PART 2:
The Origins and Agenda of Critical Race Theory

What Is CRT?

Historically, American legal theory was based on two principles of classical liberalism: (1) “All men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights,” and (2) equal justice under the law in an equal opportunity society. Critical race theory (CRT) rejects both of these premises.

Definitions of CRT vary, and there is much confusion regarding the exact nature of this ideology. To simplify, I will cite the definition of CRT as set forth by the Luskin School of Public Affairs at UCLA:

CRT recognizes that racism is engrained in the fabric and system of the American society.... Institutional racism is pervasive in the dominant culture. This is the analytical lens that CRT uses in examining existing power structures. CRT identifies that these power structures are based on white privilege and white supremacy, which perpetuates the marginalization of people of color. CRT also rejects the traditions of [classical] liberalism and meritocracy. Legal discourse says that the law is neutral and colorblind, however, CRT challenges this legal ‘truth’ by examining liberalism and meritocracy as a vehicle for self-interest, power, and privilege. [*What is Critical Race Theory?* UCLA School of Public Affairs, Critical Race Studies. https://spacrs.wordpress.com/what-is-critical-race-theory]

Note that CRT is based on the belief that racism is “engrained” in the very fabric of American society, and our cultural institutions were established on the basis of “white privilege and white supremacy,” which in turn “perpetuates the marginalization of people of color.” CRT “rejects the traditions” of [classical] liberalism – those natural law-based social, moral and political principles on which America’s constitutional republic was founded – including the ideal of individual merit in contrast to a hereditary aristocracy. By inference, America’s founding fathers were motivated exclusively by “self-interest, power and privilege” rather than any public-spirited principles such as “all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights” and the concept of equal justice under the law in an equal opportunity society.

At the outset, it is imperative to note that critical race theory also rejects the fundamental principle of the mainstream Civil Rights Movement of the mid-twentieth century. Civil Rights leaders such as Martin Luther King Jr. advocated for a “color-blind society” in which people are judged as individuals on the basis of the “content of their character” rather than the color of their skin. Conversely, CRT is obsessed with defining and judging people primarily (or exclusively) on the basis of their race. In that respect, critical race theory can more accurately be described as “critical racist theory” as it constitutes the most perverse obsession with race and identity politics since the dominance of the Ku Klux Klan in the American South or the triumph of Nazism in Germany. Watch a historical documentary on Nazi racial propaganda in German schools in the 1930s and note the striking similarities to the CRT propaganda that is propagated in the American media and in many schools.

Characteristics of CRT.

As stated in Part 1, critical race theory is a racialized derivative of the critical theory espoused by cultural Marxists over the past century. Five concepts in particular characterize this racist ideology.

(1) An obsession with group identity. Like classical Marxism and critical theory in general, CRT assesses human nature, human behavior, and all the
interactions in life on the basis of group identity – except that now it is all about race rather than socio-economic class status. This is a radically different philosophy of anthropology as it relates to human nature. As I stated in Part 1, nothing could be more insulting and dehumanizing than to label and characterize individual human beings based on some simplistic and stereotypical group identity.

(2) **Structural determinism.** CRT asserts that human beings have no free will and no self-determination, and that the “systems of oppression” in society control one’s outcome in life. Personal responsibility, one’s own work ethic, and the ideal of America as a meritocracy is a myth created and perpetuated by privileged white males. White people – in particular, white heterosexual Christian and conservative males – are by nature the “oppressor” class in American society either wittingly or not.

(3) **Racialized Social Darwinism.** CRT rejects the idea of objective truth and moral absolutes, which are merely residual concepts of Christian-influenced Western civilization. Instead, critical race theorists argue that everything in life is determined by power dynamics. In contrast to the “dialectical materialism” of classical Marxism, this is “**dialectical racism**”.

(4) **Racial conflict.** Based on skin color, everyone is either an “oppressor” or a “victim of oppression.” White people constitute the “oppressor” class in America – whether knowingly and intentionally or not. Any attempts by whites to think otherwise is a failure to confront the realities of their own nature. Conversely, blacks and other “People of Color” (POC’s) are and always have been the oppressed – perpetual victims of white systemic racism. Furthermore, the values and agendas of whites and PoC’s are incompatible and innately adversarial.

(5) **The solution: racialized “social justice.”** American history is the story of the white exploitation of blacks and other People of Color. “White privilege” and “systemic racism” are “pervasive” and “engrained in the fabric” of American society. [See the extract cited above, “What is Critical Race Theory?” by the UCLA School of Public Affairs.] Blacks and other POC’s must rise up and seize power from the white establishment that has long exploited and suppressed them.

CRT manufactures revisionistic history such as “**The 1619 Project**” to argue that “racism is the ordinary state of affairs in [American] society.” This dishonest, racist and toxic propaganda is endorsed and promoted by the Democratic Party and the two largest teachers unions, the National Association of Educators and the American Federation of Teachers. In the words of the JFK wannabe, Beto O’Rourke, “Racism in America is endemic. It is foundational. We can mark the creation of this country not at the 4th of July, 1776, but August 20, 1619, when the first kidnapped African was brought to this country against his will.” Even more astonishing is the ignorant assertion by Sen. Tim Kaine (D-VA) that “the United States didn’t inherit slavery from anybody. We created it.”

According to CRTists, the only “solution” to pervasive systemic racism is revolution – preferably a non-violent cultural upheaval but ultimately, as Malcolm X threatened, “by any means necessary.”

**Origins of CRT**

In recent history, critical race theory was an outgrowth of **critical legal studies** (CLS). Originally, the leading figure in the development of CLS was **Derrick Bell** (1930-2011). As an admitted admirer of Louis Farrakhan, America’s most notorious racist and anti-Semite, Bell was a controversial legal scholar who taught at USC, Harvard, the University of Oregon, and later at NYU. At an academic conference in 1989, Bell first introduced the term “critical race theory.”

Around the same time one of Bell’s proteges, Kimberle Crenshaw, coined the term “intersectionality” in a paper: “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination, Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.” [University of Chicago Legal Forum, Vol. 1989, Issue 1, Article 8] The concept of intersectionality is based on the idea of a “matrix of domination” or “multiple layers of oppression.” For example: a black lesbian woman with a physical handicap is considered to have four “layers of oppression.” This theory was summarized by the sociologist Patricia Hill Collins in an article published in 2012 in the Journal of Speculative Philosophy entitled “Social Inequality, Power, and Politics: Intersectionality and American Pragmatism in Dialogue.”

Because race, gender, class, sexuality, ethnicity, age, nationality, and religion constitute major axes of power... they catalyze multiple forms of social inequality. Intersectionality contributes the important insight that social inequalities are multiple, complex, and mutually constructing and offers a more robust analysis of social inequality.” [Patricia Hill Collins, “Social Inequality, Power, and Politics: Intersectionality and American Pragmatism in Dialogue (Journal of Speculative Philosophy, 2012, Vol. 26, No. 2), p. 455.]

Many books and “scholarly” papers have fed the flames of this fraudulent field of study such as Peggy McIntosh’s 1988 paper, “White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack,” and After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear & Hatred of Gays in the 90s by the Harvard professors Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen. Beginning in the early 1990s an entire academic industry emerged in addition to Black Studies, including Women’s Studies, Gender Studies, Ethnic Studies, Gay Studies, and Critical Race Studies, and in 2020 the top three political bestsellers all promoted the CRT agenda: Robin DiAngelo’s White Fragility: Why It’s So Hard for White People to Talk About Racism; Isabel Wilkerson’s Caste: The Origins of Our Discontents; and How to be an Antiracist by Ibram X. Kendi.

The Bible and Critical Race Theory

Critical Race Theory is not only blatantly Marxist, anti-American and racist, but it is transparently anti-Christian according to the following criteria.

(1) An anti-Christian ideology. Like critical theory in general, critical race theory is anti-Christian in terms of labeling and judging individuals on primarily or exclusively according to their skin color. Biblical Christianity holds that Christians should treat people as individuals – not as members of broad stereotypical groups. In the words of the African-American pastor and author Voddie Baucham:

Our problem is [Marxist] “social justice” versus [true] Biblical justice.... The current concept of social justice is incompatible with biblical Christianity. This is the main fault line at the root of the current debate. [Voddie T. Baucham Jr., Fault Lines (Salem Books, 2021), p. 5.]

Christians must be clear: CRT is an evil, racist and indefensible ideology. As such, it is every bit as despicable as the white supremacy of the Ku Klux Klan or the Aryan racism of the National Socialist German Workers Party (Nazi). However, the point must be emphasized that many who are sympathetic to CRT are not necessarily evil people. Many are sincerely concerned about the state of racial tension and conflict in America which they associate with traditional American “racial injustice.” But unfortunately, they are ignorant, naive and misguided pawns of those who are hell-bent on using CRT to divide us along racial lines and fundamentally transform America into a secular socialist state. The stakes could not be higher. As Voddie Baucham warns, “The United States is on the verge of a race war, if not a complete cultural meltdown.” [Ibid.]

So how do CRT propagandists deal with People of Color such as Voddie Baucham and many others such as those mentioned in the footnote on page 1? Typically, CRTists argue that such people have “internalized oppression” as a result of digesting and absorbing the false narratives
of white racists. Conversely, they would be highly insulted if Christians and conservatives were to point out that the problem is more likely that CRTists themselves have “internalized the Marxist and hateful” narratives of anti-white racists.

(2) A Biblical view of race. Most American cultural conservatives are either Christians or generally aligned with Judeo-Christian moral and ethical values. Likewise, Christians who understand and embrace a consistent biblical worldview are generally cultural conservatives.

A Biblical view of race is conditioned by two foundational principles:

First is the doctrine that all human beings are created by divine providence in the imago Dei – the image of God – as set forth in Genesis 1:27: “So God created man in his own image,... male and female he created them.”

Second is the inference that Christians should be “post-racial” in their attitudes toward all people. In Galatians 3:28 the apostle Paul wrote: “In Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile, slave nor free, male nor female.” If race had been a serious social issue at the time, Paul would probably have added, “In Christ... there is neither white or black or brown.”

The Bible teaches racial equality, and it is patently unChristian to judge others on the basis of their skin color. As Christians, our identity comes from our relationship with God through the saving grace of Jesus Christ and the derivative faith and character that we develop throughout our lifetime. We are created as individuals, and God judges us as individuals. Our self-identity should come through a realistic awareness of who and what we are as a special and unique person – not our racial or ethnic heritage nor our sex.

That being the case, racial identity is nothing for which one should be either proud nor ashamed. Racial identity is simply a fact of nature. Human beings do nothing to earn or deserve to be born white, black, brown, etc., any more than they earn or deserve to be born male or female. For reasons we cannot know, God providentially chose to implant our soul within a particular body in a particular place and time in history (ref. Acts 17:26). “Pride” – in the positive sense of the word – is simply a sense of satisfaction (and hopefully, a sense of gratitude) that we develop as a result of accomplishing something meaningful in life. Therefore, the idea of “racial pride” – or for that matter, racial shame – is frankly nonsensical.

Christian social ethics emphasizes that there are absolute and universal standards of right and wrong, decency and civility. The Bible does not condone moral relativism on any basis – be it racial, ethnic, cultural, social class or gender. Traditionally, different racial and ethnic groups sometimes have their own distinctive mannerisms, customs, etc. – but these usually have nothing to do with basic morality and ethics. If we truly believe in racial equality, then we hold all people to the same moral and ethical standards.

So while it is good to be sensitive to the unique life experiences of others, it is not good to patronize or excuse anyone’s bad behavior for any reason regardless of their race, sex, nationality, socio/economic status, or any other factor. Good and evil are not socially dependent. To think and act otherwise is to rob people of their individuality and their inherent dignity, which is dehumanizing and insulting. Furthermore, to grant exceptions to certain people based on their racial identity is itself racist.

(3) Sin is personal and universal. Scripture is clear that sin transcends race, sex, ethnicity, social class, and all other factors. The Bible holds everyone to the same general standards of morality regardless of social class, sex, race, ethnicity, or any other distinguishing characteristic. Sin only becomes “institutionalized” or “systemic” because human beings are themselves egocentric sinners – “rebels against God,” as C. S. Lewis once noted.

Racism and social injustice are sinful, but so are envy, jealousy, greed, hate, vindictiveness, violence, unfairness, sexual immorality, drunkenness, and lack of respect for God and his moral laws. The Greatest Commandment applies to all: Love God with all your heart, soul, mind and strength, and love others as you love yourself” (Matt. 22:37-39). The only real solution to social injustice is a changed heart – not government coercion and anti-discrimination laws. Nonetheless, government does have a role to play in terms of leveling the playing field and mandating equal justice and equal opportunity under the law while also protecting individual liberty so long as it doesn’t infringe on the rights of others.
(4) Power and privilege can certainly cloud our perceptions of social injustice. As egocentric people, we can rationalize most anything that we consider to be personally advantageous, pleasurable, or that furthers our ambitions and agenda. The same principle can apply to dominant social groups, and there is certainly some truth in the concept of “hegemonic power.” As the British historian Lord Acton famously wrote, “Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” Readers of J. R. R. Tolkien’s fantasy novels are also reminded that the “power corrupts” principle was a central theme in his *Lord of the Rings* trilogy.

According to Scripture, true spiritual conversion should be wholistic and comprehensive. It should transform not only our personal life and relationships but also how we view the world and its values. This was the theme of the apostle Paul as he challenged the believers in Rome, “Do not conform any longer to the patterns of this world [the thinking, the lifestyles, the values and the priorities of this world], but be transformed by the renewing of your mind” (Rom. 12:1-2). White Christians in America should always be mindful that power and privilege can cloud our perceptions of social injustice, which is why we need the input and insights of all our brothers and sisters in Christ. But as stated previously, while it is good to be sensitive to the unique life experiences of others, it is not good to patronize or lower the standards for anyone or any group for any reason. To grant exceptions to certain people based on their racial identity is itself racist.

(5) Racism is a universal human problem. Throughout all of history, racism has been a perennial pathology. Due to the fact that human beings have an inherent sin nature, many people hold racist sentiments either because (1) they believe people of another race are inherently inferior; (2) they dislike people who look or act different from themselves; or (3) they resent people of another race due to troublesome personal interactions in the past.

Racism – including systemic or institutional racism – has been a very real problem in American history in the past, and to deny it is either egregiously ignorant or abjectly dishonest. However, the question for contemporary Christians is whether systemic racism still exists in American society. This is an issue on which we need to be well informed as I explain in the following section of this article.


The Realities of Systemic Racism

It is important to understand that we live in a society and culture in which racial propaganda is pervasive. As such, it is imperative that we reject both the dominant racial narrative as well as much of the terminology that defines and describes race and race relations in America.

Until the mid-1960s, many social/cultural systems and institutions in America were in fact bastions of systemic racism. Various local laws and customs in America – especially (but not exclusively) in the states that constituted the old Confederacy –mandated racial segregation to the fullest extent possible. Just as segregated schools were purportedly “separate but equal,” in reality these laws and customs provided substandard facilities and accommodations for black Americans. Clearly, these provisions violated the U.S. Constitution’s guarantee of equal opportunity under the law.

Incremental changes were made under Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower, but it was President John F. Kennedy who initiated decisive action under intense pressure from the Civil Rights Movement. In 1963 JFK announced that he would propose a comprehensive civil rights act. “Racism has no place in American life or law,” he declared. “It’s time for America to fulfill its promise that all men are created equal.”

Following Kennedy’s assassination, President Lyndon Johnson advanced his predecessor’s racial justice agenda. The *Civil Rights Act of 1964* ended legally-sanctioned “systemic racism” in American society and culture. The Act was intended to eliminate
“Jim Crow” segregation laws and customs throughout the South and the rest of the nation, and its scope was sufficiently broad as it banned racial discrimination in voting booths (Title I); hotels, restaurants and theaters (Title II); public facilities including libraries, restrooms, public parks and swimming pools (Title III); and public schools (Title IV). The Act also empowered the federal government to reform and abolish certain institutions that sanctioned or promoted racial inequality, and to oversee and enforce these new regulations, the Civil Rights Commission was expanded (Title V). In addition, companies and institutions that received government money were subjected to increased government scrutiny (Title VI).

Other provisions prohibited companies with more than fifteen employees from practicing discriminatory practices in terms of hiring employees, while a new presidential agency, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), was empowered to conduct investigations and file lawsuits against noncompliant companies and institutions. In subsequent years, other laws refined the government’s power and control over companies and institutions that resisted these new regulations.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 strengthened the first two provisions of the Fifteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution (1870) which had never been consistently enforced:

- Section 1: “The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
- Section 2: The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The Voting Rights Act also effectively eliminated poll taxes and literacy tests that were often used selectively to disenfranchise racial minorities. In addition, a 1975 provision required jurisdictions containing significant language minority populations to provide bilingual ballots and other election materials.

The Fair Housing Act of 1968 eliminated discriminatory practices related to buying, renting and financing houses based on race, religion, national origin, and (since 1974) sex.

The cumulative effects of all this legislation profoundly impacted the racial dynamics in America. It not only sounded the death knell for officially-sanctioned de jure segregation but also for most forms of de facto racial discrimination. With that, America closed the book on systemic/institutional racism. Even the Harvard professor Derrick Bell, the aforementioned “father” of critical race theory, described the quarter-century after the Supreme Court’s school desegregation decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1954) as “the greatest racial consciousness-raising the country has ever known.” By law, Americans should be assessed on the basis of their own individual merits rather than their skin color, ethnicity or gender.

Affirmative Action.

America should be a nation of equal justice under the law. No person should be discriminated against or denied equal access or equal opportunity due to his/her group identity – be it racial or sexual. Therefore, conservatives oppose affirmative action quotas and other forms of legally-sanctioned discrimination that grant preferential treatment to minorities based on racial criteria in terms of admissions, scholarships, hiring, and promotions. Such policies constitute reverse discrimination against whites while stigmatizing blacks and other minorities who are quite capable of competing on an open and level playing field in which the sole bases for success are one’s character, work ethic, competence and experience.

Cultural liberals, however, continue to insist that “white privilege” and “systemic racism” are endemic to American society and a major problem that can only be remedied through perpetual racial preference policies and programs – even when no discrimination is evident. As Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) put it in 2020, “We need race-conscious laws.” In reality, however, the only “systemic racism” in contemporary America is affirmative action policies and programs that favor racial and ethnic minorities (and sometimes women). But if the goal is actually equal opportunity in a post-racial and color-blind society, there is no justification for race-based litmus tests that either favor or discriminate against anyone or any group on the basis of skin color. As David Horowitz writes in his book, The Enemy Within: How a Totalitarian Movement Is Destroying America:
It is a grim irony that for the last fifty years so-called progressives and the Democratic Party... have been working to turn back the clock and reverse the gains of the civil Rights Movement by introducing racial and gender categories and quotas into virtually every aspect of social life. [David Horowitz, The Enemy Within (Regnery Publishing, 2021), p. 10.]

Race and Racism

One of the most misused words in contemporary public discourse is “racism”. In fact, the word is thrown around so casually, so promiscuously and so disingenuously that it seems to have lost any real meaning. Most cultural conservatives still understand racism in the context of its traditional definition: The belief in the inherent genetic and/or cultural superiority of a certain race (or races) over others, and the attendant prejudice and discrimination that accompanies such beliefs. Therefore, according to the traditional definition of the word, people of any and all races can be guilty of racism and racial bigotry.

But as with everything else, cultural Marxists have redefined the meaning of racism to advance their ideological agenda. According to them, racism can only apply to the dominant/oppressor group – i.e., to white people – because only whites have the political, social and economic power to enact racial discrimination. Cultural liberals, whom Lenin described as the Communists’ “useful idiots,” generally accept this redefinition of racism that limits and applies the term exclusively to white prejudice and discrimination.

But as with everything else, cultural Marxists have redefined the meaning of racism to advance their ideological agenda. According to them, racism can only apply to the dominant/oppressor group – i.e., to white people – because only whites have the political, social and economic power to enact racial discrimination. Cultural liberals, whom Lenin described as the Communists’ “useful idiots,” generally accept this redefinition of racism that limits and applies the term exclusively to white prejudice and discrimination.

According to Roger Clegg of the Center for Economic Opportunity, the illegitimate birth rate is the prime indicator for predicting a child’s likelihood for success in terms of poverty, unemployment, crime, and level of education. In his words, “Anyone who has raised a child knows how enormously time consuming the job is for two parents, let alone one. Anyone who has raised a boy, in particular, knows that the father’s role, as model and disciplinarian, is irreplaceable.” As James Q. Wilson, a noted author and former president of the American Political Science Association once commented in a lecture at the American Enterprise Institute, the empirical data regarding the importance of family structure is “so strong that even some sociologists believe it!”

Children raised in single-parent homes are more likely to experience emotional problems, behave badly in school, and be incarcerated in prison. Nevertheless, more than half of the American public (and 70% of those under age 35) believe that having an out-of-wedlock child should not be considered morally irresponsible.

In reality, America is a land of opportunity and the most open society in all of human history. Kathleen Brush, in her incisive study of global racism entitled Racism and Anti-Racism in the World: Before and After 1945, presents an unvarnished assessment of the universal nature of the problem.

The objective of this book is to raise awareness to the origins and evolution of diversity, discrimination, and anti-discrimination in societies all over the world....
Most nations are demonstrably and unapologetically racist; they see real value in homogenous societies [that include] privileged and unprivileged people....

[Following World War II] America... became the first nation to establish an anti-racist legal system, and then the first nation with a private sector demonstrably committed to anti-racism.

African-Americans are the most educated and prosperous black population in the world.... The United States [is the world’s] leading anti-racist nation. [Kathleen Brush, *Racism and Anti-Racism in the World: Before and After 1945* (2020), p. 5, 67]

In *The Enemy Within*, David Horowitz argues that identity politics and the cult of critical race theory ignore the dedication and the sacrifices that millions of Americans of all races have made to defend the principles of a free, inclusive and equal opportunity society. “It [CRT] also ignores the actual American achievement: the creation, through two centuries of struggle, of a nation that is today the most inclusive and tolerant, multi-ethnic, and multi-racial society in human history.... America’s black citizenry [are] the freest, richest, most privileged black population in the world.”[Horowitz, *The Enemy Within*, pp. 6, 53.]

Critical race theorists have never answered the simple question: If white systemic racism is so overwhelmingly dominant and so oppressive in America, why is it that Asian Americans often outperform whites academically and economically? Furthermore, if white systemic racism is so overwhelmingly dominant and so oppressive in America, why do non-white foreign nationals – both legal and illegal immigrants – continue to flood into the U. S. each and every year?

In reality, studies consistently show that in most cases one need do only five things to avoid a life of abject poverty and failure in America:

1. Finish high school;
2. Master standard conventional English;
3. Develop a good work ethic;
4. Marry before having a child; and
5. Avoid self-destructive habits and addiction to alcohol and/or drugs.

In contemporary public discourse much is made of “white privilege.” In fact, in certain situations there is no doubt that white privilege does exist, and some people profit primarily because they are white. However, black privilege, minority privilege, and female privilege are also realities due to affirmative action policies and programs that are implemented in many institutions and organizations to favor non-whites or females.

Also consider other forms of privilege based on family connections, wealth, education, social status, or association with certain social groups. There are also special privileges accorded to politicians, physicians, ministers, athletes, entertainers and celebrities. “White privilege,” when it exists, is simply one manifestation of social inequality, but other factors should also be considered including an individual’s personality, character, competence and life experiences.

In a free society, true social justice is based on the principles of equal opportunity and equal justice under the law. Just as no two people are truly equal, no society can guarantee absolute equality. Any attempt to enforce absolute equality – or “equity” – is artificial and requires totalitarian control over people’s lives.

In all seriousness, any white person who is beset by “white guilt” or otherwise convinced that he/she holds a position exclusively or primarily because of his/her race should do the right thing: resign so that a person of color can take the job. Otherwise, get honest and cease all the self-righteous and phony virtue-signaling.

The Problem of Racialism

Realistically, a more pervasive and insidious problem than racism in American society today is racialism – an extreme hyper-sensitivity toward all things racial. Obsessed with identity politics, racialists are fixated on skin color and process everything through a racial grid that distorts their perspective on reality and inflames racial tensions. Racialists are not necessarily racists in the true sense of the term. Nonetheless, like racism, racialism is a pathological mental and moral disorder.

Undoubtedly, residual racism still exists in American society – but it is an intrinsically human problem that transcends all social, cultural, political, and religious boundaries and affects whites, blacks, and all other racial and ethnic groups alike. Thankfully, white racism is no longer socially acceptable in
mainstream society. The same standard should apply to all public expressions of race-based bigotry.

Racialism can be a greater problem than racism—but unfortunately it is an accepted component of the whole postmodern politically-correct orientation. Although many liberals and leftists claim to reject racism per se, racialism is not only tolerated but actively promoted through programs and institutions that foster racial and ethnic separatism—everything from African-American studies departments in universities, separate dorms, cafeterias, fraternities and sororities, and even separate graduation ceremonies for black students—to the Congressional Black Caucus (which excludes black Republicans) and the Black Entertainment Television network (BET). To reiterate a previous point: Racialism constitutes the most perverse obsession with race and identity politics since the dominance of the Ku Klux Klan in the American South or the triumph of Nazism in Germany in the 1930s.

As referenced earlier, there is a soul solution to this sickness. In Galatians 3:28 we read: “You are all children of God through faith in Jesus Christ.... There is neither Jew nor Greek,... male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.” If race had been a prominent issue at the time, I suspect that the apostle Paul would also have added, “There is neither Jew nor Greek,... male nor female, black nor white nor brown, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.” Likewise, Jesus’ command in Matthew 22:37-39 applies to all humanity: “Love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, mind and strength... and love your neighbor as yourself.”

Postscript: What About “Hate Crimes” Legislation?

In response to what they perceive to be inequities in the American criminal justice system, many liberals and leftists call for expanding and strengthening “hate crimes” legislation. This is, however, exceedingly problematic. For one thing, what exactly constitutes “hate”? The idea of punishing a criminal more severely based on his or her motive is unprecedented in the history of Western jurisprudence. Furthermore, classifying certain offenses as “hate crimes” violates the principle of equal justice under the law as set forth in the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Punishing someone more severely for a crime committed against a particular racial, ethnic or religious minority, a woman or a homosexual is tantamount to punishing the perpetrator for his (supposed) motive rather than for the act itself. A thought may be a sin, but it is not a crime, and there is no place for thought police in a free society. The very idea of a “thought crime” is literally—and chillingly—Orwellian.

Who can possibly know, in lieu of an admission on the part of the defendant, why someone committed an act or why he targeted a particular person? And does it really matter why he did it rather than the fact that he did it? Certainly, the negative effect on the victim is the same regardless of the perpetrator’s motive. The whole concept of “hate crime” legislation is un-American and indefensible. It implies that some people are more equal than others and some people’s lives and property deserve more protection than that of others—all of which violates the principle of equal protection under the law and the concept of “blind justice.”

NOTE: For an in-depth study of the origins and impact of critical theory, critical race theory, and other assaults on contemporary American society and culture, see Jefrey D. Breshears, American Crisis: Cultural Marxism and the Culture War – A Christian Response (Centre•Pointe, 2020).
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