

Proverbs 3:5, 6 *"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."*

What You Should KNOW.
(Thinking required.)

by

Dean Gotcher

[My writing "style."](#)

Two Paradigms (two political systems): 1 John 2:16 *"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"*

What to watch out for:

Generalization and the facilitated, dialoguing of opinions to a consensus meeting where you are "asked" (pressured out of group approval) to be "positive and not negative" while "the group" is defining and establishing right and wrong behavior based upon feelings while solving a problem (a crisis). There is no Father's authority in any of it, that is there is no being held accountable for doing wrong and not right according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth. There is only the carnal desires, that is lusts (self interests) of those facilitating the meeting and those who participate being 'justified,' 'justifying their removing the Father's authority (anyone holding to absolutes) for getting in the way. It is where 'justifying' the killing of the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, and the righteous without having a guilty conscience comes from. It is the same formula whether it is being used in pre-school or at the Supreme Court, with the same result, disrespect and even hatred toward authority, being done in the name of "the people" in order for facilitator's of 'change' (Marxists) and all who follow after them to live off the people, oppressing them, making them their slaves without accountability to anyone except themselves.

The following information explains the difference between discussion, where the Father has the final say, the basis of traditional education where the teacher, reinforcing the parents standards, tell the students how they are to behave and dialogue, the basis of transformational education where the students defining and establishing what is right and what is wrong behavior have the final say, with the facilitator of 'change's' assistance. Discussion is grounded upon established commands, rules, facts, and truth we have accepted as is. Dialogue is grounded upon our feelings of the 'moment' that the world, that is the current situation, object, people, or person is stimulating. The verse "... it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." Jeremiah 10:23 is grounded upon discussion, as was the Lord Jesus Christ, doing what His Father says when it comes to behavior, expecting the same of us. John 12:47-50 *"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."* "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." Matthew 4:4 *"It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by*

every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." John 5:30 "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Matthew 7:21 "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 12:50 "And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven." Matthew 23:9 This requires faith in the one giving the established commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as is, applied or obeyed. With man, reasoning is subject to the flesh and the world that stimulates it, thus reasoning is subject to dialogue, to how he feels and what he thinks. Thus with dialogue all man has to work with is stimulus-response, "Make me feel good and I will listen to you." "Hurt my feelings and I will not." "Take away or threaten to take away what I am lusting after and I will turn and rend you." This is the language of today. 2 Timothy 4:3, 4 "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." Jeremiah 6:16 "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." This is the result of replacing discussion, where the teacher, reinforcing the parent's authority has the final say with dialogue, where the children in the classroom, assisted by the facilitator of 'change' have the final say, 'changing' the nation, establishing "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" over and therefore against the Father and His authority, which is the basis of Marxism. Karl Marx: "Once the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the Holy family, the former must then itself be destroyed in theory and in practice." (Karl Marx, Feuerbach Thesis #4) Thus, according to Karl Marx the need for 'change.' Karl Marx : "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, the objective however, is change." (Karl Marx, Feuerbach Thesis #11). Since parents, as philosophers (as the Marxist sees them) disagree with one another in the community, causing division in the world the Marxist, that is the facilitator of 'change,' the psychotherapist focuses upon what children have in common, their lust for pleasure and their dissatisfaction, resentment, and even hatred toward being restrained, toward the Father's authority, uniting them through dialogue thus turning them against the Father, in the home, in the Nation, and in Heaven so they can sin without being judged, condemned, or being cast out, that is so they can sin with impunity, with each others affirmation. This is the "Deep State." Just look around you. It is everywhere you look. It is fermented today in the classroom with teachers using "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)," Marxist indoctrination as their curriculum, their political system. In the second taxonomy Bloom wrote: "There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children." He continued: "Bloom's Taxonomies" are "a psychological classification system" used "to develop attitudes and values . . . which are not shaped by the parents." "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 ..." In the second taxonomy he sites two Marxists as there world view, Theodor Adorno and Erick Fromm, Fromm stating: "We are proud that in his conduct of life man has become free from external authorities, which tell him what to do and what not to do." (Erick Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*) Replacing discussion with dialogue accomplishes the deed. The Greek word for deed in the Bible is the word praxis, where man is void of God's judgment upon him for his sins, doing what he wants without restraint. It is found in God's warning toward man

continuing down its pathway. Colossians 3:5-10 *"Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them. But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him:"* Romans 8:12-15 *"Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father."* Ephesians 2:2, 3 *"Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others."* Praxis is the name of the teachers National Test. The Marxist Antonio Gramsci promoted praxis: *"The philosophy of praxis is the absolute secularization of thought, an absolute humanism of history."* (Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*) When you make dialogue your means to defining and establishing behavior this is where you are.

It is all about how we communicate with our self and with others when it comes to behavior. One paradigm is *"of the Father,"* that is being *told* what is right and what is wrong behavior and being held accountable, an absolute either-or way of thinking. The other paradigm is *"the lust of the flesh," "the lust of the eyes,"* and *"the pride of life,"* only that which is *"of the world,"* that is *stimulus-response*, an ever changing, feelings responding to a situation, an object, people, or a person way of thinking along a spectrum of *"Make me feel good and I will listen to you." "Hurt my feelings and I will not listen to you." "Take or threaten to take what I am lusting after away and I will turn and rend you."* These paradigms are absolutes and are opposite one another. There is a world of difference between the two. One is from above, being told. The other from below, "sense experienced." "Rule of law" comes from the Father. Lust for pleasure and dissatisfaction, resentment, and hatred toward restraint from the child.

To begin with, first while the earthly father is born into sin, as a child still carrying a child's nature within him, lusting after pleasure hating or at least not liking restraint he still reflects the Heavenly Father's authority structure, known as the Patriarchal paradigm. While law and discussion associated with the Patriarchal paradigm, which is emphasized in this article can not save you, revealing your sinful nature, God, the Father's grace through faith in His Son, Jesus Christ, who, honoring His Heavenly Father's authority obeyed His Heavenly Father in all things commanded resolves the conflict. That conflict being between us and the Heavenly Father for breaking His law, being resolved by His Son covering our sins by his shed blood on the cross. Yet law is still essential as it reveals to us we are not God. Having disobeyed Him, needing a savior to save us from His wrath God, the Heavenly Father honors authority to the point He allows us to use it in disobedience to Him, choosing to either turning from our wicked ways, turn to Him, giving our life to Him and do His will, guided by His Word (being told) and the Holy Spirit or doing our will instead. We are now at a time the world has rejected the Father and His authority altogether, denying Him and His law,

having no guilty conscience to repent with. The following explains how that is being done, in government, in the workplace, in the classroom, and even in the "Church."

"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." Romans 10:17 *"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."* Ephesians 2:8, 9 *"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast."* Romans 5:12 *"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:"*

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

In the facilitated, dialoguing of opinions to a consensus, "be positive not negative" meeting there is no Father or Son, there is no judgment, condemnation, being cast out for sinning, therefore there is no need of redemption. Having rejected the Father's authority, that which is "negative" in the meeting dialogue and the consensus process simply 'justifies' man's carnal thoughts and carnal actions. Bohm and Peat in *Science, Order, and Creativity* explained the difference between discussion, where the Father authors established commands, rules, facts, and truth, and having the final say enforces them and dialogue, with children lusting after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating and hating restraint, having the final say. The Father's Patriarchal paradigm is an either-or, right-wrong, above-below, black-white paradigm based upon absolutes, there is no in between, no gray or seems to be. The children's Heresiarchal paradigm is along a spectrum from erotic love to outright hate in responds to what in the environment is stimulating it, uniting with those who 'justify' lust, working together to remove those who get in lust's way. Discussion: *"In an ordinary discussion people usually hold relatively fixed positions and argue in favor of their views as they try to convince others to change."* Dialogue: *"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."* The deliberate exclusion ("*suspension*") of information in order to initiate and sustain relationships ("*create common meaning*") is a political system, making an opinion appear to be truth and the truth an opinion, making feelings a fact and facts an opinion. Lust, what we all have in common, what makes us "*equal*" 'justified' negates the Father's authority, making the Father's authority irrelevant to the situation, needing to be removed in order to solve the problem at hand.

With the Father it is discussion, *"What is the right thing to do?"* With the child it is dialogue, *"What can I get out of this for me?"* While we have both, KNOWING right from wrong from being *told*, doing what we are told and lusting after pleasure, doing or trying to do what we want, disliking, resenting, or hating restraint and the restrainer for preventing us from enjoying what we are lusting after, with them taking or threatening to take that which we are lusting after away, and-or "punishing" us for actualizing what we are lusting after, which one we turn to determines our paradigm—how we feel, think, and act toward our self, toward others, toward the world, and toward authority, humbling our self in order to do right and not wrong or 'justifying' our self in order to lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a guilty conscience. This is why liberals become so "*desperately wicked*" when they lose or fear loosing power, doing whatever it takes to keep or restore it.

Discussion contains "can not," "must not," "Thou shalt not," that is limits and measures while dialogue does not. Nothing is impossible in dialogue since there is no restraint to man's imagination in dialogue. The dialoguing of opinions to a Consensus, facilitated meeting results in what I call the "Tower of Babel syndrome" in all participants. Genesis 11:6 *"And the LORD said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do."* Michael Ray: *"When we learn to silence the inner voice that judges yourself and others, there is no limit to what we can accomplish, individually and as part of a team. Absence of judgment makes you more receptive to innovative ideas [that is to 'change']."* (Michael Ray in [Abraham Maslow](#), *Maslow on Management*) *"During the period of innovation, an environment is invisible. The present is always invisible because the whole field of attention is so saturated with it. It becomes visible only when it has been superseded by a new environment."* (Federal Education Grant, Dec. 1969, *Behavior Science in Teacher Education Program*—commonly referred to as [BSTEP](#)—all Federal Grants are subject to this Grant. The book "1984" was written as a result of it, exposing what is in it) In other words, if you participate in the program you will not know what hit you until it is too late. As one author explained it, by pushing all the marbles in the brain to one side change can be made without the person becoming aware of it until afterwards. As you will see the facilitated, dialoguing of opinions to a consensus meeting is literally the pot that boils the frog. You can not change it or bring it under control, or "bring it around" when you participate. It changes you or brings you under its control, or "brings you around" instead. Your participation gives it life.

By making behavior subject to discussion, being told what is right behavior and what is wrong is a completely different paradigm than dialogue, feelings (impulses, urges, and stimulus-response). It is the difference in how we respond to the command our father gave us that got in the way of our carnal desire of the 'moment', either our "Why?" "You don't understand" voiced in defiance to the the Father or our humbling of self in order to do the Father's will, doing what we are told. With one paradigm you have a guilty conscience when you do your will instead of the Father's, with the other, there is no guilty conscience for disobeying since there is no Father's authority to disobey. The more we make behavior subject to dialogue the less guilty conscience we have for disobeying, to the point of critical mass (called "Critical Criticism"), to that of outright hate. It is in dialogue we get Critical Thinking, "Higher Order Thinking Skills," and eventually Critical Race Theory at its extreme (where no true discussion is allowed). This is where the heart, deceived in believing pleasure is the purpose for life instead of doing the Father's will becomes "desperately wicked," striking out against the Father for getting in the way. Irvin D. Yalom: *"Freud noted that ... patricide and incest ... are part of man's deepest nature."* (Irvin D. Yalom, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*)

To the Marxist, when the child submits to the Father's authority he 'creates' it. Karl Marx *"The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force."* (Karl Marx, MEGA I-3) For Karl Marx by children submitting to their earthly father's authority the Heavenly Father's authority is created. Liberation from religion, belief in the Heavenly Father thus requires removing the earthly father from society, starting with the King and all who support him. Karl Marx: *"Once the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the Holy family, the former must then itself be destroyed in theory and in practice."* (Karl Marx, *Feuerbach Thesis #4*) Transformation Marxist added psychology (dialogue) to Marxism, which rejects the

father's authority as well in order to remove the father's authority from the individual, something Karl Marx was not able to clearly articulate in his day. Knowing from then on no longer comes from being told (through discussion) but from experiencing it for yourself, making all knowledge subject to the flesh and the world that stimulates it, negating the issue of sin, of judgment, condemnation, and being cast out for immoral thoughts and immoral actions.

As the Marxist Wilfred Bion stated in his book, *A Memoir of the Future*, who was a former director of Tavistock, a major 'change' agent agency in the UK the agenda is to "prevent someone who KNOWS from filling the empty space" (where we dialogue with our self). There is a place for dialogue, the foods we eat, the clothes we wear, the colors we choose, etc., what we like (and don't like) making us one amongst billions on the earth, an individual. But when it is used where we are told what is wrong behavior it becomes the source for rebellion and anarchy leading to revolution, what every professional liberal, that is facilitator of 'change' and psychotherapist knows but most people do not, who while they might disobey the Father they do not reject His authority. [Carl Rogers](#), in his book *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy* explained the effect psychology (psychotherapy), with its use of dialogue has upon a person. Carl Rogers: "Prior to therapy the person is prone to ask himself, 'What would my parents want me to do?' During the process of therapy the individual comes to ask himself, 'What does it mean to me?'" These are two different paradigms. Two different political systems in opposition to one another, especially when the latter is done in a group, which is the key to Marxism, socialism, globalism. [Kurt Lewin](#) in his article *Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics* wrote: "The group to which an individual belongs is the ground for his perceptions, his feelings, and his actions" Kurt Lewin, in Kenneth Benne's book, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#) wrote: "It is usually easier to change individuals formed into a group than to change any one of them separately." "The individual accepts the new system of values and beliefs by accepting belongingness to the group." Kurt Lewin in Wilbur Brookover's book *A Sociology of Education* explained the effect leadership style has upon the group and the child. "The child takes on the characteristic behavior of the group in which he is placed. . . . he reflects the behavior patterns which are set by the adult leader of the group." Kurt Lewin, regarding the effect different types of leadership have upon people wrote: "Change in methods of leadership is probably the quickest way to bring about a change in the cultural atmosphere of a group." "Any real change of the culture of a group is, therefore, interwoven with the changes of the power constellation within the group." (Barker, Dembo, and Lewin, "frustration and regression: an experiment with young children" in *Child Behavior and Development*) Irvin D. Yalom, in *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy* wrote "... few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity in the face of apparent group unanimity; and the individual rejects critical feelings toward the group at this time to avoid a state of cognitive dissonance. To question the value or activities of the group, would be to thrust himself into a state of dissonance. Long cherished ... beliefs and attitudes may waver and decompose in the face of a dissenting majority." ([Irvin D. Yalom](#), *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*) Cognitive dissonance is "the lack of harmony between what one does and what one believes." "The pressure to change either one's behavior or ones belief" (Ernest R. Hilgard, *Introduction to Psychology*) The Marxist, [Norman O. Brown](#), explaining the use of psychology in Marxism wrote: "The individual is emancipated in the social group." "Freud commented that only through the solidarity of all the participants could the sense of guilt be assuaged." "Self-

perfection of the human individual is fulfilled in union with the world in pleasure." "According to Freud, the ultimate essence of our being is erotic." "Eros is fundamentally a desire for union with objects in the world." "Eros is the foundation of morality."

"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

What Global socialists fear is National socialism stealing their show. National socialism is the result of individuals in the Nation feeling the attack from Global socialist, uniting as a group to fight socialism, losing their individualism in the process, having to compromise in order to unite as one. What both have in common in outcome is described by Robert Owen's son, whose father tried socialism here in America, that all he produced was a culture of lazy, incompetent, and vicious people. Robert Dale Owen: *"All cooperative schemes which provide equal remuneration to the skilled and industrious and the ignorant and idle must work their own downfall. For by this unjust plan they must of necessity eliminate the valuable members and retain only the improvident, unskilled, and vicious."* (Robert Dale Owen, Robert Owen's son) The difference between discussion and dialogue when it comes to a group is the later unites around feelings, "What can I get out of this for me?" that is "Relationship built upon self interest," resulting in the individual being unable to stand alone in disagreement with the group, which is the byproduct of the consensus process, the former around principle or a position, "What is the right thing to do?" resulting in fellowship, the individual being then able to stand alone in disagreement with the group when it goes astray, thus the reason for majority vote, where individuals can retain their position without compromise even though they might loose.

Paradigm "Shift"

Thomas Kuhn did his research on paradigms under Ralph Tyler. Benjamin Bloom dedicated his first taxonomy to Ralph Tyler. Kuhn explaining his *"'paradigm shift' concept of 'Pre- and Post-paradigm periods,'" where facts-based scientists, those who insist upon discussion are replaced with feelings or opinion-based scientist, those who insist upon dialogue, admitted it made the true scientist no longer a scientist in the field of science, quoted Max Planck: "A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it."* whereupon *"the man who continues to resist after his whole profession has been converted is ipso facto ceased to be a scientist."* (Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*) Kuhn, as did Benjamin Bloom admitted that his "paradigm shift" concept, that is the facilitated, dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process was not provable as true science, that it only gave people the appearance that it was true science in order to initiate and retain control over "the people" in order justify sin so they could sin without being judged, condemned, or cast out. *"Kuhn admitted problems with the schemata of his socio-psychological theory yet continued to urge its application into the scientific fields of astronomy, physics, chemistry, and biology."* Benjamin Bloom, using the same "paradigm shift" concept in the classroom admitted same forty years after the publication of his first taxonomy that is was not true science as well: *"Certainly the Taxonomy was unproved at the time it was developed and may well be 'unprovable.'" (Benjamin Bloom, Forty Year Evaluation)* Despite that fact all teachers are

certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of "[*Bloom's Taxonomies*](#)" in their classroom, as their curriculum, their paradigm, their political system. To question their use in the classroom will cost the teacher their job and the school their Federal funding.

Norman O. Brown: *"By dialectic, I mean an activity of consciousness, struggling to circumvent the limitations imposed by the formal-logical law of contradiction.* (Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*) All Brown was saying is "I'm trying to figure out how I can get around what my parent's just told me to do." It also applies to getting around the Constitution and "Rule of Law."

This so called "shift" from parental authority, discussion to child autonomy, to dialogue (under the influence of a facilitator of 'change,' a Marxist), applies from a child on the playground to a Federal judge setting in our Highest Court (replacing "What did the framers of the Constitution intend," making law objective, subject to "Rule of Law" with "What does it mean 'the people,'" that is "What does it mean to me?" making law subjective, subject to the flesh and the world that stimulates it. Socialism negates the original intent of the "Bill of Rights," individualism, under God. No one can think dialectically and serve and protect established law, "Rule of Law," the Constitution with its "Bill of Rights." They can only compromise it, using their office to make it subject to their "self interests." As Karl Marx in *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'* wrote: *"Laws must not fetter human life; but yield to it; they must change as the needs and capacities of the people change,"* making law open to interpretation, that is 'change' by the court).

For example our Highest Court in *Strauss Vs. Strauss* (1941) wrote: *"Every system of law known to civilized society generated from or had as its component one of two well-known systems of ethics, stoic or Christian. The COMMON LAW draws its subsistence from the latter, its roots go deep into that system, the Christian concept of right and wrong or right and justice motivates every rule of equity. It is the guide by which we dissolve domestic frictions and the rule by which all legal controversies are settled."* Regarding stoic ethics, Karl Marx's hero Heraclitus, whose ideology was the basis of the stoics wrote: *"Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys."* Karl Marx, in *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'* wrote: *"The justice of state constitutions is to be decided not on the basis of Christianity, not from the nature of Christian society but from the nature of human society."* Our Highest Court in *ROE Vs. WADE* (1971) made stoicism, Marxism the foundation for American ethics: *"There has always been strong support for the view that life does not begin until live birth. This was the belief of the Stoics,"* making facts and truth subject to feelings and opinion, belief subject to theory, discussion subject to dialogue, the Father subject to the children of disobedience, the citizens subject to the Marxist, replacing science, that is, life begins at conception (which is irrefutable) with opinion, life begins whenever I think it does, 'justifying' the killing of the unborn and therefore the elderly, the innocent ("collateral damage"), and the righteous, that is anyone who gets in the way of their lusts, their "self interest," their fancy houses, their fancy cars, their fancy boats, their fancy planes, their fancy trips, their hanging around fancy women and fancy men which are dancing in their head if not yet attained.

James 4:1-3 *"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."

The Marxist Ervin Laszlo (the father of "climate change") explaining the consensus process, the "bypassing" of parental, Constitutional, and Godly restraint, that is "Rule of Law" (all of which dialogue, an opinion, and the consensus process do not contain) wrote: *"Bypassing the traditional channels of 'top-down' decision making, our objective center's upon transforming public opinion into an effective instrument of global politics." "Individual values must be measured by their contribution to common 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*) When our government agencies use the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process to establish rules, form policy, and make law, that is to establish what is right and what is wrong behavior, as Adam and the woman did in the garden in Eden, they "own" whatever they see. A man I knew put it this way. "They send your newly elected school board off to a conference and the come back with a lobotomy. You can no longer talk to them." The key being they have replaced discussion (commands, rules, facts, and truth) with dialogue (their feelings) when it comes to behavior, making them no longer able to communicate with you unless you abdicate knowing right from wrong behavior from being told, making your feelings the foundation from which to establish behavior, becoming like them. They have literally become missionaries of the dialectic process (Marxism) in their home town.

Jesus Christ, condemned the use of dialogue and the consensus process when it comes to defining and establishing right and wrong behavior. John 12:47-50 *"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." "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."* Matthew 4:4 *"It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."* John 5:30 *"For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."* Matthew 7:21 *"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 12:50 *"And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven."* Matthew 23:9 *"... it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."* Jeremiah 10:23

Carl Rogers, in defiance to God and His Word wrote: *"Experience is, for me, the highest authority." "Neither the Bible nor the prophets, neither the revelations of God can take precedence over my own direct experience."* This is the ideology every student is confronted with in education today, a hostile attack upon the Christian faith disguised as academics, where lust for pleasure negates doing the Father's will. Karl Marx, making man's carnal nature the basis of life did the same: *"Sense experience must be the basis of all science." "Science is only genuine science when it proceeds from sense experience, in the two forms of sense perception and sensuous need, that is, only when it proceeds from Nature."* (Karl Marx, MEGA I/3) Embedded in the "scientific method," "behavior science" is *"the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life"* what Karl Marx called

"*sensuous need,*" "*sense perception,*" and "*sense experience.*" making the participants only interested in and subject to their "*self interest,*" to that which is only "*of the world.,*" only "*from Nature.*"

Romans 7:7 "*I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.*" This is why those who use dialogue to define and establish law reject the law of God. The Marxist György Lukács (founder of the "Frankfurt School") explained what the Marxist had to overcome in order to rule over the world. ". . . *the central problem is to change reality... reality with its 'obedience to laws.'*" (György Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?*) R. W. Makepeace and Croom Helm, in their book *Marxist Ideology and Soviet Criminal Law*, explained the effect *dialogue* has upon decisions made in the court, where the liberal can be tried by dialogue, wrong being dismissed (since there is no wrong in dialogue) just needing to do better next time with the conservative being punished for being or doing wrong, only those facts being allowed (appropriate information) that determine the desired outcome, which dialogue does. "*Jurisprudence of terror takes two forms; loosely defined rules which produces unpredictable law, and spontaneous changes in rules to best suit the state.*"

The scriptures warn us of the consequence of lusting after pleasure, dialogue when it comes to behavior how we can be seduced, deceived, and manipulated with our yielding to it. 2 Peter 2:3 "*And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you.*" Carl Rogers explained how you can be "owned," that is you can be turned into "human resource" because of your lust for pleasure. Carl Rogers: "*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.*" All I have to do is find out through dialogue what you are lusting after, offer to help you actualize it and I "*own*" you. It is what is happening in the student's in the classroom and to your elected officials at the capital. Romans 6:16 "*Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?"*

When it comes to behavior, therapy, which is based upon the use of dialogue is anathema toward God and His Word, is antithetical to doing the Father's will. As an example traditional Marxism is considered to be National Marxism (Fascism) since it *tells* people how to behave, maintaining a father's authority system in some distorted form whereas transformational Marxists, using dialogue, that is psychology and the consensus process, "the group grade," "team building" process, create an environment

where people can experience being a Marxist without fear of being judged, condemned, and cast out. To participate is to become a Marxist. You are not just studying how to become a Marxist, by your participation you are one. When your politicians make law via this process, the law is Marxist in nature. To participate is to create. "Building relationship upon self interest," becoming "self actualized" you go straight to globalism, transcending Nationalism in any form. People think the Berlin wall came down because Communism was defeated. It came down because Transformational Marxism had succeeded in replacing Traditional Marxism, replacing being told with the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process all over the world. Abraham Maslow stated: *"One could reinterpret Marx into a self-actualization-fostering Third- and Fourth-Force psychology-philosophy."* ([Abraham Maslow](#), *The Journals of Abraham Maslow*) In *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature* he wrote: *"Self-actualizing people have to a large extent transcended the values of their culture. They are not so much merely Americans as they are world citizens, members of the human species first and foremost."*

In *Maslow on Management* Maslow wrote: *"I have found whenever I ran across authoritarian students [those who adhere to the father's authority, who insist upon discussion, that is upon established commands, rules, facts, and truth when it comes to behavior] that the best thing for me to do was to break their backs immediately." "The correct thing to do with authoritarians is to take them realistically for the bastards they are and then behave toward them as if they were bastards."* The consensus process is used to "beat down" any right-wrong thinking, discussion based person, labeling them 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., a label they can never outlive, since the label is written down and remains there for all to see the rest of their life.

The use of generalization to silence true discussion.

Karl Marx, in his article *The Holy Family* defined the Christian according to his understanding. Karl Marx: *"The unspeculative Christian also recognizes sensuality as long as it does not assert itself at the expense of true reason, that is of faith, of true love, that is of love of God, of true will-power; that is of will in Christ. Not for the sake of sensual love, not for the lust of the flesh, but because the Lord said: Increase and multiply."* He then explained what it was that could be used to negate the Christian's faith in God, that being his natural propensity to lust, especially his lust for approval from others. *"It is not sensuality which is presented . . ., but the attraction of what is forbidden."* By the use of generalization, use of "human nature" which encompasses *"the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,"* he could 'justify' the flesh and label the Father and anyone who thinks like Him as being anti-social, mental, neurotic. Neurosis is when a person is caught between belief in God or parent while wanting to do what they are lusting after at the same time, being tossed back and forth emotionally. Thus he could label all who believe in God as being mental or potentially mental if they persisted in holding onto and encouraging others to accepting their belief during and following the "group grade," "team building," consensus meeting; no change from position to feelings identifies him as a "resister to 'change.'" Ronald Havelock, a 'change' agent explained what the qualifications of a 'change' agent were: *"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."* (Ronald

Havelock, *A Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education*) Innovation to the 'change' agent meaning 'change' in behavior from doing the Father's will, from doing what you are told to 'changing' with the impulses and urges of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, what everyone has in common. Karl Marx used fruit trees as an example (the same issue as was in the garden in Eden). He found he could draw the believer into participation with that which would destroy his faith by making feelings, which includes the approval of men (what Kurt Lewin called "Group Dynamics") the focus of attention while solving a crisis. Making all subject to science, that is to stimulus-response, to group approval he was able to make everyone subject only to that which is "of the world." By using words or phrases that label someone holding to their position as being guilty of hurting other's feelings, causing division he was able to brand them as being uncaring and hateful toward mankind, thinking only about himself, with anyone believing in individualism, under God, insisting others think the same way being the most offensive. John Dewey: *"A democratic society repudiates the principle of external authority." "God is the source of corruption in individuals."* (John Dewey *Democracy and Education*) *"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*) Abraham Maslow: *"In a democratic society a patriarchal culture should make us depressed instead of glad; it is an argument against the higher possibilities of human nature, of self actualization."* *"In our democratic society, any enterprise—any individual—has its obligations to the whole."* (Abraham Maslow, *Maslow On Management*) James Coleman's work, *Equality of Opportunity* changed our Highest courts interpretation of education, turned education away from parental authority, the source of "prejudice" and division to socialism, communism, Marxism, globalism. Paul Lazarsfeld was James Coleman's professor at Columbia University, who was a member of the "Frankfurt School," a group of Marxists who came to the U.S. in the early 30's from Frankfurt German, thus the title. In Coleman's book *The Adolescent Society* Coleman wrote : *"In the traditional society each child is at the mercy of his parents. The 'natural processes' by which they socialize him makes him a replica of them."* *"Equality of Opportunity [in other words freedom to lust] becomes ever greater with the weakening of family power."* *"One of the consequence of the increasing social liberation of adolescents is the increasing inability of parents to enforce norms, a greater and greater tendency for the adolescent community to disregard adult dictates."* *"Strengthening the family to draw the adolescent back into it faces serious problems, as well as some questions about its desirability."* *"The family has little to offer the child in the way of training for his place in the community."* ([James Coleman](#), *The Adolescent Society*)

"Behavior science," makes behavior subject to man's lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, void of the Father's authority, making man hostile toward having to do right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, having to do what he is told when he does not feel like doing it. Thus Mao Zedong, the Communist Chinese dictator could say: *"Words and actions should help to unite, and not divide, the people"* This is what the facilitated, dialoguing of opinions to a consensus, "be positive, not negative" meeting is all about, programing people to accept generalized words as truth, rejecting discussion, principles, the truth, private convictions. As the Marxist Kenneth Benne in [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#) stated: *we "must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue."* "Bloom's Taxonomies" are all about labeling students (for life) starting with the first survey or test they are given in the "group grade" classroom. Bloom: *"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 ..." Children have been graded for decades in the classroom based upon whether they believe in God or in man's carnal nature only, whether they believe in their parent's authority and the nation or are Marxist-Globalists, being punished if they believe in the former, all being done without their parent's knowledge. Graded for life along with their parents.

The facilitator of 'change' is a Marxist.

The dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process is Marxism. To participate is to be.

Karl Marx : *"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, the objective however, is change."* (Karl Marx, *Feuerbach Thesis #11*) The 'change' of the consensus process is not changing from one position to another by persuasion but the continuous change of behavior in response to the current situation, object, people, or person present, approving those who 'justify' lust, rejecting and labeling, thus silencing those who, believing in absolutes, 'judge' it instead. The facilitator of 'change,' perceiving his *self* as being the personification of "the people," who, like him *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the moment the world *stimulates*, hating restraint, sees it as his duty to 'justify' "the people's" natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure in order to 'justify' his natural inclination to *lust* after pleasure. When you question the facilitator of 'change's' actions he will respond with "It is not just about you," really meaning "It is all about me, so I can *lust* after pleasure without having a *guilty conscience*, with your *affirmation*. If you refuse to *affirm* me, that is my *lusts* or get in my way 'the people' will remove (*negate*) you (since having 'justified' their *lusts* I now 'own' them). It appears I must keep an eye on you from now on for the 'good' of 'the people,' that is for my 'good.'" The roll of the facilitator of 'change' is to make behavior subject to dialogue, how you feel and what you think instead of discussion, what the Father says in order for him to do wrong, disobey, sin, that is *lust* after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates without having a guilty conscience, with your affirmation. By the facilitator of 'change' 'creating' an environment (a "positive," safe place-zone-space) which removes the Father's threat of judgment, condemnation, and being cast out for immoral behavior, you are now free to "be yourself." From then on the facilitator of 'change' "owns" you. It is all the serpent, the master facilitator of 'change' did with the woman in the garden in Eden, replacing "*thou shalt surely die*," what the Father says with "*ye shalt not surely die*," that is "We can talk about anything here without being judged, condemned, or cast out" and he "owned" her—with Adam, following after her.

Anyone trying to have an honest discussion, "What is the right thing to do?" based upon facts and truth, insisting those in the group do the same, in a dialogue, "What can I get out of this for me?" based environment will always be perceived and labeled as being argumentative, not a friend of "the people," needing to abdicate to the process of 'change' or at least be silenced or else be censored and removed if they persist. This is an absolute. That is why communist countries (and the UN) use the consensus process in "helping" "the people," coming between them and what is theirs, gaining and keeping control over them by using the consensus process to gain and keep control of their elected officials, with "What can I get out of the people for myself?" now

controlling their thoughts, of course using their office, that is their position of power, in the name of "the people" to support themselves and their new masters.

This is the process the "Military establishment" was using that President Eisenhower warned us about, now being used by all major (and minor) corporations, institutions, utilities, contractors, government agencies, and branches of government, using dialogue and the consensus process in establishing rules, policies, and law, making "the people" subject to supporting their carnal desires, their self interests, so they can live in their fancy houses, drive their fancy cars, sail their fancy boats, fly their fancy jets, take fancy trips, hang around fancy women and fancy men, being praised and worshiped by the citizens (at least by the liberals, the Neocons, and the deceived), all at the citizens expense (as they say "What a gig."). Doing so without having a guilty conscience. Doing whatever it takes, that is what they can get away with to gain and keep control of "the people's" cash flow, making sure it flows upward to them, adding new programs to "help" the people deal with crisis, in order to increase the flow and take "ownership" of all they see, that which is "the people's" by law. The "Deep State" is a paradigm (which the school system is training up and adding to daily, via the use of *"Bloom's Taxonomies,"* the "group grade," and the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process in the classroom). In discussion the elected official serves his constituents, they have the final say, "What is the right thing to do?" In dialogue "the people" serve him (serving them), he has the final say, "What can I get out of this office for me?" Anyway I digress.

While the earthly father can think and act as a child, lusting and chasing after pleasure and the child can think and act as a father (being mature in mind and action, doing right and not wrong according to what he has been told), respecting and honoring the Father's authority, which way a person is thinking and acting, young or old determines their paradigm. While the earthly father's right can be wrong and the child's right can be right it is the right-wrong way of thinking that the child retains that determines his paradigm, that being discussion when it come to behavior. While dialogue has it place, with us choosing the food, the paint color, and the car we like, when it comes to behavior, when we are told how we are to behave, which foods are good for us and which ones are not, which colors go together and which ones do not, what we can afford and what we can not when we go to dialogue we do what we want, usurping what we are supposed to do, if we were told, usurping the Father's authority, using dialogue instead of discussion when it comes to behavior. The Marxist as the psychologist, rejecting Spirit, being told (thus making the soul subject to the flesh and the world that stimulates it, called the psycho-motor instead of subject to God, subject to being told—the soul KNOWS from being told, the flesh by sense experience), therefore rejects the Father's authority, making reasoning subject to "sense experience," to the flesh, to approaching pleasure and avoiding pain," which includes the pain which comes with missing out on pleasure which the world is stimulating, that is stimulus-response, making himself and everyone else subject to only that which is "of the world." Rejecting the right-wrong way of thinking, that is rejecting the Father's authority he changes his paradigm to dialogue, to where his feelings control his thoughts and therefore his actions. The conservative goes to discussion, "What is the right thing to say and do, according to what I have been told?" the liberal to dialogue "What can I get out of this for me?" when it comes to behavior.

While discussion can not save you, without it you can not be saved, with God having the final say. It is the difference between *In Loco Parentis*, local control, Nationalism, individualism under God, where there is a "higher authority" directing your thoughts, directly effecting your actions and humanism, Socialism, Globalism, Marxism, Communism where lust for pleasure, which includes your lust for the affirmation of others affirming your lusts directs your thoughts, directly effecting your actions, 'justifying' your rejection of and hatred toward the Father and His authority for getting in the way. Luke 16:15 *"And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God."* Jeremiah 17:9 *"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?"* We can not see our heart as being "wicked," that is "desperately wicked" because its lust for pleasure is standing in the way, 'justifying' the hate. Even the first president of the U.S., [George Washington](#) recognized the condition of man's heart. In his *Farewell Address* he stated: *"despotism . . . predominates in the human heart."* thus the need for check's and balances in government, giving the Father in the home, as a King the authority to rule over his home, his property, and his business according to his convictions, with his children eventually leaving home, KNOWING right from wrong from being told. Matthew 6:24 *"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."* This is why David hid God's Word, discussion in his heart, restraining dialogue, him doing whatever he wanted to do in disobedience. Psalms 119:11 *"Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee."* Without God's Word all we have is that which is "of the world," and "What can I get out of it for myself?"

Making discussion subject to dialogue or building discussion upon dialogue is what the scriptures call "so called science," what "seems to be," where opinion or theory determines whether the information included is appropriate or inappropriate (which appears to be a discussion) which then determines the outcome. Proverbs 16:25 *"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."* Carl Rogers: *"The words 'seem to' are significant; it is the perception which functions in guiding behavior."* It was the woman's perception, "she saw" that led to her 'justifying' her eating the forbidden fruit in the garden in Eden, that Rogers is 'justifying.' Colossians 2:8: *"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."* Ephesians 5:5-7: *"Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them."* James 4:4 *"Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God."* Jeremiah 17:5, 7 *"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."*

Discussion is of the Father, objective truth, with the Father telling those under his authority what they can and can not do, with Him having the final say; "Because I said so," "Never the less," or "It is written." In discussion God is God. This is why you study the scriptures in order to be "approved by God" where then the Holy Spirit reminds you of what you have read, in Christ Jesus saying and doing what the Father says. While the earthly father, as a child is born into sin and can be a tyrant, or MIA, or AWOL, doing (as a child) whatever he wants in disobedience to God, his office, given to him by God is perfect, in which to do God the Father's will. He sees money as being used to survive or get ahead, making him producer driven in mind and action. His

children, instead of chasing after pleasure can sit still and listen, having been disciplined. [Hebrews 12:5-11](#) describes the authority structure of the Father in Heaven and the father on earth, ending with *"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."* Dialogue on the other hand is of the child, subjective 'truth,' *"the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,"* "I feel" and "I think" when it comes to behavior, in disobedience to the Father 'justifying' himself. In dialogue the child is God, having the final say. He sees money as stored up pleasure which needs to be spent on entertainment, on pleasure, on him, with him relating with and supporting those of like mind, being consumer driven in mind, running all over the place thinking and acting as though he owns whatever he sees. Have you seen any of those lately? In the government and even in the home, both the result of dialogue replacing discussion when it comes to behavior.

The replacing of *discussion* with *dialogue* when it comes to behavior is Jean-Jacques Rousseau's world where, in defiance to *"the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof,"* with the Lord giving man dominion over the earth (the right to say "Mine. Not yours."), under His restraint, Rousseau and men like him (Karl Marx for example in *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'* stating: *"The proletariat [speaking of himself, whatever he gets "the people" to "own" he "owns," since he "owns" them] thus has the same right as has the German king when he calls, the people his people and a horse his horse."*), rejecting the Father's authority decree, *"The fruits of the earth belong to us all, and the earth itself to nobody."* Therefore Rousseau and Karl Marx, and all who buy this 'logic' without having to labor have as much right to eat and enjoy what you have labored over as you, without you being able to restrain them. What you own they own, with you having to, through taxes pay them in order to labor on your, now their land. (1 Corinthians 10:26; Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on Inequality*) Whenever government comes to "help" those in need it takes "ownership" over what they have. Those "of and for the world" go to dialogue when it comes to behavior so they can lust after pleasure and hate restraint without having a guilty conscience, with all the children's affirmation since the spectrum from lust to hate is what they all have in common. The Marxist Jürgen Habermas noted: *"In the dialogic relation of recognizing oneself in the other, they experience the common ground of their existence."* ([Jürgen Habermas](#), *Knowledge & Human Interest, Chapter Three: The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory*) If I ask your children how they "feel" and what they "think," that is their opinion regarding what you have told them is right and wrong behavior, without fear of being corrected, chastened, or rejected for disagreeing with what you told them, and they willingly participate I have 'liberated' your children from your authority as a parent, I now "own" them.

We kept the King.

The framers of the Constitution, with its "Bill of Rights" did not get rid of the King, as all socialist countries must. They kept the King, placing him in the home, ruling over his family, his property, his business, according to his convictions. It is only with one, that being the Father a guilty conscience is created, creating a citizenry that knows right from wrong from being told, holding themselves and others accountable to doing right and not wrong.

The Marxist Warren Bennis in his book *The Temporary Society* wrote explained the result of coming between the parents and their children: ". . . any intervention between parent and child tend to produce familial democracy regardless of its intent." *"The*

*consequences of family democratization take a long time to make themselves felt—but it would be difficult to reverse the process once begun. ... once the parent can in any way imagine his own orientation to be a possible liability to the child in the world approaching ... Once uncertainty is created in the parent how best to prepare the child for the future, the authoritarian family is moribund, regardless of whatever countermeasures may be taken." "The state, by its very interference in the life of its citizens, must necessarily undermine a parental authority which it attempts to restore." "For however much the state or community may wish to inculcate obedience and submission in the child, its intervention betrays a lack of confidence in the only objects from whom a small child can learn authoritarian submission." ([Warren Bennis](#), *The Temporary Society*)*

The Marxist's, rejecting right-wrong thinking, the Father's authority, being told, by coming between the Father and his children in the classroom, were able to create a Marxist environment, were the children, through dialogue when it comes to behavior are able to bypass the Father's authority in the classroom, turning the children against the Father and His authority in the home, 'changing' the nation, taking control over it for themselves instead, so they could sin, be immoral without being judged, condemned, and cast out.

Karl Marx, 'justifying' sin, that is "human nature," using dialogue when it came to behavior wrote: *"Not feeling at home in the sinful world [in other words being fired for being immoral or for not doing what he was told], Critical Criticism must set up a sinful world in its own home [that being his dialoguing with himself, 'justifying' his sinful nature]."* *"Critical Criticism is a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without."* Benjamin Bloom, in the first taxonomy wrote: *"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."* Bloom simply paraphrased Marxist ideology as explained by Fredrick Engels *"In the eyes of the dialectic philosophy, nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred."* In the second taxonomy Bloom wrote: *"There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children."* The very act of willingly participating in the "new practice" does the job. It is that simple. It is what happened in a garden in Eden. It is what Jesus Christ refused to do in the temptations in the wilderness, stating "It is written," "Dad says" with every temptation. It is being done in the classroom every day. It is the dialectic process being put into praxis where children can think and do whatever they want, according to how they "feel" and what they "think," refusing to be told what is right and what is wrong when it comes to behavior. It is our culture today. When your teacher, mayor, town council, legislators, judge, children use dialogue to define and establish behavior (to make law) they, like the woman in the garden in Eden "own" whatever they see.

In Review

The Patriarchal paradigm: The Father authors established commands, rules, facts, truth and enforces them, preaching, teaching, and discussing, with the Father having the final say, rewarding for being right or doing right, for applying or doing what you are told, correcting for being wrong or chastening for doing wrong, and casting out for questioning, challenging, defying, disregarding, attacking authority, objective truth, divides upon who is doing His will and who is not, right-wrong, above-below, either-or, absolute, fellowship based around position, guilty conscience for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, requiring no compromise in order to do what is right, individualism under God, "I KNOW because I was told (by someone who KNOWS),"

based upon faith, at least at first unto experienced, coming to be KNOWN as being true.

The Heresiarchal paradigm: children author commands, rules, facts, and truth which are ever subject to 'change,' subject to their "feelings" of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, and enforce them, dialogue, with the children having the final say, subjective truth, divide upon who is siding with them, 'justifying' their feelings and who is siding with the Father, judging, condemning, casting them out for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, loving pleasure (that which is "positive") and hating restraint (that which is "negative"), along a spectrum from erotic love on one side to outright hate on the other, relationship based upon feelings, super-ego, requiring compromise in order to "get along," socialism-Marxism-Globalism, "I know because 'I feel' and 'I think,'" based upon sight, upon that which is of the world only.

Sigmund Freud sided with erotic love.

Explaining the merging of psychology and Marxism, focusing upon the ideology of Sigmund Freud the Marxist [Herbert Marcuse](#), in his book *Eros and Civilization: a psychological inquiry into Freud* (from where we get "If it feels good, just do it") wrote: "... the hatred against patriarchal suppression—a 'barrier to incest,' ... the desire (for the sons) to return to the mother culminates in the rebellion of the exiled sons, the collective killing and devouring of the father." "It is not really a decisive matter whether one has killed one's father or abstained from the deed, if the function of the conflict and its consequences are the same." In other words as long as the husband and father no longer exercises his authority in the home, over his wife and children he can stay round, be listened to. Focusing on the family in order to build relationship, making the father subject to dialogue when it comes to behavior negates his authority in the home. Sigmund Freud's history of the prodigal son is not of the son coming to his senses, *humbling* his *self*, returning home, submitting his *self* to his father's authority, learning his inheritance was not his father's money but his father's love for him (Luke 15:11-24), but of the son joining with his "friends," returning home, killing the father, taking all that was his (the father's), using it to satisfy their carnal desires, that is their *lusts*, killing all the fathers in the land (devouring the fathers) so all the children could be the same, that is like them, thereby *affirming* them, that is their "*incest*," 'justifying' and supporting their control over them. Human Relations in Curriculum Change, what a friend of mine called a cookbook on humans uses as its premier example of its agenda to 'change' the world, in government, in business, in the home, and even in the "Church," that of a child, a girl wanting to be like the other children at school putting on makeup that her father disapproved of, with the mother intervening on behalf of the girl, talking the father into abdicating his position for the sake of her relationship with the other children at school. In the midst of the technical processes being used change agents, a whole chapter in the middle of the book is dedicated on how to roleplay this scenario in the classroom at school.

Matriarch paradigm: wife-mother either submits to or authors commands, rules, facts, and truth, established or subject to 'change,' discussion or dialogue depending upon who she is submitting to in the 'moment,' confusion, seeks to unite the Father and the children for the sake of her feelings, having to submit to one or the other, cognitive dissonance.

The Formula

If the Father is the Thesis, making the children the Antithesis then there can not be Synthesis as the children are subject to being told, to what the Father says instead of to their feelings of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating. If the children are the Thesis, making the Father the Antithesis then there can be Synthesis when the children come together, uniting as one based upon their "affective domain," their lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint—what they all have in common. When it comes to defining and establishing behavior, the facilitated meeting, using the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process removes the Father's authority from the outcome since there is no Father's authority in the facilitation of 'change,' in dialogue, in an opinion, or in the consensus process, there is only the children's lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint being 'justified' and applied.

What is missing in dialogue:

In *dialogue* there is no Father's authority, therefore no inheritance, posterity, history, tradition, unalienable rights, sovereignty, representation (representative government), limited government, local control, culture, heritage, absolutes (established commands, rules, facts, and truth), private convictions, private property, and private business, "limits and measures," being wrong, *humbling, denying, dying to, disciplining, controlling, capitulating* of "self," contrition, repentance, forgiveness, salvation, conversion—redemption and reconciliation—(for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning), fellowship, etc. They are all missing (*negated*) in and through the use of *dialogue* when defining and establishing behavior.

This is the formula for the so called *new world order*, as stated above with teachers, as facilitator's of 'change' using "[*Bloom's Taxonomies*](#)" for their curriculum (their political system) in the classroom. You can tell which system is being used in the classroom based upon how your children respond to your authority when they get home from school. Benjamin Bloom: "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" are "*a psychological classification system*" used "*to develop attitudes and values . . . which are not shaped by the parents.*" As Bloom noted in book 2, "*The Affective Domain*," his paradigm is that of two Marxists, Erick Fromm and Theodor Adorno. The Marxist Erick Fromm wrote "*We are proud that in his conduct of life man has become free from external authorities, which tell him what to do and what not to do.*" (Erick Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*) "*Bloom's Taxonomies*" is the praxis of [Genesis 3:1-6](#), negating [Hebrews 12:5-11](#), negating [Romans 7:14-25](#), negating [John 3:15-21](#), resulting in [Romans 1:19-32](#); that is the praxis of self 'justification,' negating the Father's authority, negating the guilty conscience for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, negating the need of a savior, resulting in the damnation of the soul. "Bloom's Taxonomies," since they are based upon the very same pattern the master facilitator of 'change,' the master psychotherapist used in the garden in Eden are secularized Satanism, intellectualized witchcraft, damning the soul of every one who participates. "*The philosophy of praxis is the absolute secularization of thought, an absolute humanism of history.*" (Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*)

It is individualism, under God those "of and for the world" are out to negate (remove from the face of the earth). As the Marxist Max Horkheimer, director of the "Frankfurt School" for a time wrote in his book *Reasoning and Self Preservation*, "*Protestantism was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism.*" The "priesthood of all believers"

engenders individualism, under God. Individualism comes from doing the Father's will without compromise. Rather than doing your own will, which requires compromise in order to "get along," in Protestantism, in its original intent you do the Father's will no matter what man says or does to you. Karl Marx: *"It is not individualism that fulfills the individual, on the contrary it destroys him. Society is the necessary framework through which freedom and individuality are made realities."* (Karl Marx, in John Lewis, *The Life and Teachings of Karl Marx*) The Apostle Paul: *"Do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ."*

The guilty conscience carries the Father's authority into the world.

The Marxist Dr. Robert Trojanowicz in his book, *The meaning of "Community" in Community Policing* wrote: *"The personal conscience is the key element in ensuring self-control, refraining from deviant behavior even when it can be easily perpetrated."*

The Marxist Norman Brown in his book, *Life Against Death* wrote: *"The guilty conscience is formed in childhood by the incorporation of the parents and the wish to be father of oneself." "What we call 'conscience' perpetuates inside of us our bondage to past objects now part of ourselves:"* Kurt Lewin, in his book *A Dynamic Theory of Personality* (explaining how the guilty conscience is 'created' and how to destroy it) wrote: *"The negative valence of a forbidden object which in itself attracts the child [the guilty conscience] thus usually derives from an induced field of force of an adult." "If this field of force loses its psychological existence for the child (that is, if the adult goes away or loses his authority) the negative valence also disappears."*

In essence if you make behavior subject to dialogue, where there is no Father's authority the guilty conscience is negated that is it disappears. The guilty conscience comes from discussion, from doing the Father's will, the "super-ego" from dialogue, from doing your will instead, 'justifying' your lusts, your "self interest" and the lusts, the "self interests" of others in order to "get long." Thus Bloom could write: *"Superego development is conceived as the incorporation of the moral standards of society. Therefore the levels of the Taxonomy should describe successive levels of goal setting appropriate to superego development."* (emphasis added)

Brainwashing is simply washing the Father's authority, equated to Nationalism from the brain.

(Note the similarity of the methods Irvin Yalom, Benjamin Bloom, and Warren Bennis describe in changing how people think.)

[Irvin D. Yalom](#), in his book *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy* wrote [note: I replace client and other the words Yalom used with child or children, etc., to make the following relevant to the classroom and the home]: *"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 [to the facilitator of 'change']? The [facilitator of 'change'] is the living personification of all parental images [he 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 [they do not teach right from wrong from established commands, rules, facts, and truth], they urge the group [of children] to explore and to employ its own resources [to dialogue their "feelings," that is their desires and dissatisfactions of the 'moment' in the "light" of

the current situation, that is their desire for "the group" approval (*affirmation*). [Children] *must feel free to confront the* [the facilitator of 'change'], *who must not only permit, but encourage, such confrontation* [rebellion and anarchy]. [The child] *reenacts early family scripts in the group and, if therapy* [brainwashing—washing respect for and fear of the father's authority from the child's brain (his thoughts)] *is successful, is able to experiment with new behavior, to break free from the locked family role* [submitting to the father's authority, that is doing the father's will] *he once occupied. . . .* [the child] *changes the past by reconstituting it* ['creating' a "new" world order from his "ought," that is a world which 'justifies' his carnal nature, a world void of the father's authority and the *guilty conscience* the father's authority engenders]."

Benjamin Bloom in his book *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain* wrote: *"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."* (David Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*)

Warren G. Bennis in his book *Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays in Readings on Human Interaction*, explaining how the Communist "brainwashed" our soldiers, the actual method itself (unlike Hunter's book on brainwashing who only described the symptoms) wrote: *"The manner in which the prisoner came to be influenced to accept the Communist's definition of his guilt can best be described by distinguishing two broad phases—(1) a process of 'unfreezing,' in which the prisoner's physical resistance, social and emotional supports, self-image and sense of integrity, and basic values and personality were undermined, thereby creating a state of 'readiness' to be influence; and (2) a process of 'change,' in which the prisoner discovered how the adoption of 'the people's standpoint' and a reevaluation of himself from this perspective would provide him with a solution to the problems created by the prison pressure."*

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

Warren G. Bennis, Edgar H. Schein, David E. Berlew, and Fred I. Steele)

To understand the conflict between discussion and dialogue you have to start at the beginning. When God created man he formed him from the dust of the ground and then did something he did with nothing else in the creation. He, a "living God" breathed the breath of life into Adam, making a "living soul," something he did with nothing else in the creation. He then did something He did with nothing else in the creation, he told him what was right and what was wrong behavior. Everything in the creation, including the flesh of man is subject to stimulus-response, with living organisms that includes approaching of pleasure and the avoiding pain, instinct, impulses, and urges. Only man can read or write a book, be told and tell others what is right and what is wrong behavior, can reason from being told (having a discussion with himself and with others in how to apply what he has been told) and from the flesh (dialoguing with himself and with others what he wants to do and how to do it). It is here discussion and dialogue came into the creation, with discussion making man subject to God, since in discussion God is God with man having to accept what God says as the final word. Yet Adam could also dialogue with himself, using reasoning in response to what he liked and did not like, yet he had no one else to dialogue with. This is why God brought animals for him to dialogue with, yet animals not being able to dialogue did not solve his being all alone in the Universe. He could not dialogue with God, making himself equal with God. God created the woman to resolve the dialogue issue. Everything God told Adam he could do he could dialogue with the woman in response to, as you would dialogue in a restaurant which foods you liked and which ones you did not. He now had relationship with someone he could dialogue with. It was when the woman was seduced into dialoguing (I feel like touching the forbidden tree, I don't think there is anything wrong with it, It is just like the other trees, reasoning from the flesh, which dialogue does) regarding what God said they could not do, making herself God over the garden, now being able to do what she wanted without having to be told, with Adam following after her, abdicating his position of authority, choosing relationship with her instead of fellowship with God. They then became the first liberals, blaming the situation and someone else for their behavior. Adam throwing the woman "under the bus" blaming her for giving him what he was not to eat and then blaming God for creating her, "You could have done better. Look what you gave me to work with. I would not be in trouble except for her." and the woman the serpent for "talking" her into doing what she wanted to do. Nothing has changed. It is still the "We can think, talk, and do about anything without being judged, condemned, cast out," that is "Ye shalt not surely die," safe space, place, zone being used by psychologists in defiance to what the Father says, liberating His children from His authority. As Norman O. Brown explained it. *"To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit;"*

Martin Luther wrote: *"I greatly fear that the universities, unless they teach the Holy Scriptures diligently and impress them on the young students, are wide gates to hell. I would advise no one to send his child where the Holy Scriptures are not supreme. Every institution that does not unceasingly pursue the study of God's word becomes corrupt."* (Luther's Works: Vol. 1, The Christian in Society) In regard to the scriptures themselves he wrote: *"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)

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

Jeremiah 6:16 *"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."* 2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12: *"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."*

Institution for Authority Research, Dean Gotcher 2024 (11/21/2024)