

Chapter 24

IS THE DEMOCRAT PARTY HUMANIST?

Yes, It Is the Anti-God Party

The Democrat Party is the anti-God, anti-prayer, anti-Bible, anti-Christian, anti-traditional family, anti-USA-flag, anti-free-speech, pro-socialism, pro-enemy, pro-unborn-baby-murder, pro-pornography, pro-sodomy, pro-whatever-will-divide-the-USA party. Those are just the facts easily observed by anyone who reads newspapers. Those positions are all atheist/liberal/humanist positions. As Ann Coulter has correctly pointed out:

The fundamental difference between liberals and conservatives is: Conservatives believe man was created in God's image; liberals believe they are God. All their other behavioral ties proceed from this one irreducible minimum. Liberals believe they can murder the unborn because they are gods. They try to forcibly create "equality" through affirmative action and wealth redistribution because they are gods. They can lie, with no higher power to constrain them, because they are gods. They adore pornography and the mechanization of sex because man is just an animal, and they are gods. They revere the U.N. and not the U.S. because they aren't Americans—they are gods.⁴¹⁹

Christians should vote according to Bible principles, and not according to any party line. Presently, the Republican Party is the most conservative. However, even in the Republican Party there are some humanists. So, no Christian should vote a straight party line without careful study of each candidate first. It is anti-God to vote for a humanist, no matter what his party. But as of this writing most conservative candidates are in the Republican Party, and virtually none are in the Democrat Party. The Democrat Party is spiritually and morally bankrupt. It was long ago hijacked by radical religious humanists, and it is exceedingly unlikely to ever recover from its depravity.

The Bill Clinton Administration

In an editorial titled "New Beginnings" on page 2 of the January/February 1993 issue of *The Humanist* magazine, editor Don Page said concerning the then recent election of Bill Clinton as president of the United States: "This issue of *The Humanist* coincides with the beginning of a new era of hope in Washington and throughout the country." In this same issue of *The Humanist*, Barbara Dority wrote a special editorial in which she stated:

In the November/December 1992 issue of *The Humanist*, I expressed my hope that the American people had finally had enough of simplistic, moralistic, fundamentalist thinking. "I feel the pendulum beginning to shift," I wrote. Nevertheless, I wasn't prepared for the decisiveness of the election results, the nationwide rejection of hard-line conservative candidates, or the unexpected victories of women and minority candidates in numerous state and local races.⁴²⁰

Dority fails to mention that Clinton only received 36 percent of the vote—hardly a decisive victory. Had Ross Perot not split the conservative vote, Clinton would have most likely met decisive defeat. It is also significant to note that Ross Perot was rewarded for making this Democrat victory possible. One of the first bills passed by the Democrat dominated congress put an interstate highway through property owned by Ross Perot, increasing its value by millions of dollars. Nevertheless, in the next few paragraphs of her editorial, Dority gives her version of why Bill Clinton won the election. Leaving no doubt about her joy over Clinton's election, Dority says:

*Among additional reasons for genuine celebration and relief at Clinton's victory is, of course, the future composition of the Supreme Court. Justices Harry Blackmun and Byron White (ages 83 and 75, respectively) will both almost certainly retire within the next four years. Two more Bush Supreme Court appointments would have been nothing but disastrous, leaving us with the kind of damage that might have proved virtually irreparable.*⁴²¹

⁴¹⁹ Coulter, *Treason*, 292.

⁴²⁰ Barbara Dority, "Power to the People," *The Humanist* 53, no. 1 (January/February 1993): 3.

⁴²¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

Just the fact that a Humanist leader should be so elated over Clinton's victory is disturbing. But Dority then went on to make a statement that should make every thinking American sit up and take notice. She said that many of Clinton's campaign promises clearly reflect humanist principles. Furthermore she then proceeded to list those campaign promises so her readers would know exactly which promises she was talking about. Here is what she said:

President-elect Clinton has made many campaign promises which clearly reflect humanist principles; now it's up to us to hold him to them. He has promised to sign a Workplace Fairness Bill prohibiting permanent replacement of strikers. He has pledged to overturn anti-gay policies in the military, to sign the Family and Medical Leave Act, to revive the child-welfare bill vetoed by Bush, and to fully fund Head Start programs. He has committed himself to freedom of reproductive choice and has promised to sign the Freedom of Choice Act, repeal the gag rule, support testing of the French abortion pill RU-486, and lift the ban on the use of fetal tissue for research purposes.

He has promised to appoint an AIDS policy director to assure better funding for AIDS research and care of AIDS patients. With Al Gore, he has promised environmental reforms, including a rewrite of the Clean Air Act regulations, no expansion of offshore drilling, and tougher penalties for pollution violations. He supports school-based clinics and drug education. He says he'll sign the Motor Voter Bill. He promises health-care reform, a pressing and far-reaching problem particularly resistant to government remedies.

In addition, of course, he has promised to reduce the national debt and to boost inner-city development through national economic strategies: incentives and grants to revitalize urban economies and the expansion of education, job training, and child-care services.⁴²² [Emphasis added.]

Dority goes on to say that there are a few things Clinton promised that oppose humanist principles: he promised to oppose the legalization of "recreational" drugs, and he promised to support the death-penalty. Also, she felt he didn't promise enough support to blacks and those in poverty. She ends her editorial by saying:

Notwithstanding all these cautions, concerns, and fears, **we have made a turn in the road—a turn which alters our view of what lies ahead. We have made a profound and decisive ideological change;** we have also made a long-overdue generational change, the most dramatic since Dwight Eisenhower was replaced by John F. Kennedy. In so doing, we have rejoined the world community and entered the twenty-first century.

I am hopeful that these changes will encourage and inspire more of us to bring our humanist heritage to bear on the burning issues of the day. Free-thought activism is an affair of the heart. Let us resume our work with renewed vigor and hope. **Now at long last, it is our time.**⁴²³ [Emphasis added.]

And, indeed, it *was* the Humanists' time. There has never been a more anti-Christian, humanist president than Bill Clinton. From his constant lying to his sexcapades with Monica Lewinsky, Clinton lived by humanist principles. And he continues to do so. As Clinton's former counselor, Dick Morris, pointed out:

By traveling to Dubai, just a few hundred miles from the combat zone, to denounce the American involvement in Iraq as a "big mistake," Bill Clinton has made a big mistake of his own.

Normally, a top leader of the Democratic Party and the spouse of a presidential candidate can and should feel free to say anything he chooses. But a former president of the United States should be more careful before he tells hundreds of thousands of young men and women, many of whom served under him, that they are risking their lives for a mistake.

To do it in the Arab world compounds the error. His denunciation of our war effort so close to the spots where our troops are fighting summons memories of Jane Fonda.⁴²⁴

Yet consider this well: Bill Clinton was considered a "moderate" in the Democrat Party! If Hillary Clinton runs for president in the upcoming election (as is predicted), she will be one of the more moderate Democrat candidates even though she is probably the most divisive person in the history of US politics! All of the other candidates are so radical that they cannot hide their contempt for real Americans. When they speak you can almost once again see Nikita Khrushchev pounding his shoe on the table as he told Americans that communism would bury them—humanist beliefs are virtually identical to communism. Hillary is actually just as radical as any other Democrat—perhaps more so—, but is much better at lying about it.

Any way you look at it, the Democrat Party is the radical atheist/humanist/anti-God party. Even the Democrat leadership realizes that this has put their party out of favor with mainstream America. But every year the public school system produces more humanist Democrat voters, gradually making humanism more and more mainstream.

⁴²² Ibid.

⁴²³ Ibid., 32.

⁴²⁴ Dick Morris, "Bubba Steps Over the Line," *Journal News*, 2001 December 2005, A12.

Democrat Immorality

As these words are being written, the Democrat leadership is disturbed even though their unrelenting attacks upon the Bush administration and upon other Republican leaders is paying off.

A Pew Research Center poll shows Republican leadership in Congress is down to a 32 percent approval rating. The rating for President Bush hovers under 40 percent—unusual for a second term.

But, paradoxically, Republican public opinion losses do not translate as corresponding Democratic gains.⁴²⁵ The main reason that the Democrat Party does not connect with mainstream America is that it has rejected God and God-based morality in favor of Evolution and Situational Ethics, in which humans are considered animals, and right and wrong are determined by the individual instead of by God. For example, in spite of what God says, Democrats consider the murder of unborn babies to be a righteous act and a “fundamental human right.”

Political scientists Bill Galston and Elaine Kamarck have written a report titled “The Politics of Polarization.” They say that to win, the Democrats will have to revise their doctrine on national security and on social and moral issues. Mr. Galston and Ms. Kamarck command attention among Democrats because they helped to guide policy for the successful Clinton campaign in 1996.⁴²⁶

What Galston and Kamarck mean is that the Democrats will have to deceive the American people about what they actually believe in order to win in this next election.

An article in the February 2007 issue of U.S. News and World Report proclaims that “The Dems Get Religion.” Here is what it says,

John Kerry struggled to overcome his secular image in 2004, but the current crop of Democratic presidential front-runners is determined not to repeat his mistakes.

One of New York Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton’s first campaign hires was a top evangelical staffer on Capitol Hill. U.S. News has learned that an aide in Illinois Sen. Barack Obama’s office tasked with religious outreach is joining his presidential campaign this week. And former North Carolina Sen. John Edwards is framing poverty relief as a moral issue that’s helping to drive his campaign. “Two thousand eight could be the first time since Jimmy Carter that the presidential candidate who’s really good on faith issues is the Democrat,” says Eric Sapp, a Democratic consultant. So the Democratic primaries could see serious competition among candidates for the faith vote.⁴²⁷

Of course, the Dems don’t have to get religion—they already have it. The problem is that their religion is the same religion that underlies communism. What they have to do is convince the American public that they have a religion that professes faith in God. There is only one way they can do this, and that is to lie. The Democrats’ (im)morals are not going to change. If a person really has morals, those morals don’t change. If sodomy is a righteous lifestyle alternative as the Democrats have maintained for a long time now, then sodomy will not suddenly become sin just because an election is coming up. If the Democrats fake change on this issue in order to get votes, then the very change itself will be immoral—and they will change back to what they really believe the moment they are elected to office. The Sodomy Party will be in and sodomy party will begin! Well, actually they already have and it has.

Remember Sodom and Gomorrah

Just in case you’ve never read it, here is the history behind the word “sodomy.”

... the men of **Sodom** were wicked and sinners before the LORD exceedingly. (Gen. 13:13)

And there came two angels to **Sodom** at even; and Lot sat in the gate of **Sodom**: and Lot seeing *them* rose up to meet them; and he bowed himself with his face toward the ground; And he said, Behold now, my lords, turn in, I pray you, into your servant’s house, and tarry all night, and wash your feet, and ye shall rise up early, and go on your ways. And they said, Nay; but we will abide in the street all night. And he pressed upon them greatly; and they turned in unto him, and entered into his house; and he made them a feast, and did bake unleavened bread, and they did eat. But before they lay down, the men of the city, *even* the men of **Sodom**, compassed the house round, both old and young, all the people from every quarter: And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, Where *are* the men which came in to thee this night? bring them out unto us, that we may know them. And Lot went out at the door unto them, and shut the door after him, and said, I pray you, brethren, do not so

⁴²⁵ Daniel Schorr, “Democrats Aren’t Gaining Public Support Republicans Are Losing,” *Jackson Hole Daily* 27, no. 251 (1925 October 2005): 5.

⁴²⁶ Ibid.

⁴²⁷ Dan Gilgoff, “The Dems Get Religion,” *U.S. News & World Report*, 1925 February 2007,

<http://www.usnews.com/usnews/news/articles/070225/5evangelicals.b.htm>.

wickedly. Behold now, I have two daughters which have not known man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as *is* good in your eyes: only unto these men do nothing; for therefore came they under the shadow of my roof. And they said, Stand back. And they said *again*, This one *fellow* came in to sojourn, and he will needs be a judge: now will we deal worse with thee, than with them. And they pressed sore upon the man, *even* Lot, and came near to break the door. But the men put forth their hand, and pulled Lot into the house to them, and shut to the door. And they smote the men that *were* at the door of the house with blindness, both small and great: so that they wearied themselves to find the door. And the men said unto Lot, Hast thou here any besides? son in law, and thy sons, and thy daughters, and whatsoever thou hast in the city, bring *them* out of this place: for we will destroy this place, because the cry of them is waxen great before the face of the LORD; and the LORD hath sent us to destroy it. And Lot went out, and spake unto his sons in law, which married his daughters, and said, Up, get you out of this place; for the LORD will destroy this city. But he seemed as one that mocked unto his sons in law. And when the morning arose, then the angels hastened Lot, saying, Arise, take thy wife, and thy two daughters, which are here; lest thou be consumed in the iniquity of the city. And while he lingered, the men laid hold upon his hand, and upon the hand of his wife, and upon the hand of his two daughters; the LORD being merciful unto him: and they brought him forth, and set him without the city. And it came to pass, when they had brought them forth abroad, that he said, Escape for thy life; look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the plain; escape to the mountain, lest thou be consumed. And Lot said unto them, Oh, not so, my Lord: behold now, thy servant hath found grace in thy sight, and thou hast magnified thy mercy, which thou hast shewed unto me in saving my life; and I cannot escape to the mountain, lest some evil take me, and I die: behold now, this city *is* near to flee unto, and it *is* a little one: Oh, let me escape thither, (*is* it not a little one?) and my soul shall live. And he said unto him, See, I have accepted thee concerning this thing also, that I will not overthrow this city, for the which thou hast spoken. Haste thee, escape thither; for I cannot do any thing till thou be come thither. Therefore the name of the city was called Zoar. The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered into Zoar. Then the LORD rained upon **Sodom** and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven; and he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground. But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt. And Abraham gat up early in the morning to the place where he stood before the LORD: and he looked toward **Sodom** and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the plain, and beheld, and, lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace. (Gen. 19:1-28)