

"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." Proverbs 3:5, 6

I Keep Repeating.

([Personal note.](#))

by

Dean Gotcher

"For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." 1 John 2:16

Intro:

Just some quotations and verses to think about, that is, to get started with. Several will be repeated again below, later on.

*"By dialectic, I mean an activity of consciousness, struggling to circumvent the limitations imposed by the formal-logical law of contradiction. (Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*)*

All Brown is saying is "I'm trying to figure out how I can get around what my parents just *told* me to do." There is a way. In *dialogue*, that is in the dialectic process or through dialectic 'reasoning,' that is 'reasoning' from your carnal "feelings" (sensation) of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating*, thus 'justifying' your self. In the *praxis* of *dialogue*, "I feel" and "I think" there is no Father's authority, "I know, because I have been told," where the Father has the final say, "Because I said so," "It is written." The same is true for an *opinion*, as well as for the *consensus* process. In *dialogue* the individual's carnal desires, that is his or her *self interest* of the 'moment,' that is *lust* being 'justified' is all there is. In *dialogue* you are god—since everyone is entitled to their *opinion*, a god amongst gods. That is until their *opinion* gets in the way of your *self interest*, your *lust*. That is why those "of and for the world" want *consensus*, where everyone's *self interest*, that is *lust* is 'justified,' thus 'justifying' (*affirming*) their *lusts* (that is their *lust* for pleasure which includes their *lust* for the approval or *affirmation* of men). In dialectic 'reasoning' *lust* is 'justified,' the Father's authority is rejected (*negated*), truth is from below, subjective, "of the world," subject to 'change' not from above, objective, from God the Father, established forever. As man turns to *dialogue*, to dialectic 'reasoning,' to his *self interest*, to his carnal nature to define and establish behavior the Father's authority, fear of judgment, condemnation, being cast out for sinning is *negated* in his mind, directly effecting his behavior, turning him against the Father and His authority, silencing, censoring, removing anyone who, walking in faith adheres to the Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, expecting others to do the same, that is who refuses to 'change.' 'Change' to the world is all about *stimulus-response*, *lust* for pleasure and resentment toward restraint, requiring the removal of the Father's authority in order for man to sin without having a *guilty conscience*, that is to think and act according to his carnal nature without fearing judgment, condemnation, being cast out. For those "of and for the world," when it comes to behavior *dialogue*, that is *lust* for pleasure and resentment toward restraint, that is *self interest* is all there is. From the garden (in Eden) on *dialogue* is all the carnally minded man has to 'justify' his *lusts*, repeating it over and over again, 'justifying' himself, his *lusts* (until judgment day, when the Father has the final say). "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." Isaiah 55:8, 9 "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Matthew 6:24 "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" Romans 6:16 "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled,

we shall be saved by his life." Romans 5:8-10 "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." 1 John 1:9

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

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

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

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

Jürgen Habermas, one of the youngest and probably smartest of a group of Marxists, known as the "Frankfurt School," who, fleeing Fascist Germany came to America in the early 30's wrote *"In the dialogic relation of recognizing oneself in the other, they experience the common ground of their existence."* ([Jürgen Habermas, Knowledge and Human Interest, Chapter Three: The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory](#))

Habermas is here explaining how effective *dialogue* is in bypassing the Father's authority system in order for people to become at-one-with one another based upon what they have in common, their *lust* for pleasure and their resentment toward the Father's authority for getting in the way.

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

Karl Marx was simply stating that *self* is actualized in pleasure, that is in *lust* unrestrained by the Father's authority. For 'change' to take place you must start with what man has in common, that is his *lust* for pleasure and resentment toward restraint, not with what divides him from one another, that is with the Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, with the Father judging, condemning, casting those out who do wrong, disobey, sin, that is sin against Him. In *lust* you 'change' with the environment before you (known as *stimulus-response*), approaching pleasure and avoiding pain, which includes the pain of missing out on pleasure, making *stimulus-response* your method of 'reasoning,' rejecting the Father and His established commands, rules, facts, and truth which prevent change.

Karl Marx wrote *"It is not individualism that fulfills the individual, on the contrary it destroys him. Society is the necessary framework through which freedom and individuality are made realities."* (Karl Marx, in John Lewis, *The Life and Teachings of Karl Marx*)

In other words, according to Karl Marx the child having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* his *"self"* in order to do the Father's will is not what *"fulfills"* the child. *"On the contrary"* it is the Father's authority, that is the child having to do right and not wrong according to the Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth that *"destroys him,"* that is that prevents him from becoming his *self*, thinking and acting according to his carnal nature, that is according to what he has in common with all the children of the world, his and their natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure and hate restraint. The child's desire for approval from others, requiring him to compromise in order to "get along," that is in order to *build relationship "is the necessary framework through which freedom"* from the Father's authority and *"freedom"* to *lust* after pleasure, that is to do what he wants without having a *guilty conscience* (which the Father's authority engenders) *"are made reality."*

Georg Hegel, in *System of Ethical Life* wrote *"The child, contrary to appearance, is the absolute, the rationality of the relationship; he is what is enduring and everlasting, the totality which produces itself once again as such."* (Georg Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*)

That is once the child is 'liberated' from the Father's authority to become as he was before the Father's first command, rule, fact, or truth came into his life (separating him from his "self" and the world), making him "of and for self" and the world only—which *dialogue*, when applied to behavior does.

Karl Marx, in his *Fourth Thesis on Feuerbach* wrote "Once the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the Holy family, the former must then itself be destroyed [vernichtet, that is annihilated, that is negated] in theory and in practice [theoretically and practically]." (Karl Marx, *Fourth Thesis on Feuerbach*)

Karl Marx was simply stating since (in his mind) God, the Heavenly Father was created by the children submitting to their earthly father's authority in the home (associated with *discussion*, where the Father has the final say), the earthly father's authority in the home (as well as in government) must be *negated* if "the people" were to think and act in harmony with their carnal nature and the world that *stimulates* it, creating "worldly peace" and "socialist harmony."

Karl Marx wrote, regarding the child obeying the Father, that is doing the Father's will instead of his own, "*The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force.*" (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3)

Thus, for Karl Marx "*Laws must not fetter human life [that is laws must not restrain the child, that is inhibit or block the child's propensity to lust]; but yield to it; they must change as the needs [that is the child's "felt needs" or lusts change] and capacities of the people change [that is his ability to carry them out change].*" (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*)

If one child chewing gum in the class is wrong (breaking the rules) then have all the children in the class chew gum (*negate* the rules) and he becomes right. This is dialectic 'reasoning' being put into *praxis*.

All teachers are certified, and schools accredited today based upon the use of "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" as their curriculum in the classroom. In the second taxonomy, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain* we read "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" are "*a psychological classification system*" used "*to develop attitudes and values ... which are not shaped by the parents,*" "*The student must feel free to say he disliked _____ and not have to worry about being punished for his reaction.*" "... a large part of what we call 'good teaching' is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives through challenging the student's fixed beliefs ..." "*The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box.'*" "*The affective domain contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people.*" (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*) Pandora's box is a box full of evil, which opened cannot be closed.

In the first taxonomy, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain* we read, "*We recognize the point of view that truth and knowledge are only relative and that there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all time and places.*" (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*)

Karl Marx's ideology, as explained by Friedrich Engels was the same as Benjamin Bloom's. He wrote "*In the eyes of the dialectic philosophy, nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred.*"

Benjamin Bloom, in the second taxonomy listed two Marxists, Erick Fromm and Theodor Adorno as his and therefore the "*taxonomies*" "*Weltanschauung*" (that is world view). Both men were members of "The Frankfurt School."

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

[Theodor Adorno](#), in his book *The Authoritarian Personality*, which Bloom refers to wrote: *"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." "Submission to authority, desire for a strong leader, subservience of the individual to the state [parental authority, local control, Nationalism], and so forth, have so frequently and, as it seems to us, correctly, been set forth as important aspects of the Nazi creed that a search for correlates of prejudice had naturally to take these attitudes into account." "The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem."* The error in Adorno's 'logic' is that all forms of socialism must *negate* the father's authority in the home and the Father's authority in the mind of men in order for the socialist to rule over "the people." By generalizing the patriarchal paradigm, which includes God himself is falsely equated to "Fascism."

What is rejected in the curriculum and therefore missing in the classroom is the Father's authority system, directly effecting the students' way of thinking and acting. Thus, Bloom could write in the second taxonomy, *"There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children."*

In the second taxonomy Bloom wrote, *"What we are classifying is the intended behavior of students—the ways in which individuals are to act, think, or feel as the result of participating in some unit of instruction." "... ordering and relating the different kinds of affective behavior." "... we need to provide the range of emotion from neutrality through mild to strong emotion, probably of a positive, but possibly also of a negative, kind." "... organized into value systems and philosophies of life ..."* *"...many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in some ways brought into question while more rational and nonauthoritarian behaviors are emphasized."*

Forty years after the publication of the first taxonomy bloom wrote *"Certainly the Taxonomy was unproved at the time it was developed and may well be 'unprovable.'"* (Benjamin Bloom, *Forty Year Evaluation*) Bloom admitted that his taxonomy was only a *theory*, an *opinion*. Yet if you do not accept it as fact and apply it in the classroom, applying the Father's authority system in the classroom instead, you will be punished. Ask any teacher.

Ervin Laszlo, who organized and promoted the "climate change" agenda wrote *"Bypassing the traditional channels of 'top-down' decision making our objective center's upon transforming public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics." "Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common [lust] interests and ultimately to world interests, transforming public consensus into one favorable to the emergence of a stable and humanistic world order." "Consensus 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*

Lazlo was simply explained how the soviet system worked, where policy was (and still is) made through the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* process, which rejects (does not recognize) the Father's authority system (*"top-down decision making,"* known as the *Patriarchal paradigm* where the one in authority authors commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as is, by faith and obeyed or applied and enforces them) so the outcome was (and is) void of the Father's authority system in order for all (especially the facilitator of 'change') to do wrong, disobey, sin, that is *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates* without being judged, condemned, and-or cast out, doing so without having a *guilty conscience* (which is engendered by the Father's authority system). Ever been in a facilitated meeting where you were asked to be "positive" and not "negative?" You were in a soviet, where those who are "negative," who insist they and others do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, that is do the Father's will are "asked" (that is pressured by "the group's" to participate or be rejected) to be "positive" or be silenced, censored, and-or cast out (negated) so those who are "positive" can do wrong, disobey, sin, that is *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world *stimulates* without having a *guilty conscience*, doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, that is *lusting* without being 'judged, condemned, cast out, having everyone's *affirmation*.

"Has authority been banished in these later days? Has the world reached a point where it will condone the formation of pupil soviets?" (Will C. Woods, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of California, *March 1921*) The facilitated, "be positive and not negative," open-ended non-directed, *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus*, "group grade" classroom your child is learning to think and behave in is a soviet. A soviet is a diverse group of people (which must including the deviant, the catalyst for 'change'), *dialoguing their opinions* to a *consensus*, over social issues (where social worth becomes more important than the right of the individual, under God, as Kenneth Benne in [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#) stated it, we "must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue"), to a pre-determined outcome (that no policy or law is to be made without the soviet system, that is the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* process, which prevents the Father's authority from establishing policy or making law). When policy and law are established according to *self interests* the victim (whose individual rights were violated by the criminal) becomes the criminal (by forcing his laws upon the criminal, who was simply following "human nature"), who, now becomes the victim—since he has to obey established laws preventing him from becoming his *self* (subject to his carnal nature, that is subject to what he has in common with all that is "of the world"). Anyone holding to established commands, rules, facts, and truth placed in a *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* environment will always be perceived as being argumentative, experiencing terror as his individual rights, under God are replaced (*negated*) with social cause, that is social worth. Your child does not have to be *told* to question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack your authority as a parent (if he or she was not doing it already), all he or she has to do is participate in a classroom using "Bloom's Taxonomies" as its curriculum, that is learn right and wrong behavior in the "group grade" classroom, where he or she must go with "the group," that is become a socialist, replacing individual rights, under God with "social worth," that is be *affirmed* by "the group" or be rejected, that is silence, censored, and-or cast out by it, going with or *affirming* "the group" and he or she will do it automatically.

Irvin D. Yalom, in *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy* wrote "... few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity in the face of apparent group unanimity; and the individual rejects critical feelings toward the group at this time to avoid a state of cognitive dissonance. To question the value or activities of the group, would be to thrust himself into a state of dissonance. Long cherished ... beliefs and attitudes may waver and decompose in the face of a dissenting majority." ([Irvin D. Yalom](#), *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*)

Cognitive dissonance is "the lack of harmony between what one does and what one believes." "The pressure to change either one's behavior or ones belief" (Ernest R. Hilgard, *Introduction to Psychology*)

Kurt Lewin, who, though not being a member of "The Frankfurt School" edited their journal wrote "It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately." "The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group." ([Kurt Lewin](#), in Kenneth Benne's book [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#))

With the Father there is only one in authority, with the Father having the final say. With the facilitation of 'change,' "the group" has the final say, from where we get "group think."

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

Irvin D. Yalom, regarding behavior and the group wrote "There is no type of past behavior too deviant for a group to accept once therapeutic group norms are established." "One of the most fascinating aspects of group therapy is that everyone is born again, born together in the group." (Irvin D. Yalom, *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*)

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

Kurt Lewin along with others believed that *"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*)

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

In Bloom's second taxonomy we read *"To create effectively a new set of attitudes and values, the individual must undergo great reorganization of his personal beliefs and attitudes and he must be involved in an environment which in many ways is separated from the previous environment in which he was developed. . . . many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in some ways brought into question while more rational and nonauthoritarian behaviors are emphasized."* *"The effectiveness of this new set of environmental conditions is probably related to the extent to which the students are 'isolated' from the home during this period of time."* *" . . . objectives can best be attained where the individual is separated from earlier environmental conditions and when he is in association with a group of peers who are changing in much the same direction and who thus tend to reinforce each other."** (Book 2: *Affective Domain*)

Kurt Lewin, the father of, [*Unfreezing, Moving or Changing, Refreezing People*](#), [*Force Field Analysis*](#), and [*Group Dynamics*](#) wrote *"A successful change includes, therefore, three aspects: unfreezing the present level, moving to the new level, and freezing group life on the new level."*

Edger Schein and Warren Bennis explained what "unfreezing" was all about *"In brief, unfreezing is the breaking down of the mores, customs and traditions of an individual – the old ways of doing things – so that he is ready to accept new alternatives."* (Edger Schein and Warren Bennis, *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach*)

Warren Bennis in *Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays in Readings on Human Interaction* explained how "brainwashing" is done by the Communist. Notice the similarity to Bloom's Taxonomies, "replacing physical torture with "group rejection," that is mental torture—in the "group grade" system the whole group gets graded as one. His refusal to participate with the "the group" effects the groups grade. *"The manner in which the prisoner came to be influenced to accept the Communist's definition of his guilt can best be described by distinguishing two broad phases—(1) a process of 'unfreezing,' in which the prisoner's physical resistance, social and emotional supports, self-image and sense of integrity, and basic values and personality were undermined, thereby creating a state of 'readiness' to be influence; and (2) a process of 'change,' in which the prisoner discovered how the adoption of 'the people's standpoint' and a reevaluation of himself from this perspective would provide him with a solution to the problems created by the prison pressure."*

"Most were put into a cell containing several who were further along in reforming themselves and who saw it as their primary duty to 'help' their most backward member to see the truth about himself in order that the whole cell might advance. Each such cell had a leader who was in close contact with the authorities for purposes of reporting on the cell's progress and getting advice on how to handle the Western member . . . the environment undermined the (clients) self-image."

" . . . Once this process of self of self re-evaluation began, the (client) received all kinds of help and support from the cell mates and once again was able to enter into meaningful emotional relationships with others."

(*Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays in Readings on Human Interaction*, ed. Warren G. Bennis, Edgar H. Schein, David E. Berlew, and Fred I. Steele, explaining the steps of what is called "brain washing," that is washing the Father's authority system and therefore Nationalism from the mind of the individual and therefore from society, the same agenda as "*Bloom's taxonomies*")

Why I keep repeating.

"It is all about the Father." If you want to know what the so called "new" world order is it is all about the Father. The *negation* of His authority in the mind of the individual and in society. Since the garden in Eden, where, with the "help" of the master facilitator of 'change' two "children" rejected the "Father's authority," that is what it has been all about. Genesis 3:1-6 is the formula for the so called "new" world order. That is how new the "new" world order is. The "new" world order is you doing what *you want*, questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking the Father and His commands, rules, facts, and truth that are getting in your way. Ever done that? That is the *praxis* of the "new" world order, your *lust* for pleasure, that is "*What can I get out of this situation and-or object, people, or person for my self?*" just waiting to be 'liberated' from the Father's authority so you can sin without having a *guilty conscience*, that is not fear being judged, condemned, or cast out for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning. "*Building relationship upon self interest,*" that is upon "*What can I get out of this situation and-or object, people, or person for myself?*" is the hallmark of Marxism, the "new" world order—as long as you are doing it in the name of "*the people,*" in the act or *praxis* of "*building relationship.*"

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

"From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts." James 4:1-3 (Read [James chapters 4 and 5](#) for the total picture.)

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

". . . for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Romans 3:20

While the heavenly Father is holy and the earthly father is born into sin both have the same authority system, *preaching* commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaching* facts and truth to be accepted as is (at first at least by faith) and applied, *discussing* with those under His authority any questions they might have regarding His commands, rules, facts, and truth, providing He deems it necessary, has time, those under His authority are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking His authority, 2) *rewarding* those who do right and obey, 3) *correcting and-or chastening* those who do wrong and-or disobey, that they might learn to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their "*self*" in order to do right and not wrong according to the established commands, rules, facts, and truth they have been taught (or *told*), that is in order to do the Father's will, and 4) *casting out* (expels or grounds) those who question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack His authority, which retains the Father's authority system in the child's or man's thoughts, directing effecting his actions, resulting in the those under the Father's authority KNOWING right from wrong from being *told* (especially when it comes to behavior).

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

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

"Lawfulness without law." "Purposiveness without purpose." ([Immanuel Kant](#), *Critique of Judgment*) In other words, the law of the flesh, that is the child's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure without the law of the Father, that is the Father's authority getting in the way, becomes the means to knowing right from wrong

behavior, making the "purpose" of life the augmentation of *lust*, 'justifying' the *negation* of the Father and His authority, that is no longer having to do what the Father says.

"Laws must not fetter human life; but yield to it; they must change as the needs and capacities of the people change." (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) In other words, Karl Marx is saying "Laws must not get in the way of my *lusts*."

Those "of and for the world" write about their contempt toward the Father's authority. Defining it so they can destroy it, that is *negate* it. Erick Fromm and Theodor Adorno, for example had that in mind.

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

[Theodor Adorno](#), in his book *The Authoritarian Personality* wrote: *"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." "Submission to authority, desire for a strong leader, subservience of the individual to the state [parental authority, local control, Nationalism], and so forth, have so frequently and, as it seems to us, correctly, been set forth as important aspects of the Nazi creed that a search for correlates of prejudice had naturally to take these attitudes into account." "The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem." The error in Adorno's 'logic' is that all forms of socialism must *negate* the father's authority in the home and the Father's authority in the mind of men in order for the socialist to rule over "the people." By generalizing the patriarchal paradigm, which includes God himself is falsely equated to "Fascism."*

"The peasantry [that is the traditional family] constantly regenerates the bourgeoisie [that is the Father's authority system]—in positively every sphere of activity and life." "We must learn how to eradicate all bourgeois habits, customs, and traditions everywhere." (Vladimir Lenin, Left-Wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder An Essential Condition of the Bolsheviks' Success May 12, 1920)

Theodor Adorno, in *The Authoritarian Personality* stated, *"Our aim is not merely to describe prejudice [that is established commands, rules, facts, and truth that get in the way of lust, that is in the way of "human nature"] but to explain it in order to help in its eradication." As noted before Adorno identifies the source of that prejudice as coming from the home. "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."*

Believing that the Heavenly Father was 'created' by the children obeying their earthly father, their agenda was to 'liberate' the children, the next generation of citizens from the traditional home, with the father in control, 'liberating' society from the Heavenly Father's authority in the process.

All teachers are certified, and school accredited today based upon their use of what is called "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)" in the classroom. In the second *"taxonomy," Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain* Bloom admitted that his *"taxonomies"* were based upon the *"Weltanschauung"* or world view of two Marxists, Theodor Adorno, and Erick Fromm, who were members of a group of Marxists, known as the "Frankfurt School," who, fleeing Fascist Germany came to America in the early 30's, spreading Marxism across America and around the world. Their agenda was to remove the Father's authority from the face of the earth, starting with the traditional home, using the classroom.

"Bloom's Taxonomies" are "a psychological classification system" used "to develop attitudes and values ... which are not shaped by the parents," "The student must feel free to say he disliked _____ and not have to worry about being punished for his reaction." "There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children." (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*)

Benjamin Bloom continued: "The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box.' " "Pandora's Box" is a mythological story of a "box" (originally a jar) full of evils, which once opened, can not be closed—once parental authority, that is the Father's authority, that is fear of judgment, that is "the lid" is removed it is difficult if not impossible to put it back on again. "It is in this 'box' that the most influential controls are to be found." "In fact, a large part of what we call 'good teaching' is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives through challenging the student's fixed beliefs"

James Coleman, who's professor, Paul Lazarsfeld was a member of "The Frankfurt School," was used by the Supreme Court to move education from local control to Federal control, negating the influence of the traditional family with the Fathers' authority in the classroom. "In the traditional society each child is at the mercy of his parents. The 'natural processes' by which they socialize him makes him a replica of them." "Equality of Opportunity [freedom to lust] becomes ever greater with the weakening of family power." "One of the consequence of the increasing social liberation of adolescents is the increasing inability of parents to enforce norms, a greater and greater tendency for the adolescent community to disregard adult dictates." "Strengthening the family to draw the adolescent back into it faces serious problems, as well as some questions about its desirability." "The family has little to offer the child in the way of training for his place in the community." ([James Coleman](#), *The Adolescent Society*)

In the 50's we removed prayer, to the Heavenly Father in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Holy Bible, the Ten Commandments, and the paddle (chastening) from the public classroom, all done by Federal law, replacing traditional education, where commands and rules are *preached*, facts and truth are *taught*, and any questions regarding them are *discussed*, with the one in authority having the final say with Marxist curriculum, where the child's carnal nature, that is the students carnal feelings and carnal thoughts, that is their "*self interest*" (or *lusts*) of the 'moment' is the focus of education and therefore the outcome. This was done in order to remove the gospel message.

The gospel message is all about the Father, with the Son of God, Jesus Christ doing the Father's will, that is doing what he was *told*, even dying on a cross, by his shed blood covering our sins (*propitiation*), doing so in obedience to the Father ("O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." Matthew 26:42) asking all to follow Him doing the Father's will as He leads; "*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.

"I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." John 5:30

"For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." John 12:47-50

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

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

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

It is the Father who authors commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as is (by faith) and obeyed or applied and enforces them. Without the Father there is no being *told* what is right and what is wrong behavior. Without being *told* there is no being held accountable for your behavior. In other words without the Father's authority system there is no law (known as "rule of law"). Without law there is no doing wrong or disobedience. Without disobedience there is no sin. Without sin there is no need of a savior.

"But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."
Romans 5:8-10

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

Whoever denies the Father, denies the law, denies the Son, that is the savior—who, by his shed blood on the cross redeemed us from His Father's judgment upon us for our sins.

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

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." Romans 1:28-32

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

All those who are of the so called "new" world order have to do is find out what you are coveting, that is what you are lusting after, that is your "self interest," offer to "help" you attain (actualize) it and they "own" you. With you, with their "help" "dumping" the Father to do what you want, they will eventually "dump" you, doing to you what you did to the Father, with you reaping what you sowed.

As Carl Rogers explained it, they will not know what happened to them until it is too late, that is until after the deed is done, that is they have sold their soul to him. *"If we have the power or authority to establish the necessary conditions, the predicted behaviors [our potential ability to influence or control the behavior of groups] will follow."* *"We can choose to use our growing knowledge to enslave people in ways never dreamed of before, depersonalizing them, controlling them by means so carefully selected that they will perhaps never be aware of their loss of personhood."* *"We know how to change the opinions of an individual in a selected direction, without his ever becoming aware of the stimuli which changed his opinion."* *"We know how to influence the ... behavior of individuals by setting up conditions which provide satisfaction for needs of which they are unconscious, but which we have been able to determine."* *We can achieve a sort of control under which the controlled though they are following a code much more scrupulously than was ever the case under the old system, nevertheless feel free. They are doing what they want to do, not what they are forced to do."* *"By a careful design, we control not the final behavior, but the inclination to behavior—the motives, the desires, the wishes. The curious thing is that in that case the question of freedom never arises."*

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

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

In dialectic 'reasoning,' that is in the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process there is no Father's authority, therefore there is no established law, therefore there is no disobedience, therefore there is no sin, therefore there is no need of a savior. Therefore, the object of dialectic 'reasoning' is to remove the Father, thus removing the Father's authority, thus removing law, thus removing judgment, condemnation, and being cast out for sinning so man can sin without having a *guilty conscience*, that is so he can sin with impunity.

[György Lukács](#), carrying on the same theme as Kant, Hegel, and Marx in his article *History and Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?* wrote: "... the central problem is to change reality... reality with its 'obedience to laws.'"

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

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

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

Karl Marx, rejecting the father's authority system (*discussion*) built his ideology off of Heraclitus who wrote: "*Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys.*"

While the heavenly Father is holy and the earthly father is born into sin both have the same authority system, *preaching* commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaching* facts and truth to be accepted as is (at first at least by faith) and applied, *discussing* with those under His authority any questions they might have regarding His commands, rules, facts, and truth, providing He deems it necessary, has time, those under His authority are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking His authority, 2) *rewarding* those who do right and obey, 3) *correcting* and-or *chastening* those who do wrong and-or disobey, that they might learn to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* their "*self*" in order to do right and not wrong according to the established commands, rules, facts, and truth they have been taught (or *told*), that is in order to do the Father's will, and 4) *casting out* (expels or grounds) those who question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack His authority, which retains the Father's authority system in the child's or man's thoughts, directing effecting his actions, resulting in the those under the Father's authority KNOWING right from wrong from being *told* (especially when it comes to behavior).

When God created man He did something which he did with nothing else in the creation, He made him a "*living soul.*" "*And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.*" (Genesis 2:7). He then did something which He did with nothing else in the creation, He *told* him what was right and what was wrong behavior and the consequence for disobedience. "*And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*" (Genesis 2:16, 17). Only man can be *told* or *tell* others what is right and what is wrong behavior. Only man can read or write a book. All the rest of the creation is based upon *stimulus-response*—for living organisms, approach pleasure and avoid pain.

The issue is the heart:

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

The heart, thinking pleasure, that is *lust* is the standard for "good" instead of doing the Father's will hates anyone preventing, that is inhibiting or blocking it from enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' it is *lusting* after. The unregenerated heart (the Karl Marx in you) can not see its [hatred toward the Father's authority](#) as being evil, that is "wicked," that is "desperately wicked" because its *lust* for pleasure is standing in the way, 'justifying' the hate. ([Mark 7:21-23](#))

Satan's device is replacing *discussion* (what the father says) with *dialogue* (how the children feel and what they think) when it comes to defining and establishing behavior. All Satan, that is the master facilitator of 'change,' that is the master psychotherapist has to do is *seduce* you into *dialoguing* where *discussion* should be taking place. All he had to do was *seduce* the woman in the garden in Eden into *dialogue*, that is into basing right and wrong behavior upon her "feelings" of the 'moment' (her natural inclination to "touch") that the environment (that "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil") was *stimulating*, thereby *negating discussion*, that is what God (the Father) said regarding right and wrong behavior (where God the Father has the final say). When it comes to knowing right and wrong behavior *discussion* is based upon doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth (which you have been *told*), that is according to what the father says while *dialogue* is based upon your carnal desires, that is your "feelings" of the 'moment' that the world is *stimulating* (*stimulus-response*). Depending upon which you turn to when it comes to behavior defines you as a conservative or a liberal, either walking in faith, that is by what you have been *told* or walking by sight, that is by your "sensuous needs," "sense perception" and "sense experience," known as "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," that is by only that which is "of Nature," that is "of the world." (1 John 2:16, Karl Marx) When *dialogue* becomes the means to establishing right and wrong behavior "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," that is the law of the flesh becomes the law of the land, oppressing the people.

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

For example, the Lord Jesus Christ insisted upon doing and insists upon everyone else doing His Father's will. Not once did he say "What can I get out of this (situation and-or object, person, or group) for myself?"; to feed his flesh or tell anyone else to do the same, which is the language of *dialogue* (as will be explained below).

In a *discussion* the father has the final say. Your position is (and therefore your thoughts and actions are) dependent upon what he says, that is upon what you are *told*. In *dialogue* on the other hand you have to "suspend" (as upon a cross) any established command, rule, fact, or truth, that is what the father says that divides you from others in order for you to build relationship with them and them build relationship with you—built upon your and their common *self-interests* (*lusts*), called "sand" in the Bible.

"And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity. Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it. And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." Matthew 7:23-29

While *discussion* divides upon right-wrong, *dialogue* unites upon what people have in common, that is their *lust* for pleasure (which includes *affirmation* from each other) and their resentment toward restraint (that gets in the way of, that is that inhibits or blocks pleasure). In essence *dialogue* divides between those who 'justify' or *affirm lust*, approving them while rejecting those who, insisting upon doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth doing the father's will inhibit or block the *praxis* of *lust*.

Bohm and Peat, in their book *Science, Order, and Creativity* (explaining *dialogue*) wrote: "A dialogue is essentially a conversation between equals." "The spirit of dialogue, is in short, the ability to hold many points of

view in suspension, along with a primary interest in the creation of common meaning."

When you want to do what you *want* you go to *dialogue*, that is you go to "I feel" and "I think," making your *opinion* the basis for determining right and wrong behavior. When you want to do what is right and not wrong, that is what the father says you go to *discussion* where the father has the final say, that is "because I said so," "It is written." Whether it is a child, a parent, an educator, an employer or an employed, a legislator, a leader, a judge, or a minister it is all the same, with *discussion* holding those under authority accountable to the commands, rules, facts, and truth that they have been *told* and *dialogue* 'liberating them from the commands, rules, facts, and truth that they have been *told*, so they can do what they *want* without having a *guilty conscience* as well as not being held accountable, that is being judged, condemned, cast out for their carnal thoughts and carnal actions. Only by replacing *discussion* (what the father says) with *dialogue* (what the child wants), when it comes to defining and establishing behavior can parental authority be replaced with the child's carnal nature, by what all children have in common.

For example, when you order from a menu you choose those items you like, not ordering those items you do not like, there being a spectrum. If on that day you have to choose something you like less because they are not making what you like, you remain in *dialogue* in order to make the selection. In all of this you communicate with yourself and with others through the language of *dialogue*, like and dislike. But if your doctor has *told* you what you like is not good for you, you communicate with yourself and with others through *discussion*, right and wrong. If you remain in *dialogue*, despite it being bad for you, you will go ahead and eat what you like, doing so without having a *guilty conscience*. If you go to *discussion*, you will more than likely not eat it. If you do you will do so with a *guilty conscience*, knowing what you are doing is wrong. When a professional moves from *discussion*, that is from the check list for the pilot, the proven protocol for the doctor, the constitution for the judge to *dialogue*, making what he or she is doing subject to his or her *opinion*, the outcome becomes unpredictable for the passenger, the patient, the victim, making everything subject to 'change.' If you charge them for doing wrong, if the court goes to *discussion*, they will be found *guilty* but if the court goes to *dialogue*, they will be *told* to do better next time, given a reprimand at the most despite what their actions cost you, that is despite what you have suffered.

R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, in their book *Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law*, explained the effect *dialogue* has upon decisions made in the court room. "*Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state.*"

Karl Marx, in *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'* wrote: "*The justice of state constitutions is to be decided not on the basis of Christianity, not from the nature of Christian society but from the nature of human society.*" Karl Marx, rejecting the father's authority system (*discussion*) built his ideology off of Heraclitus who wrote: "*Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys.*" (Heraclitus's ideology, based upon *dialogue* influenced the Stoics). Our highest court, in *Strauss Vs. Strauss.*, 3 So. 2nd 727, 728, 1941 wrote: "*Every system of law known to civilized society generated from or had as its component one of two well-known systems of ethics, stoic or Christian [men's opinions or rule of law]. The COMMON LAW draws its subsistence from the latter; its roots go deep into that system, the Christian concept of right and wrong or right and justice motivates every rule of equity. It is the guide by which we dissolve domestic frictions and the rule by which all legal controversies are settled.*" In *ROE v. WADE*, 410 U.S. 113 15, 1973 our highest court (rejecting and therefore in defiance to the Christian faith) turned to stoicism (men's feelings of the "moment"; influenced by the immediate situation, rejecting the restraints of the Constitution) in making law: "*there has always been strong support for the view [opinion] that life does not begin until live birth. This was the belief of the Stoics.*" In *ROE V. WADE* our highest court embraced Marxism, establishing men's carnal nature, that is *lust over* and therefore against the Word of God, *negating* Godly restraint, that is individualism, under God, that is "rule of law."

In his article *The Holy Family* Karl Marx 'justified' the use of *dialogue*, what he called "*Critical Criticism*" to 'justify' his sins. Thus, exhonouring the human heart, that is his heart he made sin the "norm." "*Not feeling at home in the sinful world, Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home.*" "*Critical Criticism is a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without.*" In his article *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* he explained what he meant by "*Criticism.*" "*Criticism is now simply a means.*

Indignation is its essential pathos, denunciation its principle task. Criticism is criticism in hand-to-hand combat. Criticism proceeds on to praxis [or social action]. "The critique of religion [that is hatred toward the Father's authority] ends with the categorical imperative to overthrow all conditions in which man is a debased, enslaved, neglected, contemptible being [that is man being called a sinner, thus being judged, condemned, cast out for his carnal thoughts and carnal actions]."

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

"Building relationship upon self interest" is the hallmark of Marxism. It is a sad day when you have to explain Marxism in order to explain what is happening in the world around you today, that is in the classroom, the workplace, the government, and even in the "church."

Karl Marx, in his article *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'* wrote: *"To enjoy the present reconciles us to the actual."*

In other words, according to Karl Marx it is *lust*, that is enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the current situation and-or object, people, or person is *stimulating* that makes us at-one-with the world, establishing *lust over* and therefore *against* the Father's authority that gets in the way. *Self* is therefore "*actualized*" in *lust*, not in doing the Father's will.

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

Karl Marx wrote *"It is not individualism that fulfills the individual, on the contrary it destroys him. Society is the necessary framework through which freedom and individuality are made realities."* (Karl Marx, in John Lewis, *The Life and Teachings of Karl Marx*)

In other words, according to Karl Marx the child having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* his "*self*" in order to do the Father's will is not what "*fulfills*" the child. "*On the contrary*" it is the Father's authority, that is the child having to do right and not wrong according to the Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth that "*destroys him*," that is that prevents him from becoming his *self*, thinking and acting according to his carnal nature, that is according to what he has in common with all the children of the world. The child's desire for approval from others, requiring him to compromise in order to "get along," that is in order to *build relationship "is the necessary framework through which freedom" from* the Father's authority and "*freedom*" *to lust* after pleasure, that is to do what he wants without having a *guilty conscience* (which the Father's authority engenders) "*are made reality*."

[Norman O. Brown](#), in his book *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History* wrote *"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." "Self-perfection of the human individual is fulfilled in union with the world in pleasure." "According to Freud, the ultimate essence of our being is erotic." "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." "Eros is the foundation of morality."*

According to Sigmund Freud the *guilty conscience* is a product of the Father's authority, which sustains the Father's authority in society. It is only in the "*social group*" that the *guilty conscience* can *negated*. According to the Marxist, Norman O. Brown without the "*social group*" the child and society remains subject to the Father's authority. Therefore the child and society can only be liberated from the Father's authority and the *guilty conscience* which the Father's authority engenders in the "*social group*," which 'justifies' the child's carnal nature, that is Eros, that is *lust*.

Kurt Lewin, in his article *Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics* wrote: *"The group to which an individual belongs is the ground for his perceptions, his feelings, and his actions"*

Kurt Lewin, in Kenneth Benne's book, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change* wrote: *"It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately." "The individual accepts the*

new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group."

[Kurt Lewin](#) in Wilbur Brookover's book *A Sociology of Education* explained the effect leadership style has upon the group and the child. *"The child takes on the characteristic behavior of the group in which he is placed. . . . he reflects the behavior patterns which are set by the adult leader of the group."*

Kurt Lewin, regarding the effect different types of leadership have upon people wrote: *"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, and Lewin, "frustration and regression: an experiment with young children" in *Child Behavior and Development*)

It is the *guilty conscience*, which is engendered by the Father's authority that sustains the Father's authority in the child and in society.

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

Dr. Robert Trojanowicz, in his book *The meaning of "Community" in Community Policing* defining the development the *guilty conscience* and its effect upon society wrote: *"The personal conscience is the key element in ensuring self-control, refraining from deviant behavior even when it can be easily perpetrated."* *"The family, the next most important unit affecting social control, is obviously instrumental in the initial formation of the conscience and in the continued reinforcement of the values that encourage law abiding behavior."* Trojanowicz then promotes bringing the police and the community together with the *dialoguing* of opinions to a *consensus* process, *negating* local control, that is the father's authority system and the *guilty conscience* replacing it with the "police state." Done with the use of 'crime' to bring "the people" together.

There is no Father's authority, that is judgment, condemnation, fear of being cast out in *dialogue* therefore using *dialogue* to establish right and wrong behavior *negates* not only the Father's authority it *negates* the *guilty conscience* as well.

Kurt Lewin, in his book *A Dynamic Theory of Personality* (explaining in two sentences how the *guilty conscience* is 'created' and how to destroy it) wrote: *"The negative valence of a forbidden object which in itself attracts the child [the guilty conscience] thus usually derives from an induced field of force of an adult."* *"If this field of force loses its psychological existence for the child (e.g., if the adult goes away or loses his authority) the negative valence also disappears."*

While the *guilty conscience* ties the child to the Father or rather the Father to the child the "super-ego" ties the child to society.

In *Book 2: Affective Domain* Benjamin Bloom wrote: *"Superego development is conceived as the incorporation of the moral standards of society. Therefore the levels of the Taxonomy should describe successive levels of goal setting appropriate to superego development."*

It is the Father's authority system itself that Karl Marx was out to *negate*. Having denied the Heavenly Father's authority all he had to *negate* was the earthly father's authority (which he believed engendered the Heavenly Father's authority, that is religion) Sigmund Freud had the same agenda.

Explaining the merging of psychology and Marxism, focusing upon the ideology of Sigmund Freud the Marxist [Herbert Marcuse](#), in his book *Eros and Civilization: a psychological inquiry into Freud* (from where we get *"If it feels good, just do it"*) wrote: *"... the hatred against patriarchal suppression—a 'barrier to incest,' ... the desire (for the sons) to return to the mother culminates in the rebellion of the exiled sons, the collective killing and devouring of the father."* *"It is not really a decisive matter whether one has killed one's father or abstained from*

the deed,' if the function of the conflict and its consequences are the same [the husband and father no longer exercises his authority in the home, over his wife and children]."

Sigmund Freud's history of the prodigal son is not of the son coming to his senses, *humbling his self*, returning home, submitting his *self* to his father's authority, learning his inheritance was not his father's money but his father's love for him (Luke 15:11-24), but of the son joining with his "friends," returning home, killing the father, taking all that was his (the father's), using it to satisfy their carnal desires, that is their *lusts*, killing all the fathers in the land (devouring the fathers) so all the children could be the same, that is like them, thereby *affirming* them, that is their "*incest*," 'justifying' and supporting their control over them.

[Abraham Maslow](#), in his journals *The Journals of Abraham Maslow* wrote: "*Marxian theory needs Freudian-type instinct theory to round it out. And of course, vice versa.*" "*Third-Force psychology is also epi-Marxian in these senses, that is including the most basic scheme as true-good social conditions are necessary for personal growth, bad social conditions stunt human nature, ... This is to say, one could reinterpret Marx into a self-actualization-fostering Third- and Fourth-Force psychology-philosophy. And my impression is anyway that this is the direction in which they are going now.*" "*Yet nakedness is absolutely right. So is the attack on antieroticism, the Christian and Jewish foundations. Must move in the direction of the [Reichian orgasm](#).*" "*I must put as much of this as is possible and usable in my education book, and more and more in succeeding writings.*"

In other words society needs man's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure in order to become one and man's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure needs societies 'justification.' The 'liberation' of self, that is of *lust* out from under the Father's authority "*is necessary for personal growth*," while submission of self to the Father's authority "*stunt(s) human nature*." Marxism is philosophy and psychology becoming at-one-with one another. It is in *dialogue* (which does not recognize the Father's authority) that all can become one, "bypass" the Father's authority in making rules, policies, and law, that is in establishing right and wrong behavior—resulting in *lust* being right and the Father's authority being wrong.

The Marxist [Jürgen Habermas](#), one of the youngest and probably smartest of the "Frankfurt School" members in his book *Knowledge and Human Interest, Chapter Three: The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory* wrote (regarding the effect *dialogue* has upon a group setting): "*In the dialogic relation of recognizing oneself in the other, they experience the common ground of their existence.*"

Ervin Laszlo, who organized and promoted the "climate change" agenda, in his book *A Strategy For The Future: The Systems Approach to World Order* wrote: "*Bypassing the traditional channels of 'top-down' decision making our objective center's upon transforming public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics.*" "*Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common [lust] interests and ultimately to world interests, transforming public consensus into one favorable to the emergence of a stable and humanistic world order.*" "*Consensus is both a personal and a political step. It is a precondition of all future steps.*"

Karl Marx in his *Eleventh Thesis on Feuerbach* (which is inscribed on his tomb) wrote: "*The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, the objective however, is change.*"

In other words it is the father's authority system, that is the father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth (which differ from father to father) that divides the people. It is in the child's propensity to respond ('change' in accordance) to the situation and-or object, people, or person in the 'moment that is the objective of life. Without the "help" of the facilitator of 'change' the children remain subject to the Father's authority system. The facilitator of 'change,' perceiving his *self* as being the personification of "the people," who, like him *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the moment the world *stimulates*, hating restraint, sees it as his duty to 'justify' the people's natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure in order to 'justify' his natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure. When you question the facilitator of 'change's' actions he will respond with "It is not just about you," really meaning "It is all about me, so I can *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience*, with your *affirmation*. If you refuse to *affirm* me, that is my *lusts* or get in my way 'the people' will remove (*negate*) you (since having 'justifying' their *lusts* I now 'own' them). It appears I must keep an eye on you from now on for my 'good.'" This is the true meaning of "sight based management."

All the facilitator of 'change' has to do (in a "positive" environment, that is in an environment which will not judge, condemn, or cast you out for *lusting* after pleasure or for being wrong) is ask you how you feel and what you think regarding the commands, rules, facts, and truth you have been taught (that get in the way of your carnal desires), especially when it comes to behavior and the facilitator of 'change' "owns" you. This applies to all who participate in the facilitated, *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* process (establishing *lust* over and therefore against the Father's authority).

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

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

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

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

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

"For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." 2 Timothy 3:2-5

"And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Corinthians 6:15-18

End Notes

[Facilitators of 'change,'](#) that is [psychologists](#), that is [behavioral "scientists,"](#) that is ["group psychotherapists,"](#) that is [Marxists](#) (Transformational Marxists)—all being the same in [method](#) or [formula](#)—are using the [dialoguing](#) of [opinions](#) to a [consensus](#) ([affirmation](#)) process, that is dialectic 'reasoning' ('reasoning' from and through the students "[feelings](#)" of the 'moment,' that is from and through their "[lust](#)" for pleasure and their [hate of restraint](#), in the "[light](#)" of their desire for group approval, that is [affirmation](#) and fear of group rejection) in the "[group grade](#)," "[safe zone-space-place](#)," "[Don't be negative, be positive](#)," "[open ended, non-directed](#)," [soviet](#) style, [brainwashing](#) (washing [the Father's authority](#) from the children's thoughts and actions, that is "[theory and practice](#)," [negating](#) their having a [guilty conscience](#), which the Father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning in the process—called "[the negation of negation](#)" since the Father's authority and the [guilty conscience](#), being [negative](#) to [the child's carnal nature](#), is [negated](#) in [dialogue](#)—in [dialogue](#), [opinion](#), and the [consensus](#) process there is no Father's authority, that is no established aka absolute command, rule, facts, or truth to be accepted as is, by faith and obeyed; there is only the person's carnal desires, that is [lusts](#) of the past and the present being verbally expressed and 'justified'), [inductive 'reasoning'](#) ('reasoning' from and through the students "[feelings](#)," that is their natural inclination to "[lust](#)" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment'—[dopamine emancipation](#)—which the world stimulates, that is their "[self interest](#)," that is their "[sense experience](#)," [selecting "appropriate information"](#)—excluding, ignoring, or resisting, that is rejecting any "[inappropriate](#)" information, that is established command, rule, fact, or truth that gets in the way of their desired outcome, that is pleasure—in

determining right from wrong behavior), "[Bloom's Taxonomy](#)," "[affective domain](#)," French Revolution ([Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité](#)) classroom "environment" in order (as in "new" world order) to 'liberate' children from parental authority, that is from the Father's authority system (the [Patriarchal Paradigm](#))—as [predators, charlatans, pimps, pedophiles, seducing, deceiving, and manipulating](#) them [as chickens, rats, and dogs](#), that is treating them as natural resource ("[human resource](#)") in order to convert them into '[liberals](#),' [socialists](#), [globalists](#), so they, '[justifying](#)' their "[self](#)" [before one another](#), can do wrong, disobey, sin, that is can "[lust](#)" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, with impunity.

"Thus saith the LORD, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein. Also I set watchmen over you, saying, Harken to the sound of the trumpet. But they said, We will not hearken." Jeremiah 6:16, 17

[Home schooling](#) material, co-ops, conferences, etc., are joining in the same [praxis](#), fulfilling [Immanuel Kant's](#) as well as [Georg Hegel's, Karl Marx's, and Sigmund Freud's](#) agenda of using the pattern or method of [Genesis 3:1-6](#), that is "[self](#)" 'justification,' that is dialectic ([dialogue](#)) 'reasoning,' that is 'reasoning' from and through your "[feelings](#)," that is your carnal desires of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world (including your desire for approval from others, with them [affirming](#) your carnal nature) in order to [negate](#) [Hebrews 12:5-11](#), that is the Father's authority, that is having to [humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate](#) your "[self](#)" (your [lusts](#)) in order to do the Father's will, [negating](#) [Romans 7:14-25](#), that is your having a [guilty conscience](#) when you do wrong, disobey, sin, thereby [negating](#) your having to [repent before the](#) Father for your doing wrong, disobedience, sins—which is the real agenda.

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

© *Institution for Authority Research*, Dean Gotcher 2024 (5/27/2024)