

Text: Various

Title: Critical Race Theory

Truth: CRT is a false teaching.

Date/Location: June 13 and 27 and July 18, 2021 at FBC

Introduction

There is hardly a need at the present time to justify a Christian thinking through the CRT / wokeness mess that is currently all the rage. We have to analyze it from a Biblical standpoint, and recognize the danger of this pre-planned assault not only on Christian values, but on the principles that have underpinned our Republic for hundreds of years.

I knew it was past time to address the issue when I got these questions through our website:

- 1) Is Fellowship Bible Church (FBC) affiliated with the New Apostolic Reformation (modern day apostles/prophets, 7 mountain mandate)? → The Seven Mountain Mandate is a post-millennial, Pentecostal/charismatic dominion theology where the church is supposed to take over the pillars of society and then once the kingdom is established on earth, then Christ will return.
- 2) Is FBC a "woke" church? Do you espouse Critical Race Theory? → Absolutely not. FBC is not woke, and we reject CRT. We are going to look at why we do that in these notes.

I. CRT is a False Gospel

Critical Race Theory is a message that over the past several decades has been simmering beneath the surface. In the last several years, it has exploded to the forefront of the social conscience. It promotes itself in a general way as a message about how we need to make our nation better because, it is claimed, we have severe problems with systemic racism. Who would support systemic racism? No one, so it seems obvious to jump onto the band wagon.

But CRT is false doctrine based on false premises. It is not good news for how to fix society's problems. It cannot fix them, and if enacted, would only serve to increase inequities and economic

hardship for all people. Here is a side-by-side comparison of the real gospel with CRT so you can see just how opposite they are. CRT is *not even close to something that a Christian should adopt into his or her worldview.*

Biblical Teaching	Critical Race Theory Teaching
Sin is any act that falls short of God’s holy standard, including favoritism and many other things.	Racism and oppression. No consideration of greed as a motivation to take from oppressors. Sin is racism. That is really the only sin.
Righteousness from God.	Swap of power so that oppressed become powerful and powerful are made low.
The sinner	The oppressor
The redeemed person	The oppressed person
God	No god
Gospel	Social gospel, justice
Salvation	Wokeness
Gets to the root problem	Deals with a surface problem
Substitution	Direct punishment including thievery of goods.
Transformation of internal character	Swapping of positions between oppressor and oppressed
Biblical justice focused on God	Social justice focused on oppressed
Government is an agent of God, supposed to praise those who do well and punish evildoers.	Government is an enemy. Vigilantism is solution.
God is the standard.	Shifting post-modern ideas are the standard. “Foul” is called by individuals and is not arguable by those who are called out.
Cancel sin.	Cancel culture, cancel sinners.

Stewardship of blessings	Blessings are privilege that must be destroyed and transferred to others.
Poverty is inevitable because of sin.	Poverty must be eliminated but what Marxist systems end up doing is redistributing poverty.
Grace	Vengeance
Interpersonal reconciliation	Never-ending class warfare and conflict.
Savior centric.	Liberation centric. It is liberation theology all over again. Kendi says that savior theology is the problem, not the solution. This is because he has a skewed view of what savior theology is, equating it to the beliefs of southern masters who used religion to justify slavery.
Reconciliation with God.	There is no god. Reconciliation is class-based.
Ultimate problem resides in the individual because of the sin nature. Government is simply a collection of such sinners with power.	The ultimate problem resides in the structures of society like government, corporations, property ownership. These things need to be undone to create fairness.
Awake to righteousness. We must repent of all sin, and live for God.	Woke = awareness and activism
The sin of hatred resides in every human heart, and nothing short of a supernatural regeneration will bring about the spiritual transformation that is needed	CRT offers no solution for the heart problem of sin. It is at best a bandage, and because it does not acknowledge the truth of Scripture, is destined to fail.

I plan to get feedback from the audience. This topic is so hot right now, people have heard a lot about it and might wonder about the Christian teaching on some aspect of it. General society believes that Christians should just fold into this agenda because they ought to “love their neighbor.” No surprise that they do not understand the damage CRT does to the gospel.

II. What is Clear to Me...

- A. Racism exists because sin exists. Racism is just one expression of sin. It is a form of hatred and partiality (James 2:1, 4, 9), the opposite of love for one’s neighbor (Lev. 19:18).
- B. Not every white person is a racist. To make such a blanket accusation is itself a sin. Some white people are racists. Some black people are racist too. Not everyone displays depravity in this way. There are dozens of other ways in which depravity is demonstrated, and many in which it is hidden.
- C. There do happen egregious incidents that are racist in nature. There are other incidents that may appear to be racist because one of the parties happened to be black and the other white. But other explanations should be explored before coming to a final judgment. Hear the *whole* matter before answering it (Prov. 18:13).
- D. Some inequalities are because of poor choices of the person not in power. Others are because of devious behavior by a person in power. Other cases arise because of natural disasters that are not the fault of any person or group in particular. Crime exists and it is supposed to be punished evenly—regardless of whether the person who commits the crime is poor or rich or whatever class (the principle of Lev. 19:15).
- E. Judging motivations is a slippery business, but it seems that many people assumed it is possible to correctly judge motivations. The motivations for a so-called “hate crime” may simply be that the criminal hates all people equally. He may or may not have a particular opprobrium for a person of another ethnicity. A police officer may have fired his gun because he was afraid for his life, not

because the person threatening with a knife was a certain ethnicity.

- F. Statistics are often skewed or ignored entirely in this debate. Statistics of crime, or of police shootings, are left out, and sweeping generalizations or exaggeration are used to make a point. Do not accept such statements, but check them out critically.
- G. The organization Black Lives Matter is not the same as the obviously-true statement that black people's lives do matter equally with everyone else's lives. The organization is a radical pro-Marxist group which has been involved in destructive demonstrations/riots throughout the United States because they believe that is the way to accomplish what they want.
- H. Race is a socially constructed division of humanity. It is not a Biblical category. There is one single race of human beings, with much variation between them in terms of physical appearance, size, desires, etc. All of us come from one man and woman (Acts 17:26).
- I. CRT promotes what it claims to be fixing: discrimination. Ibram X. Kendi, one of the prominent critical race theorists and author of *How To Be An Antiracist*, wrote, "The only remedy to racist discrimination is anti-racist discrimination. The only remedy to past discrimination is present discrimination. The only remedy to present discrimination is future discrimination." There is no end-point when enough present or future discrimination has evened out the scales and then things can return to a complete equality.
- J. Kendi claims that racism started in a significant way in 1453 with the publication of a bio of Portuguese Prince Henry's Transatlantic slave trading of African people. It was, he claims, to save their souls, not to make money. This is the origin of the "white savior" theology which "is the oldest racist idea," he claims in a Tweet on Sep 27, 2020.

This is a twisted attack on Christian theology, which has nothing to do with the slave trade. To conflate Christianity and slavery is to commit a serious logical fallacy—these two different things were

interacting with one another in the Roman world 1400 years before Henry's initiation of the transatlantic slave trade. Slavery had been practiced centuries before that, almost for the entirety of human history. The New Testament interacted with slavery by instructing masters and servants how to conduct themselves in a Christian manner. The apostles made no direct attack on "the system" because their mission was more critical: the redemption of souls lost and under the wrath of God. As important as slavery is—and Christianity was the driving force to actually eliminate it—there is another and much larger problem.

We could say the same about poverty. It is a big problem, but Christianity does not exist to solve it because it is only a temporary problem.

He goes on: "Savior theology informs racism...liberation theology informs antiracism." Actually, the Christian teaching of reconciliation to God and loving one's neighbor informs the true solution to racism, not racism itself! Sadly, Kendi does not understand the Bible. He may know some facts that are distantly related to the Bible, but not the Bible.

K. John 4:9 shows that the world was dealing with ethnocentrism long before 1453!

III. Terms Connected to the Critical Race Theory Doctrine

Following are some definitions of terms that I have been hearing a lot lately. I thought I should do some research to learn more about them so as to be able to describe them better in conversation and preaching. These definitions are somewhat objective, but my values do peek through. For that, I am not apologetic!

A. **Anti-racism** on the surface seems to be as one definition suggests, "the policy or practice of opposing racism and promoting racial tolerance" [Oxford Languages via Google]. However, policy or belief is not enough. If you are not actively involved in dismantling racist systems, then you are not anti-racist, according to the modern adaptation of the definition. "Anti-racism is the active process of identifying and eliminating racism by changing systems, organizational structures, policies and practices and attitudes, so

that power is redistributed and shared equitably." This definition makes a sudden shift from race to power. Notice that they say that systems and policies and attitudes are changed—not to remove racism but with the goal to redistribute power. In this view, racism and power are integrally tied together. Practically, this means reducing the power of the white majority race and increasing the power of minority races.

- B. Cancel culture is defined as "the practice of withdrawing support for (or canceling) public figures and companies after they have done or said something considered objectionable or offensive". It is normally associated with a company or individual being swamped by critical social media posts on Twitter and Facebook. A targeted person of this technique may end up losing their job as a punishment or offering of atonement for whatever objectionable sin was done. It is a technique used to enforce political correctness and to ridicule unpopular opinions.
- C. **Communism** is a political philosophy which promotes class war as a means to remove private ownership and capitalist economics. In addition, communism is directly opposed to religious freedom, Christianity, and freedom of thought in general. See socialism.
- D. **Critical Race Theory** According to a paper by Nicholas Hartlep, Critical Race Theory: An Examination of its Past, Present, and Future Implications, "There are five major components or tenets of CRT: (1) the notion that racism is ordinary and not aberrational; (2) the idea of an interest convergence; (3) the social construction of race; (4) the idea of storytelling and counter-storytelling; and (5) the notion that whites have actually been recipients of civil rights legislation." Interest convergence is the idea that where the interests of whites are improved by working on racial progress, they will participate. If there is no convergence to their interests, they will not participate, since their interests and the interests of the minorities diverge after that point. The above definition misses a key component of CRT, however, because CRT emphasizes the concepts of race, law, and power. Whites, it is supposed, have constructed law in such a way as to maintain their power. Structures of society are responsible for causing race problems (not individuals); therefore structures must be changed.

- E. The **Cultural revolution** was, historically, the movement under Mao Zedong to expand Communism by removing capitalist and traditional elements from society. In this philosophy, rebellion was justified. Many Chinese people died. There is a modern movement afoot in the west to accomplish a very similar outcome. It advertises as "progressive" and is socialist and communist/Marxist in ideology.
- F. **Identity Politics** was the idea that groups that share certain characteristics like race, religion, social class, etc. gather into alliances to protect their interests. However, the phrase is presently used to denote an approach to politics, particularly by the Democratic Party, that emphasizes constituent groups based on certain characteristics, usually race or social status (black, poor, Hispanic, oppressed, LGBTQ, transgender, illegal aliens, etc.). The grievances of each group are the central focus of political activity. This is contrasted to an approach that wishes to see the constituency as one large group (citizens, American, the melting pot idea, etc.)
- G. **Intersectionality** An explanation of how various social categorizations overlap or combine to create advantage or disadvantage. For example, it is supposed that generally, a white person has privilege over other categories. A white male has an even higher privilege level because of the intersection of the two traits. A white male Christian has even more privilege. A black LGBTQ female is very disadvantaged because of the intersection of three social categories that are each disadvantaged. The idea of proponents is to eliminate advantage and elevate the disadvantaged. It seems that no distinction is made between immutable characteristics (white, black, male, female) and mutable characteristics (LGBTQ, illegal alien).
- H. **Micro-aggression** is "a statement, action, or incident regarded as an instance of indirect, subtle, or unintentional discrimination against members of a marginalized group such as a racial or ethnic minority" [Oxford Languages via Google]. The word "aggression" is important to note, as such behavior is seen by some proponents as being a form of violence. It sometimes is meant in an aggressive way, and other situations it is not at all aggressive. In the case of an

unintentional or even completely innocent statement, there seems to be an oversensitivity and refusal to overlook what might otherwise be a harmless statement. Perhaps the statement is not entirely harmless, but it arises from baked-in cultural factors that are difficult to eliminate as fast as someone might like.

- I. **Neo-marxism** An extension of "regular old Marxism" with new philosophies such as critical theory. A philosophy of governance and culture that uses social justice, racism, and other issues defined in this glossary as levers to gain power. Old Marxism was focused on class warfare (rich versus poor; industrialist versus worker/farmer). New Marxism has shifted attention to race as the new basis for the same exact thing.
- J. **Oppressor vs. oppressed** The philosophies described in this glossary are obsessed with the notion that society is made up of oppressors and the oppressed. For justice to prevail, the oppressed must throw off the oppressor (or, the oppressor must voluntarily step down). This is often advocated by any means that are available, including actual physical violence and thievery. This is connected to the cultural revolution as a way to right the oppressed categories, but will inevitably put another group into the oppressed category.

Privilege. "Social privilege is a theory of special advantage or entitlement, used to one's own benefit or to the detriment of others. These groups can be advantaged based on social class, age, height, nationality, disability, ethnic or racial category, gender, gender identity, neurology, sexual orientation, and religion.[1][2] It is generally considered to be a theoretical concept used in a variety of subjects and often linked to social inequality.[2] Privilege is also linked to social and cultural forms of power.[2] It began as an academic concept, but has since been invoked more widely, outside of academia." [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_privilege, accessed June 2021]

- K. **Socialism** is a political and economic structure where the means of production and distribution are owned and regulated by the community, not privately. Socialism is typically one step away from full-fledged communism.

- L. **Social Justice** A type of justice that is concerned not with crime or moral right and wrong, but rather with the distribution of wealth, privilege, opportunities, power, and the like.
- M. **SJW = Social Justice Warrior** A person who actively promotes social justice (progressive) views.
- N. **Woke** Adjective describing someone who is alert to injustice in society, especially racism [Oxford Languages via Google]. Someone who is naive to such issues would not be "woke." Someone who knows about such issues but does not actively campaign for the progressive agenda is also considered to be un-woke.
- O. **1619 Project** "The 1619 Project is an ongoing initiative from The New York Times Magazine that began in August 2019, the 400th anniversary of the beginning of American slavery. It aims to reframe the country's history by placing the consequences of slavery and the contributions of black Americans at the very center of our national narrative."

The rapid change of language by addition of new phrases indicates that rapid cultural change is happening. The language is adapting to express new ways of thinking. Media and academic institutions, especial public and private high school and college teachers and administrators, are at the forefront of this effort to change the culture.

IV. Questions and Answers

These come from pushback that I received. The main point of this section of the message is that Bible Christians must use the Bible—not conservative political arguments or statistics or experience—to teach truth. The Bible is absolutely essential.

Question: I was surprised to hear your strong contrast of CRT with Christianity. Many Christian organizations seem to be embracing it. Even the SBC has been debating it recently.

Answer: CRT is not merely an explanation of the past, nor of the present. It is not "history." As you know, a big part of "history" is interpretation. CRT is part explanation = interpretation of the state of affairs today in the world, some accurate and some not; and

part proposed solution based on non-Christian principles. We can see that clearly in the quotations of Kendi that I referred to last time in which advocate future discrimination to solve present discrimination. Christians cannot support that kind of solution because it is unjust. Where crime has occurred, it should be punished upon those who did the crime (Ezekiel 18:4, 20) and restitution made to those directly impacted. Where no punishment can be extracted from the offenders, nor restitution made to the direct victims, the past must be forgotten and just principles implemented going forward. This is because we live in an imperfect, unfair world. That cannot be changed.

I made quite a claim last time that CRT is diametrically opposed to Christianity. I still stand by that statement. I can do so confidently because of its Marxist/communist roots and its likeness to liberation theology. Both of these offer a solution to the world's problems that are not Christian. Marxism, for example, is at its core, atheistic and hates Christianity. The only evidence you need of that is the approach that such governments take to Christianity (USSR, China being the prime examples). You can also look at their writings. They are clearly against God. Anything that comes out of that poisoned root has to be immediately suspect to the Christian!

Question: Why are Christian organizations embracing CRT?

Answer: I see several possibilities, or a combination of the following. They see it as compatible with Christian theology. For example, if they have already bought into the social gospel or liberation theology, CRT is almost directly compatible with their views. Unfortunately, those understandings of the gospel are wrong. Perhaps they see the doctrine of Christian love or OT governmental teachings on justice as the mission of the church. Or, perhaps they see such an embrace of CRT as expedient to reach the culture. Or another possibility is that they are afraid to speak against the culture because of the fear of man.

Question: Are there other explanations for the situation in our culture than CRT offers?

Answer: It seems as if advocates believe CRT is the *only* explanation/solution to the situation today, but it is not. As I

indicated last time, there are other explanations. Primarily, one is from the conservative political viewpoint and experience, and another one is from the Christian viewpoint. These are not identical and we must be careful not to formulate our opinion solely based on logic and statistics. That can be helpful—because those things are *truth*. But incomplete information can cause us to make statements that are incorrect. Example: DWB. If you don't know about such cases, you may make sweeping statements that seem entirely misinformed to the listener who has had a different life experience. Similarly, people who know of or have experienced racism in action must remember that their experience is anecdotal, not necessarily normal. There may be a billion other interactions between people of various races that did not have that kind of outcome. The depth of feeling that you have with one bad interaction outweighs 1000 good interactions and you can become jaded in your thinking; you figure that CRT must be true, but in reality it paints only a partial picture of part of society that is blown up large because of the injustices that have been experienced. Both sides of the debate have some truth in them.

Some other examples: absolute statements like “the criminal justice system is not racist” are not true. They may be largely true, but are they true in fact in every case? I have read over the years of cases where it is *not* true. We can understand that the justice system makes mistakes, and it has biases, and offers defense differently to poor people than it does to rich people, etc.

Experience is a slippery thing. We must ultimately formulate our understanding based on Scripture, not politics, logic, stats, or experience. A big objection I have is that these things are not examined from a Biblical perspective. Politics and experience drive the conversation, but what about Bible?

Example: Salvation by faith. Convince a Christian of that. Easy—Eph. 2:8-10

Example: There is no racism in the justice system. There is no racism in policing. Are those really true? No, they are not. “Are all whites racist?” Obviously not. We discussed this last time. There

are “good” white people and “good” black people, but not all people are “good” according to the Bible’s definition of good.

PICK UP HERE 7/18/2021 (* = deal with these today)

***Question:** I have thought about how Galatians 6:7 applies to CRT. The black rates for abortion and fatherlessness are huge. The acceptance of government money is also high (and corresponding lower employment rates). In light of this Bible verse, how could we not expect a different outcome (on average) for the races?

Answer: I very much disagree with the last statement. We expect a different outcome *not for the races, but for the behaviors*. The fact that there is a correlation race ↔ behavior happens to be true on a percentage basis, but it is not the race that causes the disparity. It is the behavior. Whites who behave like that will have similar outcomes in their “white sub-culture.” But that is not as easily evident because they are lumped into the larger statistics of their “macro culture” and the significance of their misbehavior is somewhat wiped out. The statement seems to indicate that race is the main issue. It is not. Most people today would read that statement (last sentence) and say, “What you are saying is that the Bible teaches different outcomes in life for different races? No thanks.”

***Question:** All races should achieve the same, and if not then it must be that the lower-achieving race is being mistreated.

Answer: False. There are other explanations for lower achievement. Bad choices. Natural disasters, less resources, poor use of resources. Genetics—which includes race—does have an impact on things. Are whites mistreated because there are fewer of them in basketball teams than represented in the general population? Or football teams?

Take another somewhat funny example. I have heard the statement that white men cannot jump. Although stated categorically, it seems to be to be true. Of course it is not true in every case. But as a generality, there are certain athletic feats that blacks are simply better at. This *is* tied to genetics, but even here I cannot say that is because of skin color. It is because of the entire

package of genetic attributes that are correlated to color. Color is not the causative factor of better jumping ability, but it is connected to it.

<DONE>Oppression is not the only explanation for disparate outcomes. White supremacy is, as best I know, not codified in our country into law. There are other explanations for disparate outcomes. A Bible explanation for different outcomes is different behavior. God generally blesses righteous conduct and is displeased with unrighteous conduct. Different conduct has different outcomes. This is a veritable law of nature, and cannot be undone. If you are lazy and do not work, you will likely have less than a diligent person. You will have lower grades than a hard studying student. If you read less, you will complete less books than an avid reader. Consequently, you may have less exposure to information and knowledge.

I have given one principle above, that is the Ezekiel 18:4, 20 principle.

Question: Is not the *system* (society/government) responsible for the oppression that we see?

Answer: This evidences an over-reliance on collective or solidarity principles. There are aspects of life that are that way: social structures, governance, shared resources, etc. But then there are other aspects that are individualistic and cannot be otherwise. Romans 14:12: "Each of us shall give account OF HIMSELF to God." We will not give account for the authorities over us, but of OUR OWN SELVES. This is a second principle. Similarly, Gal. 6:7 – reap what you sow. That may have impact on a larger set of people than just yourself!

***Question:** I do not understand your one-race argument from Acts 17:26.

Answer: There is only one human "kind" (using that technical term as in Genesis). We are all created from one blood—Adam and Eve. There is one human race. Yes, indeed, it is in one sense semantics, but most people overlook the fact that there is only one race. That

is an axiomatic truth that is overlooked when you jump to using "race" terminology to describe skin-tone or cultural differences.

If you come at the question from an evolutionary mindset, there is no reason why there could not be multiple human 'races' that happened to develop along evolutionary lines. In other words, from an evolutionary forest, not a single rooted tree. Evolution has in this way been used as a philosophy to differentiate races (black, Jew, Aryan, etc.) and therefore to promote racist ideas. The single race truth cuts through all that.

Question: It seems that you are being vague about specific statistics and race issues. Is that because you are gun shy from prior experiences? What you are saying really only makes sense if you are talking about American black people.

Answer: About being specific... I am not intentionally being vague. There are a universe of facts that do not allow me to make all the categorical statements that you might like.

Last time, I did not address some of the statistics/political realities because I have done that before, and many others have done so, but mainly because I'm trying to address the problem from a Scriptural viewpoint, one different than a political viewpoint. For a Christian, while *truth in the secular realm* should have a lot of weight (if you can determine what that is), it is the Bible that will really grab their hearts and minds because that is from God. Its truth will resonate with the Spirit within them. If you must use secular/political realities to convince someone of the truth of something, then you have a problem. The word of God touches everything in life. Our authority is *there*, not in human logic or reason. So indeed it *should* be possible to convince a Christian, a true Christian, based on Biblical principles. If you cannot do so, it may be that you are trying to convince them of the wrong thing, an unnecessary thing, or they are not truly a Christian.

On the 'bad state' issue (that blacks put themselves into a bad state), I'm making a higher-level argument that does not depend on American blacks or whites. Samaritans had a bad outcome due to racism, but they were probably olive skin tone. Jews have bad outcomes due to racism, but they are white/olive skinned. In

Rwanda, Hutus or Tutsis are both black, but have different physical characteristics. Shem, a fellow who attends Saturday morning, said to me the main difference was the length of their noses. Short-nosed versus long-nosed...seems crazy. But the Hutu majority was discriminated against historically by racism. Actually that was under Belgian rule, so there was a European vs. black issue there. My thought is that racism is not white-on-black; it is a problem that is way bigger than that in history. Blacks enslaved other blacks. But yes, if I were to focus my eyes onto America only, I could be more specific--but even then, I keep in mind a lot of white people (Appalachians, or others that some people used to call 'white trash') have bad outcomes too.

<https://museeholocauste.ca/en/resources-training/the-genocide-against-the-tutsi-in-rwanda/>: "Using racist pseudo-scientific methods, authorities divided and created a hierarchy within the population based on physical differences. Based on measurements such as height, shape of nose, and skin colour, colonial authorities designated Tutsi as superior to Hutu. Access to education and administrative jobs was therefore reserved for this group only. These discriminatory practices led to an impoverished Hutu majority that developed resentment towards the Tutsi minority."

Question: Is CRT infiltrating reformed churches? Is it unifying the body of Christ?

Answer: It is infiltrating "pop-reformed" churches. It is dividing the body. The division alone tells us a lot about it.

***Question:** What is your position on micro-aggressions?

Answer: First, see the definition above. I curated it from a couple of places and added some of my own analysis.

Second, a lot of examples of micro-aggressions are things that we would before call insensitive, or dumb, or racist, or unintentional, or unkind. Other examples are terminology issues that are accurate ways to express a fact or situation.

Third, micro-aggressions are not truly *aggressions*, and they are not considered by advocates to be *micro* (there are exceptions, of course). *Aggression* signifies violence and evil intent, so there

seems to be a wrong label here. It could be a mis-spoken word. It could be a mis-understanding. It could be culturally baked in and just “comes out.” *Micro* in mathematics and science is a prefix that means 10^{-6} . It is not $1/10^{\text{th}}$, $1/100^{\text{th}}$, $1/1000^{\text{th}}$, but $1/1$ millionth. It is small. But people who talk about micro-aggressions multiply them by a large number of orders of magnitude so that they become macro-aggressions.

Fourth, Christians are instructed in Scripture how to handle such things. (You do believe the Bible speaks to *every* issue in life?) The "receiver" needs to be just as sensitive about the giver and his/her situation as his/her own on perception of the situation. It is unreasonable to feel terribly offended at a micro-aggression and yet treat the person who gave the offense as an evil enemy. Perhaps they are just like you in a lot of ways! They can be forgiven.

On the "giver's" side, *micro-aggression* describes insensitive and unloving statements/actions/etc. They can be confessed. They are not unforgivable.

Christians on both the receiving and giving sides are taught by God to lovingly address such matters ("let love cover a multitude of sins," and "if you brother sins against you, go and tell him...gained your brother,"), come to a better understanding, offer apology, grant forgiveness, and move ahead. See Prov. 10:12, 17:9, 1 Peter 4:8, Matthew 18:15-17.

If people are giving offenses and receiving micro-things as offenses, there is no fervent love between them. Do not kid yourself if you are in this mindset. If you are holding something against another person, you are not fervently loving them; you are embittered against them and you are thinking evil of them (1 Cor. 13:5—love thinks no evil).

***Question:** How do you explain the concept of *privilege*?

Answer: First, see the definition I gave above. (1) Some things are unavoidable, like height. How do you define privilege based on height? Do you count the times I hit my head on open cabinets, low stairwells, low doorways, and the like? Do you count when it is

hard to bend down to look in the lower shelves of the pantry or fridge when someone shorter (I won't say who) says, "It's right here. Can't you see it?" There seems to be short privilege as well. Granted, 1 Samuel 9:2 speaks of Saul and his impressive height. Goliath had a height advantage as well. But both were unbelievers who ended up dying in sin. Height is a secondary matter that we need to be able to set aside.

(2) From another angle...height is one of those immutable properties that people are born with. You are what you are. Malnutrition or better nutrition and sleep affect the outcome, but basically it is genetic. Similarly, skin color, brain capacity, nationality, etc. are things that just *are*. The people with these characteristics are stuck with them. I did not like being skinny in middle and high school. It was a sore subject because I was made fun of, but I do not even think about that today, and I do not remember any names of classmates who made fun of me that way. It is unimportant and if I were to dwell on it or somehow direct my philosophy by that sin of unkindness from years ago, I would not be demonstrating Christian character. Forgiveness, even if never transacted with the offender, has a component inside of the offended person that moves beyond the offense. Back to the point...According to Christian theology, we treat all people with love, kindness, gentleness, moderation, justice, etc., regardless of the immutable characteristics that they possess.

(3) Some of the categories in the definition are not Christian (gender identity, sexual orientation). Those are behaviors outside of Christian boundaries. Various religions are also outside the boundary of Christian theology. If you believe ungodly things or walk in ungodly ways, you can expect consequences to come as a natural result. The lack of such consequences cannot be claimed to be "privilege" for those who obey God and receive His general blessings. If you study hard and work hard, for example, there are *generally* better consequences than if you are a poor student and a lazy worker.

(4) The worldly/academic definitions look at privilege upside down. The privilege of being in a two-parent home, for example, is not privilege. It is the way God designed things to be. It is an expected

baseline, a C-average grade. The two parents could be jerks thus lowering their grade; or they could be saints, raising it. One-parent situations may indeed offer more challenges or “de-privilege” or better yet, *disadvantage*. It is disadvantageous to children for parents to make babies and not stay together. Then again, it may be more advantageous to have one out of two or two out of two jerk parents than a single good parent!! Broken homes are not a normal or right state of existence. It is also a disadvantage to children when those lose one or both parents. Thus we see God’s special care for orphans and widows in the Scriptures—both by God Himself and by God’s people. That special care is designed by God to overcome some of the disadvantage. Abstractly speaking, my view puts the “zero” point on the number line in a different spot than the worldly definition of privilege would consider.

***Question:** Isn’t Christianity a white religion? Allison Hopper, writing for *Scientific American*, titled an article “Denial of Evolution is a Form of White Supremacy.” She seems to be saying that the evolutionary model shows that the human race arose from Africa, which insulates the evolutionary view from charges of racism.

Answer: This twists evolution into a virtue instead of the vice that it is. Evolution is a key philosophical underpinning for race-supremacy philosophies. It was foundational to Hitler’s program of extinguishing the Jews and trying to raise the Aryan race to prominence. Evolution was used by slavery advocates to justify their actions of enslaving black people.

Hopper goes on to write: “At the heart of white evangelical creationism is the mythology of an unbroken white lineage that stretches back to a light-skinned Adam and Eve [FALSE]. In literal interpretations of the Christian Bible, white skin was created in God’s image [FALSE]. Dark skin has a different, more problematic origin [FALSE]. As the biblical story goes, the curse or mark of Cain for killing his brother was a darkening of his descendants’ skin [FALSE]. Historically, many congregations in the U.S. pointed to this story of Cain as evidence that Black skin was created as a punishment.” [That may be true, but not based in the Bible.] See <https://answersingenesis.org/racism/scientific-american-publishes-error-filled-hit-piece/>

This bears repeating: Christianity is a middle-eastern religion. It is not European; it is not western. It arose entirely out of the middle east. The Bible is a middle-eastern book, speaking from a human perspective. To say that Christianity is European in origin is ignorant.

Conclusion

According to the definition of *woke* by its advocates—being aware of racial injustice and actively combatting it—our church is not woke. Christian theology in general is not woke. Church work properly focuses on the gospel, which is the true and only solution to sin of all sorts, and that *certainly* includes the sin of racism.

There is another real sense, however, in which individual Christians and churches *do* take a stand against some of injustices of the sort that woke advocates are concerned about. We believe in just treatment of all people regardless of color, culture, economic position, etc. This is because the Bible shows us that God Himself desires these kinds of things.

There are other so-called injustices that we do not go along with (gender identity change, for instance, or sexual immorality). Even in those cases, however, the Bible does not advocate for mean or unloving treatment. Part of love is encouraging reform of thinking and behavior.

Exodus 23:6 says, “You shall not pervert the judgment of your poor in his dispute.” In other words, you cannot treat a poor person worse because he is poor.

But you also cannot treat a poor person *better* because he is poor. Leviticus 19:15 says, “You shall do no injustice in judgment. You shall not be partial to the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty. In righteousness you shall judge your neighbor.”

You cannot discriminate *for* or *against*. You cannot even do that when you are trying to “undo” past wrongs. Truly focus on undoing those wrongs by making things right in the present. Do not *redo* the wrongs of the past!

References

<https://answersingenesis.org/racism/three-biblical-problems-critical-race-theory/>

<https://answersingenesis.org/racism/critical-race-theory-church/>

<https://www.foxnews.com/us/what-does-woke-mean>. Here is the text of the article, published May 30, 2021:

What does 'woke' mean?

The word was first printed in a 1962 New York Times essay by the author William Melvin Kelley.

What is woke?

Aside from being the past participle of wake, for decades, it meant conscious and aware – but the slang word has come to represent an embrace of progressive activism, as well.

Merriam-Webster added the word to its dictionary in 2017, defining it as, "aware of and actively attentive to important facts and issues (especially issues of racial and social justice)." The Oxford dictionary adopted it the same year, defining it as "originally: well-informed, up-to-date. Now chiefly: alert to racial or social discrimination and injustice."

"Woke is a slang term that is easing into the mainstream from some varieties of a dialect called African American Vernacular English (sometimes called AAVE)," according to [Merriam-Webster](#). "In AAVE, awake is often rendered as woke, as in, 'I was sleeping, but now I'm woke.'"

The meaning appears to have shifted sometime after [Erykah Badu](#) repeatedly used the line "I stay woke" in her 2008 song, "Master Teacher," which begins, "I am known to stay awake."

After the song came out, "'Stay woke' became a watch word in parts of the Black community for those who were self-aware, questioning the dominant paradigm and striving for something better," according to Merriam-Webster.

Then in 2013 and 2014, after Florida man George Zimmerman was [acquitted](#) in Trayvon Martin's slaying and the police-involved death

of [Michael Brown](#) in Ferguson, Mo., a wave of Black Lives Matter activism emerged around the country. The phrase went from Twitter hashtag to rallying cry.

"The word woke became entwined with the [Black Lives Matter](#) movement; **instead of just being a word that signaled awareness of injustice or racial tension, it became a word of action,**" according to Merriam-Webster. "Activists were woke and called on others to stay woke."

In 2018, the rapper [Meek Mill](#) took the phrase as the top single on his album "Legends of the Summer."

The BLM-themed "Stay Woke" was his first song since getting out of prison in April of that year.

"How can I pledge allegiance to the flag," he raps in the final verse. "When they killin' all our sons, all our dads?"

But the meaning of woke evolved again with the rise of "[cancel culture](#)" -- as the two terms saw increased use, they became intertwined in the public consciousness. Often, someone gets canceled after they say something insensitive – something not woke.

So an addition to meaning aware and progressive, many people now interpret woke to be a way to describe people who would rather silence their critics than listen to them.

That's entirely different than what the word meant when it first appeared in print.

That was in a 1962 [New York Times](#) article about beatniks and pop culture absorbing jazz music and African American slang from Harlem, [Oxford](#) revealed in a June 2017 article about new words heading into the dictionary.

That article, written by the Black New York City novelist William Melvin Kelley was titled, "If you're woke, you dig it" – meaning if you're in the know, you understand.

As he noted at the time, a lot of jazz-era idioms became mainstream speech, and words like cool and hip. But the slang was already evolving in meaning back then.

"At one time, the connotations of 'jive' were all good," Kelley wrote.

"Now they are bad, or at least questionable."

A decade later, in Barry Beckham's "Garvey Lives!" play about the Black Nationalist leader and publisher Marcus Garvey, a character named Strong vows that he "won't go to sleep" but instead will "stay woke."

"I been sleeping all my life," he says. "And now that Mr. Garvey done woke me up, I'm gon stay woke. And I'm gon help him wake up other Black folk."

Now it's not so much a racial term as an ideological one.

MAP