

[authorityresearch.com](https://www.authorityresearch.com)

What We All Have In Common.

("The lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes," and "the pride of life," i.e., that which is "of the world" is the basis of Common-ism.)

[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

"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

"... the central problem is to change reality. ... reality with its obedience to laws." ([György Lukács](#), *History & Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?*) If "reality" is "I had not known lust, except the law had said," i.e., the law maker, i.e., the father/Father has said "Thou shalt not covet," then the only way for the Marxist to "change reality," where he can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating without having a *guilty conscience* is to get rid of (*negate* in his mind) the law maker, i.e., the one making the law, making his *self*, i.e., *lust*, i.e., that which is "of the world" the law instead. "Reality" then becomes subjective, i.e., subject to his *self*, i.e., to his carnal nature, i.e., to his *lusts*, i.e., to his *self interests* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating instead of objective, i.e., subject to the father's/Father's authority—where he has to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* his *self*, i.e., not yield to his *lusts* in order to do right and not wrong according to the father's/Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth.

"Lawfulness without law." ([Immanuel Kant](#), *Critique of Judgment*) In other words: "Reality" is the law of the flesh, i.e., [the child's carnal](#)

nature, i.e., the child's natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, without the law of the father/Father, i.e., the father's/Father's authority getting in the way.

"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/Father's authority (the Patriarchal paradigm) to become as he was before the father's/Father's first command, rule, fact, or truth, i.e., "rule of law" came into his life (separating him from his "self," i.e., lust and the world that stimulates it), "of and for self" and the world only]." (Georg Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*)

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

"The heart is deceitful above all things [thinking pleasure, i.e., lust is the standard for "good" instead of doing the father's/Father's will], and desperately wicked [hating anyone preventing, i.e., inhibiting or blocking it from enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that it is lusting after]: who can know it?" Jeremiah 17:9 The heart can not see its hatred toward the father's/Father's authority as being evil, i.e., "wicked," i.e., "desperately wicked" because it's *lust* for pleasure is standing in the way, 'justifying' the hate.

"They speak vanity every one with his neighbour: with flattering lips and with a double heart do they speak." Psalms 12:2

"And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." "... the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth;" Genesis 6:5; 8:21

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

*"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
(James chapters 4 and 5)*

"To enjoy the present reconciles us to the actual." ([Karl Marx](#), Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right') In other words, "It is lust, i.e., enjoying the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating that reconciles you to the world, 'justifying' your resentment, i.e., hatred toward the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way." "Self is actualized in lust and the world that stimulates it."

"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." "Freud saw that in the id there is no negation [no parental authority, i.e. no Godly restraint, i.e. no "Thou shalt not"], only affirmation and eternity [only the child's/student's natural inclination to lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates]." "The repression of normal adult sexuality is required only by cultures which are based on patriarchal domination [on doing the father's/Father's will]." "Our repressed desires are the desires we had unrepressed, in childhood; and they are sexual desires." "Parental discipline, religious denunciation of bodily pleasure, . . . have all left man overly docile, but secretly in his unconscious [in his urges and impulses of the 'moment' which are being stimulated by the world] unconvinced, and therefore neurotic [caught between his desire for parental approval and his lust for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulation, having a guilty conscience for thinking about or doing the latter]." "The foundation on which the man of the future will be built is

already there, in the repressed unconscious; the foundation has to be recovered ['liberated' from the father's/Father's authority, negating the guilty conscience in the process]." ([Norman O. Brown](#), *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*)

Dopamine: the drug of 'choice.' "They will be 'happy' (for the 'moment,' i.e., in the 'eternal present') forever chasing after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment,' i.e., dopamine emancipation that the world stimulates (until death), and own nothing, not even their soul (having sold it to the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist at the street corner of 'lust and affirmation,' i.e., to pleasure and the approval of men, i.e., to 'what will the group aka the village think')." Our body naturally produces a chemical (a neurotransmitter) called *dopamine* that is *emancipated (liberated)* into a small gap (called a synaptic gap) between nerves (the posterior of the first nerve *emancipating* it, the anterior of the next nerve *receiving* it), transmitting information to the brain (and in the brain-via dendrites) that we have come in contact with something in the environment (in the world) that is pleasurable, i.e., that *stimulates dopamine emancipation*. For example, when a child comes in contact with something that is pleasurable in the environment (via the senses of touch, taste, sight, smell, and sound), say in this case a toy that "feels" good, i.e., that *stimulates dopamine emancipation*, the child's natural inclination is to look into the environment to find out what it was (that stimulated *dopamine emancipation*, i.e., pleasure). Once located the child then moves in the direction of the toy (the object) in order to gain control of it (with controlling the toy or the environment in which the toy exists guaranteeing more *dopamine emancipation*, not only in the present but also in the future—stimulus-response which incorporates "approach pleasure-avoid pain"). When the toy is not the child's, i.e., the child is *told* the toy is not his to play with and he continues to play with it, "*the lust of the flesh*," i.e., *stimulus-response*, "*the lust of the eyes*," coveting or lusting after the object of pleasure in the environment that *stimulate dopamine emancipation*, and "*the pride of life*," i.e., the ability to control the environment, i.e., the situation and/or the people/object(s) that *stimulates dopamine emancipation*, it is *lust* that controls the child's, i.e., that controls the child's thoughts and actions, i.e., controls his life. Interestingly, in the child's response, i.e., [in his anger](#)

toward anyone taking the object of his *lust* away (imagined or real), *dopamine* is *emancipation* (the adrenalin rush in anger). In and of your *self* you do not control *dopamine emancipation*. If there is no restraint, i.e., no father's/Father's authority, i.e., no fear of accountability (objective truth) it controls you. In the child's eyes, *dopamine emancipation* is "good" and the father's/Father's authority is "evil," when it gets in *lusts* way. *Dopamine emancipation* engenders *want*, i.e., *lust*. When you do what you want, i.e., what you *lust* after, you think you are in control, when in truth what you want, i.e., *lust*, i.e., *dopamine emancipation* (and the world that stimulates it) is in control of you. All habitual drugs are tied to *dopamine*, imitating, it, *emancipating* it, preventing its re-uptake. God is not against pleasure, i.e., *dopamine emancipation*, he gave us *dopamine emancipation* that we might enjoy His creation. It is when we *lust* after it, instead of obeying Him it becomes sin, i.e., *lust*. As covered later, *dialogue* 'justifies' *dopamine emancipation*, *discussion* restrains it, i.e., you. When choosing what to eat for lunch, for example, when you *want* to eat what is not good (not healthy) for you to eat you go to *dialogue*, 'justifying' *dopamine emancipation*. If you go to *discussion* you will not eat it (*dopamine emancipation* is restrained, i.e., you restrain your *self*). In all matters of life, when *dialogue* is used to determine right and wrong behavior, *discussion*, which retains the father's/Father's authority is *negated*, making pleasure, i.e., *lust*, i.e., the Karl Marx in your heart right and restraint, i.e., missing out on pleasure, i.e., the father's/Father's authority wrong, making man's (your) wisdom greater than God's.

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

"Ye do the deeds of your father." "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." "... there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." John 8:41, 44

"Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds;" Colossians 3:9 The Greek word for deeds is *praxis*.

"The philosophy of praxis is the absolute secularization of thought, an absolute humanism of history." (Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*) The name for the National Test for teachers is *Praxis* where teachers must solve problems without depending on answers they have learned in the past, especially from God.

The lie is, you can do what you want and not be held accountable (before God) for your carnal thoughts and carnal actions.

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

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

Without the father's/Father's authority in your life the Karl Marx in your heart directs your steps.

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

Why has Marxism spread so widely and rapidly around the world, especially amongst the youth? Because it 'justifies' *lust*, i.e., "*human nature*," establishing it over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority, thereby 'justifying' the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority (personally, i.e., in your thoughts/communication with your *self* and socially, i.e., in your relationship/communication with others, i.e., in "theory and practice") for getting in the way. Karl Marx, i.e., *lust* for pleasure, i.e., for *dopamine emancipation* is in your parent's, your spouse's, your children's, your neighbor's, your leader's, your minister's, and even your own heart waiting to be 'liberated' from the father's/Father's authority, i.e., from having to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate* his *self* in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/father's will so he—questioning, challenging, defying, denying, disregarding, attacking the father's/Father's authority—can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating without having a *guilty conscience*,

which the father's/Father's authority engenders, with your approval, i.e., your [affirmation](#). The Apostle Paul explained the Karl Marx in your heart.

"For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." (Excerpts from [Romans 7:14-25](#))

The soul is different than the flesh. The soul is "God breathed," the flesh is "formed from the dust of the ground."

"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

The soul *KNOWS* from being *told*. The flesh by "[sense experience](#)." When God created Adam he made him, unlike any other living thing in the creation "*a living soul*." He then *told* ("commanded") him what he could and could not do, i.e., He *told* him what was right and what was wrong behavior, i.e., which trees he could eat the fruit of and which one he could not (lest he die).

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

No animal, being subject only to stimulus-response (approach pleasure - avoid pain) and impulses and urges (instincts) can read or write a book, i.e., can be *told* or *tell* others what is right and what is wrong behavior, i.e., what they can and can not do. By making man subject to stimulus-response man is (deceptively) equated to an animal, approach pleasure and avoid pain, denying the fact that man does what animals can not do, i.e., reason from being *told*. Psychology, which means "study of the soul" (as

Marxism) makes the soul subject to the flesh, i.e., to *lust*, i.e., to *sense experience* (the *cognitive*, *affective*, and *psycho-motor* domains), not to the Father, i.e., to KNOWING right from wrong from being *told*.

"Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices." 2 Corinthians 2:11

In [Genesis 3:1-6](#) is find the method used by the master facilitator of 'change' to 'liberate' the Karl Marx, i.e., the child of *lust* within you from the "Father's" authority.

"And he [the Serpent] said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." Genesis 3:2-6

When, in the garden in Eden, the master facilitator of 'change' (through the use of Neuro-linguistics [*"Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?"*]), i.e., the language of the nervous system, i.e., an embedded statement in a question, as in, "I wonder whether you know where you knee is?" which destabilizes and then sensitizes you to your "feelings," i.e., to your *self*, i.e., to your knee, establishing your "feelings," i.e., your *self*, and as was in the case in the garden in Eden, establishing the woman's *lust*, i.e., *self interest over* and therefore against any standard that was restraining her, i.e., standing in her way) seduced the woman into *dialogue*, i.e., into sharing her *lust*, he "*owned*" her. *Discussion* retains the authority that restrains, i.e., that "is," preventing 'change,' at least rapid 'change.' *Dialogue* on the other hand contains the world (in our eyes) that

"ought" to be, i.e., that we desire, i.e., that we *lust* after, i.e., that we "covet."

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

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

"The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force." (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3)

According to Karl Marx, the father's/Father's authority is 'created' in the child's act of obedience, i.e., in his *humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulating his self* in order to do the father's/Father's will, empowering the father/Father to rule over him, preventing the child from becoming his *self*, according to his carnal nature — *self-actualized*. Since the *guilty conscience* [*"the negative valance"*] is engendered from the father's/Father's authority, the only way to *negate* the *guilty conscience* is to *negate* the father's/Father's authority in the child's thoughts first, so he can do what he wants without having a *guilty conscience*. By replacing *discussion* (established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority) with *dialogue* (feelings, i.e., the child's *self interest*, i.e., *lusts*), when it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior the deed (*praxis*) is done.

"The negative valence of a forbidden object which in itself attracts the child [the guilty conscience] thus usually derives from an induced field of force of an adult." "If this field of force loses its psychological

existence for the child (e.g., if the adult goes away or loses his authority) the negative valence also disappears." (Kurt Lewin, A Dynamic Theory of Personality)

"[We] must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions [see those people adhering to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., holding to absolutes, i.e., having a guilty conscience for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning] in joint deliberations [in the consensus process] as a vice rather than a virtue." (Kenneth Benne, Human Relations in Curriculum Change)

The facilitator of 'change' is out to *negate the guilty conscience* (Romans 7:14-25) that the father's/Father's authority engenders (Hebrews 12:5-11) so he can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, removing (negating) anyone who get in his way, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous without having any sense of guilt. By using the method of Genesis 3:1-6, i.e., replacing *preaching, teaching, and discussing*, which retains the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the father/Father has the final say (if/when you disobey; "*Thou shalt surely die*") with *dialogue*, which supports the child's carnal desires, i.e., the child's *lusts*, the facilitator of 'change' and the child have the final say ("*Ye shall not surely die*"; and the woman saw the tree, i.e., the child saw that what he *lusted* after was "*good*," "*pleasant*," and "*to be desired*"). By remove "*chastening*," i.e., being held accountable for your carnal thoughts and carnal actions, *righteousness*, i.e., doing the Father's will is replaced with *sensuousness*, i.e., doing your will instead, i.e., the *guilty conscience* is replaced with the "*superego*." "... *the superego 'unites in itself the influences [impulses and urges, i.e., lusts and hates] of the present and of the past* [the child's resentment toward authority in the past becomes at-one-with his resentment toward authority in the present, 'justifying his resentment toward authority].'" (Brown) "*Superego development is conceived as the incorporation of the moral standards of society* [socialism, which requires compromise, setting aside the father's/Father's authority, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth when they get in the way of relationship, i.e., for the sake of relationship]. *Therefore the*

*levels of the Taxonomy should describe successive levels of goal setting appropriate to superego development." (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*. All educators are certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of what are called "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)," i.e., Genesis 3:1-6, i.e., Marxism in the classroom. Explained in greater detail later on)*

"Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." [Hebrews 12:5-11](#)

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

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

While the earthly father, i.e., your dad is not perfect, he may be (or may have been) a down right tyrant (or MIA/AWL)—as a child *lusting* after the carnal pleasure of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, without restraint—his office of authority is perfect, having been given to him by God (the "*Heavenly Father*") who is perfect, in which to do His will. By *negating* the office itself, Karl Marx rules from your heart, 'justifying' your *lusting* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating and your removing (*negating*) of anyone who gets in the way (of your *lusts*), including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous without having a *guilty conscience*, *lusting* after the approval of others (with the same *lusts*), *affirming*, i.e., 'justifying' your (and their) *lusts*. You might say "*I am not*

doing those things. I would never do them," but it is not how far down the path you have gone, it is the path you are on. One step on it you have "stepped in it," i.e., you stink. Reject the father's/Father's authority and that is the path you are on.

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

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

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

"But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light: Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy. Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul;" 1 Peter 2:9-11

Marxism is based upon what we all have in common, i.e., *lust*, 'justifying' what we all have in common, i.e., *lust*, thereby uniting us upon what we all have in common, i.e., *lust*. The same is true for psychotherapy. Both are based upon the facilitation of 'change,' where man's carnal nature, i.e., "*human nature*," i.e., that which is "*of the world*" supersedes (*negates*) the father's/Father's authority.

"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, the objective however, is change." (Karl Marx, Feuerbach Thesis #11)

Inscribed on Karl Marx's tomb so it must be important.

"...the fundamental character of reality is change itself." (T. Z. Lavine, From Socrates to Sartre, The Philosophic Quest)

What is 'change' all about? While we normally think of change as changing from one position, i.e., from one established command, rule, fact, or truth to another, then holding to that new position, repenting of (no longer accepting) the old position, 'change' in the 'modern' sense is the person moving progressively away from adhering to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, toward 'justifying' his carnal desires, i.e., his *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, making commands, rules, facts, and truth subject to his feelings of the 'moment,' i.e., subjective rather than subject to an absolute authority or position, i.e., objective. Objective truth, i.e., established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., the father's/Father's authority inhibits or blocks 'change.' Subjective truth, i.e., your *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating initiates and sustains 'change.' Since *opinions* are not absolutes, by making every position, i.e., established command, rule, fact, and truth an *opinion*, "*fixity*" is *negated*, i.e., replaced with "*changingness*," i.e., "*what ought to be*" (according to your *lusts*) becomes "*what is*." By the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist treating commands, rules, facts and truth as an *opinion* (saying "*That is your opinion*" when you accuse him of being wrong), *opinion*, i.e., *lust* and the world that stimulates it, i.e., 'change' becomes all there is to life, i.e., he can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., he can *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating without being wrong, i.e., without having a *guilty conscience*, with your *affirmation* (providing you agree, i.e., set aside any command, rule, fact, or truth that inhibits or blocks you from initiating or sustaining relationship with him). "*What can I get out of this situation and/or this person or these people for my self?*" i.e., *lust* and the world that stimulates it, i.e., the process of 'change' now controls your life.

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

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

In a world of 'change,' i.e., of Marxism, i.e., of psychotherapy laws become subject to the person's carnal needs, i.e., *lusts* of the 'moment' instead of subject to established commands, rules, facts, and truth which were learned in the past.

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

Marx saw the "problem" emanating from the father's/Father's authority system itself. While children resent missing out on pleasure, i.e., their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating (because of their parents

authority), when they become parents themselves they hold their children accountable to their established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., their authority, producing resentment toward authority in their children. Without the process of 'change,' i.e., the *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* process itself becoming the means to establishing law, 'change' will continue to be inhibited or blocked by the father's/Father's authority system.

"The justice of state constitutions is to be decided not on the basis of Christianity, not from the nature of Christian society [not from the father's/Father's authority] but from the nature of human society [from the child's carnal nature, i.e., lust]." (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*)

This is reflected in the 'change' of "policy," i.e., how law is defined, i.e., made (whoever defines terms for you controls your life, i.e., makes the law) by the Supreme Court regarding human life, i.e., the unborn child, the elderly, the innocent, and the righteous, changing it from established (position, i.e., objective) law, where laws are subject to an authority greater than man's carnal desires, i.e., his *lusts* of the 'moment';

"Every system of law known to civilized society generated from or had as its component one of two well known systems of ethics, stoic or Christian [men's opinions or the Father's authority]. The COMMON LAW draws its subsistence from the latter, its roots go deep into that system, the Christian concept of right and wrong or right and justice motivates every rule of equity. It is the guide by which we dissolve domestic friction's and the rule by which all legal controversies are settled." (Strauss Vs. Strauss., 3 So. 2nd 727, 728, 1941)

to situational (*opinion*, i.e., subjective) law, where laws are subject to the carnal desires (*lusts*) of man, i.e., situational, i.e., subject to continuous 'change.'

"... there has always been strong support for the view [opinion] that life does not begin until live birth. This was the belief of the Stoics."

(ROE v. WADE, 410 U.S. 113 15, 1973)

Karl Marx based his ideology off of Heraclitus (who influenced the Stoics), who believed "*Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys.*" In other words, *lust*, i.e., the child's carnal nature and the world that stimulates it, i.e., 'change' is the basis of reality requiring "*every grown man,*" who holds himself and others accountable to a higher authority than "*human nature,*" i.e., than *lust* to go and "*hang himself*" and "*leave the city to the boys.*"

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

This is where the facilitator of 'change' comes in.

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

When the facilitator of 'change'—in an environment void of the father's/Father's authority, i.e., void of the fear of judgment, i.e., void of the fear of being rejected, i.e., through the use of *dialogue*—*seduces, deceives, and manipulates* you into sharing your *lusts* with him he "owns" you. Without your *lusts* he has no power (control) over you. It is your *dialogue* with your *self*, i.e., your thinking about what you want or want to do, restrained by *discussion*, i.e., knowing right from wrong from being *told*, i.e., your being warned about what will happen to you if you do wrong, that the potential for 'change' resides.

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

By focusing upon *dialogue*, i.e., upon what you want or want to do (void of true *discussion*, by making all positions an *opinion*), to the point of having to have it or do it "lest ye die" and fearing someone taking it away from you, desperation is engendered to remove whoever is threatening to do it, before they do it, i.e., the "*desperately wicked*" part of the heart shows up—what Karl Marx called "*Critical Criticism*" (where Critical Race Theory is derived).

"Not feeling at home in the sinful world, Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home." "*Critical Criticism is a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without.*" (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) Karl Marx understood the role of *dialogue*, i.e., "*a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without*" (emphasis added) in revolution—where the individual no longer thinks about (*dialogues* with his *self*) but acts (carries out his *thoughts*) in violence, i.e., in defiance toward a world of "sinners" judging him for being a sinner, thus giving him and everyone else the duty of overthrowing them in order to be their *self*, i.e., in order to "*feel at home in a sinful world,*" i.e., in a world no longer restrained by the father's/Father's authority.

Karl Marx wrote: "*The unspeculative Christian [the believer, the man of faith in God] also recognizes sensuality as long as it does not assert itself at the expense of true reason, i.e., of faith, of true love, i.e., of love of God, of true will-power, i.e., of will in Christ* [emphasis added, Karl Marx wrote this]. *Not for the sake of sensual love, not for the lust of the flesh, but because the Lord said: Increase and multiply.*" (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*)

Then he added: "*It is not sensuality which is presented ..., but mysteries, adventures, obstacles, fears, dangers, and especially the attraction of what is forbidden.*" ibid.

Marx's definition of "*sensuality*" includes "*the attraction of what is forbidden*" (which is the persons natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating), making the "*unspeculative Christian*" as much a part of the carnal world as the pagan. *Lust* being present in the "*unspeculative Christian*" makes him subject to 'change'—given the right situation (condition or environment).

"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." (Rogers)

That is the "duty" of the facilitator of 'change,' who knows how to initiate and sustain that environment.

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

The Marxist, the psychotherapist, the facilitator of 'change' have this one thing in common. Perceiving their self to be the personification of "*the*

people," who like them lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates and hate restraint, i.e., hate the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way, they, through dialogue ("feigned words," i.e., plastic words; Greek) seduce, deceive, and manipulate all who come before them into 'justifying' their lusts so they can lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a guilty conscience (which the father's/Father's authority engenders), with "the people's" affirmation, i.e., financially and emotionally supporting them. The "duty" of the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist, i.e., the psychotherapist is to remove (negate) the father's/Father's authority in the environment so he (along with "the people") can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the situation and/or people are stimulating without having a guilty conscience, with "the people's" approval, i.e., affirmation.

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

Stated another way, the "duty" of the facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist, i.e., the psychotherapist is to protect the criminal (the one doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating) from the father's/Father's authority, so they (the facilitator of 'change' and the criminal) can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating without being held accountable for their carnal thoughts and carnal actions. In this way of thinking the criminal is the victim (being "repressed," i.e., judged and condemned by the victim who insists upon right and wrong being defined by established commands, rules, facts, and truth) and the victim is the criminal ("repressing," i.e., judging and condemning the criminal for taking what he needed, i.e., what he wanted, i.e., what he was lust after, i.e., for not doing right but doing wrong instead, according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth).

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

"Authoritarian submission [humbling, denying, dying to, controlling, disciplining, capitulate "self" in order to do the father's/Father's will] was conceived of as a very general attitude that would be evoked in relation to a variety of authority figures—parents, older people, leaders, supernatural power, and so forth." "God is conceived more directly after a parental image and thus as a source of support and as a guiding and sometimes punishing authority." "Submission to authority, desire for a strong leader, subservience of the individual to the state [parental authority, local control, Nationalism], and so forth, have so frequently and, as it seems to us, correctly, been set forth as important aspects of the Nazi creed that a search for correlates of prejudice had naturally to take these attitudes into account." "The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem." (Adorno) Adorno's error in logic is that Fascism, like all forms of socialism, must *negate* the father's/Father's authority in order to rule over "*the people*."

All the facilitator of 'change' has to do is, through *dialogue*, i.e., through you sharing your *lusts* with him (without him and "*the group*" judging you, thus gaining your trust) turn you into "*human resource*" so he can use you for his own pleasure. He "owns" you through your *lusts*. You think you are in control of your life, when you do what you want when what you want to do, i.e., *lust* and the world that stimulates it is in control of you. It is the

father's/Father's authority that gets in the way of, i.e., that liberates you from *lust*. It is why the father's/Father's authority is hated by the Marxist, the psychotherapist (who gets the father, mother, and children to "focus on the family" placing his *self* between the father/Father and his/His children, *negating* the father's/Fathers' authority in the children's thoughts, thus 'liberating' the children from the father's/Father's authority in their actions), and the facilitator of 'change,' who all use *dialogue* to "help" you 'discover' right and wrong behavior for your *self*, i.e., from your carnal nature, i.e., from how you feel and what you think (in the "light" of the 'moment'), thus 'justifying' your *lusts* and resentment toward restraint.

". . . any intervention between parent and child tend to produce familial democracy [replacing discussion, which retains the father's/Father's authority with dialogue, which 'justifies' the child's carnal nature 'liberates' the child from the parent's authority, i.e., from having to do right and not wrong according to the parent's (the father's/Father's) established commands, rules, facts, and truth] regardless of its intent." "The consequences of family democratization take a long time to make themselves felt—but it would be difficult to reverse the process once begun. . . once the parent can in any way imagine his own orientation to be a possible liability to the child in the world approaching." "... Once uncertainty is created in the parent how best to prepare the child for the future, the authoritarian family is moribund [the father's/Father's authority is negated in the child's thoughts, directly effecting his or her actions—questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking the father's/Father's authority for getting in the way, doing so without having a guilty conscience], regardless of whatever countermeasures may be taken." "For however much the state or community may wish to inculcate obedience and submission in the child, its intervention betrays a lack of confidence in the only objects from whom a small child can learn authoritarian submission [the father/Father]." ([Warren Bennis](#), *The Temporary Society*)

There is no father's/Father's authority in *dialogue*, in an *opinion*, or in the *consensus (affirmation)* process. There is only the *lusts* and hate of all who

are participating.

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

Karl Marx:

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

Sigmund Freud:

"... the hatred against patriarchal suppression—a 'barrier to incest,' ... the desire (for the sons) to return to the mother culminates in the rebellion of the exiled sons, the collective killing and devouring of the father." (Sigmund Freud in Herbert Marcuse, Eros and Civilization: a psychological inquiry into Freud)

Sigmund Freud's history of the prodigal son is not of the son coming to his senses, *humbling his self*, returning home, submitting his *self* to his father's authority, learning his inheritance was not his father's money but his father's love for him, but of the son joining with his "friends," returning home, killing the father, taking all that was his (the father's), using it to satisfy their carnal desires, i.e., their *lusts* of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, killing all the fathers in the land so all the children could be the same, i.e., like them, thereby *affirming* them, i.e., their control over them. Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud, i.e., socialism and psychology have this one thing in common, the 'justification' of *lust*, i.e., "*human nature*" and hatred toward the father's/Father's authority that gets in the way of *lust*, i.e., of "*human nature*."

"Marxian theory needs Freudian-type instinct theory to round it out. And of course, vice versa." "Third-Force psychology is also epi-

*Marxian in these senses, i.e., including the most basic scheme as true-good social conditions ['liberation' of "self" from the father's/Father's authority] are necessary for personal growth, bad social conditions [submission of "self" to the father's/Father's authority] stunt human nature,... This is to say, one could reinterpret Marx into a self-actualization-fostering Third- and Fourth-Force psychology-philosophy. And my impression is anyway that this is the direction in which they are going now." ([Abraham Maslow](#), *The Journals Of Abraham Maslow*)*

"Experience is, for me, the highest authority." "Neither the Bible nor the prophets, neither the revelations of God can take precedence over my own direct experience." (Rogers)

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

"To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit; and this book [Eros And Civilization] cannot without sinning communicate that experience to the reader." (Brown)

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

"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

The Father gave us the law. The law can save no one (only God can fulfill it). The Son, fulfilling the law, dying (shedding his blood) on the cross for (covering) our sins, redeems us, i.e., our soul from the Father's judgment upon us for breaking it (for pretending we are God, i.e., for establishing right and wrong behavior from our carnal nature, i.e., from our *lusts* and hate of restraint instead of from His Word). The facilitator of 'change,' i.e., the Marxist, i.e., the psychotherapist, on the other hand comes to 'redeem' us, i.e., our flesh from the father's/Father's authority. While you might deny the Son coming in the flesh, thus making you a liar (all liars will have their place in the lake of fire that is never quenched), to deny the Father is the spirit of antichrist, i.e., the spirit of the Marxist and the psychotherapist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change.' It was in a garden in Eden that the master facilitator of 'change' first made his appearance, 'liberating' two "children" from the "Father's" authority so they could be their *self*, i.e., be like Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, and the facilitator of 'change, i.e., "*of the world*" only.

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

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

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

"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." Matthew 10:32, 33

When you bring *dialogue* into an environment establishing right and wrong behavior you 'justify' "*the lust of the flesh*," "*the lust of the eyes*," and "*the pride of life*," establishing your *self*, i.e., "*human nature*," i.e., lust over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority. When we want to do what we want we go to *dialogue*, where our feelings and thoughts have the final say. When we want to do what the father/Father wants we go to

discussion, which retains the father's/Father's authority, i.e., the father/Father has the final say. The Lord Jesus Christ, in the temptations in the wilderness, went to *discussion* (with the devil, i.e., with the master facilitator of 'change') resulting in the Father, i.e., the Word of God having the final say, i.e., "*It is written,*" (with the devil, i.e., with the master facilitator of 'change' leaving him) while the woman in the garden in Eden went to *dialogue* (with the devil, i.e., the master facilitator of 'change') resulting in her *lusts* having the final say, resulting in her doing the devils, i.e., the master facilitator of 'change's' will instead of God's (with Adam following after her).

"In an ordinary discussion people usually hold relatively fixed positions and argue in favour of their views as they try to convince others to change." (Bohm and Peat, *Science, Order, and Creativity*) *Discussion* divides upon being right and not wrong, i.e., KNOWING, which is formal, i.e., judgmental, i.e., the father/Father retains his authority in *discussion*, i.e., has the final say, i.e., "*Because I said so,*" "*Never the less,*" "*It is written.*" There is a *guilty conscience* in *discussion*, i.e., in not doing right but wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth.

"A dialogue is essentially a conversation between equals." "*The spirit of dialogue, is in short, the ability to hold many points of view in suspension, along with a primary interest in the creation of common meaning.*" (Bohm and Peat, *Science, Order, and Creativity*) *Dialogue* unites upon "*feelings,*" i.e., "*I feel*" and/or "*I think,*" i.e., an *opinion*, which is informal, i.e., non-judgmental, i.e., the child retains his carnal nature in *dialogue*, having the final say (against authority, i.e., absolutes, i.e., the father's/Father's authority). There is no *guilty conscience* in doing wrong, according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth since there are no established commands, rules, facts, and truth to be wrong to in *dialogue*, i.e., in *dialogue* everything is an *opinion*, i.e., subject to 'change.'

When you bring *dialogue*, i.e., men's *opinions* into the "church," in order to understand the Word of God, you bring Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, the

facilitator of 'change' into the "church," making God's Word subject to men's *lusts*, i.e., no longer subject to God.

"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

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

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

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

"Miserable Christians, whose words and faith still depend on the interpretations of men and who expect clarification from them! This is frivolous and ungodly. The Scriptures are common to all, and are clear enough in respect to what is necessary for salvation and are also obscure enough for inquiring minds ... let us reject the word of man."
(Luther's Works: Vol. 32, Career of the Reformer: II, p.217)

"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

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

Apart from the Father, and His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ all you have is *lust*., i.e., what you have in common with all men.

"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

"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

When you, with the "help" of the facilitator of 'change,' establish right and wrong behavior through the *dialoguing* of *opinions* to a *consensus* (*affirmation*) process all you are doing is 'justifying' your *lusts*, establishing *lust*, i.e., "*human nature*" over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority. Twenty students, for example, from twenty different homes, with father's who disagree with one another on personal-social issue (regarding right and wrong behavior) results in twenty students, holding onto their father's position (authority) refusing to get along with one another when it comes to right and wrong behavior (personal-social issues). By switching ("*shifting*") communication, i.e., curriculum in the classroom from the *preaching, teaching, and discussing* of established commands, rules, facts, and truth which are to be learned by faith and obeyed as given, which retains the father's/Father's authority system (engendering division based upon those doing right according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth and those who are not, i.e., those who are doing wrong) to the students *dialoguing* their *opinions*, i.e., their carnal desires (*lusts*) of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or students are stimulating to a common "*feeling*" of agreement (at least tolerance), i.e., to a *consensus* (in an environment void of the father's/Father's authority system, where the students can share their carnal desires, i.e., their *lusts* without fear of being judged, condemned, and cast out), unity (which is based upon the students carnal nature, i.e., *lusts*—what they all have in common, engendering *common-ism*) negates division (which is caused by the father's/Father's authority system engendering individualism, under God, i.e., "*rule of law*").

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

The "*priesthood of all believers*," i.e., putting no man between you and the Father, "*doing your best as unto the Lord*," i.e., doing the Father's will engenders individualism, under God. Protestantism, putting no man between the Father and you *negates* the effect of "*group dynamics*," i.e., your *lust* for the *affirmation* of men, thus 'liberating' you from socialism/Mass-ism. Even the Marxist, Max Horkheimer understood this. The only means to *negating* individualism, under God is to replace the individual's adherence to Father's authority with his desire for the approval of men, i.e., his *lust* for "*the group's*" *affirmation* of his *lusts*.

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

According to Karl Marx, not until the child identifies with and unites with other children (as one class) in ridding his *self* of the father's/Father's authority (the opposing class) can he become his *self*, i.e., self-actualized, i.e., of (and for) the world only—with the "help" of the Marxist, i.e., the facilitator of 'change,' since he can not do it on his own (it does not come naturally). By simply making policy via *dialogue* (with any "discussion" being the result of the facilitator of 'change's' and participants *opinions* defining the commands, rules, facts, and truth to be "discussed," making them subjective, i.e., subject to 'change') a class is formed that is *antithetical* to the father's/Father's authority (which makes policy via *discussion*, i.e., according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth). *Discussion* restrains *dialogue*. making the outcome subject to established

commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., subject to the father's/Father's authority. *Dialogue negates discussion*, i.e., *negates restraint*, making the outcome subject to 'change,' i.e., subject to the child's carnal desires of the 'moment,' which are being stimulated by the world, i.e., by the current situation and/or people present (imagined or real). The method of communication used in establishing policy defines right and wrong behavior, i.e., determines which "*class*" you belong to—for the father/Father, which "*class*" you are to restrain in order to bring them to the knowledge of the truth for their soul sake, for the Marxist, which "*class*" you are to negate (kill), since, for them *lust*, i.e., the "here-and-now" is all there is, not the soul, i.e., where they will spend eternity, i.e., the "there-and-then." (See the issue "[What Is Missing \(*Negated*\) In Dialogue.](#)") As long as the father's/Father's authority remains in place in the children's lives they are prevented from finding their identity in "*the group.*"

"The dialectical method was overthrown—the parts [the children] were prevented from finding their definition [their identity] within the whole [within "the group," i.e., within society (through dialogue)]." ([György Lukács, History & Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?](#))

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

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

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

"The individual is emancipated [liberated from the father's/Father's authority] in the social group." "Freud commented that only through the solidarity of all the participants could the sense of guilt [the guilty conscience which is engendered by the father's/Father's authority] be assuaged." (Brown)

It is in "*the group*" that man 'justifies' his carnal nature, i.e., his *lusts*.

"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, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*)

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

*"The 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*)*

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

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

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

"Only when the immediate interests [lusts, i.e., self interests] are integrated into a total view and related to the final goal of the process do they become revolutionary [overthrowing the father's/Father's authority]." (Lukács)

"Our aim is not merely to describe prejudice [the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, that get in the way of lust, i.e., "human nature"] but to explain it in order to help in its eradication. Eradication means re-education." (Adorno)

There is a cost to *"eradication."* Millions (hundreds of millions) died violent deaths (were *"eradicated"* and continue to be *"eradicated"* today) as a result of this ideology.

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

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

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

The method used in a classroom (or in the home) to educate the children (students) is a political system. Traditional education produces citizens who will hold themselves accountable to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., "rule of law" when serving in public office.

Transitional education produces citizens who will use public office to "better" themselves. Transformation education produces citizens who will use public office to 'change' (convert) the citizens into "human resource," supporting their *self interests*.

Traditional education is based upon the teacher reflecting the father's/Father's authority in the classroom, i.e., a *Patriarchal paradigm*, i.e., a way of feeling, thinking, and acting or behavior toward *self*, others, the world, and authority where the teacher, as the father/Father has the final say on any matter, 1) *preaching* established commands and rules to be obeyed as given, *teaching* established facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith, and *discussing* any question(s) the children might have regarding the commands, rules, facts, and truth being taught, at the educator's discretion, i.e., providing he or she deems it necessary, has time, the children are able to understand, and are not questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking authority, 2) *rewarding* the child who does right and obeys, 3) correcting and/or *chastening* the child who does wrong and/or disobeys, that he might learn to *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate his self* in order to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, i.e., in order to do the father's/Fathers' will, and 4) *casting out* (expelling/grounding) any child who questions, challenges, defies, disregards, attacks the father's/Father's authority system (1-4).

Transformational education is based upon the teacher, while maintaining some semblance of order, allowing the students to "do their own thing" as long as it does not interfere with classroom activities (whatever that might be), allowing the teacher "to think about their own thing" in the process, i.e., a *Matriarchal paradigm*.

Transformational education is based upon the teacher, as a facilitator of 'change' 'changing' the way the student's feel, think, and act (behave) toward their *self*, others, the world, and authority; from loyalty to the father's/Father's authority system, i.e., demanding they and others *humble, deny, die to, control, discipline, capitulate their self* in order to

do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, thus engendering a *guilty conscience* when they do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., when they *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating to loyalty to the facilitator of 'change' and the process of 'change,' where they can 'justify' their *self*, i.e., their and the other student's natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., the current situation and/or people are stimulating, thereby 'justifying' their questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking the father's/Father's authority without having a *guilty conscience*, with "*the group's*" approval, i.e., *affirmation*., i.e., a *Heresiarchal paradigm*.

Change the method of education (curriculum) in the classroom and you change the world.

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

"A change in the curriculum is a change in the people concerned—in teachers, in students, in parents" "Curriculum change means that the group involved must shift its approval from the old to some new set of reciprocal behavior patterns." "... people involved who were loyal to the older pattern must be helped to transfer their allegiance to the new." "Re-education aims to change the system of values and beliefs [paradigm] of an individual or a group." (Benne)

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

By replacing the father's/Father's authority (in the front of the classroom) with the facilitator of change, the children are 'changed.' In "*Bloom's*

Taxonomies" (explained below), i.e., in transformational education the "educator," i.e., the facilitator of 'change' replaces "*knowing*" by being *told*, "*comprehending*" that you will be held accountable for being wrong or disobeying (*thesis*), "*applying*" what they want instead of obeying (*antithesis*), "*analyzing*," as "dad" is taking you to the "woodshed" for being or doing wrong, that "*knowing*" from what you have been *told*, i.e., doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth instead of "doing your own thing" is what life is all about, with "*synthesizing*," where you must set aside any established command, rule, fact, or truth, i.e., *negate* doing the father's/Father's will that gets in the way of your building relationship with others based upon what you and they have in common (*synthesis*), i.e., their and your natural inclination to *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world, i.e., that the current situation and/or people are stimulating and their and your hate of restraint, "*evaluating*" your and their response to the situation, i.e., "did we do the process of compromise, i.e., of 'change' right," not letting the father's/Father's authority get in the way of our relationship with one another or did we do the father's/Father's will instead, i.e., inhibiting or blocking our building of relationship upon "human nature," i.e., upon *lust*, i.e., upon what we have in common. To "*build relationship upon self interest*," i.e., upon *lust*, i.e., upon "*What can I get out of this situation and/or this person for my self?*" *negates* the father's/Father's authority, i.e., *negates* doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth in your thoughts and action. While looking for gold with your "friend" (for example) things might appear to be right but when you find it you had better watch your back, your "*friends*" *self interest* (thinking he could do more with your gold) could cost you your life.

*"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'/Father's authority to become as he was before the father's/Father's first command, rule, fact, or truth came into his life (separating him from his "*self*" and the world), "*of and for self*" and the world only]."* (Georg Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*)

When you make the child's carnal nature, i.e., *lust* the *thesis*, making the father's/Father's authority, i.e., having to do the father's/Father's will the *antithesis*, *synthesis* is created, i.e., becomes actualized as the children unite as one, based upon what they have in common, i.e., their *lust* for pleasure and hatred toward restraint.

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

*"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*)*

All "educators" are certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of "Bloom's Taxonomies," i.e., Marxist curriculum in the classroom. Marxism, as is psychology is based upon the *negation* of the father's/Father's authority in the individuals thoughts, directly effecting his actions, i.e., 'justifying' his *lust* for the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating and therefore his resentment toward restraint, establishing *lust*, i.e., the child's carnal nature over and therefore against the father's/Father's authority.

"Blooms' Taxonomies" are "a psychological classification system" used "to develop attitudes and values ... which are not shaped by the parents." "Ordering" "different kinds of affective behavior," i.e., "the range of emotion(s)" "organized into value systems and philosophies of life." "It was the view of the group that educational objectives stated in the behavior form have their counterparts in the behavior of individuals, observable and describable therefore classifiable [true science is "observable and repeatable," i.e., objective, i.e., constant not "observable and describable," i.e., subject to an opinion, i.e., subject to 'change']]." "Only those educational programs which can be specified in terms of intended student behaviors can be classified." "What we are classifying is the intended behavior of students—the

*ways in which individuals are to act, think, or feel as the result of participating in some unit of instruction." "... ordering and relating the different kinds of affective behavior." "... we need to provide the range of emotion from neutrality through mild to strong emotion, probably of a positive, but possibly also of a negative, kind." "... organized into value systems and philosophies of life ..." "...many of these changes are produced by association with peers who have less authoritarian points of view, as well as through the impact of a great many courses of study in which the authoritarian pattern is in some ways brought into question while more rational and nonauthoritarian behaviors are emphasized." "The student must feel free to say he disliked _____ and not have to worry about being punished for his reaction." (Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain* and *Book 2: Affective Domain*)*

"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." (Book 1: Cognitive Domain)

"In the eyes of the dialectic philosophy [using dialogue, i.e., "feelings" to come to the "truth"], nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred." (Karl Marx's ideology, as explained by Friedrich Engels)

Benjamin Bloom simply paraphrased Karl Marx's ideology (without giving him credit, for obvious reason).

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

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

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

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

"Most were put into a cell containing several who were further along in reforming themselves and who saw it as their primary duty to "help" their most backward member to see the truth about himself in order

that the whole cell might advance. Each such cell had a leader who was in close contact with the authorities for purposes of reporting on the cell's progress and getting advice on how to handle the Western member . . . the environment undermined the (clients) self-image."

" . . . Once this process of self of self re-evaluation began, the (client) received all kinds of help and support from the cell mates and once again was able to enter into meaningful emotional relationships with others." (Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays in Readings on Human Interaction, ed. Warren G. Bennis, Edgar H. Schein, David E. Berlew, and Fred I. Steele)

It is through *lust*, i.e., the "*affective domain*" you become at-one-with the world, i.e., that *worldly peace and socialist harmony* is initiated and sustained. This is why when leaders gain power through *lust*, with "*the people's*" affirmation, they refuse to relinquish their power, removing anyone who gets in the way of their *lusts*, doing so in the name of "*the people*." Even George Washington understood this. "*Despotism ... predominates in the human heart.*" ([George Washington](#), *Farewell Address*)

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

"In the more traditional society a philosophy of life, a mode of conduct, is spelled out for its members at an early stage in their lives." "A major function of education in such a society is to achieve the internalization of this philosophy." "This is not to suggest that education in an open society does not attempt to develop personal and social values." "It does indeed." "But more than in traditional societies it allows the individual a greater amount of freedom in which to achieve a Weltanschauung¹." ¹Cf. Erich Fromm, 1941; T. W. Adorno et al., 1950. (Book 2: Affective Domain)

Erich Fromm and T. W. Adorno (Benjamin Bloom's "*Weltanschauung*," i.e., world view) were two Marxists (Transformational Marxist's—Marxist's who merge socialism and psychology, i.e., Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud) who were members of the "Frankfurt School" who came to the states, fleeing Fascist Germany in the early 30's—who entered our universities and "assisted" our government in making policy—moving education out from under parental (the father's/Father's) authority, i.e., local control ("in loco parentis") to government control, i.e., to their control.

"Without exception, [children] enter group therapy [the "group grade" classroom] with the history of a highly unsatisfactory experience in their first and most important group—their primary family [the traditional home with parents telling them what they can and can not do]." "What better way to help [the child] recapture the past than to allow him to re-experience and reenact ancient feelings [resentment, hostility] toward parents in his current relationship to the therapist [the facilitator of 'change']? The [facilitator of 'change'] is the living personification of all parental images [takes the place of the parent]. Group [facilitators] refuse to fill the traditional authority role: they do not lead in the ordinary manner, they do not provide answers and solutions [teach right from wrong from established commands, rules, facts, and truth], they urge the group [the children] to explore and to employ its own resources [to dialogue their "feelings," i.e., their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' in the "light" of the current situation, i.e., their desire for "the group" approval (affirmation)]. The

group [children] must feel free to confront the [the facilitator of 'change'], who must not only permit, but encourage, such confrontation [rebellion and anarchy]. He [the child] reenacts early family scripts in the group and, if therapy [brainwashing]—washing respect for and fear of the father's/Father's authority from the child's brain (thoughts)] is successful, is able to experiment with new behavior, to break free from the locked family role [submitting to the father's/Father's authority, i.e., doing the father's/Father's will] he once occupied. ... the patient [the child] changes the past by reconstituting it ['creating' a "new" world order from his "ought," i.e., a world "lusting" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the current situation and/or people are stimulating, i.e., a world void of the father's/Father's authority and the guilty conscience which the father's/Father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, i.e., for "lusting" after pleasure in disobedience]." (Yalom)

When it comes to establishing right and wrong behavior, when you *dialogue your opinion* with others, i.e., with "*the group*" in order to arrive at a *consensus*, you are 'discovering' what you have in common with them, i.e., "*the lust of the flesh*," "*the lust of the eyes*," and "*the pride of life*," i.e., that which is only "*of the world*," making *lust* "*good*" and the father's/Father's authority, that gets in the way of *lust* "*evil*."

"In the group not only must the individual strive for autonomy but the leader must be willing to allow him to do so. ... an individual's behavior cannot be fully understood without an appreciation of his environmental press. ... one member's behavior is not understandable out of context of the entire group. ... there is no more important issue than the interrelationship of the group members. ... 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 but self-defeating beliefs and attitudes may waver and decompose in the face of a dissenting majority. One of the most difficult patients for me to work with in

groups is the individual who employs fundamentalist religious views in the service of denial. The 'third force' in psychology ... which emphasized a holistic, humanistic concept of the person, provided impetus and form to the encounter group ... The therapist assists the patient to clarify the nature of the imagined danger and then ... to detoxify, to disconfirm the reality of this danger. By shifting the group's attention from 'then-and-there' [parental authority] to 'here-and-now' [their feelings of the 'moment'] material, he performs a service to the group ... focusing the group upon itself. Members must develop a feeling of mutual trust and respect and must come to value the group as an important means of meeting their personal needs. Once a member realizes that others accept him and are trying to understand him, then he finds it less necessary to hold rigidly to his own beliefs; and he may be willing to explore previously denied aspects of himself. Patients should be encouraged to take risks in the group; such behavior change results in positive feedback and reinforcement and encourages further risk-taking. Members learn about the impact of their behavior on the feelings of other members. ...a patient might, with further change, outgrow ... his spouse ... unless concomitant changes occur in the spouse." (yalom)

The "educator" (the facilitator of 'change') does not have to *tell* the students to question, challenge, defy, disregard, attack their parent's authority when they get home from school, if they were not doing that already (*telling* them would be "old school," maintaining the "old" world order of being *told* even if it was done for the 'purpose' of 'change,' i.e., for the 'purpose' of creating a "new" world order), all they have to do is use a curriculum in the classroom that "*encourages*," i.e., pressures the students to participate in the process of 'change,' i.e., into *dialoguing* their *opinions* to a *consensus*, '*justifying*' their carnal nature, i.e., "*lust*" over and therefore against their parent's authority. Being *told* to be "*positive*" (supportive of the other students carnal nature) and not "*negative*" (judging them by their parent's standards) pressures students to 'justify' their and the other students love of pleasure and hate of restrain, doing so in order to be approved, i.e., *affirmed* by "*the group*," resulting in "*the group*" labeling those students who, holding onto their parent's standards, i.e., refusing to participate in

the process of 'change' or fighting against it as being "*negative*," divisive, hateful, intolerant, maladjusted, unadaptable to 'change,' resisters of 'change,' not "team players," lower order thinkers, in denial, phobic, prejudiced, judgmental, racist, fascist, dictators, anti-social, etc., i.e., "*hurting*" people's "*feelings*" resulting in "*the group*" rejecting them—the student's natural desire for approval and fear of rejection forces him to participate. The same outcome applies to all adults, in any profession who participate in the process. Once you are 'labeled,' you are 'labeled' for life. In the soviet union, once you were 'labeled' "*psychological*," no matter how important you were in the past, your life was over, your career was done.

"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!" Isaiah 5:20, 21 Woe unto them that call *lust* good, and the Father evil; ...

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

By "Reasoning" from your carnal nature, thinking of how the world "*ought to be*," you establish your *self*, i.e., your *lusts* as the 'drive' of life and the augmentation of them as the 'purpose.' Rejecting the world that "*is*," i.e., subject to the father's/Father's authority you can only make it subject to your *lusts*, turning what "*ought to be*" into what "*seems to be*," dying in your sins. "*We have to study the conditions which maximize ought-perceptiveness.*" "*Oughtness is itself a fact to be perceived.*" "*If we wish to permit the facts to tell us their oughtness, we must learn to listen to them in a very specific way which can be called Taoistic.*" "*Discovering one's real nature is simultaneously an ought quest and an is quest. An 'Ought-Is-Quest' is a religious quest in the naturalistic sense. Is becomes the same as ought. Fact becomes the same as value. The world which is becomes the world which ought to be.*" (Abraham Maslow, *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature*)

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

Facilitators of 'change,' i.e., psychologists, i.e., behavioral "scientists," i.e., "group psychotherapists," i.e., Marxists (Transformational Marxists)—all being the same in method or formula—are using the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus (affirmation) process, i.e., dialectic 'reasoning' ('reasoning' from/through the students "*feelings*" of the 'moment,' i.e., from/through their "lust" for pleasure and their hate of restraint, in the "light" of their desire for group approval, i.e., affirmation and fear of group rejection) in the "group grade," "safe zone/space/place," "Don't be negative, be positive," "open ended, non-directed," soviet style, brainwashing (washing the father's/Father's authority from the children's thoughts and actions, i.e., "theory and practice," negating their having a guilty conscience, which the father's/father's authority engenders, for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning in the process—called "the negation of negation" since the father's/Father's authority and the *guilty conscience*, being *negative* to the child's carnal nature, is negated in dialogue—in dialogue, opinion, and the consensus process there is no father's/Father's authority, i.e., no established aka absolute command, rule, facts, or truth to be accepted as is, by faith and obeyed), inductive 'reasoning' ('reasoning' from/through the students "*feelings*," i.e., their natural inclination to "lust" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment'—dopamine emancipation—which the world stimulates, i.e., their "self interest," i.e., their "sense experience," selecting "appropriate information"—excluding, ignoring, or resisting, i.e., rejecting any "inappropriate" information, i.e., established command, rule, fact, or truth that gets in the way of their desired outcome, i.e., pleasure—in determining right from wrong behavior), "Bloom's Taxonomy," "affective domain," French Revolution (Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité) classroom "environment" in order (as in "new" world order) to 'liberate' children from parental authority, i.e., from the father's/Father's authority system (the Patriarchal Paradigm)—as predators, charlatans, pimps, pedophiles, seducing, deceiving, and manipulating them as chickens, rats, and dogs, i.e., treating them as natural resource ("human resource") in order to

convert them into 'liberals,' socialists, globalists, so they, 'justifying' their "self" before one another, can do wrong, disobey, sin, i.e., can "*lust*" after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates, with impunity.

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

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

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