The following explains how and why dialectic 'reasoning'\(^1\) replaced the father's/Father's authority system\(^2\) in the classroom—"pressuring" parent's into educating their children at home in order to retain their authority ("local control") over their children, i.e., in order to retain their children's respect toward authority, thereby maintaining order (as in the "old" world order of top-down authority) in the home. It explains how and why the "right-wrong" (as in "do what is right" as you are instructed and "do not do wrong or disobey"), "either-or" (as in "either do what you are told, i.e., do what is right or face the consequences"), "above-below," "top-down." "Mine, Not yours," "Because I said so," hierarchy system, i.e., the Patriarchal paradigm, with its preaching of commands and rules to be obeyed and its teaching of facts and truth to be accepted as given, i.e., as "is," by faith—with the school using the same "right-wrong", i.e., "is-is not" or "can-can not," as in "Two plus two 'is' four and 'can not' be any other number," grading system in order to sustain the children's facts or truth based individuality, under their parent's and/or God's authority, i.e., reinforcing the children's personal accountability to their parents and/or to God—was replaced in the classroom with the Heresiarchal paradigm of 'change,' i.e., with the children determining right from "wrong" according to their "feelings" of the 'moment' (with "right or wrong" being "feelings" based instead of truth based), dialoguing their opinions (their "thoughts," i.e., their "ought's," which are subject to their "feelings," i.e., their desires and dissatisfactions or "sensuous needs" of the 'moment' in the "light" of, i.e., stimulated by or illuminated by the immediate situation, i.e., that which is of sight or "sense perception") to a consensus—with the school using the "group grade" system, i.e., "encouraging" the students to question and challenge what "is," i.e., to question and challenge the father's/Father's authority system in order (as in the "new" world order of "liberté, égalité, fraternité") to 'change,' i.e., to convert (program) them into socialist's-globalist's. By "helping" the children "build relationship based upon self-interest, the father's/Father's authority system (doing right and not wrong) is negated in their feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in their relationship with one another and the world, 'creating' a "new" world order of perpetual 'change.'

**Change the method of teaching (the system or curriculum) you use in the classroom and you 'change' the children, i.e., you 'change' the way they feel, think, and act, and relate with one another and the world as well as respond (feel, think, and act) toward authority. The father's/Father's authority system (with its commands, rules, facts, and truth having to be accepted by faith first) and the dialectic process (with its "feelings of the 'moment,'" which are subject to sight, i.e., to the children's "sense perception," i.e. to what "seems to be," having to be accepted first) are political systems which are antithetical to one another. Either the father (the parents), i.e., "right-wrong" rules the home, i.e., rules over the children's "feelings" of the 'moment' or the children's "feelings" of the 'moment' will rule over the home, i.e., rule over the father instead (negating the father's/Father's authority system in the children's feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in their relationship with one another and the world). Both (established "right-wrong" and the "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., the parents, i.e., the husband and wife and the children) ruling together, in order to initiate and sustain "relationship" ("liberté, égalité, fraternité"), means that the children rule, with their "feelings" of the 'moment,' with their desires of the 'moment,' with their desire for pleasure, including the pleasure of approval (affirmation)—making pleasure, and the approval of it, "right" and that which engenders dissatisfaction, i.e., that which prevents, i.e., inhibits or blocks them from satisfying their carnal desires (pleasures) of the 'moment,' including the pleasure of approval (affirmation), "wrong." In essence, the children's carnal nature rules, with the parents becoming as (at-
one-with-the) children, with their "feelings" of the 'moment' in agreement, harmony, or concord (consensus) with the children's "feelings" of the 'moment.' With the use of dialectic 'reasoning' in the home both parent's and children rule over and therefore against "right-wrong." i.e., over and therefore against the father's/Father's (the traditional parents) authority system. Being grounded upon the children's (and parents) carnal nature, i.e., their "feelings" (their "sensuous needs" and "sense perception") of the 'moment," i.e., their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' dialectic 'reasoning,' when used in one part of the children's (and parents) life, will be used in (will spread into) all parts of their life, 'liberating' the children (and the parents) from the father's/Father's authority system, turning them from faith (having a guilty conscience for doing wrong) to sight (justifying themselves), i.e., 'justifying' their carnal desires, i.e., 'justifying' their "feelings" of the 'moment'—the role of the so called "super-ego") in their thoughts and actions, and in their relationship with one another and the world. In actuality, it is not the children who rule, but the 'liberator' of the children from the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' the psychotherapist, the seducer, deceiver, and manipulator who rules instead, living off the children and their inheritance.

Dialectic 'reasoning' has had a major affect upon American culture—"affectively" 'changing' our parents, us, our spouse, our children, our relatives, our friends, our neighbors, the nation, including the "church," 'liberating' themselves, ourselves, itself from the preaching of commands and rules to be obeyed and the teaching of facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith (indicative of the father's/Father's authority system), through the praxis (social or "group" action) of dialoguing opinions, i.e., by the sharing of everyone's "feelings" and "thoughts," i.e., everyone's "sensuous needs" and "sense perception" of the 'moment'—which are subject to the situation of the 'moment,' which is subject to the "suggestions" or "help," i.e., the seduction, deception, and manipulation of the facilitator of 'change'—to a consensus, i.e., to a "feeling" of oneness. To arrive there (at consensus) the father's/Father's authority system ("right-wrong," i.e., "negativity") must be negated in the feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in the relationship people have with one another. Switching ("shifting") the learning (policy setting) environment from the father's/Father's authority system (doing right and not wrong—according to the father's/Father's commands and rules) to the children's system of "feelings," naturally 'changes' the way the children think (evaluate life, i.e. evaluate the immediate situation) and therefore act and relate with one another and the world. If the parent's abdicate their office of authority to the children's "feelings" of the 'moment,' it is impossible for the children to accept and honor the father's/Father's authority system (on their own). In other words, after participated in and 'justified' their "feelings" based system, it is impossible for the children to accept and honor the father's/Father's authority system if the parent's abdicate (refuse to use) their office of authority, i.e., if the parents abdicate the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., if the parents refuse to chasten their children when they do "wrong"—requiring the children to repent, die to their "self," do their father's/Father's will, i.e., live by faith instead. Once "humpty dumpty" falls off the wall it is impossible to put him back together again. Only an act of God, i.e., the Father (and His obedient Son) can do that, 'redeeming' him from his sins (from his fall), 'reconciling' him to Himself. "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 the authoritarian family is moribund, regardless of whatever countermeasures may be taken. Any non-family-based collectivity that intervenes between parent and child and attempts to regulate and modify the parent-child relationship will have a democratizing impact on that relationship." (Warren Bennis, The Temporary Society)

Using the "affect" dialectic 'reasoning' has had upon the "church" for an example: instead of the fellowship of believers evaluating themselves and the world from the Word of God, therefore being rejected (persecuted) by the world for preaching and teaching the Word of God as is, i.e., uncompromised—resulting in believers being "unadaptable to 'change'" because they accept the Word of God, i.e., the Father's and the Son's relationship as being "unadaptable to 'change'"—the "church"
The same can be said for every institution, organization, association, department, committee meeting, policy meeting, gathering, etc., in the neighborhood, township, city, county, state, and nation, including the workplace, the police, the military, the medical profession, etc., dialectic 'reasoning' and the facilitator of 'change' (the consensus process) has become a part of, replacing persuasion (discussion)—the person changing or holding onto their position (private convictions) based upon the commands, rules, facts, and truth having been preached and taught and accepted as is, by faith (associated with
'local' control—with the most 'local' control being the father's authority over his family, property, and business—requiring 'limited,' i.e., separation of branches, representative, majority vote government in order to prevent government from infringing upon or usurping the father's authority over his family, property, and business, i.e., private or "nobody else's business")—with the art craft of seduction and deception instead (associated with centralized government, where all branches of government network together via the consensus process in order to prevent "individualism," under God, "isolationism," and/or "authoritarianism" AKA Nationalism AKA "Fascism" [resulting from, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' the children, i.e., "the people" accepting the father's, i.e., Hitler's or Stalin's authority over {and therefore against} themselves] from rising up and taking control over "the people," with all departments, agencies, etc., of government united in 'liberating' the citizens, i.e. "the people," i.e., the "community" and all of society, including [and especially] the children from the father's/Father's authority system—making everyone subject to manipulation, according to the "light" ("enlightenment") of their own "feelings," i.e., according to their "felt" needs (their "sensuous needs") of the 'moment' and their opinion (their "sense perception") of "the current situation" or crisis, therefore making themselves subject to (subjects of) the one(s) manipulating ("suggesting" solutions or "suggesting" different ways of looking at and dealing with) the "situation," thereby manipulating their "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., the facilitator of 'change.' Using dialectic 'reasoning' in one situation (which might be or appear, i.e., "seem" to be "good") directly "affects" (changes) how the child or adult will respond, i.e., feel, think, and act and relate with others in another. By 'liberating' the children's "feelings" of the 'moment' from the father's/Father's authority (system), 'change' automatically (naturally, i.e., according to the children's carnal nature, i.e., the children's carnal desires of the 'moment,' which are stimulated by the current situation) takes place, resulting in 1) the situation (the crisis) of the 'moment,' 2) the children's "feelings," i.e., their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' and 3) the facilitator of 'change' becoming their guiding "light," directing their thoughts and actions and their relationship with one another and the world which stimulates them, blinding them to the truth which lies above, beyond, outside, etc., their carnal nature, i.e., outside their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment.' "Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness." Luke 11:35 "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." John 3:19

In other words, truth (the Son sent by the Father, obeying the Father in all things commanded) came into the room (preaching and teaching) but the children—loving their own "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., subject to the "light" of the world—dialoged their opinions with one anther to a consensus—'justifying' their "deceitful" and "wicked" hearts—rejected the truth which was sent from above and followed after the "facilitator of 'change,'" i.e., the 'liberator' of the flesh ("human nature") from Godly restraint instead, i.e., "liberating" the children and mankind from having a "guilty conscience" for doing wrong, thereby 'liberating' them from having any fear of judgment and damnation for their wicked, evil, unrighteous, abominable thoughts and actions—known as "theory and practice." Whether in the home, in the classroom, at the workplace, at the capital, or in the "church," when we dialogue our opinions to a consensus in the policy setting environment, i.e., when we set aside (reject) the persuasion of facts and truth being preached and taught, we circumvent, i.e., we negate in our feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in our relationship with others the father's/Father's authority (system). In the dialectic policy setting environment, not only is the deceitful and wicked heart of man 'justified,' but, being put into praxis (into "group," "community," or "social" action), it is propagated and defended ("served and protected"), resulting in unrighteousness and abomination becoming the law of the land—what we see happening today.

The dialectic process comes under many titles and labels, yet it is one process, a process of "dialogue," i.e., of "self justification," i.e., of the child talking to his "self" about ("justifying" to his "self") his desires, i.e. his "self interest" (his desire for pleasure [the "lust of the flesh and eyes"] and approval from others [the "pride of life"]), 'justifying' his behavior of disobedience (to authority), i.e., 'justifying' his feelings, thoughts, and actions, and his relationship (or desire to relate) with others who he is not
supposed to build relationship with, i.e., who he is not supposed to "hang around with," i.e., who he is not to become "at-one-with" because they are "doing wrong" according to his parent's, the teacher's, ... God's standards, with one 'drive,' i.e., the child's sinful (carnal) nature ("human nature"), and one 'purpose,' i.e., 'liberating' the child from the father's restraints, i.e., from the father's authority system (so that the child no longer has to "repress," himself, i.e., deny, humble, control, discipline his "self"—in order to do the father's will—and "alienate" himself from others and others from himself—because his father's standards, which he adheres to, conflict with their father's standards, or their desires of the 'moment,' and their father's standards, which they adhere to, or their desires of the 'moment,' conflict with his father's standards, which he adheres to). Dialectic 'reasoning' is all about negating the father's/Father's authority system (the father's commands and rules—to be obeyed, as given—and facts and truth—to accepted as is, by faith) in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions and in his relationship with others (so that he can disobey with impunity, i.e., so that he can do wrong [evil, wickedness, unrighteousness, abominations, etc.,] without having a "guilty conscience"), thus (according to dialectic 'reasoning') 'liberating' man from the Heavenly Father's (God's) restraints (so that man no longer has to "repress" himself, i.e., deny his carnal desires and "alienate" himself from others and others from himself because of their carnal actions, i.e., "the old man with his deeds," i.e., Gr. praxis, Colossians 3:9), negating the Heavenly Father's authority system (the Heavenly Father's commands and rules—to be obeyed, as given—and facts and truth—to be accepted as is, by faith) in man's feelings, thoughts, and actions and in his relationship with others (so that he can sin with impunity, i.e., so that he can do wrong [evil, wickedness, unrighteousness, abominations, etc.,] without having a "guilty conscience"). "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

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' how we feel, think, and act, and relate with others is a system. Therefore, when we 'change' the system, i.e., when we 'change' the way we feel, think, and act, and relate with others from the preaching of commands and rules to be obeyed as given and the teaching of facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith—from the "old" world order of "top-down" authority (emphasizing morality and competence) to the dialoguing of our and others opinions to a consensus, i.e., to a "feeling" of "oneness"—to the "new" world order of equality (emphasizing consensus, i.e., "oneness" [common-ism] with self, others, and the world in thought and in action, i.e., in "theory" and in "practice"), we 'change' the world, i.e., we 'liberate' the world (and ourselves) from the Father's authority system, i.e., from the Father's (God's) restraints, i.e., from His judgment and condemnation of us (which engenders a "guilty conscience" in us) for disobeying, i.e., for doing wrong, i.e., for sinning, 'liberating' our "self" (our minds) from any sense of impending damnation because our deceitful and wicked heart (and mind) is now perceived as being "normal," i.e., a "blank tablet" just waiting to become "good" through our participation in social action (praxis) for the "common good," with "goodness" being based upon the approval of others of like mind and action (theory and practice), i.e., 'justifying' sensuousness, i.e., 'justifying' "human nature" (ours and theirs) based upon "sense experience" rather than being based upon the approval of the father/Father, i.e., being 'justified' by his/His righteousness, according to faith.

While the child might come to know, through his own experiences ("sense experiences"), that his father's facts and truth are true (the same being true of his teacher facts and truth), he accepts them at first by faith, evaluating the current situation and making decisions based upon his father's knowledge and experience, establishing a system of obedience to authority in his feelings, thoughts, and action, and in his relationship with others, placing his father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., his father's authority system over and therefore, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' against "human nature," i.e., over and therefore against his own "sensuous needs" ("felt needs") and "sense perception" (opinion), as well as the "sensuous needs" and "sense perception" of others, of the 'moment,' i.e., over and therefore against his own the feelings, thoughts, and actions of the 'moment' (as well as others)—which are subject to the "light" of the 'moment' (the current situation), i.e., over and therefore against his and others desires, resentments, and fears, i.e., anxieties (angst) of the 'moment.' Dialectic 'reasoning' negates that system,
i.e., the father's/Father's authority system, 'liberating' the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions, and relationship with others from the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., from "prejudice," i.e., from "discrimination" (according to the flesh and the world), thereby 'liberating' others from the father's/Father's authority system (from "prejudice," i.e., from "discrimination") as well, negating faith, replacing it with sight, i.e., with the 'feelings' of the 'moment.' In dialectic 'reasoning' 'feelings' (of the flesh and the world) are "truth," negating the truth which comes from the Father, i.e., from the Word, which is confirmed by the Spirit—preached and taught as given, as "is" ("I AM, THAT I AM"), having to be accepted by faith.

The objective of those promoting dialectic 'reasoning' is to incorporate the child's "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., his "affective domain," i.e., his natural desires and resentments (stimulated by the situation) into the grading system, which is only knowable (observable) through the child's 'willingness' to share, i.e., to dialogue his opinion with others, in the "light" of the 'moment,' i.e., in the "light" of the given situation—thereby making it possible to grade his level of adaptability to 'change' (where along the spectrum of loyalty to 'liberalism' vs. loyalty to tradition he resides) at any given moment, in any given situation. His 'willingness' to "set aside" the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., his father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth during his "group project" ("group grade") experience, in order to "get along," i.e., in order to "build relationship" with others, not only initiates but also sustains his newly 'discovered' and 'liberated' feelings, thoughts, and actions—resulting in his willingness to question and challenge authority in order to sustain relationship with, i.e., be in good standing with, i.e., be affirmed by "the group."

While the earthy father is not the same as the Heavenly Father, one being flesh, i.e., from "below" (unholy/impure/unrighteous/sensuous, temporal, changing), the other Spirit, i.e., from "above" (holy/pure/righteous, eternal, unchanging), they are similar in system (Hebrews 12:5-11), i.e., "top-down" ("Mine. Not yours." as in "My garden. Not yours." "My property. Not yours." "My wife. Not yours." "My business. Not yours." "My family/children/child. Not yours." etc., "Do what I say or else." "Because I said so." "It is written." ), "right-wrong" ("Thou shalt." "Thou shalt not." ), requiring faith and obedience on the part of the child (with faith coming first—obedience without faith and faith without obedience are of the flesh), engendering a "guilty conscience" for disobedience (Romans 7:11-25). Through the child's use of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., Genesis 3:1-6, i.e., 'justifying' his carnal desires ("human nature"), the child's faith in the earthy father and his authority system—which has promises, i.e., reward, i.e., inheritance (which are temporal)—is negated. Likewise, through man's use of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., Genesis 3:1-6, i.e., 'justifying' his carnal desires ("human nature"), man's faith in the Heavenly Father and His authority system—which has promises (redemption by the Son, reconciliation) to the Father, and the infilling of the Holy Spirit to guide us in all truth John 16:3, i.e., reward, i.e., inheritance (which are eternal)—is negated. 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 He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. Revelation 21:7

Understand this, and you understand the so called "new" world order and its agenda (both secular and spiritual). It is a process which promises to give people what they want up front, but enslaves them in the end. It is what history warns us of. Yet today, few people discipline their "self" to study, know, or understand history—the conflict between the father's/Father's authority system, which requires faith in and obedience to a "higher authority" (in good conscience, i.e., with God being the "Highest authority"—requiring all to come to the saving knowledge of the truth via revelation, i.e., via. His Word, as given) and the child's/man's desires, i.e., his impulses and urges of the 'moment,' which are subject to sight—which stimulates his desires of the 'moment,' making him ever subject to the world, i.e., ever subject to 'change,' i.e., rebellious and/or revolutionary, making 'truth' subject to his own "sensuous
needs" and "sense perception" only. We, by nature, do not get up in the morning desiring to do the father's/Father's will when it gets in the way of, i.e., when it inhibits or blocks us from doing what we want to do or prevents us from having what we desire in the 'moment,' i.e., when it gets in the way of us having pleasure. It is easier to walk by sight (by "sense experience," i.e., according to our "feelings" of the 'moment' and the situation that stimulates them) than by faith (by hearing, i.e., thinking and acting according to the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth no matter what comes our way), especially when living by sight (living "of and for" the flesh, i.e., "of and for 'self,'" i.e., "of and for" human nature, "of and for" the world, i.e., "of and for" the pleasures of the 'moment'—imagined or real—including the approval of others, which engenders "self esteem"), i.e., "of and for" dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., "self' justification,' i.e., "common-ism"—what we all have in common—AKA Communism (communitarianism, democratization, conscientization, synergism, "tolerance of ambiguity," "deviancy in unity," "public-private partnership," etc., i.e., the consensus process) becomes the law of the land. As the Lord Jesus Christ stated: "Neverthless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke18:8 The implied answer is "No."

The following will explain how that takes place. It is closer to home than you might think or realize, or want to admit. It has to do with the father's/Father's authority system and the child's/man's (the individual's and "societies") rejection of it. It is the result of a facilitator of 'change' ("big brother") coming between the father/Father and his/His children, as Satan, the master facilitator of 'change' came between Adam and the woman and God in the garden in Eden. Everything the woman "saw" concerning ("sense perceived" about) the tree was true. The tree was good, pleasing, and desirous, according to nature. The issue was not the tree, i.e., that it would kill them, it was their lack of faith in God's Word, i.e., "leaning to their own understanding"—trusting in their own "sensuous needs" and "sense perception" of the 'moment' instead—for the truth, and therefore their disobedience to God which lead to their death, and ours. The facilitator of 'change's "role" is to "help" (make it easier for) the children to 'liberate' their "Self" from the father's/Father's authority system, negating the father's commands, rules, facts, and truth and therefore the "guilty conscience" for doing wrong in their feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in their relationship with one another and the world, resulting in the children, instead of repenting, uniting themselves, i.e., 'justifying' their "Self," becoming as "one," through the consensus process, i.e., in their use of dialectic 'reasoning'—'justifying' their feelings, thoughts, and actions, and their relationship with one another and the world over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority system, blaming someone else or the situation for their problems. While there is an inheritance for the children (of faith and obedience) in the father's/Father's authority system, there is none in the children's system of approaching pleasure—who's only 'drive' in life is the pleasure of the 'moment,' living for the 'moment,' who's only 'purpose' in life is the augmentation of pleasure, and who's only reward is in the "here and now"—with the facilitator of 'change' taking dominion over their inheritance, using it, i.e., natural resource (and the children, as "human resource") for their own gain, i.e., for their own pleasure. What makes your children your children is their faith in you (and obedience), i.e., respecting your authority. Otherwise they are "your" children in DNA only, i.e., living "of and for" their "self" and the world only.

As Karl Marx wrote: "Not feeling at home in the sinful world, Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home." (Karl Marx The Holy Family) In other words, the child, adhering to (honoring) the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., not being able to be "at-one-with," i.e., be at "peace" with himself, i.e., with his sinful nature and the world of sin (along with the "children of disobedience"), i.e., having a guilty conscience when he sins, i.e., when he disobeys, must make the home a place of sin (a place of disobedience—questioning and challenging authority), so that he can become "at-one-with," i.e., be at "peace" with himself and the world without having a guilty conscience. Only by negating the father's authority system in the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in his relationship with others, i.e., preventing the father's authority system from having influence upon his feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in his relationship with others, i.e. 'liberating' the child's carnal nature, so that the child can
be "of and for his self" (in the home and in the world), can this be done. As the Transformational Marxist Theodor Adorno (following after the dialectic 'reasoning' of George Hegel, Karl Marx, and Sigmund Freud) wrote: We must use "social-environmental forces to change the parent's behavior toward the child," "convincing" the parent's to accept their children as they are, i.e., carnal, of the world only. (Theodor Adorno, The Authoritarian Personality)

Changing the way you communicate with your "self" and with others, in the home, in the classroom, in the workplace, in government, in the "church," etc., from doing "right" and not doing "wrong" (from the preaching of commands and rules to be obeyed, as given and the teaching of facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith) to "How do you feel?" and "What do you think?" (to the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus—to a "feeling of oneness") changes you, your family, your neighbors, the nation, and even the "church." It is what the 'change' process (the dialectic process) is all about. While those of dialectic 'reasoning' say it is "Not about you," in truth it all about "You"—either about "You" standing before God being held accountable (judged) for your every thought and action or about "You" talking to your "Self" about "building relationship" with others and others talking to their "Self" about "building relationship" with you, i.e., about everyone "building relationship" with one another based upon everyone's common "Self interest," i.e., upon their and your common desires, with everyone "thinking," i.e., talking to their "Self," "What can I get out of this relationship for me?" or "What is going to happen to me if I lose relationship with them?" i.e., "What will happen to me if they reject me?"—willing to ignore (or set aside) the facts and/or 'compromise' the truth in order to initiate and sustain relationship, instead of you (and everyone else) being concerned about doing "right" and not "wrong"—willing to break off relationship if doing "wrong" is the direction relationship is taking you (and them).

After all isn't it our desire for approval from others (who we like and/or have something to gain in building relationship with) where our willingness to 'compromise,' i.e., to 'change' begins. When the school system 'changed' from preaching commands and rules to be obeyed as given and teaching facts and truth to be accepted as is by faith to the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus, i.e., to the "group grade" it 'liberated' the child's "feelings" from the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., from the father's/Father's restraints, making the child (as an animal) subject to the seduction, deception, and manipulation of facilitators of 'change.' Thus the language that came back into the home (from the classroom) was not that of respect and honor of the father's/Father's authority but that of questioning and challenging it instead.

When parents began homeschooling their children (taking their children out of the public, as well as private, school system) it was mainly for two reasons, 1) to make sure that their children were receiving the facts and truth (faith) that they had received in their education, which were now missing in their children's education, and 2) to recover the respect toward authority (obedience) which they had as children, which was now missing in their children. What parent's did not know, much less understand was that their children's lack of knowledge and disrespect toward authority (lose of faith and obedience) was the result of the public (and private) school's use of the dialectic process ("Bloom's Taxonomies" and "Bloom's [Marzano's/Webb's] Taxonomies") in the classroom (the "Taxonomies") adding the child's "feelings," i.e., the "affective domain" to the classroom curriculum, "taxonomizing" the teacher's and therefore the school's objective between 'liberating' the child's "feelings," i.e., his desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' in the "light" of the situation, from the father's/Father's authority system or retaining the father's/Father's authority system of commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as is, by faith—-with the "taxonomy" being in favor of [promoting] the former, i.e., the child's "feelings" [desires and dissatisfactions] of the 'moment' over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority system. All "certified" teachers are trained in the use of "Bloom's Taxonomies" and all "accredited" schools (public and private) are required to use them, including Christian Colleges and Universities. Even some homeschooling material is being developed by men and women who are trained in their use, i.e., who are applying them in their curriculum development, reading material, exercises,
While most citizens, legislators, etc. are reacting to their symptoms, poor grades and attendance, few are addressing (exposing) them, i.e., "Bloom's Taxonomies"—if they even know they exist—for what they are, works of anarchy, i.e., "evil," making those who use them facilitators of immorality and rebellion (revolution)\(^8\)—making "right-wrong" ('truth') subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to the children's "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., to their "sensuous needs" and "sense perception," i.e., subject to the "pleasure-pain" (spectrum) of human nature ("of and for self," the flesh, and the world, i.e., subject to the carnal desires of the child and the carnal desires of the children of the world only) which is ever 'changing,' i.e., ever subject to the situation of "the 'moment'"—which stimulates the children's response—which makes it possible for others (facilitators of 'change') to seduce, deceive, and manipulate them (the children) through their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' (which are of sight, whether imagined or real), teaching children to "preserve" (or save) their "self"—Selbstverhaltung, to "esteem" their "self," to "actualize" their "self," (uniting their "self's" with the other "self's" of the world, i.e., "building relationship" upon their common "self interest") rather than making human nature (their "self") subject to the "right-wrong" ("either-or") of authority, i.e., subject to the commands, rules, facts, and truth (restraints and instructions) of parents and/or of God (which requires faith), requiring "self" control, "self" discipline, humbling and denying of "self." You are never deceived because somebody lies to you. You are deceived because you like and/or trust them, i.e., you have something to gain (which you covet) in your relationship with them, resulting in you being used by them (as natural resource) for their own profit (for their pleasure). "Thus saith the L ORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the L ORD." Jeremiah 17:5

While "Bloom's Taxonomies" claim to be teaching students how to use "higher order thinking skills" in solving problems (a method which can only be used on material things—which is true science), they are in reality using "so called science" (I Timothy 6:20)\(^9\) i.e., using the "scientific method" (dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., "self" justification,' i.e., Genesis 3:1-6) to teach children how to 'justify' their carnal nature over and therefore against the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, teaching them to feel, think, and act, and relate with one another and the world according to their desires of the 'moment,' i.e., according to the laws of the flesh, i.e., according to the law of sin only, i.e., Romans 7:11-25, i.e., 'liberating' their "self" from parental and/or Godly restraint, i.e., from the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., from Hebrews 12:5-11, i.e., from doing right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's will, thereby no longer having a "guilty conscience" for doing wrong, i.e., for sinning, i.e., for questioning the father's/Father's commands and rules and challenging his/His facts and truth, i.e., for disrespecting authority. The so called "paradigm shift" in education is away from the Patriarchal Paradigm, i.e., away from the "old" world order of teachers (in loco parentis) preaching commands and rules to be obeyed and teaching facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith, (so that the student can stand alone if need be, i.e., refuse to compromise in a room full of students who are wrong), to the Heresiaclal Paradigm of 'change,' i.e. to the "new" world order where students are "measured" (evaluated) in a "group setting"—where all the students are 1) "encouraged" to dialogue (openly share) their "feelings" and "thoughts," i.e., their opinions of the 'moment' regarding the social (and personal) issues (crisis) of the 'day,' 2) "encouraged" to arrive at a consensus (based upon "group approval") on what personal-social issues they have in common, and 3) working together as a "team," develop a plan on what they can do to resolve them and then apply it—in order to determine their social
worth, i.e., their adaptability to 'change,' i.e., to 'discover' their willingness to compromise, i.e., to "set aside" (transcend) learned commands, rules, facts, and truth (of the past) in order to "building relationship" with others (in the present)—'changing' the way the students feel, think, and act and relate with one another, from "right and wrong"—which are unadaptable to change, i.e., which divide—to learning how to share with one another their "feelings" and "thoughts," i.e., their self interests, i.e., their opinions of the 'moment,' in order to 'discover' "common ground," "build relationships based upon self interests," and initiate and sustain social 'change,' transcending, i.e., negating the "old" world order of local control, i.e., negating the father's/Father's authority system in the home, thereby negating its influence in the neighborhood, the township, the town, village, city, the county, the state, and the nation.

By 'changing' the way that (or how) teachers, students, school staff, and parent's "communication" with one another, from preaching commands and rules and reaching facts and truth, i.e., from "right and wrong" to everyone sharing (dialoguing) their "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment' (i.e., in the current situation), with one another, i.e., to everyone sharing (dialoguing) their desires and resentments of the 'moment' (the 'purpose' for the development of "Bloom's Taxonomies" and their use in the classroom—adding the "affective domain," i.e., the student's "feelings," i.e., their desires and dissatisfactions, i.e., their "like's and dislike's" of the 'moment' to the classroom curriculum, i.e., to the students assignment), culture is 'changed' from honoring the father's/Father's authority to questioning and challenging it—which is being done for "the common good," i.e., in order to 'create' "community" out of neighborhoods, i.e., "unity out of diversity" (read deviancy), negating the true meaning of neighborhood, as neighborhoods, made up of families, tend not to tolerate "deviancy," i.e., tend not to encourage their children to communicate (dialogue) with "deviants," "building relationship" with those who they (the parent's) perceive as being immoral, i.e., bad, wicked, or evil or doing what is wrong. While those who communicate via didactic reasoning (deductive reasoning) 10 justify their actions (the outcome, i.e., their response) based upon the commands, rules, facts and truth, i.e., upon the "right and wrong" they have been taught, those who communicate via dialectic 'reasoning' (inductive reasoning) 11 justify their actions (the outcome, i.e., their response) based upon the situation and their (and others) "feelings" or opinion of the 'moment,' i.e., upon their (and others) "sensuous needs," i.e., "felt needs," and "thoughts" (their "sense perception" which is subject to, i.e., stimulated by their "feelings" and the situation of the 'moment')—making themselves seducible, deceivable, and "manipulatable" by whoever "controls" (manipulates) the environment or situation (using it to get them to divulge their "feelings," i.e., their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment'), i.e., manipulating the environment it in order to get them to 'change,' i.e., in order to get them to 'change' the way they feel, think, and act, and relate with others, i.e., in order to get them to 'change' the way they communicate with themselves and with others, thereby 'changing' the world. The role of the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the psychotherapist, i.e., the transformational Marxists (all three being the same, as will be explained below) is to encourage people (young and old) to dialogue (share) with one another what they are (privately) dialoguing with themselves about, i.e., their "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment,' i.e., their desires of the 'moment' and their resentment toward the authority system which restrains them, i.e., which inhibits or blocks them from having what it is they desire in the 'moment,' instead of preaching to and teaching them "right" from "wrong," i.e., teaching them to reprove, correct, and rebuke not only themselves but others as well, when they say, write, or do (or are thinking about doing) what is wrong, with them learning to respond to the situation according to "private convictions," i.e., according to the father's/Father's standards (which divide, i.e., which discriminate between "right and wrong," i.e., between good and evil), instead of according to their personal desires and dissatisfactions of the "moment," i.e., according to "human nature," i.e., according to that which all people (young and old) have in common. This (change in communication) "affects" (changes) not only to the individual, it "affects" (changes) the home, the neighborhood, the city, i.e., the "village," the county, the state, the nation, and the "church" as well.
I bold, italicize, and underline wrong and not wrong for a reason. As you will soon understand, it has to do with "Bloom's Taxonomies," i.e., the classroom curriculum, i.e., the classroom "environment," the so-called "new" world order, and George Hegel's peace and affirmation,\textsuperscript{12} i.e., pleasure and group approval, with, according to Sigmund Freud (the "father" of psychology, i.e., psychoanalysis and psychotherapy)\textemdash who considered all children as being sexually active\textsuperscript{13} \textemdash sexual pleasure between the mother and children ("equality of opportunity"), as well as between the siblings themselves (incest) being natural and therefore "normal." According to Freud, the "healthy" family (and community) is uninhibited or unobstructed by the father's/Father's authority system\textemdash "repressing" the children's and mother's natural "impulses and urges" of the 'moment,' i.e., their natural 'desires' of the 'moment,' "alienating" themselves from themselves and from one another, having to obey the father's/Father's "right-wrong" and "Mine, not yours" commands, rules, facts, and truth.

Freud considered sexual pleasure as being the greatest of all pleasures, i.e., the most desired pleasure. His mythological "heroes" were Narcissus (who received pleasure by admiring himself) and Orpheus (who acquired pleasure from making love to young boys, i.e., giving them pleasure)\textemdash which is not brought up in Psych. 101 or even admitted, instead being denied if brought up, for obvious reasons. You would not want to upset "naive" minds and/or awaken parents to what is really going on. Psychology, i.e., psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, especially "group psychotherapy"\textemdash which, through the consensus process, merges Sigmund Freud with Karl Marx and visa versa, i.e., unites the individual with the "the group" and "the group" with the individual, making them, i.e., "human nature" and the "community" ("theory" and "practice") one and the same\textemdash is why we are where we are today as a culture, i.e., a culture of abomination. If you love abomination, you hate righteousness (removing or silencing any who call abomination wrong). It has not happened by accident, as Abraham Maslow\textsuperscript{14} explained in his journals: "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." "Third-Force psychology is also epi-Marxian \textemdash this is the direction in which [we] are going now.""\textsuperscript{15} Psychology (psychoanalysis and psychotherapy, especially "group psychotherapy") has become so much a part of our lives, i.e., so widely accepted, even in the "church" today, to question its use will result in you're sanity being questioned, with "the group" separating itself from you if you persist, i.e., if you refuse to tolerate its "tolerance" of immorality, i.e., if you refuse to 'compromise,' i.e., if you refuse to stop being "prejudiced," "judgmental," and "divisive," hurting peoples "feelings."

We come into this world subject to the "pleasure-pain" spectrum of our carnal nature\textemdash our "sensuous needs," i.e., "felt needs," i.e., desires, i.e., pleasure, i.e., lust of the flesh and our "sense perception," i.e., desire for the pleasure which comes from approval by others (who approve of the things we desire, including them), i.e., "lust of the eyes" (sight, imagined or real)\textemdash approaching pleasure (including the pleasure that we receive from others who we like and who approve of the things we desire, i.e., who like us) and avoiding pain (including the pain which comes from others who we like and want approval from, who reject us, i.e., who do not like us and/or do not approve of the things we desire). Desiring the approval of others we are hurt (pained) when they reject us. One of the most painful experiences of life is being rejected by someone who we desire love from, i.e., who we want approval or affirmation from. It is what drives the dialectic process, i.e., what moves us to use dialectic 'reasoning' ("self' justification") to get what we want (in the 'moment'), i.e., pleasure, including the pleasure which comes from being approved by others, i.e., by those who receive pleasure from us having pleasure (making the object of pleasure and the pleasure of approval from others one and the same, both of and for the "self," i.e., of and for the world, i.e., of and for "sensuousness" only). It is why "group pressure," i.e., "pear pressure," i.e., "group dynamics" is so effective in getting a person to 'change' their "mind," getting them to go with "the group" even though they know what they are doing is wrong. It is why picking up your cross, i.e., willingly facing rejection by others for the truth (no matter what),
i.e., being a witness (a martyr, i.e., μαρτυρία) for the truth, can not happen without you first "denying your self,” i.e., dying to your "self." Your desire for approval (from "the group") is so strong in you you will 'compromise' the truth or refuse to hear the truth, i.e., refuse to accept reproof, correction, rebuke, or chastening from the father/Father (or anyone reminding you of his/His commands, rules, facts, and truth), keeping your "self" alive. It is why you must deny your "self" first, i.e., die to your "self" daily—thereby being able to follow after the Lord Jesus Christ (the only begotten son of God), as he followed after His Heavenly Father, doing His will (obeying Him) in all things commanded.

The father's/Father's disapproval of the child, i.e., disapproval of the child's behavior is the result of the child doing wrong instead of right (disobeying instead of obeying the father's/Father's commands and rules, i.e., not accepting, learning, and applying the father's/Father's facts and truth)—causing conflict and tension between the father/Father and the child. When the father/Father chastens, reproves, corrects and/or rebukes the child, with the child repenting, i.e., placing the father's/Father's authority over his own personal desires, pleasures, "enjoyments," or "lusts" of the 'moment, i.e., over his "self interest," the child learns to restrain (humble, deny, control, discipline) his "self" (in order to do the father's/Father's will), receiving the father's/Father's approval, i.e., receiving the father's/Father's blessing—engendering a guilty conscience, i.e., the "voice of the father/Father" in the child (when he is doing or thinking about doing wrong, i.e., disobeying). "The group's" (societies) disapproval (rejection) of the child results from the child placing "right and wrong," i.e., the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth over pleasure, i.e., over and therefore against his "self," therefore, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' over and therefore against "the group," i.e., over and therefore against society—causing division (conflict and tension) between the child and "the group," i.e., society. I am explaining political systems here, one which originates from the home, i.e., with the father's authority system restraining the children's "feelings" of the 'moment,' and the other system (of "feelings") originating from society, i.e., 'liberating' the child's "feelings" of the 'moment,' placing them over and therefore against the father's authority system. To attempt to merge the two only results in negating the father's/Father's authority system, deceiving the father into believing that he is still in control, when he is not. One of the first (and major) training manuals for 'change agents,' Human Relations in Curriculum Change 15 (explaining the procedure used to facilitate 'change' in all meetings, whether in the school system, in the workplace, in local or national government, or even in the church) shows how the father is manipulated into abdicating his authority in order to retain "peace and affirmation" in the home, in order that his daughter receive "peace and affirmation" from her peers at school—the issue (confrontation) being between the father and his daughter, i.e., her use of makeup and his rejection of it, the resolution being facilitated (mediated) by his wife, the child's mother, in favor of the child's "feelings," i.e., "group approval." (Kenneth Benne, Human Relations in Curriculum Change, What is Role-Playing, pgs. 223-241)

When the child accepts "group approval" (when "the group" is going counter to and/or is not in agreement with, i.e., questioning the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth and/or challenging His authority, i.e., challenging his/His authority system), he negates the guilty conscience for doing wrong, i.e., the "voice of the father/Father" in his "self"—restraining his "self"—replacing it instead with the "super-ego," i.e., the "voce of the group," i.e., the "voice of the village," i.e., "self justification," making pleasure (his and others "feelings" of the 'moment') the 'drive' of life and the augmentation of pleasure (for himself and for others) its 'purpose,' 'liberating' himself (and others) from the father's/Father's authority system in the process. It is not that the father's/Father's authority system is against pleasure. It is that pleasure must become subordinate to (not take precedents over) the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth. By becoming "at-one-with" "the group" (through the dialoguing of his opinion, i.e., his "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment' with others and their dialoguing their opinion, i.e., their "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment' with him, to a consensus, i.e., to a "feeling" of oneness, i.e., to "affirmation"), the child places pleasure, i.e., "group approval" over and therefore against doing right and not wrong, i.e., over and therefore against the father's/Father's
approval, negating the father's/Father's authority system in his feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in his relationship with others. As the Transformational Marxist—Transformation Marxists are those who merge Karl Marx with Sigmund Freud and visa versa, who merge society and the individual and the individual and society, making them one and the same in "theory and practice," i.e., in thought and action, i.e., carnal, i.e. of the world only (the "seedbed" of transformational education), i.e., are psychoanalyst and/or psychotherapists, i.e., "group psychotherapists" (social-psychologists)—Theodor Adorno explained it: "[L]iberals tend to view social problems [conflict and tensions] as symptoms of the underlying social structure [the way the child thinks, i.e., the way the child was educated, i.e., the environment the child was "brought up" in], while conservatives view them as results of individual incompetence [the child's inabilities] or immorality [his doing wrong and not right, i.e., disobeying]. In short, political problems tend to be seen in moral [the individual, i.e., the child or adult holding himself (and others) accountable to a "higher" authority—doing right and not wrong, i.e., to parents ,, to God] rather than sociological [their working together with others in augmenting pleasure and attenuating pain—not only for themselves but for others as well, i.e., "of and for self" and "the group," i.e., socialist] terms."

(Theodor Adorno, The Authoritarian Personality) With this understanding, "in loco parentis," which used to mean the school carried out the father's/Father's authority system in the classroom, retaining the child's respect toward authority (in the home), now means "social capital," i.e., the home environment, now dedicated to social cause (social media), must be reflected in all places of education, whether it be public, private, or in the home.

It was our parent's, with their use of authority (following after the pattern of Hebrews 12:5-11) who not only established policy for us but also taught us how to establish policy (based upon having faith in them, i.e., trusting in "higher authority," who, through reproving, correcting, rebuking, and/or chastening us—getting us to reprove, correct, rebuke, and chasten our "self" when we were wrong or disobeyed—produced a "peaceful fruit of righteousness" in us, and thereby initiated and sustained authority in the home). While dads and moms are not perfect, they can be down right tyrants ("lusteing" after the pleasure of this life, i.e., of the 'moment' only, hating and destroying anything that gets in their way), the office they serve in, under God, is perfect, being established by God to serve Him in (under). We learned how policy was not only initiated but also sustained by our parent's 1) preaching commands and rules to us, to be obeyed as given and teaching facts and truth to us, to be accepted as is (by faith), 2) rewarding or blessing us when we did or got things right and/or obeyed, 3) chastening, reproving, correcting, and rebuking us when we got things wrong and/or disobeyed—discussing things with us when we did have questions and/or did things wrong (at their discretion), and 4) casting out the child (hopefully not us) who disrespected their authority, i.e., who questioned their commands and rules and challenged their facts and truth. It was the same pattern or system, i.e., the father's/Father's authority system that traditional teachers used in the traditional classroom.

This all 'changed' when the Supreme Court (using dialectic 'reasoning') removed the father's/Father's authority system from the classroom—at the same time Bloom's Taxonomies began to be used by "educators" in the classroom—reflected in the removal of the Ten Commandments (the Father's commands and rules which revealed our sinful nature, i.e., our deceitful and wicked heart), prayer in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (who was/is obedient to His Heavenly Father in all things commanded, who, by His shed blood on the cross, 'redeems' us from His Heavenly Father's condemnation, judgment, and damnation upon us for our sins, and by His Heavenly Father resurrecting Him from the grave and death, 'reconciling' us to Himself, to know, worship, and serve Him and His Son, we can know their love, joy, peace, righteousness, holiness, glory, mercy, and grace not only now but throughout eternity), the reading of the Scriptures (with the Scriptures, the Word of God, being included in the textbooks), and spanking (teaching us right from wrong when we refused to listen or disobeyed). It is our parents (and traditional teachers) who introduced us to the "right-wrong," "above-below," "top-down" way of thinking (the Patriarchal Paradigm) of God, i.e., our Heavenly Father (requiring faith), which our soul (not our flesh) recognized and desired, i.e., with His duality of "light-dark," "good-evil," "faith-sight,"
"saved-lost," "Heaven-Hell," "sheep-goats," "either-or," "is-is not," "Thou shalt- Thou shalt not," etc., engendering a "guilty conscience" in us for doing (or thinking) wrong, and/or for disobeying, i.e., for sinning—resulting in us turning to our parents, to the teacher, etc., and/or to the Lord Jesus Christ and asking for forgiveness, repenting when we did wrong or sinned (resolving the antithesis of Romans 7:11-25).

The conflict or tension (antithesis) we experienced in the home, between desiring the approval of our parent's and desiring the pleasures which the world offered us in the 'moment,' resulted in us finding ourselves "tempted" to not only do wrong (disobey) but also to 'justify' our "self," i.e., to use dialectic 'reasoning' to 'justify' our feelings, thoughts, and actions of the 'moment,' as well as to 'justify' our relationship with (or desire to relate with, seeking approval from) those who are parents disagreed with (who they saw as doing wrong, tempting us to do wrong and/or to disobey as well), i.e., to 'justify' our "self" not only to our "self" but to them as well. Thus, attempting to use dialectic 'reasoning' (self 'justification') to "rescue" our "self" from having a "guilty conscience" for doing wrong and/or disobeying, i.e., for sinning (following after the pattern of Genesis 3:1-6), we found our "self" being chastened, reproved, corrected, and rebuked by our parents instead. Our parents, responding to our "Why" with a "Because I said so" (or "It is written") instead of with an "I feel," or "I think," i.e., sustaining their authority over us by refusing to dialogue with us—which would have made us "equal" with them and them "equal" with us, discussing with us instead (without abdicating their position of authority) our behavior (at their discretion) and/or chastening us for doing wrong or for disobeying them, prevented 'change'—retaining the antithesis condition, i.e., the conflict between the parent's "right and wrong" and the child's "feelings" or desires of the 'moment,' i.e., the conflict between "spirit" and "flesh" in the home.

Despite man's opinion, God rules over all, judging every soul, i.e., ever man's and woman's thoughts and actions, including the child's (at the age of accountability, i.e., knowing right from wrong), according to His Word. Therefore synthesis (consensus) is only possible in man's "perception" of himself and the world around him, void of Godly restraint. Despite that truth, according to dialectic 'reasoning' (the 'great deception'), when parents 'change' how policy is established in the home—'changing' how policy is being taught and practiced, moving away from their preaching and teaching (and enforcing) their commands, rules, facts, and truth, to be accepted as is, by faith, along with the child's behavior being discussed (at the parent's discretion), to the dialoguing of "feelings," i.e., dialoguing their and their child's opinion of the 'moment' (without fear of judgment or reprimand by the parent, i.e., the so called "discussion" being void of the parent's authority) to a consensus (to a "feeling" of "oneness"—producing a so called "paradigm shift" in how policy is initiated and sustained in the home) the world is being 'changed.' Therefore, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' 'change' is only possible when how policy is initiated and sustained in the home is 'changed.' With the dialoguing of everyone's opinions to a consensus, replacing the parents preaching and teaching (and enforcing) of their commands, rules, facts and truth, a so called "new" world order is not only being 'created' in the home but in the community, the nation, around the world, and in the "church" as well. 'Creating' a "new" world order, where the "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., the nature of the child rules in the home (and therefore in the world) negates the "old" world order, where the established "laws" of right and wrong of the parents, the landowner, the boss, the King, and/or God rule over the children, the worker, the citizen, and man. This is what Immanuel Kant meant by "lawfulness without law," where the laws of the flesh (of the child), which are ever subject to 'change,' i.e., the situation, rules over the child (and therefore man) instead of the laws of God (or the parent), which are not adaptable to 'change,' i.e., which produces "resists to 'change.'" (Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason). His "purposefulness without purpose" necessitates the negation of the father's/Father's authority, the "purposefulness" of life being the 'liberation of "human nature," i.e., thinking and acting according to (of and for) that which is of nature, i.e., of the "feelings" of the 'moment' only, instead of the "purpose" of life being obedience to the father/Father, i.e., carrying out his/His commands and rules without question and accepting his facts and truth as given (by faith).
It is our natural desire to "enjoy," i.e., to "lust" after the pleasures of the 'moment' (that which the world offers us, over and therefore against our parent's commands, rules, facts, and truth) that brings dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., 'self' justification," i.e., the pattern of Genesis 3:1-6, i.e., "enlightenment," i.e., Gnosis"("knowing"), i.e., aufheben"("evaluation") into our lives. While God evaluates according to His righteousness, judging the flesh according to His nature, dividing spirit from flesh—creating antithesis, man evaluates according to his carnal desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' judging God and His Word from his carnal nature, synthesizing his "self" with the world and the world with his "self," thus 'liberating' his flesh from God's authority, restraints, righteousness, and judgment (he thinks) in the process. When we 'justify' our carnal desires of the 'moment' over and therefore against our parent's and or God's authority system, we are using dialectic 'reasoning' in order (as in "new" world order) to synthesize our "self" with the world (and the world with our "self"), questioning and challenging authority (replacing its "is" with our "ought," i.e., with how the world "ought" to be, according to our flesh), negating the "guilty conscience" for doing wrong and/or for disobeying in the process (initiating and sustaining what is called a Heresiarchal Paradigm of 'change'). This is where the facilitator of 'change' (who first appeared in the garden in Eden, "helping" two "children" 'liberate' their "self" from the Father's authority system) comes into our lives, "helping" us to 'justify' our "self" over and therefore against the authority of our parent's, as well as over and therefore against the authority of God.

Dialectic 'reasoning,' if you personalize it, evaluates where along the "right-wrong" ⇔ "pleasure-pain" spectrum (or continuum), i.e., 'loyalty' to their parents or God (seeking their/His approval based upon doing right and not wrong, i.e., "holiness") vs. 'loyalty' to their "feelings" and the "feelings" of others of the moment (seeking their approval based upon "feelings," i.e., "pleasure") a child resides at any given moment, i.e., in a particular situation—whether they refuse to compromise their parent's commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., continue to be a "resistor of change," "not a 'team player," etc., doing what their parent's want them to do instead, desiring their parent's or God's approval (despite not being able to do what they want to do because they continue to humble, deny, control, discipline, i.e., "repress" their "self" and/or continue to be rejected by others, i.e., "alienate" their "self" from themselves, others, and the world and others from themselves because they "offend" others with the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, making them feel guilty for doing wrong) or they are willing to compromise or set aside (suspend for the 'moment') "right-wrong" thinking and acting, i.e., set aside their parents or God's standards ("judgments," "condemnations," i.e., "prejudice" against wrong) in order to initiate or sustain the approval ("affirmation") of others. Dialectic 'reasoning' and 'group approval' (the key to 'group dynamics') moves the child in the direction of 'pleasure," i.e., "tolerating ambiguity,"i.e., "justifying "deviancy," with him no longer being "negative" toward those doing wrong in order to "get along," i.e., in order to "build relationship" with them, basing "right" and "wrong" upon the "pleasure-pain" spectrum of "human nature", with "right" being "pleasure" (with the pleasure of approval by others being "good," i.e., "right"), and "wrong" being "pain" (with the pain of missing out on the pleasure of the 'moment'—"repressing themselves"—and the pain of rejection—"alienating themselves from themselves, others, and the world and others from themselves"—being "evil," or "wrong"), which makes "right" and "wrong" relative or situational (ever 'changing,' i.e., ever subject to the 'situation'), rather than right and wrong being based upon the commands, rules, facts, and truth established by their parents and/or God, i.e., absolute, fixed, etc., I e. unchanging in 'changing' times, i.e., despite the situation.

As was noted by the psychoanalyst (Transformational Marxist) Kurt Lewin, when the parent's and/or God's authority system, i.e., when the consequences (the threat of the parent's chastening or God's judgment) for one's thoughts and actions are not brought into the "discussion"—where the "group" of children are dialoguing their opinions regarding personal-social issues without fear of chastening or judgment by their parents or condemnation and damnation by God (unless they repent of their sins, receiving his forgiveness, mercy, and grace, with the Father imputing His righteousness to them by their
faith in Him), their only fear therefore being the fear of rejection (alienation) by the "group," the "guilty conscience" for doing wrong, i.e., for sinning disappears, i.e., is negated. (Kurt Lewin)\textsuperscript{18}

Psychotherapists acknowledge: "One of the most fascinating aspects of group therapy is that everyone is born again, born together in the group." "Few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity [their individuality, under their parents and/or God's authority] in the face of apparent group unanimity;" (Irvin D. Yalom, Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy) "The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group." (Kurt Lewin in Kenneth Benne, Human Relations in Curriculum Change) "The individual is emancipated in the social group." "Freud commented that only through the solidarity of all the participants could the sense of guilt be assuaged." (Norman O. Brown, Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History)

This follows in line with Karl Marx's teaching: "Only within a social context individual man is able to realize his own potential as a rational being." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right') "It is not individualism [the child under the parent's/God's authority system, being personally held accountable to them for his thoughts and actions, "repressing" his desires of the 'moment' in order to do their will, "alienation" himself from others and being "alienated" by others for his ridged (parent's or God's) position on issues, or isolating himself, doing what he wants to do when he wants to do it, but for himself alone] that fulfills the individual, on the contrary it destroys him. Society ["the group," "human relationship based upon self interest,"'"compromising' commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to "get along" with others] is the necessary framework through which freedom and individuality [freedom from the father's/Father's authority system and freedom to do as one desires in the 'moment,' i.e., to be carnal, i.e., to be of the world only, with group approval, i.e., "affirmation"] are made realities." (Karl Marx, quoted in John Lewis, The Life and Teachings of Karl Marx) It should be noted that "Bloom's Taxonomies" are (in its own words) "a psychological classification system" modeled after two Transformational Marxists, Theodor Adorno and Erick Fromm, who, merging Freud and Marx, i.e., merging the individual and "the group," created "group psychotherapy"—the contemporary Goals 2000, No-Child-Left-Behind, Common Core, etc., classroom, TQM workplace, TQL military, COPS police force, HMO medical profession, STW government, "synergistic "church," etc..

Families, unlike animals, do not come in "litters," i.e., in "groups." The standards established for each child's age in the home ("Johnny gets to go out." "Why can't I?" "Because Johnny is sixteen and you are five.") requires each child to attend to the parent's commands, rules, facts, and truth (for them specifically) at any given 'moment' and age, instilling in them the system of respecting, honoring, and obeying authority. The school system began categorizing children according to age in the last century. In the name of age appropriate education they began placing the same aged children in a box (as a litter), thus making it easier for facilitator's of 'change' to bypass "You can" and "You can not," i.e., discrimination, replacing it with the agenda of "equality of opportunity" (James Coleman),\textsuperscript{19} negating the parent's authority system (in the feelings, thoughts, and actions of the children) in the process. Kindergarten\textsuperscript{20} fell under the same umbrella, giving children their first common experience of building social relationships without the "divisiveness" of parental authority. Coleman explained, in his book "Public School - Private School," why "in Loco Parentis" schooling (home schooling) or a religious school which does not open its doors to anyone other than its own members is more difficult to bring under government control than the public and even the private schools, both of which require compromise (diversity in community) in order to maintain fiscal viability and social (community) approval. Coleman, beginning with community ("equality") rather than with the individual ("private-conviction"), was able to categorize all parent's and children according to the physical, mental, and social capital they bring into the community, or prevent it from having, thus putting pressure on the parents to perform according to community (their children's social) needs. The agenda is to bring homeschooling under the umbrella of private schooling, thus making parent's and their children subject to community (socialist) objectives.
According to dialectic 'reasoning,' instead of knowledge ("I know") being subject to hearing, with hearing being subject to the words of the parent, the teacher, etc., including the Word of God (righteousness), which requires faith, i.e., to be accepted "as is" or "as given," "knowledge" is based upon the child's "feelings" of the 'moment' ("I sense"), with "thinking" (dialectic 'reasoning,' 'reasoning' through dialogue) thereafter being based upon "feelings" ("I perceive" sensually, questioning and challenging what "is," thinking about what "ought" to be, according to my sensuous desires), resulting in "knowledge" ("I know") being experiential, i.e., sensual, which is, in actuality, an "opinion" or a "theory." The dialectic pathway of 'change' is "I feel," therefore "I think," therefore 'I know.' It is not how far down the dialectic pathway of 'change' you have gone, i.e., "I'm not as bad (as evil) as that person (I would not do what he is doing, but he can do it without me 'judging' him as long as it does not 'hurt' me, him, or others," it is that you are on the dialectic pathway of "self" justification, i.e., of 'change' in the first place that condemns you. Dialectic 'reasoning,' like building a house on shifting sands, makes "knowledge" (and 'truth') ever subject to 'change.'

Making the child subject to the sensuous situations of life, i.e., making the situation subject to the child's "feelings" of the 'moment,' which are ever 'changing,' makes the child ever subject to the seduction, deception, and manipulation of the facilitator of 'change.' As the psychotherapist (Transformational Marxist) Carl Rogers explained it: "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." "If we have the power or authority to establish the necessary conditions, the predicted behaviors will follow." "We cannot use good sense in human affairs unless someone engages in the design and construction of environmental conditions which affect the behavior of men." "Now that we know how positive reinforcement works [with the child dialoguing (with other children) his "thought's," i.e., his opinion, i.e., his desires of the 'moment' and his dissatisfaction with authority (his hatred of restraint and the restrainer) which are subject to his "feelings" of the 'moment,' without the fear of being reproved, corrected, or rebuked by his parent's, his defiance toward authority being approved ("affirmed") by "the group" instead], and why negative doesn't' [with the parents preaching commands and rules and teaching facts and truth to the child, to be accepted as is (by faith), chastening the child when he is wrong or disobeys] ... 'we can be more deliberate and hence more successful in our cultural design. We can achieve a sort of control under which the controlled, though they are following a code much more scrupulously than was ever the case under the old system, nevertheless feel free. They are doing what they want to do, not what they are forced to do. That's the source of the tremendous power of positive reinforcement—there's no restraint and no revolt. By a careful design, we control not the final behavior, but the inclination to behavior—the motives, the desires, the wished. The curious thing is that in that case the question of freedom never arises." (Carl Rogers, On becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy)

As Jürgen Habermas explained it, "if moral realism [doing "right" and "not wrong"] can no longer be defended by appealing to a creationist metaphysics [to the parent's or God's authority] then moral statements can no longer be assimilated to the truth of assertoric statements [to the parent's "Because I said so." and God's "It is written."])." (Jürgen Habermas, Communicative Ethics: The inclusion of the Other) While dialectic 'reasoning' has an effect upon the child through individual "counseling," i.e., through psychotherapy, it has been found to be more effective within the group setting, i.e., through group psychotherapy (which will be covered in greater detail below). "In the dialogic relation of recognizing oneself 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) For example, how dialectic 'reasoning' affects the making of law or the establishing of policy (and this includes you as a parent): instead of one meeting setting policy, which is established for the next, lets say, ten years (resulting in the preaching and teaching of established commands, rules, facts, and truth for the next ten years), there will be ten years of continuous meetings (with everyone who is present in the next meeting dialoguing their opinions to a consensus), resulting in policies (laws) which
are ever 'changing'—ever subject to the perception of those present in the latest meeting, thus making laws ever 'changing,' i.e., subject to the desires ("self interests") of the 'moment' and the current situation (crisis), i.e., subject to the facilitator of 'change,' who's "job" is to manipulate the meeting (seducing, deceiving, and manipulating those in the meeting) in order to actualize to his desired objective, 'liberating' man (society), i.e., the making of law or the establishing of policy, from God's authority, i.e., from Godly restraint so that man can praxis unrighteousness and abomination, i.e., can sin with impunity.

The dialectic process, as you will see, bases 'reality' upon the nature of the child, i.e. bases 'reality' upon the 'changingness' of the "pleasure-pain" spectrum of "human nature," where having pleasure (or having more pleasure than pain) is having a "good" day and having pain (or having more pain than pleasure) is having a "bad" day—which we can all identify with—which, negates the "right-wrong" way of thinking (authority) of parents, i.e., which 'liberates' the child from having to miss out on pleasure, i.e., which 'liberates' the child from having to endure pain in order to do right and not wrong, i.e., which 'liberates' the child from having to do the father's will, which, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' negates the "right-wrong" way of thinking (authority) of God, i.e., which 'liberates' man from having to do the Heavenly Father's will—through faith in His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. The dialectic process therefore replaces having to endure pain and/or having to miss out on pleasure, i.e., having to deny or die to one's "self" daily in order to do the father's/Father's will—which inhibits or blocks the process of 'change,' with the approaching of pleasure and the avoiding of pain, i.e., with "human nature," which, from then on, makes the augmentation of pleasure and the attenuating of pain, i.e., the advancement of "human nature" (over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority) "the only game in town."

While God's ways are not our ways, the earthly father's authority and the Heavenly Fathers authority are the same in pattern (or system), i.e., "top-down," "above-below," chastening for doing wrong, etc. This is something social-psychologists have not wasted their time in noticing and responding to. Theodor Adorno, who worked to promote and advance Marxism in American (especially in education—"Bloom's Taxonomies" are based upon his works), wrote: "God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority." "The conception of the ideal family situation for the child [is] 1) uncritical obedience to the father and elders, 2) pressures directed unilaterally from above to below, 3) inhibition of spontaneity and 4) emphasis on conformity to externally imposed values." "Authoritarian submission 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." "The whole socioeconomic picture of the parents, and possibly of the grandparents, the status achieved as well as that aspired to, had to be understood in order to throw light on the security or the tensions existing within the family." "The power–relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem." (Theodor Adorno, The Authoritarian Personality)

The dialectic 'logic' (agenda) is: If you want to get rid of the restraints of God, i.e., the Heavenly Father's authority over man on the earth you must first get rid of the restraints of the parent, i.e., the earthly father's authority over the children in the home. George Hegel, Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud had this as their agenda. As you will see the school system has embraced their 'logic,' i.e., dialectic 'reasoning' as their form (type) of curriculum.

It's influence (dialectic 'reasoning') can now be noticed in the home. Instead of parents instructing their children in righteousness, they have now become "friends" with their children. Out of fear of losing that "friendship," i.e., their children's approval, they no longer establish ridged standards of right and wrong. They therefore no longer have to discipline their children, i.e., chasten, reprove, correct, rebuke them,
because they no longer hold themselves (and therefore their children) accountable for doing wrong.

Looking at it another way, from the perspective of the child who honors their parent's (their father's) authority and obeys their commands and rules and preaches and teaches their facts and truth, the child is pressured (forced) into picking up their cross if they continue to hold to their parent's (their father's) standards in the midst of a class being "encouraged" to be "tolerant of ambiguity," i.e., to be "tolerant of deviancy," with the class rejecting them for holding them accountable to their parent's (their father's, and therefore, being an obedient child, their) commands, rules, facts, and truth (their absolutes), i.e., for making the class "feel" guilty for doing wrong—as Jesus, obeying his Heavenly Father in all things commanded, endured the rejection of men for holding them accountable to (for preaching to and teaching them) His Father's (and, being obedient to His Heavenly Father, His) commands, rules, facts, and truth, making them "feel" guilty for doing wrong, i.e., for sinning. Although the cross of the child is not the same as that of Christ (one being temporal the other eternal) they are similar in structure, with both holding to (preaching to and teaching others) their father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth (by faith), making others "feel" guilty for doing wrong, having to enduring social (group) rejection in the process.

"Educators," i.e., facilitators of 'change,' are trying to convince children that they are not wrong but only misguided, therefore no longer needing to be concerned about bearing a cross (holding to absolute "right's" and "wrong's" established by their parents or God, i.e., of the "past"). They are now accepted (approved) as they are by the class, 'liberated' to think and act according to their own carnal nature (desires) of the 'moment,' i.e., approaching pleasure and avoiding pain, making 'reasoning' (taken captive to the "feelings" of the 'moment'—their own "feelings" and the "feelings" of others) the foundation upon which to base 'reality.' According to Immanuel Kant (with Hegel, Marx, Freud, Maslow, Rogers, etc., following) the child's hope (love) of pleasure, i.e., "lust" is the engenderer of dialectic 'reasoning,' with dialectic 'reasoning' then being used to 'justify' the child's carnal nature (to "lust"), negating the restrainer (the father and his authority), resulting in the child no longer having a "guilty conscience" for doing wrong—since, through dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., through "self" justification the "guilty conscience" (for doing wrong), which is engendered by the father's/Father's authority, is now negated in the feelings, thoughts, and actions of the child, as well as in his relationship with others.

Embracing the ideology of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., feeling, thinking, and acting, and relating with one another as children, i.e., as children of disobedience, i.e., according to our "feelings" (our "sensuous needs" and "sense perception") of the 'moment,' we now find ourselves in a world of "lust," with "lust" becoming the law of the land. According to those who reason dialectically, "the essence of man consists in desiring [in "lusting"]." (Norman O. Brown, Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History) The child, therefore, no longer subjecting himself to parental authority, i.e., being judgmental, i.e. being "negative," finding "oneness" (openness) with the group, i.e., being "positive" instead, i.e., who "lives openly and freely in relation to others, guiding his behavior on the basis of his immediate experiencing" "has become an integrated process of changiness." "The innermost core of man's nature, the base of his 'animal nature,' is positive in nature." "Experience [living in the 'moment,' with the world in pleasure] is, for me, the highest authority." "Neither the Bible nor the prophets, neither the revelations of God can take precedence over my own direct experience." (Carl Rogers, On becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy) "Bloom's Taxonomies" are based upon Carl Rogers' dialectical 'reasoning,' instructing "teachers," i.e., facilitator's of 'change' in how to 'liberate' children from parental authority, i.e., how to 'emancipate' them from having to learn the history of the "past."

History, like faith, comes from the "past," instructing us in how to deal with the present and the future, i.e., is not 'limited' to or is greater than the "sense experiences" of our own life—like, when we were children, our parents informing (teaching) us of things, i.e., facts and truth which our "sense
experiences" had not provided (or could not provide) us—preparing us to deal with the things of the present and the future so that we could do what was right and not wrong, i.e., so that we did not have to repeat history, having learned the lessons of history, i.e., the lessons of the "past" instead. Those of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., psychoanalysts and psychotherapists, i.e., facilitators of 'change,' making children subject to their own "sense experiences" only, instead (which is the "dialectician's" definition of history, limiting "history" to the child's own "sense experiences"—the child's own "sensuous needs" and "sense perception," i.e., from their past experiences to the present only, placing their hope in the carnal pleasures, enjoyments, "lusts" of this world only, rejecting that hope which is greater than this world, i.e., the hope of glory, i.e., "Christ in you" Colossians 1:27), turn children into animals, i.e., into Thorndike's chickens, Skinner's rats, and Pavlov's dog, making them subject to the stimulus-response of their own carnal nature and the world only, instead (thus making them subject to the seduction, deception, and manipulation of the facilitator of 'change,' for the facilitator's of 'change's' own gain), programing the child to jump through their hoops, at their command, for their entertainment, pleasures, "lusts." This is why, when those of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., facilitators of 'change' transform the child's feelings, thoughts, and actions, and their relationship with other children, "helping" them justify their carnal thoughts and carnal actions, i.e., "encouraging" them to build bridges to the "future," bridges to the "past," to history, and to faith, i.e., respect for (hope in) authority is missing—having been removed (negated), i.e., destroyed in their praxis or social action of "creating" a "new" world order based upon their "building of relationship" with others of like "self interests," uniting themselves as "one" upon the "imagination of the thoughts of their hearts" only, 'liberating' themselves from parental authority and Godly restraint by negating parental authority and Godly restraint in their feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in their relationship with one another, feeling, thinking, and acting, and relating with one another according to their own carnal nature (pleasures, enjoyments, "lusts") only, instead. "And GOD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Genesis 6:5

"Social animals" are therefore children (programed children, i.e., socialist children, even in adult bodies) who are "positive," i.e., who openly question their parent's commands, rules, facts, and truth and openly challenge their authority, i.e., who have overcome, i.e., negated "negativity" (parental restraints) by "building relationship" with other children upon their common "self interests," feeling, thinking, and acting and relating with one another according to their common desires of the moment, i.e., according to their common love of pleasure, i.e. according to their common "lusts" and their common resentment toward restraint, i.e., according to their common hatred of restrainers. Instead of feeling, thinking, and acting, and relating with (or not relating with) one another according to their parent's commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., having "fellowship" with one another according to their common faith, they establish unity (consensus) upon their own common carnal "feelings" instead. Under one condition children either relate or refuse to relate with one another based upon established standards (being in the world but not "of and for" it), maintaining their individuality (under their parent's or God's authority), having a guilty conscience for relating with those who they are not supposed to relate with, i.e., who think and act wrong, while with the other they must relate, i.e., sacrifice (negate) their individuality (under their parent's or God's authority) or face alienation, rejection, and possible negation from—death at the hands of—the rest of the "social animals," the laws of the land from then on being based upon "feelings," i.e., upon the child's social worth instead of upon facts and truth, i.e., upon their individuality, under their parent's or God's authority. "The relation between theory and practice [between the child's thoughts and his actions] becomes even closer the more the conception [the more his imagination] is vitally [is sensual, i.e. is worldly] and radically innovatory [and is put into action] and opposed to old ways of thinking." (Antonio Gramsci, The Prison Notebooks) "Unfreezing [brainwashing]. This term, also adopted from Lewinian change theory, refers to the process of disconfirming an individual's former belief system." (Irvin Yalom, The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy) "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,
History teaches (warns) us of the death and destruction that follows a people (children) who become 'social animals.' "Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts." James 4:2, 3 "And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them. And the people shall be oppressed, every one by another, and every one by his neighbour: the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honourable." "As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." Isaiah 3:4-5, 12 '', and the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death." Matthew 10:21 "Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein." Jeremiah 6:16

What started out as a short issue has turn into a substantially longer article. Having read (and studies) over six hundred social-psychology books (some one hundred of which are listed here, 23 many of which are required reading for a Ph.D. in education today), taught in a University, and given over five thousand presentations (at colleges, universities, churches, and community centers, etc., in homes, and on radio and TV, etc., over the last twenty years) on the subject of 'change,' i.e., the dialectic process, I hope the following pages will help you better understand how it is being used by local, state, and national government and its departments and agencies as well as private and public institutions and organizations (secular and religious) to 'change' you, your children, your spouse,, the world.

If you are a 'liberal' minded person the following may be too difficult for you to handle (to "wrap your head around"), being too personal (too guilt producing) to deal with, with you using the dialectic process, i.e., "self'justification," dialoging with your "self," i.e., 'justifying' your "self," with "self" (which worships you, i.e., which always sees you as being "the center of the universe") rescuing you, i.e., blinding you, i.e., preventing you from seeing the error of your way of thinking—rejecting the truth before you can come to an understanding of it—in denial of the truth, having already "perceived" your way of thinking as being the truth, i.e., as "seeming" to be the only right way to think. As Carl Rogers stated, in defense of 'liberalism': "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) The scriptures warn us: "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." Proverbs 16:25 "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, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" Jeremiah 17:9 The children's hearts' desires are always "good" in their eyes, deceiving them into believing that they are good ("righteous" in and of themselves), especially when they receive the approval or "affirmation" of others. The same is true for 'liberals,' the power of 'justification' ("affirmation") blinding them to their hearts' true condition. The more "heart" driven, i.e., pleasure driven, i.e., i.e., "feelings" driven, i.e., "self" driven, i.e., child driven a person becomes the more 'liberal' they become, blinding themselves to the consequences of their feelings, thoughts, and actions, becoming as a spoiled child, living only for the pleasures of the 'moment,' hating anyone who gets in their way, 'justifying' it as "caring" for others, i.e., defending their carnal desires of the 'moment' over and against doing right and not wrong, i.e., questioning and challenging your and God's authority over them.
While you might discern that something is wrong with (or missing in) your child's school, classroom experience, and/or reading material, discernment can only tell you that something is wrong. As darkness is the absence of light and cold is the absence of heat so lies are the absence of truth, wrong is the absence of right, and evil or wickedness is the absence of good or righteousness. It is up to you to find out what is wrong and do something about it. Without your awareness and knowledge of the dialectic process you, as a homeschooling parent can be using the dialectic process in your child's education (circumventing or bypassing the father's authority), directly affecting your child's attitude toward facts and truth as well as toward your authority, resulting in your child questioning your commands, rules, facts, and truth and challenging your authority, commonly (in intellectual-radical circles) referred to as "critical thinking" or "critical theory."

Feelings engender 'change' (continuous 'change'). Doing right and not wrong inhibits or blocks it. 'Change' (dialectic 'reasoning') is about making right and wrong subject to "feelings," i.e., subject to the 'moment,' i.e., subject to the immediate situation, i.e., subject to the pleasure-pain spectrum of nature, i.e., subject to 'change' deceiving man (the child) into believing that his heart is "good" (making pleasure, i.e., the child's carnal desires of the 'moment' the standard for "good") or can become "good" (making the augmenting of pleasure, i.e., the advancement of the child's carnal desires of the 'moment' the standard for "good"), with "good" being dependent upon (equated with) the child being given the right circumstances or situation, i.e., the right education, environment, or upbringing (conditioning or programing), where he can not only learn dialectic 'reasoning' but also learn how to put it into praxis (into social action), with the augmentation of pleasure and the attenuation of pain 'liberating' the child's/man's carnal nature from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., negating parental/Godly restraint. The agenda of dialectic 'reasoning' is not to 'change' the heart but to 'liberate' it, i.e., to 'emancipate' the child's carnal nature from parental and Godly restraint, i.e., to 'liberate' or 'emancipate' nature from that which is not "of and for" nature, i.e., to 'liberate' "human nature" from that which is not "of and for""human nature," i.e., to 'liberate' the child's carnal nature from that which is not "of and for" the child's carnal nature itself.

Compassion for (loving) the child is good but making the child's nature (his natural propensity to approach pleasure and avoid pain, i.e., his natural inclination of loving/desiring pleasure and hating/resisting restraint), i.e., making satisfying the child's heart's desire of the 'moment' the standard for "good" is not good. In order to learn to do what is right and not do what is wrong the child must be willing to miss out on pleasure and endure pain, including the pain of missing out on pleasure as well as the pain of being rejected by others for refusing to "tolerate" or do wrong with them, insisting they do right instead, i.e., he must learn to humble, deny, control, and discipline himself. It is what "growing up," i.e., becoming mature is all about. It is what takes place when children grow up under their father's/Father's authority (or the father's/Father's authority system), no longer thinking and acting according to their own "impulses and urges" of the 'moment,' considering the consequences of their actions instead.

Postmodernism engenders (facilitates) unrighteousness and abomination because it, rejecting the father's/Father's authority, rejects any reference point other than the child's "impulses and urges" of the moment, resulting in parents now worshiping at the alter of the child's nature (justifying their own carnal nature, propensities, inclinations, desires, resentments) instead. George Hegel, advocating dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., "self" justification, i.e., worshipping the child, wrote: "the child, contrary to appearance, is the absolute, the rationality of the relationship; he is what is enduring and everlasting, the totality which produces itself once again as such [once his feelings, thoughts, and actions and relationship with others is 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority system]." (George Hegel, System of Ethical Life) According to dialectic 'reasoning,' it is from the nature of the child, i.e., his love of pleasure and his resentment toward restraint, i.e., his hatred of the restrainer, that the "new" world order is initiated and sustained.
A popular (mandatory) teacher training manual, used by teachers (and schools) today, states: "There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children." "In fact, a large part of what we call 'good teaching' is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives" [the teacher's skill in "helping" your child 'liberate' his (or her) "feelings," i.e., his desire for pleasure and dissatisfaction with restraint, revealing (being able to express or share with the other students and the teacher) his resentments toward parental authority, i.e., toward your authority without fear of reprisal] through challenging the student's fixed beliefs [getting your child to question your standards and belief, i.e., your commands, rules, facts, and truth and your authority in the "light" of the current situation, i.e., his "feelings" regarding the social issues of the day and "group approval"] and getting them to discuss issues [encouraging your child to dialogue his opinion with the other children in the classroom regarding how he feels and what he is thinking about regarding personal-social issues, i.e., sharing his "self interests," "building relationship" with the other children, i.e., uniting himself as "one" with them, i.e., upon their common interests of the 'moment,' negating his having a guilty conscience for disobeying you in the process, the approval of "the group," i.e., pleasure now being more important in his life than your approval, i.e., doing right and not wrong!" (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook 2, Affective Domain) Your child's participating in the "new practices" (even taking its tests) has a lasting affect upon them, 'changing' the way they feel, think, and act toward you as a parent—disrespecting your authority when they get home.

These quotations above are from a training manual all "certified" teachers are trained from and all schools are "accredited" by today (although they might not read or study from it directly). It is one of two books referred to as "Bloom's Taxonomies" (although they have been updated by Marzano and Webb over the past 50 years). Goals 2000, No-Child-Left-Behind, Common Core, and any new label (local, state, or national) which comes along are based upon Marzano's and Webb's redesign of Bloom's works. To question and/or challenge them will put you at risk of being either censored or cost you your job as an "educator." They are even now being used in the development of homeschooling material. Their "new practice" of "challenging the student's fixed beliefs," (as stated in the second "taxonomy") and "truth and knowledge are only relative," thus "there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all times and places" (as stated in Bloom's first "Taxonomy," i.e. Handbook 1, Cognitive Domain)—expressing Karl Marx's ideology: "nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred"—unites children upon their "superego," i.e., their "feelings" of the 'moment' (their desire for pleasure and resentment toward restraint) "helping" them decide what is right and what is wrong, i.e., what is "good" and what is "evil" ("good" being that which is "of and for" themselves, "evil" being that which inhibits or blocks them from being "of and for" themselves), with the "gemeinschaft," i.e., the "intimate community," i.e., their association with one another, i.e., with the "group"—basing right and wrong upon "the groups" "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., upon group approval (with affirmation or consensus, i.e., a "feeling" of "oneness" resulting from the "group" "building relationship" upon common desires and resentments, i.e., "self interest"), negating the "guilty conscience," i.e., the father's voice (your voice as a parent) within the child (which makes him "feel" bad for doing wrong, i.e. for disobeying you) and the "gesellschaft," i.e., the neighborhood—with each family divided (independent) within it, and possibly opposing one another (because of the parents differing standards and beliefs regarding what is right and what is wrong). Dialectic 'reasoning' ("Bloom's Taxonomies") 'liberates' children from their parent's and God's authority—not only from the earthly father's authority and restraints but the Heavenly Father's authority and restraints as well, negating the "old" world order, preparing the children for "socially useful work" (USSR Constitution, Articles 14.3, 66; 1977), i.e., the "new" world order, allowing all children to become united as one, "of and for" themselves, i.e., carnal, i.e., "of and for" the world only. From the garden in Eden on, all of history has been about the father's/Father's authority system and the child's rebellion against it, i.e., the child (children) loving the pleasures of the world more than loving the Father. Your flesh, your "self," and the world are antithetical to the Spirit, the Son, and the Father. Justifying the former negates the latter in your feelings, thoughts,
"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 What is missing in education (even in some, and increasingly more, homeschool classrooms and reading material) is the father's/Father's authority system. If the husband-wife authority system, under God (the Heavenly Father's authority system), is not working, the parent-child (father-children) authority system, under God (the Heavenly Father's authority system), will not work—resulting in the children playing off the parent's in order to get their heart's desires—directly affecting how the next generation will feel, think, and act toward themselves and authority, including the Heavenly Father's authority (in Christ Jesus). "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." "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 5:30; 14:6 "For whatsoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Matthew 12:50

The gospel is based upon the Father's authority system. Negate the system and you negate the gospel message, i.e., God's restraint upon mankind, at least that is what those who 'reason' dialectically hope, demanding that everyone think and act and relate with one another according to ('of and for') their carnal heart's desires of the 'moment,' living "in and for" the 'moment,' joining them, i.e., affirming them in their abominations. The world and the flesh is grounded upon the approaching of pleasure and the avoiding of pain (sensuousness), the soul upon doing right and not wrong (righteousness). One is temporal, "of and for" the 'moment' only, by sight. The other is everlasting, spending eternity either in Heaven (as the result of righteousness imputed by faith in God) or in Hell (as the result of trusting in man, i.e., the flesh and the world, i.e., trusting in sight alone). We are born into this world into sensuousness. We become aware of righteousness through the preaching and teaching of the truth, i.e., according to the father's/Father's authority system, with righteousness being imputed to us by faith in Him (since we are not righteous in and of ourselves). Dialectic 'logic' says: to make the world "healthy" (according to our carnal desires, i.e., according to our "self interests," i.e., according to "human nature"), righteousness (that which "represses" our carnal nature and "alienates" us from the world) must be negated. When we, through dialectic 'reasoning,' establish sensuousness ("human nature") over and therefore against righteousness (God's will), 'justifying' sensuousness, making it, i.e., our carnal nature, i.e., ourselves, i.e., that which we have in common with the world, "righteous" in our own eyes (rejecting that righteousness which can only come from the Father and His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ), we "lose our soul." "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Mark 8:36

Your children's soul is their most "private property." It is all they will have when they stand before the Lord, giving account for their thoughts and actions. Their carnal nature, i.e., their desire for the things of pleasure of the world and their resentment toward those who or that which prevents them from having pleasure is what all children have in common—from where we get "common-ism." It is their ability to 'justify' their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' i.e., 'justify' their "self interest," from which "equality" ("human relationship") is based. Philosophy, i.e., dialectic 'reasoning' (which is "of and for" the world) is the child 'justifying' his desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' making his desires "rational" and his parent's restraints "irrational," i.e., making himself "relevant" and his parent's and their authority "irrelevant" in 'changing' times, i.e., in the current situation. It is the child thinking about how the world "is" (with his parent's "repressing" him) and how it "ought" to be (with him doing what he wants to do, when he wants to do it). What those of dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., facilitators of 'change' desire is that all children come together in a lifelong sequence of meetings, dialoguing their opinions (their desires and dissatisfactions) with one another to a consensus, i.e., to a "feeling" of "oneness," initiating and sustaining a world of perpetual 'change,' based upon their carnal desires and the world that stimulates them. Karl Marx wrote: "Laws [parental authority] must not fetter human life [inhibit or
block the child's carnal nature]; but yield to it; they must change as the needs [as the child's carnal desires] and capacities of the people [and the child's ability to satisfy them] change." (Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right') Through the consensus process, laws that are established this morning will be easily 'changed' by committees this afternoon for the sake of "the people," i.e., according to the committee's perception of their "felt needs" of the 'moment'—what Immanuel Kant called "lawfulness without law," (Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason), i.e., the law of the flesh, ever subject ('changing') to the desires and situation of the 'moment,' without the father's authority and/or the law of God restraining it. Karl Marx summed it up this way: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, the objective however, is change." (Karl Marx, Feuerbach Thesis #11) In other words, it is not enough to initiate 'change,' i.e., anarchy; it is essential to sustain 'change' through the consensus process, guaranteeing "worldly peace and socialist harmony," i.e., a world 'liberated' from Godly restraint, i.e., a "people" who no longer have a guilty conscience for doing wrong, i.e., a "people" no longer restrained ("repressed") by the standards (laws) of the "past." but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise." 2 Corinthians 10:12

You lose your soul at the alter of "equality," i.e., consensus. It is saved (redeemed) at the cross. "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Galatians 5:24 2 "Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth." Colossians 3:2 In the end it is an "either-or," not a maybe, might be, could be, "I feel," or "I think." Even the Marxists know this: "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) Who you set your mind, i.e., your "affections" upon, i.e., yourself and the world or the Father and His Son, will affect how you live your life now and determines where you will spend eternity.

Faith (trusting in the Son and the Father) and sight (trusting in self and the world) are different political systems. Political systems, i.e., which determine how policy is initiated and sustained depend upon how children (the next generation of citizens) are educated. How you educate your children evinces a political system. Tyrannical, totalitarian, and globalist governments ("group-ist," "common-ist," type governments, promoting freedom from "the conscience," with their citizens being controlled by dictators or seduced, deceived, and manipulated by facilitators of 'change,' i.e., "big brother," negating local control, i.e., negating a culture of restraint) depend upon a different education system than do civil and limited government (which recognize, encourage, and promote "individualism," i.e., freedom of "the conscience," engendering local control, i.e., engendering a culture of restraint, under God, with every soul being ultimately accountable to Him alone, i.e., above all other authorities). "And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven," Matthew 23:9

Unlike other nations with a King, i.e., a "father figure" over the citizens, i.e., over "the people," we 'limited' the power of government, via. a constitutional republic, breaking it up into separate branches, not only in the federal level, but the state, county or parish, township, city, village levels as well, leaving the power of "kingship" in the father figure of the home (with the father having the right to establish his family, property, and business upon his "private convictions" as well as to protect them from encroachment from the government and from "We, the people," i.e., the "collective," according to the Bill of Rights), 'creating' a generation of citizens respecting authority, having a guilty conscience when they did wrong, which is all but lost now, not only in government but in the minds of the citizens as well, being replaced with government by "consensus," following after the French Revolution with its directorate, negating the King, not only over the nation but in the home as well, engendering a culture of unrighteousness and abomination. As the (Historical or Transformational) Marxist Max Horkheimer wrote: "Protestantism [with its work ethic, i.e., doing your best as unto the Lord and the priesthood of all believers, with everyone being personally held accountable for their thoughts and actions before God alone] was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism." (Max Horkheimer,
As parents send their children to the store to buy their goods, representing them, a representative is sent to the capital to represent his constituents interests. And as parents no longer send their children to the store when they spend their money on themselves and/or their "friends" interest, the constituents no longer send their representative to the capital who no long represents their interests, sending someone else in their place instead. By encouraging children to no longer represent (preach and teach) their parent's commands, rules, facts, and truth (representing their parent's position, i.e., being "negative," i.e., being intolerant of wrong), but by encouraging them to dialogue their opinions, i.e., their desires of the 'moment' and dissatisfaction with authority amongst themselves (to a consensus) instead, the parent's authority system (doing right and not wrong) is negated, i.e., is replaced with the children's interest of the 'moment,' i.e., their desire for approval (from "the group") and their resentment toward authority (with 'loyalty' to authority being replaced with 'loyalty to "self" and "the group," as what took place in the Royal Tennis Court—Serment du Jeu de Paume—which spearheaded the French Revolution). Individualism is swallowed up (negated) in groups which are formed from diverse beliefs, positions, or faiths which the individual has to tolerate (can not reprove, correct, or rebuke for being wrong). Individualism survives in groups which are established upon the belief, position, or faith the individual adheres to—"the group," i.e., the fellowship, the congregation ("a gathering of like minded people") being the result (the byproduct) of the belief, position, or faith which all individuals have in common. Socialists do not want people in government who have a guilty conscience when they do wrong, they want people who will compromise, i.e., look the other way for the sake of (or for the "good" of) "the people." It is how representative government is replaced with socialist-globalist governance.

The absence of the parental authority system (anarchy-socialism, i.e., accountability to one's "self" and/or to "the group," i.e. to "the people," engendering the 'justification' for 'compromise') and the presence of the parental authority system (individualism under the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., personal accountability to parents, constituents, ,, and/or God for one's thoughts and actions, engendering a guilty conscience for doing wrong), in your child's education are two different political systems. Which system are you using (or condoning) in your child's education? Is your authority, as a parent, under God, missing in your child's education? How your child is being educated does make a difference, not only now but for all eternity.

"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) "Kurt Lewin emphasized that 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." (Wilbur Brookover, A Sociology of Education) The pleasure which comes from being approved by others (pl.) and the pain which comes with being rejected by them (which engenders socialism) is so powerful that Kurt Lewin noted: "It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group [with everyone focused upon "building relationship" with one another] than to change any one of them separately [as "individuals" with "private convictions," i.e., subject to their parent's, teacher's, bosses', and or God's commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., remaining 'loyal' to their authority system, having a guilty conscience when doing wrong]." (Kurt Lewin in Kenneth Bennie, Human Relations in Curriculum Change)

It should be noted that the fear of rejection (emotional pain) and the fear of judgment (physical pain) always go hand in hand, whether by/from the parent, teacher, boss, .... God (an individual) or by/from...
"the group," the "collective," the "community," "the people," etc., with the former demanding doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (forgiving, i.e., showing mercy for true repentance) and the later basing your worth upon "feelings," i.e., their "felt needs" of the 'moment,' making you forever vulnerable to the "winds of change." "Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state ["the people"])." (R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law) Only individuals have a conscience (if it is not seared). Groups do not.

How your children, your spouse, your relatives, neighbors, educators, employer, fellow workers, police and police chief, sheriff, representatives, judges, mayor, governor, president, minister, etc., feel, think, and act (respond) toward you and your authority as a parent (occupying the office of "restrainer," i.e., "restraining" the pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., the desires of the child in order for them to learn to do right and not wrong, i.e., demanding self-control and discipline, humbling and denying of their "self," engendering a 'guilty conscience' in them for doing wrong) is directly affected by how they were or are being educated (or "re-educated). As you will see, if their learning took place in a traditional education system, they will hold you and themselves (as an individual, under God), accountable to (and judge you according to) standards which were established in the "past," i.e., by their parents ..., and/or God. Through discussion, i.e., basing right and wrong, i.e., "can" and "can not" (liberties and limitations, freedoms and restraints) upon established commands, rules, facts, and truth, they will determine whether your response to a situation (and therefore you) will be approved (and supported) by them or not. But if they participated in a transformational education system, they will hold you accountable to (and judge you according to) their "feelings" and "thoughts," i.e., their desires of the 'moment,' i.e., according to their opinion, i.e., according to what they and/or others can get (or "feel" they "need" to get—"felt needs") out of the situation (out of you) for themselves (pl.), i.e., according to how they think the world ought to be, i.e., using their imagination to 'create' heaven on earth (which is pleasing to the flesh and eyes), 'creating' a "new" world order based upon "human nature" void of parental or Godly restraints.

Their approval of you (and hatred toward you, disguised as "caring" for others) is therefore based upon whether you bring (or can bring) pleasure into ("benefit") their lives and/or the lives of others in the present and the future (or whether you prevent, i.e., inhibit or block them from having the pleasures of the 'moment' they desire), with your worth, as well as "right" and "wrong" becoming situational, i.e., subject to 'change,' i.e., dependent upon your ability or potential to "better" their lives and the lives of others, i.e., to augment pleasure and attenuate pain. If you judge them, they will judge you (get rid of you) but if you 'justify' them, they will 'justify' you (keep you around). Your worth as a citizen in a transformational world is based upon your "willingness" to participate with the "community" in the social action (praxis) of negating "restrainers," i.e., "judgmentalism," i.e., "prejudice," i.e., "negativity," i.e., the parental authority system, i.e., the father's authority system, 'creating' a "new" world order, 'liberated' from the Heavenly Father's authority system (with its restraints). "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 ["of and for himself" only] continually." Genesis 6:5 (see also Genesis 8:21; Jeremiah 3:17, 7:24, 11:8, 13:10, 16:12, 18:12, 23:17, and Matthew 24:37, 38)

The way a person feels, thinks, acts, and relates with others is initiated and sustains through their participation in a particular education system, either discussing commands, rules, facts, and truth which they have learned through preaching and teaching, learning to deny, humble, discipline, control, etc., themselves in order to do right and not wrong or, with the "help" of facilitators of 'change,' "discussing" personal-social issues (which is actually the dialoguing of opinions), basing "right" and "wrong" upon their "feelings" of the 'moment,' which are stimulated by the situation of the 'moment,' making all things subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to the facilitator of 'change' (the 'change' agent) who is manipulating the situation and therefore the "feelings" of the 'moment,' initiating and sustaining the process of 'change.' The battle line in education is between "lovers of pleasure" and "lovers of God," with traditional education siding with "lovers of God more than lovers of pleasure" (God is not against pleasure, only
wanting us to love Him first and foremost, as a parent is not against the child getting pleasure out of the toys they give them, only wanting them not to love the toys more than them—willingly putting their toys aside, suspend pleasure, in order to do what their parent's want them to do in the 'moment') and with transformational education siding with "lovers of pleasure more than (over and therefore against) lovers of God" (with "disobedient to parents" included). 2 Timothy 3:1-5\(^{28}\)

For example (and this applies to homeschooling as well, although the number of students might be one): If I have twenty students in my classroom, I have twenty \textit{individuals}, who, remaining 'loyal' to (having faith in) their parents' position (belief, ideology) remain divided amongst themselves, as \textit{individuals}, with each child personally being held accountable to their parent's authority (which is a \textit{system}), with their parent's commands, rules, facts, and truth giving them a reference from which to determine right from wrong. In the traditional classroom I can, as a teacher, only \textit{preach} and \textit{teach} those commands, rules, facts, and truths which support their parent's authority \textit{system}, i.e., which do not challenge the children's personal accountability to their parents, i.e., their individuality (under their parent's and/or under God's authority, i.e., under the father's/Father's authority \textit{system}), i.e., "\textit{do right and not wrong, as you are told}," "\textit{Because I say so}," disciplining them when they disobey or get things \textit{wrong}, preventing 'change'—inhibiting or blocking them from deciding "right" and "wrong" according to their "feelings" of the 'moment,' in the "light" of the current situation—making truth subject to their \textit{opinions}. If I focus upon "\textit{doing things right and not wrong}," encouraging (blessing) children when they do right (do things right), disciplining, i.e., reproofing, correcting, rebuking them when they do \textit{wrong}, i.e., when they misbehave (or sin), then the fear of doing something \textit{wrong}, i.e., the \textit{guilty conscience} will inhibit or block them from easily or rapidly 'changing,' i.e., 'compromising' for the sake of "\textit{building relationship with others with the same carnal 'self interests}'"—which are based upon feelings. If I focus upon "feelings" instead, then "right" and "wrong" become subject to their "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., to the situation, demanding 'compromise' in order to initiate and sustain relationship with others, i.e., approval by "\textit{the group}," i.e., with those of the same "self interest," making responses such as "\textit{more right than wrong}" and test questions as "\textit{Mostly agree}," "\textit{Agree}," "\textit{Disagree}," Mostly disagree," i.e., 'relativity' the foundation from which to determine their progress (grade) in education, rather than 'absolutes,' i.e., "\textit{either-or}," i.e., "\textit{Either you are right or you are wrong}."] If you do not reprovet, correct, or rebuke \textit{unrighteousness}, i.e., if you "tolerate," i.e., remain silent in the midst of \textit{unrighteousness} then \textit{unrighteousness} becomes the "\textit{norm}."] \textit{Qui tacet consentire videtur}, "\textit{He who is silent is taken to agree.}" i.e., "\textit{Qui tacet consentit}," "\textit{Silence gives consent.}" Your silence is a "positive," an approval—not guilt producing—in the perception of the unrighteous, thus counted as an \textit{affirmation} in the \textit{consensus} process, overruling the \textit{negative}, i.e., those who speak up for \textit{righteousness}, thus 'justifying' their \textit{negation}. Your silence is what makes the process of 'change' work. It depends upon it, with you sacrificing your child at the altar of 'change,' for the "\textit{good}" of "\textit{the people}."] 'Change,' i.e., 'compromising' for the sake of unity, always "progresses" in the direction of depravity, i.e., downward.

You might have to read this through a few times but it is important to know and understand. It is the \textit{system}, not just the content that is of issue here. In traditional education, i.e., in the "old" \textit{system}, content (two plus two equals four) depends upon the \textit{system} (and \textit{can not} be any other number, i.e., any other answer is \textit{wrong}, i.e. there is only \textit{one} right answer, an "is-is not," "true-false," "either-or" construct). By simply bringing the "old" \textit{system} content (two plus two equals four) into a "new" \textit{system} (all answers are right, including four), i.e., leaving the "old" \textit{system} structure of "\textit{can not}," i.e., of \textit{negativity} out, the "old" \textit{system} (all answers except four are \textit{wrong}) will \textit{wither} away, thereby negating the "\textit{not}," i.e., \textit{negating} the \textit{negative}, i.e., \textit{negating} the father's/Father's authority \textit{system}, resulting in a condition referred to as the "\textit{negation of negation}." In this way the children or students (\textit{how} they think) can be 'change' without them (and their parents) fully knowing or understanding what is happening to them in the classroom (with their "old" \textit{system} of "\textit{negativity}," i.e., of "\textit{can not}," "\textit{must not}," "\textit{thou shalt not}," "\textit{you are wrong}," etc., i.e., of commands, rules, facts, and truth continually \textit{withering} away as they 'willingly' participate in the process of "\textit{positivity}," "\textit{tolerance}," and "\textit{change}," i.e. as they 'justify' the
"new" system of unrighteousness and abomination).

George Hegel noted: "When a man has finally reached the point where he does not think he knows it better than others, that is when he has become indifferent to what they have done badly and he is interested only in what they have done right, then peace and affirmation have come to him." (G. F. W. Hegel quoted in Carl Friedrich, The Philosophy of Hegel) Hegel, unable to use the word "wrong" resorted to the relativistic word "badly" instead. By "peace" Hegel meant that the child no longer has a guilty conscience (a sense of negativity) for doing what he naturally desires to do in the 'moment' and by "affirmation" he meant that the child has the approval of others, i.e., no putdowns or judgmentalism from others for his natural (carnal) feelings, thoughts, and actions, i.e., for his "lusts," enjoyments, pleasures, etc., of the 'moment.' His "peace" is not the peace which the Lord gives, i.e., which is eternal but is the peace which is of the flesh and the world only, i.e., subject to the carnal 'moment,' i.e., temporary, passing away. "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you." John 14:27 "And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Philippians 4:7

According to dialectic 'reasoning,' right-wrong thinking, i.e., judgmentalism," i.e., "intolerance," i.e., the parent's or God's authority prejudices a person against not only himself, i.e., his nature, but against other's, i.e., the nature of others as well (that which he has in common with them and they with him), while tolerance, i.e., focusing on "feelings," i.e., on "right" only, i.e., bypassing or circumventing the parent's or God's authority, negates negativity, i.e., negates wrong, i.e., negates judgmentalism, i.e., prejudices, i.e., negates individualism, negates having a guilty conscience for doing wrong, under God, i.e., liberates the person to be himself, i.e., to be as he was before the father/Father's first command, rule, fact, or truth prevented him from being carnal, i.e., of the world only. While Martin Luther King Jr. was proud of his father's confrontation, i.e., reproof of a white man for his racist comments, persuading the white man that his attitude was wrong, he resented the father of his best friend, who was white, telling his son not to play with him. By switching the confrontation from being between adults, retaining a father's authority system of "right and wrong," to the confrontation being between children (i.e., the youth, college students, etc.) and the "establishment" instead, thus uniting the children upon their "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., upon their desires of the 'moment' and their dissatisfaction with their parent's authority (the father's/Father's authority system), civil disobedience could be used to negate parental authority, i.e., to negate the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., to negate "prejudice" within all races. Through the social (affirmative) action of rebellion and revolution against the "establishment," children, isolated as individuals under their parent's control, could be 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority system, finding their identity within the social(ist) group instead, fulfilling Karl Marx's dictum as quoted above. While racism is wrong, right-wrong thinking is not. The most prejudice people of all are those who are prejudiced against right-wrong thinking because they can never accept the fact that they are wrong, and repent.

Discussion is based upon commands, rules, facts and truth (right-wrong) while dialogue is based upon feelings (pleasure-pain)—with "thinking" taken captive to the feelings, i.e., to the "sensuous needs" and sense perception," i.e., to the "sense experience" of the 'moment,' i.e., to the situation. If we switch ("shift") our conversation (our means of communication) from a discussion to a dialogue, right and wrong wither away, i.e., give way to our feelings of the 'moment,' i.e., to our desire for pleasure (including our desire for approval from others) and resentment toward restraint (pain, including the pain which comes with rejection) therefore, if I want to turn children into socialists, i.e., into globalists—who are hostile toward the father's/Father's authority system—and I do not, but some do) all I have to do is 'create' a transformational classroom where I allow the children "freedom" to circumvent (set aside or bypass)—which is a political system—their parent's authority system ("right-wrong") in the classroom, "encouraging" them to 1) dialogue (share amongst themselves, with no "put downs," i.e., with no "You are wrong," judgmental, "prejudiced" responses) 2) their opinions (their feelings and "thoughts" of the
'moment,' i.e., their desire for pleasure and their dissatisfaction with or resentment toward restraint, in the 'light' of the current situation—from where we get "situation ethics") to 3) a consensus (to a "feeling" of oneness," i.e., "affirmation"), in 4) a "group grade" project, and their natural desire for pleasure, i.e., including their desire for approval from the other students, and dissatisfaction toward restraint, i.e., their resentment toward their parent's authority system (being common to all children therefore common to all the students in the classroom) will unite them as one (from where we get "common-ism"). The dialectic idea is: if the "right" conditions can be 'created' in the classroom the 'right" behavior will follow. If the facilitator of 'change' (as your child's "teacher") can use the classroom as a laboratory, "helping" your child liberate' their "self," i.e., their "feelings" or desires of the 'moment' from your commands, rules, facts, and truth, negating their having a "guilty conscience" for questioning you and challenging your authority in the process, they can 'create' a "new" world order which has no father's/Father's authority system, i.e., no parental/Godly restraint in it, resulting in a "new" world order of unrighteousness and abomination, i.e., a world "united," with no 'limitations,' boundaries, or borders (what we now see happening around us). Private convictions are thus replaced with analysis, i.e., "critical thinking," i.e., questioning authority, i.e., negating the authority system. Replacing producing for the family with consuming pleasure.

A soviet29 (the "group grade" or "group project") is (1) a diverse group of people (of students) "affirming" the disenfranchised and the deviant, i.e., "subcultures" which resent and resist (question and challenge) the father's/Father's authority system, (2) dialoguing their opinions to a consensus (there is no father's/Father's authority system in a dialogue, in an opinion or theory, or in a consensus—only in a discussion, in a belief, or in a confirmation), (3) over personal-social issues (over humanist, socialist, environmentalist, globalist issues), (4) in a facilitated meeting (the process will not work without the "help" of the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., antichrist, thinking and acting as Satan in the garden, i.e., using the dialectic process, i.e., "self'justification," "helping," in that instance, two "children" 'liberate' themselves [their "self"] from the Father's authority system), (5) to a predetermined outcome (that is that no public-private decision will be made without the use of the soviet system, i.e., the consensus process, i.e., the children's "feeling" system, guaranteeing that no father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., authority system will be allowed to initiate and sustain public-private policy). "Bypassing the traditional channels of top-down decision making, our objective centers upon transform public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics." "Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common interests and ultimately to world interests... transforming public consensus into one favorable to the emergence of a stable and humanistic world order." "Consensus is both a personal and a political step. It is a precondition of all future steps." (Ervin Laszlo, A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World Order)

The education system you use is spiritual (faith based, from God, based upon the Father's authority system), although some (deceiving you) would like you to think it is "academics" (sight or sense based, of the world only, based upon the nature of the child—"liberated" from the father's/Father's authority system). The Father's authority system is the essence of the gospel message. "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." 1 John 2:22

The dialectic lie is that we will not be held accountable before God for our carnal thoughts and actions, that we came into this world as a "blank tablet," with our life's experiences, i.e., the environment in which we were or are being raised up in, shaping us into becoming "good" or "evil." The "liar" is the one who denies that "Jesus" is "the Christ," i.e., "the messiah," "the son of God," i.e., the only begotten Son of God, obedient to His Heavenly Father in all things commanded, 'redeeming' us (by His death, i.e., by His shed blood on the cross) from His Father's judgment upon us (damnation) for our sins, with His righteousness being imputed to us by our faith in Him, 'reconciling' us to His Heavenly Father (by His resurrection from the grave) and the "antichrist" is anyone who denies "the Father and the Son," the Father's authority system. We are to be as Christ, "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 As Christ said: "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." "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven." Matthew 7:21, 10:32 Question: "Who was Christ obedient to?" Answer: "To His Heavenly Father." Question: "Who are we to be obedient to?" Answer: "To Our Heavenly Father." While the system itself can save no one, without it (having faith in the Son, doing the Father's will) no one can come to know "the Father and the Son." "And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." 1 John 3:1 Negate the father's/Father's authority system (through dialectic 'reasoning,' i.e., through "self-justification") and you negate the gospel message (making it a socialist's gospel, i.e., "of and for self" and the world, i.e., "of and for 'feelings,'" i.e., "of and for" the child, i.e., "of and for" the children of disobedience" only). "Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:" "Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them." Ephesians 2:2; 5:6, 7 "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: In the which ye also walked sometime, when ye lived in them." Colossians 3:5-7

Theodor Adorno, whose Marxist "Weltanschauung" (world view) is "Bloom's Taxonomies" "Weltanschauung," defined the traditional family and explained his agenda to negate it this way: "Family relationships are characterized by fearful subservience to the demands of the parents and by an early suppression of impulses not acceptable to them." "God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority." The "logic" of dialectic 'reasoning' is: if God's authority over man is the result of the parent's authority over the child, both systems being the same, then God's authority over man can be negated by negating the parent's authority over the child, allowing the child and therefore man to be himself, i.e., of his carnal nature, i.e., of the world only. "Authoritarian submission [the child submitting his will to his father's will, i.e., man submitting his will to God'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." "The conception of the ideal family situation for the child [is]: (1) uncritical obedience to the father and elders, (2) pressures directed unilaterally from above to below, (3) inhibition of spontaneity, and (4) emphasis on conformity to externally imposed values." "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 [the negation of the Father's authority system, the source, according to Adorno, of nationalism, i.e. fascism, and "prejudice," i.e., religion]." His agenda was to use ('change') the education system and those governmental departments, agencies, and institutions which support it, including the "community," "child protective services," and the media, using "Social environmental forces to change the parents behavior toward the child." (Theodor Adorno, The Authoritarian Personality) It is therefore essential that the classroom environment exclude parental surveillance and control over it lest traditional minded parents prevent their children (and other children) from participating in the process of 'change.' "In order to effect rapid change, [one] must mount a vigorous attack on the family lest the traditions of present generations be preserved. It is necessary, in other words, artificially to create an experiential chasm between parents and children—to insulate the children in order that they can more easily be indoctrinated with new ideas." (Warren Bennis, The Temporary Society) As Bloom admitted: "To create effectively a new set of attitudes and values, the individual must undergo great reorganization of his personal beliefs and attitudes and he must be involved in an environment which in many ways is separated from the previous environment in which he was developed." "...many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in some ways
The system of education (the curriculum) that teachers use in their classrooms reveals their objective, whether they, as a traditional teacher, are intent in initiating and sustaining limited government (self control, self discipline), under the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., under the parent's and God's authority or they, as a facilitator of change, are intent in initiating and sustaining globalism (self esteem, self-social justification, humanism), uniting the students, i.e., the next generation of citizens under the banner of "Making the world safe for democracy [tyranny]" (the 'purpose' of Common Core), following after and supporting facilitators of change, i.e., human resource personnel, i.e., psychotherapists, i.e., "common-ists" (all four being the same in system)—driven by the pleasures (lusts) of the 'moment,' purposed in negating parental/Godly restraint of "human nature," i.e., intent in negating the father's/Father's authority system—which, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' is equated to negating 'local' control and nationalism (private property, borders, and sovereignty, which divide people from people)—from the land. Once children are "programmed" (conditioned into "thinking through their feelings of the 'moment,'" they are subject to the seduction and deception of facilitators of change, who, manipulating the situation (the crisis of the 'moment'), "help" them select, through the use of inductive reasoning 10 or dialectic 'reasoning' (reasoning from their own sense based experiences, i.e., their common desire for pleasure and their resentment toward restraint) rather than deductive reasoning 9 or didactic reasoning (reasoning from their parent's or an established position, i.e., an a priori), the appropriate information (their opinion) will guarantee the outcome of the process of change, 'liberating' themselves and the world from traditional authority and Godly restraint (both perceived as being the same in structure or system). "Freud noted that patricide [killing the father] and incest [abomination] are part of man's deepest nature." (Irvin Yalom, The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy) Bloom admitted that his "Taxonomy" was a "psychological classification system" intent in "changing the child's way of feeling, thinking, and acting," i.e., 'liberating' his deepest nature. (Benjamin Bloom et al., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain) "The affective domain [the child's carnal desires and resentment toward authority] is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box.' [a box full of evils which, once the lid is removed, can not be closed—the lid to it being the father's/Father's authority]" "We are not entirely sure that opening our 'box' is necessarily a good thing;" "To keep the 'box' closed is to deny the existence of the powerful motivational forces that shape the life of each of us." "It is in this 'box' that the most influential controls [by socialists] are to be found." (David Krathwohl, Benjamin Bloom, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book II: Affective Domain) Bloom's intent was to open the "Box." It's lid (parental authority) is daily being removed in the classrooms across the nation.

In essence, the answers are in the questions. "What do you know?" type questions (associated with traditional education) engender "right-wrong" type answers ("You are wrong and I am right.") which divides, engendering individualism/local control, under the father's/Father's or God's authority system whereas "How do you feel?" and "What do you think?" type questions (associated with transformational education) engender "desires" and "dissatisfactions" type answers ("We are all the same, i.e., in the same boat together.") which unites, engendering socialism/globalism under the facilitator of change's, i.e. "big brother's" system of control. Lawrence Kohlberg's dilemma questions (which pit life, erotic love and sex, religion, truth, authority, conscience, property, law, punishment, affiliation, contract, civil rights against one another) were designed to pressure children into revealing their level of compromise. His "life raft dilemma," for example, requires the death of someone (which type of person would you kill or talk into killing themselves, including yourself) in order to save the lives of the rest of the people on the raft. What is missing is the fact there is another raft, for the redeemed, who have a God (a teacher) who sent His Son to die for us, to save us (as individuals), instead of pressuring us into killing another person or ourselves to "save" the group, in order to satisfy the "teacher" (who is now a "god," establishing the
'purpose' of life). All answers to the question require you (or your child) to kill themselves or someone else in order to satisfy the "teacher" (to appease the "god" of this "new" world order, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the psychotherapist).

While "traditional" minded parents (and educators) focus upon "morality and competence," i.e., training up their children to obey authority, i.e., to restrain themselves and do right and not wrong, inculcating (preaching and teaching) "individualism," i.e., personal accountability to authority, i.e., to the parent and to God—which was especially strong (in the middle class) up until the mid twentieth century (when "Bloom's Taxonomies" were introduced into the education system)—and "transitional" minded parents focus upon their children having a "better life," i.e., having more pleasure and less restraint then they had as children, "transformational," i.e., 'liberal' minded "parents," building upon the desire that not only their children but that all children have a "better life," i.e., "the good life," i.e., a life of pleasure without parental or Godly restraints, i.e., without the children judging (restraining, i.e., "repressing") themselves and others for their carnal ways (engendering "prejudice" or "alienation"), focus upon "the augmentation of pleasure and the attenuation of pain," i.e., the building of personal-social relationships based upon 'self interest,' i.e., where the situation of the 'moment'—affecting ("affirming") the children's pleasures and dissatisfactions of the 'moment'—directs their thoughts and actions. The former parent makes pleasure (the child's "feelings" of the 'moment') subordinate to doing right and not wrong (with the child missing out on the pleasure of the 'moment' as well as enduring pain, even the pain of missing out on pleasure, in order to do things right), while the latter makes "right" and "wrong" subordinate to the child's "feelings" of the 'moment,' making "the augmentation of pleasure" right and therefore the use of pain (chastening), including the pain of missing out on pleasure (restraint, i.e., punishment)—in order to inculcate obedience as well as doing things right and not wrong (the keystone of traditional education)—wrong. For the traditional mind knowledge and understanding is attained through faith and obedience, i.e. in honoring the one restraining pleasure, while for the transformational mind "knowledge" and "understanding" must be experienced in the 'liberating' of pleasure from restraint, i.e., in 'liberating' the object of pleasure from the control of the restrainer, negating the restrainer (parental authority and Godly restraint) in the process.

The saying "capitalism rewards good work and socialism bad" comes from the understanding that removing "wrong" from the classroom or workplace in order not to offend somebody, i.e., in order not to hurt somebodies "feelings" (called general system theory) results in "bad" work being treated as "good" in the 'moment'— done for the sake of initiating and sustaining the building of relationships—something traditional parents, educators and bosses would not put up with, making them "prejudiced," "irrational," "hateful," "uncaring" in the eyes of the socialist. Those of the specific system, which is facts based—focusing upon the details in order to do or get the job right the first time—would tell you that you are wrong, when you are wrong, understanding that bad work going out the door, which could knowingly take up somebody else's time to correct, repair, exchange, etc., or even hurt or kill somebody, would be immoral.

The so called 'shift' in education, i.e., the 'changing' of the child's classroom experience (including the child's reading material) has been away from the Patriarchal paradigm (where the father's/Father's authority system is reflected in the classroom), where children learn to control and discipline themselves, i.e., learn to humble and deny themselves in order to obey and do right and not wrong, i.e., learn to submit themselves to authority to the Heresiarchal paradigm of 'change' (where the child's "feelings" system, which is ever subject to the situation of the 'moment' and therefore is ever subject to 'change,' directs their thoughts and actions), where children, through the dialoguing of their opinions with one another to a consensus (to a "feeling" of "oneness," i.e., of "affirmation"), are encouraged (are 'liberated') in their classroom experience (including through their reading material), to 'justify,' esteem, and exalt themselves over and therefore against authority. When schools use "facilitators of 'change" (calling themselves "teachers") who are trained in the use of "Bloom's Taxonomies," i.e., in how
to seduce, deceive, and manipulate children, i.e., in how to "unfreeze, move, and refreeze" their feelings, thoughts, and actions, and their relationship with one another, children are 'changed' from honoring their parent's authority, i.e., being subordinate to the father's/Father's authority system to being insubordinate to, i.e., questioning and challenging it and them instead—'creating' a so called "new" world order of 'change,' i.e., of unrighteousness and abomination, a world of children without Godly, i.e., the father's/Father's restraint. While the father is not God, i.e., righteous in and of himself, his system of authority is from God, producing a "peaceful fruit of righteousness" in the child and in the home when applied, under God. The key to 'change' (the use of dialectic 'reasoning') is the child's love for the pleasures of the world, i.e., what he wants to do in the 'moment,' and his dissatisfaction with his father's authority, i.e., his hate of restraint, what he dialogues within himself about day and night. The 'change' in education has been from the father's/Father's authority system of doing right and not wrong to the child's "feelings" system of 'change,' that which is "of and for self" and the world only.

Dialogue is different than discussion. The key to understanding the dialectic process (the so called "scientific method") is its use of dialogue to "change" how they determine right from wrong, 'changing' right and wrong from being preached and taught (and discussed at the parent's, teacher's, bosses', etc., discretion) and therefore established by an authority above them, such as God, their parents, teacher, boss, etc., i.e., having to be accepted "as is," i.e., by faith—which is the foundation for facts (right-wrong, either-or, is-is not, i.e., intolerance toward wrong answers in order to do things right) based education, to where "right" and "wrong" are 'discovered' through dialogue and therefore are subject to the child's own "sense experience" of the 'moment,' i.e., subject to the child's "feelings" of the 'moment' (his desires and dissatisfactions) and the environment, situation, person, or persons who stimulate them, making right and wrong situational, i.e., 'changeable'—which is the foundation for feelings (affective, "more or less," opinion, i.e., tolerance of wrong answers in order to initiate and/or sustain relationships) based education—using open ended, i.e., "We can talk about anything" (which is a lie, because any preaching and teaching of commands, rules, facts, and truth will not be allowed, i.e., will be looked down upon), non-directive, i.e., "I'm not going to tell you what is the right or wrong answer since there is no absolute right or wrong answer" (which is a lie, because any absolute answer becomes a wrong answer), non-judgmental, i.e., "No one is going to tell you that your opinion is wrong, i.e., judge you or put you down for sharing your opinion" (which is a lie, because you will be judged if you hold to absolute answers) type questions, which is not true science.

Dialogue comes from the flesh, i.e., comes from your desire for pleasure, i.e., comes from your desire to have relationship with the things of the world, while discussion comes from the soul, i.e., comes from your desire to do right and not wrong, resulting in you reproving, correcting, and rebuking your "self" when you do wrong (and others, if you have the authority, when they do wrong). While with discussion there is a sense of accountability (a consequence and therefore a guilty conscience) for doing things wrong, in dialogue there is not, since wrong ("prejudice") is suspended for the 'moment' in order to initiate and sustain dialogue (relationships). In short, discussion focuses upon doing things right and not wrong, engendering a guilty conscience (intolerance) for doing things wrong or for disobedience, while dialogue focuses upon your (and others) desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment,' i.e., your and their feelings of pleasure and pain, including the pleasure of "affirmation" and the pain of rejection, i.e., the pain of missing out on pleasure, negating the guilty conscience for doing wrong or for disobedience in the process. It is why you talk to yourself (dialogue with your "self") when you want to do something you are told (you know) you are not to do, in order to justify your "self," i.e., in order to convince your "self" that it is (or was) the right thing to do in the situation, so that you can do it, i.e., enjoy the "lust" of the 'moment' without having a guilty conscience. The more who are in agreement with you, i.e., "affirming," i.e., exalting your "lust" of the 'moment,' the more "right" it becomes in your eyes (which is "the pride of life"). "Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the LORD: though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished." Proverbs 16:5
When you discuss what you know—(prior learned facts that you have been taught and believe or are convinced are right or true, making all other answers or responses wrong or false, unless you can be persuaded or convinced that they are right or true)—you are not easily changeable, you are not readily adaptable to the current situation. But when you dialogue with others, and others dialogue with you, you and they must both suspend right and wrong, i.e., set aside established facts and truth (prejudice) for the 'moment' in order to allow each other the opportunity to share their "feelings" or "perception" of the 'moment,' i.e., in order to allow everyone an "equality of opportunity" to share their opinion of the 'moment,' which makes everyone easily 'changeable,' i.e., readily adaptable to or influenced by the current situation, making everyone's desire for the pleasures, enjoyments, "lusts" of the 'moment' (because of the "tolerance," i.e., approval of or "affirmation" of each others opinion) appear not to be wrong, bad, or evil but appear to be right instead. When you discuss things with your "self" you have to humble, deny, control, discipline (restrain, reprove, correct, or rebuke) your "self," i.e., set aside your "feelings" (your desires, i.e., your pleasures, enjoyments, "lusts") of the 'moment,' you have to restrain your "self" as you preach and reach to your "self" facts and truth, i.e., right and wrong you have been taught (or are being taught)—which "in the day" was a sign of you becoming mature, but when you dialogue with your "self" you end up esteeming (justifying) your "self," with you and your "self" becoming best of friends, making your "feelings" (your desires, i.e., your pleasures, enjoyments, "lusts") of the 'moment' and the situation that is stimulating them your ground of being, making them right in your eyes. Unlike in a discussion, where established facts and truth directs your steps, in dialogue, your "feelings" of the 'moment' and the situation that is stimulating them "helps" you decide right from wrong, resulting in your desires and interests of the 'moment' (your heart's desires of the 'moment' and the situation that is stimulating them, along with those manipulating the situation) directing your steps, blinding you to the consequence of your actions. "O LORD, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." Jeremiah 10:23

Einstein came up with $E=MC^2$ filling up blackboards with "is" and "not," i.e., "two plus two is four and can not be any other number" (facts and truth), not "I feel" and "I think" (opinions). True science deals with matter, i.e., it matters that you get (or do) things right and not wrong, i.e., there is a consequence to your actions—no matter how you feel or what you think in the 'moment.' "So called science" (dialectic 'reasoning'), i.e., basing "facts" and "truth" on your "feelings" of the 'moment' (or on your opinion) is in essence "anti-matter," i.e., "It doesn't matter what you say I can or can not do or tell me is right or wrong, I'm going to do what I 'feel' like doing i.e., what I want to do, I'm going to do what I 'think' is right, i.e., what "seems to be" right for me in the 'moment' (in this situation)."

True science only deals with material things (either-or, right-wrong, is-is not, i.e., that which is "observable and repeatable," i.e., constant, i.e., unchanging). When adults teach and children accept the so called "scientific method" (the dialectic process of 'change,' i.e., of "more or less," of generalization, theory, opinion)—[note: opinions are "of and for" the flesh, tolerating wrong answers for the sake of initiating or augmenting pleasure and/or avoiding or attenuating pain, resulting in the person 'justifying' their "perception" of the situation as being "right" since their "facts" and "truth," i.e., "feelings" (whether imagined or real) are "observable and definable" [Benjamin Bloom] which is not true science which is "observable and repeatable"]) as their way of thinking, all they can do is evaluate and produce that which is "of and for" their carnal nature, i.e., "of and for" their impulses and urges of the 'moment,' making right and wrong subject to their "self interest"—to whatever makes them "feel good" in the 'moment,' i.e., subject to the law of the flesh, i.e., subject to the law of sin. Making behavior subject to opinion (uniting "theory and practice," i.e., uniting the flesh and the world, i.e., making them one and the same) 'liberates' the child from parental restraint, i.e., 'liberates' man from Godly restraint, negating the father's authority system (right-wrong) in their feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in their relationship with one another and the world, negating the guilty conscience (the voice of the parent) for doing wrong, replacing it with the so called "super-ego" (the voice of the flesh, the "village," and the
world) in the process.

Evolution (which is grounded upon opinions, i.e., theories, i.e., "I feel" and "I think," and not true science, which is grounded upon facts and truth, i.e., "is" and "is not," right and wrong) is, for example, man's effort to 'justify' his carnal nature (his carnal thoughts and actions), i.e., Immanuel Kant's "lawfulness (of man's carnal nature, i.e., of his impulses and urges of the 'moment') without (the) law (of God, i.e., of unnatural restraint)." It is man's effort to cut off any discussion of (and therefore any sense of guilt for) his sins against God, removing any awareness of God's judgment upon him for his unrighteous/abominable thoughts and actions. In a class discussing true science, anyone mentioning God as creator can be approved, in any class dialouging "so called science," anyone mentioning God as creator can not be approved, i.e., has to be rejected, the language (the means of communication, i.e., the dialouging of opinions to a consensus, i.e., to an approval of the group) demands it. 1 John 2,15-17

Those promoting dialectic 'reasoning' seduce you (bait you) into thinking that your children are studying, facts and truth, when in truth they are deceiving you (switching the subject to the dialouging of their feelings or opinion regarding personal-social issues), using "so called science" (perceiving their "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., their response to the current situation or stimulant—group setting or group approval—as being the ground from which to determine facts and truth by) in order to manipulate your children into questioning your commands and rules and challenging your facts and truth, i.e., into questioning and challenging your authority. Is that to hard to understand? It appears it is, as we have now embraced "behavior science," "human resource," and the "consensus process" (determining right and wrong from the children's, i.e., "the groups" "feelings" or their perceived "felt needs" of the 'moment') as the way of life. To turn your children into one of Thorndike's chickens, Pavlov's dogs, or Skinners rats, so that they can seduced, deceived, and manipulated as "human resource," the facilitator of 'change' must first draw them into dialogue, preventing them from discussing what is right and what is wrong behavior, as established by God, you (their parent), their teacher, their boss, etc., preventing 'change.'

As Carl Rogers admitted (regarding therapy, i.e., the dialouging of opinions to a consensus, i.e., removing the guilty conscience for doing wrong, i.e., negating the father's authority system in the feelings, thoughts, and actions of the child), "Prior to therapy the person is prone to ask himself 'What would my parents want me to do?' During the process of therapy the individual comes to ask himself 'What does it mean to me?'") (Carl Rogers, on becoming a person : A Therapist View of Psychotherapy) In other words the child, during therapy, i.e., during his affective classroom experience, will ask himself "What can I get out of this for me?"
(not self interest) instead of "What would my parent's say?" (obedience), the worker will ask himself "What can I get out of this for me?" instead of "What would my boss say?" your spouse will ask himself (or herself )"What can I get out of this for me?" instead of "What would my wife (or my husband) say?" the legislator (or the representative) will ask himself "What can I get out of this for me?" instead of "What would my constituents (or does the constitution) say?" the minster will ask himself "What can I get out of this for me?" instead of "What would God (or does the Word of God) say?" with the parents, the boss, the spouse, the constituents, the constitution, God's Word becoming 'irrational' in the current situation and therefore 'irrelevant.'

Accountability to one, i.e., to God, to the father, to the teacher, to the boss, etc. (who demands that you do things right and not wrong) is different than accountability to the many, i.e., to the "group" (which demands 'compromise,' i.e., that you to set aside wrong, i.e., 'judgmentalism,' i.e., "prejudice" in order to "get along"). "Beneficial prejudice" is acceptable since it places "feelings" over and therefore against facts and truth, when they get in the way. It is therefore the "common-ism" of the child's carnal nature with the other children of the world which makes it possible for the child to transcend the father's authority system—which divides him from the other children of the world.
The difference between the earthly father's/the Heavenly Father's authority system (which are the same in structure, i.e., right-wrong, above-below, etc., i.e., Hebrews 12:5-11, with the child or man evaluating and 'judging' himself and the world around him from his father's/Father's standards, i.e., Romans 7:11-25, as Jesus did during His temptations in the wilderness, i.e., "It is written ..." Matthew 4:1-11) and the child's "feelings" system (with the child evaluating and 'justifying' himself and the world around him according to his "feelings" or desires of the 'moment,' as the woman did in the garden in Eden, i.e., Genesis 3:1-6, and man has done ever since, acting as though he is God, righteous in and of himself, doing what he wants to do when he wants to do it, with no fear of one above him telling him what he can and can not do in the 'moment,' i.e., judging him for his thought and actions) is key to understanding the affect dialectic 'reasoning' has upon your child, negating their faith in you, your commands, rules, facts, and truth as well as negating their faith in God and His Word. By "leaning to their own understanding" they replace faith with trusting in themselves, i.e., trusting in their "feelings" of the 'moment,' in the "group," the "community," and the world and all that it has to offer them (in pleasure) in the 'moment' as well as in the future. Immanuel Kant, in Critique of Pure Reason ('justifying' dialectic 'reasoning'), placed the child's/man's hope in pleasure (in himself and the world), instead of in the Lord. "Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD." "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the LORD, and whose hope the LORD is." Jeremiah 17:5, 7 "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart, and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths." Proverb. 3: 5-6

The father's authority system—the Patriarchal Paradigm—is to: (1) preach commands and rules to be obeyed (as given), teach facts and truth to be accepted as is (by faith), and discuss, at his discretion, that which is not understood or misunderstood by the child, to (2) bless or reward the child who obeys or does things right, to encourage them to continue to obey and do things right, to (3) chasten or punish the child who disobeys or does things wrong, to encourage them to obey and do what is right, and to (4) cast out the child who disrespects the father's authority system, i.e., who questions the father and challenges his authority, in order to encourage him to repent, to return to where reasoning is subject to doing right and not wrong (righteousness) and not to their "feelings" of the 'moment' (sensuousness). While dad and mom are not perfect, they may be down right tyrants, their office is perfect—given to them by God to serve Him in.

The child's "feelings" system—the Heresiarchal Paradigm—is to dialogue (to himself and with others) his opinion, i.e., his desires and dissatisfactions (his "felt needs") of the 'moment,' i.e., is to: (1) approach pleasure and to (2) avoid pain, where 'reasoning' is subject to his "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., where the 'drive' of life is the approaching of pleasure and the avoiding of pain (like an ameba) and the 'purpose' of life is to augment pleasure and attenuate pain, negating the resister of 'change' (the "change resister") in the name of "progress," i.e., "peace and affirmation," i.e., "building relationships," i.e., "worldly peace and socialist harmony," negating the "guilty conscience" in the process.

The father's authority system uses pain—punishment, i.e., the child missing out on the reward because they did things wrong and/or chastening for disobeying—in order to produce a guilty conscience in the child for disobeying or a feeling of disappointment for doing things wrong, resulting in the child holding himself accountable for his thoughts and actions (self-control, self-discipline, humbling and denying of self to do what is right). The child's "feelings" system affects the child with pain—the pain of rejection by others for getting in the way of their pleasure and the fear of missing out on pleasure because of their rejection of him—in order to remove the guilty conscience for disobeying or the feeling of disappointment for doing things wrong, blaming someone or something else for his (or others) bad or evil behavior, which he (esteeming himself, i.e., being esteemed or approved by others) does not see as being bad (or that bad) or evil, as Adam and the woman did in the garden in Eden before God. To
augment pleasure and attenuate pain is not bad or evil in and of itself, but when man (or the child) places it over (above) the Father's authority system he becomes evil, turning himself (his feelings, thoughts, and actions) against the Father and His authority system. Parental authority is negated (becomes moribund) when the child's feelings of the 'moment,' i.e., his opinion is used as the foundation from which to determine right from wrong. If the child starts with and remains 'loyal' to the father's/Fathers commands, rules, facts, and truth, his feelings remain subject to his fathers/Father's authority system, but if he starts with and remains 'loyal' to his feelings of the 'moment,' the father's/Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth become subject to his interpretation or opinion of the 'moment,' negating the father's/Father's authority system in his feelings, thoughts, and actions and in his relationship with others.

The fathers' authority system is based upon the preaching of commands and rules and the teaching of facts and truth while the child's "feelings" system is to dialogue his opinion, i.e., how he "feels" and what he "thinks" in the 'moment,' i.e., his desires and his dissatisfactions (first within himself and later, if possible, with others)—which is the language of psychology, i.e., psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. The father's system of right-wrong is established upon an "either-or," making everybody subject to doing right and not wrong, and the child's system of pleasure-pain is ever 'changing,' i.e., a "more or less," making everybody subject to their "feelings" of the 'moment' and the situation stimulating them.

For example: the child, desiring to go out and play with his friends (doing something he wants to do that is pleasurable to him in the 'moment,' which includes the pleasure which comes from the approval of those who he wants to have pleasure with) is stopped by the father's command "You can not go out." The child then has the options of either obeying, disobeying, or responding with "Why?" This "Why?" is not seeking for more commands, rules, facts and truth to obey, but is instead an effort on the part of the child to draw the father into dialogue, i.e., to 'change' the way the father is communicating—"Well I don't feel like you should go out." or "I don't think you should go out."—which carries with it no father's authority, the father thereafter having no right to chasten (reproof, correct, or rebuke) his child for doing wrong or for disobeying, since dialogue is not a command, rule, fact, or truth but only an opinion, i.e., how the father is feeling and what he is thinking in the 'moment' regarding the situation.

You can not chasten or discipline your children when you give them your opinion. There is no judgment, condemnation, conviction, contrition, or repentance in an opinion. An opinion, i.e., how you "feel" and what you "think" in the 'moment' is always subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to the situation of the 'moment' and your perception of it (sight). When you respond to your children's "Why?" with dialogue, you and your children become equal, subject to each others "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment,' i.e., subject to 'compromise' and 'change' for the sake of initiating or sustaining relationship, based right and wrong upon your and their emotions of the 'moment,' not upon facts or truth (doctrine). Doctrine established upon God's Word makes man subject to God's Word. Doctrine established upon man's opinion of God's Word makes God's Word subject to man, i.e., subject to man's "feelings" and "thoughts" of the 'moment'—as is done in the apostate "church." You don't want your children following you (your opinion) following the Lord. You want your children following the Lord or they might end up in a cult, following after a man's (or a woman's) opinion.

It is here that you, as a parent (as God) respond with "Because I said so" ("Because God says so," i.e., "I Am, That I Am"), cutting off dialogue, preventing you from being pulled into compromise, i.e., abdicating your position of authority (setting aside your commands, rules, facts, and truth) for the sake of relationship (feelings). It is not that parents, i.e., that fathers do not discuss things with their children, they do. It is important that you share with your children your knowledge about things, which are subordinate to doing what is right and not wrong (as established by God or the laws of nature—which are established by God) as they share their knowledge with you (which makes it a discussion rather than dialogue). If you start with dialogue ("equality," letting you and your child's "feelings" of the 'moment' determine what is right and what is wrong) you can not move your conversation to a discussion (restore
your position of authority, i.e., return to facts and truth) without your child "feeling" betrayed. Like leaving one foot on a dock (basing right and wrong upon established facts and truth) and placing the other in a boat leaving the dock (basing right and wrong upon your child's "feelings" of the 'moment') you will eventually have to jump to the one (discussion, insisting that your position is right) or the other (dialogue, 'justifying' your child's "feelings" of the 'moment') or fall into the water (become 'irrational' and therefore 'irrelevant,' which you have already become by entering into dialogue with your child in the first place). Any "Why?" seeking more information (in order to do the job right or to better understand the command, rule, fact, or truth) is an honoring of the father's authority system—the father says "Birds fly." the child asks "Why?" the father says "Because they have wings." the child asks "Why?" the father says "Because God made them that way." etc., Because means "some being (God or I) caused it to be." In essence you are saying to your child, when you say "Because I say so," "I am the creator and you are the created," i.e., "I caused it (you) to be."

But when the father gives the child commands, rules, facts, and truth, which the child does not want to obey or accept as is (by faith), since it is getting in the way of what the child wants to do, the child (of rebellion) responds with a "Why?" in order to get the father into dialogue, i.e., tempting the father into abdicating his position of authority (so that the child can do what he wants to do, which may not be evil, wrong, or bad in and of itself), the father has to respond either with "Because I said so," which carries with it the potential of action (correction, reproof, rebuke, punishment, or chastening) if the child continues, cutting off dialogue or else respond (to the child's "Why?") with a discussion, explaining to the child the facts or truth and the consequence of the child's thoughts and actions, i.e., why he must do what is right and not do what is wrong, or else the father will go into dialogue, abdicating right-wrong as a way of thinking and acting for the sake of the child's (and his) "feelings" of the 'moment,' i.e., initiating and sustaining relationship with the child for the sake of social harmony instead of teaching him to do what is right and not wrong—doing right and not wrong, no matter the loss of pleasure and/or the pain which might come his way. After all, the word witness (holding fast to the truth no matter what) comes from the Greek word μαρτυρία (martyr).

The example of the father responding to the child's "Why?" (in regard to the fact or truth that "Birds fly.") is a discussion, as the father never stepped outside of his position of authority, giving the child information (facts and truth) he needed (wanted) to know in the 'moment' in order to better understand the subject, while the other "Why?" (the child responding to the father's command or rule) was an attempt on the part of the child to draw the father into dialogue, so that the child could have his way, do what he wanted to do in the 'moment.' In the father's discussion with his child (presenting the facts and truth of his position), the child learns the father's position in order to present it when he is confronted with the temptation to establish his "feeling" ("felt needs") of the 'moment' over and against the father's authority, such as Jesus did in the wilderness ("It is written, ... "), presenting the source (authority) above him, giving him his position. Remember Jesus, humbling himself, took on the form of a man under God (even thou he was equal with God), in order to become as a child under a father's authority, i.e., obey His Heavenly Father in all things, that we might come to know His Heavenly Father's love for us through Him (through His obedience).

While dialogue is a key ingredient of true science, questioning what is to find out what can be, with nature being an either your theory or opinion is right, a law of nature, i.e., observable and repeatable, or it is wrong, not a law of nature, not observable and repeatable, giving you or revealing to you a law established by God, any attempt to dialogue, when it comes to truth (as given by God, the parent, the teacher, etc.,) to be accepted as is, as given in the 'moment,' by faith is an act of challenging and questioning the authority system, questioning and challenging doing wrong, making the authority system subject to the "feelings" of the 'moment,' subject to the world, i.e., subject to "human nature" only.
For example: "higher order thinking skills" or "critical thinking," i.e., the questioning of what "is," i.e., the questioning of established laws, in order to 'discover' what can be, i.e., to prove a theory or an opinion right is essential when it comes to true science, but when it is used to develop man's morals, values, and ethics (what 1 Timothy 6:20 calls "so called science," what we, as believers are to "avoid"), it makes right and wrong subject to our feelings of the 'moment,' i.e., subject to our "ought," which is "of and for" our carnal nature, subject to the world only. Socrates was sentenced to death for two reasons: he (his "critical thinking" method) corrupted the morals of the youth and destroyed faith in authority. A direct correlation can be made from its use in the classroom (including home school material) to the attitude change children have towards their parents. "Bloom's [Marzano's, Webb's] Taxonomies" (used for teacher certification and school accreditation, with Christian teachers and schools included, even being used by companies developing homeschooling material and curriculum) are instrumental in turning children against their parent's authority and individualism, with "private convictions" under God, turning them to the authority of the facilitator of 'change' and "group approval" instead, engendering socialism. In essence, according to dialectic 'reasoning,' children must have an external source which resists their nature, i.e., which restrains their carnal desires of the 'moment' in order for them to "realize" and then "actualize" dialectic 'reasoning' ("self" justification), 'discovering' and using "higher order thinking skills" or "critical thinking" (i.e., the child, being dissatisfied with the way things are, begins thinking about how the world "ought" to be) to 'liberate' themselves, i.e., their carnal nature (that which they have in common with all the children of the world) from any external (unnatural) source, i.e., parental authority, which tells them what is right and what is wrong, i.e., inculcating belief, i.e., "repressing" them, "alienating" them from themselves and from the other children of the world.

"[Students] satisfied with things as they are must be helped to acquire convictions for change and arrive at that state of dissatisfaction." "[Students] will not come into full partnership in the process until they register dissatisfaction toward authority." "We must develop persons who see non-influenceability of private convictions in joint deliberations who have a "guilty conscience" when tempted to compromise, i.e., who refuse to compromise in order to gain "group approval"] as a vice rather than a virtue." (Kenneth Benne, Human Relations in Curriculum Change) "The individual may have 'secret' thoughts which he will under no circumstances reveal to anyone else if he can help it. To gain access is particularly important, for here may lie the individual's potential." (Theodor Adorno, The Authoritarian Personality) Without gaining access to the child's "secret" thoughts, i.e., his desires and his dissatisfactions, his potential for 'change' can not be set into motion. This is where dialogue, i.e., your child sharing in the classroom how they feel and what they "think" regarding authority, comes into play.

When your home school reading material asks your child to respond with facts and truths they have learned in the lesson, they are participating in traditional, facts based education, reflecting the father's authority system. But when they are asked for their opinion (how they feel and what they think), they are participating in transformational, "affective" based, i.e., feelings based education, i.e., they are being encouraged to bypass or circumvent what "is," i.e., your commands, rules, facts, and truth, directly affecting their respect and response toward you and your authority. Why would you allow your child to be taught anything you did not believe? Replacing the preaching and teaching of commands, rules, facts, and truth to be learned ("as is"), with the dialoguing of opinions (how the world "ought" to be, according to the child's feelings of the 'moment') is essential to the introduction of socialism into education, which negates the father's authority system in your child's feelings, thoughts, and actions, and in his relationship with others, turning him into a socialist, i.e., into a liberal. 34 It is what the "new" world order is all about, following the same method, system, paradigm, procedure, or curriculum as was used by the first (master) facilitator of 'change' in the garden in Eden, 'liberating' two "children" from the Father's authority system, i.e., "helping" them to think for themselves, negating the Father's authority system (faith), i.e., 'changing' them from a biblical: right-wrong, above-below, heaven-hell, spirit-flesh, good-evil, light-dark, saved-lost, righteous-unrighteous, redeemed-unredeemed, either-or and no in between—what if's, maybe's, or but's way of thinking to a pleasure-pain ("feelings" of the 'moment') way
of thinking, equating right to pleasure and wrong to pain, negating right and wrong being established upon the father's/Father's authority (to be accepted by faith), negating the guilty conscience for doing wrong in the process. In this way socialists do not have to kill the father and those who honor the father's or parent's authority system (as was done in the French and Marxist, i.e., socialist, i.e., Communist revolutions around the world) but by simply using the child's classroom experience, facilitators of 'change' can "help" the children 'change' their feelings, thoughts, actions, and the way they relate with themselves and others, as well as respond to authority, 'changing' their 'loyalty' to the one above to the many below, thereafter using the "velvet revolution," i.e., civil disobedience (which is not really "velvet" or "civil") to 'change' the world, making the world "safe for democracy."

Do you not think that when the parent's and the son or daughter go at one another because some facilitator of 'change,' i.e., psychotherapist has convicted the son or daughter that they do not have to listen to their parent's any more is not a violence revolution that is taking place in the home? It is why Bloom could confidently write in his so called "Taxonomy": "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: The Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook 2, Affective Domain)

It is a subtle but complex process with major ramifications, as Adam and the woman learned in the garden in Eden. Our "feelings" or desires of the 'moment,' when placed above commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., 'living for the 'moment'' blind us to the consequence (immorality and hate which come out) of our thoughts and actions.

Be forewarned, youth groups commonly use this process to grow their membership, using the youth's opinion of God's Word to grow "the group," as the contemporary "church" uses men's opinions to grow their "church," instead of preaching and teaching the Word of God as is, letting the Word of God and the Holy Spirit do their work, bringing man to repentance, forgiveness, and salvation before God, with the Lord adding to the fellowship as He wills. The first commandment (of the first four commandments—the sacred commandments—which deal with you before God) commands that you honor God's authority above all (placing no other father's authority above Him—exactly what Jesus did and has called us to do), the fifth commandment (of the next six commandments—the secular commandments—which deal with you and your neighbors) starts with you honoring your father and mother (parental authority), with all the rest following after. Satan did not go after the Father, he went after the Father's authority system in the garden in Eden. 'Liberate' the child's feelings and thoughts from the father's authority system and you have succeeded in turning him against the father. While Jesus came to divide the father from the son, he did not come to negate the father's authority system. He only wants us to obey His Heavenly Father above all things, even above our earthly father, leaving the system in place, with us instilling it in our children. The "new" world order is using the dialectic process in order to remove the Father's authority system in our children, leaving them with only the carnal system of the child, i.e., with the child's desires of the flesh and eyes along with his dissatisfaction with restraint, i.e., his resentment and hatred toward the restrainer, following after "the prince of the power of the air" instead.

Hegel, Marx, and Freud understood this. We have not because we have become like Israel, who (wanting to be like the world) wanted an earthly king between them and God, placing a man (subject to the flesh and men's opinions) between them and God (instead of His judges preaching and teaching the truth) so that they could do their own thing without having a "guilty conscience," i.e., without having a "fear of God" for doing wrong. It is not that your children, after they have left the home, have to turn to you for direction and advice, it is that they should turn to their Heavenly Father and His Son, Jesus Christ, with you coming alongside them, encouraging them in their walk, leaving the system in place. "And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." 1 John 3:1
Read the issues *ARP* and *The Key to 'Change* and the article *Diaprax Exposed* which reveal the hatred "educators" who 'reason' dialectically have toward the father's/Father's authority system.
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1. What are the differences between traditional and transformational education?
2. Why can "Higher Order Thinking Skills" be used on nature but cannot be used to determine right and wrong behavior when it comes to the child (and man)?
3. What is the difference between discussion and dialogue?
4. How is the child's way of thinking 'changed' through the dialoging of his or her opinion with others?
5. What is the difference between the father's authority system (the father's way of thinking and acting) and the child's "feeling" system (the child's way of thinking and acting)?
6. Give examples in scripture.
7. How do you prepare your children to respond to those "affected" with transformational education?
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