

authorityresearch.com

College Students Beware!

A college course on college—for college students and their parents
(as well as those planning to go to college).

(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

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

"The heart is deceitful above all things [thinking pleasure, 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 it's lust for pleasure is standing in the way, 'justifying' the hate.

"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

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

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

"Laws must not fetter human life [lust]; but yield to it; they must change as the needs [lusts] and capacities of the people change." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right') Laws must be readily adaptable to 'change' as the lusts , i.e., "self interests" of "the people" i.e., the facilitator of 'change' 'change.'

When you KNOW what you are doing is wrong (having been *told*) and you do it anyway, that is when sin, i.e., *lust* is revealed, i.e., is made manifest ("*self*" is "*actualized*"). By making sin, i.e., *lust* the standard of life—tolerating sin, i.e., being silent around sin, not condemning sin is to condone sin, i.e., is to consent to sin in the eyes of the sinner—in college and beyond (in the workplace aka Total Quality Management, in education aka Outcome Based Education, plus many other names [the name keeps changing but the process is the same], in government aka School-To-Work, in the "Church," i.e., "Church Growth," "Mega-Church," etc., i.e., if you entertain them they will come and keep coming back, etc.), professors, administrators, staff, and students today silence anyone who KNOWS so they can sin, i.e., can *lust* without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without having any sense of accountability for their carnal thoughts and carnal actions. When you *negate "belief-action dichotomy,"* where, when you have done wrong, are doing wrong, or thinking about doing wrong, having been *told* you KNOW better, you have to repent and stop doing it or not do it, i.e., stop thinking about doing it, with "*theory and practice*" or "*stimulus-response,*" you have to remove anyone in the environment who makes you feel *guilty* for having done wrong, while doing wrong, or for thinking about doing wrong. *"We believe in 'freedom of speech' and 'freedom of religion' as long as what you say does not hurt our 'feelings,' i.e., does not make us feel guilty, i.e., does not get in the way of our lusts."*

"For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

The Marxist's solution to being wrong is to get rid of or silence (*negate*) anyone who accuses him of being wrong so he can see himself

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.

as always being right, i.e., "good," i.e., like God in his eyes.
(Only God is good.)

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

By making everything an *opinion*, i.e., "*That is your opinion*" (when you point out someone being wrong or doing wrong), being wrong or doing wrong is *negated*. There is no wrong, i.e., accountability for being wrong or doing wrong in an *opinion*. At the worst (or most, according to how you look at it) there is only "*I'll do 'better' next time*" (no matter the harm that was done to or the cost incurred by the other person). It is the difference between *discussion*, which retains the word wrong (regarding behavior or action, i.e., application; "*I knew better*"), and *dialogue* which *negates* it (does not include, i.e., recognize wrong when it comes to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., being *told*; "*I didn't think*"). "Mercy before guilty 'justifies' sin. Mercy after guilty is for those who repent." When mercy precedes *guilty* (which is convoluted thinking, *negating guilty*) there will be no mercy given to the one accusing others of being *guilty*, i.e., of being sinners (thus the 'justified' hatred, in those doing this process toward believers, i.e., toward authority, i.e., toward those making them "feel" *guilty*).

"But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we

have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him." 2 Corinthians 11:3, 4

Dialogue, i.e., "I feel" and "I think" (but not certain), where you have to experience it for your *self* in order to "know" is the language of the flesh. *Discussion*, i.e., "I KNOW" because you have been *told* (you are persuaded, i.e., you are certain) is the language of the soul. When it comes to right and wrong behavior, by replacing *discussion*, i.e., what the father/Father says with *dialogue*, i.e., with your carnal desires, i.e., your *lusts* of the 'moment,' the master facilitator of 'change' "owns" you. In the use of Neuro-linguistics, i.e., the language of the nerves system, i.e., an embedded statement in a question (as in, "I wonder whether you know where you knee is?" which destabilizes and then sensitizes you to your "feelings," i.e., to your *self*, i.e., to your *lusts*, i.e., to your *self interest*, establishing "feelings," i.e., *self*, i.e., *lust*, i.e., *self interest* over and therefore against any standard that is restraining you, i.e., standing in your way), i.e., "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" the master facilitator of 'change' was able to 'discover' what the woman in the garden in Eden was *lusting* after, i.e., her desire to "touch it" (she was thinking about, i.e., setting her mind upon) the "forbidden," i.e., the "Thou shalt surely die" tree, giving her a "positive" ("Ye shalt not surely die") environment in which to 'discover' her "potential," i.e., to decide for her *self*, i.e., from her carnal nature (her own "senses," i.e., "feelings" of the 'moment') right and wrong behavior. Laws made via *dialogue* (*opinion*) makes law readily adaptable to 'change,' i.e., subject to the person's *lusts*, i.e., "*self interests*" of the 'moment.'

Dialogue is the language of the flesh;

"I feel," "I think."

Discussion is the language of the soul; "I KNOW because I have been *told*."

When you bring *dialogue* into an environment establishing right and wrong behavior the language of the flesh, i.e., knowing right from wrong according to your *lusts* and hate of the 'moment' (your *lust* for pleasure and your hate of restraint) supersedes (*negates*) the language of the soul, i.e., knowing right from wrong from being *told*.

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

The dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process (the "group grade" classroom) 'justifies' sin, i.e., 'justifies' *lust* (affirms what all men, women, and children have in common aka common-ism), *negating guilty*, i.e., the need of a savior (other than the "need" of "another savior," i.e., the facilitator of 'change' who rescues them from the knowledge of sin, i.e., of being *guilty*), *negating* the need to repent (other than the "need" to "repent" for evaluating and judging their *self* and others from established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of sin, i.e., their *lusts*, i.e., that make them "feel" *guilty* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, which inhibits or blocks, i.e., prevents 'change'). 'Justifying' their *self*, i.e., their *lusts* before men, *negating* those who get in the way is the hallmark of a Marxist, i.e., Marxism, now being put into *praxis* in the college classroom and on the college campus today. The trickery, as explained in greater detail near the end of this issue is to create "*hardheaded arguments*" in order to silence any facts or truth based answer to a problem. By simply bringing *dialogue* and *opinions* into a facts based *discussion*, anyone holding to facts or truth (trying to persuade others by facts and truth, holding to their position) will eventually be perceived as being *argumentative*, i.e., of being "unreasonable." The same is true for established commands and rules. The "three minute time rule" (time allotted to speak) in a meeting setting

policy, i.e., establishing right and wrong behavior, replacing ten minutes (Robert's Rules of Order) which gives you time enough to *persuade* others with facts, is to give the perception that all statements are an *opinion*, i.e., "*Thank you for sharing (your opinion). Next.*" When established commands, rules, facts, and truth are treated as an *opinion*, established commands, rules, facts, and truth are *negated*, making the person's *opinion*, i.e., his "*feelings*" of the 'moment' the command, rule, fact, and truth of the 'moment,' i.e., making commands, rules, facts, and truth subject to perpetual 'change,' i.e., subject to the person's *lusts*, i.e., *self interests* of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating.

"*Who told thee*" Genesis 3:11

If you "trouble" yourself, i.e., endure to the end of this issue you will KNOW the truth about college (including the "Christian"/conservative colleges) today. That is, if you want to KNOW. They are certainly not going to *tell* you. Why would they? They need your money, government money, your parents money (your inheritance), and your soul, i.e., you and your [affirmation](#) to support and 'justify' their *lusts*, i.e., their habit.

The *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process (the "*group grade*" classroom) is the *praxis* of [Genesis 3:1-6](#), i.e., of *self* 'justification,' *negating* [Hebrews 12:5-11](#), i.e., the father's/Father's authority, *negating* [Romans 7:14-25](#), i.e., the *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating (instead of doing the father's/Father's will)—which is the real agenda—so all (especially the facilitator of 'change') can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a *guilty conscience*, with "*the student's*," i.e., "*the group's*," i.e., "*the people's*" *affirmation*. This is the *praxis* of the college classroom and college campus today.

This is as a college course in itself. There are many important, revealing quotations (from the source—revealing "the rest of the story," i.e., their

agenda in their own words) throughout and at the end of this issue (so I encourage you to read it all). Most books you read in college you would not buy just to 'enjoy' reading them, only buying them and reading them in order to get a good grade. Although there is no grade or cost or college credit involved here the same is true, i.e., you have to be upset with what is going on in education, i.e., in college in order to get through this material. It will be life changing, i.e., you will not be the same if you do. When I lectured at liberal Universities, exposing their evil agenda (with much of the information presented in this issue) the liberal professors would tell me, in front of their students, they could not refute a word I said, yet (for some reason) they did not invite me back to speak again. Other issues covering the same topic: [College](#), [College Syndrome](#), [Why Homeschooled Students So Quickly Become Marxist in College](#).

"To enjoy the present reconciles us to the actual." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right') Lusting after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates 'reconciles' man to the world, i.e., makes man at-one-with the world.

In other words, according to Karl Marx and his followers *"Lust, i.e., enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating, over and therefore against the father/Father's authority that gets in the way reconciles you to the world," i.e., "Self is actualized in lust that the world stimulates."*

Dopamine: the drug of pleasure, i.e., of choice. They will be 'happy' (for the 'moment,' i.e., forever chasing after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment'—until death) and own nothing, not even their soul (having sold it to the facilitator of 'change' at the street corner of 'lust and affirmation,' i.e., pleasure and the approval of men, i.e., "the group").

Our body naturally produces a chemical (a neurotransmitter) called *dopamine* that is *emancipated (liberated)* into a small gap (called a synaptic gap) between nerves (the posterior of the first nerve *emancipating* it, the anterior of the next nerve *receiving* it), transmitting information to the brain (and in the brain-via dendrites) that we have come in contact with

something in the environment (in the world) that is pleasurable, i.e., that *stimulates dopamine emancipation*. For example, when a child comes in contact with something that is pleasurable in the environment (via the senses of touch, taste, sight, smell, and sound), say in this case a toy that "feels" good, i.e., that *stimulates dopamine emancipation*, the child's natural inclination is to look into the environment to find out what it was (that stimulated *dopamine emancipation*, i.e., pleasure). Once located the child then moves in the direction of the toy (the object) in order to gain control of it (with controlling the toy or the environment in which the toy exists guaranteeing more *dopamine emancipation*, not only in the present but also in the future—stimulus-response which incorporates "approach pleasure-avoid pain"). When the toy is not the child's, i.e., the child is *told* the toy is not his to play with and he continues to play with it, the "*lust of the flesh*," i.e., *stimulus-response*, the "*lust of the eyes*," *coveting* or *lusting* after the object(s) of pleasure in the environment that *stimulate dopamine emancipation*, and "*the pride of life*," i.e., the ability to control the environment, i.e., the situation and/or the people/objects that *stimulates dopamine emancipation*, it is *lust* that controls the child's thoughts and actions, i.e., controls his life. In and of your *self* you do not control *dopamine emancipation*. If there is no restraint, i.e., father's/Father's authority, i.e., fear of accountability it controls you. All habitual drugs are tied to *dopamine*, imitating, it, *emancipating* it, preventing its re-uptake. As covered later, *dialogue* 'justifies' *dopamine emancipation*, *discussion* restrains it, i.e., you. When choosing what to eat for lunch, for example, when you *want* to eat what is not good (not healthy) for you to eat (*dopamine emancipation* is *want*) you go to *dialogue*. If you go to *discussion* you will not eat it (*dopamine emancipation* is restrained, i.e., you restrain your *self*). It is not that God is against *dopamine emancipation*. He created it in us that we might enjoy His creation. It is when it and the creation that stimulates it supersedes His will it becomes *lust*, i.e., disobedience, i.e., sin. When applied to the marriage vow a new clause is added to "*for better or for worse, till death do us part*," i.e., "*until someone 'better' comes along (who stimulates more dopamine emancipation in me than you)*."

"I am nothing and I should be everything [God]." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right')

"... in the day ye eat thereof, ... ye shall be as gods...." Genesis 3:5 (excerpt) When you reject what God tells you regarding right and wrong behavior, you become god, deciding right from wrong behavior, i.e., "Reasoning" from your own nature, 'justifying' your sins, i.e., your lusts, taking that which is not yours (God created the earth and the fullness thereof, including you), consuming it unto your self in order to satisfy your lusts.

Despite linking his statement to *"the people,"* (*"Every class lacks the breadth of soul which identifies it with the soul of the people, that revolutionary boldness which flings at its adversary the defiant phrase;"*) Karl Marx was expressing his hatred toward authority, i.e., his contempt toward those *telling* him right from wrong behavior, i.e., holding him accountable for his carnal thoughts and his carnal actions, i.e., accusing him of being a sinner. Keep in mind, the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the 'liberal' professor (although he might call or present himself a 'conservative'/"Christian") perceives his *self* as being the personification of *"the people,"* who like him *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates and hate restraint, which 'justifies' in his mind his "right" and "duty" to *negating* anyone who does not think like him, i.e., like *"the people,"* i.e., who adheres to the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., who gets in *"the people's,"* i.e., his, i.e., *lust's* way. The 'liberal,' the socialist, the Marxist, the psychologist, the facilitator of 'change,' etc., makes his *"feelings,"* i.e., *lust*, i.e., *dopamine emancipation*, i.e., that which the world stimulates, what everyone has in common (not established commands, rules, facts, and truth that he and they have been *told*) the means to knowing right from wrong behavior. Therefore, when he says "the people" he means his *self*. When he say *"It's not about you."* when you question his activities he is saying in essence *"It is about me. So I can sin, i.e., so I can lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating without having a guilty conscience, i.e., without your, i.e., God's judgment/condemnation, i.e., with your affirmation instead."* Your

affirmation leaves God out of the equation, not only for the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist, i.e., the "professor" but also for you—that is the "plan," i.e., the agenda. With you leaving God out of your "conversation" with him he owns your *inheritance*, i.e., your father's money (which you are paying him, going into debt—government money, i.e., "free money" is debt money you and your children will have to pay back in the future, consuming your inheritance) and your soul (which you sold to him for the pleasures, i.e., for the *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, i.e., in order to have his *affirmation*, i.e., the approval of men). In the dialectic process, i.e., using *dialogue* to determine right and wrong behavior "*the end justifies the means*," i.e., the facilitator of 'change' can do whatever he wants (to satisfy his *lusts*), i.e., "*whatever it takes*" (without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., with no *sense* of accountability to anybody) as long as he is doing it, in the eyes of "*the people*," for "*the people*." The same is true for "*the people*," i.e., "*the group*." The human heart, i.e., *lust* for pleasure always leads to [hatred toward restraint](#), i.e., is "*wicked*," i.e., is "*desperately wicked*," destroying (*negating*) anything or anyone getting in its way. "*Despotism ... predominates in the human heart*." ([George Washington](#), *Farewell Address*) Even George Washington understood this. Once the despot, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' is in a position of authority (in power), he will do whatever it takes to remain in the position of authority (in power). [Patrick Henry](#) warned us about this.

"The proletariat [the child, i.e., "the people"] thus has ["I" thus have] the same right as has the German king [the father/Father] when he calls, the people his people and a horse his horse [thus 'justifying' the negation of the father/Father, i.e., the King/God and his/His authority since in the Marxist's mind there is no "top-down" authority structure except his own—with everyone, thinking like him, i.e., 'justifying' their carnal nature, i.e., his lusts putting him, i.e., the defender of their lusts on top)]." (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) This follows the ideology of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "*The fruits of the earth [lusts] belong to us all [to the children, i.e., to Rousseau, i.e., to the facilitator of 'change'], and the earth itself to nobody [i.e., the father/Father (the King), i.e., God has no right of authority]."* (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on Inequality*) Follow the 'logic' all the

way through. If you perceive your *self* as God, determining right from wrong behavior according to your carnal nature (according to your flesh, i.e., your *lust* for pleasure and your hate of restraint) and the earth belongs to no one, you have no right to call anything yours. The one making this statement therefore ends up controlling everything, including you, i.e., your soul with no concern for what happens to you if you get in his way (in the way of his *lusts*), showing no mercy toward you (he loves *lust*, i.e., "*the fruit*" not you, i.e., your soul). You labor to plant, then water, prune, cultivate, protect, and harvest your fruit trees by the sweat of your brow (working in the heat of the day and in the cold of the spring and fall, when you are not feeling so well, working late into the night and getting up early in the morning while others are sleeping, taking risks financially to "*get ahead*" or "*keep your head above water*"). Then Mr. Rousseau comes by, who has never worked a day of his life (by the sweat of his brow), who helps determine how much taxes you should pay for the "*privilege*" of working for "*the people*," i.e., paying his salary as he "*protects*" your "*rights*," picks fruit from your labor and walks away saying "*It belongs to us all*." To question him will put your future (you) at risk. Karl Marx, in *The Holy Family* also used *fruit trees* as his example of how men are to see themselves and the world they live in. By generalizing, i.e., finding what all fruit trees have in common, i.e., "*The Fruit Tree*" Marx evaluated and then treated all fruit trees (men) from his generalized perception. Anyone growing fruit trees knows you have to treat each kind of tree unique to its characteristic, i.e., there is a right way and wrong way to raise each kind of fruit tree (it is in the details). By generalizing, i.e., evaluating man from what he has in common with his *self* (collectively) and the world, Marxist's, i.e., socialist, i.e., globalists deny (reject) the true understanding of man as a soul—created by God, made in his image. This method of generalizing, as also used by Theodor Adorno (quoted below)—labeling all authority figures as "*Nazis*" ("*prejudiced*") and those submitting to their authority as potential "*Nazis*"—is used by Marxists in order to *deceive* and then *manipulate* men into using their carnal minds (which are being stimulated by the world) as their means to defining who they are, why they are here, and how they are to think and act, giving the

Marxist control of their lives. This is reflected in the 'liberal's' ideology (*deceptive* use) of "public-private" partnership (where "private," which is nobody's business, i.e., only your business and "public" which is everybody's business)—making "private," i.e., that which is your business his business and "public," i.e., that which is everybody's (including your business) his business as well, resulting in him controlling all. Are people really this stupid? It appears so. Rousseau, Karl Marx, et al, as all 'liberal's do, voiced their defiance to "*The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof,*" wanting you to 'join' with them, i.e., submit to their rejection of God and His authority, i.e., to the Word of God. (1 Corinthians 10:26) It is God who defines who we are and how we are to behave, i.e., who determines where we will spend eternity based upon our behavior (*humbling* our *self*, repenting of our sins, i.e., our *lusts*, enduring the rejection of others, i.e., the world for not 'justifying' its *lusts*, having faith in and following the Lord Jesus Christ, doing the Father's will—receiving eternal life—or thinking and acting according to our carnal nature, i.e., justifying' our *self*, i.e., our sins, i.e., our *lusts* and the sins, i.e., the *lusts* of others—receiving eternal death). In generalizing, *lust* (what all men have in common) takes the place of the Father (God), i.e., the father's/Father's authority, with the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' the *psychotherapist*, 'justifying' *lust* over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority becoming the voice of authority instead. It is therefore, according to Karl Marx, the child, 'driven' by *lust*, who is responsible for the creation of the father's/Father's authority when he submits to the father's/Father's authority—instead of attacking it for getting in his way, i.e., preventing him from becoming his *self*, i.e., *self actualized*, i.e., preventing him from '*Reasoning*' from his carnal nature, i.e., his *lusts* for pleasure and hate of restraint, i.e., responding to what the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people or person is stimulating, forcing him to reason from the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, which prevents 'change' instead. '*Reasoning*' from *self*, i.e., from *lust*—which requires the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority—therefore becomes the 'purpose' of life. "*The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force.*" (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3) "*On account of the*

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

Since, according to the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' there is no "top-down" authority structure, i.e., father/Father, i.e., God to be held accountable to, all are accountable to him, i.e., to the one making this statement, making himself God, i.e., making you subject to him, i.e., to his statement, i.e., *telling* you how to think—in this case from your *lusts* so he can *lust* without you condemning him, i.e., with you 'justifying' (*affirming*) him, i.e., his *lusts*. To question his, i.e., "*the peoples*" *lusts* therefore puts you in jeopardy. As J. L. Moreno stated it in his book, *Who Shall Survive?* "*Parents have no right upon their offspring except a psychological right. Literally the children belong to universality.*" To the 'liberal,' to the Marxist (Moreno), to the socialist, to the psychologist, to the facilitator of 'change', etc.,—as an "unruly" child (as two "children" in a garden in Eden)—what he sees he "owns" (including your children, your property, your business, your soul). If you get in his way he will *negate* you without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without any concern for what happens to you physically, emotionally, spiritually since your soul, i.e., where you (and he) will spend eternity does not exist in his mind, i.e., is no concern of his. Your soul (which is eternal) is the only property you have, all else is passing away. He has already sold his soul to the process of 'change,' wanting you to 'join' with him, i.e., 'justify' (*affirm*) him, i.e., his *lusts*, after death 'joining' him in the lake of fire that is never quenched. The "American Dream" (why people came to America) was the principle of you not infringing upon your neighbor's rights as he did not infringe upon yours, the same being true between the government and the citizens—those rights being, for the individual, the right of free speech, religion (private convictions, i.e., freedom of

the *conscience*), private property, and private business. That has all been *negated* with Marxist ideology (being taught in the colleges). With *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority becoming the law of the land (developed via the use of *dialogue* in setting policy—[What Is Missing \(Negated\) In Dialogue.](#)) all "*the people*" have is the "right" to *lust*, i.e., be "happy" (which is fleeting, i.e., momentary, i.e., always passing away), while owning nothing. We "*must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions* [see those people adhering to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., who believe in individualism, under God] *in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue.*" (Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#)) 'Shift' communication in a meeting or classroom from *discussion* (which retains the individual's rights, under God, i.e., the father's/Father's authority) to *dialogue* (which *negates* those rights) when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior and the agenda is accomplished, i.e., the God given rights of the individual, i.e., individualism, under God is *negated* for the carnal needs, i.e., *lusts* of "*the people*," i.e., the socialist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist, who is now in control.

Rejecting the father's/Father's authority, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts and truth (which he has been *told*, i.e., has been taught, i.e., he has learned in the past) all the college student has to reason from is his *self*, i.e., his *lusts* that the world, i.e., that the classroom and the college environment stimulates (that the 'liberal'—although he might present himself as a conservative/"Christian"—professor *consents* to; to be silent before wrong behavior, i.e., not to correct wrong behavior is to *consent* to the behavior, in the mind of the student or professor doing wrong, effecting the thoughts of those watching). In the "*group grade*" classroom the college student learns that *lust* for pleasure and resentment toward restraint, i.e., toward being *told* (what all students have in common—the basis of common-ism), what the world, i.e., what the college environment stimulates is all there is to life, with "*What can I get out of this situation and/or this person or these people for my self, i.e., to satisfy my lusts?*" and "*What will happen to me if*

they reject and/or turn on me?" instead of "What is the right thing to do according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., according to my father's (my parent's)/the Father's (God's) will?" now controlling his thoughts and actions. Instead of humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating his self (his lusts) 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 he now esteems his self, 'justifying' his and his "friends" (and "the groups") lust for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the college environment stimulates (which includes his lust for the facilitator of 'change's,' i.e., the "professor's" approval, i.e., affirmation which begins with his fear of the facilitator of 'change's,' i.e., the "professor's" disapproval aka a bad grade if he does not or refuses to participate) as well as his and their resentment, i.e., hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority that gets (and you if you get) in the way of their lusts, i.e., their college experience ('justifying' the negation of, i.e., the absence of the father's/Father's authority in their thoughts and actions, i.e., no longer having a fear of judgment (where they will spend eternity), i.e., a sense of accountability, i.e., a guilty conscience for their carnal thoughts and carnal actions). Fear of losing out on the carnal pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., fear of death (since to them, 'life' is in the carnal pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., in the flesh) now supersedes, i.e., negates fear of where they, i.e., their soul will spend eternity after death. When they speak of you and themselves, despite their use of the scriptures (selected scriptures, twisting their meaning, making them subject to "human nature") when and if they are used, they only speak of the flesh. "That which is Below corresponds to that which is Above, and that which is Above, corresponds to that which is Below, to accomplish the miracles of the One Thing." (The Emerald Tablet of Hermes Trismegistus, translated by Dennis W. Hauck.) "The Hermetic tradition was both moderate and flexible, offering a tolerant philosophical religion, a religion of the (omnipresent) mind, a purified perception of God, the cosmos, and the self, and much positive encouragement for the spiritual seeker, all of which the student could take anywhere." (Tobias Churton The Golden Builders: Alchemists, Rosicrucian's, and the First Freemasons.)

"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matthew 10:28

"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)

"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)

"The sophists have imposed tyranny and bondage upon our freedom to such a point that we must not resist that twice accursed Aristotle, 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) "Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light." "Virtually the entire Ethics of Aristotle is the worst enemy of grace." (Luther's Works: Vol. 31, Career of the Reformer: I, p.12)

Aristotle, as all philosophers, sociologists, and psychiatrists based his *praxis* on the theory, i.e., on the *opinion*, i.e., on the lie that if he could 'create' a "healthy" environment (subject to his *opinion* of what a "healthy" environment is) and get the person to participate, he could 'create' a "healthy" person, i.e., the "healthy" person would manifest his *self*, i.e., become *actualized*. You might say he was wrong since Adam and the woman in the garden in Eden were in a perfect environment yet sinned, but according to the "wisdom" (reasoning) of philosophers, sociologists, and

psychiatrists, i.e., *sophists* they were not in a perfect environment. God was present *telling* them what they could and could not do, getting in the way of their carnal nature, i.e., their *lusts*, not allowing them to become their *self*, i.e., *self actualized*. According to the "*sophists*," i.e., the wisdom of men (*esteeming* their unrighteousness reasoning, 'justifying' their *self*, i.e., their *lusts*) it took the master facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the master psychotherapist, i.e., the master "*sophist*" to "help" them to become their *self* (thinking and acting according to their carnal nature, i.e., their *lusts* without God, the Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth getting in the way). Although the earthly father, as a child is subject to *lust* it is his pattern of authority, i.e., requiring those under his authority, i.e., his children (and himself) to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to establishing commands, rules, facts, and truth because he KNOWS the cost of being or doing wrong, i.e., in order to do the Father's will that *sophists* seek to *negate* so they can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without having a sense of accountability for their carnal thoughts and their carnal actions.

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

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

"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." ([Carl Rogers](#), *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*)

What "*seemed to be right*" to the woman in the garden in Eden was wrong because she depended upon her "*perception*" (what *seems to be*) to

determine right and wrong behavior instead of the Word of God (what "IS"). The "forbidden tree" did not kill her (as she saw it, it was like all the other trees in the garden; it was called "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" because by eating from it the person made his or her *self*, i.e., his or her *lust* the basis of knowing right and wrong behavior), her disobedience lead to her death (removal from having access to the tree of life), along with Adam's (and all following). We are all born into sin, needing a savior, i.e., the tree of life, i.e., the Father's Son, Jesus Christ in order to be redeemed from eternal death, i.e., in order to inherit eternal life (an issue of the soul). The issue is not the flesh (which is passing away) but the soul (which is eternal). College is now based upon the flesh, i.e., *lust*. No longer the soul, i.e., doing the Father's will. Although psychology means "the study of the soul" it, in truth is only the study of the flesh and the carnal mind (the *cognitive, affective, and psycho-motor domains*) and the world that stimulates them—as put into *praxis* in the garden in Eden.

"[A] rotten apple added to a barrel of healthy ones corrupts them all. A good apple mixed with rotten ones is immediately corrupted." ([Dick York, The Question Has Been Asked, Shield of Faith Mission International newsletter, winter-2022](#)) The point being, you keep healthy and rotten apples apart—when it comes to right and wrong behavior, you think upon that which is above, i.e., right, i.e., doing the Father's will, i.e., that which is eternal not upon that which is below, i.e., *lust*, i.e., the flesh, i.e., that which corrupts, i.e., passing away. While we are all "in" the world, we are not to be "of" it. How people communicate with their *self* and with others (either *humbling* their *self* in order to do right and not wrong, i.e., in order to do the father's/Father's will or *esteeming* their *self*, i.e., 'justifying' their *lusts*) manifests whether they are "of and for the world," i.e., "*of and for self*" or seeking to do the Father's will. They can not be mixed together (become at-one-with one another) without *lust* (rot) winning the day—the result of listening to the master facilitator of 'change' who made his first appearance in a garden in Eden.

By 'creating' an environment of *lust*, i.e., of "human nature," i.e., of "*building relationships upon self interest (lust)*" the *sophist* grades a

student based upon his willingness to participate (a "good" grade) or his resistance, i.e., not being a "team player" (a "bad" grade, needing remediation). Goodness, like "good sense" for the *sophist*, i.e., for the facilitator of 'change' resides in "human nature"—made manifest in how a student responds to the current situation and/or students present in the classroom, i.e., how he responds to the environment that the *sophist*, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' has created, right being tolerant of *lust*, i.e., non-judgmental of sin, i.e., "open minded," i.e., "positive," wrong being intolerant of *lust*, i.e., prejudiced, i.e., condemning of sin, i.e., "negative," with the project at hand being "good" for everyone in the project.

"...? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ."

Galatians 1:10

In this way, i.e., according to the wisdom of men where you and the other students will spend eternity is replaced with how you and they "feel" toward one another in the 'moment'—with your (and their) grade (the "group grade") reflecting a) your (and their) participation in the process of 'change,' i.e., 'justifying' *lust*, i.e., *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment,' *affirming* the *lusts* of the others without having a *guilty conscience*, which is a "good" grade (you have potential leadership skills), b) your (and their) tolerance of *lust* (to tolerate, i.e., to be silent before those who *lust* is to *consent*), yet having a *guilty conscience*, which means you still need remediation, or c) your (and their) resistance toward *lust*, i.e., condemning it, which means you get a "bad" grade, i.e., you fail "the group," i.e., "the group" fails, while working on a project that is "good" for all (or at least it "seems to be"). *"To question the value or activities of the group, would be to thrust himself into a state of dissonance. Long cherished but self-defeating beliefs and attitudes [faith in God] may waver and decompose in the face of a dissenting majority [rejection by "the group"]. One of the most difficult patients for me to work with in groups is the individual who employs fundamentalist religious views [faith in God] in the service of denial [refusing to become at-one-with "the group" in 'justifying' their own and "the groups" lusts]."* *"By shifting the group's attention from 'then-and-there' [what the father/Father says] to 'here-and-now' [how "the group" feels] material, he performs a service to the group*

*... focusing the group upon itself." "Members learn about the impact of their behavior on the feelings [lusts] of other members. ...a patient might, with further change, outgrow ... his spouse ... unless concomitant changes occur in the spouse [the spouse learns to 'justify' lust as well]." ([Irvin D. Yalom](#), *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*)*

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

"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

"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

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

The soul *KNOWS* from being *told*. The flesh by "[sense experience](#)." True science is based upon *knowing*, having been *told* and proven right and not wrong. "So called" science, i.e., what "seems to be" science, i.e., "*I think*" or "*I feel*" is based upon a *theory*, i.e., an *opinion*, i.e., your "*feelings*," i.e., your carnal desires ("*ought*") of the 'moment' that are being stimulated by the world, i.e., the current situation or people present—not *knowing* for sure—making "science" ever subject to 'change,' i.e., subjective as the person's carnal desires, i.e., *lusts*, i.e., "*sensuous needs*" and "*sense perception*" 'change.' "*I think I know*" or "*I think it is*" (when asked if the bridge is safe to cross) does not instill any sense of certainty (security). It is the difference between the *conscience*, i.e., *KNOWING* right from wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., from having been *told* and *consensus*, i.e., *knowing* from your carnal desires, i.e., from your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, i.e., from "*sense experiences*" only.

"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)

All Karl Marx did was redefine *"the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes,"* and *"the pride of life,"* i.e., only that which is *"of the world,"* as *"sensuous need," "sense perception,"* and *"sense experience,"* i.e., only that which is *"of Nature,"* (reflected in Abraham Maslow's *Hierarchy of 'felt' needs*) making the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust,* i.e., that which is stimulated by *"the world"* the only means to knowing the 'truth,' i.e., to knowing what is *"actual"* and what is not, i.e., to knowing what is right and what is wrong behavior, with pleasure, i.e., *lust* (and hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority) being right and the father's/Father's authority, i.e., that which gets in the way of *lust* being wrong—turning good, i.e., *humbling, denying, dying to your self* (not yielding to your *lusts*) in order to do the father's/Father's will into evil, and evil, i.e., 'justifying' your (and *"the groups"*) *lusts,* hating the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way into good.

"Eliminate these relations [i.e., the father's/Father's authority over the children, i.e., the children/citizens doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth they have been told, having a guilty conscience when they do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., when they lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, i.e., "rule of law"] and you abolish the whole of society ["the traditional channels of top-down decision making"]; ... a scientifically acceptable solution does exist ... For to accept that solution, even in theory would be tantamount to observing society from a class standpoint [from the child's "feelings," i.e., "the people's" lusts of the 'moment'] other than that of the bourgeoisie [the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth]. And no class can do that-unless it is willing to abdicate its power freely [either the child humbles his self and does the father's/Father's will or the father abdicates his authority to the lusts of the child (and his own)]."
(Lukács)

Karl Marx wrote the following.

*"The unspeculative Christian [the believer, the man of faith in God] also recognizes sensuality as long as it does not assert itself at the expense of true reason, i.e., of faith, of true love, i.e., of love of God, of true will-power, i.e., of will in Christ . Not for the sake of sensual love, not for the lust of the flesh, but because the Lord said: Increase and multiply." "It is not sensuality which is presented ..., but mysteries, adventures, obstacles, fears, dangers, and especially the attraction of what is forbidden." (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) It is "the attraction of what is forbidden," i.e., it is *lust* that resides in all of us, i.e., that also resides in "the unspeculative Christian" that Karl Marx and his followers, i.e., facilitators of 'change' were/are interested in. It is *lust*, i.e., what all men, women, and children have in common that initiates and sustains "worldly peace and socialist harmony." It is the father's/Father's authority that causes division (based upon doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., limits and measures, i.e., "rule of law").*

When confronted with the child's "Why?" voiced in defiance to his command or rule the father has the choice of either maintaining his authority, i.e., "Because I said so"/"It is written" or going into *dialogue* with the child, abdicating his authority to the child's (and his) "feelings," i.e., *lusts* of the 'moment.' In *discussion* the father/Father retains his authority, i.e., he has the final say. In *dialogue*, his *opinion* and the child's *opinion* are equal (as explained in greater detail below). The child's *lust* is to go play (if it is with his "friends," it is intoxicating). The Father's *lust* is for the child's approval/acceptance of him. With the father/Father duality is between doing right and not wrong according to established standards (he knows the cost of being wrong). Right being obeying established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will. Wrong being disobeying, i.e., the child doing his will (in defiance) instead. The issue is not that the father is right or wrong (he could be wrong) it is the authority structure itself that is *negated* in *dialogue* (when it comes to right and wrong behavior). With the child duality is between doing right and doing wrong according to his "feelings" of the 'moment,' with right

being *affirmation* of his carnal nature, i.e., 'justifying' his *lusts*, wrong being anyone or anything getting in his way, i.e., inhibiting or blocking, i.e., preventing him from being/becoming (*actualizing*) his *self*, i.e., fulfilling his *lust*. For the father doing right and not wrong is the issue because he knows the cost of being wrong. For the child right is being able to do what he want [with his friends](#), saying "*I'll just die,*" "*You don't understand,*" if he can not go out with his friends, wrong is not being able to do what he wants, which includes going out with his friends, i.e., his "life" depends upon it.

The father's/Father's authority divides upon being or doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. The child's carnal nature unites all children on what they have in common, *lust* for pleasure and resentment toward restraint, i.e., toward the restrainer, dividing them from children who insist upon holding onto the father's/Father's authority, insisting that all children do the same. You are now graded in college, not on whether you are right or wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (although that might be present) but whether you are 'loyal' to the father's/Father's authority (you are intolerant of or not readily adaptable to change, i.e., you have to be persuaded with commands, rules, facts, and truth) or 'loyal' to "*the group,*" i.e., to the process of 'change' (you have to be tolerant of diversity aka deviancy, i.e., the "feelings," i.e., the *lusts*, i.e., the *self interest* of others). You have to be readily adaptable to 'change' when you participate with, i.e., find your identity in "*the group.*" The purpose of the "*group grade*" is to leave the father's/Father's authority, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., where you will spend eternity for your thoughts and actions out of the solution. The "life raft moral dilemma," for example requires you to save your (or someone else's, i.e., "*the groups*") flesh and damn your soul. To participate you must sell your soul to the "professor" and the world, i.e., to the carnally minded student's he represents (defends), i.e., become at-one-with them.

*"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 KNOW by being told, i.e., by faith (with the Lord directing your thoughts, i.e., your reasoning ["Why are you doing what you are doing? Because He told me to."] and thereby you, "acknowledging him," your actions) and not by "sense experience," i.e., by experimentation ([aufheben](#)), i.e., by sight (being directed by, i.e., "Reasoning" from your flesh, i.e., your *lusts* and the world that stimulates it, i.e., them), "casting down imaginations, and every high thing ["higher order thinking skills"] that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ [doing the Father's will];" 2 Corinthians 10:5*

In a class of twenty students, coming from different homes with standards that differ between one another the teacher has twenty individuals divided between one another, based upon their parent's standards. By 'creating' an environment where they can share (*dialogue*) their carnal desires, i.e., their *self interests*, i.e., their *lusts* of the 'moment' they become one based upon their carnal nature, i.e., their love of pleasure and hate of restraint, establishing their *self* (collectively) over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority—that divides them from one another. This is known as the dialectic process, i.e., dialectic 'reasoning' where reality is based upon "*feelings*," i.e., what children have in common with one another not on external commands, rules, facts, and truth that restrain them from being/becoming/*actualizing* their *self*, i.e., their *lusts*, engendering "*repression*" and divides them from one another, engendering "*alienation*." It is 'liberation' of *self*, i.e., *lust* from the father's/Father's authority (what all student's can identify with), not doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will, that divides students from one another that college is now based upon, turning the students (and therefore society) against the father's/Father's authority. Refusing to be *told* right from wrong college students are no longer capable of hearing and receiving the truth, believing a lie instead, i.e., that truth resides in them, i.e., in their "*feelings*," i.e., in their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and or people are stimulating. *Lust* is plural in that *lust* for pleasure and *lust* for

approval from others, *affirming lust* are both of the carnal child's nature since the carnally minded child must find his identity in what is internal, i.e., *lust* as well as what is external, yet in harmony with his carnal nature, i.e., *lust*, requiring the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority in the child's thoughts as well as in the world around him. This is the heart and soul of Marxism, i.e., the contemporary "*group grade*" college classroom.

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

In other words, not until students can find their identity in one another (love of pleasure and hate of restraint) can they unite as one in overcoming the effect of the father's/Father's authority (doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, having a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, which retains the father's/Father's authority) in themselves and in society.

"The dialectical method was overthrown—the parts [the children] were prevented from finding their definition [their identity] within the whole [within "the group," through dialogue 'justifying' their lusts]."
(Lukács)

"By 'dialectical' I mean an activity of consciousness struggling to circumvent the limitations imposed by the formal-logical law of contradiction." (Brown) Instead of reasoning from established commands, rules, facts, and truth, dialectic reasoning "struggles" to get around having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth so the person can *lust* without having a sense of guilty, i.e., without having a *guilty conscience* (the voice of

the parent in them—in *dialogue* there is no parental voice only the carnal desires, i.e., *lusts* of the child being expressed, i.e., 'justified').

"Part of the dialectics of the process of winning independence from parental authority lies in using the extrafamilial peer group as a foil to parental authority, particularly in the period of adolescence."

(Bradford, Gibb, Benne, *T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method: Innovation in Re-education*)

"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, and to consider itself no longer subject to the demands of parents and teachers." ([James Coleman](#), *The Adolescent Society*) John Coleman, a student of Paul Lazarsfeld (a member of the "Frankfurt School") was instrumental in Supreme Court decisions regarding education in the nation, making education subject to Marxist ideology.

"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*)

As long as students are subject to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., evaluating and judging their *self* and others from established commands, rules, facts, and truth they can not find their identity in what they have in common with "*the group*," i.e., *lust*. In making "*sense experience*," i.e., their "*feelings*" of the 'moment' (that which is temporary) the means to knowing right from wrong behavior they sell your soul (that which is eternal) to the *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., "*the group*" stimulates—to that which is passing away. Explained in greater detail below there is no righteousness, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth in *dialogue*. When it comes to behavior there is only the unrighteous aka carnal desires of the person being expressed and 'justified.'

*"In order to effect rapid change, . . . [one] must mount a vigorous attack on the family lest the traditions of present generations be preserved. It is necessary, in other words, artificially to create an experiential chasm between parents and children—to insulate the children in order that they can more easily be indoctrinated with new ideas." "If one wishes to mold children in order to achieve some future goal, one must begin to view them as superior. One must teach them not to respect their tradition-bound elders, who are tied to the past and know only what is irrelevant." ". . . 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*)*

The [benevolent father/Father](#) incorporates *discussion* in his/His *preaching* of commands and rules to be obeyed as give and his/His *teaching* of facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith (at least at first, until they are understood), providing he/He deems it necessary, has time, those under his/His authority are capable of understanding, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking his/His authority. The "autocratic" father refuses to *discuss* with his children why they have to do what he says (always says "Because I said so" without every giving an explanation regarding right and wrong behavior, i.e., his source). In *dialogue* there is no father's/Father's authority (benevolent or "autocratic"). In *dialogue*, when it comes to right and wrong behavior, only *lust*, i.e., the child's carnal desires of the 'moment' that the world stimulates wins the day, i.e., determines the outcome. That is why those of the world turn to *dialogue* (inhibit or block *discussion*) when it comes to determining right and wrong behavior, accusing all father's/Father's of being "autocratic," i.e., "authoritarian" except those who *dialogue* with their children, i.e., who *negate* their God given authority in the home, thus making the issue

of life the flesh instead of the soul. Mingling *dialogue* in with *discussion*, when it comes to right and wrong behavior makes *discussion* subject to *dialogue*, i.e., to the child's carnal feelings, i.e., *lusts* of the 'moment' in the end. To focus on the family, making human relations the focus in the home (which is done via *dialogue*) *negates* the father's/Father's authority in the home, i.e., neuters the father (the father's/Father's authority) in the children's (and the wife's) thoughts and actions (always).

"Any non-family-based collectivity [dialogue based organization] that intervenes between parent and child and attempts to regulate and modify the parent-child relationship will have a democratizing impact on that relationship." "The state, by its very interference in the life of its citizens, must necessarily undermine a parental authority which it attempts to restore." "For however much the state or community may wish to inculcate obedience and submission in the child, its intervention betrays a lack of confidence in the only objects from whom a small child can learn authoritarian submission, an overweening interest in the future development of the child—in other words, a child centered orientation." (Bennis)

In *dialogue*, the issue of the soul, where you (and your spouse, children, and friends) will spend eternity is replaced with your (and their) carnal desires, i.e., your (and their) *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating.

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

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

"Flee also youthful lusts:" 2 Timothy 2:22

The facilitator of 'change' and those who follow after him reject *KNOWING* (from being *told*), letting their flesh, i.e., their *"sense experience,"* i.e., their *lust* for pleasure and their hatred toward restraint, i.e., that which is of the world lead the way, i.e., determine what is right and what is wrong behavior, dying in their sins.

"For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"
Mark 8:36, 37

When God created Adam (man) he made him, unlike any other living thing in the creation, *"a living soul."*

"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

He then *told* ("*commanded*") him what he could and could not do, i.e., He *told* him what was right and what was wrong behavior, i.e., which trees he could eat the fruit of and which one he was not (lest he die).

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

No animal, being 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. To apply science, i.e., "*behavioral science*" to man is to make him an animal, subject to stimulus-response and impulses and urges (which can only be known from "*sense experience*," i.e., approach pleasure and avoid pain, including the pain of missing out on pleasure, engendering and 'justifying' his *lust* for pleasure and his hate toward restraint, i.e., toward the restrainer), *negating* (damning) his soul (which can only *KNOW* from being *told*, i.e., by the Word of God). The eyes are stronger than the ears, i.e., sight is stronger than faith, i.e., reasoning from our "senses" is stronger than reasoning from what we have been *told* (that conflicts with our feelings) when it comes to right and wrong behavior. When the woman in the garden in Eden turned to sight, i.e., to "human reasoning," i.e., to Karl Marx, i.e., to her *opinion* to

determine right and wrong behavior, faith, i.e., the authority of the Word of God was *negated* in her thoughts and actions.

"Eyes are more accurate witnesses than the ears." "All that can be seen, heard, experienced—these are what I prefer." (Heraclitus; who Karl Marx built his ideology off of.)

Apart from God's Word, i.e., being *told* all we have is our *opinion*, i.e., our carnal "senses" which are subject to the world that stimulates them to reason from. God will share his glory with no one. When we make His Word subject to our *opinion*, i.e., to our "feelings" or disregard it all together, He turns us over to our demise, to our *lusts* (that are passing away) if we do not repent, i.e., turn back to Him, i.e., accept His Word as is and do what He *tells* us by faith. The reason we have all the many and varied (conflicting) translations of the bible today (replacing *discussion*, i.e., *"It is written"* with the *dialoguing* of *opinions*, i.e., *"I feel," "I think"* in the "Church" today) is due to the replacing (*negating*) of the *Textus Receptus* as the source (one source) from which to translate from. From the sixteenth century up to the 1880's there was only one source for the Protestant church to translate from. The translations, i.e., translators may disagree but the source is the same for all, everyone could go to the source and find understanding there. Then two Catholic's (Westcott and Hort) were successful in introducing heresy sources into the source text, *Vaticanus B*, *Sinaiticus* &, *Codex X* (which are in harmony with the Alexandrian Text, which are of gnostic, i.e., dialectic origin, which the Catholic bible/Church is based on), which conflicted with one another (which are the bases of the Metzger, Nestle, Aland Greek texts which all "ministers" study from in seminary and apply in the "Church"), bringing *dialogue* (*"We are not sure what God means here. What do you think?"*), i.e., men's *opinions* into the "Church," making faith dependent on men's *opinions* (the "wisdom" of men) instead of the Word of God itself, *negating* faith in God and his Word, with a man, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' and men, i.e., *"the group,"* i.e., *lust* having taking His place (making God and His Word dependent upon, i.e., subject to the *opinions*, i.e., the *lusts* of men).

"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." Isaiah 55:8, 9

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

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

"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)

*"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) God sets the limits and measures for man, i.e., for his behavior, as He did in nature, not man. When man sets the limits and measures for his behavior he 'justifies' his *self*, i.e., his flesh, i.e., his *lusts*.*

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

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

"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)

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

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

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

"And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Jesus Christ." Colossians 3:23-24

*"Protestantism was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism." (Max Horkheimer, *Vernunft and Selbsterhaltung*; English: *Reasoning and Self-Preservation*)*

"Doing your best, as unto the Lord," "The priesthood of all believers," i.e., putting no one between you and the Father, and His Son Jesus Christ, i.e., freedom of the conscience, which the father's/Father's authority engenders (not freedom from the conscience, which lust and the world engenders) engenders individualism, under God. If Marxists understand this (Max Horkheimer was a Marxist) why do not "Christians" (who so easily compromise and/or set the gospel aside in order to receive the approval of men, i.e., "the group"—doing what Marxists want them to do—as the parable of the rocky soil points out, you will go no deeper into the Word of God than your relationship, i.e., your "friendship" with others will allow you). Marxists know what they are doing is wrong, i.e., of God's judgment. This is why Marxists, i.e., facilitators of 'change' are so desperate in silencing or removing those who bring God's judgment up in the classroom (in society, i.e., in the workplace, in government, etc.)—so they can lust

after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without have a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without having any sense of accountability for their carnal thoughts and carnal actions.

"If the 'restoring of life' of the world is to be conceived in terms of the Christian revelation, then Marx must collapse into a bottomless abyss." ([Jürgen Habermas](#), *Theory and Practice*)

Jürgen Habermas was a Marxist amongst Marxist, establishing the reasoning behind and the language of the world court (now being practiced in the "group grade" classroom). According to Marxist ideology, the victim in the courtroom or in the "group grade" classroom is not the one who was robbed or received a bad grade for holding to their belief, speaking the truth (not being a "team player"), but the robber or the immoral or perverse (deviant) student, who's "feelings" are hurt by the truth, being "punished" for robbing or being his *self*, i.e., for trying to satisfy his carnal "'felt' needs," i.e., his *lusts*. *"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., those in power, i.e., in position of authority]."* (R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, *Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law*) Whether in the courtroom or the classroom the outcome is always the same, *lust*, i.e., "*human nature*" triumphing over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, i.e., over and therefore against doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of *lust*. The Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change' is always sympathetic toward the deviant, i.e., toward the rebellious and revolutionary who is attempting to 'liberate' his *self* (and the facilitator of 'change') from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., from "rule of law." Bringing "social worth" into the courtroom or the classroom *negates* the right of the individual, under God (the Magna Carta and American Revolution were in response to this issue). The Marxist will say, as Karl Marx, *"The justice of state constitutions is to be decided not on the basis of Christianity, not from the nature of Christian society [not from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., "rule of law"] but from the nature of human society [from the child's carnal nature, i.e., lust]."* (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) This 'change' in "policy" regarding right and

wrong behavior is reflected not only in the classroom but also in the courtroom where in the past it was understood that *"Every system of law known to civilized society generated from or had as its component one of two well known systems of ethics, stoic or Christian [men's opinions or the Father's authority]. The COMMON LAW draws its subsistence from the latter, its roots go deep into that system, the Christian concept of right and wrong or right and justice motivates every rule of equity. It is the guide by which we dissolve domestic friction's and the rule by which all legal controversies are settled."* (Strauss Vs. Strauss., 3 So. 2nd 727, 728, 1941) That was 'change' in ROE v. WADE where *lust*, i.e., *"human nature,"* i.e., *opinion* superseded the father's/Father's authority, i.e., *"rule of law,"* under God, i.e., facts and truth (life begins at conception). *"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 [Heraclitus]."* (ROE v. WADE, 410 U.S. 113 15, 1973) This nation is heading into a *"bottomless abyss"* because of this action, i.e., the rejection of God, i.e., the truth for the pleasures, i.e., *lusts* of the 'moment.' The road to Utopia, i.e., to *"worldly peace and socialist harmony,"* i.e., to the *"eternal present"* is paved with the bodies (lives) of those who got in the way (of *lust*), including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous. The *"group grade"* classroom is to prepare (program) you to accept that agenda, i.e., that outcome.

College professors and their 'loyal' students (doing the process) do not want you to bring up God's condemnation of sin, i.e., of *lust*, i.e., of *"human nature,"* accusing you of being (in their eyes) *"negative,"* divisive, *"hateful,"* intolerant when you do.

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they

which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." 1 Romans, 28-32

When you make *lust* the standard of life, trying to 'justify' your *self*, i.e., your *lusts* (knowing inside you are doing wrong) where can you go when you reject the Father's authority, i.e., repentance, only deeper into sin, i.e., into *lusts*. In God's eyes it is one or the other. You can not have both.

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

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Corinthians 6:14-18

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

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

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

"Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 14:6

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

"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](#)

While dad is not perfect, he may be (or may have been) a down right tyrant (or MIA/AWL)—as a child *lusting* after pleasure without restraint—his office of authority is perfect, having been given to him by God (the *"Heavenly Father"*) who is perfect, in which to do His will. When it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior (preaching and teaching) it is important that he [discusses](#) with his children any command, rule, fact, or truth they question, providing he deems it necessary, has time, they are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking his authority. David, in the Scriptures having the opportunity to kill Saul (although Saul was not his father), did not do so because he respected the office Saul served in, even though Saul was not using it as God willed (1 Samuel 24:2-12).

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

The role of the father, besides loving his wife, i.e., the children's mother, providing food, clothing, safety, and a roof over his family's head is to train up his children in the admonition of the Lord—doing the Father's will—and teach them how to "pull weeds," i.e., to work (get off their duff, expecting someone to wait on them). A father, in the true sense of the

word, i.e., a *benevolent father* loves his children while hating their doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, holding them accountable for their actions—*chastening* them when they do wrong, disobey, sin that they might learn to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their "self" and do right, obey, not sin, grounding them when they reject his authority, having mercy on them then they repent and do what is right, but not hating them, wanting to kill them as the carnally minded, i.e., *lust* seeking child does when the father gets in his way, i.e., in the way of his "lust" for pleasure. God loves everyone but judges us according to our thoughts and actions, with us either accepting His authority, *humbling* our *self*, repenting of our *lusts*, doing His will or rejecting Him and His authority, *esteeming*, i.e., 'justifying' our *self*, i.e., our *lusts* doing our will instead, dying in our sin, facing his judgment, i.e., damnation (the lake of fire that is never quenched, prepared for the master facilitator of 'change and all his followers). What sins, i.e., *lusts* the father does not confess before the Father and repent of he brings into the family, doing it or tolerating it, i.e., condoning it in his silence. The same applies to the college student in college, i.e., in the "group grade" classroom.

"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

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

In the garden in Eden the master facilitator of 'change' came between two "children" and the "Father," 'liberating' them from the "Father's"

commands, rules, facts, and truth so they could become their *self*, i.e., *self actualized*, *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or person(s) stimulated without the "Father's" commands, rules, facts, and truth getting in the way. When caught, like 'liberals' they blamed someone else for their "bad" behavior, with Adam blaming the woman—*"throwing her under the bus"* (along with "the Father" for creating her, i.e., for creating an "unhealthy environment" for him to live in)—and the woman blaming the master facilitator of 'change'—*"throwing him under the bus"* for "helping" her 'justify' her *lusts*.

"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

Prior to the fifties College students were generally held accountable for their behavior and thoughts, according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. Today college is "party time." It did not happen by accident.

"Perhaps one of the most dramatic events highlighting the need for progress in the affective domain ['liberation' of the student's carnal nature, i.e., lust from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., 'liberation' of the college student from his or her parent's, former teacher's, and minister's standards, i.e., their established commands, rules, facts, and truth] was the publication of Jacob's Changing Values in College (1957)." (Book 2: Affective Domain)

Without 'change' in the method of teaching, 'change' in the student's values and beliefs would not become *actualized*. This required the aid of "change agents," i.e., facilitators of 'change.'

A "change agent... should know about the process of change, how it takes place and the attitudes, values and behaviors that usually act as barriers.... He should know who in his system are the 'defenders' or resisters of innovations ['change']." (Ronald Havelock, A Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education)

"During the period of innovation, an environment is invisible. The present is always invisible because the whole field of attention is so saturated with it. It becomes visible only when it has been superseded by a new environment." (Federal Education Grant, Dec. 1969, *Behavior Science in Teacher Education*—[BSTEP](#). All Federal Education Grants are subject to this Grant even today. The book "1984" was a result of it, exposing what is in it. One third of it is a "feasibility study," predicting where the world would be in the years 1984, 2000, 2100 (subject to the Grants application), one third of it is on how to develop psychological portfolios on all students in college (as well as all citizens of the nation and world), and one third of it is on how to track students, educators, staff, etc.,)

In other words you will not know what hit you until it is too late. The example of the frog in the pot getting boiled is the result of it not jumping out immediately when it was put in (frogs should not be sitting in a pot with a fire under it unless they want to be cooked), since the water in the pot (*lust*) felt good to begin with.

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

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

"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 [paradigm] of an individual or a group." (benne)

"In the area of human relations, individual and group process becomes the curriculum." (Benne)

"One of the most fascinating aspects of group therapy is that everyone is born again, born together in the group." (Yalom)

What is 'change' all about?

"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).

"...the fundamental character of reality is change itself." (T. Z. Lavine, From Socrates to Sartre, The Philosophic Quest) Heraclitus (who Karl Marx studied) believed *"Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys."* In other words, *lust*, i.e., the child's carnal nature and the world that stimulates it, i.e., change is the basis of reality requiring *"every grown man"* who hold those under their authority accountable to established commands, rules, facts, and truth to *"hang himself."* In 'change' it is not the object (objective truth) that is reality but the sensation of *lust* (for pleasure) and hate (toward restraint) itself that the object stimulates, i.e., it is *"sense experience"* (subjective truth) that is reality, i.e., what is actual.

The father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* one's *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 inhibits or blocks, i.e., prevents 'change.' Only when a person is stimulated by and responding to the world, i.e., to the current situation and/or people around him, according to his carnal nature (*lusting* after pleasure, that which is *"positive"* and hating restraint, that which is *"negative"*) can 'change' be initiated and sustained, requiring the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders) in the person's thoughts and

actions. In other words, for Karl Marx, while children resent the father's/Father's authority, i.e., hate established commands, rules, facts, and truth for getting in the way of their *lusts*, when they grow up and have children of their own they establish commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority over their children, preventing 'change,' i.e., preventing their children from becoming their *self*—*lusting* after pleasure, having a *guilty conscience* when they do (called "*neurosis*").

"Adult sexuality, restricted by rules, to maintain family and society [to maintain the "top-down" system or patriarchal paradigm of the "old" world order], . . . leads to neurosis." "If society imposes repression [by supporting the traditional family structure, i.e. honoring the Father's position of authority in the home], and repression causes the universal neurosis of man [man obeying the Father's "top-down" authority instead of following after his own natural inclinations, i.e. thinking, feeling, and acting according to "human nature"], . . . there is an intrinsic connection between social organization [the traditional family structure which separates the child from his own carnal nature and the carnal nature of society, i.e. the "communist community," i.e. where 'common-unity' is based upon 'common-ism'] and neurosis." "The bondage of all cultures to their cultural heritage [where children have to obey their parent's commands and rules, accepting their facts and truth "as given" (regarding right and wrong behavior), which "represses" their natural inclination, i.e. "putting the lid on" Pandora's box, ,i.e. on their impulses and urges to become at-one-with the world in pleasure, in the 'moment'] is a neurotic construction."

*"Psychoanalysis must treat religion [man having faith in God as a child has faith in his father, obeying His commands and accepting his chastening when he disobeys] as a neurosis." ([Norman O. Brown](#), *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*)*

"In psychology, Freud and his followers have presented convincing arguments that the id [the child's impulses and urges of the 'moment'], man's basic and unconscious nature, is primarily made up of instincts which would, if permitted expression, result in incest, murder, and other crimes. The whole problem of therapy, as seen by this group, is

how to hold these untamed forces in check in a wholesome and constructive manner, rather than in the costly fashion of the neurotic [having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of the person's lusts of the 'moment' that the world stimulates]." (Rogers)

How do you hold "*man's basic and unconscious nature ... instincts ... incest, murder, and other crimes ... in check in a wholesome and constructive manner?*" It can only be done by a "police state," i.e., "sight based management" since the *guilty conscience* and the father's/Father's authority that engenders it (the cause of "*neurosis*") is *negated*. In other words it can not be done, resulting in those in power using them ("*murder, and other crimes*") to push people into their "solution," i.e., under their control.

"The community of interest generated by crime, disorder and fear of crime becomes the goal to allow the community policing officer an entree into the geographic community." (Trojanowicz, Dr. Robert, *The meaning of "Community" [Communism] in Community Policing*)

While Karl Marx established the killing of fathers (the King and all who supported his way of thinking and acting) as the pathway to 'liberty,' he was not able to *negate* the *guilty conscience* ("*neurosis*") in those doing it, who then, when left to their *self*, restored the father's authority system, only this time with "*the group*"—known as Fascism. What America did, unique amongst the nations was to make the father of the home King via his God given rights of private convictions, property, and business, limiting government so he could train his children up to do right and not wrong according to his established commands, rules, facts, and truth, under God. Local control begins in the home and is lessened the farther from the father's authority it gets. The representative is as a child sent to the store by his father, i.e., the constituents to buy the father's goods. If the child spends the father's money on his *self*, i.e., on his *self interests*, i.e., on his (and his "friends") *lusts* he is not sent to the store again. The courts passed laws bypassing the father's rights, giving the children power to rule over the father and the home, 'changing' the nation. It was the *guilty conscience* that

needed to be 'changed' (to the "super-ego") if 'change' was to be permanent. (The "super-ego" unites the person's *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint in the past to the present, making *lust* for pleasure and hate of restraint the foundation from which to evaluate and respond to the current situation and/or people present.)

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

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

"The most important symptom of the defeat in the fight for oneself is the guilty conscience." (Erich Fromm, Escape from Freedom)

According to the Marxist Erich Fromm it is the *guilty conscience* that sustains the father's/Father's authority, that prevents 'change,' i.e., that prevents the so called "new world order" from becoming reality, where facilitators of 'change,' i.e., psychotherapists, i.e., those of the *vanguard party* rule over the children. Separate the child from his parents in the grocery store (at College), gain his trust in you "helping" him find his parents (or in this case his "identity") and you can take him anywhere you want, using him for your own pleasure. This is what College is all about today.

"Human consciousness can be liberated from the parental complex [the father's/Father's authority system] only by being liberated from its

cultural derivatives, the paternalistic state and the patriarchal God."
(Brown)

"The family is one of these social forms which ... cannot be changed without change in the total social framework." (Max Horkheimer, Kritische Theori)

Kurt Lewin explained (in two sentences) how the *guilty conscience* (the "negative valence") is 'created,' preventing 'change,' i.e., *lust* and how it is *negated*, emancipating 'change,' i.e., *lust*.

"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)

In other words, the "negative valence," i.e. the *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "*lusting*") is *negated* when the father's/Father's authority is *negated* in the child's/student's thoughts, thus 'justifying' his carnal actions, i.e., *lust* —with "*the group's*" support, i.e., *affirmation*. This requires, through *dialogue* his participation in "*the group*" establishing behavior upon that which is "*positive*" to his carnal nature, i.e., *lust*, *negating* that which is "*negative*" (called "*the negation of negation*"), i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of his *lusts*.

"... the superego 'unites in itself the influences [impulses and urges, i.e., lusts and hates] of the present and of the past.'" (Brown)

"Superego development is conceived as the incorporation of the moral standards of society ["the group"]. Therefore the levels of the Taxonomy should describe successive levels of goal setting appropriate to superego development." (Book 2: Affective Domain) Therefore "appropriate information," i.e., "positive" information that unites all

participants on *"self interest,"* i.e., on *lust* must reject, drown out, replace *"inappropriate information,"* i.e., *"negative"* information that gets in the way of unity, i.e., that prevents the building of relationship upon *lust*, i.e., upon *"self interest,"* i.e., that causes division based upon doing or being right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (absolutes).

While the father's/Father's authority engenders "individualism, under God" *"the group"* makes each individual accountable to what he has in common with *"the group,"* requiring him to compromise (at least set aside) any command, rule, fact, or truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority in order to "get along," i.e., in order to be a part of *"the group."* (*To be silent is to consent.*) It is his *lust* for the approval of others, *affirming his lusts,* i.e., *"What can I get out of this situation or this person for my self?"* and *"What will happen to me if they reject me and/or turn on me?"* that keeps him 'loyal' to *"the group."* "Individualism, under God," i.e., 'loyalty' to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., to established commands, rules, facts, and truth is sacrificed at the alter of "group approval," i.e., *affirmation,* i.e., the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* process. When you do not reprove, correct, or rebuke deviancy, deviancy becomes the "norm."

"It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately." "The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group." (Kurt Lewin in Benne) *"What would dad say?"* i.e., individualism, under God is replaced with *"What will the group thing?"* i.e., socialism.

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

"The individual is emancipated [liberated from the father's/Father's authority] in the social group." "Freud commented that only through the solidarity of all the participants could the sense of guilt [the guilty

conscience which is engendered by the father's/Father's authority] be assuaged." (Brown)

*"It is not individualism [the child, humbling, denying, dying to ,, 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*)*

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

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

"Group members must be able to synthesize individual 'felt' needs [lusts] with common group 'felt' needs [lusts]." (Bennis)

"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]." "The whole system of Marxism stands and falls with the principle that revolution is the product of a point of view in which the category of totality ["group think"] is dominant [which is the 'purpose' of the "group grade" classroom]." (Lukács)

*"The goal of revolutionary activity was understood as the unifying of theory and praxis." (Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination*) Putting theory into praxis is the "revolution," i.e., the overthrow of the father's/Father's authority.*

Without the *"group think"* *"What would my father/Father think?"* is still in control of the individual (and society).

"Bypassing the traditional channels of top-down decision making [the father's/Father's authority] our objective centers upon transforming public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics."

"Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common interests and ultimately to world interests transforming public consensus into one favorable to the emergence of a stable and humanistic world order." "Consensus is both a personal and a political step. It is a precondition of all future steps." (Ervin Laszlo, A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World Order)

The desire for approval (*affirmation*) from other's facilitates 'change,' i.e., compromise for the sake of relationship. It is not only *"repression"* (not being able to *lust* after pleasure) that is of concern here but also *"alienation"* (not being able to relate with others with the same *lusts*, i.e., *self interests*). By identifying with the father/Father, doing the father's/Father's will the child is prevented from finding his identity in his *self* and in *"the group,"* i.e., in society, i.e., in *lust* and the world that stimulates it.

"Personal relations between men have this character of alienation. Hegel and Marx have laid the foundations for the understanding of the problem of alienation." (Fromm)

"Every form of objectification results in alienation" "Alienation is the experience of 'estrangement' (Verfremdung) from others, . . ."

"Alienation has a long history. Its most radical sense already appears in the biblical expulsion from Eden." "God is thus the anthropological source of alienation . . ." "Alienation will continue so long as the subject engages in an externalization (Entausserung) of his or her subjectivity." (Stephen Eric Bronner, Of Critical Theory and its Theorists)

"The major barrier to mutual interpersonal communication is our very natural tendency to judge, to evaluate, to approve or disapprove, the statement of the other person, or the other group." (Rogers)

*"When we learn to silence the inner voice that judges yourself and others, there is no limit to what we can accomplish, individually and as part of a team. Absence of judgment makes you more receptive to innovative ideas ['change']." (Michael Ray in ([Abraham Maslow](#), *Maslow on Management*))*

How we communicate with one another directly effects relationship/fellowship. Relationship is based upon *feelings*, i.e., common *self interest*, i.e., *lusts*. Fellowship is around established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., a position both parties agree upon. Relationship is based upon *dialogue*. Fellowship via *discussion*.

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

Discussion divides upon being right and not wrong, i.e., KNOWING, which is formal, i.e., judgmental, i.e., the father/Father retains his authority in *discussion*, i.e., has the final say, i.e., "Because I said so," "Never the less," "It is written." Majority vote retains the father's/Father's authority system although the father might lose out on the particular issue at hand.

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

Dialogue unites upon "*feelings*," i.e., "I feel" and/or "I think," i.e., an *opinion*, which is informal, i.e., non-judgmental, i.e., the child/student retains his carnal nature in *dialogue*, having the final say (against authority, i.e., absolutes, i.e., the father's/Father's authority). There is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, or in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only the child's/student's natural inclination to *lust* after

pleasure and hate restraint being 'justified.' *Dialogue* moves *opinions* to a *consensus*, *negating* the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* it engenders in the process. When, in the garden in Eden, the master facilitator of 'change' *seduced* the woman into *dialogue*, i.e., into sharing her *lust*, he "owned" her. By creating a non-hostile, i.e., a "positive" environment, i.e., a "Ye shalt not surely die" environment where she could share her *lust* to "touch" the "Thou shalt surely die" tree she was 'liberated' (in her mind) to be her *self*, i.e., *self actualized*, replacing the "Father's" authority with her *lust(s)* of the 'moment' that the world stimulated. In *discussion* you can only eat fruit from the trees in the garden which you have been given permission to eat, since in *discussion* there is right and wrong. In *dialogue* you can eat fruit from all the trees in the garden, since in *dialogue* all trees are equal, i.e., there is no right and wrong. This is why, when it comes to right and wrong behavior (which you have been *told*) you go to *dialogue* (with your *self* and with others) so you can do what you "feel" like doing without having a *guilty conscience*, i.e., without feeling *guilty*, i.e., without feeling bad for doing wrong—everybody is doing it which makes it right.

"Not feeling at home in the sinful world, Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home." "Critical Criticism is a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without." (Karl Marx, The Holy Family)

"Critical Criticism" is where we *dialogue* with our *self* our *lusts* of the 'moment' and our resentments toward restraint, i.e., toward the restrainer, i.e., toward anyone getting in the way of our *lusts*, causing us to "not feel at home" (in a world of sinners, i.e., of "*lusters*" condemning one another for sinning, i.e., for *lusting*). *Dialogue* in its "pure" form, void of *discussion*, i.e., no longer fearful of *restraint* is *lust* and hate in full control, "intolerant of any influence from without," "setting up a sinful world in its own home," i.e., in the world around it. "*Criticism*" does not become "*Critical*" until *lust*, 'justified' in the mind (*discussion* is *negated*) is being threatened. It is *lust* responding out of desperation to *negate* whoever is standing in *lusts* way, threatening it, preventing (or potentially preventing)

it's actualization. *Critical Race Theory* is "*Critical Criticism*" (hatred toward authority) being put into *praxis* (social action).

*"The basic innovation introduced by the philosophy of praxis is the demonstration that there is no abstract 'human nature,' fixed and immutable (a concept which derives from religious and transcendentalist thought), but that human nature [lust for pleasure and hate of restraint responding to the world around it] is the totality of historically determined social relations." "The relation between theory and practice becomes even closer the more the conception is vitally and radically innovatory ['revolutionary,' i.e., self, seeking 'change'] and opposed to old ways of thinking [that inhibit or block 'change']." "Truth is a moment in correct praxis." (Antonio Gramsci, *Selections From The Prison Notebooks*) In other words, 'truth' is only made manifest when truth, which is external to "human nature," i.e., repressing *lust* is *negated*. If stimulus-response is all there is then likewise, anyone getting in the way of "human nature," i.e., inhibiting or blocking *lust* must be *negated* in order for man to become his "*self*," i.e., "*of the world only*," i.e., *self actualized*.*

Truth, in other words does not reside outside the individual, directing his steps but is the individual discovering his *self*, i.e., the truth within, responding to the world that stimulates it.

*"In short, philosophy as theory ["Reasoning" from an opinion, i.e., from "feelings," i.e., from lust] finds the 'ought' [lust, i.e., the child's carnal nature] implied within the 'is' [within the one in authority], and as praxis [setting aside the father's/Father's authority] seeks to make the two coincide [making the child's carnal nature, i.e., lust and the world that stimulates it the voice of authority]." (Comments by Joseph O'Malley Ed. of Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) When you reject the Heavenly Father all you have is the earthly father with his *lusts*, becoming at-one-with his *self*, his family, and the world around him.*

"Criticism is now simply a means. Indignation is its essential pathos, denunciation its principle task. Criticism is criticism in hand-to-hand combat. Criticism proceeds on to praxis." (Marx, *Critique*) Violence against the father's/Father's authority (according to Karl Marx) is a part of "human nature" which therefore must be put into *praxis* (social action).

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

"Marx sees ... consciousness as 'practical critical activity' with the task of 'changing the world' [negating the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way of lust]." (Lukács)

Dialogue is a "spirit," i.e., a "feeling" of oneness, when put into *praxis* (social action) removes anyone who gets in its way, 'changing' the world. It is "pure spontaneity" responding to the world that stimulates *lust* and hate, 'justifying' and augmenting that which engenders *lust*, removing that which engenders hate, i.e., that gets in the way of *lust*. Without *discussion*, i.e., restraint, *dialogue* when put into *praxis* defines right and wrong behavior from 'human behavior' and puts it into action ("*Critical Criticism*") controlling the person, "the group," and the world, removing anyone who gets in its, i.e., *lust's* way (without compassion), including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous.

"The philosophy of praxis is the absolute secularization of thought, an absolute humanism of history [where all thought and action is void of the father's/Father's authority, i.e., Godly restraint, i.e., accountability before God for one's thoughts and actions, i.e., where one will spend eternity]." (Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*)

"Praxis [lust for and augmentation of pleasure and hatred toward restraint, i.e., silencing and removal of the restrainer (by force if necessary)] becomes the form of action appropriate to the isolated individual, it becomes his ethics." (Lukács)

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

The Greek word for "*deeds*" (works) is *praxis*.

"Ye do the deeds of your father." "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." John 8:41, 44

What was/is the *lie*? That you can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates and not be held accountable. The facilitator of 'change' taking the place of the father/Father, instead of holding you accountable for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, 'justifies' it, 'justifying' his *self*, i.e., his *praxis*, i.e., his deeds (works), i.e., his *lusts*. There is no fear of God before his eyes, wanting you to be just like him, *affirming* (serving, protecting, supporting, defending, praising, worshiping) him.

"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 "In all thy ways acknowledge him [the Lord]," Proverbs 3:6

The name for the national test for teachers is *Praxis*. There is no acknowledgment of or fear of God in any of the questions or answers (other than to mock Him). If you are 'justifying' your *self*, i.e., your *lusts* you will not notice.

"Change in organization [from 'loyalty' to the father/Father to 'loyalty' to "the group" (and the facilitator of 'change')] can be derived from the overlapping between play and barrier behavior [between dialogue and discussion, which when brought 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 one's belief." "To be governed by two strong goals [doing the father's/Father's will and receiving approval from "the group"] is equivalent to the existence of two conflicting controlling heads within the organism ... the forces under the control of one head have to counteract the forces of the other before they are effective [the individual must choose between either doing the father's/Father's will, i.e., rejecting "the group" or going with "the group," i.e., rejecting the father's/Father's authority]." (Ernest R. Hilgard, *Introduction to Psychology*). " (Barker, Dembo, & Lewin, "frustration and regression: an experiment with young children" in *Child Behavior and Development*)*

By 'shifting' communication from *discussion*, which retains the father's/Father's authority in the mind of the participants to *dialogue*, which makes all equal according to their carnal nature, i.e., to what they have in common, the father's/Father's authority is *negated* in the mind of those making policy, resulting in their establishing right and wrong behavior upon their *lusts*, i.e., their "*self interests*" of the 'moment,' without having a *guilty conscience*. In the *praxis* of *dialogue* any opposition to "*the group's*" carnal desires, i.e., *lusts* is *negated*.

*"With the devaluation of the epistemic authority of the God's eye view, moral commands lose their religious as well as their metaphysical foundation." "The shift in perspective from God to human beings has a further consequence. 'Validity' now signifies that moral norms could win the agreement of all concerned, on the condition that they jointly examine in practical discourse whether a corresponding practice is in the equal interest of all." "This idea of a discursively produced understanding also imposes a greater burden of justification on the isolated judging subject than would a monologically applied universalisation test." (Jürgen Habermas, *Communicative Ethics The inclusion of the Other. Studies in Political Theory*)*

"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]." (Adorno)

"In the dialogic relation of recognizing oneself [one's lusts] in the other, they experience the common ground of their existence." (Habermas, *Knowledge & Human Interest, Chapter Three: The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory*) I know I entered this quotation before, but it is key to the process of 'change.'

It was the family structure of both the "*Holy family*" and the "*earthly family*," where those under authority have to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their *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, which creates a *guilty conscience* for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for *lusting* that had to be *negated* if mankind, i.e., society, i.e., the Marxist (Karl Marx) was to be able to *lust*, i.e., to be their (his) *self* without restraint, externally and internally.

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

Sigmund Freud believed the same thing. Without the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority in the next generation's thoughts and actions the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will would remain in force, i.e., in place, preventing 'change.'

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

*rebellion of the exiled sons, the collective killing and devouring of the father." (Sigmund Freud in [Herbert Marcuse](#), *Eros and Civilization: a psychological inquiry into Freud*)*

"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." (Brown)

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, killing all the fathers in the land so all the children could be the same, i.e., like them, thereby *affirming* them, i.e., their control over them.

"Freud saw that in the id there is no negation [no parental authority, i.e. no Godly restraint, i.e. no "Thou shalt not"], only affirmation and eternity [only the child's/student's natural inclination to lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates]." "Children have not acquired that sense of shame which, according to the Biblical story, expelled mankind from Paradise, and which, presumably, would be discarded if Paradise were regained [if pleasure (lust) became the agenda, i.e., the 'drive' and 'purpose' of life]." "The repression of normal adult sexuality is required only by cultures which are based on patriarchal domination [on doing the father's/Father's will]." "Our repressed desires are the desires we had unrepressed, in childhood; and they are sexual desires." "Parental discipline, religious denunciation of bodily pleasure, . . . have all left man overly docile, but secretly in his unconscious [in his urges and impulses of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world] unconvinced, and therefore neurotic [caught between his desire for parental approval and his lust for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulation, having a guilty conscience for thinking about or doing the

latter]." *"The foundation on which the man of the future will be built is already there, in the repressed unconscious; the foundation has to be recovered ['liberated' from the guilty conscience, requiring the negation of the father's/Father's authority]. (Brown)*

"The Communist Manifesto makes the point that the bourgeoisie [the traditional, "middle-class" family, requiring those under authority to honor authority] produces its own grave-diggers [children/students, dissatisfied with their parent's authority, 'justifying' their "self," i.e., their lusts before one another, killing their parents (at least not caring what happens to them—"dying with dignity" at least gets them out of the way sooner, without the children/students having a guilty conscience)]." (Lukács)

*"Revolutionary violence reconciles the disunited parties by abolishing the alienation of class antagonism [the father's/Father's authority] that set in with the repression of initial morality [lust]. ... the revolution that must occur is the reaction of suppressed life [hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward authority], which will visit the causality of fate upon the rulers [the parent's, the property owner, the business owner, etc., i.e., the father]. It is those who establish such domination and defend positions of power of this sort who set in motion the causality of fate [hate and violence toward them], divide society into social classes [parent's-children, owner-worker, man-God, etc.], suppress justified interests [lusts], call forth the reactions of suppressed life [hate and violence], and finally experience their just fate in revolution [violence against and overthrow of their right of person (individuality), property, and business]." (Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge & Human Interest, Chapter Three: The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory*)*

"It is necessary to know that war is common and justice is strife and that all things happen in accordance with strife and necessity." (Heraclitus) This is why Marxist's are never really happy, i.e., are always full of rage and hate (hiding it, i.e., presenting themselves as "caring" until they have the upper hand, i.e., are able, in their mind to

gain control, while using strife to pressure people, out of fear to turn to them for "help"—since they "seem to care").

*"I've decided to get into the World Federalists, become pro-UN, & the like." "Only a world government with world-shared values could be trusted or permitted to take such powers. If only for such a reason a world government is necessary. It too would have to evolve. I suppose it would be weak or lousy or even corrupt at first—it certainly doesn't amount to much now & won't until sovereignty is given up little by little by 'nations.'" "The whole discussion becomes species-wide, One World, at least so far as the guiding goal is concerned. To get to that goal is politics & is in time and space & will take a long time & cost much blood." ". . . A caretaker government could immediately start training for democracy & self-government & give it little by little, as deserved." "This is a realistic combination of the Marxian version & the Humanistic. (Better add to definition of "humanistic" that it also means one species, One World.)" "I must put as much of this as is possible & usable in my education book, & more & more in succeeding writings." (Abraham Maslow, *The Journals of Abraham Maslow*)*

*"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 [there is no father's authority getting in the child's/student's way, i.e., the father has abdicated his authority to the lusts of the family]." (Sigmund Freud in Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization*)*

"The entry into Freud cannot avoid being a plunge into a strange world and a strange language—a world of sick men,It is a shattering experience for anyone seriously committed to the Western traditions of morality and rationality to take a steadfast, unflinching look at what Freud has to say. To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit; and this book cannot without sinning communicate that experience to the reader." "Our real choice is between holy and unholy madness: open your eyes and look around

you—madness is in the saddle anyhow." "It is possible to be mad and to be unblest, but it is not possible to get the blessing without the madness; it is not possible to get the illuminations without the derangement," "I wagered my intellectual life on the idea of finding in Freud what was missing in Marx." (Brown)

*"Through the sudden popularity of Herbert Marcuse in the America of the late 1960's, the Frankfurt School's Critical Theory (Kritische Theorie) [known as "Marxist Theory" in Europe where we get the phrase "Critical Thinking" i.e., "Question Authority" and is now become manifest in Critical Race Theory] has also had a significant influence on the New Left in this country." "Praxis and reason were the two poles of Critical Theory." "Eros and Civilization went far beyond the earlier efforts of Critical Theory to merge Freud and Marx." "As the Frankfurt School wrestled with how to 'reinvigorate Marx', they 'found the missing link in Freud'" (Martin Jay *The Dialectical Imagination: The History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923-1950*)*

*"Marxian theory ["the group," i.e., society] needs Freudian-type instinct theory [the individuals lust for pleasure, including his lust for approval from others, affirming his lusts, and his hatred toward restraint, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority] 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." (Abraham Maslow, *Journals*)*

"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)

"I have found whenever I ran across authoritarian students that the best thing for me to do was to break their backs immediately." "The correct thing to do with authoritarians is to take them realistically for the bastards they are and then behave toward them as if they were bastards." (Maslow, Management)

"Yet nakedness is absolutely right. So is the attack on antieroticism, the Christian & Jewish foundations. Must move in the direction of the Reichian orgasm." "I must put as much of this as is possible & usable in my education book, & more & more in succeeding writings." (Maslow, Journals)

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

The College classroom today:

Replacing traditional education, i.e., the 1) *preaching* of established commands and rules to be obeyed as given, the *teaching* of established facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith, and the *discussing* of any question(s) the children might have regarding the commands, rules, facts, and truth being taught, at the father's/Father's, i.e., the educator's discretion, i.e., providing he/He deems it necessary, has time, the children are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking his/His authority, 2) *rewarding* the child who does right and obeys, 3) *correcting* and/or *chastening* the child 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 established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Fathers' will, and 4) *casting out* (expelling/grounding) any child who questions, challenges, defies, disregards, attacks the father's/Father's authority system (1-4), which retains the father's/Father's authority system, with transformational education, i.e., the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process, i.e., the "group grade" classroom in order to *negate* the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., in order to initiate and sustain 'change.' There is no father's/Father's authority, i.e., established commands,

rules, facts, or truth in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus* process. There is only the carnal desires, i.e., *self interests*, i.e., *lusts* of those participating being made manifest and 'justified.'

In traditional education, *knowing* is the child having been *told* right from wrong, *comprehending* he will be held accountable if he does wrong or disobeys, i.e., that there is a cost for being wrong, *applying his self* to obedience or disobedience, and *analyzing* whether he did right or wrong as dad (the educator) either rewards him for doing right and obeying or takes him to the "*wood shed*" for disobey or doing wrong, teaching him that he had better do what he is *told*. This cuts off *synthesizing*, i.e., the child finding what he has in common with the other children/students, i.e., *lust* for pleasure and hate toward restraint, and *evaluating* whether he did the dialectic process or reverted back to the father's/Father's authority in solving the problem, needing remediation.

In transformational education, i.e., with the use of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*," i.e., Marxist curriculum in the classroom (covered below) the father's/Father's authority is replaced with the children's/student's "feelings," i.e., *lusts* ("*the affective domain*"). In dialectic language the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust* (what all children/people have in common) is made the *Thesis*, making *Antithesis* the father's/Father's authority (which divides children/people from one another based upon their having to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth which differ between families, i.e., the people), making *Synthesis* possible by simply *negating* the *Antithesis*, i.e., the father's/Father's authority, i.e., "prejudice," i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth when it comes to determining/establishing right and wrong behavior.

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

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

In other words, in order for the world to be 'changed,' the "educator" must be 'changed,' i.e., must reject (*negate*) the father's/Father's authority system in the classroom, which engenders individualism, under God, replacing it with the child's/student's carnal nature, i.e., *lust* which, when 'justified' in a group setting 'liberates' the child/student and society from the father's/Father's authority system. How the educator is educated directly effects the child/student, effecting government, i.e., how the child/student will vote when he comes of age.

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

"There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children." (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain)

Mao's long march across America began in earnest in the fifties and sixties with the introduction of Marxist curriculum in the classroom—called "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)." We are seeing its effect in America today. All "educators" are certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" i.e., Marxist curriculum in the classroom. By 1971 over one million of Bloom's "*taxonomies*" were published for the Communist Chinese education system. (Benjamin Bloom, *Forty Year Evaluation*)

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

Evaluation)

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

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

Benjamin Bloom dedicated his first Taxonomy to [Ralph Tyler](#), who's 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*—As Irvin Yalom in his book, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy* pointed out: *"The current generation is the first in the history of the world which has nothing to learn from grandparents;"*) *"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]."* (Kuhn) All Tyler, Bloom, Kuhn, et al. did was 'shift'

communication in the lab from *discussion*, which holds everyone accountable to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., to limits and measures, i.e., to "rule of law" to *dialogue*, which makes the *experiment* itself (*opinion* or *theory*) the outcome, putting the *theory* or *opinion* into practice (*praxis*), silencing any true scientist who (using established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., limits and measures, i.e., "rule of law") questions and/or rejects the outcome, i.e., the *theory*. There is no "wrong" (accountability for the cost of being wrong) in an *opinion*, i.e., in *dialogue*, only "*I will do 'better' next time.*" When a *theory* or an *opinion*, i.e., a "*feeling*" (expressed through *dialogue*) is treated as fact or truth anyone defending (*preaching, teaching, and/or attempting to discuss*) facts or truth, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, or truth will appear to be "*argumentative,*" i.e., not worth listening to (censored). Evolution, climate 'change' ("global warming"), life begins at birth, etc., are *opinions*, i.e., *theories* in response to what "IS," i.e., the truth—man is a sinner, i.e., "*deceitful above all things*" and "*desperately wicked*" in heart, *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating, hating restraint, *negating* anyone who gets in his way (to *lust*, i.e., to "Utopia"), including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous (there is no other purpose), needing to repent and turn from his deceitful and wicked ways and "*return unto the Lord ... and our God.*"

"You make me feel wicked. You make me feel like I'm doing something wicked." Response from a kindergarten teacher after only two minutes into explaining "*Bloom's Taxonomies.*" *WOW!!!* I was not ready for that response (much less that soon). I was just getting started. Needless to say she walked away, not wanting to hear any more, i.e., repent and turn from her wicked ways. "*Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the LORD, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.*" Isaiah 55:7

Ask any teacher today if they have ever heard of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" and they will probably smile, thinking you are a fellow comrade ready to inform them on some new way of applying it in the classroom. Any teacher

questioning and/or challenging their use in the classroom will be looking for another job, if they can find one—having been labeled "unfit" to teach.

"Blooms' Taxonomies" are "a psychological classification system" used "to develop attitudes and values ... which are not shaped by the parents." "Ordering" "different kinds of affective behavior," i.e., "the range of emotion(s)" "organized into value systems and philosophies of life." "It was the view of the group that educational objectives stated in the behavior form have their counterparts in the behavior of individuals, observable and describable therefore classifiable [true science is "observable and repeatable," i.e., objective, i.e., constant not "observable and describable," i.e., subject to an opinion, i.e., subject to 'change']." "Only those educational programs which can be specified in terms of intended student behaviors can be classified." "What we are classifying is the intended behavior of students—the ways in which individuals are to act, think, or feel as the result of participating in some unit of instruction." "... ordering and relating the different kinds of affective behavior." "... we need to provide the range of emotion from neutrality through mild to strong emotion, probably of a positive, but possibly also of a negative, kind." "... organized into value systems and philosophies of life ..." "...many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in some ways brought into question while more rational and nonauthoritarian behaviors are emphasized." "The student must feel free to say he disliked _____ and not have to worry about being punished for his reaction." (Book 1: Cognitive Domain and Book 2: Affective Domain)

"To create effectively a new set of attitudes and values, the individual must undergo great reorganization of his personal beliefs and attitudes and he must be involved in an environment which in many ways is separated from the previous environment in which he was developed.... many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in

some ways brought into question while more rational and nonauthoritarian behaviors are emphasized." "The effectiveness of this new set of environmental conditions is probably related to the extent to which the students are 'isolated' from the home during this period of time." "... objectives can best be attained where the individual is separated from earlier environmental conditions and when he is in association with a group of peers who are changing in much the same direction and who thus tend to reinforce each other." (Book 2: Affective Domain)

The following section is from a book explaining how the Communist Chinese brainwash their victims.

*"The manner in which the prisoner came to be influenced to accept the Communist's definition of his guilt can best be described by distinguishing two broad phases—(1) a process of 'unfreezing,' [see the issues on Kurt Lewin, [Unfreezing, Moving or Changing, Refreezing People](#), [Force Field Analysis](#), and [Group Dynamics](#); "Unfreezing. This term, also adopted from Lewinian change theory, refers to the process of disconfirming an individual's former belief system." ([Irvin D. Yalom](#), *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*) "A successful change includes, therefore, three aspects: unfreezing the present level, moving to the new level, and freezing group life on the new level." (Kurt Lewin) "In brief, unfreezing is the breaking down of the mores, customs and traditions of an individual – the old ways of doing things – so that he is ready to accept new alternatives." (Edger Schein and Warren Bennis, *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach*)] in which the prisoner's physical resistance, social and emotional supports, self-image and sense of integrity, and basic values and personality were undermined, thereby creating a state of 'readiness' to be influence; and (2) a process of 'change,' in which the prisoner discovered how the adoption of 'the people's standpoint' and a reevaluation of himself from this perspective would provide him with a solution to the problems created by the prison pressure."*

"Most were put into a cell containing several who were further along

in reforming themselves and who saw it as their primary duty to "help" their most backward member to see the truth about himself in order that the whole cell might advance. Each such cell had a leader who was in close contact with the authorities for purposes of reporting on the cell's progress and getting advice on how to handle the Western member . . . the environment undermined the (clients) self-image." ". . . Once this process of self of self re-evaluation began, the (client) received all kinds of help and support from the cell mates and once again was able to enter into meaningful emotional relationships with others." (Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays in Readings on Human Interaction, ed. Warren G. Bennis, Edgar H. Schein, David E. Berlew, and Fred I. Steele)

Without the *"affective domain,"* i.e., *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint 'change,' i.e., 'liberation' from the father's/Father's authority can not be initiated or sustained.

"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 hate restraint] contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people." "The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box' [a "box" full of evils, which once opened, can not be closed—once the father's/Father's authority, i.e., fear of judgment, i.e., "the lid" is removed it is difficult if not impossible to put it back on again]. 'It is in this 'box' that the most influential controls are to be found." "In fact, a large part of what we call "good teaching" is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives ['liberating' the child's/student's carnal thoughts from the father's/Father's authority] through challenging the student's fixed beliefs [challenging the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth] and getting them to discuss issues [evaluating the world through their carnal desires, i.e., their "lusts," i.e., their "self interests" of the 'moment']." (Book 2: Affective Domain)

"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." "¹Cf. Erich Fromm, 1941; T. W. Adorno et al., 1950." (Book 2: Affective Domain)

Erich Fromm and T. W. Adorno were two Marxists who were members of the "[Frankfurt School](#)" who came to the states, fleeing Fascist Germany in the early 30's—who entered our universities and "assisted" our government in making policies—moving education out from under parental (the father's/Father's) authority, i.e., local control ("[in loco parentis](#)") to government, i.e., their control. You can not get any closer to local control than the traditional family—where local control emanates from.

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

"Fromm gave the humanitarian, idealist, and romantic proponents of the New Left a Marx they could love." (Bronner)

"Authoritarian submission [humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulate "self" in order to do the father's/Father's will] was conceived of as a very general attitude that would be evoked in relation to a variety of authority figures—parents, older people, leaders, supernatural power, and so forth." "God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as

*a guiding and sometimes punishing authority." "Submission to authority, desire for a strong leader, subservience of the individual to the state [parental authority, local control, Nationalism], and so forth, have so frequently and, as it seems to us, correctly, been set forth as important aspects of the Nazi creed that a search for correlates of prejudice had naturally to take these attitudes into account [through the use of generalization, in error labeling all father's as Fascist or potentially Fascist, when Fascism, as all socialist systems must negate the father's/Father's authority in the home in order to gain and maintain control over "the people"]." "The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem." ([Theodor Adorno](#), *The Authoritarian Personality*)*

"Our aim is not merely to describe prejudice [established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of lust, i.e., "human nature"] but to explain it in order to help in its eradication. Eradication means re-education." "Using social-environmental forces to change the parent's behavior toward the child." (Adorno)

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

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

"In a democratic society a patriarchal culture should make us depressed instead of glad; it [a patriarchal culture] is an argument against the higher possibilities of human nature, of self actualization."

"In our democratic society, any enterprise—any individual—has its obligations to the whole." (Maslow, Management)

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

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

Eradication means crushing (silencing) the parents if necessary in order to 'liberate' the children (*lust*) out from under their authority, i.e., out from under having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* one's *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, so the facilitator of 'change' can *lust* after the canal pleasure of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a *guilty conscience* (which the father's/Father's authority engenders), with the children's (and now the crushed parents) *affirmation* (in the mind of the facilitator of 'change' to be silent is to *affirm*, i.e., to *consent*).

"The antithesis of the 'authoritarian' type was called 'revolutionary.'"
"By The Authoritarian Personality [Theodor Adorno's book]
'revolutionary' had changed to the 'democratic.'" (Martin Jay *The Dialectical Imagination: The History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923-1950*) This is why President Ronald Reagan stated, *"I did not leave the democratic party. The democratic party left me [became Marxist]."*

By making the student's *"self interest,"* i.e., *"lusts"* of the 'moment,' i.e., the *"affective domain"* the core of his classroom experience the "educator" is able to 'change' the student's way of thinking and acting—intoxicated with,

addicted to, possessed by *lust* he will naturally follow the "educator" wherever he is leading. You *manipulate* "feelings." You persuade with facts and truth.

"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 [lusts] 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 lusts]. The curious thing is that in that case the question of freedom never arises." (Rogers)

"Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." John 8:34, 36

Freedom resides not in you doing whatever you want, i.e., being controlled, as a drug addict by your carnal nature, i.e., your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating but in you doing the Father's will. Apart from the Father, *lust*, and the world that stimulates it is all you have.

"Let your conversation be without covetousness; and be content with such things as ye have: for he hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee. So that we may boldly say, The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me." Hebrews 13:5, 6

"And having food and raiment let us be therewith content." 1 Timothy 6:8

When the facilitator of 'change' finds what you *lust* after, i.e., what you *covet* he "owns" you.

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

The facilitator of 'change,' through the use of *dialogue* is able to 'discover' what you *covet*, i.e., what you *lust* after, i.e., your *self interest*. He is then able to gain your trust, i.e., he has your best interest, i.e., your *self interest* in mind. Having gained your trust he "owns" you, i.e., he is able to use you (as "*human resource*") to satisfy his *lusts*, i.e., his *self interest* with your *affirmation*, casting you aside when you no longer satisfy his *lusts*, i.e., his *self interest* or you get in his way, doing to you what you did to the father/Father for getting in your way—it is the "game" you decided to play when you turned to him for direction (advice) instead of to the father/Father. He is dependent upon you, i.e., your *affirmation* in order to gain and retain power (control over you), getting rid of you when you get in his way (hurt his "feelings," i.e., his *lusts* which he will not forget). The farmer for example is caught up in this, having to face the risks and responsibilities of getting a crop in and then out, learning that while he might have two good years, the next year, a bad year can ruin him if he lives like he did during the good years, learning to live in moderation in the good years in order to keep the farm. It is more often he has one good year, one average or bad year, and one bad year. 'Liberal,' i.e., socialist, i.e., Marxist college professors (adding the three years up and averaging them out), encourage and advise bankers and the government on how to *seduce*, *deceive*, and *manipulate* the farmer—offering him subsidies, guaranteeing him, in his mind a good years income from then on, not knowing that living like the good years, i.e., without restraint, the banker (tempting him to live the "good" life, i.e., to borrow more money) and the government (forcing him to pay taxes set upon the good years) will go into debt, i.e., will have to borrow more money to cover the costs of the bad year) will "own" his farm, i.e., make him their servant, working on "their" farm that

he calls his own. He then sends his child to college in order to have a "better" life, who, going into debt in order to get an education, then sits under the 'liberal, socialist, Marxist college professors, who, living the good life with the student's (debt) money and his father's (tax) money, teach him how to think and act like them, *seducing, deceiving, and manipulating* others, in order to support their (and his) *lusts*, i.e., their (and his) habit. The father/Father, who is not dependent upon you, i.e., your *lusts* (showing mercy and grace to you) forgives you when you repent and obey, i.e., when you do what is right according to his/His established commands, rules, facts, and truth. Those of the world, not being subject, in their mind to doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth will not forgive you. This the child, being *lust* driven does not understand. As with the college student, all the facilitator of 'change' needs to know ('discover' via *dialogue*) is your legislators "*self interests*," i.e., *lusts*, offer to "help" him to achieve them, and he "owns" him. The same is true for you in college, where, in the "*group grade*" classroom you must set aside absolutes, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., "prejudice" in order to let the immoral, incompetent, or lazy "feel" good about his *self* while you have to work with him on a group project. As Robert Owen's son remarked regarding his father socialist experiment "*All cooperative schemes which provide equal remuneration to the skilled and industrious and the ignorant and idle must work their own downfall. For by this unjust plan they must of necessity eliminate the valuable members and retain only the improvident, unskilled, and vicious.*" (Robert Dale Owen, Robert Owen's son) Since then 'liberal's,' socialists, Marxists pressure the "*skilled and industrious*" and the moral to participate (they can not leave) if they want a "good" grade (the grade is based upon "*working together as a team without hurting the immoral, the incompetent, or the lazy person's 'feelings'*") which directly effects their having a "good" job in the future. No matter where you apply it, it has the same effect, i.e., outcome (to those who participate)—the justification of *lust* and hatred toward restraint, i.e., hatred toward the restrainer, i.e., toward the father's/Father's authority.

"Individuals move not from a fixity through change to a new fixity [from doing right and not wrong according to established commands,

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

The whole grading system has 'changed' from being right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth to where along the spectrum of 'change,' i.e., *lust* the student resides in any given moment, in any given situation—from 'loyalty' to the father's/Father's authority to 'loyalty' to the facilitator of 'change' and those 'justifying' and following him, i.e., 'loyalty' to his and the other student's carnal nature, i.e., *lust* for pleasure and hate toward restraint.

"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)

"Frauds individual psychology is in its very essence social psychology." "Freud's theory is in its very substance 'sociological.'" (Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*)

Marcuse, quoting Freud, wrote: *"Individual psychology is thus in itself group psychology ... the individual ... is an archaic identity with the species."* *"This archaic heritage [lust] bridges the 'gap between individual and mass psychology.'"* (Sigmund Freud, *Moses and Monotheism* as quoted in Marcuse)

"Without exception, [children/students] enter group therapy [the "group grade" classroom] with the history of a highly unsatisfactory experience in their first and most important group—their primary family [the traditional home with parents telling them what they can and can not do]." *"What better way to help [the child/student] recapture the past than to allow him to re-experience and reenact ancient feelings [resentment, hostility] toward parents in his current relationship to the therapist [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/the students] 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/students] 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/student'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/the student] changes the past by reconstituting it ['creating' a "new" world order from his "ought," i.e., a world "lusting" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, i.e., a world void of the father's/Father's authority and the guilty conscience which the father's/Father's authority engenders for doing*

wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "*lusting*" after pleasure in disobedience]. " (Yalom)

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

"... 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)

"To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit; and this book [Eros And Civilization] cannot without sinning

communicate that experience to the reader." (Brown)

"But Brown believed that the payoff was worth the price of sin—namely, that alienation would be overcome, and the return of the repressed completed, rendering problems of sin permanently moot. Life Against Death established Brown, along with his colleague and friend Herbert Marcuse, and later Charles Reich, as an intellectual leader of the New Left a Marxist mode of Freudian analysis." (March 23-30, 2005 issue of Metro Santa Cruz)

Only by destroying the college student's faith in the traditional family system can globalism become reality, i.e., actualized. This is what College is all about. And you thought it was about academics. Not any more. As it was in the day's of Noah (pre and post flood), so it is today. *"And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil [lust and hate] continually." "... the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth;"* Genesis 6:5; 8:21 Academics now has this as its agenda, i.e., the restoring of the tower of babel. *"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."* Genesis 11:6

"The ideas of the Enlightenment taught man that he could trust his own reason [his own "feelings," i.e., his "sensuous needs" and "sense perception," i.e., his "sense experience," i.e., his lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint] as a guide to establishing valid ethical norms and that he could rely on himself, needing neither revelation [the Word of God, i.e., the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth] nor that authority of the church [the Son of God, Jesus Christ] in order to know good and evil." (Bronner)

"The Christian religion has been deeply affected by the process of Enlightenment and the conquest of the scientific spirit." "Although these latter ideas ('the idea of the crucifix and the sacrifice of blood') have been more or less successfully replaced by 'Christian Humanism

[concern about pleasing God has been replaced with concern about pleasing men], *'their deeper psychological roots [the guilty conscience for doing wrong, i.e., for sinning] have still to be reckoned with.'* (Adorno)

"Enlightenment is man's release from his self-incurred tutelage. Tutelage is man's inability to make use of his understanding without direction from another. Self-incurred is this tutelage when its cause lies not in lack of reason but in lack of resolution and courage to use it without direction from another. Sapere Aude! Dare to know! 'Have courage to use your own reason!'- that is the motto of enlightenment." (Immanuel Kant, Konigsberg in Prussia, 30 September 1784)

"We must ultimately assume at the highest theoretical levels of enlightenment ... a preference or a tendency ... to identify with more and more of the world, moving toward the ultimate of mysticism, a fusion with the world, or peak experience, cosmic consciousness, etc."
"Enlightened economics must assume as a prerequisite synergic institutions set up in such a way that what benefits one benefits all."
"Enlightenment management and humanistic supervision can be a brotherhood situation." "The more enlightened the religious institutions get, that is to say, the more liberal they get, the greater will be the advantage for an enterprise run in an enlightened way [according to man's carnal nature]." (Maslow, Management)

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

"And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." 2 Corinthians 11:14, 15

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that

is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." 2 Thessalonians 2:3-10

Every facilitator of 'change' is possessed by the spirit of "antichrist."

*"He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." 1 John 2:22
This is why I call "Bloom's Taxonomies" "Secularized Satanism.
Intellectualized witchcraft."*

"Denying the Father and the Son," who is "the light of the world," i.e., "the light of life" all who follow after the facilitator of 'change' "walk in darkness."

"Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." John 8:12

"For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth

cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." John 3:17-21

"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 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 aka absolute command, rule, facts, or truth to be accepted as is, by faith and obeyed), 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. Also I set watchmen over you, saying, Hearken to the sound of the trumpet. But they said, We will not hearken." Jeremiah 6:16, 17

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 your "self" 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 2022