

Light Brings Salt

Volume 6, Issue 37

October 5, 2008



Iron Range Bible Church

Dedicated to the Systematic Exposition of the Word of God
"Sanctify them in the truth: Your word is truth."



PATRIOT PERSPECTIVE

Comrade Barack Hussein Obama

By Mark Alexander of the PatriotPost.us

In October 1939, a month after Great Britain declared war on Germany in that unpleasantry a few of us history buffs remember as "World War II," Winston Churchill said of communist Russia: "It is a riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma..." In true Churchill form, he added wryly, "But perhaps there is a key. That key is Russian national interest."

In other words, if you want to decode "a riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma," just consider the underlying "interest."

A year ago, Barack Hussein Obama was something of an enigma, but his interests are now clear—crystal clear.

I have written at length about Obama's worldview in a series of essays archived at No ObamaNation. These essays provide a foundational understanding of the danger Obama poses to American liberty (at least the vestigial remains of our Founders' legacy) based on his words and deeds.

Hundreds of other essays in ***The Patriot Archive*** are, likewise, devoted to individual liberty, the restoration of constitutional limits on government and the judiciary, and the promotion of free enterprise, national defense and traditional American values. These compositions reflect a vision diametrically opposed to that espoused by Barack Obama.

The prospect of an Obama presidency, supported by a legislative branch controlled

by like-minded liberals, and only the slightest conservative margin in the judicial branch, poses a greater risk to American liberty than any domestic enemy in our nation's great history.

Should Obama defeat John McCain in the only opinion poll that matters this election cycle, the poll on Tuesday, 4 November (merely 32 days from now), that would be a stunning offense of staggering proportions to our national heritage, an offense equaled only by the impending assault against the liberties set forth in our U.S. Constitution following an Obama inauguration.

Yes, Obama has the dubious distinction of being ranked the most liberal of the "useful idiots" in the Senate—apologist for socialist political and economic agendas. And it took him only half a term to achieve that ill repute. That puts him to the left of his primary benefactors, Ted Kennedy and John Kerry. (By contrast, his running mate, Joe Biden, has taken 36 years to achieve his status as the Senate's third most liberal member.)

But Obama is entitled to his political views.

After all, our Constitution's Bill of Rights affirms every American's inherent right to liberty, not just in what we say and write, or how we worship, but also in what we believe and with whom we choose to associate.

And, we know plenty about what Obama believes and with whom he associates. Here is a partial list of key associates: There is his communist mentor Frank Marshall Davis, his terrorist friends William Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn, his religious mentor Jeremiah Wright, the ACORN crowd, Leftists Richard Daley, Michael Pflieger, Khalid al-

Mansour, Kwame Kilpatrick, Rashid Khalidi and, well, you get the picture.

The problem is that Obama and his ilk believe they are not bound by the plain language of our Constitution, adhering instead to the errant notion of a "Living Constitution," which they have adulterated by judicial diktat to comport with their worldview. In his view, we should be "One nation under Obama."

What informs Barack Hussein Obama's worldview first and foremost?

Obama is the consummate "useful idiot," a socialist who believes not only that the will of the people should be subject to that of the state, but, likewise, the economy should be state controlled through taxation and regulation.

Obama insists that our economy is "out of balance," and our tax policies "badly skewed." To resolve this, he says we need a "tax policy making sure that everybody benefits, fair distribution, a restoration of balance in our tax code, money allocated fairly..."

"Fair distribution"? By this, of course, he means "redistribution."

Further, Obama asserts that free enterprise is nothing more than "Social Darwinism, every man or woman for him or herself... tempting idea, because it doesn't require much thought or ingenuity."

Free enterprise "doesn't require much thought or ingenuity"? Only in the mind of a lifelong adherent of socialist doctrine could such an absurdly un-American assertion originate.

Obama's economic plan represents a maturation of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's class-warfare decree: "Here is my principle: Taxes shall be levied according to ability to pay. That is the only American principle."

In fact, Roosevelt's "principle" was no more American than Obama's. Roosevelt was paraphrasing Karl Marx, whose maxim declared, "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs."

English sociologist and historian H.G. Wells, whose last work, *The Holy Terror*, profiled the psychological development of a modern dictator based on the careers of Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler, said of Roosevelt's reign, "The great trouble with you Americans is that you are still under the influence of that second-rate—shall I say third-rate?—mind, Karl Marx."

That admonition is equally true today—even more so.

In 1987, Ronald Reagan commented on useful idiots: "How do you tell a Communist? Well, it's someone who reads Marx and Lenin. And how do you tell an anti-Communist? It's someone who understands Marx and Lenin."

While Obama and his cadre of elitists both understand and advocate socialist doctrine, their populist support across the nation is not from academic, intellectual or philosophical equals. Their adoring masses can't begin to articulate why our nation was founded, what our Constitution sets forth, what citizenship entails, or why free enterprise is superior to socialism.

They are, by and large, good people who have been dumbed down by government schools and the Leftmedia. They are not in possession of an ethic that inspires them to put "Country First," as John McCain and a long list of American Patriots have done. Instead, they follow Obama's example, asking not what they can do for their country, but what their country can do for them.

They "feel" rather than "think" their way through political issues, and the consequences for future generations of Americans are dire.

Soviet despot Nikita Khrushchev observed that America's transition from liberty to serfdom would have to be incremental: "We can't expect the American people to jump from Capitalism to Communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving them small doses of Socialism, until they awaken one day to find that they have Communism."

Obama's constituents are checkers players being led by chess masters, and the Democrat brew they have been drinking has been incrementally spiked with socialist booze such that they are completely intoxicated, and don't know it. Will they sober up before the dawn?

Thursday night, after Joe Biden demonstrated his outstanding credentials as a "useful idiot" while debating Sarah Palin, who demonstrated that she is a citizen, not a Beltway politico, Biden closed with this remark: "This election is the most important of your entire life."

On this point, and only this point, do I unreservedly concur with Joe.

Quote of the week

"It is freedom itself that still hangs in the balance, and freedom is never more than one generation from extinction." —Ronald Reagan

From the Newsletter of Dr. Chuck Wood called the "Woodchuck's Den"

When seeking to discern between the promptings of the flesh and the guidance of the Spirit, there is one factor that is always present - Is what I sense I am to do or say in accord with the teaching of the Scripture? If it is, there may still be other questions to ask, but if it isn't, the answer is clear. Since God cannot contradict Himself, and since the Holy Spirit guided the writing of the Scriptures, then any "message" I receive from Him would have to coincide with the teaching of His Word. When it does not, it is clearly and definitively not of God.

There are three reasons why we might fail to give adequate place to the Word of God in our considerations. One reason is that we simply don't know the Word well enough to have any clear understanding of its principles. Another is that we are not willing to spend the time "digging around" in Scripture to find what it has to say about the specific thing we seek. The third, and often most common, is that we really don't want to know what the Word has

to say because it may run counter to what we have already decided to do or what we really want to do. I have heard some people clearly say, "I really don't care what the Bible says; I know what I want to do." I have watched countless others, however, people who would never make a statement like that, simply live it out in their lives.

My belief in the "moving" or "speaking" of the Spirit is heavily conditioned by my total dedication to the absolute authority of the Word. Since I am told that the Scriptures contain "all things that pertain unto life and godliness," I assume that the Bible is designed to be my primary source of direction and guidance for life. I'm willing to allow for the internal working of the indwelling Holy Spirit, but I'm not willing to allow that aspect of my spiritual life to crowd out, impinge upon, or otherwise detract from the role of the Bible. Even when I "sense" or "feel" He has spoken to me, I always try to measure the message against the ultimate standard of the Scriptures. Isaiah 8:20: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Great Quote

"Much of that mess [in the financial markets] is due to the very people we are now turning to for solutions—members of Congress. Past Congresses created the hybrid financial institutions known as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, private institutions with government backing and political influence. About half of the mortgages in this country are backed by these two institutions. Such institutions—exempt from laws that apply to other financial institutions and backed by the implicit promise of government support with the taxpayers' money—are an open invitation to risky behavior. When these risks blew up in their faces, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were taken over by the government, costing the taxpayers billions of dollars. For years the *Wall Street Journal* has been warning that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were taking reckless chances but liberal Democrats especially have pooh-poohed the dangers. Back in 2002, the *Wall Street Journal* said:

‘The time for the political system to focus on Fannie and Fred isn’t when we have a housing crisis; by then it will be too late.’ The hybrid public-and-private nature of these financial giants amounts to ‘privatizing profit and socializing risk,’ since taxpayers get stuck with the tab when high-risk finances don’t work out... Both Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have been generous in their contributions to politicians’ political campaigns, so it is perhaps not surprising that politicians have been generous to them. This is certainly part of ‘the mess in Washington’ that Barack Obama talks about. But don’t expect him to clean it up. Franklin Raines, who made megamillions for himself while mismanaging Fannie Mae into a financial disaster, is one of Obama’s advisers.” —Thomas Sowell

Science Tries to See

Psalm 139:14

I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well.

Scientists have tried to tackle the job of creating a machine that is able to see as well as the human eye. In the process, they are gaining a new appreciation for the wonderful gift of sight.

First of all, they have learned that no computer chip can be made today which could begin to do what the retina does. The retina is a thin membrane like a small slip of clingy food wrap at the back of the eye. It contains the rods and cones and converts the picture from the lens into chemical signals that are sent to the brain. The retina is believed to contain the equivalent of twenty-five billion transistors! One expert has estimated that a computer chip that could begin to do what your retina does would be about half-a-million times bigger than your retina, contain over a million transistors and weigh in at about 100 pounds. It would also need a cooling system! Even with all of this, it couldn't see very well. It would only be able to resolve a square area of about two thousand

pixels, while your eye can resolve five times that much!

Truly, modern science offers elegant testimony to the fact that the eye could not have been produced by evolution and that it could have only been created by a very wise Creator!

Birds Helping Birds

Luke 10:33-34

But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion on him, And went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him.

Altruism helping one another is a real puzzle to those who explain the world of living things in terms of materialistic evolution. Evolution is supposed to work on the selfish survival-of-the-fittest principle, so there should be no reason for any creature, including man, to develop a helping attitude. In fact, there is no way to explain how the genetic code could possibly develop and pass on a trait such as altruism.

Researchers have studied a bird called the white-fronted African bee-eater. Members of this species help each other, sometimes even at the sacrifice of their own life. For example, one bird will face a spitting cobra to defend another, and scientists have been puzzled to know how this altruistic trait can possibly be passed on, when it often results in death. Another common altruistic habit of the African bee-eater is that one female will put off starting her own family to help another bee-eater raise her young. Some argue that such behavior is limited to birds that are related. But they admit that even adopted orphaned bee-eaters will help their adopted parents in this way.

While it is often denied, the theory of evolution has yet to adequately explain altruism. Altruism is a demonstration of that commandment given by our Creator to love our neighbor.