

— 4 —

CONTEMPORARY PROGRESSIVE XIANITY

1. Theological Liberalism

[Ref. Parts 1-3]

2. The Secular Socialist Agenda

[Ref. Jeffrey D. Breshears, *American Crisis: Cultural Marxism and the Culture War – A Christian Assessment*; C. S. Lewis on *Politics, Government, and the Good Society*; and *The Life & Legacy of Francis Schaeffer*.

3. The Sexual Agenda

[Ref. Jeffrey D. Breshears, *American Crisis: Cultural Marxism and the Culture War* (pp. 69-70; 321-330).]

The Sexual Revolution.

- Secular ideology and “sexual liberation”.
 - ▶ A driving force in the French Revolution and the writings of Karl Marx.
- The “sexual revolution” as an essential component of cultural Marxism.
- Since the 1920s, Neo-Marxists have emphasized the ‘X’ factor as part of their strategy for cultural subversion.
- A key component of cultural Marxism: the integration of Marxism and Freudianism.
- Sexual repression v. sexual libertinism.

Christianity and Sexuality.

- C. S. Lewis in *Mere Christianity*:
 - ▶ “Chastity is the most unpopular of Christian virtues.... There is no getting away from it; the Christian rule is, “Either marriage, with complete faithfulness to your partner, or else abstinence.... Christian sexual morality is so contrary to our instincts that either Christianity is wrong or our sexual instincts have been perverted.”
- Philip Rieff in *The Triumph of the Therapeutic* (1966):
 - ▶ The sexual revolution of the Sixties is the premier example of our society’s “deconversion” from generic Christianity to post-Christian secular humanism.
- Rod Dreher in *The Benedict Option* (2017):
 - ▶ Sex, if used “in a disordered way, can be one of the most destructive forces on earth.”
 - ▶ “For a Christian, there is only one right way to use the gift of sex: within marriage between one man and one woman. This is heresy to the modern world.... There is no core teaching of the Christian faith that is less popular today, and perhaps none more important to obey.... There is no other area in which orthodox Christians will have to be as countercultural as in our sexual lives....
 - ▶ “There can be no peace between Christianity and the Sexual Revolution because they are radically opposed.”

Sexuality and the Culture War.

- The most intense conflicts in our current culture war are waged on the sexual front between those who seek to uphold standards based on traditional moral values and those who prefer a more libertine and permissive attitude regarding human sexuality.
- In a nation built on individual civil liberties, Biblical standards of sexual morality cannot be imposed on consenting adults.
- Christian beliefs regarding human sexuality derive directly from a biblical worldview.
 - ▶ Humans have a distinct and fixed nature, along with an innate moral conscience, and are accountable to God for how we think and act.
 - ▶ God has an intended purpose for human sexuality just as for everything else in life.
 - ▶ In his love for humanity, God established specific guidelines regarding sexual behavior.
 - ▶ Christians and other cultural conservatives accept what human beings have always recognized: males and females are inherently different.
 - These differences are not only physiological in terms of anatomy and genitalia, but are also manifest at the hormonal and even the chromosomal levels.
 - Gen. 1:27 (also, Mark 10:6): “So God created man in his own image;... male and female created he them.”
- Cultural liberals seek to eliminate the distinction between male and female by promoting unisex social standards, homosexuality and even transgenderism.
- The LGBTQ+ agenda marks the ultimate triumph of secular humanism in general and the sexual revolution in particular by scorning most everything that civilized societies have known about anthropology since the dawn of recorded history.
- Cultural liberals argue that there is no fixed human nature and that gender is fluid.
 - ▶ Rod Dreher: “*The new normal is that there is no normal.*”
- Sexual exhibitionism in mainstream American culture.
- C. S. Lewis: Ever since the 1920s and the dawn of the Jazz Age, Western societies have been inundated and saturated with sexual propaganda.
 - ▶ The result has been anything but wholesome and socially beneficial: it has only contributed to a dramatic increase in sexual chaos and sexual anarchy.
- 20th century sex propagandists – from Sigmund Freud, Eric Fromm and Wilhelm Reich to Alfred Kinsey and Hugh Hefner – argued that repression of the sexual libido was psychologically unhealthy and worse than sexual promiscuity.
 - ▶ C. S. Lewis: “Everyone knows that the sexual appetite, like our other appetites, grows by indulgence.”
- The sexualization (and in many cases, pornification) of America through Hollywood movies, TV, popular music, the Internet and other mass media outlets is a major contributing factor to the moral chaos that is degrading our culture.

The Social Consequences.

- The Sexual Revolution and the illegitimate birth rate.
- 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 America in terms of poverty, unemployment, crime, and level of education.
- James Q. Wilson: 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 have emotional problems, behave badly in school, and be incarcerated in prison.

Homosexuality.

- The LGBTQ argument: “Homosexuality is natural for some people.”
 - The Bible is unequivocal that homosexual sexual activity is sinful.
 - ▶ **Lev. 18:22** and **20:13** – Homosexual activity is “detestable” and an “abomination.”
 - ▶ In **Genesis 19** – God’s judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah.
 - ▶ **Matt. 19:4-6** – The only valid form of sexual interaction is between a married man and a woman, who then become “one flesh.”
 - ▶ **Rom. 1:18-32** – Homosexual activity is “unnatural” – i.e., contrary to God’s purpose for sexuality.
 - Homosexual behavior is also contrary to generic natural (moral) law.
 - ▶ **I Cor. 6:9-10** – Homosexual sex is wicked and “sexually immoral” – as is fornication, adultery, prostitution, drunkenness, idolatry, greed, etc.
 - ▶ **I Tim. 1:9-10** – Sexual perversion includes those who “practice homosexuality.”
- [NOTE: A distinction should be made between people who, due to various reasons, are *attracted* to others of the same sex and those who indulge in homosexual *behavior*. We all have psychological/mental disorders – based on complex factors – that we must constantly resist and control.]
- **Q:** How do you know that homosexuality is “natural” for some people?
 - ▶ How exactly would the “homosexual gene” be passed on?
 - **Q:** “Why do you think homosexuality is ‘natural’?
 - ▶ Why would ‘nature’ give people *bodies* for one kind of sex and *desires* for another kind of sex?”
 - **Q:** Shouldn’t one follow the design of one’s anatomy rather than the impulses of one’s desires?
 - **Nancy Pearcey** in *Love Thy Body* (2018):
 - ▶ “Nature has an order, a plan, a purpose, a design. And we are happier and healthier when we live in accord with that design – when our biological sex, gender identity, and sexual desire are in harmony.”

[NOTE: In 1973 the **American Psychiatric Association** removed homosexuality from its list of mental illness – despite no new “scientific” evidence. This declaration helped shift public opinion and marked a major milestone in the LGB agenda.

Likewise, in 1974 the **American Psychological Association** followed suit, declaring homosexuality to be “a normal and positive variation of human sexual orientation.... Homosexuality per se is not a mental disorder....”

“Same-Sex Marriage.”*

- ▶ Marriage is by definition the union of one man and one woman.
 - ▶ **Gen. 2:24** – “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh.”
 - ▶ Jesus in **Mark 10:6-8**.
- Traditional marriage is the optimal family environment for raising healthy and well-adjusted children.
- Cultural liberals think they have the prerogative to redefine marriage.

* Note the Pew Research Center study of 2019 on same-sex marriage.

The Transgender Agenda.

- John Stonestreet (of the Colson Center):
 - ▶ Nowadays, the LGB movement has largely retired the “born this way” argument to make way for the “T” – transgender identity. So in place of “I was born this way and I can’t change,” we now hear “I was born this way, it was wrong, and I want to change....”
 - “My response is simple: Even if there is a biological impulse toward a certain kind of behavior, that doesn’t make it right to act on the impulse. Science tells us of all kinds of biological impulses for behaviors that are harmful, like depression, extreme anger and violence, anorexia, even pedophilia. And of course, biological impulses don’t alter the very clear biblical condemnations of homosexual behavior....”
 - “Are sexual desires driven more by one’s genetics or environment? Whatever their source, do attractions justify actions?”

The Sanctity of Life

The Abortion Agenda.

- Christians and other cultural conservatives hold that human life is sacred and that abortion-on-demand is an unconscionable crime against humanity.
- Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence: the right to life is a “self-evident” and “unalienable” right.
- Modern science confirms that human life begins at conception.
- Pro-abortion advocates argue that a pregnant woman should have the legal right to choose whether or not to kill her pre-born child.
- Cultural liberals not only oppose common sense provisions such as mandatory parental notification for underage daughters seeking abortions.
 - ▶ They also demand public funding of the hideous abortion industry.
 - ▶ Sanger advocated selective breeding to “weed out the unfit” from the human gene pool.
- Sexual revolutionaries intend to decouple sexual activity from the consequence of unwanted pregnancy.
- Barack Obama (2013): “Thank you, Planned Parenthood. God bless you. God bless America.”

The “Right to Choose.”

- Mother Teresa: “If a mother can kill her own children, then what can be next?”
- **Q:** “A woman’s right to choose *what*? Please be specific.”
 - ▶ “Mommy [or Daddy], can I kill this?”
 - ▶ Greg Koukl: Before you can know whether or not it’s right to kill any living thing, you first have to know what it is you’re killing.
- **Q:** “What scientific evidence is there that a *fetus* is anything but a human life?”
- **Q:** “Do you think a mother and a doctor have the right to kill a baby after it’s born?”
- **Q:** “Do you think a mother and a doctor have the right to kill a baby just before it’s born?”
- **Q:** “If we should protect life at one end of the birth canal, why not at the other end?”
- **FACT:** A baby is a separate “being” from its mother with its own genetic code, etc.
- **FACT:** Less than 1% of abortions are to save the life of a mother. [Guttmacher Institute survey]

“A *fetus* is not a child until it can survive outside its mother’s body.”

- **Q:** “Can a 1-week-old (or 1-month-old or 1-year-old) child survive outside its mother’s body?”
- The spurious distinction between “humanness” and “personhood.”
- The spurious argument regarding “unwanted” babies.

Why Are Churches Celebrating Sin?

Scott Hogenson

(Feb 19, 2023)

https://townhall.com/columnists/scotthogenson/2023/02/19/why-are-churches-celebrating-sin-n2619660?utm_source=thedailymp&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&recip=18913842

Not all sins are treated equally. Increasingly, Protestant churches are celebrating sin through the installation of ministers whose behavior promotes LGBTQ ideology. Consider this February 15th report whose headline heralds the "First openly transgender pastor called to guide Lutheran church in North Dakota."

"The pastor's installation was unanimously approved by the congregation of the church, which has reportedly hosted town hall meetings to discuss, among other things, whether people should be forced to deny reality by calling women men, and vice versa; and whether children should be protected from genital mutilation. One can only speculate as to how those discussions will be steered."

The article goes on to quote the new pastor saying, "Historically the church hasn't been kind to transgender people. A lot of churches still aren't kind to transgender people." I do not know how the pastor defines what is kind or unkind but I do know that historically, the church has believed in the word of God as written in the Bible. A lot of churches still believe what is written in the Bible.

The behavior that defines LGBTQ ideology is sinful. That's not my assessment, that's what Christ said. He laid it out in the Gospel of Mark when He said, "Out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, sexual immorality, theft, murder, adultery, coveting, wickedness, deceit, sensuality, envy, slander, pride, foolishness. All these evil things come from within, and they defile a person."

Affirming and celebrating the behavior of LGBTQ adherents raises a question for Christians: If we're going to celebrate this sin, what other sins are we prepared to celebrate? That's a scary proposition and it's already happening.

The sin of murder is celebrated through the increase of euthanasia [and abortion]. The sin of theft is celebrated through prosecutors who have decriminalized it through their failure to prosecute. The sins of coveting, envy and deceit are celebrated through Critical Race Theory.

Components of Critical Race Theory are even creeping into conservative parishes today. Whether this portends churches celebrating the sins of CRT's advocacy for race hatred or its alignment with Marxist ideology remains to be seen.

We all sin, and through confession, repentance and grace, God forgives us. We are also called to forgive those who sin against us. Whether these are sins of sexual immorality, envy, theft or anything else, our duty is to forgive others as God forgives us.

But forgiving sin is not the same as affirming it.

The Bible instructs us to love one another but it also tells us to abhor that which is evil. None of my sins should be celebrated; they should be abhorred. If any pastor in the pulpit affirmed or celebrated my sins, I would walk out in the middle of that sermon and find a better church. But more churches are celebrating more sins, and it's a colossal moral and civic hazard.

If the North Dakota pastor has been harassed, threatened, assaulted or otherwise treated unkindly, that is flat out wrong. Likewise, the pastor is entitled to the full enjoyment of and participation in American civic life, and I would demand that any effort to prevent the free exercise of these rights be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

But it is not unkind to believe what the Bible says. It is not unkind to call a sin a sin. It is not unkind to notice reality and natural law. These are normal behaviors. Just as I reject any affirmation of my sin, I reject any attempt to deny that which is normal and in accordance with Scripture.

In many cultures across time and space, the church has provided the moral bedrock of society. When churches celebrate sin, that bedrock crumbles and over time, so do the societies built upon it.

Fr. Calvin Robinson: Oxford Union Debate Speech

Opposing “This House Supports Same-Sex Marriage in Church” (February 4, 2023)

<https://calvinrobinson.substack.com/p/oxford-union-debate-speech>

Below is a transcript of my speech to the Oxford Union debate on the Feast of the Presentation of the Lord, in opposition against “This House Supports Same-Sex Marriage in Church.” I will upload the video to this post, when it becomes available. Dr Ian Paul and I went up against the Bishop of Buckingham, the Bishop of Dudley and the Bishop of Worcester. Suffice to say we lost the debate: 186 for, 41 against. I would like to thank those 41 sound students at Oxford who braved the lion’s den. It must be a very lonely place for them.

PRAYER: May the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be pleasing to you, O LORD.

Thank you for the invitation – it is a genuine pleasure to speak here tonight, and I am happy to see that the Oxford Union is still able to stand up for diversity of thought and opinion and defend free speech, even in the stifling atmosphere of 21st-century academia. Well done!

I struggled with this one. I’ve not slept much all week. I don’t get stage fright. I don’t get nervous when I go on TV, and I am used to public speaking – I’ve already done the Cambridge Union and Durham Union in the past couple of months with no problems whatsoever. But there is something different about this one that has been causing me real anxiety.

Someone kindly sent me Luke 12:11-12, “And when they bring you before the synagogues and the rulers and the authorities, do not be anxious about how you should defend yourself or what you should say, for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that very hour what you ought to say.”

But why the anxiety? We are up against the authorities - three bishops from the Established Church. That means either I am wrong – and Christians have been teaching incorrectly on marriage for 2,000 years – or we have Church leaders attempting to drag the Church into apostasy.

The consequences are severe. This debate is not just happening within this chamber. The house of bishops is debating this very topic as we speak. There is a growing number of vocal bishops who want to change the Church’s teaching on marriage, the result being the spiritual neglect of Anglicans up and down the country.

I may have trained at the last remaining sound Anglican seminary in the country – just up the road at St Stephen’s House – but I am only a newbie deacon. Perhaps I am wrong on this, so let’s consult people far wiser than me, starting with the Church Fathers.

St. Thomas Aquinas, in his *Summa Theologica*, quite clearly identifies Matrimony as being between one man

and one woman, beneficial for “begetting of children” and for the good of offspring for both educational and developmental purposes, “necessary for the perfection of the community” and for the worship of God.

St Paul describes marriage as, “Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and clings to his wife, and they become one flesh.” in which he is mirroring the language of Genesis, where God tells man and wife to “Be fruitful and multiply”.

Both Aquinas and Paul refer to Matrimony as a Sacrament. A holy mystery in which one man and one woman are joined together in a conjugal union with the



potential to be blessed by the grace of God with children, to start a family for the worship of God.

People will argue, “we know more about homosexuality now than we did then” maybe so. But are you then suggesting God knew less than we do now? For either all Scripture is God-breathed, or it isn’t. Either we believe Christ, or we don’t.

Let’s refer to another source, the Book of Common Prayer. One of the Anglican formularies, an authority of liturgy and catechism in the Anglican Church:

The Prayerbook lists three ordained reasons for Matrimony:

First, it was ordained for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nature of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy name.

Secondly, it was ordained for a remedy against sin, and to avoid fornication; that such persons as have not the gift of continency might marry, and keep themselves undefiled members of Christ’s body.

Thirdly, it was ordained for the mutual society, help, and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity.

If we look at the wider Church, the Catechism of the Catholic Church defines matrimony as:

The matrimonial covenant, by which a man and a woman establish between themselves a partnership of the whole of life, is by its nature ordered toward the good of the spouses and the procreation and education of offspring; this covenant between baptized persons has been raised by Christ the Lord to the dignity of a sacrament.

This is referred to as marriage in God’s plan.

Are we looking to alter the catechism of just the Anglican Church, or should the Catholic Church ‘get with the times’, too? 2,000 years of Christian doctrine and 4,000 years of Jewish doctrine cannot be altered at the whim of a few liberal bishops. What is God-ordained cannot be adjusted to suit our liberal progressive worldviews. Marriage is heterosexual and monogamous and should be open to the possibility of children.

The Bible backs all of this up, it is very clear throughout on this matter. Marriage is between one man and one woman for the purpose of procreation. Sex outside of marriage is a sin. That is the same for heterosexuals as it is for homosexuals. Although, the Bible is also very clear that same-sex sexual relations are abhorrent.

And before some smart aleck starts asking me if I’m wearing mixed fabrics – there is a difference between moral laws and ceremonial laws. Christ came to fulfil the Old Laws. Both the issues of marriage and homosexuality are addressed in the New Testament. In Paul’s epistles, but also in the Gospels. Jesus talks of marriage in Mark and Matthew, both in the context of heterosexual union.

So my question to the bishops would be, do we not believe in the authority of the Scriptures any more? Can we pick and choose which parts of the Gospel we adhere to?

The Church is Christ’s bride. Jesus is described as the bridegroom so that we may know how he relates to us. Two grooms would be pointless; Christ is already in union with the Father and the Holy Spirit; it is us he is inviting in. Two brides are what we’re looking at here; the Church is attempting to marry itself and leave Christ out of the picture.

We are directly talking about undermining God’s plan as he has revealed it to us. We are replacing his authority with our own.

If marriage is no longer between one man and one woman, are we open to the idea of polygamy? We disregard the heterosexual aspect. Why not the monogamous aspect, too? If love is love. Who is to say three men in a relationship is not more loving than two?

And I’m sure someone will echo those dreaded words tonight: love is love. This is about marriage. The Sacrament of Holy Matrimony. Not directly about love. Too many people who utter those words have a confused understanding of love. Agape – love in a Biblical context - divine love is a sacrificial love. It is not lustful. People often conflate sex with love, that is very disingenuous.

Then, of course, atheists often parrot the words “God is love” again without any understanding. Yes, God is love, and he sets the terms, not us.

Another one we’ll hear plenty of is ‘inclusivity’. Shouldn’t the Church be more inclusive? Again it’s a play on words people use to virtue signal. To appear good rather than being good.

The Church should absolutely be inclusive. Christ spent time with tax collectors and prostitutes, but it is they who went away changed, not he. We are all fallen, and therefore we are all sinners. The Church is open to sinners, that is its purpose, but it should not

encourage people to continue sinning.

Our duty as clerics is to help lead people to Christ, to lead them away from sin, not to embrace and affirm sin.

I know many LGB people who live lives in Christ – abstaining from sexual gratification to be closer to God. It is not easy, and perhaps not fair, but it is right, and it is good. These people are being let down. I have had people crying, saying, “I could have got married. I did what the Church taught as right, and now the Church is saying it was wrong all along?”

As Christians, we are called to be in the world but not of the world. The trap we have fallen into with this debate is looking at the Church through the eyes of the world around us rather than through His Kingdom.

In the secular world, we all have equality in law. People can enter civil partnerships or even gay marriage outside of the Church, and that is their prerogative. However, the faith is inherently discriminatory. God is discriminatory. He set conditions on us entering his heavenly kingdom. It is not a free-for-all. Turn away from sin – repent – and follow Christ.

And I want to specify it is the sin that is the problem. Not the sinner. Every single person is loved by God. And God forgives us of our depravity. But we have to turn away from our sins and turn toward him. It seems the panel opposite me has forgotten to separate the sin from the sinner. One can denounce sin whilst welcoming the sinner.

So as I wrap up, my message to the proposing side is, do not lead people astray. Do not be the wolves in sheep’s clothing or the false teachers the Bible warns us about. Remember your obligation to defend the faith. Stop teaching about diversity, inclusion and equality. Get back to teaching about Redemption and Salvation!

This is spiritual neglect. Help people by telling them the truth. Be kind to them by supporting them through their struggles and reminding them Christ suffers with them, and be compassionate by leading them to Christ when the world tries to lead them away from him.

The Church is imploding. The faithful masses have stopped turning up on Sundays. We are seeing the most rapid decline of Christianity in this country that we may have ever seen. Do not accelerate this with heresy.

You do not have the authority to bless sin! When I hear the bishop of London on record saying these new prayers will mean priests can bless same-sex relationships, some of which will be sexual in nature, I hear the devil at work. Bishops are promoting the idea of sacramental sodomy. Let them be anathema! Repent!

And to the rest of you. I have no doubt some of you will consider me a bigot, a homophobe. But I am neither of those things. I am simply a follower of Christ. A Christian. We are naturally counter-cultural, and if the so-called liberals were truly diverse and tolerant, they would embrace us just as they embrace everyone else.

There is a growing Christophobic attitude around this public debate and an ugly level of hypocrisy. We rarely see people hold Moslems and people of other faiths to the expectations they hold us Christians to. Who is calling for Islam to embrace gay marriage? Who is calling for the Quran to be updated to modern norms? Yeah, I thought not. It is at the same time patronising to people of others faiths and intolerance toward Christians. Shame. But in the words of St. Athanasius of Alexandria: “If the world is against the truth, then I am against the world.”

VIDEO:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yMbTb2HS5Rc&t=4s&ab_channel=OxfordUnion

4. The Racialist Agenda

[Ref. Jeffrey D. Breshears, *Critical Race Theory: A Critical Analysis* (pp. 16-20); and Jeffrey D. Breshears, *American Crisis: Cultural Marxism and the Culture War* (pp. 316-321).]

Racism and Racialism.

- Racism: The belief in the inherent genetic superiority of a certain race (or races) over others, and the attendant discrimination that accompanies such beliefs.
 - ▶ People are judged by their group identity rather than as individuals.
 - ▶ A new re-definition: Since whites are the majority and the power-elite in American society, they alone can be “racist” since only they have the power to enforce their bigotry.
 - Such a notion is intellectually dishonest and defies reality.
 - ▶ In keeping with the tenets of neo-Marxist Critical Race Theory (CRT), the intention is to assign permanent victimhood status to blacks and other minorities and attribute any problems primarily or exclusively to white racism.
- Perhaps a more pervasive and insidious problem than racism is racialism: an extreme hypersensitivity toward all things racial.
 - ▶ Obsessed with identity politics, racialists fixate on skin color and process everything through a racial grid.
 - ▶ Like racism, racialism is a pathological mental disorder.
- Racism is an intrinsically human problem that transcends all social, cultural, political, and religious boundaries and all racial and ethnic groups.
- Racialism is as great a problem as racism, but it is increasingly accepted.

Origins of Racialism.

- In *Critical Race Theory: A Critical Analysis*, I trace the philosophical and political origins of Critical Race Theory to neo-Marxist theoreticians in the 1920s.
 - ▶ Rather than foment a revolution in America on the basis of traditional Marxist “class warfare,” neo-Marxists shifted the emphasis to racial injustice.
- The origins of contemporary CRT.
- CRT is antithetical to the core message of Martin Luther King Jr. and the mainstream Civil Rights movement that advocated a “color-blind” society in which people are judged as individuals based on the content of their character rather than the color of their skin.
- CRT is best understood as “critical racist theory.”
 - ▶ It constitutes the most perverse obsession with race and identity politics since the dominance of the KKK in the American South or the triumph of Nazism in Germany.

The Bible and Race: Three Foundational Principles.

(1) All human beings are created in the *imago Dei* – the image of God.

- ▶ **Gen. 1:27:** “So God created man in his own image,... male and female he created them.”
- ▶ All human beings are created equal.

(2) Sin – including the sin of racism – is personal and universal.

- ▶ Sin transcends race, sex, ethnicity, social class, and all other factors.
- ▶ There are absolute and universal standards of right and wrong, decency and civility – to which all people are accountable.
 - The Bible does not condone moral relativism on any grounds – be it racial, ethnic, cultural, social class or gender.
 - All people are held to the same moral and ethical standards.
- ▶ Sin only becomes “institutionalized” or “systemic” because human beings are inherently egocentric sinners.

(3) Christians should be “trans-racial (or “post-racial”) in our attitudes and behavior toward all people.

- ▶ **Gal. 3:28** – “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 undoubtedly would have added, “In Christ... there is neither white or black or brown.”
- ▶ The Bible teaches racial equality.
 - As Christians, our identity comes from our relationship with God through the saving grace of Jesus Christ and the derivative faith and character we develop.
- ▶ Racial identity is nothing for which one should be either proud nor ashamed – it is simply a fact of nature.
 - 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).
- ▶ We are created as individuals, and God judges us as individuals.
 - Our self-identity comes through a realistic awareness of who and what we are as a unique person created in the image of God – not our race or ethnicity.
- ▶ While we should be sensitive to the unique life experiences of others, it is not good to patronize anyone for any reason.
 - To think and act otherwise is to rob people of their individuality and their inherent dignity, which is dehumanizing.
 - To grant exceptions to certain people based on their racial identity is itself racist.

The Problem of Racialism.

- Racial propaganda is pervasive in contemporary American society.
- America provides more equal opportunity than any nation in history.
- The last vestiges – of legally-sanctioned systemic racial discrimination ended with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and other social justice legislation.
- What about white “systemic racism”?
- The issue of affirmative action.
 - ▶ Affirmative action as racial discrimination.
 - Affirmative action and “equal justice in an equal opportunity society.”
 - Affirmative action and the principle of meritocracy.
- Five keys to success:
 - (1) Master standard English and graduate from high school;
 - (2) Develop an honest and dependable work ethic;
 - (3) Marry before having a child;
 - (4) Obey the law(!); and
 - (5) Avoid self-destructive habits and addictions.*
- The issue of “white privilege.”
 - ▶ Other forms of “privilege” based on race, sex, education, vocation, socio-economic status, etc.
 - ▶ Other factors to be considered: 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.

* Ref. Roger Clegg, “Percentage of Births to Unmarried Women.” Other than the nation in which one lives, “the most important factor in explaining disparities in all manner of life outcomes (poverty, unemployment, crime, education, etc.) is whether one was born out-of-wedlock.” In the U.S. today (2019), nearly 40% of all birth are out-of-wedlock. [<https://www.ceousa.org/issues/1354-percentage-of-births-to-unmarried-women>]