

21. Robert Bork, former circuit judge for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, addresses this Progressive accomplishment in the Introduction of *A Country I Do Not Recognize*:

Today's Court manifests one of the less attractive hangovers from the Sixties, that it is, in fact, enacting, in the name of the Constitution, the modern liberal agenda of political correctness. That, I believe, is indisputable, shown not only by the decisions of the Court but by a comparison of the rhetoric of the Court majority and that of the founding document of the Sixties New Left, the *Port Huron Statement*, a document that became the most widely circulated manifesto of the New Left. The *Statement* asserted that "The goal of man and society should be ... finding a meaning in life that is personally authentic," and this was to be accomplished through a "politics of meaning." (pp. xvi-xvii)

Perhaps the first explicit statement of this attitude came in Justice Henry A. Blackmun's dissent, joined by three other justices, in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, arguing that there is a constitutional right to engage in homosexual sodomy. Rejecting the view that prior cases involving the right to privacy had confined that right to the protection of the family, Blackmun wrote:

We protect those rights [associated with the family] not because they contribute, in some direct and material way, to the general public welfare, but because they form so central a part of an individual's life. "The concept of privacy embodies the moral fact that a person belongs to himself and not to others nor to society as a whole." (p. xvii)

Moral facts there may be, but that assuredly is not one of them. Blackmun was saying that the family has no value except as it contributes to the individual's gratification. Presumably, when there is a gratification deficit, individuals are morally free to shed themselves of spouse, children, and parents. On this reasoning, no-fault divorce should be a constitutional right. The second sentence sweeps even more broadly. There would seem to be no moral obligation to obey any inconvenient law and, moreover, no duty owed to colleagues, neighbors, nation, society, or anyone or anything outside one's own skin. The ultimate in psychopathology is urged on us as a constitutional right. The four-member minority did not, of course, seriously mean anything so incomprehensible, but it speaks volumes about their mood that they could utter such a sentiment, as well as about the frivolity with which they justified their position to the nation. What they did mean was that the justices would choose which obligations a person must honor and that among the least of these are laws reinforcing morality. (pp. xvii-xviii)

Blackmun's position became constitutional law when *Bowers* was overruled in *Lawrence v. Texas*. In creating a right to homosexual sodomy, Justice [Anthony] Kennedy's opinion for a six-member majority stated:

These matters, involving the most intimate and personal choices a person may make in a lifetime, choices central to personal dignity and autonomy, are central to the liberty protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. At the heart of liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life.

That is not an argument but a Sixties oration. It has no discernible intellectual content; it does not even tell us why the right to define one's own concept of "meaning" includes a right to abortion or homosexual sodomy but not a right to incest, prostitution, embezzlement, or anything else a person might regard as central to his dignity and autonomy. Nor are we informed of how we are to know what other rights will one day emerge from some person's concept of the universe. (p. xviii)

In the absence of a real theory, political correctness will have to do. The Court, like the New Left, may practice a politics of expression and self-absorption, but that does not mean the politics is innocuous. To the contrary, it does serious, lasting, and perhaps permanent damage to valuable institutions, socially stabilizing attitudes, and essential standards.¹ (p. xix)

22. These principles and excerpts from Judge Bork summarize the problem that emerges in Cosmic 2's category of "Anti-Establishment."

4. Degeneration.

This category is best introduced by consulting definitions from the dictionary:

Degenerate \di-jen'-ret\ adjective: having sunk to a condition below that which is normal to a type; especially having sunk to a lower and usually corrupt state.

Degenerate \di-jen'-e-rāte\ verb: to sink into a low intellectual or moral state.

Degenerate \di-jen'-ret\ noun: one downgraded from the normal moral standard; a sexual pervert.

Degeneration di-jen-e-rā'-shan\ noun: a lowering of effective power, vitality, or essential quality to an enfeebled and worsened kind or state; intellectual or moral decline.²

¹ Robert Bork, ed., "Introduction," in *A Country I Do Not Recognize: The Legal Assault on American Values* (Stanford: The Hoover Institution, 2005), xvi–xix.

² *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th ed. s.vv. "degenerate," "degeneration."

The concept for this category of antagonism is going from a divine state to a cosmic state.

In the context of one's spiritual status, degeneration tracks a person's decline away from establishment and biblical standards while moving through the stages of reversionism.

A believer, while previously growing in grace, is distracted by internal or external concepts and from that influence exchanges doctrine for human viewpoint and devolution³ into evil.

Inside the bubble, the advancing believer functions under standards common to the heavenly **πολίτευμα** (**políteuma**): to behave as a citizen.

πολίτευμα; The condition or life of a citizen. In the New Testament, the state itself, community, commonwealth, used metaphorically of Christians in reference to their spiritual community and their status as citizens of heaven.⁴

Philippians 3:20 - Our citizenship [**πολίτευμα** (**políteuma**)] is in heaven—and we also await a savior from there, the Lord Jesus Christ,

v. 21 - who will transform [predictive future active indicative of the verb μετασχηματίζω (*metaschēmatízō*): prophetic of resurrection bodies at the Rapture] these humble bodies [Homo sapiens' human bodies] of ours [believers] into the likeness of His glorious body [resurrection bodies] by means of that power [omnipotence] by which He is able to subject all things to Himself. (NET)

³ “Devolution: descent or degeneration to a lower or worse state” (*The New Oxford American Dictionary*, 2001, s.v. “devolution.”)

⁴ Spiros Zodhiates, ed., “πολίτευμα,” in *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament*, rev. ed. (Chattanooga: AMG Publishers, 1993), 1194.