of the father's/Father's authority, the Word of God gives us the right of private property, i.e. of *"Mine. Not yours,"* as in *"My garden, Not yours to do with as you please in defiance to my commands and rules,"* yet it does not condone us ignoring, i.e. not caring for those who do not have, i.e. the poor, the needy, and/or the helpless (Lazarus and the rich man, Luke 16:19-31 for example).

If, on the other hand, your "object" in education is to produce socialists (a "new" world order where everyone demands a "feeling" of "equality," insisting upon "enjoying" the pleasures of the 'moment' while doing any job, whether done will or not, right or wrong, indicative of a "consumer" driven society—capitalism rewards good work while socialism rewards bad work) you must make sure that you (the facilitator of 'change') "encourage" the children to 'willingly' *dialogue* their *opinions* (openly sharing with one another **how** they are "feeling" and **what** they are "thinking" in the 'moment') with no fear of reproof, correction, or rebuke, i.e., with no fear of being chastened or being cast out for their questioning or challenging of the traditional authority **"system."** (You may be cast out by the group, be asked by the facilitator to leave, or leave on your own if you refuse to participate in the *"relationship building"* process, i.e., if you question and challenge the process, with the group labeling you as being a resistor of 'change, i.e., refusing to be a *"team player,"* what in the soviet union was called *"psychological"*) By creating an **"open ended,"** i.e., *"We can talk about anything,"* **"non-directed,"** i.e., *"I am not going to tell you what is right or wrong, that is up to you to decide in the 'moment,' i.e., in the 'light' of your 'feelings' of the 'moment,' in response to the current situation,"* dialoguing opinions to a consensus environment, all the students can become at-one-with one another in their answers (in their response) to any problem (or crisis), whether the solution be right or wrong, works or does not work. The students *"relationship building skills,"* i.e., the student's socialization, i.e., the student's **"belongingness to the group,"** i.e., to the collective, i.e., to the "community," i.e., to the universal is the *"group grade," consensus, "team building"*

classroom objective.

All children (in particular, i.e. in their private thoughts) 'justify' their "self." With their *"ought,"* as in *"I ought to be able to go out,"* they 'justify,' at least to themselves in private, their carnal desires of the 'moment,' having learned that their parents *"No"* and *"Because I said so"* prevents it from happening in practice. Thus they learn to humble, deny, control, and discipline their "self" in obedience to their father's/father's will, embracing their father's/Father's authority **"system."** The facilitator's (the 'change' agent's) "job" is to "help" the children learn how to 'liberate' their "self," i.e., *"esteem"* their "self," showing them **how** to 'justify' their "self" (their carnal nature) through *"group approval,"* i.e., identifying themselves with what all children have in common, i.e., their carnal desires of the 'moment' and their resentment toward authority which restrains them, not only internally, in their thoughts but also externally, in their public actions, i.e., *"in theory and in practice"* negating the father's/Father's authority **"system"** in the process.

In the former educational **"system,"** i.e., in the "old" world order (in "old school"), the "objective" (the desired outcome) is that the children embrace and sustain the father's/Father's authority **"system,"** doing right and not wrong in all situations. In the latter educational **"system,"** i.e., in the "new" world order (in the school of innovation and 'change'), the objective (the desired outcome) is that the father's/Father's authority **"system"** (*"judgmentalism," "prejudice"*) is *negated*, not only in the children's feelings, thoughts, and actions but in their relationship with one another and the world, 'liberating' the world of Godly restraint, i.e., 'liberating' "the people" from having a *"guilty conscience"* for doing wrong, i.e., for being unrighteous and abominable, thus producing a society doing unconscionable things, i.e., killing their unborn children and elderly, and anyone else who stands in their way of "progress," i.e., preventing them from attaining their carnal pleasures of the 'moment.'

Diaprax is putting **dialogue** (the child's "feelings" of the 'moment') into **praxis**, **negating** the father's/Father's authority **"system"** in the process. When the father/Father *"discusses"* an issue with his son he does not abdicate his/His position of authority but in *"dialogue"* he becomes equal with the son in the 'moment.' ([The difference between discussion and dialogue](#) is that in *discussion* the father/Father retains his position of authority while in *dialogue* there is no father's/Father's authority position, only an *opinion*, i.e., *how* everyone is feeling and *what* they are is thinking in the 'moment,' all subject to the current situation.) There is no

father's/Father's "above-below," "top-down," "right-wrong" authority "**system**" in *dialogue*, only "equality," only **opinion** (how a child/person is *feeling* and what he is *thinking* [which is subject to his "feelings"] in the 'moment'), i.e. only the carnal 'moment.' Therefore, in *dialogue*, no one has a sense of "guilt" for disobeying the father/Father since, in *dialogue*, there is no father's/Father's authority to feel "guilty" about disobeying.

It was through *dialogue*, through the use of the *dialectic process*, i.e. getting the "children" to share (especially with one another) what they are talking to themselves about in the 'moment,' i.e., their *feelings* and their thoughts, which are taken captive to their *feelings* of the 'moment,' i.e. 1) their desire(s) of the 'moment,' 2) their resentment towards anything or anyone who is preventing, i.e., inhibiting or blocking them from attaining that which they want in the 'moment,' along with 3) their desire for approval or acceptance—with approval from two or more (of differing positions) 1) desiring the same pleasures, 2) resenting authority which prevents (inhibits or blocks) them from attaining it (which requires the 'compromising' of established positions, i.e. the father's/Father's authority in order to initiate and sustain the relationship), having greater influence, i.e. offering a greater opportunity to attain the pleasures of the 'moment' than approval from the one in authority, where relationship is based upon an established position, i.e. theirs, i.e. with you doing right and not wrong according to their will and standards, missing out on the pleasures of the 'moment'—and 4) their resentment (hate or fear) of disapproval or rejection—which 'changes' **from** the one, i.e., from the authority figure **to** the two or more, i.e. to "**the group**" as **pleasure** (the child's *feelings*) **supersedes** (becomes the issue of focus instead of) **doing right and not wrong** (the father's/Father's authority), that Satan was able to deceive the woman in the garden in Eden (and every man since). [Genesis 3:1-6](#)

Jesus would not *dialogue* with the devil. Instead He *preached, taught, and lived* the words of His Father, "**It is written**" Jesus said: "**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 His whole ministry depended upon His Father's authority. ([John 17](#)) "**For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father who sent me, he gave me commandment what I should say, and what I should speak.**" John 12:49 and He has called us all to do the same. "**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 fact Jesus came that we might come to know His Heavenly Father as our Father. "**And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.**" Matthew 23:9 Jesus (the obedient Son of our Heavenly Father), who, by his death on the cross,

'redeeming' us from His Father's wrath upon us for our sins (for our disobedience) is the only one who, through his resurrection from the grave, can 'reconcile' us to His Heavenly Father. ***"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

Praxis of the dialectic process is anathema to the Gospel, it rejects the Father's authority. No one can keep their faith in the Son and His Heavenly Father and *praxis* dialectic 'reasoning'—'justifying' their carnal feelings, thoughts, and actions of the 'moment' and their relationships with others, who are likewise 'justifying' themselves. It is only in the Son, i.e. in His obedience to His Heavenly Father that we have eternal life, i.e., that we are saved from Hell and eternal death. ***"And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever."*** [1 John 2:15-18](#) Without the only begotten Son there is no Father and without the Father there is no only begotten Son, with the Holy Spirit bearing witness of both. ***"But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him."*** I Corinthians 8:6 ***"And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."*** 1 John 3:1

Although the Son, Jesus Christ, is equal with God, He, as a son before his father, humbled Himself (taking on the form of a man), and did what we could not do, He did all things which were commanded of Him by His Heavenly Father, i.e. He lived righteously. His righteousness is therefore imputed to all who have faith in Him and His Heavenly Father. By shedding His blood on the cross, to 'redeem' us from His Father's wrath upon us for our sins, i.e., for our disobedience, and by His resurrecting from the grave He 'reconciled' us to His Heavenly Father. ***"Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."*** Philippians 2:5-11

Dialectic 'reasoning' *negates* the Father-Son "top-down" relationship. It *negates* the gospel message. By making *sensuousness* ("*sense experience*," i.e., pleasing the flesh, i.e., pleasing man), not *righteousness*

(pleasing the Father, doing right and not wrong according to the Father's will) the ground of being, faith is *negated*. **"So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God."** Romans 8:8 **"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 "Enlightenment," i.e. dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e. self 'justification,' i.e. aufheben, i.e. *dialoguing* your *opinion* with others to a *consensus*, i.e. to a feeling of "oneness," *negates* the Father-Son "top-down" relationship in your thoughts and actions. It, leaving you sufficient, i.e. "righteous" "in and for" yourself, *negating* (blinding you to) the gospel message and your hope of eternal life, leaving you in darkness and eternal death instead. **"Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness."** Luke 11:35

The "new world order" is as "new" as [Genesis 3:1-6](#), the first *praxis* of dialectic 'reasoning'—the art-craft of *seduction, deception, and manipulation* upon which the "new world order" is being initiated and sustained. It is man's attempt to *negate* [Hebrews 1: 5-11](#) (the father's/Father's authority "**system**") and [Romans 7:14-25](#) (the "guilty conscience" for disobedience), i.e., to *negate* the "old world order," thereby *negating* the Father's and His obedient Son's solution, i.e., faith in the Father, in the Son, and in the Word, i.e., living and walking by the Holy Spirit. Hegel, Marx, and Freud focused upon 'liberating' the child/man from the father/Father by exalting (esteeming) the nature of the child over and against the father's authority, *negating* the father's authority "**system**" in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions, as well as in his relationship other children in the process. Dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., the 'liberation' of children from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority from society is the foundation upon which the *theory and practice* of the "new" world order is based.

Karl Marx wrote: **"once the earthly family** [with the earthly father's authority '**system**'] **is discovered to be the secret of the holy family** [with the Heavenly Father's authority '**system**'], **the former** [the earthly father's authority '**system**'] **must itself be annihilated** [*vernichtet*] **theoretically and practically** [in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions and in his relationship with others]." (Karl Marx, *Theses On Feuerbach* #4) Sigmund Freud wrote: **"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** [that the father's/Father's authority '**system**' no longer has relevance in and for the family]." (Sigmund Freud as quoted in Herbart Marcuse, *Eros*

and Civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud)

The child's nature is to approach pleasure, including the pleasure of approval which comes from the father (the "one" in authority, i.e. the "old" world order) or from the other children ("the group," the many in common, i.e. the "new" world order) and to avoid pain, including the pain of disapproval (rejection) which comes from the father (the "old" world order) or from the children ("the groups," the many in common, i.e. the "new" world order), with the former engendering the conscience and individualism (doing right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's will, restraining or blocking the impulses and urges of the 'moment') and the latter engendering the super-ego and socialism (the children 'driven' by pleasure, therefore 'purposed' in augmenting pleasure, not for only for themselves but for all the world as well). "Self," as in "your-'self,'" desires two things, i.e. pleasure and the approval of others (both of which are from nature), i.e., either from the parent (the "one") or "the group" (the "many"). "Equality" can only be found in "the group," i.e. in the many, i.e. in nature.

Therefore, to move from consciousness (where the child is subject to parental authority), to self-consciousness (where the child is dissatisfied with parental authority), to self-actualization (to where the child is 'liberated' or 'liberating' his "self" from parental authority), the child most progressively distance himself from the father's (the parent's) authority "**system**" while "building relationship" with "the group." i.e. "build relationship" upon that which he has in common with all children, i.e. his "*self interest*" of approaching/augmenting pleasure and avoiding/attenuating pain, i.e., 'discovering' him "self" and the "self" of others through the *dialoguing* of *opinions*, i.e., 'discovering' what all children have in common with all the children uniting in *consensus*, i.e., uniting upon "*human nature*" only. Those of dialectic 'reasoning' seek to 'create' a "new" order of the world where all the children of the world can become "one," not only in their personal thoughts but also in their social actions, *negating* the father's/Father's authority in the process.

Isn't it strange that no matter how clear you make the truth, people still refuse to see it, having to accept it by faith, even though it is in plain sight for all to see. Your love for the things of this world (of sight), i.e. seeking to become at-one-with the world, in pleasure, in the 'moment' (*aufheben*, i.e., 'justifying' your "self" in the 'moment,' i.e. making all things subject to your "feelings" of the 'moment,' which are passing away, making you subject to eternal death) blinds you to the love of your Heavenly Father, who chastens you that you might partake in His holiness, i.e. that you might inherit eternal life instead. As a father desires to bless his children,

giving them toys to play with, he often finds that the child is more in love with the blessing, with the toys, than with him. Such is the situation with man. Dialectic 'reasoning' is built upon this ground, i.e. the children's carnal heart, i.e., his love for the things of the world. It is 'driven' by the children's carnal nature, 'purposed' in 'liberating' the children from the father's authority, with the children becoming lovers of pleasure more than lovers of the father/Father (of God). The pilgrims came to America from religiously free Holland for this very reason, for the sake of their children, because they were losing them to the culture of their day. William Bradford wrote: ***"But that which was more lamentable, and of all sorrows most heavy to be borne, was that many of their children, by these occasions, and the great licentiousness of youth in that country and the manifold temptations of the place, were drawn away by evil examples into extravagant and dangerous courses..."*** (William Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, pg. 108)

How would you like to be a father whose children never thank him for the many gifts he has given and continues to give them, having pleasure in the gifts only. The next breath they take is a gift from God. Every breath you have ever taken or will take is a gift from Him. Are you thanking Him for the next breath He has give you or are you using it for your "self" and the world only. Are you talking to Him and thanking Him and His Son, who 'redeemed' you by His shed blood upon the cross, covering your sins from the Father's wrath upon you (for your sins), and who, by His resurrection from the grave 'reconciled' you to His Heavenly Father, who, along with the Father filled you with His Holy Spirit so that you might know His Love, Joy, and Peace in this life, in order that you not only know Him in this life but, after your last breath here, spend eternity with Him. Place you hope in Him and not in the pleasures of the 'moment,' in order to not spend eternity in Hell and torment with the unredeemed, with those who, rejecting God as their savior, who take their next breath without thanking Him, who, followed after Satan (the master facilitator of 'change') and his angels, chase after the pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., who, rejecting His justification by faith, 'justified' themselves, i.e., their carnal nature ("*human nature*") instead.

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light,

because their deeds were evil." John 3:16-19

© *Institution for Authority Research*, Dean Gotcher 2015