

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."*

## *The Institution for Authority Research*

### An Overview Of The Dialectic Process - Part 1 ([pdf](#))

([An Over View Of The Dialectic Process - Part 2](#) and pdf, which is a repetition of Part 1 with more information and audios.)

by

Dean Gotcher

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."*

First a crash course on the Father's authority exposing its antithesis, the dialectic process (Marxism), contemporary education, what is going on in your local classroom's today (as well as all across the nation and around the world), that is the rejection of the Father's authority in "academics," as explained through scriptures. (I dread doing this, starting with the scriptures as my experience during the five thousand meetings I've had over the eighteen years I was on the road was that of Christians being enamored with all the quotations of those of dialectic 'reasoning' but going to sleep on me the moment I quoted the Word of God, "Oh, we have heard those before. Do you have anything new?" not realizing that God has addressed the dialectic process in His Word. The answer to the dialectic process, the negation of its effect upon you is found in the Son of God, Jesus Christ's obedience to His Heavenly Father, calling you to follow Him, walking in the spirit, doing the Heavenly Father's will as well. John 5:30 *"I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me."* John 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."* Matthew 12:50 *"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 10:32-38 *"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 23:9 *"And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven."* Isaiah 55:8, 9 *"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."* 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."* 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?" Romans 10:17 "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." James 1:14, 15 "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." Proverbs 16:25 "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." 1 John 2:18 "And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." Jeremiah 17:9 "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" 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." Psalms 36:1-4 "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." Jeremiah 10:23 "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." 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." Romans 5:13 "For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law." 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." Psalms 10:3, 4 "For the wicked boasteth of his heart's desire, and blesseth the covetous, whom the LORD abhorreth. The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God: God is not in all his thoughts." 2 Peter 2:3 "And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you." Genesis 3:1-6 "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." 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." Matthew 16:26 "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" John 2:22 "He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." 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." Jeremiah 6:10, 13-19 "Hear, O earth: behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto my words, nor to my law, but rejected it." Hebrews 12:5-11. "And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him: For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.

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." Romans 7:14-25

"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. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." 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." 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." 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." John 14:6

"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." 2 Corinthians 6:15-18

"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." Galatians 6:8

"For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." 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." Galatians 5:16

"This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." Galatians 1:10

"Do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." John 5:30

Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and

*the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.*" Romans 5:1 *"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."* Matthew 4:4 *"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."* Ephesians 2:8, 9 *"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:"* 1 Corinthians 1:18, 21 *"For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God."* *"For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe."* The gospel message is all about the Father, with the Son of God, Jesus Christ, in obedience to the Father shedding his blood on the cross, paying for our sins, 'redeeming' us from His Father's wrath upon us for our doing the dialectic process, for our denying His authority, doing our will instead of His, with the Father raising Him from the grave 'reconciling' us to Himself. Whoever refuses to be told, that is refuses to have faith can not be saved.

Next a crash course in Marxism. Why? Because it is the world we now live in, with the praxis of Genesis 3:1-6, the rejection (and therefore negation) of the Father's authority (the scriptures above) as its agenda. For the Marxist "human nature" is all there is with "behavior science" 'justifying' it. "Human nature" is only "of and for the world," making all things subject to stimulus-response. When you make "academics" subject to "human nature," to "behavior science," to stimulus-response, then the "affective domain," which includes lust or "self interest" is included, 'justifying' the rejection (and therefore negation) of the Father's authority as the curriculum. There is no Father's authority in lust. Lust is your bodies rejection (therefore negation) of the Father's authority. Lust for pleasure is a part of "human nature," thus lust is 'justified' by "behavior science." Lust is like a drug. Once you are on it it is hard if not impossible to get off it. You will do whatever it takes to have your next "fix." Those who 'justify' "human nature," that is who 'justify' lust (dopamine emancipation, explained below) are drug pushers. Once they get you on it, they "own" you, buying and selling your soul, using you as "human resource" for their own gain, casting you aside (along with the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous) when you no longer bring them pleasure, or someone else brings them more pleasure, or you get in their way (doing to you what you did to the Father for getting in your way—you reap what you sow). Including lust as being a part of "human nature," that is as being normal makes man at-one-with lust and the world that stimulates it, that is makes man only "of the world," Karl Marx: *"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) Karl Marx simply secularized 1 John 2:16, redefining *"the lust of the flesh"* as *"sensuous need,"* *"the lust of the eyes"* as *"sense perception,"* and *"the pride of life"* as *"sense experience,"* making that which is only "of the world," that is that which *"only" "proceeds from Nature"* all there is to life. Psychology is in full agreement. Carl Rogers: *"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."* *"In this process the individual becomes more open to his experience. It is the opposite of defensiveness or rigidity. His beliefs are not rigid, he can tolerate ambiguity."* ([Carl Rogers](#), on becoming a person: *A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*) Sigmund Freud hated the father's authority. Psychology, that is "behavior science" is all about negating the father's authority in the thoughts of the individual, 'justifying' his carnal thoughts and carnal actions. Herbert Marcuse, quoting Sigmund Freud wrote of Freuds history of man: *"... 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." (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 (Luke 15:11-24), but of the son's uniting as one, returning home, killing the father, "the 'barrier to incest,'" taking all that was the father's, using it to satisfy their carnal desires, that is their *lusts*, killing all the fathers in the land so all the children could be like them, *affirming* their lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, following after, serving, protecting, defending, praising, worshipping, and even willingly dying for them for 'justifying' their *lusts*. Norman O. Brown explained Sigmund Freud's interpretation of history as that of man using 'reasoning' to 'liberate' himself from the Father's authority, coming to know himself in the process. Norman Brown (with information added for clarification): "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 [that is there is no parental authority, no Godly restraint, no "can not," "must not," "Thou shalt not" in the id], only affirmation and eternity [that is only the child's natural inclination to lust after pleasure and hate restraint, which includes the hate of missing out on pleasure]." "Children have not acquired that sense of shame which, according to the Biblical story, expelled mankind from Paradise, and which, presumably, would be discarded if Paradise were regained [if "lusting after pleasure," the "eternal present" became the agenda, that is lust became the 'drive' of life and its augmentation the 'purpose']." "The repression of normal adult sexuality is required only by cultures which are based on patriarchal domination [upon doing the Father's will]." "Our repressed desires are the desires we had unrepressed, in childhood; and they are sexual desires [Sigmund Freud considered all children to be sexually active]." "Parental discipline, religious denunciation of bodily pleasure, . . . have all left man overly docile, but secretly in his unconscious [that is 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 stimulating, 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 [by 'liberating' the child from the *guilty conscience*, which requires the *negation* of the Father's authority, which is its source]." ([Norman O. Brown](#), *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*) The famous philosopher Georg Hegel explained the bases of that "foundation," which is the basis of all philosophy, psychology, sociology, . . . : "The child, contrary to appearance, is the absolute, the rationality of the relationship; he is what is enduring and everlasting, the totality which produces itself once again as such." (Georg Hegel, *System of Ethical Life*) According to dialectic 'reasoning,' it is only when the child is 'liberated' from the Father's authority to become as he was before the Father's first command, rule, fact, or truth came into his life (separating him from his "self" and the world) he can become himself, self-actualized, only "of and for the world." Marxism and psychology are one and the same, with Sigmund Freud removing the Father's authority from the mind of the individual and Karl Marx removing the Father's authority from society. Abraham Maslow made it clear: "Marxian theory [that is removal of the Father's authority from society] needs Freudian-type instinct theory [that is the child's natural inclination to lust after pleasure and hate restraint] to

round it out. And of course, vice versa." "Third-Force psychology is also epi-Marxian in these senses, that is including the most basic scheme as true-good social conditions [that is 'liberating' the child from the Father's authority so they can be their self] are necessary for personal growth, bad social conditions [that is submission of "self" to the 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*) For the Marxist, lust for pleasure is the 'drive' of life, making the augmentation of lust (the removal of the Father's authority) the 'purpose.' When you make building relationship upon self interest, that is upon lust the agenda, lusting after pleasure and hating restraint, "human nature" becomes the "norm." In dialogue, with your self and with others there is no Father's authority. Therefore there is no sin, other than the sin of your not setting aside (that is negating) the Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to get along with others. There is only your and the other persons carnal desires, your and there lusts and sins of the 'moment' being 'justified.' For Karl Marx, since all are dialoging with themselves what they are lusting after, hating restraint (what Karl Marx called "Critical Criticism"), since all are sinners what gives a parent, a boss, the King, or any authority the right to judge, condemn, and cast a sinner out ("ground" the child, not hire but fire the worker, imprison the thief) for sinning. Karl Marx: *"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 made lust for pleasure the measure for reality: *"To enjoy the present reconciles us to the actual."* (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) Marxism is putting aside differences in position, negating the father's authority in the process in order to work together on a project. The Father's authority resides in what you are talking to your self about, that you are wanting to do that He has told you you can not do. When you do what you want to do that you were told you were not to do for the sake of relationship with others you make relationship with others, lust for pleasure more important than doing what the Father says, negating the Father's authority in the process. Mao Zedong: *"Words and actions should help to unite, and not divide, the people."* For the Marxist the source of individualism is the individual doing the Father's will against his carnal nature, what he has in common with all mankind. The Marxist, rejecting the issue of sin and the need for salvation focuses only upon the restraints the Christian imposes upon his carnal nature. Karl Marx wrote of the "Christian": *"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."* (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) For the Marxist, the solution to Christian faith is the believers recognition of sensuality, his potential to lust, the potential for 'change.' Karl Marx: *"It is not sensuality which is presented . . . , but the attraction of what is forbidden."* (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) For the Marxist the father's authority is 'created' when children obey their father, when their father's commands, rules, facts, and truth go against their carnal nature, inhibiting or blocking them from enjoying their lusts of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating. 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 the Marxist it is everyone recognizing and uniting upon what they have in common, their lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint that overcomes the Father's authority. Jürgen Habermas (a Marxist, a member of the Frankfurt School): *"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*) It is in their uniting upon lust, upon their common self interests (which dialogue brings forth) that the Father's authority is negated in the thoughts of "the people," 'justifying' their actions. For the Marxist, having rejected the Heavenly Father's authority outright, the Heavenly Father's authority is 'created' when children honor their earthly father's authority. For the Marxist the only solution to overcoming the Heavenly Father's authority is to negate the earthly father's authority in the thoughts of the individual as well as removing his authority from society. 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*) Max Horkheimer (a Marxist, a director of the Frankfurt School): *"Protestantism was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism."* (Max Horkheimer, *Reasoning and Self Preservation*) Martin Luther warned of the effect removing God's Word, that is the Father's authority from "academics" would have upon the students: *"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*) For the Marxist individualism is created when children obey their earthly father, making their and everyone else's behavior subject to his commands, rules, facts, and truth. Society can only be created when the child compromises, that is sets aside his father's commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to "get along" with or build relationships with others. It is the traditional family, with the father in authority that creates individualism, with each child being personally held accountable to the father's standards for his thoughts (when expressed) and behavior, dividing him from the other children in the community when he refuses to compromise his father's standards in order to "build relations." 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 Marxist's answer to individualism and division (since children come from different homes with different standards) is to focus on the children's self interests, making their lust for pleasure and resentment toward restraint the focus of attention in order to overcome the effect the father's authority has on them, that is their having to humble and die to their self, having to deny their lusts in order to do right and not wrong according to his established commands, rules, facts, and truth. Karl Marx: *"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in different ways, the objective however, is change."* (Karl Marx, *Feuerbach Thesis #11*) Imprinted on Marx's tomb so it must be important. While change for the Father is changing from one position to another, that is from your position to His position, from doing your will to doing His will, for those "of and for the world" 'change' is the individuals immediate response to the current situation and-or object, people, or person present (imagined or real) that is stimulating either pleasure or pain, with pain including the pain which comes with missing out on pleasure or the potential of missing out on pleasure (this is where *"desperately wicked"* or *"Critical Criticism"* comes into play). For the Marxist, those who are stimulating and augmenting pleasure, that is being "positive" are right or good and those who are inhibiting or blocking pleasure, that is being "negative" are wrong or evil, needing to be either converted or silenced, censored, and-or removed from the environment for the "good" of "the people." The Marxist agenda is not to add to a person's behavior, telling him how to behave but removing from the person that which prevents him from becoming himself, preventing him from doing what comes naturally to him, lusting after pleasure. Jürgen Habermas (a Marxist, a member of the "Frankfurt School"): *"If the 'restoring of life' of the world is*

to be conceived in terms of the Christian revelation, then Marx must collapse into a bottomless abyss." ([Jürgen Habermas](#), *Theory and Practice*) The Marxist knows that what he is doing is evil but does it anyway, taking pleasure in those who do it with him. Romans 1:28-32 *"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."* All teachers are certified and schools accredited today based upon their use of "[Bloom's Taxonomies](#)" as their curriculum in the classroom. Bloom admitted they are unprovable and are based upon the world view, "Weltanschauung" of Marxism, sighting two Marxists in his "taxonomies" as an example, Erick Fromm and Theodor Adorno. In his book, *Forty Year Evaluation*, published forty years after the publishing of his first taxonomy Bloom wrote: *"Certainly the Taxonomy was unproved at the time it was developed and may well be 'unprovable.'"* In the first taxonomy he identified his work as in agreement with Karl Marx's rejection of absolutes. Benjamin Bloom: *"We recognize the point of view that truth and knowledge are only relative and that there are no hard and fast truths which exist for all time and places."* (Benjamin Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 1: Cognitive Domain*) Friedrich Engels, a friend of Karl Marx explained Marxism this way: *"In the eyes of the dialectic philosophy, nothing is established for all times, nothing is absolute or sacred."* Bloom established the child's carnal nature, the "affective domain," which he compared to "Pandora's box," a box full of evils, which once opened can not be closed over and therefore against the Father's authority. 'Liberating' the student's from their parent's authority and therefore society from God's authority is what "Bloom's Taxonomies" are all about. They have been in use in the classrooms across America from the 50's and 60's. We have witness the 'changing' of a nation because of them. In the "taxonomies" we read: *"There are many stories of the conflict and tension that these new practices are producing between parents and children."* "Bloom's Taxonomies" are "a psychological classification system" used "to develop attitudes and values ... which are not shaped by the parents." ". . . 'good teaching' is the teacher's ability to attain affective objectives through challenging the student's fixed beliefs . . . ." *"The affective domain is, in retrospect, a virtual 'Pandora's Box.'" "The affective domain contains the forces that determine the nature of an individual's life and ultimately the life of an entire people."* (*Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain*) As cited earlier Bloom noted two Marxist as being the world view of his "taxonomies," Erick Fromm and Theodor Adorno. What they both have in common is the rejection of, that is negation of the Father's authority in education. Erick Fromm: *"We are proud that in his conduct of life man has become free from external authorities, which tell him what to do and what not to do."* *"All that matters is ... to give up 'God.'"* ([Erick Fromm](#), *Escape from Freedom*) Theodor Adorno: *"Authoritarian submission as 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."* *"Family*



relationships are characterized by fearful subservience to the demands of the parents and by an early suppression of impulses not acceptable to them." "The power-relationship between the parents, the domination of the subject's family by the father or by the mother, and their relative dominance in specific areas of life also seemed of importance for our problem." ([Theodor Adorno](#), *The Authoritarian Personality*) The use of dialogue, where the individual has the final say based upon his carnal nature, that is his lust for pleasure and dissatisfaction, resentment, or hatred toward the Father and His authority for getting in the way, being "positive," "tolerant of the deviant" (building relationship with the deviant based upon common self interests) and not being "negative," judging, condemning, and cast the deviant out (refusing to build relationship with the deviant because of his immoral thoughts and actions) is the Marxist's solution to overcoming the father's authority in the individual and in society. It is the 'purpose' of the "group grade" in the classroom, training up the student's to be Marxists. The "teacher" does not have to tell the students to attack their parent's authority when they get home from school. All they have to do is, through the dialoguing of their opinions to a consensus 'justify' their lusts, their "affective domain" in the classroom and they will do that automatically when they get home. Herbert Marcuse and Norman Brown best explained the source of Marxism and psychology. Herbert Marcuse: "... 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.'" ([Herbert Marcuse](#), *Eros and Civilization: a psychological inquiry into Freud*) Norman Brown: "To experience Freud is to partake a second time of the forbidden fruit;" ([Norman O. Brown](#), *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History*) Everyone says make it simple. It is simple. Do what the Father says. But nobody want to hear that today. At least not many. They like to mingle discussion, what the Father says with dialogue, with what they think, 'justifying' their self, their lusts, their "likes," negating the Father's authority in the process. Now you know what Marxism is, the choosing of "human relationship," sight, "all that is of the world" over and therefore against the Father's authority, faith, doing the Father will. It can not be equal. You have to choose one or the others (it is what Adam did in the garden in Eden, choosing to follow the woman, dialogue, relationship instead of God, discussion, fellowship). If you are concerned about your children's social life instead of where they will spend eternity (you can not have both), you are a Marxist. You can deny it, but you can not refute it.

Having read and studied over six hundred social-psychology books over a five year period, evaluating them from the Word of God, "for we are not to be ignorant of Satan's devices," taught a 480 level class in a University on the subject of dialectic 'reasoning,' which is man 'reasoning' from his carnal desires, from his lusts (plural in that it is not only his lust for pleasure that the world is stimulating but also his lust for the approval of others, with their lusting for his approval, affirming his lusts), driving thirty thousand miles a year over an eighteen year period, traveling coast to coast giving five thousand lectures, including radio and TV explaining the process of 'change' to parents, teachers, University students, congregations and their ministers, government workers, town councils, state and Federal legislators and senators, even Federal Judges, since the passing of Karen my wife on October 11, 2023 (who I miss beyond words) I have dedicated my time totally to this website, explaining the process of 'change' as clear as I can to whoever stops by and takes time to read and-or listen. I may be up to traveling again and speaking. If you are interested in hosting a meeting let me know. [deangotcher@gmail.com](mailto:deangotcher@gmail.com)

The dialectic process is 'reasoning' from our "feelings," from the "affective domain," what Karl Marx called our "sense experience," our "sensuous needs" and our "sense perception," which incorporates, and thus 'justifies' "the lust of the flesh, and

the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," "only" that which is "of the world," or as Karl Marx stated it "only" that which "proceeds from Nature," 'justifying' our natural inclination to lust after pleasure and to resent or even hate restraint (that which causes us to miss out on pleasure), that is to approach pleasure and to avoid pain (associated with stimulus-response), that is "human nature." The dialectic process, self 'justification,' being God is such a big part of our life we can not see the harmful effect it has upon us and upon others if someone did not tell us and restrain us for our own good and for the good of others, Hebrews 12:11. Dialectic 'reasoning' was made manifest in our "Why?" in response to our parent's command that inhibited or blocked us from doing what we wanted, without us knowing it wanting them to go into dialogue with us where they have no authority to tell us what we can or can not do or hold us accountable if we went ahead and did what we wanted. There is no Father's authority in dialogue. There is only their opinion and ours, which has no parental authority, no "can not," "Thou shalt not." Dialectic 'reasoning' is a secular way, a so called "academic" way of 'justifying' our heart which is *"deceitful above all things and desperately wicked,"* thinking pleasure is the purpose of life instead of doing the Father's will, doing what we want instead of doing what we have been told, hating anyone who is taking or threatening to take what we are lusting after away. Jeremiah 17:9 This, in a nutshell is Marxism. Why did they kill the King and all who were 'loyal' to him in socialist revolutions. Because he, as a father does in the home, and God does to man tells those under his authority what they can and can not do, holding them accountable if they disobey. The framers of this nation made the father in the home King. Those "of and for the world" have come between the father and his children. Through the use of dialogue, the "affective domain" in the classroom they have 'liberated' his children from his authority, turning them against him instead. All I have to do as a teacher, actually as a facilitator of 'change' is 'create' a classroom environment where your child is pressured, out of fear of group rejection to accept that socialism, relationship with "the group" is right (is "positive") which requires compromising your standards and individualism, under God, that is doing what you tell them is not right (is "negative"), which the use of dialectic 'reasoning' or dialogue (the "affective domain") in the classroom does and I have turned them against your authority as a parent. You told them "Because I said so," like "It is written" when they went Why? in response to your command and persisted, which I as a teacher, with the use of "the group" answered, 'justifying' and establishing their Why? over and therefore against your authority to say NO. Luke 16:15, Romans 7:7, Romans 3:20, and Romans 5:13. Why am I am explaining Marxism and contemporary education at the same time? Because they are one and the same. György Lukács (a Marxist, the founder of the "Frankfurt School," a group of Marxists who fleeing Fascist Germany came to United States in the early 30's, entered our universities training up Marxist professors and government advisers, who working from the Federal level down 'changed' our nation, who through the use of the classroom undermined parental authority, which taught the next generation of citizens to respect and honor authority and obey the law.): *"... the central problem is to change reality... reality with its 'obedience to laws.'" (György Lukács, History and Class Consciousness: What is Orthodox Marxism?)* Immanuel Kant wrote of a world where *"lawfulness without law"* reigned, where the law of the flesh ("sense experience") ruled without the law of God (being *told*) getting in the way. ([Immanuel Kant](#), *Critique of Judgment*) Karl Marx: *"Laws must not fetter human life; but yield to it; they must change as the needs and capacities of the people change."* (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*) In other words, according to the Marxist laws are not to be established by what the Father says, that is are not to be subject to discussion, where the Father has the final say, thus making law established once and for all but must be subject to 'change,' to dialogue, to the "affective domain," as the lusts (plural as in

lust for pleasure and lust for the affirmation of others) of the 'child' changes in him and in response to the current situation, and-or object, people, or person present. As will be explained in greater detail ahead, in discussion laws are established once and for all, that is by the Father's authority while in dialogue they are ever subject to 'change,' subject to your carnal desires of the 'moment' that the current situation (imagined or real) is stimulating.

When a man rejects being told, and therefore rejects being restrained, and therefore rejects the Father's authority, and therefore rejects salvation, through His Son Jesus Christ, and therefore rejects eternal life, choosing eternal death instead (they all go hand in hand, when you reject one you reject them all) all he has is his lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, that is "human nature," using his God given 'reasoning' ability (which God gave us to reason from His Word, to reason from what he was told) to figure out how he can get around or get rid of what or who is in his way, 'justifying' his lusts, dying in his sins, Proverbs 16:25. I am explaining the difference between discussion, doing what the Father says and dialogue, the process of 'change,' the praxis of dialectic 'reasoning,' the so called "academics" being used in the classroom, in the workplace, in government, and even in the "church" today. In discussion we do what we are told while in dialogue we try to figure out how we can get around what we have been told we can not do in order to do what we want to do instead. ("If it feels good, just do it" for example comes to mind; source Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: a psychological inquiry into Freud*.) In discussion, where the Father has the final say while the earthly father can be wrong, the Heavenly Father is always right. Discussion is a way of thinking which the Heavenly Father needs us to have in order for us to hear from Him. By rejecting discussion, because the earthly father is wrong, accusing him and thus labeling him as being a Fascist for example, discussion with the Heavenly Father is negated. That is the plan being used by those "of and for the world" in the classroom, in the workplace, in government, and even in the "church," in the name of 'change.' It is our 'reasoning' through dialogue or our use of dialectic 'reasoning,' where we try to figure out how we can 'liberate' our self, our flesh out from under the source of restraint, the Father's authority that those "of and for the world" are interested in. If they can find out what you are dialoguing with your self about regarding your dissatisfaction with the Father and get you to share it in a "Thou shalt not surely die" environment they can "own" you. Dialogue is the catalyst for 'change,' where stimulus-response, that which is "of the world" directs our thoughts instead of being told, doing what the Father says. When we use dialogue as the means to defining behavior we 'justify' sin, negating discussion, what the Father says, resenting and rejecting (martyring) anyone who brings what the Father says into the room, that is who brings discussion into the environment of 'change.' Any time you bring discussion, what the Father says into a room full of dialogue, full of "I feel" and "I think" you will always be accused of being argumentative, being labeled by them as being divisive, hateful, negative, prejudiced, not a team player, and so forth, needing to join in the dialogue or be silenced, censored, and-or removed if you persist. It is an absolute. The use of generalized terms has always been used to silence anyone who wants to deal with the truth, the details. Those "of and for the world" know it and use the dialectic process every day to 'change' you and the world you live in, so you can sin without having a guilty conscience, with you affirming them. Your silence is consent. You might say to your self you have not compromised your position but you have, in their mind you have chosen relationship with them over and therefore against your position with God. They call it "academics." It is not. It is a spiritual attack upon the souls of the children and anyone else who participates (being "beat down" in the "group grade" classroom, or "team building" workplace, or bipartisan

session, or church board meeting) . It is the pattern of Genesis 3:1-6, where the desire to "touch," shared in a "We can talk about anything and not be judged, condemned, or cast out for what we think or say" environment led to the use of dialogue, the dialectic process (in disobedience to the Father) 'justifying' the eating of the forbidden fruit, being applied today in the classroom, in the workplace, in government, and even in the "church," unabated because everybody wants to be respected in the eyes of the world, that is not be called "negative," divisive, hateful, intolerant, prejudiced, and so forth (even Jesus Christ despised the shame of the cross but did not compromise what His Father said) no one is addressing the dialectic process from the Word of God, from what God says. You can not see it until you start there. No conservative group today starts with righteousness as their platform because today nobody (or very few) would listen to them, having attended the contemporary classroom where God, the preaching of [God's Word](#) is denied access, other than to be made subject to man's opinions.

Kenneth Benne (a Marxist): *"Persons will not come into full partnership in the process until they register dissatisfaction."* (Kenneth Benne, [Human Relations in Curriculum Change](#)) It is in lust being restrained that the 'drive' for 'change' takes place. By creating an environment of dialogue, when it comes to behavior lust becomes the drive force, the need for 'change.' Dialogue 'justifies' lust, our "affective domain." Discussion justifies restraint, the Father's authority. Which one we use, that is which one we turn to when it comes to behavior directly effects the outcome, whether we honor and obey authority, that is do what the Father says, that is do the Father's will or we question, challenge, defy, disregard, or attack His authority, doing our will instead. Matthew 12:50 Education always includes behavior. Whoever controls *how* the students are taught, whether through discussion or dialogue directly effects how the students will behave as a result. Kurt Lewin: *"Change in methods of leadership [that is replacing the traditional teacher, where the teacher, using discussion has the final say with a facilitator of 'change,' where, through dialogue the student's have the final say] is probably the quickest way to bring about a change in the cultural atmosphere of a group."* *"Any real change of the culture of a group is, therefore, interwoven with the changes of the power constellation within the group."* (Barker, Dembo, & Lewin, "frustration and regression: an experiment with young children" in *Child Behavior and Development*) Kurt Lewin: *"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*) Irvin 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."* ([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*) Yalom continues: *"Few individuals, as Asch has shown, can maintain their objectivity [their loyalty to the Father's authority] in the face of apparent group unanimity."*

According to Bohm and Peat, as they state in their book *Science, Order, and Creativity* there is a world of difference between discussion and dialogue. *"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."* *"A dialogue is essentially a conversation between equals."* *"The spirit of dialogue, is in short [notice the mention of 'spirit'], the ability to hold many points of view in suspension, along with a primary interest in the creation of common meaning."* In discussion there is only either-or, a right or a wrong answer, above-below, light-

dark, Heaven-Hell with the one above, the Father defining what is right and what is wrong behavior, having the final say while in dialogue right and wrong is based upon "feelings," a whole spectrum of "feelings," from love to hate, from love of pleasure to hate of restraint with the children, including those in adult bodies having the final say, according to their feelings of the 'moment' that the situation and-or the object, people, or person is stimulating. While discussion is based upon being *told*, dialogue is based upon *stimulus-response*. In discussion you persuade and are persuaded with facts and truth while in dialogue you manipulate and are manipulated with feelings, leaving out "inappropriate" information that will get in the way of your desired outcome and including "appropriate" information that will guarantee it. It is what you leave out, any command, rule, facts, or truth that gets in the way, that is "negative" that guarantees the outcome. In dialogue you do not want the truth, the rest of the story to get in the way. Dialectic 'reasoning' is based upon dialogue being used to define and establish behavior, pleasure being right and restraint, that is the missing out on pleasure being wrong. All of philosophy, psychology, sociology, . . . begins with "I feel" and "I think." Rene Descartes said as much, "I think, Therefore I am." When you start with the Father, doing His will being the focus of attention, the child's carnal nature is restrained. When you start with the child, making his "feelings" the focus of attention, the Father's authority is negated. Karl Marx based his ideology off of Heraclitus. Heraclitus stated: *"Every grown man of the Ephesians should hang himself and leave the city to the boys."* Heraclitus's focus upon feelings was the foundation of the stoics, which our Supreme Court turned to in 'justifying' abortion. At one time embracing Christianity, discussion, the Father's authority, "rule of law," it now rejects it, turning to stoicism, dialogue, the children's lusts instead. In *Strauss Vs. Strauss.*, 1941 the Supreme Court concluded: *"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."* In 1973, *ROE v. WADE* the Supreme Court embraced Socialism, Marxism, globalism: *"there has always been strong support for the view that life does not begin until live birth. This was the belief of the Stoics."* The difference between dialogue and discussion, and the danger which comes from using dialogue when it comes to behavior is not just some idle words. It explains what is going on today. Quotes following, from the Marxists to prove that point.

The dialectic process, contemporary education with its emphasis upon "feelings," upon the "affective domain," disguising itself as being "academics" is in actuality spiritual, and not of God's spirit. Ephesians 2:2,3, Ephesians 5:5-7, and Colossians 2:8. Karl Marx referred to dialogue, man's ability to 'justify' his carnal nature, "human nature," his heart, his lust for pleasure and resentment or hatred toward restraint (and the restrainer) as being *"a spiritualistic lord, pure spontaneity, actus purus, intolerant of any influence from without."* (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) If God did not warn us about the evil side of our heart, that is our use of dialogue to 'justify' our self, to 'justify' our lust for pleasure and resentment and even hatred toward restraint, toward God, the Father's authority we would not KNOW it. The agenda of those "of and for the world," as Wilfred Bion stated it is to *"prevent someone who KNOWS from filling the empty space."* (Wilfred Bion, *A Memoir of the Future*) The "empty space" is man's ability to dialogue with his self, to 'justify' his self, which those "of and for the world" want to be the only means by which man is to communicate, with his self and with others when it comes to behavior, preventing any voice from outside from getting in the

way. It is that safe space-place-zone where only that which is 'positive,' or tolerant of the deviant and immoral is spoken and that which is "negative," judgmental, condemning, intolerant of the deviant and immoral is either converted or silenced, censored, and-or cast out. Dialectic 'reasoning' which removes the Word of God from "academics" 'liberates' man (in his thinking) from Godly restraint, perpetuating the lie that man can sin, that is lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world stimulates (the basis of stimulus-response) without being held accountable for his carnal thoughts and carnal actions. In Colossians 3:9 the word "*deeds*" is the Greek word *praxis*. The "lie" of the "old man" is the praxis you can do what you want without God judging, condemning, and casting you out for your carnal thoughts and carnal actions, Psalms 10:4 and Psalms 36:1. Antonio Gramsci (a Marxist): "*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. When it comes to behavior those "of and for the world" have been successful in accomplishing their agenda, using dialogue, the dialectic process, dialectic 'reasoning' to remove God's Word, the Father's authority from "academics." It is being put into praxis everywhere you turn.

Martin Luther and therefore the Protestant Reformation rejected stimulus-response, the ideology of Aristotle (and all philosophy, psychology, sociology, . . .) that by creating a "healthy" environment you can develop a "healthy" person. Dialectic 'reasoning,' which is only "of the world" replaces righteousness, doing the Father's will with sensuousness, children, including those in adult bodies doing what they want according to their carnal nature, 'justifying' the removal of anyone who gets in their way, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, and the righteous, doing so without having a guilty conscience. When you make behavior subject to science, to stimulus-response all you have is that which is "*of the world,*" "*the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life.*" Righteousness can only be imputed by God to man, by man's faith in the Son of God, Jesus Christ and in the Father alone (by the work of the Holy Spirit), John 14:6. Karl Marx's response to righteousness and education in his day: "*Education as yet is unable and unwilling to bring all estates and distinctions into its circle. Only Christianity and morality are able to found universal kingdoms on earth.*" (Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*) Karl Marx's agenda is accomplished today, from the Federal level down to the home. Everyone is enamored with sensuousness, "What can I get out of this situation, object, these people or this person for my self?" including the "conservatives," who in their effort to "restore America" leave "righteousness," what God says out of their communication with their self and with others. The lie is leaving what God, the Father says out of man's communication with his self and with others and calling himself a believer, if he is believer. "*In all thy ways acknowledge him.*" The same being true for his children, if he has children.

We have two political systems within us. Which one we turn to when it comes to behavior determines which political system we are serving under, Matthew 6:24 and Romans 6:16. Discussion and dialogue, when it comes to behavior are antithetical to one another. One is of the flesh and the other is of the soul (which those "of and for the world" make subject to the flesh—calling it the psycho-motor). The first one, dialogue is the result of God "forming" man from "the dust of the ground." The second one, discussion is the result of His breathing the breath of life into Adam, making him a "living soul." Then doing something with man (besides forming him from the dust of the ground and then breathing life into him) that he did with nothing else in the creation. God TOLD Adam what he could and could not do (for his soul sake). The soul KNOWS from being told, from what the

Father says. The flesh by "sense experience," according to stimulus-response. Everything in the creation is subject to stimulus-response except the soul of man, who can reason either from what he has been told (discussion), doing what the Father says or reason from his flesh (dialogue), 'justifying' his natural inclination to lust after pleasure and hate restraint, making him subject only to stimulus-response, to his heart's desire, making everything subject to dialogue, to the opinions of men. According to God good is doing right and not wrong according to what He says, His commands, that is doing His will while evil is lusting after the things of the world in disobedience. (I am talking academics here, those "of and for the world" know this stuff, I have read their works, Romans 1:28-32). With man pleasure is good and anyone inhibiting or blocking it is evil. Man is like God in that he can reason but in his case when it comes to behavior, in defiance to God he reasons from his flesh, that is through the use of dialogue, where he has the final say instead of from God's Word, from what God says, from what he has been TOLD, with God having the final say. Genesis 3:22 *"And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:"* Jeremiah 17:9 Death is the result of the woman using dialogue in response to God's Word, with Adam following after her. Death is a "reminder" to man that he is not God, that God is God, having the final say. *"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?"* This is why David made dialogue, how he felt subject to discussion, to what God the Father said. Psalms 119:11 *"Thy Word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against thee."* Language or communication goes with each. Discussion goes with the soul, with the Father telling man what is right and what is wrong behavior, with the Father having the final say, which is an either-or, right-wrong, above-below, Heaven-Hell way of thinking. Dialogue on the other hand goes with man's flesh, that which God "formed from the dust of the ground," with man doing what he wants, according to how he "feels" and what he is "thinking" in the 'moment,' that the world is stimulating, with him having the final say (at least in his imagination, in dialoguing with himself 'justifying' his carnal desires, his lusts). Genesis 6:5; 8:21 *"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;"* That is why the Word of God says 2 Timothy 2:22 *"Flee also youthful lusts:"* Proverbs 16:25. In discussion, God is God. In dialogue, you are God. What God told Adam he could do, Adam could dialogue (go "I like" or "I don't like" and everything in between and beyond). In dialogue we are in control (at least in our imagination). When we establish dialogue, what we "think" above discussion, what God says it is called "the pride of life." In discussion God is in control, requiring us to humble, die to, deny our self in order to do His will. It was when the woman used dialogue ("I 'feel' like touching the forbidden tree," and "I don't 'think' there is anything wrong with the forbidden tree") in the realm of discussion, where the Father has the final say she sinned, with Adam following after her, lusting after the flesh, lusting after the woman, wanting to dialogue with her instead of having a discussion with God, having to do God's will. Anyone coming between the one in authority and those who are under his authority and draw them into dialogue regarding their behavior, that is 'justifying' their lusts is doing what the serpent in the garden in Eden did, 'liberating' them from the Father's authority so they, as a predator, charlatan, pimp, pedophile can use them for their own pleasure. That is why those "of and for the world" go to dialogue when they want their way, making discussion subject to dialogue so others have to do what they say, thinking they are in control of the situation when they are not, when they, like Thorndike's chickens, Skinner's rats, and Pavlov's dog are being seduced, deceived, and manipulated instead (remember it is stimulus-response, only that which is of the world where dialogue resides). Jesus never went to dialogue. John 5:30 In all three

temptations in the wilderness, regarding his flesh (this life), his eyes (the nations), and the pride of life (God's protection), at the point of death, with there being no return Jesus responded not with lust, "What about me?" but with *"It is written,"* in other words "Dad says." The closest He came to dialogue was the night before the cross, in the garden of Gethsemane cutting dialogue off, *"let this cup pass from me"* with *"Nevertheless, Thy will be done."*

We use both discussion and dialogue, using dialogue when we eat, eating what we like, not eating what we do not like (dialogue is a spectrum from love to hate, with everything in between, "like" being the most common word used). When we are told what we like to eat is bad for us we have a choice between discussion, not eating it or dialogue, eating it anyway. We use language to determine how we will behave. When it comes to behavior, when we accept discussion, what the Father says, with the Father having the final say yet resorting to dialogue we disobey, we have a guilty conscience (there is a consequence if we are caught). This condition is referred to as a "belief-action dichotomy." It is the guilty conscience those "of and for the world" want to negate since it is the guilty conscience that carries the Father's authority into society, with you telling others what they can and can not do, telling them they are wrong when they are wrong, not joining with them but judging, condemning, casting them out, that is refusing to relate with them when they do wrong instead, as a boss for example will not hire someone who is wrong, who disobeys, who sins, who lusts after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating instead of doing what he is told, firing him if he was hired. This is where money comes into play. When discussion has control of it, doing right and not wrong according to what the worker is told determines whether he will be hired and paid or not. If dialogue has control of it, the incompetent, lazy, and vicious get paid. The guilty conscience for doing wrong resides in discussion, not in dialogue, where there is no wrong, where there is only "It was not my fault, it was so-and-so's fault or the situation." and "I will do better next time," where there no confession of and repentance for doing wrong. Kurt Lewin (a Marxist) explained not only where the guilty conscience (what he calls the "negative valence") originates but also how to negate it in the individual, removing it from society: Kurt Lewin: *"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*) By making your behavior subject to dialogue, to your "feelings" of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating (what dialogue does, having to remove the "negative," the "Thou shalt surely die" from the room, replacing it with the "positive," the "Ye shalt not surely die," "we can share our feelings and thoughts here without being judged, condemned, or cast out in order for everyone to freely share what they are thinking about and want to do—as was done in a garden in Eden) the Father's authority is negated in dialogue, negating your having a guilty conscience when you do wrong, disobey, sin, so those "of and for the world" can do wrong, disobey, sin, that is lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating with your affirmation, not having to worry about your judging, condemning, and casting them out for their unrighteous thoughts and unrighteous actions since you have replace discussion, your having to do what the Father says with dialogue, with what you want to do, resulting in those "of and for the world" "owning" you, buying and selling their soul, with you following after, serving, protecting, defending, praising, worshiping, and even willingly dying (or at least giving your time and money) for them since they 'justified' your lust for pleasure, dying in their sins, Matthew 16:26 Since your flesh is temporary, it has no eternal value. It is your soul



that is eternal, where you spend eternity depends upon who you listen to and obey in this life, your self, others, or God. Carl Rogers (a Marxist): *"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?'"* Rejecting the Heavenly Father's authority, those "of and for the world" perceive that when children accept and obey their earthly father they 'create' the Heavenly Father's authority. Thus their agenda, when it comes to behavior is to use dialogue, where there is no father's authority. 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."* ([Carl Rogers](#), *on becoming a person: A Therapist View of Psychotherapy*) Abraham Maslow: *"I have found whenever I ran across authoritarian students [those who adhere to the Father's authority] 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."* ([Abraham Maslow](#), *Maslow on Management*) In other words, the agenda for those "of and for the world" is to not let discussion, what the Father says get in the way of your dialogue, your talking to your self regarding what you want to do so you can do what you want without having a guilty conscience, as was done in a garden in Eden. In education, via Federal laws and the use of "Bloom's Taxonomies" as the method of teaching in the classroom, call curriculum, the Father's authority, being told and discussion, with the Father having the final say was replaced with the students carnal nature, with "that which was formed from the dust of the ground," with dialogue, with how the students "feel," their "affective domain" and what they "think," their opinion regarding behavior. Which one you turn to, to discussion or to dialogue when it comes to behavior determines which political system you are going to live under, either under "rule of law," the Father's authority or rebellion, tyranny, and revolution, where the child's carnal nature where lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint resides, ruling over the world. Norman Brown: *"By dialectic, I mean an activity of consciousness, struggling to circumvent the limitations imposed by the formal-logical law of contradiction."* All Brown was saying is "I'm trying to figure out how I can get around what my parents just told me to do." Replacing discussion, what the Father says, where the Father has the final say with dialogue, with how you feel and what you think, where you have the final say when it comes to behavior, the Father's authority is negated so you can sin without having a guilty conscience, with "the people's" affirmation, dying in your sins. That is how it works. 1 John 2:18 and 2 Timothy 4:3, 4. All of this will be repeated below. This is only a heads up (an overview) on what will be covered in greater detail below. God's solution is not found in stimulus-response, in that which is of the world, with man's reasoning taken captive to it, using dialogue to 'justify' his self, his lusts but is found in faith in God and His word, requiring the same faith God required of Adam but now in

His Son, Jesus Christ, 'redeeming' him from God's judgment upon him for his sins, covering his sins by His shed blood on a cross, with God the Father 'reconciling' him to Himself by raising His Son from the grave.

When you witness students in a classroom circled around a desk, or youth in a "youth group" dialoguing their "feelings" and their "thoughts," that is their opinions regarding personal-social issues (having to put aside their differences in order for everyone in "the group" to share their "feelings" and "thoughts," that is to share their opinion, having to be "positive," "tolerating ambiguity," having to be tolerant of the other person's unrighteous (or sinful or deviant) thoughts, statements, or opinion and-or behavior and not be "negative," judging, condemning, casting them out, that is refusing to listen to them and-or relate with them, telling them they are wrong instead), working on a "group project," receiving a "group grade" (based upon how well they are setting aside their principles for the sake of group harmony), striving for consensus, a "feeling" of oneness with one another, which requires compromise, suspending (as upon a cross) what the Father says, what they have been told in order to "build relationship" with one another based upon common "self interest," lust, silencing, censoring, and casting anyone out who, insisting upon everyone doing what the Father says, who refuses to participate in the process of 'change' being labeled as being not just "prejudiced" but a "Fascist," amongst other terms (lower order thinker, maladjusted, unadaptable to 'change,' a resister of 'change,' not a team player, divisive, hateful, intolerant, and so forth) you are witnessing Marxism, the dialectic process at work.

Marxism is created when a diverse group of people (which must include the deviant, the catalyst for 'change,' compromising one's position for the sake of relationship), dialogue their opinions to a consensus (there is no Father's authority in dialogue, in an opinion, or in the consensus process), in a facilitated meeting (since the process of 'change' does not come naturally, you have to be seduced, deceived, and manipulated in order to participate correctly), over social issues (which requires everyone to set aside what the Father says in order for everyone to "get along") to a predetermined outcome (that the process just described is being used whenever any rule, policy, or law, that is right and wrong behavior is being established). In dialectic 'reasoning,' reasoning from how you "feel" (which is always through dialogue, where you have the final say) instead of from what you have been told (which is through discussion, where the Father has the final say) makes "human nature," unrighteousness, your natural inclination to lust after that which stimulates pleasure in you, that you want to have or do, that you are attracted to, which you have been told you can not have or do the "norm." In order to make "human nature," your natural inclination to lust after pleasure and hate restraint, unrighteousness the "norm," that which gets in the way of pleasure, that which inhibits or prevents you from being your self, doing what you want has to be removed from the the environment, has to be removed from the room, from the classroom or work environment. In order to make behavior subject to dialogue, to doing what you want, to unrighteousness instead of subject to what you have been told to do, discussion, what the Father says, with the Father having the final say, the Father's authority, insisting that everyone humble themselves, die to, that is deny their lusts, doing right and not wrong according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, doing what they have been told instead has to be removed from the room. When discussion, what the Father says, with the Father having the final say stays in the room, has control of communication, dialogue, what you want, with you having the final say, the dialectic process is prevented from becoming actualized ("*self-actualization*" is prevented from becoming). György Lukács: "*The dialectical method was overthrown—the parts [the children] were prevented from finding their definition [their identity] within the whole [within one another, within "the*

*group," through dialogue 'justifying' their carnal nature, their natural inclination to lust after pleasure and hate restraint]. "Your carnal heart, thinking pleasure is the purpose of life instead of doing the Father's will becomes desperate in its effort to acquire or retain the pleasure of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, striking out against anyone taking or threatening to take it away, not seeing its action as being wicked, "desperately wicked" since its lust for pleasure is standing in the way, 'justifying' the action, the hate. Sin resides in the human heart, where dialogue, what Karl Marx called "Critical Criticism" resides, 'justifying' his carnal nature, his natural inclination to lust after pleasure and hate restraint, to hate the restrainer who is taking or is threatening to take his pleasure away. Marxism is the spirit of "You can't tell me what I can and can not do." Rejecting the Father's authority, those who are "of and for the world," Marxists, facilitators of 'change' reject any law that judges, condemns, or 'justifies' their being cast out (firing or not hiring them) for lusting after pleasure instead of doing what the Father says, for doing what they want instead of doing what they are told. While that definition (replacing discussion, what the Father says, righteousness with dialogue, with how you feel and what you think in the 'moment,' with unrighteousness when it comes to behavior, resulting in you hating the Father's authority for getting in the way) might go over a lot of peoples heads ("who can know it") it is what is going on right now in the public (as well as in the "Christian") classroom as well as in meetings in the workplace, in government, and even in the "church," across the nation and around the world. The Father's authority, having to humble and die to your self, deny your lusts in order to do right and not wrong according to the Father's established commands, rules, facts, and truth, in order to do what you have been told is being negated, is being replaced with your natural inclination to lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating, making you subject to the facilitator of 'change,' to the Marxist, who, 'justifying' your propensity to lust after pleasure and hate restraint "owns" you; 2 Peter 2:3 and 2 Timothy 4:3, 4. We have become a Marxist nation and few people realize it, and fewer yet know what it is and how it was done (and continues to be done). I have sat across the table from heads of major Christian ministries who could have made a difference, sharing this information with them with them turning sideways in their chair, refusing to listen, wanting to hear the truth but not this much truth, which would cost them, getting in the way of what they wanted, the praises and support of men. In describing America today I am describing Marxism. In describing Marxism I am describing America today. America has become a Marxist Nation, a nation which lusts after pleasure and hates restraint, that hates the Father's authority, that hates being told what is right and what is wrong behavior according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth, that hates doing what it is told. Just try to take its i-phones or tablets away. While you might deny it. You can not refute it. It is everywhere you turn. 2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12*

What is Marxism? Marxism is dialectic 'reasoning,' that is self 'justification,' the 'justification' of lust being put into action, called praxis. The idea being, don't attack the righteous or those who insist upon everyone doing the Father's will, just don't include them in your communication with one another, that is what dialogue, when it comes to behavior does. All there is in praxis is man's carnal nature and the world that stimulates it. The word praxis is found in the Bible. In Colossians 3:9 the word "*deeds*" is the Greek word *praxis*. The "lie" of the "old man" is the praxis you can do what you want without God judging, condemning, and casting you out for your carnal thoughts and carnal actions, Psalms 10:4 and Psalms 36:1. The name for the national test for teachers is Praxis. Instead of reasoning from what the Father says the Marxist uses 'reasoning' to 'liberate' his self from what the Father says. (As will be soon covered it is the difference between using discussion or dialogue when it comes to defining and

establishing right and wrong behavior, with discussion siding with the Father and dialogue siding with what you want to do.) In brief, Marxism, incorporating man's lust for pleasure as a part of "human nature," establishes lust over and therefore against the Father and His authority. For the Marxist or the socialist it is what you have in common with everyone else on the earth and they have in common with you, your and their natural inclination to lust after pleasure and be dissatisfied with, resenting or hating authority for getting in the way that unites you with them and then with you, with everyone having to reject the Father's authority which divides man one from another based upon who is doing the Father's will and who is not. For the Marxist "building relationship upon self interest," upon lust, upon "What can I get out of this situation, object, people, or person for my self?" is what unites. It is the Father's authority, having to do right and not wrong according to what the Father says that divides.

Individualism comes from the Father's authority, from where we get "Individualism, under God." Socialism, Marxism, globalism on the other hand comes from what man has in common, his lust for pleasure and his hatred toward restraint. As long as the Father's authority, doing what the Father says occupies the individual's mind, effecting his actions, socialism, Marxism, globalism, the 'justification' of lust can not take control over his life and the life of "the people." In dialogue we 'justify' what we like. There is a place for dialogue, As long as we use dialogue, "I feel" and "I think" regarding what we have been told by the Father what we can do or we have it is fine, retaining the Father's authority in our thoughts, directly effecting our actions. But the moment we use dialogue to 'justify' what we want to do or have that the Father has told us we can not do or have it becomes lust, resulting in us using it, that is dialogue to 'justify' our dissatisfaction with, resentment or hatred toward the Father who is getting in the way of our lusts. The more you focus upon what you are lusting after, upon what you want, especially with others affirming, that is 'justifying' your lust, the the greater your resentment or hatred toward the Father's authority will become, preventing you from having what you want. It is here, in your natural inclination to lust after pleasure and hate restraint (that is hating to miss out on pleasure), with you not only dialoguing within your self but dialoguing with others 'justifying' your lust that hatred toward the Father authority resides, that Marxism resides. In discussion you hate yourself for being or doing wrong. In dialogue you hate the person or thing that prevents you from doing or having what you want. The more you use dialogue when it comes to behavior the more Marxist, that is the more hateful toward authority you become. You can not see it happening since dialogue and what you want go hand in hand, blinding you to your increasing hatred toward authority, 'justifying' it instead.

Instead of being "born again," of the spirit, as the Lord requires, that is subject only to the Father, while being "in the world" being no longer "of it," socialism, Marxism, globalism requires man to be "born again," only "of the world," where lust for pleasure along with lust for being affirmed by others, makes him at-one-with himself and at-one-with the world, creating "worldly peace," where he can sin without having a guilty conscience and "socialist harmony," where he can sin with "the peoples" affirmation. Irvin Yalom (a Marxist): *"One of the most fascinating aspects of group therapy is that everyone is born again, born together in the group."* (Irvin D. Yalom, *Theory and Practice and Group Psychotherapy*) Kurt Lewin (a Marxist): *"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*) By the Lord Jesus Christ establishing the soul above the flesh, faith above sight, being told above stimulus-response, what the Father says above what man says, including what the earthly father says, He did not destroy the

Father's authority as those "of and for the world" seek to do. He simply established His Heavenly Father's authority above all authority, since all other authority is subject to stimulus-response, is subject to the flesh and the world that stimulates it, is subject to "sense experience," is subject to "What can I get out of this situation and-or object, people or person for my self." He therefore causes division between man doing His Father's will and their doing their will instead. The difference being His Heavenly Father's authority deals with your soul, which is eternal. Man's authority deals with your flesh and the world that stimulates it, which is temporary, passing away. 1 John 2:18, Matthew 10: 28, and Matthew 10:32-38

It is the Father's authority the Marxist is against, the Marxist is out to negate, is out to remove from the face of the earth whether it be of God or of man. Marxism, the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process is antithetical to the Father's authority, where the Father preaches commands and rules to be obeyed, teaches facts and truth to be accepted as is, by faith and applied, and discusses them with those under His authority at His discretion, rewards those who obey and do things right, that is who do what they are told, corrects and-or chastens those who disobey, that is who do not do what they were told, and casts out (grounds or expels) anyone who questions, challenges, defies, disregards, attacks His authority. This is the same structure found in traditional education. This is important to know as dialectic reasoning, the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process, the facilitated "be positive, not negative" meeting negates the Father's authority in all who participate, so the Marxist, the facilitator of 'change' can lust without having a guilty conscience, so he (or she) can sin with impunity. The scriptures explain the Father's authority, where the Father authors commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as is, obeyed or applied, and enforces them. You have to have both the authoring and the enforcing. If you negate the enforcement, as you have to do in the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus, "be positive, not negative" classroom or meeting you negate the Father's authority, that is you negate having to accept and obey His commands and rules and accept and apply His facts and truth). Marxism, simply put is the rejection of the Father's authority so the Marxist can sin without being judged, condemned, and cast out for his immoral thoughts and immoral actions, removing anyone who gets in the way of his lusts, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous without having a guilty conscience. The Father's authority is defined in [Hebrews 12:5-11](#) and represented in Ephesians 6:1-3 "*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.*" While the "earthly father" is not perfect, he may be (or may have been) a down right tyrant—as a child *lusting* pleasure without restraint—or MIA or AWOL his office of authority is perfect, having been given to him by the "Heavenly Father," who is perfect, in which to do His will, teaching his children to do right and not wrong according to what they have been told. The Father requires those under His authority to do what they are told. The Marxist requires everyone, when it comes to behavior to think and act according to their carnal nature, according to "*the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,*" according to what they have in common, according to that which is only "*of the world,*" establishing "sense experience" over and therefore against being told. (Take note: this is an indicator of what is going on in the classroom, the intended outcome)

If stimulus-response is all there is then man's ability to reason, to be told by others and to tell others what is right and what is wrong behavior, that is his ability to read or write a book, which nothing else in the creation can do, that ability being the result of God "breathing" the "breath of life into" that which He "formed" from "the dust of the ground," thus making man a "living

soul" must be negated, negating the very tool (man's ability to reason) those who are "of and for the world" use to negate those telling them what they can and can not do. As the serpent in the garden in Eden when you truly understand what they are doing, they have no legs to stand on. As the laws of nature are established by God so are the laws He has established for man to obey, with man being told what is right and what is wrong behavior, with man having the ability to do what he is told or do what he wants, with God judging him according to his obedience or disobedience, according to his response to the laws He has established for him to do. Being guilty of sin, of disobedience to God's laws, there is no law of the creation that can save man from God's judgment upon him for his sins, for his disobedience, which is eternal death. Only an act of God, that is in His Son's obedience to the Father in all things commanded, even to death can man be saved, by faith in Him. This the Marxist, establishing lust, that is sin, that is immorality as a part of "human behavior" rejects, having to reject the Father and His authority in order for him to sin, to lust, to be immoral with impunity, without having a guilty conscience, with the affirmation of men. It can not be defined any simpler than that. As will be explained in greater detail below, when it comes to defining and establishing behavior when you replace discussion, what the Father says, with the Father having the final say with dialogue, what the child says, with the child having the final say "sense experience" negates being told, lust negates the Father's authority. In discussion "I have to do what the Father tells me to do." In dialogue "I can do what I want." Which one is being used in defining and establishing right and wrong behavior determines whether the Father's authority is being 'justified' and lust is being condemned or lust is being 'justified' and the Father's authority is being condemned. It has to be one or the other. With man, accepting the Father's authority yet yielding to the flesh, thus having a guilty conscience for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, called a "belief-action dichotomy," taking the Father's authority wherever he goes, taking it into society, the socialist's, Marxist's, globalist's agenda is to remove the Father's authority in the mind of man so he can do wrong, disobey, sin without having a guilty conscience, called "theory and practice," where "I feel" and "I think" occupies his thoughts instead of what the Father says, 'justifying' his sinful behavior.

When you making behavior subject to stimulus-response, to science (the Holy Scriptures call it "so called science") you negate the Father's authority, you negate (in your mind) your having to do what you have been told to do, you negate the issue of sin, you negate the issue of righteousness, negating your having to do the Father's will. It is what is going on today in our nation and around the world. While people are going after organizations, institutions, parties, and individuals they are not addressing the problem, the very process itself, the dialectic process which 'justifies' the carnal nature of man, the human heart, establishing lust over and therefore against the Father's authority, over and therefore against doing the Father's will, over and therefore against the Word of God. Even George Washington recognized the problem, the human heart. George Washington: "*despotism . . . predominates in the human heart.*" ([George Washington, Farewell Address](#)) Whether it is an individual 'justifying' his lusts or a group the outcome is the same, lust for pleasure ruling over and therefore against the Father's authority. Our framing fathers did not get rid of the King. They put him at the head of the family, with the father, according to his convictions ruling over his family, his property, and his business. Thus the Constitution with its "Bill of Rights" was established in order to limit the power of those in government in order for the father to train up his children according to his convictions, teaching them right from wrong when it comes to behavior (even if the father is wrong the children, knowing he is wrong keep the right-wrong way of

thinking), having a guilty conscience when they do wrong, disobey, sin, when they lusting after the carnal pleasure of the 'moment' that the world was stimulating do what they want instead of doing what they are told. Anyone in government without a Father's structure of thought, without having a guilty conscience for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning will use the office they are serving in to satisfy their own self interest, their lusts using your tax dollars to create, promote, and support those who think like them, 'justifying' "the people's" lust for pleasure (that is their lust for pleasure), removing anyone who gets in "the people's" way (that is who get in their way). Any time you are (and-or your children, your spouse, your neighbors, your teachers, your fellow workers, your leaders, legislators, and judges, your minister is) participating in a facilitated, dialoguing of opinions to a consensus meeting, being told to "be positive," tolerant of ambiguity, that is tolerant of immorality and not "negative," judging, condemning, casting the immoral person out, in other words refusing to relate with them, not hiring but firing them instead, telling them that their immoral thoughts and immoral actions are wrong, you (and-or they) are being indoctrinated in Marxism. Robert Dale Owen, Robert Owen's son explained what his father's socialist project in America produced, a culture of lazy, incompetent, and vicious people in control of society.

Norman Brown (a Marxist) explained where the guilty conscience originates: *"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:"* Robert Trojanowicz (a Marxist) explained what effect the guilty conscience has upon the individual and society: *"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*) When you use dialogue to 'justify' your doing what you have been told you are not to do you sear your conscience. There is no guilty conscience in dialogue, only self 'justification.' This the Marxist, the facilitator of 'change' knows, replacing discussion, where the Father the final say with dialogue, where the child has the final say when it comes to defining or establishing right and wrong behavior. It is the difference between right and wrong being an either-or, according to established commands, rules, facts, and truth or along a spectrum from love to hate based upon a persons "feelings" of the 'moment,' responding to the current situation or object, people, or person present. It is the difference between objective truth, which tells you what you can and can not do, which holds you accountable for disobeying and subjective truth where you decide for your self what you are going to do according to your "feelings" of the 'moment,' that is according to your "sensuous needs," which includes "the lust of the flesh" and your "sense perception" which includes "the lust of the eyes," making "sense experience," "the pride of life," only that which is "of Nature," which is "of the world" the only means to knowing right from wrong behavior. When the woman in the garden "saw" the forbidden tree as being "good" she was using dialogue, having negated discussion, what the Father said, *"thou shalt surely die."*

Marxism is the exclusion of "governance," "rule of law," what the Father (or the Constitution, parent, teacher . . .) says, what the Word of God says when it comes to behavior, which holds man accountable for his carnal thoughts and carnal actions. Marxism is the inclusion of lust, that is your lust for pleasure, what you are dialoguing with your self about, what you are 'justifying' as a part of the outcome (as I will repeat over and over again, there is no Father's authority, no "can not," "must not," "thou shalt not"

in dialogue, there is only your carnal desires of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating being 'justified'), thus making lust the "norm," negating the Father's authority (that is washing the Father's authority from your brain, and from the brain of everyone else who participates) in the process. It is the negation or exclusion of what God says regarding your and other's behavior. It is the rejection of Romans 10:17, Proverbs 3:6, and Jeremiah 10:23. You may not realize that in your silence in the midst of unrighteousness, in order to initiate or sustain relationship (say to "grow" the "church") you are making unrighteousness the "norm." Every lawyer knows *"qui tacet consentire videtur"* that is "silence is consent." If someone did not tell you, you would not know. While doing what you want you can not see what you are doing is wrong (when it is wrong) until someone tells you what you were doing is wrong. Romans 7:7, Romans 3:20, and Romans 5:13. The objective of those "of and for the world," insisting everyone be "positive" ('justifying' lust) and not "negative" (judging, condemning, and casting those out, that is not relating with, not hiring and firing those who practice it) when it comes to behavior is to negate the law, thus negating the issue of sin, which requires their negation of the law giver, that is the Father and His authority. Since, as will be covered ahead there is no law of the Father in dialogue, only the law of the flesh, those "of and for the world" use dialogue when it comes to defining and establishing behavior, rejecting true discussion, where the Father has the final say, in discussion "rule of law" is retained.

While the American "Bill of Rights" made the Father King over his family, his property, and his business, ruling over them according to his convictions the French "Bill of Rights" (as all socialist revolutions do) 'liberated' "the people" from the King, negated the father's authority over his family, his property, and his business. Kenneth Benne (a Marxist): We *"must develop persons who see non-influencability of private convictions in joint deliberations as a vice rather than a virtue."* (Kenneth Benne, *Human Relations In Curriculum Change*) In the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process, in the "be positive, not negative" classroom or meeting private convictions must be set aside for the sake of "the group," for the sake of "worldly peace and socialist harmony." Have you heard the word 'change' recently. In a world of 'change,' law or behavior is established through dialogue, where the child has the final say, 'justifying' his natural inclination to lust after pleasure and hate restraint instead of through discussion, where the Father has the final say, judging, condemning, casting those out who praxis lust, doing their will instead of His.

Walking in the spirit you always have a discuss with God if you have any questions, with God having the final say. We come into this world with both discussion and dialogue, wanting to do right and not wrong according to what we have been told and yet wanting to do our will instead, having a guilty conscience when we, doing our will do wrong, disobey, or sin. The solution to our conflict, according to those "of and for the world" is to reject discussion, what the Father says altogether and go strictly to dialogue, doing our will without having a guilty conscience. That is why you can not talk to children (or your elected officials or anyone else) today, insisting you dialogue with them, not being able to hear you if you try to have a discussion with them, with you having the final say. Matthew 13:15 *"For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."*



The *dialoguing of opinions* to a *consensus* process is the praxis of Marxism, negating the Father's authority in the thoughts of the participants so the Marxist, along with "the people" can lust after pleasure without having a guilty conscience, so he (or she), with "the people's" affirmation can be immoral, no longer judged, condemned, and cast out for his and their immoral thoughts and immoral actions. By the Marxist rejecting (that is denying) God's definition of right and wrong behavior, with God distinguishing between righteousness (with man doing what he is told, doing the Father's will) and unrighteousness (with man lusting after pleasure, doing his will instead), turning to his definition of behavior instead, the Marxist makes lust a part of "human nature," "boys will be boys," "If it feels good, just do it" making lust disappear as an issue (in doing so the Father's authority, that is man being judged, condemned, and cast out for his immoral thoughts and immoral actions, judging, condemning, and casting others out for their immoral thoughts and immoral actions disappears as well, that is the Father's authority is negated, is no longer in the thoughts of "the people" other than to be hated when it arrives on the scene). There is no Father's authority in dialogue. Therefore when behavior is established through dialogue the Father's authority is excluded (negated) in the thoughts of "the people," 'justifying' their immoral actions. After reading over 600 social-psychology books this is what they all boil down to, the 'justification' of immorality and hatred toward the Father's authority for getting in the way. I've shared this information in liberal universities, before hundreds of students to hear at the end of the lecture, from the professors, in front of their students "We can not refute a word you said." The following is going on right under your nose, in the local schools (even Christian), in the workplace, in government, and even in the "church," unabated.

According to those "of and for the world," facilitators of 'change,' 'change' is all about negating the Father's authority in the thoughts of the individual so he can act (or behave) according to his carnal nature without having a guilty conscience (which is engendered by the Father's authority), resulting in his no longer judging, condemning, or casting others out for their immoral thoughts and immoral actions. When in a position of authority, having power over "the people" he will focus on supporting, financially and emotionally those who are immoral, establishing rules, making policies, and passing laws that 'justify' their immoral thoughts and immoral actions. The earthly father's authority in the family is negated when lust, the "affective domain," that is "human nature" is 'justified,' *negating* the Heavenly Father's authority in the heart of man, *negating* (or removing) from society, individualism, under God. That is the plan. Socialism, Marxism, "relationship built upon self interest," built upon the affirmation of lust, the tolerance of immorality (called "tolerance of ambiguity"), globalism can not be initiated or sustained as long as the earthly father retains his authority in the family and the Heavenly Father retains his authority in the heart of man, engendering a guilty conscience in the individual when he does wrong, disobeys, sins, taking the Father's authority into society with him, judging, condemning, casting out (not relating with, not hiring, not voting for, firing instead) those who are 'justifying' immorality. In dialectic 'reasoning' any time you are told something you did not experience on your own you are prevented from being your self, thinking and acting according to your carnal nature and the world that stimulates it. Socialism, Marxism, globalism is based upon experience (stimulus-response) not upon being told (what the Father says). Romans 1:28-32

'Change' according to those "of and for the world" is not a person changing his position from one position to another, maintaining an either-or, black-white, right-wrong, above-below, heaven-hell structure of thought, called a Patriarchal paradigm but is based upon stimulus-response, where whoever in the environment stimulates or 'justifies' pleasure is right (is labeled as

being "positive") and whoever inhibits or blocks it is wrong (is labeled as being "negative") needing to be "positive" or be removed from the environment in order for it to be right. Max Horkheimer (a Marxist) noted that in America *"Protestantism was the strongest force in the extension of cold rational individualism."* (Max Horkheimer, *Reasoning and Self Preservation*) Protestantism, the priesthood of all believers; putting no object or person between you and the Lord; sola Scriptura (scriptures only), solus Christus (Christ only), sola fide (faith only), sola gratia (grace only), and soli Deo gloria (glory to God only)," 'liberated' the individual out from under the control of self interest and society, *lust* and "the group." The individual, under God while being "in the world" is not "of it." When it comes to behavior, the believer, rejecting stimulus-response (the idea that by creating a "healthy" environment you can create a "healthy" person, knowing there is nothing in man or in the creation that can make a man righteous or "good," that righteousness has to be imputed by God himself) submits himself to the Father and His authority, doing the Father's will as a result, John 14:6. While the Father demands no compromise society or rather socialism, Marxism, globalism does. It is the difference between the conscience, doing right and not wrong according to what the Father says, according to what you have been told and the "super-ego," the moral standard of society, which requires compromise, that is requires the setting aside or "suspending" of what the Father says, doing what you want in order to "build relationship with others" based upon what you and they have in common, that being lust for pleasure and resentment toward restraint, resentment toward the Father and His authority for getting in the way. Doing the Father's will engenders "individualism, under God," Galatians 1:10. Socialism, Marxism, globalism, which 'justifies' "human nature" or lust negates individualism, making the individual subject to what "the group" or what society thinks (making all subject to lust and the world that stimulates it, thus making everyone subject to those manipulation it, controlling the "discussion" of the day). (By making all the news about a flood in one small town somewhere in the world the whole world becomes concerned about a flood. Snap your fingers and the whole world jumps. Personal-social issues exclude accountability before God. Noah son's building a tower, making a name for their self negated being scattered, having to trust in God.) Those "of and for the world" do not want the Father, that is what the Father says in your brain they want only what you have in common with others and others have in common with you, lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint in your brain. At the most you can have the Father in your brain as long as you keep Him to your self and do not let Him get in the way of what others think and do. 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*) If you are concerned about your child's social life instead of where he or she will spend eternity (it is an either-or) you are a socialist. It is an absolute. You can deny it but you can not refute it. The plan is to turn everyone into a socialist, a Marxist, a globalist, creating worldly peace and socialist harmony. It is there for anyone to see, if they care. Karl Marx: *"The justice of state constitutions is to be decided not on the basis of Christianity, not from the nature of Christian society but from the nature of human society."* (Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right'*)

Discussion ties us to KNOWING by being told, making us subject to doing right and not wrong according to what we have been told, that is subject to the Father with His authority, who authors commands, rules, facts, and truth to be accepted as is obeyed or applied and enforces them, that is who holds us accountable for disobeying or being wrong. Dialogue on the other hand ties us to

our "feelings" of the 'moment,' making us subject to sensuousness, to stimulus-response, which includes lust, making us subject to only that which is "of the world." The soul KNOW by being told. The flesh by "sense experience."

When it comes to defining and establishing behavior, when communication is moved from discussion, where the Father establishes what is right and what is wrong behavior and has the final say to dialogue, where the child thinks and behaves according to his carnal nature and has the final say the earthly father's authority in the family and the Heavenly Father's authority in the heart of man is negated. It is a subtle 'change,' 'changing' communication from discussion to dialogue when it comes to behavior but it has major ramifications. It is what happened in the garden in Eden (Genesis 3:1-6) where what the Father said, discussion, with the Father having the final say was replaced with what the woman wanted, dialogue, with the woman having the final say. It is what 'change,' that is psychology, Marxism, globalism is all about. What they all have in common is stimulus-response, approaching pleasure (which includes the approval of men) and avoiding pain (which includes missing out on pleasure). According to Karl Marx when the earthly father's "Do what I say," "Because I said so" is removed from the mind of the child, the Heavenly Father's "It is written" is removed from the mind of the individual, resulting in individualism, under God being removed from society. The 'drive' and the 'purpose' of psychology, Marxism, and globalism is to replace doing the Father's will with the child doing his will instead. When it comes to behavior replacing discussion, what the Father says, where the Father has the final say with dialogue, how the child feels, where the child has the final say the deed, that is 'change' is accomplished, with children now doing what they want instead of doing what they are told. Rejecting the Heavenly Father, with the Son of God, Jesus Christ doing His Heavenly Father's will, Karl Marx determined that God was 'created' when children did what they were told, doing their earthly father's will in defiance to their carnal nature, thereby establishing the Father and His authority over and therefore against "human nature." According to Karl Marx the fathers in the community create division and disharmony in the community as their children do right and not wrong according to what they have been told, insisting others do the same, judging, condemning, and casting out (firing or not hiring; refusing to build relationship with) anyone who does wrong, disobeys, sins, who act immoral—this being the characteristic of private business. For "worldly peace and socialist harmony" to become reality what children have in common, their lust for pleasure and dissatisfaction with, resentment toward, and hatred of the Father's authority for getting in the way must become the focus of life, making them readily adaptable to 'change,' responding in favor to those in the environment who are stimulating pleasure (who are being "positive"), rejecting and turning against those in the environment who are judging, condemning, casting them out for their immoral behavior (who are being "negative"). It is in 'change,' stimulus-response, not in doing the Father's will that Marxism, the New world order is based. When it comes to behavior when you replace discussion, what the Father says with dialogue, with how the child "feels" 'change,' that is negation of the Father's authority is being initiated and sustained.

According to those "of and for the world" since all are immoral what gives the boss the right to fire or not hire someone who is immoral. It is in the individual's dialoguing with his self that lust, immorality, sin, the imagination of the heart is 'justified.' It is in dialogue that Karl Marx established the moral standard of society, requiring the individual's communication with his self and with others to move progressively (increasingly) away from discussion, away from what the Father says to dialogue, to focusing upon what he and others are lusting after until critical mass or desperation sets in (from where dissatisfaction with the Father and

His authority, moves to resentment toward Him and His authority, to eventually outright hatred toward Him and His authority, making the individual willing to die for what he is lusting after, that is "desperately wicked"), what Karl Marx called "Critical Criticism." Doing "Critical Criticism" in a group exponentially amplifies the reaction, dying for "the group" has greater purpose. That is why the 'change' process, with the "help" of the facilitator of 'change' is always done in a group. Theodor Adorno: *"The individual may have 'secret' thoughts which he will under no circumstances reveal to anyone else if he can help it. To gain access is particularly important, for here may lie the individual's potential."* According to Hegel, Marx, and those "of and for the world" only by removing the authority of the Father from the mind of the child (what the child is already doing in his dialoguing with himself, 'justifying' his lust for pleasure and his resentment if not hatred toward restraint, toward the Father and His authority) and from society (that is from the environment where the child is learning right from wrong behavior) can the child become innocent again, as he was before the Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth came into his life telling him what he could and could not do. This was what the master facilitator of 'change' did with two "children" in a garden in Eden, convincing them they could do what they wanted without being held accountable. For those "of and for the world" to "eat from the tree of knowledge" establishes lust for pleasure and hatred toward restraint, stimulus-response as the ground from which to reason, doing what they want, not from what the Father says, doing the Father will, making all there is "here-and-now" disregarding any warning about the "there-and-then."

The soul and the flesh. Discussion and dialogue. They are two different political systems. The soul is eternal, dealing with where we will spend eternity, either eternal life or eternal death. The flesh deals with the here-and-now, the "eternal present," and passes away. When we choose the flesh, dialogue, the "eternal present," stimulus-response as our political system (to establish right and wrong behavior) all the soul has to look forward to is eternal death. The soul KNOWS from being told, making it subject to the Father's authority, to doing the Father's will. The flesh knows by sense experience, making it subject to the world, to stimulus-response. When God created man He did something with him which he did with nothing else in the creation (which he spoke into existence, "Let there be . . ."), He *"formed man"* from *"the dust of the ground,"* getting ahead of my self this is where dialogue, man doing his will resides, While discussion restrains dialogue (that is the Father restrains the child), dialogue negates discussion (that is the child negates the Father). He then *"breathed into his nostrils the breath of life"* making him a *"living soul,"* where discussion, man doing God's will resides. Genesis 2:7 *"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."* He then did something with man which He did with nothing else in the creation, He *told* him what was right and what was wrong behavior and the consequence for doing wrong, for disobedience (all the rest of the creation is subject to stimulus-response, including the flesh of man). Genesis 2:16, 17 *"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."* Only man can be *told* or *tell* others what is right and what is wrong behavior. Only man can read or write a book. Nothing else in the creation can tell others or be told what is right and what is wrong behavior, or can read or write a book. All of the creation is based upon *stimulus-response*, including that part of man God *"formed"* *"from the dust of the ground,"* the flesh, for all living organisms that means approaching pleasure and avoiding pain—except for that which God *"breathed . . . the breath of life"* into, he was to do what he

was told. Since relationship is based upon dialogue, upon "I feel" and "I think," and nothing in the creation could dialogue with Adam, Adam had no one to have relationship with, he was all alone in the universe when it came to sharing his feelings and thoughts. Fellowship is different in that it is based upon discussion, upon what the Father says, with the Father having the final say. Since in dialogue we are god, choosing what we want to do and what we do not want to do based upon what we like and what we do not like, to dialogue with God would make Adam equal with God, the flesh equal with Spirit. By creating the woman God solved the dialogue problem, that is the issue of relationship. Genesis 2:18 *"And the LORD God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him."* Adam and the woman could dialogue regarding all the trees God had told Adam they could eat the fruit of, choosing which fruit they liked and wanted to eat and which ones they did not like and did not want to eat (it is in dialogue we have the continuum or spectrum of love, like, indifferent, don't like, hate which is based upon our feelings of the 'moment'). But when the woman took dialogue, how she felt and what she thought into the realm of discussion, where they were told they were not to go, she became God over the garden, in essence declaring that the garden was hers, she could do what she wanted instead of having to do what she was told—in that act sensuousness, stimulus-response super-seeded the Father's authority, negated her having to do what she was told. "I can do what I want, when I want. You can't tell me what I can and can not do." negated *"Thou shalt not."* Dialogue negates discussion. Thinking for to one's self negates doing what you are told. Lust for pleasure negates the Father's authority. When it comes to behavior, 'Reasoning' from the flesh negates reasoning from the Word of God. Sight negates faith. When it comes to behavior dialogue negates faith, other than faith in yourself, mankind, and the world (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."* Psalms 1:1, 2 *"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the LORD; and in his law doth he meditate day and night."* Jeremiah 6:10, 13-19). You can not make behavior subject to dialogue and do the will of God.

[Genesis 3:1-6](#): *"Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat."* *"Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?"* is a neurolinguistic construct, an imbedded statement in a question, a tool used in hypnosis, bringing dialogue, what the woman was lusting after up to the surface of her thought, making it equal with discussion, with what the Father said. Thus bringing up *"neither shall ye touch it,"* her self interest became her focus of life, simply requiring the master facilitator of 'change' to 'create' a safe place, zone, space where she did not have to fear being judged, condemned, being cast out for her thought of the 'moment,' *"Ye shall not surely die"* with her from then being able then to evaluate the situation for her self, from her carnal nature, recognizing the "forbidden" tree was just like the rest of the trees, except in her evaluation of it making

her now God, deciding for her self what was right and what was wrong behavior. The 'moment' the woman used dialogue when it came to behavior, the master facilitator of 'change' knew he "owned" her. No need for her to repent since in dialogue she was God, who is never wrong, just needing to do things better next time if anything goes wrong. Adam, in order to continue relationship with her followed after with her, rejecting fellowship with God. When caught Adam and the woman blamed someone else. Adam: "It is not my fault, it is this woman's fault. It is also your fault for creating her, for creating an unhealthy environment for me to live in." The woman: "It is not my fault, it is the master facilitator of 'change's' fault for talking me into doing what I wanted to do." Genesis 3:12, 13 *"And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. And the LORD God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."* Adam and the woman, instead of repenting, admitting that they were wrong became the first 'liberals,' blaming someone else and the situation for what they did wrong. The whole concept of Gnosticism is based upon the serpent, the master facilitator of 'change' liberating man from God so he can become at one with himself, thinking and acting according to his carnal nature, resulting in God coming to know himself as man knows himself collectively as God; this is the dialoguing of opinions to a consensus process, resulting in everyone in defiance to God saying "You can't tell us what we can or can not do. We can do what we want, when we want."

While man seeks to 'change' the environment so he can do what he wants (removing from the environment whatever or whoever gets in the way of pleasure, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous), God changes a man's heart that he might do right and not wrong according to what he has been told, despite the environment he happens to be in. 2 Corinthians 10:5 *"Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;"*

*Therapy* is based upon dialogue, where, when it comes to behavior the child or man has the final say, negating discussion, doing what the Father says, negating the Father's authority in the mind of the individual, negating the Father's authority (right-wrong thinking or "prejudice") in society, in "the group" in the process. The Constitution with its "Bill of Rights" did not get rid of the King. It kept the King. It made the father King over his family, property, and business engendering a guilty conscience in his children in the home, that is in the next generation of citizens when they did wrong, disobeyed, sinned, when they lusted after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world was stimulating instead of doing the Father's will, when they did what they wanted instead of doing what they were told.

Psychology, socialism, globalism comes between the father and his children, through dialogue negating their obedience to the father, doing what they want to do instead of what they are told. Even focusing upon the family, using dialogue in order to build relationship between the Father, the mother and the children negates the father's authority in the home. The use of *"Bloom's Taxonomies"* in the classroom goes on unabated because everybody likes doing what they want to do instead of doing what they are told, including parents. Proverbs 22:6 *"Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it."* Ephesians 6:4 *"And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."* Proverbs 4:1 *"Hear, ye children, the instruction of a father, and attend to know understanding."* Proverbs 15:32 *"He that*

*refuseth instruction despiseth his own soul: but he that heareth reproof getteth understanding.*" 2 Timothy 4:3, 4 and Jeremiah 6:16. Once students as well as their parents are on the drug of pleasure or lust, that is addicted to the "affective domain" it is difficult if not impossible to get them off.

When you realize that the majority of pleasure we experience is the result of a chemical called dopamine, a chemical our body naturally produces that is "emancipated" or "liberated" into a small gap (called a synaptic gap) between nerves—when we come into contact with something of pleasure in the environment. We are not aware of it being pleasurable until the nerve ending that is associated with pleasure, be it touch, taste, sight, sound, smell comes in contact with whatever or whoever in the environment stimulates pleasure, sending that information to the brain where dopamine is "emancipated" by a dendrite in the brain. Then our natural reaction is to locate whatever or whoever it is that is stimulating dopamine with the hope of gaining access to the object or person or people in order to control it, him or her, or them in order to experience more dopamine. All habitual drugs are associated with dopamine, some imitating it, other stimulating it, and others preventing its re-uptake (preventing it from being broken down to be reused again). It only lasts for a 'moment' and then is gone with us wanting more, resulting in us, being 'driven' to experience it again 'purposed' in controlling the object, the person, or the people (or imagining controlling it, him or her, or them) or the environment it, or they reside in. God created us with dopamine that we would enjoy his creation, not that we would worship it and the world that stimulates it instead of Him. As a drug addict, we by nature become intoxicated with, addicted to, and possessed by dopamine if we are not restrained (detoxed). Remove the Father's authority and pleasure, lust, the "emancipation" of dopamine, the "affective domain" becomes the 'drive' of life and its augmentation the 'purpose,' 'justifying' in the mind of those possessed by it the removal of the Father and His authority from the environment, along with anyone else who gets in the way, including the unborn, the elderly, the innocent, the righteous, doing so without having a guilty conscience (since the guilty conscience is engendered by the Father's authority). Without the Father's authority and the guilty conscience it engenders all we have is dopamine (and other chemicals our body naturally produce) as the 'drive' of life and its augmentation the 'purpose.' If we live chasing after dopamine, that is the "affective domain" at the end of life we have nothing to show God except a corpse (1 John 2:18). All that man has to offer God at the end of his life is nothing since dopamine only lasts momentarily. having to depend upon those who facilitate 'change,' drug pushers in order to get more of it. The 'purpose' of *"Bloom's Taxonomies"* is to turn the next generation of citizens into drug addicts, in order for those "of and for the world" to use them, as "human resource" for their own pleasure, If you entertain them they will come, and keep coming back for more, paying you well for the experience. Even the "church" has joined in the buying and selling of souls for its own gain, doing so in the "name of the Lord."

James 1:14, 15, Karl Marx used Fruit trees as an example (in correlation to the trees in the garden in Eden), discovering as the woman did that all the trees were alike (doing what is called *aufheben*, where you pick up something you have been told you are not to, in order to examine it to see if it is safe or not—I have been warning people for years the candle they are lighting is a stick of dynamite but they are not listening), her desire super-seeded any warning. Draw you in, for example to work with others on a common cause, say to solve a crisis, telling you to set aside the Father's commands, rules, facts, and truth in order to work with them and if you do you are "own." Ervin Laszlo (the originator and promotor of the 'climate change' agenda): *"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*) Your lust for the approval of others and your fear of rejection by them will get you every time. Your silence is consent. You might think that you will share with them what you believe later on, after building relationship with them so they will listen then but in their mind you have already established relationship with them as being more important than what you believe. Revelation 12:11 *"And they overcame him [the master facilitator of 'change,' the anti-Christ] by the blood of the Lamb [by what the Lord has done in obedience to the Father], and by the word of their testimony [by what the Lord is doing in your life]; and they loved not their lives unto the death [eternal life is more important to them than dopamine, which includes the praises of men, which only last for a 'moment' and has no eternal value]."**

If you do not end (stop) the use of *"Bloom's Taxonomies"* (Marxist curriculum) in the classroom, the *negation* of the father's authority will go on unabated (so the "educator," as a facilitator of 'change' and the students can sin, that is lust with impunity, with each other's *affirmation*). Until you restore the Father's authority, the authoring of established commands, rules, facts, and truth and enforce them in the classroom you have not addressed the problem. In "old school" the teacher preached established commands and rules to be obeyed, taught established facts and truth to be learned and applied, and discussed with the students any questions they might have with the teacher having the final say, rewarding those students who obeyed and got things right, correcting and chastening those who got things wrong or disobeyed, and casting out those who challenged the teachers authority. This is the same pattered applied by God. When education introduced dialogue (the "affective domain," dopamine) as the curriculum, where the students have the final say, the father's authority in the home was challenged, defied, disregarded, attacked, not only destroying the home but also the nation. This is the same pattern which was applied in a garden in Eden, where the master facilitator of 'change' "helped" two "children" 'liberate' their self from the "Father's" authority so they could do what they wanted, when they wanted without someone telling them what they could and could not do, which describes our nation today. Benjamin Bloom, forty years after its publication admitted his first "taxonomy" *"was unproved at the time it was developed and may well be 'unprovable.'"* (Benjamin Bloom, *Forty Year Evaluation*) He dedicated his first "taxonomy" to Ralph Tyler who's student Thomas Kuhn, working on his *"paradigm shift' concept of 'Pre- and Post-paradigm periods,'" where facts-based scientists are replaced with feelings-based scientist, quoting Max Planck wrote: "A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it."* 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*) Despite the "taxonomies" being only an opinion any teacher questioning their use in the classroom will be attacked for being "irrational." Parent's will be treated the same way by their children who participate in classes using "Bloom's Taxonomies" as their curriculum. That is their objective, making students who participate Marxists, that is haters of the Father's authority.



When the Father, that is discussion is the thesis, with the Father having the final say then the children, that is dialogue becomes the antithesis, preventing synthesis, the children united as one according to their lusts. But if you make children, dialogue, lust the thesis, then the Father, that is discussion becomes the antithesis resulting in the children uniting as one (coming to consensus) according to what they have in common, lust, creating synthesis. This is the formula for 'change.' When you start with the "affective domain," when it comes to behavior the outcome will always be the same, children turning against the Father and His authority; Ephesians 2:2,3, Ephesians 5:5-7, and Colossians 2:8.

Living for the 'moment,' for the "eternal present," programming you, your spouse, your children, your boss, your leaders, your minister to 'reason' from the "affective domain" makes you and them subject to being seduced, deceived, and manipulated. All anyone has to do then is through dialogue 'discover' what you are coveting (in the 'moment'), offer to "help" you attain it and they "own" you. Coming between you and what you covet they are able to use you as "natural resource" called "human resource," profiting (that is living) off of you. This is now being applied everywhere, called "services." You can not buy or sell without "profiting" (that is paying) them. Getting what you want, what you are lusting after (that which stimulates dopamine, which only lasts for a 'moment') they now "own" you, with you having to come back to them for more, thinking you are "free" when in fact you can do nothing without their approval, paying them for the service. The use of "Bloom's Taxonomies" in the classroom is all about 'liberating' children from parental restraint, thus "the people," including you from Godly restraint so you can be manipulated like Thorndike's chickens, Skinner's rats, and Pavlov's dog and used by those "of and for the world," facilitator's of 'change' for their own pleasure, casting you aside when you no longer bring them pleasure or someone else brings them more pleasure or you get in their way, doing to you what you did to the Father for getting in your way—rejecting God's love for you, eternity for the love of the world, for dopamine, which only last for the 'moment' and then passes away. John 3:16 When those in government get on the drug they will do all they can to keep themselves and those who support them in power.

2 Timothy 3:13 *"But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived."* The facilitators of 'change's' agenda is to seduce you into 'justifying' your carnal nature so he can do wrong, disobey, sin, that is so he can lust after the carnal pleasures of the 'moment' that the world is stimulating with your affirmation, without your judging, condemning, and cast him out. 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 role 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. All he did was use *"Bloom's Taxonomies"* so the woman could define and establish what is right and what is wrong behavior from her carnal nature, without the Father's authority, what the Father says getting in the way. Destroy the father's authority in the home and you destroy the nation. Destroy the Father's authority in the mind of man and you destroy his soul. That is the facilitator of 'change's,' the "wolf in sheepskin's" agenda. Now you KNOW.

The Father's authority, for the Marxist is equated to Nationalism, where the citizens are 'loyal' to their Nation as children are 'loyal' to their Father, causing division amongst the Nations as there is division amongst families in the community.

"Brainwashing" is the washing of the Father's authority, that is Nationalism from the brain. While Hunter in his book describes the symptoms of "brainwashing" he did not explain the method itself. When you read "Bloom's Taxonomies," how therapy is done, and how the Communist Chinese do "brainwashing," as you will see they are all one and the same. Instead of using physical torture, the torture that comes from being rejected is used, which is one of the most painful experiences in life. A man I knew would always say "They send you newly elected school board members off to a conference and they come back with a lobotomy, you can no longer talk to them." What they have embraced is that behavior is subject to dialogue, to their carnal desires of the 'moment' instead of to discussion, where the Father has the final say making it impossible for you to have a discussion with them any more. [Irvin D. Yalom](#), in his book *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy* explained how the therapy session is done. (I replace his word client with children in the following in order to make the comparison easier to understand.). Irvin Yalom: *"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 [they take 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 [of the 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)]. The group [of 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 [that is brainwashing—washing respect for and fear of the father's authority from the child's brain (from his thoughts) ] is successful, is able to experiment with new behavior, to break free from the locked family role [that is having to submit himself to the father's authority, that is to having to do what the father says, to having to do the father's will] he once occupied. . . . [the child] changes the past by reconstituting it [by 'creating' a "new" world order from his "ought," that is a world where "lusts," that is a world void of the*

father's authority and the *guilty conscience* which the father's authority engenders for doing wrong, disobeying, sinning, that is for "*lusting . . .*" reigns]."

Benjamin Bloom in his book *"Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Book 2: Affective Domain"* explained how the 'changing' of the students way of thinking, how their paradigm is 'changed' in the school environment when his "Taxonomies" are used.

Benjamin Bloom: *"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*)

Now the technical definition of "brainwashing." Warren G. Bennis in his book *Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays in Readings on Human Interaction*, explaining how the Communist "brainwash" their victims: Warren Bennis: *"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) When it comes to defining and establishing behavior psychotherapy, "*Bloom's Taxonomies*," and "brainwashing" are all the same (in method and outcome), replacing the Father's authority, that is discussion, where the Father has the final say with the child's carnal nature, dialogue, where the child has the final say when it comes to behavior.

By the "Frankfurt School" coming to America in the early 30's, training up Marxists to influence government leaders they were able to overcome the influence of the Father's authority on the individual and the Nation. James Coleman's works influenced the

Supreme Court on the issues of education, forcing Marxist indoctrination into the schools across the nation. James Coleman's professor, Paul Lazarsfeld was a member of the Frankfurt School. "Bloom's Taxonomies" indoctrinated the students across the nation and around the world with Marxism in the local schools. Local schools were consolidated in order to overcome the local parent's control over the school. If you care to look, their influence and others who thought like them 'changed' the nation by negating the Father's authority in the home, undermining the intent of the Constitution, 'changing' the Nation. Working from the Federal level down they took control of the Nation. They could only do that by negating the father's authority in the home and the Father's authority in the individual.

Bloom wrote: *"Perhaps one of the most dramatic events highlighting the need for progress in the affective domain was the publication of Jacob's Changing Values in College (1957)."* (*Taxonomy of Education Objectives Book 2 Affective Domain*) The agenda was to replace traditional teachers with facilitator's of 'change' in college (as well in all institutions of education, at all levels), 'liberating' the next generation of citizens from the Father's authority in order for Marxist's to rule the nation and the world not having to fear being judged, condemned, or cast out for their immoral thought and immoral actions. Everyone loves dopamine, the "affective domain." Once addicted they can not get off its influence, resulting in them following after, serving, supporting, protecting, defending, praising, worshiping, and even willingly dying for those who keep them on the drug. 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."* John 8:36 *"If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."*

*Institution for Authority Research, Dean Gotcher 1997 - 2024 (9/20/2024)*