

Review: The Lust Pattern & Sexual Sins; Definitions: Political Views; Change: Partial, Radical, & Revolutionary;
Obama: Shades of Hitler & Alinsky

Satinover, Jeffrey. *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996), 141:

In the case of pleasure, the chemical released from the nerve endings is a special type called an "opioid", meaning "opium-like." Of all behaviors, none would appear to be accompanied by so intense a burst of internal opioids as sex. Therefore, apart from the repetitive ingestion of such external opiates as heroin—the classic example of addiction—no experience is more intensely pleasurable. This fact sheds light on the ease with which repeated sexual behaviors are especially strongly reinforced.

The experience of pleasure creates powerful, behavior-shaping incentives. For this reason when biological impulses—especially the sexual ones—are *not* at least partially resisted, trained, and brought under the civilizing influence of culture and will, the pressure to seek their immediate fulfillment becomes deeply embedded in the neural network of the brain. Furthermore, the particular, individualized *patterns* by which we seek this fulfillment will also become deeply implanted. (p. 141)

Sex **outside** of marriage is always classified as a sin:

Hebrews 13:4 - Marriage must be honored among all and the marriage bed kept undefiled, for sexually immoral people and adulterers God will judge.

The Lust Pattern and Sexual Sins:

The lust pattern is the area of weakness of the sin nature. It may be defined as the overwhelming desire for something; a passionate desire; an illicit, uncontrolled, and overwhelming obsession which originates from the sin nature and gains the cooperation of a person's volition.

There are six categories of sexual sins:

1. **Adultery**, which is voluntary sexual intercourse of a married person with someone other than his or her spouse.
2. **Fornication**, which is voluntary sexual intercourse between two unmarried persons or two persons not married to each other.
3. **Fellatio**, voluntary oral sex: a form of fornication that *is* illicit sex regardless of a former president's assertion to the contrary.
4. **Degeneracy** in three subcategories:
 - a. **Homosexuality**, which is voluntary sexual intercourse directed toward a person of one's own sex.
 - b. **Bestiality**, which is sexual relationship between a human being and an animal.
 - c. **Necrophilia**, which is erotic attraction to a corpse.
5. **Criminal** sexual sins in four subcategories:
 - a. **Rape**, which is to force a person to have intercourse.
 - b. **Incest**, which is sexual intercourse between parents and children.
 - c. **Pederasty**, which is sexual relationship between two males, one of whom is a minor.
 - d. **Prostitution**, which is the practice of engaging in sexual intercourse for money.

6. The sexual sins related to **evil**. This includes the phallic in all of its historic representations.

Romans 1:22 - They claimed to be wise but became fools [anthropocentric academic speculation and pseudo intellectual arrogance].

v. 23 - and exchanged the essence of the incorruptible God for an image in the form of corruptible mankind and of birds and four-footed animals, and crawling creatures [idolatry].

v. 24 - Therefore, because of heathenistic reversionism, God delivered them over in the lusts of their flesh to immoral status that their bodies might be degraded among themselves [phallic cult].

v. 25 - For they who exchanged the truth of God for a lie: they both worshipped and served the creature [Satan] rather than the Creator [God]. (Cosmic 2 reversionism)

Romans 1:26 - Because of this God delivered them over to judgment to passions of dishonor, not only did their **females exchange the natural function of sex for that which is unnatural** [lesbian homosexuality],

v. 27 - but also in the same manner even the males, after they had abandoned the natural sexual function of the female, became inflamed with sexual desire in their lust for each other, male with male [μαλακός, *malakos* or the passive effeminate and αρσενικοίτης, *arsenokoitēs* and assertive aggressive male homosexuals, 1 Corinthians 6:9], accomplishing perverted acts and receiving back payment within themselves [physical debilitations] that judgment of their perversion which is inevitable.

v. 28 - And since in full knowledge they rejected having God after careful examination, God gave them over to a worthless mind, to do those things which are improper.

This is a passage that Senator Obama refers to as “obscure.”

“Change” is a term that needs a Progressive definition to be truly appreciated:

Kohl, Herbert. *From Archetype to Zeitgeist: Powerful Ideas for Powerful Thinking*. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1992), 158:

Change. There are a number of words used to indicate the nature and direction of social, political, and economic change. These words, which also have other uses in the context of politics, form a loose continuum, at the center of which is the status quo. The status quo is the current historical situation in a particular community, state, or nation.

Conservatives are, in the context of trying to describe the nature of change, people who want to maintain the status quo. Progressives are people who advocate a new social, political, or economic order that provides for more personal and group freedom, and a greater equalization of opportunity, wealth, and power. Reactionaries are people who want to return to an older order characterized by some traditional authoritarian rule.

NOTE: Today there are three factions competing for power in America:

1. **Conservatives (Neoconservatives)**, who promote the expansion of democracy, enforced by a foreign policy that views superpower status as an imperative for nation building. This policy is encouraged by the philosophy “democracies do not go to war with each other. “ Thus, we go to war to prevent war. Neoconservatism also supports lower taxes but at the same time is complicit with an ever-enlarging central government – a contradiction. Neoconservatives include Presidents George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush, most Republican senators and congressmen, the current administration, and Senator John S. McCain III in particular.
2. **Progressives** advocate government intervention into economics, income redistribution, and universal health care. There is an inordinate concern for the environment betraying a hidden agenda which journalist James Ridgeway described as “a safe, rational, and above all peaceful way of remaking society and developing a more coherent central state.” Liberals are more moderate than progressives but both place emphasis on civil liberties, yet progressives consider liberals and conservatives to be content with the political status quo. The progressives’ desire for a complete break with the status quo is exemplified by their appeal for “change.” Progressives include Presidents James E. Carter, Jr., and William J. Clinton, Jr., members of their administrations, most Democrat senators and congressmen, and Senators Hillary R. Clinton and Barack H. Obama, Jr., in particular.
3. **Reactionaries (Paleoconservatives)**, are those who want a return to the older order characterized by traditional authoritarian rule, such as by the Constitution interpreted from the standpoint of its original intent. This would result in power to the central government being diminished and power to the States being increased according to provisions of the Tenth Amendment.

Reactionaries, so called, are reactors to the transfer of constitutional power away from the people and toward the central government. Reactionaries are better classified as traditionalists. They do not desire the conservatism of the status quo but a return to the “older order.” Traditionalists include Drs. Russell A. Kirk, Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn \que’ knelt lay-dean’, and Maxwell L. Rafferty, columnist Samuel T. Francis, authors Thomas S. Molnar, and Patrick J. Buchanan, Justices Antonin G. Scalia and Clarence Thomas, Judge Robert H. Bork, and Professors Thomas Sowell and Walter E. Williams.

It should be noted that Progressives are motivated by collectivism: “a political or economic theory advocating collective control especially over production and distribution. Emphasis on collective rather than individual action or identity” (M-WCD/11).

On the other hand, Traditionalists subscribe to individualism: “A theory maintaining the political and economic independence of the individual and stressing individual initiative, action, and interests” (M-WCD/11).

Kohl, *From Archetype to Zeitgeist*, 158-59:

If change is partial and occurs through the channels of power considered legitimate in the status quo, it is called reform. Reform adds to the current arrangements or modifies them but it does not attempt to create a new order.

Change is radical when it involves new power relationships that are fundamentally different from those under the status quo. (p. 158)

Radical change can take place over a period of time, or it can happen suddenly. When radical change takes place suddenly and power relationships change practically overnight, such change is called revolutionary. (pp. 158-59)

It is important always to remember that change is measured from the perspective of the prior status quo. Once you discover the nature of that situation, you can begin to understand the direction of the change that is taking place. (p. 159)

Change in the government of the United States is constitutionally permitted under Article 5. "Whenever two thirds of both houses" of Congress (Senate, 67 and House, 290) or "the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States" (34) "shall propose Amendments" and when "three fourths of the States (38) ratify it, then it becomes "valid ... as Part of (the) Constitution." This kind of legitimate "change" has occurred in our Constitution's history twenty-seven times.

The "change" referred to by Senator Obama has to do with two types defined by Kohl:

(1) **Partial change** that has taken place over a period of time through unconstitutional Supreme Court Decisions which have established precedents.

Once a Court decision establishes precedent and future cases are decided based on that decision, then the meaning of the Constitution is altered.

When attempts are made to return to the original intent of the Constitution, Progressive justices argue *stare decisis*: "a doctrine of following rules or principles laid down in previous judicial decisions" (M-WCD/11). "Rule by which common law courts are reluctant to interfere with principles announced in former decisions and therefore rely upon judicial precedent as a compelling guide to decision of cases raising issues similar to those in previous cases" (Gifis, *Dictionary of Legal Terms*, 3d ed., 468).

Progressive justices who subscribe to the notion of a "living Constitution" have never argued *stare decisis* regarding decisions that have overturned the original intent of the Founders. Yet, whenever a Progressive decision is under review and arguments are made that it was wrongly decided, suddenly *stare decisis* is invoked.

(2) **Radical Change** that occurs suddenly is made possible when a person in a position of political power has the backing of the people to implement these sudden changes. A charismatic personality who has the backing of "The People," can use long-established precedent and case law to implement sudden changes. The Supreme Court, in its current configuration, will not overturn itself and Congress, which has participated in the making over of the Constitution, won't buck the public will.

The charismatic personality that fits this bill is Senator Barack Obama, presently a candidate for the Democrat nomination for president of the United States.

If nominated and if elected, Obama may not be so bold as to implement black liberation theological ideas upon our diverse population, but the wide variety of backing that he possesses at the moment would give him opportunity to implement a host of Progressive ideas that liberation theology promotes, unless Congress remains in its fortunate deadlock. On this subject we return to the commentary of:

Shiver, Kyle-Anne, "Obama's Politics of Collective Redemption," *American Thinker*, (February 11, 2008).

http://www.americanthinker.com/2008/02/obamas_politics_of_collective.html:

A messianic fever grips a segment of the American populace and media. A great leader seems to them poised to redeem our collective sins and change nearly everything, bringing about a new era in which permanent solutions are found to age-old conditions.

Whenever I watch Barack Obama, listen to his eloquent but nonspecific oratory, and see the near-swooning young people who invariably follow him wherever he goes, I cannot help but think of the pied piper and wonder toward what destination he is marching our youth. Obama is having this pied-piper effect not only on kids, but also on a large swath of Democrat and not a few independents and Republican voters, too.

Call me skeptical, but this whole Obama phenomenon seems downright eerie. Over and over again, Obama invokes his double mantra: "*It's time for change!*" and "*Yes, we can!*"

A number of internet postings indicate that a great many see Obama in not only political terms, but also wrapped in the untarnished cloak of some vague spiritual-awakening.

It is quite tempting to assume that Barack Obama simply is harvesting the inevitable fruits of 35 years of dumbed-down, political indoctrination in the guise of education in this country. This is dangerous. The problem goes deeper, right into the human soul.

A lust for transformation is a common feature of revolutionaries, and when they succeed in grabbing power, the results usually are brutal. Less than a century ago, massive numbers of people fell for a different political messiah on the European continent, and they were products of an education system and cultural establishment widely regarded as a world leader. That place was, of course, Germany. And the political messiah promoting "change" was Adolph Hitler. Hitler's slogan: "*Alles muss anders sein!*" ("Everything must be different!")

Hitler used each of these phrases to describe his own political program:

- "A declaration of war against the order of things which exist, against the state of things which exist, in a word, against the structure of the world which presently exists."
- "Revolutionary creative will" which had "no fixed aim, no permanency, only eternal change."
- "An ethic of self-sacrifice"
- "People's community"
- "Public need before private greed"
- "Communally-minded social consciousness"

All of these expressions came from Adolph Hitler.

Saul Alinsky, one of Obama's primary political mentors, espoused eerily similar societal admonitions in his book *Reveille for Radicals*; p. 133 and 105:

"A People's Organization (later changed to "community organization") is dedicated to an eternal war. It is a war against poverty, misery, delinquency, disease, injustice, hopelessness, despair, and unhappiness."

"A People's Organization is not a philanthropic plaything or a social service's ameliorative gesture. It is a deep, hard-driving force, striking and cutting at the very roots of all the evils which beset the people...it thinks and acts in terms of social surgery and not cosmetic cover-ups."

"There is hope, and life is worth living. There may not be a light at the end of the trail but they (the masses) have a light in their hands, a light they made themselves, and they know that not only will they themselves have to work out their own destiny but that they themselves can."

Obama says, "Yes we can!" *change ...*

Exactly what should change and how is unclear.