

authorityresearch.com

Cash Flow - Moving "Cash Flow" From The Local To The Global.

(From The Specific To The General; From The Father's Authority To The Child's/Man's Carnal Nature.)

([Personal note.](#))

by

Dean Gotcher

"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

God is interested in your soul. He is interested in where you will spend eternity. It is man who is interested in your cash (not your soul, unless cash is involved). He is interested in what he can get out of you to feed his own *lusts*. "Cash flow," i.e., how you spend cash reflects your interest either in doing right and not wrong according to what you have been *told*, i.e., restraining your *self* in order to do the father's/Father's will (which is local, engendering individualism under parent/God—once you go beyond the one, compromise sets in, which is based upon feelings, which includes *lusts*; plural in that it is *lust* for pleasure and *lust* for approval or *affirmation* from others) or in enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates*, i.e., pleasing the flesh (which is global, i.e., universal, i.e., common to all). By 'discovering' (through *dialogue*) what you are *lusting* after, i.e., what you are *wanting*, i.e., your *self interest* those "*of (and for) the world*" will offer to help you attain it. Gaining your trust ("they have your best interest in mind") a.k.a "*building relationship*" with you they "own" you, using you to attain and satisfy their own *lusts*, with you *affirmation*. The father's/Father's authority is external (as Karl Marx saw it "*an alien and hostel force*") to your *senses*, i.e., is external to your understanding, i.e., is "*external authority*" (as Kurl Lewin called a "*negative force field*" to the flesh) which authors established commands, rules, facts, and truth and enforces them (rewarding those who do right and obey, correcting those who do wrong, chastening those who disobey, judging, condemning, casting out those who question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack authority) while pleasure ([dopamine emancipation](#)) (a "*positive force field*" to the flesh) is internal, i.e., is your *senses* which

directly ties you to the world—thus called *stimulus-response*. (Whenever you are in a meeting or classroom being asked to be "positive" and not "negative" this is what it is all about, i.e., somebody is out to buy and sell your soul, there is no other purpose.) It is not that pleasure is bad in itself, God created it. It is when pleasure gets in the way of doing the father's/Father's will it becomes an act of disobedience, i.e., sin, where *lust negates* the father's/Father's authority (in the mind of the individual)—until the father/Father steps in, in person or via the *guilty conscience*. The father/Father will sacrifice for you (if you submit to his/His authority). Those "*of (and for) the world*" will sacrifice you (if you get in the way of their *lusts*).

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

This is all very important since "cash flow" is determined and controlled by these two interests, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., *humbling, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating your self*, i.e., *denying your lusts* in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth and *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates*, i.e., that the current situation and/or object, people, or person is *stimulating*. Traditional business, i.e., culture is based upon the former, i.e., is not readily adaptable to 'change,' i.e., is not made subject to *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it (not responding to the impulses and urges of the 'moment'), i.e., is intolerant of immoral (deviant) behavior, requiring those under authority to do what they are *told* while contemporary business, i.e., cooperativism, globalism is based upon the latter, i.e., is readily adaptable to 'change,' i.e., is subject to *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it (responding to the impulses and urges of the 'moment'), i.e., is tolerant of immoral (deviant) behavior, requiring "the people" to be non-judgmental aka not "prejudice" (which in itself is prejudice against authority). While the earthly father is of the flesh, i.e., born into sin and the heavenly Father knows no sin both have the same "top-down" system of authority (with the heavenly Father's authority superseding the earthly). It is the system itself (*paradigm*, i.e., way of feeling, thinking, and behaving toward *self*, others, the world, and

authority) that is of interest to those *"of (and for) the world."* *Negate* the system (obedience to authority, i.e., fear of being judged, condemned, cast out) and you *negate* both the earthly father and the heavenly Father's authority and therefore the issue of sin, i.e., having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates* instead of doing the father's/Father's will.

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

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly," Psalms 1: 1a

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

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

Not caring about your soul, i.e., where you (or he) will spend eternity man (thinking "What can I get out of this situation and/or object, people, or person for my *self*") will buy and sell your soul for the pleasures of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates*, casting you aside when you no longer serve his purpose, i.e., when you no longer bring him pleasure, when you cost him time and money, or when you get in his way, i.e., when you become a pain, doing to you what you did to the Father (thinking "What can I get out of God for my *self*"), not caring about your soul, i.e. where you will spend eternity, casting Him aside for not bringing you pleasure, for costing you time and money, or for getting in your way, i.e., for being a pain.

"From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not,

because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts." James 4:1-3 (Read [James chapters 4 and 5](#) for the total picture.)

"The heart is deceitful above all things [thinking pleasure, i.e., lust is the standard for "good" instead of doing the father's/Father's will], and desperately wicked [hating anyone preventing, i.e., inhibiting or blocking it from enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' it lusts after]: who can know it?" Jeremiah 17:9

It can not see its [hatred toward the father's/Father's authority](#) as being evil, i.e., *"wicked,"* i.e., *"desperately wicked"* because its *lust* for pleasure is standing in the way, 'justifying' the hate. ([Mark 7:21-23](#))

With money being in the eyes "of the world" "stored up pleasure," how much deceit because of it and fighting over it has gone on down through the ages? Even in the home. "Cash flow" reflects the heart of man. It is either made subject to doing the father's/Father's will or made subject to satisfying man's *lusts*, i.e., man's *self interest* of the 'moment' that the current situation and/or object, people, or person is *stimulating*, i.e., it is subject either to doing right and not wrong according to what you have been *told*, i.e. to what the father/Father says, i.e., to *belief-action dichotomy* (since you are tempted to think and act, and have thought and acted contrary to what you believe or say you believe) or subject to your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*, i.e., to *stimulus-response*. *"Building relationship upon self interest,"* i.e., upon *lust* is the hallmark of Marxism, globalism, where, when it comes to "cash flow" the father's/Father's authority (restraint) must be *negated*, i.e., must no longer be recognized (accepted) in order (as in "new" world order) for the Marxist, globalist (and you) to sin (use the "cash flow" to satisfy his/your own *lusts*) without being judged, condemned, cast out, removing anyone who gets in the way, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous without having a *guilty conscience*—you must sell your soul to the Marxist, globalist, i.e., those *"of (and for) the world,"* i.e., suspend the truth, as upon a cross in order for you to be of any worth (social worth). Fellowship is different since it is build upon commands, rules, facts, and

truth that is external to the individuals impulses and urges of the 'moment,' i.e., "feelings." While feelings might be present they are not the driving force in the fellowship, truth is. Individualism, under God having been *negated* in the mind of those "*of (and for) the world,*" 'justifying' their actions will martyr anyone holding onto the father's/Father's authority system, for "the good" of "the group," i.e., for the "good" of society, i.e., for the "good" of the psychotherapist, the Marxist, the globalist (who want total control of the "cash flow" without being judged, condemned, cast out, i.e., without fearing God, i.e., without having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*). Marxism is the praxis of carrying on a conversation with your *self* and with others without it coming to your mind what God (or parent) would say or do (wants you to say or do)—refusing to listen to and accept any one who does, being able therefore to remove (silence, censor, excommunicate, imprison, torture [mentally and/or physically], kill) them without having a *guilty conscience*.

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

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

It is to simple: to move "cash flow" out from under local control, i.e., out from under the father's/Father's authority system moving it into the globalist's control the individual's *lust*, i.e., *self interest* (which is common to all) must be identified and 'justified,' allowing the Marxist, globalist, social-psychologist to come between those in authority and those under it, turning them against those in authority, resulting in their turning their soul and the "cash flow" over to them. *When cooperate Walmart came into a community, local business' were closed, resulting in local cash going to Communist China with its slave camps. Walmart literally became a Communist outlet store, moving the "cashflow" out from under the localist's control to the globalist's control. The same being true for all cooperate activity across America and around the world (called a culture war) with lust for money, i.e., control of the "cash flow" being the 'driving'*

force, done of course in the name of "the people." It is the middle-class, with its do right and not wrong (according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) attitude that brings the "cash flow" back to local control, i.e., to the father's/Father's authority. This is why the globalists seek to destroy (negate) the middle-class—with its recognition of and propagation of the father's/Father's authority system. Many quotations are given below, by those "of (and for) the world" which confirm their agenda—the negation of the father's authority in the family (the negation of the traditional family) and the negation of the Father's authority in the individual's life (the negation of individualism, under God).

- pg.
- 7 "Human nature." Carl Rogers.
- 8 The father's/Father's authority (system).
- 12 Judgment (accountability).
- 15 "Cash flow" and *dialogue vs. discussion*.
- 17 Jürgen Habermas, György Lukács and the use of *dialogue* along with the *consensus* process to *negate* the father's/Father's authority (to *negate* the father's/Father's control over the "cash flow")
- 20 Georg Hegel, etc.,
- 21 The 'problem' with the law.
- 23 Mao Zedong on unity, i.e., on "the group" and Karl Marx on pleasure, i.e., on *lust*. Until you bring to two ("the group" and *lust*) together you can not have 'change.' The *guilty conscience*. Why it has to be *negated* and how.
- 25 Karl Marx on sin, i.e., making "Critical Criticism," i.e., rebellion and revolution the law of the land
- 27 Karl Marx on 'change,' i.e., *negating* the father's/Father's authority system (absolutes). The use of psychology to engender 'change,' i.e., to 'liberate' *self* from the father's/Father's authority.
- 28 The "Frankfurt School," Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, "*Bloom's Taxonomies*," Vladimir Lenin, Warren Bennis, Ralph Tyler, James Coleman, et al. and the use of psychology to *negate* the father's/Father's authority (to *negate* the father's/Father's control of the "cash flow").
- 32 The meaning of cash. Using the "scientific method," i.e., "behavior science" to 'liberate' man and the "cash flow" from the father's/Father's

authority.

35 The "*negation of negation*," i.e., the *negation* of the *guilty conscience*. How it is done (Kurt Lewin).

36 Law, making it subject to human nature instead of subject to the father's/Father's authority. How it was done in the garden in Eden.

45 Immanuel Kant, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, et al.

47 The "tower of Babel," socialism, and "group think" and its effect upon the individual, under the father's/Father's authority.

48 Whoever defines terms for you control your life, i.e., whoever control the environment where you are learning what is right and what is wrong behavior controls the outcome.

51 Martin Luther and individualism, under God.

53 Karl Marx, *negating* individualism, under God, i.e., 'liberating' the individual out from under the father's/Father's authority by "*building relationship upon self interest*" which unites man upon his carnal nature, establishing *lust over* and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, moving "cash flow" from the local (from the father's/Father's authority system) to the global (to the facilitator of 'change's,' i.e., psychotherapist's, i.e., the Marxist's control).

54 It is either one or the other, i.e., the Father or the world. You can not serve both. America was founded upon the father's/Father's authority, i.e., individualism, under God.

55 The use of the Federal Government and its control over education (through its use of "Bloom's Taxonomies," i.e., Marxist curriculum (pg. 49) in the classroom) to *negate* local control, i.e., to *negate* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to *negate* individualism, under God.

64 The use of Heraclitis to 'change' America, i.e., to *negate* the father's/Father's authority in establishing rules, policies, and making law, i.e., to 'change' how people are to think and act (behave).

65 The lie of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" and Therapy *negates* the father's/Father's authority.

68 What God's Word says about all this. Endnotes (overview)

"All that is in the world," 1. *"the lust of the flesh,"* i.e., your ability to become aware of and desire, i.e., *lust* after whatever it is that *stimulates* pleasure (*dopamine emancipation* in you), 2. *"the lust of the eyes,"* i.e.,

your ability to look into the environment to 'discover' and then think upon, i.e., *lust* after that which *stimulates* pleasure (*dopamine emancipation* in you, i.e., [aufheben](#)), which in itself *stimulates* pleasure (*dopamine emancipation* in you), and 3. "*the pride of life*," i.e., your ability to control the environment, i.e., the current situation and/or object, people, or person that *stimulates* pleasure (*dopamine emancipation* in you), in order to have pleasure (*dopamine emancipation*) over and over again (without restraint) with man's approval (*affirmation*) "*is not of the Father*" i.e., is not of He who restrains, i.e., who says "Can not," "Must not," "Thou shalt not," i.e., who sets limits and measures "*but is of the world*," i.e., is of (and for) *self* only, i.e., is only subject to *stimulus-response*, i.e., approach pleasure and avoid pain (which includes the pain of missing out on pleasure). The world *stimulates lust*. It is *lust* then that draws man back to (to be at-one-with) the world—in disobedience to the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., to what he has been *told* (that gets in the way of *lust*). If all that "is" is *stimulus-response*, i.e., is "*of the world*" then all a man has to do is 'create' a specific environment or condition for another man and he will do what he (the 'creator' of the environment) wants, without having a *guilty conscience* (which is engendered by the father's/Father's authority). The idea being "create a 'healthy' environment and you can 'create' a healthy person" which carnal man defines (disregarding the sinful nature of man which the father/Father defines), i.e., 'create' an environment where another man's *lusts*, i.e., *lust* for pleasure and *lust* for *affirmation* (imagined or real) are free to be expressed (shared), offer to "help" him achieve them and you "own" him, i.e., you can make money, i.e., feed your *lusts* off of him. The 'justification' of *lust* is what "*Building relationship upon self interest*" is all about. God (our creator) created us to praise and worship Him but *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it got in the way, resulting in us praising and worshiping our *self*, i.e., *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it instead. In this way if you can gain access to another man's *lust* and *affirm* it, you can gain access to his "cash flow," using him, i.e., it to satisfy your *lusts*. As Carl Rogers, the famous psychotherapist so clearly explained it:

"If we have the power or authority to establish the necessary conditions, the predicted behaviors [our potential ability to influence or control the behavior of groups] will follow." "We can choose to use our growing

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

Taken captive to *lust* your soul is no longer free to do the father's/Father's will, i.e., to do right and not wrong according to his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth, receiving the father's/Father's blessings (having sold your soul to the world, i.e., to the social psychologist, Marxist, globalist instead).

God established *stimulus-response* aka approach pleasure and avoid pain in nature. While man's flesh (the law of the flesh) is subject to *stimulus-response* his soul (being *told* what is right and what is wrong behavior) is not. In order for those "*of (and for) the world*" to do what they want (*lust* after pleasure without restraint, i.e., without having a *guilty conscience*), God must be *negated*, establishing *stimulus-response*, i.e., approach pleasure and avoid pain as the right (only) way for man to think and act (behave) if he is to become his *self*, i.e., only "*of (and for) the world.*"

The father's/Father's authority (system) is based upon the father/Father authoring commands and rules to be obeyed as given (as *told*), facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith and applied (requiring His children to *humble, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self*, i.e., *deny* their *lusts* in order to do right and not wrong and apply them), enforcing them

(correcting his/His children when they do wrong, chastising them when they disobey, judging, condemning, casting them out, i.e., grounding them if they question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack him/Him and his/His authority.

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

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

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

Without restraint, i.e., "governance" children will use the "cash flow" to fulfill their *lusts*, oppressing "the people."

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

"As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." Isaiah 3:12

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

"For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Romans 5:19

The gospel message is all about the Son's obedience to the Father, in His obedience (even to death on the cross, on our behalf) 'redeeming' us from the Father's wrath upon us for our disobedience—for being [children of disobedience](#).

"I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." John 5:30; 12:47-50

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

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

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

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

"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

"I and my Father are one." John 10:30 "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." Matthew 10:32, 33 ". . . he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; . . . Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake." John 14:9-11 ". . . for my Father is greater than I." John 14:28 "He that hateth me hateth my Father also." John 15:23 ". . . the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" John 18:11 "And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine be done." Luke 2:49; 22:42 "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost." Luke 23:46 "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." "for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." John 14:16, 17, 20, 26, John 16:7

Traditional education reinforces the father's/Father's authority system with the teacher 1) *preaching* established commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaching* established facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith, and *discussing* with the students any question(s) they might have regarding the commands, rules, facts, and truth being taught, at the teacher's descretion, i.e., providing he or she deems it necessary, has time, the

students are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking authority, 2) *rewarding* the students who do right and obey, 3) correcting and/or *chastening* the student who does wrong and/or disobeys, that he might learn to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* his "self" in order to do right and not wrong according to the established commands, rules, facts, and truth he has been taught (*told*), i.e., in order to do the father's/Fathers' will, and 4) *judging, condemning, casting out* (grounding/expelling) any student who questions, challenges, defies, disregards, attacks the father's/Father's authority system, engendering a *guilty conscience* in the students when they do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., when they *lust* (daydream) instead of doing what they are *told*, which retains the father's/Father's authority system in the students thoughts, directly effecting their actions, resulting in the students KNOWING right from wrong from being *told* (especially when it comes to behavior).

The 'justification' of *lust negates* the father's/Father's authority in the thoughts of the person, effecting his actions, making him subject to (a servant of) the one(s) 'justifying' his *lust*, using him for their own pleasure, throwing him away when he not longer brings them pleasure, costs them money and time, or gets in their way, doing to him what he did to the father/Father for not bringing him pleasure, costing him money and time, and getting in his way. It is a vicious *praxis* when your soul (where you will spend eternity) is at stake.

"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

On the day of judgment man has nothing to bring to the table (even his "good works" in "the name of the Lord" will not count). He can only rely upon what the Father has provided, i.e., His Son, who died for his sins—but his name has to already be entered into "the lambs book of life."

"Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many

wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matthew 7:22-23

You are saved not because you do "God's work," i.e., "good works." You have to die to your *self*, i.e., deny your *lusts* (daily) in order for Him to do His work *through* you. He will share His glory with no one.

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

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

"Woe unto them that call evil ["human nature," i.e., lust] good, and good [the Father's authority] evil; that put darkness [pleasure] for light, and light [obedience to the Father] for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!" Isaiah 5:20, 21

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

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

"The words 'seem to' are significant; it is the perception which functions in guiding behavior ['liberating' the child/man from who "IS," i.e., from the Father's authority]." (Rogers) Since no man has seen God at any time, his perception is Godless, making himself God, i.e., the decider of right and wrong behavior.

In the garden in Eden they had the choice of either doing the "Father's" will, by faith doing what they were *told* to do (not doing what they were *told* not to do) or following their senses (what made sense to them, i.e., "*leaning to their understanding*") doing their will instead (doing what they were *told* not to do).

"Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life."

Proverbs 4:23 "Keep your heart tender before the Lord." (Kay Rea) If you don't the world will "own" you, i.e., you will lose your soul.

"I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart." "Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee." Psalms 40:8, 119:11

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

When "cash flow" is subject to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., subject to the father's/Father's control, i.e., subject to his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth it stays local (subject to the one above—you can not get any more local than the father's authority in the home, than the Father's authority over your soul, which engenders a *guilty conscience* and a fear of being judged, condemned, cast out for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*, anything beyond requires compromise—with two fathers you can "play the game" without having a *guilty conscience*—*lust* being the name of the game). When "cash flow" becomes subject to children (the child's carnal nature) it no longer remains local, i.e., under the father's/Father's authority, it becomes global, i.e., subject to

the carnal nature of men (what all men have in common), i.e., subject to those "of (and for) *the world*" only, i.e., under the control of those who "help" children "*build relationship upon self interest,*" i.e., upon their natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and hate restraint, i.e., hate the father's/Father's authority (for *telling* them what they can and can not do, inhibiting or blocking them from doing what they *want*, having to do what they are *told* instead). Those "of (and for) *the world*," having rejected the father's/Father's authority have to *negate* the system or *paradigm* (called *Patriarchal Paradigm*) itself in the minds of men, 'changing' their behavior in order for men to follow after them, doing their will instead—supporting them in their use of the "cash flow" to feed their *lusts*, removing those who get in their way. *Lust* (the 'justification' of it) makes it easy.

When it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior (way of feeling, thinking, and acting toward *self*, others, the world, and authority) by replacing *discussion* (which retains the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the father/Father has the final say; whether the father is right or not, he could be wrong it is the right-wrong way of thinking that is being supported in a *discussion*) with *dialogue* (there is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process, there is only the individuals *lust* for pleasure and resentment toward restraint, i.e., the desire for 'change,' i.e., how the world "ought" to be according to the individual's *lusts*) the father's/Father's authority is *negated*, the child's carnal desires, i.e., *self interests*, i.e., *lusts* having taken its place—*dialogue negates discussion*, i.e., the child's carnal desires (*lust*), i.e., *self interests*, when 'justified' (which *dialogue* does) *negates* the father's/Father's authority (*negates* having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth) when it is used to establish right and wrong behavior.

"In an ordinary discussion people usually hold relatively fixed positions and argue in favour of their views as they try to convince others to change." (Bohm and Peat, *Science, Order, and Creativity*)

Discussion emanates from established commands, rules, facts, and truth. *Discussion* divides upon either being/doing right or being/doing wrong

according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., KNOWING from being *told*, which is formal, i.e., judgmental. The father/Father retains his authority in *discussion*, i.e., has the final say, i.e., "*Because I said so,*" "*Never the less,*" "*It is written.*" Majority vote retains the father's/Father's authority system although the father might lose out on the particular issue at hand.

"It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately." (Kurt Lewin in Kenneth Benne, [*Human Relations in Curriculum Change*](#))

Discussion maintains *fellowship* around an accepted command, rule, fact, or truth, with the focus being upon doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth whereas *dialogue* initiates and sustains *relationship* around common "feelings" and desires, i.e., *self interests*, i.e., *lusts*, with the focus being upon compromise (setting aside established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., suspending the truth, as upon a cross) in order to "get along," i.e., in order to have the approval of men, i.e., in order to 'create' "worldly peace and socialist harmony," i.e., in order to have access to and control of the "cash flow." "*Top-down decision making,*" i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., "prejudice" is *negated* in *dialogue*. Under the father's/Father's authority system you can *dialogue* all you want about what you have been *told* you can do. You can not *dialogue* about what you have been *told* you can not do. If you do the father's/Father's authority is under attack, i.e., is *negated* since there is no "can not" in *dialogue*—except *telling* others what they can not do, you can not tell others what they can not do. Anyone insisting upon *discussion*, i.e., holding onto established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., bringing the father's/Father's authority system into a room that is using *dialogue* to establish right and wrong behavior, i.e., to make law is going to be martyred.

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

Dialogue emanates from the child's (and the facilitator of 'change's, i.e., the psychotherapist's, i.e., the Marxist's) "*feelings*," i.e., from his "*I feel*" and/or "*I think*," i.e., from his *opinion*, which is informal, i.e., non-judgmental, i.e., open-ended. The child (and the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the psychotherapist, i.e., the Marxist) retains his carnal nature in *dialogue*, i.e., has the final say against authority, i.e., against absolutes that get in the way of his natural inclination to *lust*, i.e., against the father's/Father's authority (system). There is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only the child's (and the facilitator of 'change's,' i.e., the psychotherapist's, i.e., the Marxist's) natural inclination to "*lust . . .*" being 'justified.' *Dialogue* moves *opinions* to a *consensus*, *negating* the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* it engenders in the process.

Perceiving his self as being the personification of "*the people*," who, like him *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the moment the world *stimulates*, the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the psychotherapist, i.e., the Marxist sees it his duty to 'justify' "*the people's*" natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and hate restraint in order to 'justify' his natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and hate restraint. By 'justifying' their *lusts*, i.e., their *self interests* he "owns" them, i.e., they will follow after, serve, protect, defend, praise, worship him. When you question his actions he will respond with "It is not just about you," really meaning "It is all about me, so I can *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience*, with your *affirmation*. If you refuse to *affirm* me, i.e., my *lusts* or get in my way 'the people' will remove (negate) you (since having 'justifying' their *lusts* I now 'own' them). It appears I must keep an eye on you from now on for my 'good.'" The meaning of "sight based management."

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

"Only when the immediate interests [lusts, i.e., self interests] are integrated into a total view and related to the final goal of the process do they become

revolutionary [overthrowing the father's/Father's authority, making what "the group," i.e., what the many below think (and will do for and to you) more important than what the father/Father, i.e., the one above thinks (and does and will do to you)]." (Lukács)

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

Rejecting the father's/Father's authority, those *"of (and for) the world"* place themselves in a position where they can "help" people in a crisis, so they can move communication from *discussion* to *dialogue*, controlling the outcome (the "cash flow"). "Cash flow" when made subject to *discussion* keeps it local, i.e., under the father's/Father's authority. When made subject to *dialogue*, i.e., to the child's carnal nature it goes global, under the control of those *"of (and for) the world"* only.

Follow the "cash flow." "Cash flow" is either making money (as stored up reserve) subject to doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., *humbling, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating self*, i.e., *denying lust* in order (as in "old" world order) to get the job done (done right), in order to take care of family, i.e., those under the father's/Father's authority, i.e., subject to doing right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., subject to doing what you have been *told*, with there being a consequence (accountability) as well as a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* (instead of doing what you were *told*—a *belief-action dichotomy*; where you do not always *act* in accordance to your *belief*) or making money (as stored up pleasure, i.e., [dopamine emancipation](#)) subject to *lust*, i.e., subject to enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*

(*stimulus-response*) without being judged, condemned, cast out, i.e., without having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., in order (as in "new" world order) to *lust* with impunity. Which describes much of our nation and leadership today.

It is being corrected and chastised (being held accountable) for not *humbling, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating one's self*, i.e., for not *denying* one's *lusts* in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth that initiates and sustains the *guilty conscience*. It is the *guilty conscience* that initiates and sustains the father's/Father's authority system (the *Patriarchal paradigm*, i.e., the father's/Father's way of feeling, thinking, and behaving toward *self*, others, the world, and authority) in the community, thereby initiating and sustaining the father's/Father's control over the "cash flow." It is the *questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking* of the father's/Father's authority that leads to judgment, condemnation, and damnation, i.e., being cast out, i.e., being cut off from having any access to the "cash flow," with the father "cutting the child out of the will," and the Father cutting man out of life after death (being instead cast into [the lake of fire that is never quenched](#), prepared for the master facilitator of 'change' and all who follow after him, Revelation 19:20; 20:10, 14, 15)

"Cash flow" is all about *who* controls the cash, either the father/Father controls it, who requires the child to *deny* his *lusts* in order to do right and not wrong according to his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do his/His will or the child controls it, using it to gain and retain control of the world, i.e., the situation and/or object, people, or person who *stimulates lust* in him, in order to enjoy *lust (dopamine emancipation)* over and over again, without restraint ("till death dost he depart"). There once was a time when parents taught (and expected) their children to do right and not wrong no matter what happened to them or came their way. Then came a time where they wanted their children to have a "better life." It is not that there is anything wrong with having a "better life," as long as you do right and not wrong in order to attain and retain it. The marriage vow followed in suit. It once said "for better or for worse, till death do you part." It now has an unwritten, i.e., hidden (not so

much) clause that says "till someone 'better' comes along." The issue of [divorce](#) comes into view here.

"The philosopher Hegel said that truth is not found in the thesis nor the antithesis but in an emerging synthesis which reconciles the two." (Martin Luther King Jr. Strength to Love)

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

Although it was Fichte not Hegel who used the words *thesis*, *antithesis*, and *synthesis* the concept was there meaning while the father held to his position (doing right and not wrong according to his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., doing his/His will) and the child to his position (doing what he *wanted*, i.e., doing his will), 'reconciliation' could only come as a result of what they both had in common, their natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure, requiring compromise, i.e., setting aside their position ("I'm right and your wrong"). In order for *synthesis*, i.e., the *"building of relationship"* with one another to become reality, both the child's and the father's *"self interests,"* i.e., *lusts* have to come into play—the child's *lust* for "relationship" with the world, i.e., [affirmation](#) from "his 'friends,'" the father's *lust* for "relationship" with (approval from) the child, moving the "cash flow" away from the local control, i.e., out from under the father's/Father's control of it to global control, i.e., to be used on what the father and the child have in common, i.e., *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it. Reconciliation in this formula is therefore between the flesh and the world, i.e., man and his nature, i.e., man and mankind not between the creator and the created, i.e., God and man, thus leaving God (the Father) out, unless He compromises, i.e., He sets aside His position, i.e., He *negates* His laws in order to have relationship with man. We fellowship

with one another around what (or who) is external to us, that we have accepted as true (the truth). We develop relationship with one another based upon what we can gain from the relationship, i.e., what makes us "feel" "good." The gospel message is not the Lord *negating* the law, i.e., *negating* what the Father says, 'reconciling' man to his carnal nature, i.e., to his flesh and the world that *stimulates* it. It is the Father reconciling man to Himself, through his Son's obedience to Him, i.e., fulfilling the law redeeming man from judgment, condemnation, and eternal death for his disobedience, i.e., by grace saving man through faith, resulting in man doing the Father's will. Language becomes important here. In *discussion*, where the father/Father has the final say ("Because I said so"/"It is written"), if the child does what the father/Father says he is reconciled to the father/Father. In *dialogue*, i.e., by 'justifying' the father's and the child's carnal nature, i.e., what they both have in common, i.e., *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it, *negating* the father's/Father's authority (*negating* the *guilty conscience* in the process, which the father's/Father's authority engenders) the father is "reconciled" to the child, i.e., the father's/Father's authority (establishing law, i.e., what is right and what is wrong behavior and enforcing it) is *negated*.

"Laws must not fetter human life [inhibit or block lust]; but yield to it; they must change as the needs [the lusts] and capacities [interests/attractions of lust] of the people change." (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*)

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

Your *lusting* for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates* makes it possible for those saying "We are here to 'help' you" to gain your trust (when it is their *lusts* they are out to satisfy). Gaining your trust they are able to turn you into 'human resource' (like Thorndike's chickens, Skinner's rats, Pavlov's dog) to be used by them to 'justify' and satisfy their own *lusts*, casting you aside when you no longer satisfy their *lusts* or get in their way, doing to you what you did to the father/Father,

casting him/Him aside for getting in the way of your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world was *stimulating*—demanding his/His "cash flow" be subject to your *lusts*. By 'discovering' what it is you are *coveting*, i.e., what you are *lusting* after and offering to "help" you attain it they are able to gain control over you, using you to get rid of the father/Father so they can control the "cash flow," using it to "feed" their *lusts*.

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

This is why those *"of (and for) the world"* (in order to gain control over the "cash flow" in order to feed their *lusts*) have to *negate* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., *negate* the fear of judgment, condemnation, being cast out (no longer thinking about what will happen to them in the future—replacing the "there-and-them" with the "here-and-now") in the thoughts of the children, thus *negating* the *guilty conscience* for not doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* instead, replacing the *guilty conscience* with the so called "super-ego" which makes them subject to their "feelings," both of the past as well in the present, making them subject to "human nature," i.e., to that which is only "of the world," i.e., to the "here-and-now," i.e., to the *"eternal present,"* i.e., to their *lust* for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' and their hatred toward restraint that the current situation and/or object, people, or person is *stimulating*—with that which *stimulates* and *affirms* pleasure, i.e., that which is "positive" being "good" or right and that which *stimulates* hate, i.e., that which gets in the way of and restrains pleasure, i.e., that which is "negative" being "bad" or evil, needing to be 'changed,' i.e., turned into "good," i.e., *stimulating* pleasure or be removed and *negated*. When you remove something you can still think about it (have "feelings"

for it) but when you *negate* it, it no longer comes to mind (you are no longer concerned about what happens to it; or him or her). Since for those "of (and for) *the world*" there is no accountability, i.e., no eternal consequence for their actions, they can (and will) do whatever it takes to gain control of and retain control of the "cash flow" in order to feed their *lusts*, i.e., "the ends justifies the means," i.e., the heart is not only "deceitful" ("*above all things*"), thinking pleasure (*lust* and the world that *stimulates* it) is all there is to life but also "desperately wicked," hating and removing anyone who gets in the way of pleasure, not knowing its hatred toward restraint is evil (thinking it is "good") because *lust* is standing in the way—'justifying' the hate. (Jeremiah 17:9) This is why, when it comes to politics the 'liberal' (or the "conservative" who practices compromise) will do whatever it takes (that he can get away with) in order to remain in office or keep his "man" in office in order to gain control of or retain control over the "cash flow," to feed his and his "buddies" *lusts* (in the name of and for the "good" of "the people"—thereby "representing" their *lusts*, i.e., that which is general or global, i.e., that unites and not their position, i.e., that which is specific or local, i.e., that divides, that they were sent into office to re-present). All I have to do is find your representatives *self interest*, which includes his next term in office and offer to help him attain it (if he votes my way—which I do not have to bring up) and I "own" him.

The Communist dictator Mao Zedong said: "*Words and actions should help to unite, and not divide, the people.*" This requires *negating* the father's/Father's authority which divides people on who is doing his/His will and who is not, i.e., who is doing what they are *told* and who is not. (Ironically this is what Mao did himself, forcing people to think his way, i.e., do what they were *told* or else be *negated*—what the father did was different, he simply removed them, thus retaining a *guilty conscience* if something bad happened to them, especially if he was the cause.)

Karl Marx wrote: "*To enjoy the present reconciles us to the actual.*" ([Karl Marx](#), *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) This makes *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it all that is "actual," requiring the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority in order for the "actual," i.e., only that which is "of the world" to become all there is to life.

"... *the superego 'unites in itself the influences of the present and of the past.'*" ([Norman O. Brown](#), *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*)

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

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

Since "*Community*" (common-ism a.k.a. Communism) was Dr. Trojanowicz's main objective, he was only defining what had to be *negated* if there is to be a "police state," i.e., "*community policing*"—with facilitators of 'change,' i.e., psychotherapists in control. For example, by simply having your local sheriff develop an understanding of law through the *dialoging* of his *opinion* along with the *opinions* of sheriffs of other communities, i.e., counties, coming to a *consensus* (to a "feeling" of "oneness") with them, his 'loyalty' to the beliefs and standards of his local community, i.e., the county he was raised up in is weakened if not *negated*, resulting in him defending global control, establishing global control (the *consensus* process) over (and therefore against) local control (doing what the father/Father, i.e., the law says), i.e., establishing *lust over* and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, 'justifying' and defending the moving of the "cash flow" away from local control (where private convictions control the "cash flow") to global control (where the citizen must set aside private convictions for the "good" of "the people." i.e., for the sake of society, i.e., so as not to "hurt peoples feelings"—make them feel *guilty* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*—in order for "the people" to be "adaptable to 'change,'" i.e., readily accepting,

following, supporting, defending, protecting, praising, worship, killing for, and dying for those who 'justify' their *lusts*, abdicating their inheritance, i.e., the father's/Father's "cash flow" to the [facilitator of 'change,'](#) i.e., to the [group psychotherapist](#), i.e., to the [Transformational Marxists](#) (all being the same in structure of thought, i.e., in *paradigm*, where *lust*, and therefore they must rule over the "cash flow" instead of the father/Father and his/His authority). ([What You Lose In Dialogue](#), [When Discussion Is Rejected](#).)

"[We] *must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions* [see those people adhering to the father's/Father's authority, judging, condemning, casting out those who refuse to do the father's/Father's will] *in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue.*" (Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#))

Karl Marx wrote: "*Not feeling at home in the sinful world* [in a world full of people *lusting* after pleasure, calling him a sinner for *lusting* after pleasure, i.e., trying to make him feel *guilty* for *lusting* after pleasure, not giving him money, i.e., paying him to 'liberate' them from the father's/Father's authority so they can be sinners like him without having a *guilty conscience*)]. *Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home* [[dialogue](#), i.e., *lust* being role-played, i.e., 'justified' in one's thoughts, leads to their thinking on how the world "ought" to be, where they can *lust* without being judged, condemned, cast out]." "*Critical Criticism is a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without* [[dialogue](#) is where *lust* for pleasure is free to roam, i.e., where there is no judgment, condemnation, or fear of being cast out for *lusting* and hatred toward those who judge, condemn, cast those who *lust* out is 'justified,' hatred is at the forefront of thought, ready to be acted on, removing restraint/the restrainer, a.k.a. "Critical Theory," "Critical Thinking," "Higher Order Thinking Skills," "Critical Race Theory"]." (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) In other words, it is not enough for you to *dialogue* with your *self* about removing anyone who is getting in the way of your *lusts*, i.e., who is judging, condemning, casting you out for sinning, you must through *dialogue* join with others of like mind and put sin, i.e., *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint into *praxis*, removing those who judge, condemn, cast you and others out for sinning. The child's

"Why?" in response to the father's command that gets in the way of his *lust* of the 'moment' (which he has, through *dialogue* 'justified' in his own mind) is the child's effort to move the father into *dialogue*, where he and the father can become one, based upon what they have in common, i.e., *lust* (despite the child's *lust* to have relationship with others, i.e., with his "friends" and the father's *lust* to have relationship with the child being different in detail, it is *lust*, i.e., what they both have in common that makes them one). Since the father will not go into *dialogue* with his child (regarding his commands, rules, facts, and truth, insisting upon *discussion* at the least, with his "Because I said so" cutting off *dialogue* if the child persists) he retains his authority over the child (and the "cash flow"). Since he will not abdicate his authority (and therefore the "cash flow") to his child's *lusts*, the "education" establishment (explained below) has taken it upon itself (in the "group grade" classroom) to have his child along with other children *dialogue* what they want to do (regarding right and wrong behavior), *negating* the father's/Father's authority system in the way they think, directly effecting their actions—unity (relationship) is therefore built upon *lust*, i.e., upon the children's *self interests*, not upon their father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, which differ amongst the children, dividing them from one another. It is not the father/Father himself that is of issue here. It is his/His authority system, holding those under his authority accountable to his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth (even if he, referring to the earthly father is wrong, with those under his authority knowing and therefore saying or at least wanting to say, i.e., tell him he is wrong) thus engendering a right-wrong way of thinking (prejudice) in the next generation of citizens. This is tied to the definition of and use of money, i.e., the "cash flow." "Cash flow" when made subject to *discussion* retains the father's/Father's authority (system), i.e., local control over the use of cash. "Cash flow" when made subject to *dialogue* makes cash subject to the *lusts*, i.e., to the *self interests* of children and to those "helping" them 'liberate' themselves from their father's authority, *negating* local control, i.e., the father's/Father's authority over the "cash flow."

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

Karl Marx, the "philosophers" are the father's of the community, i.e., the leaders of nations, divided from one another because of their differing positions on right and wrong behavior. If "worldly peace and socialist harmony" is to become reality it is the father's/Father's authority system, the cause of division amongst "the people" that has to be removed from the environment, i.e., *negated* in the thoughts and the actions of "the people."

Sigmund Freud's ideology was the same as Karl Marx's. His "method" of counseling, i.e., his use of *dialogue* to establish right behavior was used to 'liberate' the children and therefore society from the father's/Father's authority system. "... *the hatred against patriarchal suppression—a 'barrier to incest,' ... the desire (for the sons) to return to the mother culminates in the rebellion of the exiled sons, the collective killing and devouring of the father.*" "It is not really a decisive matter whether one has killed one's father or abstained from the deed,' if the function of the conflict and its consequences are the same [the father no longer exercises his authority in the home]." (Sigmund Freud in [Herbert Marcuse](#), *Eros and Civilization: a psychological inquiry into Freud*) Sigmund Freud's history of the prodigal son is not of the son coming to his senses, *humbling* his *self*, returning home, submitting his *self* to his father's authority, learning his inheritance was not his father's money but his father's love for him, but of the son joining with his "friends," returning home, killing the father, taking all that was his (the father's), using it to satisfy their carnal desires, i.e., their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates*. "Freud commented that only through the solidarity of all the participants [as a result of the *dialoguing* of their *opinions* to a *consensus*] could the sense of *guilt* [the *guilty conscience* for disobeying the father/Father] be *assuaged* [be *negated*]." "Self-perfection of the human individual is fulfilled in union with the world in pleasure." "According to Freud, the ultimate essence of our being is erotic." "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." "Eros is the foundation of morality." "The foundation on which the man of the future will be built is already there, in the repressed unconscious [in the carnal nature of the child]; the foundation has to be recovered [the child has to be 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority]." (Brown) The only place individualism is 'created' is under the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the "one" above, who demands no

compromise regarding his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth, anything or anyone outside or beyond his/His authority requires compromise in order to "build relationship." *"Protestantism was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism."* (Max Horkheimer, *Vernunft and Selbsterhaltung*) In other words, according to the Marxist Max Horkheimer (director of the "Frankfurt School" for a time), "Protestantism," i.e., the "priesthood of all believers," i.e., letting no one come between you and the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ, i.e., *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating your self*, enduring the rejection of others for not 'justifying' their *lusts*, following the Son, Jesus Christ, doing the Heavenly Father's will, was the source of individualism, under God, i.e., doing your best, as unto the Lord, i.e., obeying the "one" above you, refusing to compromise in order to "get along with" the many around (below). *"... 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 In the parable of the soils, the rocks in the rocky soil are your friends, i.e., you will go no deeper into the Word of God than your friendship ("relationship") with your friends will allow you. *"... do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ."* Galatians 1:10

There is history behind this becoming the mindset of many who are in a position of authority in this nation today (establishing *lust*, i.e., *self interest*, i.e., "human nature" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority). America was founded upon the father's/Father's authority system (freedom of speech and religion, i.e., freedom of convictions), not in a King or a "group of people" deciding right and wrong behavior for "the people" (as is now being done), but in the home and the "church" with the father/Father establishing right and wrong behavior for the children/mankind, i.e., for the individual (as each child/man is held personally accountable for his behavior) thus engendering a *guilty conscience* in the individual when he does wrong, disobeys, sins, i.e., when he *lusts*, initiating and sustaining the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the individual's rights, under God in government, i.e., limiting the power of those in government in order for the father/Father to train up the next

generation of citizens according to his/His convictions. That has all 'changed,' i.e., has (for the most part) been *negated*.

"As the Frankfurt School wrestled with how to 'reinvigorate Marx', they 'found the missing link in Freud'" (Jay, Martin, *The Dialectical Imagination: The History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923-1950*) The "Frankfurt School," officially the *Institute of Social Research* was a group of Marxist (Transformational Marxist's—who merged Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud, i.e., sociology and psychology, making it their philosophy—who, fleeing Fascist Germany came to America in the early thirty's (entering our Universities, training up professors and government officials to carry on their work, not only here but around the world). [Kurt Lewin](#), the "father" of "[group dynamics](#)," "[force field analysis](#)," "[unfreezing, moving, refreezing](#)" (which are key elements in [brainwashing](#), the real thing) who, though not being a "member" of "the group" edited their paper while in Germany (*Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*) along with [Wilhelm Reich](#), whose work was essential to their success. His method of 'change' is not only being used here in America but is also being used around the world today via the [NTL's](#), [Tavistock](#), "Encounter Groups," etc., and especially through the use of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" in the classroom.

Abraham Maslow wrote (regarding the merging of psychology with Marxism and vice versa): *"Marxian theory needs Freudian-type instinct theory to round it out. And of course, vice versa."* *"Third-Force psychology is also epi-Marxian in these senses, i.e., including the most basic scheme as true-good social conditions ['liberation' of "self" from the father's/Father's authority] are necessary for personal growth, bad social conditions [submission of "self" to the father's/Father's authority] stunt human nature,... This is to say, one could reinterpret Marx into a self-actualization-fostering Third- and Fourth-Force psychology-philosophy. And my impression is anyway that this is the direction in which they are going now."* *"The whole discussion becomes species-wide, One World."* *"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.)"* (Abraham Maslow, *The Journals of Abraham Maslow*)

All "educators" are certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of what are called "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)" i.e., Marxist curriculum in the classroom. In his second "*Taxonomy*," "*Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*" Bloom referenced two Marxists, Erick Fromm and Theodor Adorno as his "*Weltanschauung*," i.e., his world view. Both were members of the "Frankfurt School."

"*Bloom's Taxonomies*" are ". . . a psychological classification system" used "*to develop attitudes and values . . . which are not shaped by the parents.*" *ibid.* Psychology *negates* parental authority, i.e., the father's/Father's authority in the home (despite what those who *praxis* it might think or say).

The leader of the Russian Revolution wrote: "*The peasantry [the traditional family] constantly regenerates the bourgeoisie [the father's/Father's authority system]—in positively every sphere of activity and life.*" "*We must learn how to eradicate all bourgeois habits, customs, and traditions everywhere [i.e., negate parental authority, i.e., the father's/Father's authority system in the home, in business, in government].*" ([Vladimir Lenin](#), *Left-Wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder An Essential Condition of the Bolsheviks' Success* May 12, 1920)

This revolution is now being carried out in the home (because of what is being practiced in the schools). "*There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children.*" (*Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*)

Warren Bennis wrote: ". . . any intervention between parent and child tend to produce familial democracy regardless of its intent." "*The consequences of family democratization take a long time to make themselves felt—but it would be difficult to reverse the process once begun. . . . once the parent can in any way imagine his own orientation to be a possible liability to the child in the world approaching.*" "*... Once uncertainty is created in the parent how best to prepare the child for the future, the authoritarian family is moribund, regardless of whatever countermeasures may be taken.*" ([Warren Bennis](#), *The Temporary Society*)

Ralph Tyler, who was adviser to six of our Presidents on education wrote: *"Should the school develop young people to fit into the present society as it is or does the school have a revolutionary mission to develop young people who will seek to improve the society?" "Perhaps a modern school would include in its statement [that] it believes that the high ideals of a good society are not adequately realized in our present society and that through the education of young people it hopes to improve society."* (Ralph W. Tyler, *"Achievement Testing and Curriculum Construction," Trends in Student Personnel Work*) Whoever defines "improve" control the outcome. Benjamin Bloom summed it up in his first "taxonomy": *"Obedience and compliance are hardly ideal goals."* (*Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*)

James Coleman greatly influenced our Supreme Court on the issue of education. Benjamin Bloom dedicated his first "taxonomy" to James Coleman's mentor, Ralph Tyler. Coleman wrote: *"In the traditional society each child is at the mercy of his parents. The 'natural processes' by which they socialize him makes him a replica of them."* *"Equality of Opportunity [freedom to lust] becomes ever greater with the weakening of family power."* *"One of the consequence of the increasing social liberation of adolescents is the increasing inability of parents to enforce norms, a greater and greater tendency for the adolescent community to disregard adult dictates."* *"Strengthening the family to draw the adolescent back into it faces serious problems, as well as some questions about its desirability."* *"The family has little to offer the child in the way of training for his place in the community."* ([James Coleman](#), *The Adolescent Society*)

Anyone who comes between the children and their parent's, giving the children the right to question their parent's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, which get in the way of their carnal desires, i.e., their *lusts*, especially when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior, begins the process of 'liberating' children from their parent's authority, creating a revolution in the home, with the parent's either setting aside their established commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to initiate and sustain "relationship" with their children, negating their authority to their

children's *lusts*. or retaining their authority having to daily, hourly face their children of rebellion, i.e., of disrespect.

This is all being done in order for those who hate the father's/Father's authority to gain and retain control of the "cash flow," so they can spend it on their *lusts* without being judged, condemned, cast out.

On the issue of "cash flow" György Lukács (a Marxist) wrote: *"Capital" ["cash flow"]. . . is, according to Marx, 'not a thing but a social relation between persons mediated through things.'* *'These relations,' Marx states, 'are not those between one individual and another [based on "human nature," i.e., lust for pleasure and hate of restraint, which he wanted it to be], but between worker and capitalist, tenant and landlord [what he wanted to negate, i.e., children under their parent's authority, the worker under his boss's, man under God's, i.e., a "top-down" order with the "capitalist," the "landlord," the parent, God setting the standards for who is getting paid (rewarded, and how much) and who is not—which Marx (being a child of disobedience, i.e., a child who would not get paid or rewarded for his actions) was out to negate, so he could sin, i.e., be his self, i.e., lust after pleasure and hate restraint, i.e., do what he wanted and get paid)], etc.. Eliminate these relations and you abolish the whole of society [if you remove the father's/Father's authority, i.e., "top-down" leadership chaos would ensue].'* György Lukács writings not only influenced Lenin and other Marxists of the past, including the "Frankfurt School" (which he started), they influence many (I want to say most) leaders of our nation and leaders around the world today. Contemporary education is grounded upon them.

But Karl Marx, according to Lukács had a solution—make man subject to "human nature," i.e., subject to science (or sight) only and not to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to doing what they are *told* (or faith). Karl Marx wrote: *"Sense experience must be the basis of all science." "Science is only genuine science when it proceeds from sense experience, in the two forms of sense perception and sensuous need, that is, only when it proceeds from Nature."* ([Karl Marx](#), MEGA I/3)

Marx simply secularized God's Word, with "*sensuous needs*" (the *carnal feelings*, i.e., *impulses* and *urges* of the 'moment' that are *stimulated* by the world desiring satisfaction, needing fulfillment) replacing "*the lust of the flesh*," "*sense perception*" (that which can only be seen by the eyes, i.e., that is only "of the world" that *stimulates* pleasure) replacing "*the lust of the eyes*," "*sense experience*" (that which can only be known, i.e., *experienced* by the *senses*) replacing "*the pride of life*" (controlling and *augmenting* the environment that *stimulates lust*, 'changing' that which is in the environment that does not *stimulate* or *augment* the *stimulation* of *lust* to where it *stimulates lust*, and removing that which *stimulates* hate, i.e., that gets in the way of *lust*, i.e., that is not "*of the world*") and "*only when it proceeds from Nature*" (only that which is based upon *stimulus-response*) replacing "*all that is of the world.*" Academics is the study of the creation (what God established the limits and measures of) as well as the study of man (who God created and established the limits and measures for). By removing God in academics there are no limits and measures to what man can do, i.e., no restraint regarding what he can do to those who get in the way of his *lusts*—with *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it being all there is to the creation, i.e., all there is to life.

Psychology a.k.a. "behavior science" is based upon the same ideology. "Behavior science" 'liberates' man from the father's/Father's authority in order for him to *lust* without feeling *guilty* (it has no other purpose). The famous psychotherapist, Carl Rogers wrote: "*Experience is, for me, the highest authority.*" "*Neither the Bible nor the prophets, neither the revelations of God can take precedence over my own direct experience.*" (Rogers) While Carl Rogers included Karl Marx in this list (which I left out) he did so because, to the "transformational" Marxist the agenda was not to just teach, i.e., inculcate Marxism, as "traditional," hard line, National, i.e., "traditional" Communist do (thus retaining the "top-down" system, i.e., father's/Father's authority system) but for the students to "experience" being Marx themselves (to "*sense experience*" *lusting* after the things of the world without being judged, condemned, cast out).

In other words, if you make everything subject to "human nature," i.e., subject to man's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure that the world, i.e.,

that the current situation and/or object, people, or person *stimulates* and to hate restraint, i.e., to hate missing out on pleasure, i.e., if you make everything subject to the "scientific method," i.e., to "behavioral science," i.e., to *stimulus-response*, where there is no "top-down" order except nature itself, then men can have access to the "cash flow" without being judged, condemned, cast out for his carnal behavior, i.e., he can think and act according to his carnal nature without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without the father's/Father's authority getting in the way, i.e., without having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., he does not have to do what he is *told*.

György Lukács then continued: ". . . a scientifically acceptable solution does exist ["behavior science"—through the use of *dialogue affirming* the child's ("the people's") natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and to hate restraint (what all people have in common) establishing the child's carnal nature, i.e., "human nature," i.e., *lust*, i.e., Marxism over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, 'liberating' the child (the Karl Marx in the child) from the father's/Father's authority so he can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., *lust* after the carnal pleasure of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates* without having a *guilty conscience*—without fearing being punished, rejected, or cast out, etc., i.e., without losing financial support for his carnal thoughts and carnal actions]... *For to accept that solution, even in theory, would be tantamount to observing society from a class standpoint [from the child's perspective] other than that of the bourgeoisie [from the father's/Father's]. And no class can do that-unless it is willing to abdicate its power freely.*" (Lukács)

In other words, when the father observes the world, including his God given authority from his child's perspective he *negates* his God given authority making the "cash flow" subject to the child's "*feelings*," i.e., subject to the child's carnal desires, i.e., subject to the child's *lusts* of the 'moment,' giving control of it to the Marxist, i.e., to the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., to the "behavior scientist" who's whole agenda (despite his denial of it) is to 'liberate' his *self*, i.e., his *lusts* from the father's/Father's authority system so he can control the "cash flow," in order to use it on his *lusts*, i.e., to *actualize* his *self interests* with impunity, i.e., without having

to answer to (give an account to) a "higher authority," i.e., without having a *guilty conscience*.

By 'shifting' communication in a meeting or classroom from *discussion* to *dialogue*, i.e., from position ("I KNOW because my parent's, my teacher, my boss, God, who KNOWS said so, i.e., because the law says so") to "I feel" and "I think," i.e., to an *opinion* (which is not subject to the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., to the parent's, the teacher's, the boss's, God's established commands, rules, facts, and truth) when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior the agenda is accomplished. "Everyone is entitled to their *opinion*," i.e., *lust*, i.e., freedom from the *guilty conscience negates* "Everyone is entitled to their position," i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., freedom of the conscience thereby *negating* the *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* (instead of doing the father's/Father's will). *Opinion* (*dialogue*, i.e., the child's "feelings") *negates position* (*discussion*, i.e., the father's/Father's authority) when it is used to establish behavior. "Behavior science," as is Marxism is based upon *dialogue*, i.e., upon the child's/man's carnal nature *negating discussion*, i.e., *negating* the father's/Father's authority. Freedom of speech (and freedom of religion) is *negated* when freedom from speech (and freedom from religion) is put into *praxis*, i.e., when being "positive" and not "negative" is used to establish right and wrong behavior,

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

Money ("cash flow") is either subject to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to doing right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's *specific* commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., to doing what he/He says (what you are *told*) or else to your carnal nature, i.e., to your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*, i.e., to that which is *general*, i.e., to that which is

found in every human being. To put it simply, "cash flow" is either subject to your *needs* or to your *wants*. The trickery (deceitfulness) is your ability to make your *wants* your *needs*, i.e., "I'll just die (dad) if you don't let me go out and play with my friends" (we have all been there) called "felt needs," making "cash flow" subject to your *wants*, not your *needs* (you won't die, you just "feel" like you will—*lust*, being in control of your mind does not want to die).

As with the laws (limits and measures) of nature (that God has established), where there is a consequence (for you and for me) to being or doing wrong so it is with the laws (limits and measures) that God has established for us (for our thoughts and our actions, i.e., for our behavior) where there is a consequence for our doing wrong and not right (for not doing what we were *told* or doing what we were *told* not to do).

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

The "BIG PRINT" ("*Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat*") giveth. The "small print" ("*But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*") taketh away. The *general*, i.e., *lust* says "Ye shalt not surely die," i.e., "You can do what you *want*." The *specific*, i.e., the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth says "You can not," i.e., "*Thou shalt surely die,*" i.e., "If you disobey, i.e., set aside or disregard the 'small print' you will be found *guilty*, i.e., you will pay the price." If you leave out the "small print" you can do what you *want* until the writer of the contract, who gave you the "BIG PRINT" and the "small print" shows up. It's a BIG DEAL. You can deny the contract and the writer of it but you can not refute the "small print." We all die (because of our sins, i.e., for doing what we *want* instead of doing what God, the writer of the contract says—the breath you are now taking, every breath you have taken, and ever breath you will take and the world you are taking it in is given to you by the writer of the contract, that is the "BIG PRINT," the "small print" is

what you **can not** do and what will happen to you if you do). Those "of (and for) *the world*" can offer you only one choice (*lust*, with eternal death following; the power of eternal life or even life itself not being in them). The writer of the contract (the giver of life) offers you real choice, i.e., where you will spend eternity after your last breath, i.e., either eternal life for doing what you are *told* (for doing what He *tells* you) or eternal death for doing what you *want* instead (in disobedience to Him). Those "of (and for) *the world*," rejecting the "small print" (so they can feel "good" about their *self*, i.e., *lust* without having a *guilty conscience* "and be less offensive to others") want you to join with them (*affirming* their *lust* for pleasure), rejecting the "small print," dying in your sins (along with them), being cast into [the lake of fire that is never quenched](#), prepared for the master facilitator of 'change' and all who follow after him—for doing their, i.e., his will instead of God's, i.e., living by sight instead of by faith, i.e., doing what they *want* instead of what they are *told*.

You can *dialogue*, i.e., go "I feel" and "I think," or "I like" and "I do not like" and act on it (be like God) all you *want* in regard to the first command (regarding the fruit of the trees you are commanded you **can** freely eat from). You can only *discuss* with God, i.e., the Father the second command (regarding what you **can not** do), with God, i.e., the Father having the final say (reflected in the traditional home, i.e., "[Because I said so](#)"). To *dialogue*, i.e., to go "I feel" and "I think" or "I like" and "I do not like" and then to act on it (on your feelings, i.e., on "sense perception"), disregarding the second command (making your *self* god) is to reason from your flesh, i.e., from *lust*, i.e., from your *self interest*, i.e., is to sin, i.e., is to establish your carnal nature over and therefore against doing God the Father's will, i.e., is to usurp the Father's authority, i.e., is to disobey God. God hates no one. He hates sin, judging us according to our thoughts and actions, whether we are setting our *affections* upon Him, doing His will or upon the things of the world that *stimulate lust*, doing our will instead.

". . . *It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.*" Matthew 4:4

"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

Romans 10:17

"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

". . . every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Romans 14:12

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

Your soul and your flesh are different. The soul KNOWS by being *told* (by the *preaching* and *teaching* of the Word of God) engendering *discussion* if there are any questions, where the father/Father has the final say—making commands, rules, facts, and truth **objective**, i.e., a *position*, i.e., absolute, i.e., external to your control, .e., "Because my father, my teacher, my boss, God said so," i.e., "It is written" no matter the situation and/or people or person present. The flesh knows by "*sense experience*" (by *stimulus-response*), engendering *dialogue*, i.e., "I feel" and "I think"—making commands, rules, facts, and truth **subjective**, i.e., an *opinion*, i.e., subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to your impulses and urges of the 'moment,' i.e., subject to your *lusts* and hate of the 'moment' (engendered in response to the current situation and/or people or person present), i.e., subject to your control.

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

When God created Adam He made him unlike any other living thing in the creation, i.e., He "*breathed into his nostrils the breath of life*" making him "*a living soul*." He then *told* him what he could do and what he could not do (what He did with no other creature in the creation), i.e., He *told* him what was right and what was wrong behavior, i.e., which trees he could eat

the fruit of and which one he could not (lest he die), something he did with nothing else in the creation.

No animal, which are all subject only to *stimulus-response* (approach pleasure - avoid pain) and impulses and urges (instincts) can *read* or *write* a book, i.e., can be *told* or *tell* others what is right and what is wrong behavior, i.e., what they can and can not do. By making you subject to *stimulus-response* (to only that which is "of the world," i.e., to "*behavior science*," i.e., to the "*cognitive, affective, and psycho-motor domains*," i.e., to your "*lust of the flesh*," "*lust of the eyes*," and "*pride of life*,"—what the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' does) you are (deceptively) equated to an animal (approach pleasure and avoid pain) denying the fact that you do what animals can not do, i.e., reason from being *told*, which requires faith in the one giving you commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as is and obeyed. For the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' if you are to "think" for your *self*," i.e., if you are to 'discover' for your *self* what is right and what is wrong behavior you must, like them "Reason" from your *perception* of what is and what is not in the world before you (according to your carnal nature, i.e., your *senses*, i.e., your *lust* for pleasure and your dissatisfaction with, resentment toward, hatred of being restrained)—of course with their "help," using the same ("scientific") method or formula the master facilitator of 'change' used on the woman in the garden in Eden.

"Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? [this is a neurolinguistic construct (an imbedded statement in a question, sensitizing a person to their lusters, when it comes to right and wrong behavior, beginning the process of liberating a person's lust out from under their fear of judgment, i.e., out from under the father's/Father's authority)—which is one of the most powerful forms of hypnosis] And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it [she revealed her lust], lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die [removing the "negative," i.e., fear of judgment (which was not a lie regarding the here-and now, i.e., the tree

itself did not kill her—or Adam—but a lie regarding the there-and then, with God removing her—and Adam—from having access to the "tree of life" for their disobedience, then, after death both coming to judgment, i.e., inheriting eternal life or eternal death): *For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise [evaluating from her senses, i.e., from her understanding she made her self god, i.e., the establisher of right and wrong behavior], she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.*" [Genesis 3:1-6](#) (emphasis added)

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

By simply bringing dialogue (sharing what you are thinking about, i.e., what you want and do not want) into an environment establishing right and wrong behavior the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth is negated making your lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint right (good) and the father's/Father's authority wrong (evil).

Man, rejecting, i.e., in defiance to the laws that God has established (for him) spends money on his lusts of the 'moment' (pl. i.e., his lust for

pleasure and his *lust* for the approval of others, *affirming* him, i.e., *affirming* his *lusts*) that the world (that the current situation and/or object, people, or person) is *stimulating* with impunity, i.e., without having a *guilty conscience*—till death, when he will be held accountable for his carnal thoughts and carnal actions, i.e., for his rejection of God and His laws, i.e., for his rejecting the Father's authority (who authors commands and rules to be obeyed as given and facts and truth to be accepted as is—by faith—and applied, and enforces them, i.e., holding us accountable to obeying Him, i.e., to doing them, i.e., to doing His will). The same is true of the father's authority in the home (who is not perfect, i.e., who is subject to spending money on his *lusts* of the 'moment' instead of doing the Father's will) who holds his children accountable to doing right and not wrong according to his specific commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., subject to doing what they are *told*.

"Cash flow" in order to be moved from the local to the global, from the *specific* (what the father/Father says) to the *general* (what they *want*), must be 'liberated' from the father's/Father's ("*in loco parentis*") control over it. By Identifying the father's "felt needs," i.e., his *wants*, i.e., his *lusts* (the Father is left out because he will not cooperate, i.e., play the "game") and offering to "help" him attain them (removal of "risk" being a big one—no longer having to "trust in the Lord," with man, who is interested in *lust*, i.e., in his *self interest* taking His place) "cash flow" is moved from the local to the global where commands, rules, "facts," and "truth" are made subject to their interpretation (*opinion*), i.e., subject to their control instead of subject to the father's/Father's *specific* commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., to his/His definition. Those "*of (and for) the world*" make laws *general* (relative) a.k.a. ambiguous, i.e., where "I feel" and "I think," i.e., *opinion* (which is based upon *self interest*) determines the outcome (why children try to change the rules in a game when they are losing) instead of *specific* (absolute) a.k.a. holding them accountable for being or doing wrong, i.e., where "I know" because the law says so, i.e., "It is written" determines the outcome in order for them to have "wiggle room"—so they can escape judgment while prosecuting those they want to get rid of. Ambiguity *negates* absolutes. The child's carnal nature *negates* the father's/Father's authority. The *general* *negates* the *specific* (just because fruit trees lose

their leaves in the winter, i.e., the *general* does make them all the same, i.e., does not mean you treat them all the same way, i.e., if you do you will soon be out of business—anyone with an orchard, living in reality knows that: I am responding to Karl Marx's ideology, i.e., stupidity on fruit trees in his paper, *The Holy Family*; people who have never pulled weeds, etc., i.e., "worked by the sweat of their brow" have no grasp of reality, i.e., think, like a child others should work to satisfy their *lusts*—entitled). The global *negates* the local. "Cash flow" subject to *lust*, i.e., to *self interest* *negates* "cash flow" subject to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. Justice subject to *self interest*, i.e., to *lust*, i.e., to "felt needs," i.e., to social (socialist) cause *negates* justice subject to established law, i.e., to laws from above, i.e., to "rule of law."

"Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state [i.e., the Marxist, i.e., those lusting after pleasure and hating restraint]." (R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law)

To those "of the world," i.e., to those who are *lusting* after pleasure and hating restraint (the missing out on pleasure), making *lust* and the world that *stimulates* it all there is to life, because the father has both *lust* for pleasure and authority over his children he must abdicate his authority over his children (or be removed from having authority over, i.e., access to them) in order for his children to become "normal," i.e., in order for his children to become like them, i.e., only "of the world," thinking and acting only according to their carnal nature, making the "cash flow" subject to those 'liberating' the children from the father's/Father's authority, so they can spend it on their *lusts* (in "the name of and for the 'good' of the children"—"good" being pleasure, i.e., *lust*, "bad" being the father's/Father's authority, getting in the way of *lust*, i.e., judging, condemning, casting out those who, doing their will, do what they *want* instead of doing the father's/Father's will, doing what they are *told*; which makes "cash flow" external to and therefore hostile toward the child's carnal nature, i.e., external to and therefore hostile toward their *lust* of the

'moment' and the world, i.e., the current condition and/or object, people, or person that is *stimulating* it, therefore making "cash flow" external to and hostile toward those wanting the children to be like them, *lusting* after pleasure, hating restraint, i.e., hating the restrainer, i.e., hating the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way).

For those "of the world" it is not about the children (despite what they might think or say). It is all about the "cash flow." The children are only being used (as a means) to gain access to the "cash flow." The father/Father will give his life/His Son's life for his/His children—not for their *lusts*. Those *lusting* after pleasure will sacrifice the children if they get in the way of their *lusts*, i.e., in the way of their control of the "cash flow" or use the children to gain access to the "cash flow" in order to feed their *lusts*, casting them aside (rejecting them) when they no longer serve their *interest* or satisfy their *lusts* or get in their way. Where they spend eternity being of no interest and therefore no concern of theirs, they do not care what happens to the children in the end (there is no consequence for their actions).

'Change' for the world is *stimulus-response*, i.e., is the child *responding* to the condition and/or object, people, or person that is either *stimulating* pleasure or hate in the 'moment,' approaching and *affirming* that which *stimulates* pleasure, 'changing' or removing that which *stimulates* hate (making his thoughts and his actions only subject to the urges and impulses of the 'moment,' i.e., only subject to the world). Change for the father/Father is the child—no longer chasing after the *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* and hating restraint—doing right and not wrong according to what he has been *told*, i.e., according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth (making his thoughts and his actions subject to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., subject to doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., subject to doing what he is *told*).

The objective of those "*of (and for) the world*" is to *negate* the father's/Father's authority in order (as in "new" world order) for them to do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., to *lust*, i.e., to do what they *want* without being

judged, condemned, cast out—without being cut off from the "cash flow"—now, having access to and control of the "cash flow" being able to use it, as a drug addict to support their habit, i.e., to feed their *lusts*. *Lusting* after pleasure and hating restraint, i.e., hating missing out on pleasure is the sum total of the carnally minded man, thinking and acting in defiance (or in indifference) to the Father's authority, i.e., not doing the Father's will, i.e., not doing or refusing to do what he is *told*, doing what he "wants" to do, i.e., *lusting* after pleasure instead.

Local control of the "cash flow" requires those under the father's/Father's authority to *humble, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self*, i.e., *deny* their *lusts* in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will, in order to be blessed, i.e., in order to have access to and inherit the "cash," and under the Father's authority, by His grace and by their faith in Him inherit eternal life. You can not get any more local (specific) than the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the father's authority in the home/the Father's authority over the soul (individual accountability to the father/Father, i.e., doing what the father/Father says "or else"; "Because I said so"/"It is written"). When the father is in control of the "cash flow," doing right and not wrong, i.e., setting aside the *lusts* of the 'moment' in order to "stay afloat," i.e., in order to get through the year and hopefully "get ahead" controls the "cash flow" (there is a consequence for spending it wrong or not having it regarding having a roof over your head, food on the table, etc., or where you will spend eternity). You can not get any more global (general) than the child's/man's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and hate restraint—missing out on pleasure. Global control of the "cash flow" requires those under the father's/Father's authority to set aside (deny) the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to set aside (deny) the father's/Father's specific commands, rules, facts, and truth (equated to being "prejudice") in order for them to gain control the "cash flow" so they can *lust* after (enjoy) the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' ([*dopamine emancipation*](#)) that the world is *stimulating* without restraint, i.e., without being judged, condemned, cast out, i.e., without the father's/Father's authority, i.e., without established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., without local control, i.e., without the *guilty conscience*

(which the father's/Father's authority engenders) getting in the way. While local control makes cash subject to specific requirements, i.e., subject to the father's commands, rules, facts, and truth in order for it to "flow," global control makes cash subject to that which is general, i.e., subject to "*the people's*" natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*, making it possible for those in control of the "environment" (perceived and actual) to live off "*the people's*" money, enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* with "*the people's*" *affirmation*, i.e., no longer being judged, condemned, cast out for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* (having 'justified' "*the people's*" natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* now "owning" them and thereby controlling the "cash flow"), thereby 'justifying' (in their mind) their judging, condemning casting out (removing or killing) those who get in the way of their *lusts* of the 'moment,' i.e., who get in the way of the "cash flow" (including the unborn, elderly, innocent, righteous who cost them time and money, i.e., who are an inconvenience). To those "*of (and for) the world*" *lust* and money ("cash flow") are one and the same, making the father's/Father's authority (having to do the father's/Father's will, i.e., not having control over the "cash flow") their enemy. Without the father's/Father's authority in the home/in the soul, teaching his/His children there is a consequence for being or doing wrong there is tyranny, anarchy, and revolution in the land.

This is in line with Immanuel Kant's dialectic world, a world of "*lawfulness without law*," where the law of the flesh, i.e., man's carnal nature, i.e., *lust* rules (controls the "cash flow") without *rule of law*, i.e., the father's/Father's authority getting in the way. ([Immanuel Kant](#), *Critique of Judgment*) It is Jean-Jacques Rousseau world where, in defiance to "*the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof*," i.e., rejecting the Father's authority (rejecting the Father controlling the "cash flow"), he says "*The fruits of the earth belong to us all, and the earth itself to nobody* [except to him, i.e., the one making this statement who, in his thoughts and actions "owns" whatever he sees (controls the "cash flow"), i.e., as Karl Marx declared "*The proletariat* (Karl Marx and all who think like him) *thus has the same right as has the German king* (who replicates after the

father's/Father's authority) *when he calls, the people his people and a horse his horse* (making the father's/Father's "cash flow" his "cash flow." .") (1 Corinthians 10:26; Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on Inequality*; Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*)

A side bar: when you share your *opinion* of God's Word, i.e., how you "feel" and what you "think" regarding God's Word, which is common practice in the "Church" today, making it subject to your "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment,' i.e., making your *opinion*, i.e., your *self* equal with God, you take God's place, i.e., you become God, making God subject to you, i.e., making His Word subject to your *lusts*. Your *opinion* is subject to your *lusts*. God's Word is not subject to your *opinion*, i.e., to your *lusts*. This is why those "of the world" who are in the "Church" today ask you for your *opinion* regarding a verse in the Bible, so they, hearing your *lusts*, i.e., your *opinion* do not have to hear the Word of God, i.e., do not have to accept it as "IS." You will more than likely support them with your "cash flow" when they ask you for your *opinion* than if you confront them with the Word of God as "IS," their not being in agreement, i.e., rejoicing with you over God's Word, i.e., their not accepting it as "IS"—asking you for your *opinion* of it instead. You "weigh" the Word of God with the Word of God, not with men's *opinions*, making God subject to the doctrines, i.e., the *lusts* of men—the "success," i.e., growth of the "church" today is based upon "If you entertain them they will come (and keep coming back for more and more), growing the "cash flow" as the numbers grow.)."]

It is Georg Hegel's world where *"On account of the absolute and natural oneness of the husband, the wife, and the child, where there is no antithesis of person to person [no "top-down" order controlling the "cash flow"] or of subject to object, the surplus is not the property of one of them, since their indifference is not a formal or a legal one,"* your spouse, your children, your property, your business, and even your soul [the "cash flow"] is not yours but is subject to George Hegel's, Jean-Jacques Rousseau's, Immanuel Kant's, Karl Marx's, et al, i.e., the Marxist's, i.e., the facilitator of 'change's' *lusts* of the 'moment,' making all that "is" objects to fulfill (satisfy) his carnal desires of the 'moment,' 'justifying' his removal of all who get in his

way, i.e., in the way of the "cash flow." (ibid.) The children of disobedience (because of their wicked behavior losing access to the "cash flow") must convince the rest of the children that all children are equal according to their carnal nature, thus uniting as one (with all the children) they are able to remove the father/Father and his/His authority, being able then to regain access to and therefore control over the "cash flow" they are able to rule over the rest of the children who must 'justify' their *lusts* or be removed from having access to or control over the "cash flow."

Building "*a city and a tower*" that you can be proud of (in defiance to the father/Father), i.e., working on a "*group project*" (void of the father's/Father's authority, i.e., setting aside your parents restraints in order to "get along") so you can "make a name for their self" prevents you from scattering (from standing alone with the truth, i.e., from doing the father's/Father's will). "*Building relationship upon self interest*" rejects and attacks the person doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., rejects and attacks the person standing alone with the truth, i.e., rejects and attacks the person doing right and not wrong according to specific commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., rejects and attacks the person accusing "the group" of doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, judging, condemning, casting them out (or at least not having relationship with them)—must be rejected and attacked since their position (way of thinking) stands in the way of *lust*, i.e., stands in the way of "human nature," i.e., stands in the way of their control of the "cash flow." Any student holding to the father's/Father's authority (system) in a "*group grade*" classroom is going to be martyred for the sake of "*the group*," i.e., for the sake of the facilitator of 'change's control of the "cash flow"—used to support his *lusts* (as a drug addict, using it to support his habit).

"And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth."

Even Karl Marx understood the message (with evil intent to destroy it):
"The unspeculative Christian also recognizes sensuality as long as it does not assert itself at the expense of true reason, i.e., of faith, of true love, i.e., of love of God, of true will-power, i.e., of will in Christ. Not for the sake of

sensual love, not for the lust of the flesh, but because the Lord said: Increase and multiply." (Karl Marx, The Holy Family) Karl Marx wrote this. All he had to do was draw "the unspeculative Christian" into dialogue, where "sensuousness," i.e., lust lies, using his opinion ("I feel" and "I think") when defining right and wrong behavior (in order to make "a name" for himself, i.e., "thinking for himself 'What can I get out of this for me?'" setting aside what he has been told) and he "owned" him.

"And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there. And they said one to another, Go to, let us make brick, and burn them throughly. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar. And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. And the LORD came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the LORD said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth." Genesis 9:1; 11:1-9

Setting aside what the father/Father says in order to "build relationship," i.e., in order to "make a name for your self" (to be recognized, respected, and desired to be around by others) while "building a tower" (while working on a "group project") is the quickest way to 'change' a person, setting aside the father's/Father's authority for the approval of "the group." "We think" negates "He said."

"It is not the will or desire of any one person which establish order but the moving spirit of the whole group. Control is social." (John Dewey, Experience and Education)

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

"A democratic society repudiates the principle of external authority." "God is the source of corruption in individuals." (John Dewey Democracy and Education)

"In a democratic society a patriarchal culture should make us depressed instead of glad; it [a patriarchal culture] is an argument against the higher possibilities of human nature, of self actualization." "In our democratic society, any enterprise—any individual—has its obligations to the whole." "I have found whenever I ran across authoritarian students [those who adhere to the father's/Father's authority] that the best thing for me to do was to break their backs immediately." "The correct thing to do with authoritarians is to take them realistically for the bastards they are and then behave toward them as if they were bastards." (Abraham Maslow, Maslow on Management) This is the spirit behind education today, even in the "Christian" schools—If they are using "Bloom's Taxonomies" as their curriculum it is a given, i.e., they have to.

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

"The child takes on the characteristic behavior of the group in which he is placed. . . . he reflects the behavior patterns which are set by the adult leader of the group." (Kurt Lewin in Wilbur Brookover, A Sociology of Education)

"There is no more important issue than the interrelationship of the group members." "To question the value or activities of the group, would be to thrust himself into a state of dissonance." "Few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity [their loyalty to the father's/Father's authority] in the face of apparent group unanimity." ([Irvin D. Yalom](#), The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy)

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

*"Change in methods of leadership [replacing the father's/Father' authority, i.e., having to humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate your self in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will with the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., dialoguing your opinion with others, without fear of being judged or cast out, to a consensus, i.e., to a "feeling" or sensation of "oneness"] is probably the quickest way to bring about a change in the cultural atmosphere of a group." "Any real change of the culture of a group is, therefore, interwoven with the changes of the power constellation within the group." (Barker, Dembo, & Lewin, "frustration and regression: an experiment with young children" in *Child Behavior and Development*)*

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

God can speak into the local (to the "scattered"), i.e., to those doing the father's will (even though the father might be wrong), where the value of a dollar is tied to doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (where the concept of doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth is the issue, i.e., the right way of thinking). He can not speak into the general,

i.e., to those *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*, where the dollar has value only when it can be used by "*the people*" (by those in control of "*the people*") to satisfy their *lusts*—rejecting, attacking, and removing, i.e., refusing to listen to those who judge, condemn, cast them out for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*. For those *lusting* after the things of the world, wanting "*the people*" to support them "*the people*" must *negate* local control, i.e., *negate* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., *negate* those judging, condemning, casting out others who do not do the father's/Father's will but their will instead, so they can *lust* without being judged, condemned, cast out for not doing right, i.e., for not doing the father's/Father's will but doing wrong, i.e., doing their will instead—in defiance to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in defiance to doing the father's/Father's will that gets in the way of their *self interests*, i.e., *lusts* of the 'moment,' i.e., in the way of the "cash flow") in their thoughts, directly effecting their actions.

". . . 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

Martin Luther wrote: *"I greatly fear that the universities, unless they teach the Holy Scriptures diligently and impress them on the young students, are wide gates to hell. I would advise no one to send his child where the Holy Scriptures are not supreme. Every institution that does not unceasingly pursue the study of God's word becomes corrupt."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 1, The Christian in Society: p. 207) *"Miserable Christians, whose words and faith still depend on the interpretations of men and who expect clarification from them! This is frivolous and ungodly. The Scriptures are common to all, and are clear enough in respect to what is necessary for salvation and are also obscure enough for inquiring minds ... let us reject the word of man."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.217) *"In vain does one fashion a logic of faith, a substitution brought about without regard for limit and measure."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 31, Career of the Reformer: I, p. 12) As Paul the Apostle wrote: *"For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."* Romans

10:3 *"My advice has been that a young man avoid scholastic philosophy and theology like the very death of his soul."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.258) As Paul the Apostle wrote to Timothy: *"O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace be with thee. Amen."* 1 Timothy 6:20-21 *"The sophists have imposed tyranny and bondage upon our freedom to such a point that we must not resist that twice accursed Aristotle [who taught that if you can 'create' a "healthy" environment (whatever that means, according to whoever defines "healthy") you can 'create' a "healthy" person (disregarding or ignorant of the depraved nature of the human heart), but are compelled to submit. Shall we therefore be perpetually enslaved and never breathe in Christian liberty, nor sigh from out of this Babylon for our scriptures and our home?"* (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.217) *"The sophists, nevertheless, rise proudly up, hold their ears, close their eyes, and turn away their heart just so that they may fill all ears with their human words, and alone may occupy the stage so that no one will bark against their assertion[s] ... The word of man is sacred and to be venerated, but God's word is handed over to whores ... the meaning of sin ... is dependent on the arbitrary choice of the sophists."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.216)

Those *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* must *negate* the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., *negate* the father's/Father's control of the "cash flow" in order for them to *lust* without being judged, condemned, cast out, i.e., in order for them to be in control of the "cash flow," using it to satisfy their *lusts*.

"Once the earthly family [where children learn to humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate their self in order to do the father's will] is discovered to be the secret of the Holy family [where the Son of God and those who follow him humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate their self in order to do the Father's will], the former must then itself be destroyed [vernichtet, i.e., annihilated, i.e., negated] in theory and in

practice [in the persons personal thoughts and in his social actions]." (Karl Marx, *Feuerbach Thesis #4*)

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

"Building relationship upon self interest" negates the father's/Father's authority—makes "cash flow" subject to the lusts of the 'moment,' i.e., to the Marxist, i.e., to the socialist, i.e., to the globalist, i.e., to the facilitator of 'change' instead of subject to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., subject to doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., subject to local control. The general negates the local, i.e., lust negates the father's/Father's authority over the individual. When lust becomes the foundation of 'reasoning' the general, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat:" negates the local, i.e., negates "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" Genesis 2:16, 17 Becoming "equal" with God makes God (your behavior) subject to your lusts, making you (lust) God (in your eyes). "Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." [Genesis 3:1-6](#)

In order for the Marxist (the globalist) to control the "cash flow" *"the people"* must be 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority system (in their mind) so they can be "free" to spend money on their lusts of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*, that those in control of the "environment" are *stimulating*, moving money out from under local control, i.e., out from under the father's/Father's control (who requires those under his/His authority to do right and not wrong according to

his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to have access to it) to the globalist's control, i.e., to the Marxist's control (who requires "*the people*" to cast aside the father's/Father's authority so they can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*, i.e., that the globalist is controlling, without being judged, condemned, cast out, no longer having a *guilty conscience* which the father's/Father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting*, giving control of the "cash flow" to those in control of the "environment," 'justifying' their *lusts*—making themselves subject only to *stimulus-response*, i.e., only to that which is "of the world" instead of subject to being *told*, i.e., subject to the father/Father and his/His authority, i.e., subject to doing the father's/Father's will).

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

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

There is a direct correlation to the father's/Father's authority, local control, and doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, the "cash flow" being subject to them all. This was not wasted on the Marxist, i.e., on those wanting to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the moment that the world *stimulates* without being judged, condemned, cast out—having access to and control over the "cash flow" themselves.

When the general, i.e., *lust* controls the local, individualism under the father's/Father's authority (individualism, under God), i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth is *negated*. America was founded upon the father's/Father's authority system, not upon a King or a "*group of people*" but upon limited government, with the "Bill of Rights" retaining the power of the local, recognizing the father's right of private conviction, private property, and private business,

making him King over his own home, i.e., over his family, his property, and his business, preventing government (that which is general) from taking control. This is what President Dwight D. Eisenhower's warned us about in his "Farewell Address" (1961): *"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."* This followed President [George Washington's](#) warning, expressed in his "Farewell Address" (1796): *"Despotism ... predominates in the human heart." "If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation ;[by those in one branch of government over another]; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."* President Reagan warned us as well: *"The eight most dangerous words you will ever hear are 'We're from the government. We're here to help.'"*

As is now the *praxis* of Federal programs and grants, where those in power (and those influencing those in power) acquire control over the local, offering to "help" the local resolve local crisis, pocket their "share" in the contract, the quality of the product not being that which the local would produce, who would require those making the product to do right and not wrong according to their established commands, rules, facts, and truth, keeping the cash flow local (and the makers of the product under the father's control, doing what they are *told*). Whoever controls the "cash flow" controls the quality of the product and the behavior of those making it, with the general 'liberating' the "cash flow" and the behavior of *"the people"* from the father's/Father's authority system ('liberating' them from local control, i.e., from established commands, rules, facts, and truth) in order for them to have access to the cash, using it on their fancy houses, fancy cars, fancy boats, and fancy women without local standards, i.e., the father's/Father's authority 'limiting' their access to the "cash flow," forcing the local instead via taxes, as well as bribing them through Federal grants (which they pocket money through—it is not "free" money, people are forced to "pay up" or go to jail) to support their cause, 'liberating' money

from local control, i.e., for the father's/Father's authority so they can have access to in order to pay for (actualize) their *lusts*. The power to tax is the power to destroy local control. Government, "helping" the people re-solve local crisis, requiring them to set aside local control, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., established commands rules, facts, and truth in order to do so is how a free people are made slaves. Without the father/Father (the local) in control of the "cash flow" those who *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates* (the general) control "*the people*," living off of their money—passing laws (requiring the local's to set aside their standards in order) to "help" the local solve local crisis, making them their slaves—through taxes (and tax breaks) the local's paying for their *self interests*, i.e., for their *lusts* which the local's would not finance if the "cash flow" was under their control.

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

All "educators" are certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of what are called "[*Bloom's Taxonomies*](#)" i.e., Marxist curriculum in the classroom. Whoever develops the curriculum, i.e., the learning environment and the test questions controls the outcome. Locally developed curriculum and test questions are different than State and National (Global). The State and National curriculum and test questions, leaving out local standards in order to be general, directly effect the students, 'changing' the way they feel, think, and act toward their self, other, the world, and authority, 'changing' their attitude toward local control (where those in control of the "cash flow" restrain them instead of spending it on their *lusts*, now, with the "help" of the "educator" engenders hostility in them toward their parents, i.e., toward authority—the same being true for politicians, no longer "re-presenting" their constituents position but their own *self interests* instead).

"We recognize the point of view that truth and knowledge are only relative and that there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all time and

places." (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*)

In other words Bloom, paraphrasing Karl Marx recognized the children's *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, i.e., the children's "*affective domain*," making it, i.e., *lust*, i.e., their "*affective domain*" the 'drive' of life and its augmentation the 'purpose,' thereby *negating* local control, i.e., parental authority, i.e., the father's/Father's authority in the thoughts of the children, effecting their actions.

"*Bloom's Taxonomies*" are ". . . a psychological classification system" used "*to develop attitudes and values . . . which are not shaped by the parents.*" "*The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box.'*" "*In fact, a large part of what we call 'good teaching' is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives through challenging the student's fixed beliefs. . . .*" "*It is in this 'box' that the most influential controls are to be found.*" "*The affective domain [the student's natural inclination to "lust" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world (including "the group") stimulates and hatred toward restraint] contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people.*" (Book 2: *Affective Domain*)

"*Pandora's Box*" a.k.a. the "affective domain" is a "*box*" (or jar) full of evil, which once opened can not be closed. Once local control, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., fear of God is removed from the classroom, i.e., from the child's learning environment (curriculum) *lust* and those in control of the environment (classroom) *stimulating* it are in control of the child's thoughts, turning the child against the father's/Father's authority, i.e., against local control. *Negating* local control. "Cash flow" from then in is under the control of the general, i.e., those making *lust* the 'drive' of life and its augmentation the 'purpose,' with their control of the "cash flow" controlling "*the people.*" By moving communication in the direction of the child's *self interest*, i.e., his *lusts*, i.e., the "affective domain," when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior he will not hear (can not hear) what he is being *told*, i.e., he will not listen to the one telling him how he is to behave. This is where "chastisement" comes into play—

getting his attention, moving him away from his *lust* for pleasure, detoxing him, making doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth the right way to think.

Bloom wrote: *"In the more traditional society a philosophy of life, a mode of conduct, is spelled out for its members at an early stage in their lives." "A major function of education in such a society is to achieve the internalization of this philosophy." "This is not to suggest that education in an open society does not attempt to develop personal and social values." "It does indeed." "But more than in traditional societies it allows the individual a greater amount of freedom in which to achieve a Weltanschauung¹ [world view, i.e., how a person perceives and responds to his self, others, the world, and authority]." ¹Cf. Erich Fromm, 1941; T. W. Adorno et al., 1950 [who both were Marxists]." (ibid)*

Bloom's "*Weltanschauung*," and therefore the "taxonomy," i.e., the curriculum is based upon the ideology of two Marxists. "Erich Fromm" and "T. W. Adorno."

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

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

state [parental authority, local control, Nationalism], *and so forth, have so frequently and, as it seems to us, correctly, been set forth as important aspects of the Nazi creed that a search for correlates of prejudice had naturally to take these attitudes into account.*" *"The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem."* (Adorno) The error in Adorno's "logic" is that Fascism, instead of supporting the father's/Father's authority in the home and in the individual's thoughts and actions, *negated* it. *"Our problem,"* according to Adorno, i.e., the Marxist is the father's/Father's authority in the children's/"*the people's*" thoughts, i.e., in the environment directly effecting their actions, i.e., getting in the way of their leaders who want to rule without accountability to God, i.e., to the Father above.

The "educator," i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the group psychotherapist does not have to *tell* the students to question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack their parent's authority when they get home from school, if they were not doing that already (*telling* them would be "old school," maintaining the "old" world order of being *told* even if it was done for the 'purpose' of 'change,' i.e., for the 'purpose' of creating a "new" world order), all they have to do is use a curriculum in the classroom that *"encourages,"* i.e., pressures the students to participate in *dialoguing* their *opinions* to a *consensus*, 'justifying' their carnal nature, i.e., *"lust" over* and therefore against their parent's authority. Being *told* to be *"positive"* (supportive of the other students carnal nature) and not *"negative"* (judging them by their parent's standards) pressures students to 'justify' their and the other student's love of pleasure and hate of restraint, doing so in order to be approved, i.e., *affirmed* by *"the group,"* resulting in *"the group"* labeling those students who, refuse to participate in the process of 'change' or who fight against it as being *"negative,"* divisive, hateful, intolerant, maladjusted, unadaptable to 'change,' resisters of 'change,' not "team players," lower order thinkers, in denial, phobic, prejudiced, judgmental, racist, fascist, dictators, anti-social, etc., i.e., *"hurting"* people's *"feelings"* resulting in *"the group"* rejecting them—the student's natural desire for approval and fear of rejection forces him to participate. The same outcome applies to all adults, in any profession who participate in the process as

well. Once you are 'labeled,' you are 'labeled' for life. In the soviet union, once you were 'labeled' "*psychological*," no matter how important you were in the past, your life was over, your career was done.

"Prior to therapy the person is prone to ask himself, 'What would my parents want me to do?' During the process of therapy the individual come to ask himself, 'What does it mean to me?'" (Rogers)

The use of *therapy* is to *negate* the father's/Father's authority in the individuals thoughts, directly effecting his actions. There is no other purpose (despite what the therapist might think or say).

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

from his "ought," i.e., a world which "lusts," i.e., a world void of the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* which the father's/Father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "*lusting . . .*". (Yalom)

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

"Only a dead father is a good father." "The current generation is the first in the history of the world which has nothing to learn from grandparents;"

"Freud noted that patricide and incest are part of man's deepest nature."
(Yalom)

By making *lust*, i.e., the general (the "*affective domain*," that which all children/all men have in common) the standard of life the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the local (being told what is right and what is wrong behavior) is *negated* in the thoughts of "*the people*," so those in power can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* with the people's *affirmation*, i.e., cash and time—without being judged, condemned, or fearing being cast out. Having control of the father's "credit card" *lust* puts the children ("*the people*") into debt. Making laws that actualize their own *self interests*, doing so in the name of "*the people*" moves the "cash flow" out from under local control, where *lust* is restrained or blocked in order to "get the job done," i.e., "done right" according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth into general control, 'liberating' "*the people*" and those in government from the father's/Father's authority system so they can *lust* with impunity. The local, i.e., the father/Father knows the value of a dollar. The general, i.e., the child does not.

The facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist establishes "human nature," i.e., "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," i.e., only that which is "of the world" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority in order for him to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the moment (*dopamine emancipation*) that the current situation and/or the people or person is *stimulating* without having a *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders), with "*the people*" or "the person's" *affirmation*, i.e., approval.

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

"The people," being a slave to *lust*, i.e., a servant to the environment that *stimulates lust* (selling their soul to those who control the environment), those who control, i.e., who "own" the environment that *stimulates lust*, (that they have given control over to by turning to them for direction instead of to the father/Father—thereby abdicating their inheritance, which can only come from the father/Father, turning it over to their use of it to satisfy their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*) controls them, i.e., "owns" them, making them a servant, i.e., a slave of theirs (without them being aware of it, at least at first, but then, having lost their inheritance being too late)—resulting in their serving, protecting, defending, praising, worshiping, killing, and dying for them, removing anyone who gets in the way of their control of, i.e., their "ownership" of the environment (that *stimulates lust* in them), which includes control over the "cash flow." This is the meaning of and the 'purpose' for using *stimulus-response* ("operant conditioning," i.e., [psychology](#)) on people, turning them into Thorndikes chickens, Skinner's rats, Pavlov's dog, i.e., into "human resource," making them, responding to their "trigger words," i.e., responding to their commands, subject to them, i.e., their slaves (no longer being free individuals, receiving an inheritance, be it land, cash, etc., that is under their control, under God who gave it to them to be stewards over/eternal life which only the father/Father, i.e., the father's/Father's authority system can give). Without the father/Father, i.e., the father's/Father's authority all you have is your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*, with those in control of the environment "owning" you, i.e., buying and selling your soul, i.e., using you to satisfy their *lusts*, wanting you to be like them, doing the same to the next person you meet coming down the road, 'justifying' his or her *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* making him or her subject to you, thereby making his or her "cash flow" subject to them (who "own" you), to be used by them to satisfy their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*. For example when the "minister" (facilitator of 'change') brings "entertainment" into the "church," "entertainment" (even in the name of the Lord) will keep "the people" coming back (despite the preaching of false doctrine), with their "cash flow" coming his (or her) way.

"Cash flow," made subject to being *told*, i.e., subject to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., subject to the father's/Father's authority system is antithetical to "cash flow" made subject to the children's *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world (that the current situation and/or object, people, or person) is *stimulating*. Without the father's/Father's authority the facilitator of 'change' rules over the children, making everyone subject to his use of the "cash flow," i.e., subject to his *lust* for pleasure and power.

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

"As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." Isaiah 3:12

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

Karl Marx based his ideology off of Heraclitus (as did the stoics), making *lust* the 'drive' of life and therefore its augmentation the 'purpose'—instead of doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., instead of doing the father's/Father's will.

"Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys." Heraclitus

ROE v. WADE was based upon stoicism, which was based off of Heraclitus, i.e., *"there has always been strong support for the view [opinion] that life does not begin until live birth. This was the belief of the Stoics."* (ROE v. WADE, 410 U.S. 113 15, 1973) rejecting and therefore in defiance to the Christian faith, *"Every system of law known to civilized society generated from or had as its component one of two well known systems of ethics, stoic or Christian [men's opinions or rule of law]. The*

COMMON LAW draws its subsistence from the latter, its roots go deep into that system, the Christian concept of right and wrong or right and justice motivates every rule of equity. It is the guide by which we dissolve domestic friction's and the rule by which all legal controversies are settled." (Strauss Vs. Strauss., 3 So. 2nd 727, 728, 1941) In ROE V. WADE our highest court embraced Marxism, establishing it over and therefore against the Word of God, i.e., Godly restraint, i.e., individualism, under God, i.e., rule of law. Marx wrote: *"The justice of state constitutions is to be decided not on the basis of Christianity, not from the nature of Christian society but from the nature of human society."* (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) When the courts turned to "I feel" and "I think" instead of "It is written" "*jurisprudence of terror*" came into play. *"Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state [i.e., the Marxist]."* (R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, *Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law*) In this way the facilitator of 'change' can silence, censor, remove anyone getting in the way of "progress," i.e., in the way of the "cash flow," augmenting their *lusts*, even killing (or justify the killing of) the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous in the name of "*the group*," i.e., in the name of "*the people*," i.e., to sustain the "*cash flow*," doing so without having a *guilty conscience*.

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

"Woe unto them that call evil ["human nature," i.e., lust] good, and good [the Father's authority] evil; that put darkness [pleasure] for light, and light [obedience to the Father] for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!" Isaiah 5:20, 21

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

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

"The words 'seem to' are significant; it is the perception which functions in guiding behavior ['liberating' the child/man from who "IS," i.e., from the Father's authority]." (Rogers)

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

"It has been pointed out that we are attempting to classify phenomena which could not be observed or manipulated in the same concrete form as the phenomena of such fields as the physical and biological sciences. It was the view of the group that educational objectives stated in the behavior form have their counterparts in the behavior of individuals ... observe(able) and describ(able) therefore classifi(able)." (Book 1: Cognitive Domain)

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

Bloom dedicated his first taxonomy to Ralph Tyler whose student, Thomas Kuhn (quoting Max Planck) wrote, *"A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it."* (Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*)

Kuhn continued: *"If a paradigm [a 'change' in culture, from Patriarch to Heresiarch] is ever to triumph it must gain some first supporters, men who will develop it to the point where hardheaded arguments can be produced and multiplied" which eventuates "an increasing shift in the distribution of professional allegiances" whereupon "the man who continues to resist after his whole profession has been converted is ipso facto ceased to be a scientist."* *"Thomas S Kuhn spent the year 1958-1959 at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavior Sciences, directed by Ralph Tyler, where*

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

"Hardheaded arguments" make it difficult if not impossible to respond to this process, especially when those advocating it are in a position of authority—any response with facts and truth will only be perceived as being "argumentative." When you make the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process the means of knowing the truth anyone with the truth, who insists upon it becomes "argumentative" to those with an opinion. Anyone questioning or pointing out the errors of the theory of evolution or 'climate change' is out of a job or holding any position of authority as the result (theory negating fact and truth). The only reason for the theory of evolution is to make moot (silence) judgment for sin so the evolutionist can sin without having a guilty conscience, i.e., accountability for his thoughts and actions (and his use of the "cash flow" to feed his lusts).

*In order to gain and maintain control of the "cash flow" those "of (and for) the world" must "prevent someone who KNOWS from filling the empty space." (Wilfred Bion, *A Memoir of the Future*) Since stimulus-response, i.e., "behavior science" is all there is to the therapist any information outside of "sense experience" is "inappropriate" information, needed to be removed from the environment. The error in therapy it man can become a good person by being raised up, educated, and living in a "good" environment, which negates his heart being deceitful ("above all things") and wicked ("desperately wicked").*

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

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

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

"For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." Romans 10:3

"The transgression of the wicked saith within my heart, that there is no fear of God before his eyes. For he flattereth himself in his own eyes, until his iniquity be found to be hateful. The words of his mouth are iniquity and deceit: he hath left off to be wise, and to do good. He deviseth mischief upon his bed; he setteth himself in a way that is not good; he abhorreth not evil." Psalms 36:1-4

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

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

Facilitators of 'change,' i.e., psychologists, i.e., behavioral "scientists," i.e., "group psychotherapists," i.e., Marxists (Transformational Marxists)—all being the same in method or formula—are using the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus (affirmation) process, i.e., dialectic 'reasoning' ('reasoning' from/through the students "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., from/through their "lust" for pleasure and their hate of restraint, in the "light" of their desire for group approval, i.e., affirmation and fear of group rejection) in the "group grade," "safe zone/space/place," "Don't be negative, be positive," "open ended, non-directed," soviet style, brainwashing (washing the father's/Father's authority from the children's thoughts and actions, i.e., "theory and practice," negating their having a guilty conscience, which the father's/father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning

in the process—called "[the negation of negation](#)" since the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience*, being *negative* to [the child's carnal nature](#), is *negated* in *dialogue*—in *dialogue*, *opinion*, and the *consensus* process there is no father's/Father's authority, i.e., no established a.k.a. absolute command, rule, facts, or truth to be accepted as is, by faith and obeyed; there is only the person's carnal desires, i.e., *lusts* of the past and the present being verbally expressed and 'justified'), [inductive 'reasoning'](#) ('reasoning' from/through the students "*feelings*," i.e., their natural inclination to "*lust*" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment'—[dopamine emancipation](#)—which the world *stimulates*, i.e., their "[self interest](#)," i.e., their "[sense experience](#)," [selecting "appropriate information"](#)—excluding, ignoring, or resisting, i.e., rejecting any "*inappropriate*" information, i.e., established command, rule, fact, or truth that gets in the way of their desired outcome, i.e., pleasure—in determining right from wrong behavior), "[Bloom's Taxonomy](#)," "[affective domain](#)," French Revolution ([Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité](#)) classroom "environment" in order (as in "new" world order) to 'liberate' children from parental authority, i.e., from the father's/Father's authority system (the [Patriarchal Paradigm](#))—as [predators, charlatans, pimps, pedophiles, seducing, deceiving, and manipulating](#) them [as chickens, rats, and dogs](#), i.e., treating them as natural resource ("*human resource*") in order to convert them into '[liberals](#),' [socialists](#), [globalists](#), so they, '[justifying](#)' [their "self" before one another](#), can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can "*lust*" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates*, with impunity.

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

[Home schooling](#) material, co-ops, conferences, etc., are joining in the same *praxis*, fulfilling [Immanuel Kant's](#) as well as [Georg Hegel's](#), [Karl Marx's](#), and [Sigmund Freud's](#) agenda of using the pattern or method of [Genesis 3:1-6](#), i.e., "*self*" 'justification,' i.e., dialectic (*dialogue*) 'reasoning,' i.e., 'reasoning' from/through your "*feelings*," i.e., your carnal desires of the 'moment' which are being *stimulated* by the world (including your desire for approval from others, with them *affirming* your carnal nature) in order

to *negate* [Hebrews 12:5-11](#), i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* your "self" (your *lusts*) in order to do the father's/Father's will, *negating* [Romans 7:14-25](#), i.e., your having a *guilty conscience* when you do wrong, disobey, sin, thereby *negating* your having to repent before the father/Father for your doing wrong, disobedience, sins—which is the real agenda.

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

© *Institution for Authority Research*, Dean Gotcher 2023 (10/22/2023)